Volume 3, Number 2, Spring 1989

Home Economics FORUM

HUMAN NEEDS

Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu Offices
1257 Haslett Road
Haslett, MI 48840
January 15, 1989

Dear Chapter:

We, the national officers of Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu, are pleased to present the enclosed Consolidation Plan for your careful consideration. This Plan truly represents a model of collaboration. Armed with the input from many of our members, we shared responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making. With an openness to risk and innovation, our two groups created a Consolidation Plan that builds on strengths and proposes changes that will embrace new visions and scholarly pursuits for the profession. A climate of mutual respect helped us deal with opposite points of view and problems that were identified through membership feedback.

From the beginning, our similarities in philosophies and interests were a factor in the development of a synergistic relationship. The collaborative work we shared occurs in special settings or in unusual circumstances. We have come to appreciate the significance of our pursuit and hope you share in our commitment.

Most accomplishments of a collaborative group come from hard work but a portion can be attributed to the intense caring of the partners. We ask you to examine the Consolidation Plan and share your suggestions so that we can be assured that the best minds of our two societies have contributed to this document.

Sincerely yours,

Peggy S. Meszaros
KOPhi President

Gladys G. Vaughn
KOPhi President-Elect

Janelle Walter
KOPhi Vice President/Program

Shirley Hymon-Hendricks
KOPhi Vice President/Finance

Gwen C. Cooke
ON President

Sharon A. Wallace
ON President-Elect

Virginia Clark
ON Vice-President

Katharine B. Hall
ON Secretary

Donna Beth Downer
ON Treasurer

Reed McMillan
ON CDR

Jan Smith
ON CDR

Rob Vail
ON CDR

Lisa Swopes
KOPhi SR

Michele Hollis
KOPhi SR

Honor Society

Consolidation Plan

Mission

____________________ is a national honor society* for Home Economics** units that grant the baccalaureate or higher degrees. The Society recognizes and promotes excellence in scholarship, research, and leadership and thereby advances the field. The Society is composed of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and professional members who support the purposes of the organization. To accomplish this mission, __________ pledges

- to promote scholarship and encourage intellectual development.
- to promote research and foster the spirit of inquiry.
- to confer distinction for high achievement.
- to promote leadership development.
- to stimulate student and faculty dialogue.
- to enrich the intellectual environment of higher education institutions.
- to impose high standards of practice and ethical behavior.
- to stimulate worthy attitudes toward professional responsibility for the public good.

Membership Categories and Eligibility Criteria

- **Collegiate—** This membership category includes students enrolled in undergraduate or graduate programs at the time of initiation.
  Undergraduate Students shall
  - Be enrolled in the institution represented by the chapter.
  - Have declared a major in Home Economics or one of the Home Economics-related specializations as identified in the Classification of Instructional Programs (e.g. 13.1313, 19.01-19.999, 20.0209, etc.).
  - Have completed 45 semester hours or equivalent, including 12 semester hours in Home Economics or one of the Home Economics-related specializations.
  - Have a minimum GPA of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. Rank in the top 25% of the university class.

  Graduate Students shall
  - Be enrolled in a graduate program in Home Economics or one of the Home Economics-related specializations as identified in the Classification of Instructional Programs.
  - Have completed 12 semester hours of graduate work or equivalent.
  - Have a minimum GPA of 3.5 on a 4.0 scale.

- **Professional—**This membership category includes
  - Alumni initiated as either undergraduate or graduate students.
  - Professionals who have earned one or more Home Economics degrees with a 3.0 GPA as undergraduates or 3.5 as graduate students, not previously initiated into the honor society (or its predecessors).
  - Professionals, without a Home Economics degree but working in the field, who have made distinctive contributions to the profession.

- **Honorary—**This membership category includes professionals, working outside the field, who have made distinctive contributions to the field of Home Economics.

Organizational Structure

The Society shall be organized in the following manner:

- National Headquarters with Executive Director and Staff.
- Conclave — The government of the organization shall be vested in the Conclave of delegates.
  - One delegate (chapter president or designee) per collegiate and alumni chapter — each delegate one vote.
  - Each member of the Board of Directors one vote.
- Board of Directors — Between Conclaves the governance of the honor society shall be in the hands of the Board of Directors.
  - President and President-Elect — President- Elect elected annually for a one-year term as President-Elect and a one-year term as President.
  - Vice President/Program — Two-year term elected in even years.
  - Vice President/Finance — Two-year term elected in odd years.
  - Secretary — Two-year term elected in even years.
  - Three Student Representatives, elected at Conclave.
  - Executive Director, ex officio, nonvoting.
- Chapters
  - Collegiate
  - Alumni
- Standing Committees — Committees shall be appointed by the President with the consent of the Board of Directors, with the exception of the Editorial and Nominating Committee members who shall be elected.
  - Awards
  - Constitution and Bylaws
  - Editorial
  - Finance
  - Membership
  - Nominating
  - Program
- Elections — Each active member*** is entitled to vote for members of the Board of Directors and Editorial and Nominating Committee members.

Membership Benefits and Services

- Active membership benefits:
  - Recognition as a scholar.
  - Membership in a collegiate or alumni chapter.
  - Leadership opportunities as officers or committee members.
  - Participation in governance.
  - Fellowship, scholarship, and award opportunities.
  - Professional, leadership, and research development opportunities.
  - Refereed publication.
  - Communication with honor society and other professional networks.
- Membership services:
  - Programs
    - Scholarship
      - Matching Chapter Scholarship Program
      - Masters/Doctoral Fellowships
    - Project Grants for Alumni
  - Research
    - Student Research Papers
    - Alumni Research Grants
    - Masters/Doctoral Fellowships
    - Refereed Publications
    - Grantsmanship and Research Workshops
  - Leadership
    - Committee and Officer Service
    - Conclave and Regional Meetings
    - Outstanding Chapter and Adviser Awards
    - Student and Alumni Programs and Workshops
- Communications
  - Refereed Research Publications and Presentations
  - Newsletters
  - Brochures
  - Governance Documents

Financial Management

- The Finance Committee shall be responsible for recommending practices and policies to the Board of Directors to assure sound financial management of the Society.
- The Finance Committee shall consist of the following elected and appointed members:
  - Vice President/Finance
  - One Student Representative from the Board of Directors, appointed by the President in even numbered years for a two-year term.
  - One member from the active professional membership appointed by the President in odd numbered years for a two-year term
  - President
  - President-Elect
  - Executive Director, ex officio, nonvoting
- The functions of the Finance Committee shall be to
  - Develop the long-term fiscal program (proposed budget and investment program) to accomplish the mission and program priorities for the approval of the Conclave.
  - Recommend needed adjustments to the annual budget to the Board of Directors.
  - Propose long-term and annual development fund appeals for the Society for restricted and unrestricted endowed funds.
- At the point of consolidation
  - All funds shall become the property of the new organization.
  - All unrestricted funds shall become the base for growth and development activities for the new organization.
- Those funds that are designated as restricted fellowship funds shall remain intact as designated in perpetuity.
  - All endowed funds shall be administered by the new organization.
- Those funds that are designated as restricted trust funds shall remain intact until the monies are depleted.
  - Omicron Nu Life Memberships shall be honored.
  - Kappa Omicron Phi *Distaff* Life Subscriptions shall expire with the tenth volume of *Home Economics FORUM.*
- The new organization shall not establish new life memberships.
- All member benefits shall accrue to any active member of the new organization.
- The fee structure shall include
  - Initiation fee — $20.00
  - Annual national dues, including subscription — $15.00
- The new organization shall support the continuation of program initiatives that implement its mission.
- The new organization shall accept and administer new gifts for endowed programs (scholarship, research, leadership).

Transition Plans to Implement Affirmative Vote

- Announcement of Consolidation Vote—January 1, 1990—Publicity release to chapters and AHEA *Action*, announcement in *Home Economics FORUM.*
- Name of the New Organization — In addition to determining whether or not consolidation takes place, chapters shall choose among three alternative names:
  - Kappa Omicron Nu
  - Omicron Society
  - Sigma Rho Lambda (scholarship, research, leadership)

**An honor society is an association of primarily collegiate members and chapters whose purposes are to encourage and recognize superior scholarship at either undergraduate or graduate levels. —Assoc. of College Honor Societies*

***The term encompasses a variety of academic unit names, e.g., Human Ecology, Human Resources, Family and Consumer Sciences, etc.*

****Active member — Collegiate or professional member who pays annual national dues. Undergraduate and graduate student members will not be required to pay further national dues for one full academic year following the year of initiation.*

- Chapter Names — In addition to selecting the name of the organization, chapters shall choose among three alternative processes for naming chapters:
  - Sequencing chapter names according to dates of installation
  - Lottery
  - *Kappa* in front of all Kappa Omicron Phi chapter names and *Omicron* in front of all Omicron Nu chapter names
- Insignia for New Organization — Key of Greek letters to represent the name. The first Conclave shall choose among proposed designs.
- Initiation Ceremony for New Organization — The ceremonies of the founding societies, with an addendum to explain the new organization, shall be used until the 1991 Conclave selects a ceremony.
- Nominating Committees of each group shall be combined to prepare a ballot for Fall 1990 election for the following: President-Elect, Vice President/Program, Secretary, Nominating Committee members, Editorial Committee members, all of whom shall take office January 1, 1991.
- Terms of Officers of the founding societies shall be revised as follows:
  - Omicron Nu President and Kappa Omicron Phi President-On January 1, 1990, one shall become President and the other shall become President-Elect — decision to be made by lot.
  - Omicron Nu Vice President — end December 31, 1989 (shorten term 6 months).
  - Kappa Omicron Phi Vice President/Program — end December 31, 1990 (shorten term 6 months).
  - Omicron Nu Secretary — end December 31, 1990 (term extended 6 months).
  - Omicron Nu Treasurer-Elect — end June 30, 1990 to become Vice President/Finance July 1, 1990 and complete term December 31, 1991 (shorten term 6 months).
  - Kappa Omicron Phi Vice President/Finance — Vice President/Finance January 1, 1990 to June 30, 1990 (full term completed).
  - Omicron Nu CDRs — complete term to Conclave 1991.
  - Kappa Omicron Phi Student Representatives — One SR complete regular two-year term and extend one SR term for one year.
- Constitution — The provisions in the Consolidation Plan shall form the basis of the Constitution, and the document shall be written with the assistance of a parliamentarian and legal counsel. The 1991 Conclave shall approve the Constitution.
- Program Theme and Direction — No transition needed as the two groups have collaborated on programming for 1989-91.
- Planning for 1991 and beyond shall begin January 1, 1990 and shall be presented at Conclave 1991.
- Financial Planning — Adjustments to 1989-90 budgets may be needed for both societies until the fiscal year closes September 30, 1990. Budget preparation for 1990-91 and for 1991-93 shall begin January 1, 1990.
- Legal — The new organization shall be chartered in the State of Michigan as a non-profit corporation classified as tax-exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Consolidation Plan Distribution Process

February 1, 1989	Distribution to each Chapter (Feedback for refinement due August 15, 1989.).
April, 1989	Publication in *Home Economics FORUM*.
June, 1989	Discussion at AHEA FORUM.
August 3-6, 1989	Presentation at Omicron Nu Conclave.
August 15, 1989	Refinement of Consolidation Plan according to member feedback.
October 1, 1989	Distribution of Consolidation Plan to chapters for chapter vote on Consolidation.

Consolidation: Answers to Your Questions

Background

The notion of consolidation grew out of a strategic planning session for the Administrative Merger of Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu. The governing bodies of the two societies met prior to the AHEA Annual Meeting in St. Louis in June 1986 to assure that the Administrative Merger had clear direction for the future and for the day-to-day operation of the venture. The two groups clarified values and discussed mission statements and found that they shared the same visions for the future. Thus the mission statement for the Administrative Merger represented a consensus for direction.

The original Administrative Merger documents noted that both groups were committed to maintaining the distinct characteristics and strengths of the two organizations, to maximizing resources, and to making a significant impact on the profession through implementing shared goals. During the intensive planning session, these same ideas were reaffirmed but with one difference: the leaders proposed one honor society. It was felt that the synergistic effect of consolidating would ensure that the resulting organization would be greater than the sum of the individual parts. To accomplish these goals, an invitation to Phi Upsilon Omicron to join in discussion of one honor society was prepared.

Rationale

The underlying reasons for consolidating include the desire to offer more significant benefits to members, to increase the impact on the profession, to shape the future of society, and to manage resources effectively. The fact that all Home Economics honor societies have experienced declines in new initiates, as Home Economics units have changed direction and size, adds yet another reason to integrate management of human and material resources. The notion of consolidation was not born out of crisis but of good planning for the future.

More specifically, the planning group concluded that a consolidated society will give members of Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu

- One voice in advocacy for scholarship.
- Greater visibility of the honor society.
- Unity and clarity of purpose in the quest for excellence in scholarship, research, and leadership.
- A broader scholarly community for critical dialogue, collaboration, and networking.
- An arena for examination of the responsibility of scholars to society.
- Innovative and enhanced services.

Operationally, a consolidated society will conserve and effectively manage human and material resources, avoid duplication of effort, and increase efficiency. Furthermore, the planning group concluded that consolidation was supported by the following influences:

- Decline in membership.

- Increase in number of honor societies within the profession.
- Fragmentation of Home Economics.
- Increase in legal and association management complexity.

The strategic planning process was a systematic effort by the officers of the two honor societies to deal with the inevitability of change and to attempt to envision the future of the Administrative Merger. It was an effort to shape the future rather than to simply prepare for the future. Consolidation, it was concluded, served that end.

Why was the Administrative Merger formed?

Omicron Nu asked Kappa Omicron Phi to consider sharing an Executive Director and headquarters office facilities. The idea was appealing to Kappa Omicron Phi (even though it required moving KOPhi headquarters to Michigan) because Omicron Nu was interested in sharing in the publication of its refereed journal and because a permanent headquarters was a long-term goal. The prospects for lower operational costs and expanded services to members were also appealing to both honor societies.

If only the two groups are considering consolidation, why isn't the Administrative Merger collaboration adequate? Why do we need consolidation?

It is true that some of the benefits are already being realized, but the costs to maintain the distinct operational and financial procedures and different programs is inefficient use of the available human and financial resources. Consolidation will allow the financial resources to be allocated to specific goals according to the mission. The management of an honor society is subject to all of the complexities of legal and governmental regulations, and the cost of operating two groups for essentially the same purpose in this climate does not make good business or philosophical sense.

Who developed the Plan for Consolidation?

Representatives of each governing body have met in five face-to-face meetings to develop the structure of the plan, and responses by national officers to written drafts have been used to refine the plans.

How did members participate in the planning for consolidation?

Feedback from two questionnaires distributed to the general membership, three AHEA Forums, and Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu conclaves provided ideas for development and refinement of the Consolidation Plan.

When will the new society begin operations, if consolidation is approved?

January 1, 1990. See the Transition Plans in the Consolidation Plan (pp. 3-4).

Will I automatically become a member of the new society?

Yes, on January 1, 1990. A formal induction ceremony shall be held at the 1991 Conclave.

How will new chapters be named?

Based on the decision about the process for naming chapters of the founding societies, a proposal shall be submitted to the 1991 Conclave for approval.

Is a 3.0 GPA an appropriate standard for an honor society?

Yes. It is the current standard for each of the founding societies. This is a minimum standard, and all chapters will be encouraged to establish higher standards if, in so doing, a group size can be maintained to fulfill the functions of a chapter.

Is the eligibility criterion of 45 semester hours appropriate for honor society status?

Yes. This standard meets the ACHS requirements; combined with the 12 semester hours in Home Economics courses, this standard assures scholastic excellence in the field as well as in general education. Most students would be eligible in the junior year.

What will happen to my life membership in Omicron Nu?

Life membership in the new organization shall be honored, and active professional membership status will be maintained by the Life Membership Trust Fund.

What will happen to my life subscription to *Distaff*?

The life subscriptions shall be changed to a ten-year subscription to *Home Economics FORUM* which shall expire with the 10th volume, and the subscriptions shall be maintained by the Subscription Trust Fund.

How will Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu be remembered and honored?

The History of the founding societies shall be documented and preserved. The brochure about the new society shall include a brief historical description of the two founding so-

What are the similarities and differences between Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu?

	Kappa Omicron Phi	Omicron Nu
Founding	1922 Northwest Missouri State University	1912 Michigan State University
Total Membership	26,000	65,000
Active Chapters	79	50
Alumni Chapters	8 plus Alumni Chapter-at-Large	5 plus National Alumni Chapter
Publication	*Home Economics FORUM*	*Home Economics FORUM*
Purposes	Further the best interests of Home Economics by recognizing and encouraging scholastic excellence, developing leadership abilities, fostering professional activities and interests, promoting fellowship among faculty and students.	Recognize scholarship, leadership, and research potential of Home Economics students, promote graduate study and research, stimulate scholarship and leadership toward the well-being of individuals and families throughout the world.
Major Activities	Three annual fellowships Two-four Project Grants Matching Chapter Scholarships Biennial Conclave Regional Meetings Chapter Project Grants "Heritage I and II" Outstanding Chapter Award Annual Required Program	Two annual doctoral fellowships One annual master's fellowship Post-Doctoral fellowship Biennial master's fellowship Matching Chapter Scholarships Research Project Grant Chapter Enrichment Awards Adviser Award of Excellence Biennial Conclave

cieties. Each campus shall be encouraged to keep the past alive through development of a local history. Each society shall prepare an up-to-date history to conclude its own separate history. Each of the endowed funds shall offer named fellowships, grants, or other awards to retain the visibility of the founding societies (i.e., Omicron Nu Research Fellowship, Kappa Omicron Phi-Hettie Margaret Anthony Fellowship).

What will happen to the Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu insignia?

The insignia can be worn as desired, and members may want to purchase new insignia and use the founding society insignia as a guard. The dies of the insignia shall be destroyed and a new die shall be struck after the insignia is approved at the 1991 Conclave. Official documents shall be sent to the Library of Congress to be held in perpetuity.

What will happen to ceremonial paraphernalia?

Chapters will be encouraged to place paraphernalia and records in the archives of the university library or other local historical location.

When will the first Conclave be held?

Summer, 1991.

How will Conclave travel be funded?

A portion of the Initiation Fee for new members and the chapter dues for alumni will be designated for reimbursement of travel for Conclave delegates.

Will regional meetings be held?

Regional meetings will be organized by regional area chapters for similar purposes as the Conclave. The benefits are that opportunities for involvement are increased and costs are decreased. Students will have opportunities to present papers and to participate in educational seminars and workshops.

Who will be eligible for the fellowships funded by Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu endowed funds?

Any active member of the new organization who meets the criteria for the fellowship may apply.

Who will manage the process for awarding fellowships?

The Society shall conduct the search and select the award recipients. Provided that the criteria are met, one application shall qualify the candidate for all fellowships awarded by the Society.

Who will manage the trust funds and endowed funds of Kappa Omicron Phi and Omicron Nu?

Each fund shall have specific policies to describe the objectives and procedures for use of the funds, and the Vice President/Finance, Finance Committee, and the professional staff shall implement the policies.

Who will be eligible for candidacy for national office?

Collegiate delegates to Conclave shall be eligible for the Student Representative positions on the Board of Directors. All other positions on the Board of Directors shall be held by active professional members.

How will participation of professional members and alumni chapter representation be assured?

Each alumni chapter shall have one vote in the Conclave. Committee membership shall be open to professional members and collegiate members. See question immediately above.

What is the rationale for the size of the Board of Directors?

The Board positions are organized around the functions of governance, and the size of the Board of Directors is streamlined to minimize the operational costs of the honor society and maximize budget appropriations for mission objectives. The organizational structure offers many opportunities for members to provide volunteer leadership to help the Board develop policy and govern the honor society.

Direct comment and feedback by August 15, 1989 to:

Kappa Omicron Phi
Omicron Nu
P.O. Box 247
Haslett, MI 48840-0247
(517) 339-3324

EDITOR'S CORNER

The topic of human needs was intended to expand our understanding of the subject and to address the critical issue of our social responsibility for satisfying human needs and improving the quality of life.

It is my hope that the papers in this issue will

- Challenge the reader to consider the value of Nygren's human-needs approach,
- Promote dialogue leading to insights for the application of each professional specialization to human problems, and
- Spark further interest in continuing the theoretical development of basic human needs.

DM

Basic Human Needs: Implications for Home Economics

L. Gertrude Nygren

The visibility of serious social problems is a compelling reason to consider the subject of basic human needs and the plight of people who are unable to maintain a healthy physical and social environment. The prevalence of crime and delinquent behavior, substance abuse, street violence, family estrangement, and poor health status of many young people have played a part in raising the level of awareness. A high proportion of antisocial behavior is associated with the impoverished segment of the population, but whether the public is willing to commit private and public resources for ameliorating these problems depends to a certain extent upon the approaches that are proposed. Professionals, including home economists, and other knowledgeable people must provide leadership in proposing viable action.

Programs sponsored by the International Labor Organization (ILO), the World Bank (IBRD), and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) have applied the concept of basic human needs in rural areas of several developing nations. This strategy was developed because funds appropriated for economic growth failed to improve the condition of the poorest segment of the population. Though it is too early to assess the progress for each country, reports from several areas are somewhat encouraging (Gaudier, 1980). It is the thesis of this paper that a basic-needs approach has merit for developed countries in urban as well as rural areas.

Definition of Basic Human Needs

Judging from the dates of publications, the search for basic needs received public recognition and emphasis about the middle of this century. As an outgrowth of his study of motivation, A. H. Maslow (1943) proposed a sequence of basic needs: physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. He believed that the hierarchical relationship among basic needs was not totally exclusive because individuals could attempt to satisfy a higher level need before a lower one was fully achieved. Maslow's efforts attracted the attention of researchers who generally accepted the conceptual theory but found the lack of verification of the hierarchy troublesome.

Amitai Etzioni explained his definition: By basic needs "we simply mean that persons can be denied a specific kind of experience only at the cost of an intrapersonal tension" (1968, p. 871). He sought to advance sociological theory by proposing a method to correct what he believed was an overemphasis on socialization as an explanation of human behavior. Etzioni assumed the existence of basic needs and theorized that one could identify common responses in different societies and that human beings have biologically determined needs not found in other organisms. He proposed methods of testing this concept through studies of various societies.

A report by John McHale and Magda Cordell McHale, supported by the United Nations Environmental Programme, considered basic needs to be minimal requirements to meet an adequate standard of quality of life (1977). They proposed three levels of needs without specific reference to research support. First-floor or biophysical needs were identified as food, health, shelter, and clothing. Enabling needs, following in the second floor, included education, employment, communication, mobility, recreation, and security. The third floor, called felt needs, consisted of self-realization, growth, and participation. Aside from the first-floor level, McHale and McHale believed that the needs varied by culture, regions, and time scale and that nations and regions should verify the proposed needs through implementation with specific groups.

The theories of Maslow, Etzioni, and McHale & McHale illustrate the diversity which has existed in purposes, definitions, and methods of arriving at basic needs. In contrast to Maslow and Etzioni who were hoping to advance theories, the McHales chose to apply their basic-needs approach to countries with wide-spread poverty.

Although Maslow's theory of a hierarchical relationship of human needs fell short of validation, he restated his belief in the importance of human psychosocial needs. In a compilation of his work, Maslow warned that ". . . the loss of the basic need satisfactions of safety and protection, belongingness, love, respect, self-esteem, identity, and self-actualization produces illnesses and deficiency diseases" (1971, p. 22) of neurosis and psychosis.

Discrepancies exist in the interpretation of basic needs as illustrated by the three authorities cited above. Etzioni (1968) assumed that there were universal psychosocial needs. Maslow's definition was somewhat qualified. In accounting for the unity observed in different societies, he claimed that basic needs "were more ultimate, more universal, more basic than superficial desires or behaviors" (1947, p. 390). The McHales (1977) acknowledged the influence of social factors on the second and third levels. The confusion is not surprising because the theories of basic needs have originated from scientific, theoretical, religious, and other perspectives. In addition some of the discrepancies can be attributed to other sources, e.g., the word need is itself subject to interpretation.

For the purposes of this paper, *basic* is defined as fundamental and a *need* as physiological or psychological requirements for the well-being of an individual. Together it can be said that basic needs are fundamental requirements for physical and psychosocial health.

Maslow believed that any basic need had to be relatively isolable (1947), e.g., hunger cannot be satisfied over time by anything but food. He stated that "they must be basic goals rather than partial or superficial ones . . . [and reflect] ends not means" (p. 370). Maslow used the word instinctoid though others used innate, asocial, genetic, and unlearned to mean that human beings are born with fundamental needs.

Proposed Conceptual Framework

A belief in the relevance of the basic-needs approach for present-day problems is strengthened by its use in a number of international programs for alleviating poverty in rural areas.

Dr. Nygren is Professor Emerita, Department of Human Environment and Design, College of Human Ecology, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Study of the basic human needs has revealed areas of agreement in the literature, but there is no clearly established theory of basic human needs.

Figure 1 organizes human needs in a conceptual framework to show the elements involved. Because they are most often quoted, Maslow's basic needs were chosen to illustrate the concept. This proposed framework is not meant to exclude other suggested needs, such as the need for uniqueness or sensation which may prove to be additional basic needs or more inclusive designations than those mentioned in this text (See Burns, p. 10 in this issue).

The term basic human needs was used in the literature in two different ways. For example, physiological needs were called basic but food and water were also called basic needs. For clarification, the proposed framework uses the titles, *generic or general* basic needs and *specific* basic needs, to make this distinction. Instrumental needs are the means by which a specific basic need is met. The category of upper level needs relies on the assumption that they emerge after physical (lower level) health needs are met.

Theoretically, generic basic needs originate from universal, common, or innate motivations or goals. The illustration of the relationship of needs and goals in the Table clarifies how the specific basic needs implement the general basic needs.

Instrumental needs are the customary or preferred means for fulfilling needs. Food is a basic need, and protein is a nutrient required for healthy physical development. The means of obtaining this nutrient does not require meat because it is only one source of protein. The failure to recognize the influence of culture, environmental conditions, and personal preferences on the means for fulfilling needs can result in physical or psychosocial harm.

Though there is a high degree of consensus for physiological and safety needs as general basic needs, there is less agreement on the specific basic needs required to meet them. Food, water, and housing are mentioned most frequently. Others that may or may not be named are clothing, health, education, sex, and sanitation. Although air and rest are required for survival, they are seldom discussed in the literature. Because of air pollution and the loss of jungles and forests, air is a great concern today and can no longer be taken for granted.

In the process of organizing the content of Figure 1, a problem was encountered because housing and clothing are often cited as physiological needs. If the goal is physical health, these specific basic needs supply protection. It seems that if safety and protection are defined interchangeably, there is no goal for housing and clothing to fulfill under physiological needs. The same appears to be true for sanitation, as it protects physical health. The advantage of classifying housing and clothing under safety is that protection receives emphasis and increased visibility as a basic need.

Another problem emerged in considering the placement of love within the general category of basic needs. Relatively recent research indicates that infants do not thrive physically without overt affection; thus the goal of physical health would not be met. There are, however, many sources associating love with psychological well-being. A sense of belonging is highly associated with love, and yet perhaps they are sometimes separable.

The similar but different functions of love and a sense of belonging raised the issue of whether these were one need or two. The hypothesis that love and belongingness fulfill physical and psychosocial goals complicated the assignment of need level. The framework classifies both of them as lower level needs because of their contribution to human survival. An additional compelling reason for classifying love and belongingness at this level is to highlight their essential nature. The arousal of feelings "of loneliness, of ostracism, of rejection, of friendlessness, of rootlessness" (Brockett, 1975, p. 79) from the lack of gratification of these needs leads to maladjustment and more severe pathologies.

Maslow (1971) believed that all individuals (with few pathological exceptions) have a need for self-esteem and the esteem of others. Rollo May (1972) concluded that "no human being can exist for long without some sense of his own significance" and "it is the lack of significance, and the struggle for it, that underlies much violence" (p. 37). Self-esteem according to Maslow is derived from "real capacity, achievement, and respect from others" (1971, p. 381). The failure to gain the ego enhancement derived from esteem leads to feelings of infirmity, weakness, and helplessness.

Self-actualization probably elicits more controversy than any other single need proposed by Maslow. Such a reaction is fairly predictable when its meaning is explained as a drive to attain self-fulfillment or to realize a personal potential—two relatively ambiguous goals. Actualized people, Maslow believed, are committed to causes outside of themselves or ultimate values, e.g., truth, goodness, and beauty. Adler (1978) in his attempt to explain Aristotle's idea of "living well" stressed the importance of satisfying biological needs (such as food, clothing, and shelter) first, so that those needs leading to a "real good" could be realized. Happiness, living well, and the good life (as used by Adler) have similarities to self-actualization— "the fulfillment of all our human capacities and tendencies" (1978, p. 82).

Figure 1. Basic Needs Conceptual Framework

GENERIC BASIC NEEDS	SPECIFIC BASIC NEEDS*	INSTRUMENTAL NEEDS*	GOALS
Lower Level			
Physiological	Food	Protein	Physical
	Air	Oxygen	Health**
	Rest	Sleep	
Safety	Housing	Woodframe house	Physical
Protection	Clothing	Coat	Health
	Nonhazardous Environs	Nontoxic water	
	Sanitation	Sewer System	
Love	Affection	Nestling, Attention	Physical
			& Psycho-
Belongingness	Acceptance	Family Interaction	social
		Neighborhood Network	Health
Upper Level			
Esteem	Acknowledgment	Compliments	Psycho-
	Achievement	Awards	social
	Prestige	Position	Health
	Autonomy – socially directed	Freedom	
Self-actualization	Autonomy – self directed	Freedom	Psycho- social
	Growth	Education	Health
		Creative activities	
	Productivity	Progress indicators	

* This category includes examples only.
**Attainment or failure to achieve a physical health goal has a concomitant psychological response and vice versa.

The Basic-Needs Approach

Adopting a basic-needs approach requires more than accepting the theory of basic needs. The United States has attempted to meet a number of basic needs for everyone, and most would fall under the general basic needs and physiological and safety categories. The lack of consideration of other needs is due to the failure to accept a synthesis of human knowledge from both the qualitative and quantitative research traditions; the result is a piecemeal and fragmented effort to meet the needs of people.

Paul Streeten (1984), Director of the World Development Institute, concluded that there are some unsettled questions in applying the basic-needs approach. Who should make the decision about what needs are most essential? Will the basic-needs approach work if people do not spend their resources to fulfill their basic needs? Will the basic-needs approach contribute to economic growth? These questions raise some difficult issues that could lead to paternalistic action or to intractable positions and inaction.

Blunt (1984) concluded from his observations in Africa that achieving basic needs is dependent upon decentralized decision making; he maintained that high officials are too far removed from the realities of people's lives. Physical and human resources and commitment from the political leadership were also required.

As the search for a basic-needs approach continues, insights from human service program successes and failures and from research could be used to develop procedures for helping people choose health and positive social goals. Former and present recipients of subsidized programs and local social workers, teachers, planners, researchers, concerned citizens, political/business leaders, and students of public affairs possess knowledge of basic-needs requirements and of client-centered principles related to generating trust, commitment, cooperation, and resources for implementation of a basic-needs approach. Follow-up of the proposed needs and the action plan should be conducted throughout actual implementation (McHale & McHale, 1977) to verify relevance and efficacy. Past experience, a viable basic-needs theory, involvement of recipients and significant persons in the social unit, and follow-up verification—all these elements constitute a basic-needs approach.

Implications for Home Economics

Home economists in their work with individuals and families are in a position to obtain evidence of filled and unfilled needs. Their observations could make a valuable contribution to clarifying the issues and refining the approaches for satisfying basic human needs. No other profession would benefit more than Home Economics from an understanding of motivation as it influences human behavior. Therefore, it behooves us to continue the search for a consensus on basic human needs and the means for their attainment.

Home economics teachers in secondary schools and universities have an opportunity to challenge their students to consider specific needs in the lower and higher levels. Dietetics, as an example of one Home Economics specialization, has developed a deep understanding of nutrition in relation to the goal of physical health. Other areas in home economics, e.g., clothing and housing, are less developed, but professionals are engaged in research to build upon the known characteristics which satisfy specific basic needs.

Opportunities exist in every community for leadership and participation of home economists in activities addressing the needs of people and in working with individuals and families to enable them to identify their needs and the means of achievement. In these ways home economists will be involved in education and prevention and in helping the public and private sectors to move beyond rhetoric to take action that responds to the needs of individuals and families.

References

Adler, M. J. (1978). *Aristotle for everybody.* New York: Bantam Books.

Brockett, C. (1975). Toward a clarification of the need hierarchy theory: Some extensions of Maslow's conceptualization. *Interpersonal Development, 6,* 77-90.

Blunt, P. (1984). Conditions for basic need satisfaction in Africa through decentralized forms of decision making. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20* (4), 403-421.

Etzioni, A. (1968). Basic human needs, alienation and inauthenticity. *American Sociological Review, 33,* 870-884.

Gaudier, M. (1980). *Basic needs: Some essential questions.* Boston: World Development Institute.

Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50,* 370-396.

Maslow, A.H. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature.* New York: Viking Press.

May, R. (1972). *Power and innocence: A search for the sources of violence.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

McHale, J. & McHale, M. C. (1978). *Basic human needs.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Streeten, P. (1984). *Basic needs: Some unsettled questions*—A working paper. Boston: University World Development Institute.

Continued from page 10

References

Arkes, H.R. & Garske, J.P. (1982). *Psychological theories of motivation.* Monterey CA: Brooks/Cole.

Birenbaum, M. (1986). On the construct validity of the sensation seeking scale in a non-English-speaking culture. *Personality and Individual Differences, 7,* 431- 434.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7,* 117-140.

Fromkin, H.L., Olson, J.C., Dipboyle, R.L., & Barnaby, D. (1971). A commodity theory analysis of consumer preferences for scarce products. *Proceedings of the 79th annual convention of the American Psychological Association* (pp. 653-654). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Grubb, E.L., & Hupp, G. (1968). Perception of self, generalized stereotypes, and brand selection. *Journal of Marketing Research, 5,* 58-63.

Kaestner, E., Rosen, L., & Appel, P. (1977). Patterns of drug abuse: Relationships with ethnicity, sensation seeking and anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45,* 462-468.

Kelly, H.H. (1952). Two functions of reference groups. In G.E. Swanson, T.M. Newcomb and E.L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology,* 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 410-414.

Logue, A.W. & Smith, M.E. (1986). Predictors of food preferences in adult humans. *Appetite, 7,* 109- 125.

McAlister, L., & Pessemier, E.A. (1982). Variety seeking behavior: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Consumer Research, 9,* 311-322.

Mittelstaedt, R.A., Grossbart, S.L., Curtis, W.W., & DeVere, S.P. (1976). Optimum stimulation level and the adoption decision process. *Journal of Consumer Research, 3,* 84-94.

Parsons, T., Shils, E.A., Allport, G.W., Kluckhohn, C., Murray, H.A., Sears, R.A., Sheldon, R.C. Stouffer, S.A., & Tolman, E.C. (1951). Some fundamental categories of the theory of action: A general statement. In T. Parsons and E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action: Theoretical foundations for the social sciences.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Ragu, P.S. (1980). Optimum stimulation level: its relationship to personality, demographics, and exploratory behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research, 7,* 272-282.

Snyder, C.R., & Fromkin, H.L. (1980). *Uniqueness: The human pursuit of difference.* New York: Plenum Press.

Weinraub, M., Brooks, J. & Lewis, M. (1977). The social network: A reconsideration of the concept of attachment. *Human Development, 20,* 31-47.

Zuckerman, M. (1979). *Sensation seeking: Beyond the optimal level of arousal.* Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zuckerman, M. (1983). A biological theory of sensation seeking. In M. Zuckerman (Ed.), *Biological bases of sensation seeking, impulsivity and anxiety* (pp. 37-76). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zuckerman, M., Eysenck, S.B.G., & Eysenck, H.J. (1978). Sensation seeking in England and America: Cross-cultural, age and sex comparisons. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46,* 139-149.

Zuckerman, M., Neary, R.S., & Brustman, B.A. (1970). Sensation seeking correlates in experience (smoking, drugs, alcohol, "hallucinations," and sex) and preference for complexity (designs). *Proceedings of the 78th annual convention of the American Psychological Association* (pp. 317-318). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Current Approaches to the Study of Higher Level Human Needs

David J. Burns

Because Home Economics deals with the interaction of individuals and/or families and their interaction with the environment, an understanding of the forces which drive those interactions would be beneficial. According to Parsons, et al. (1951), such interaction arises from a desire to fulfill certain needs. Interaction enhances human needs to be fulfilled by social or physical exchange. Therefore, an understanding of these human needs is vital to the field of Home Economics.

Although the existence of basic physiological needs crucial to survival (e.g., need for food and water) are generally accepted, the existence and/or importance of higher-level, nonsurvival-oriented needs remains an area of controversy. The purpose of this paper is to review two proposed types of higher-level needs, sensation and uniqueness, and to indicate the behaviors believed to be predictable by each.

Higher Level Needs

The proposed higher-level, nonsurvival-oriented needs arise from two origins: intrapersonal needs, or those arising from innate origins, and interpersonal needs, or those arising from societal-based origins (McAlister & Pessemier, 1982). Both have the capability to materially affect an individual's behavior.

Intrapersonal Needs

Early research into human needs and motivation attempted to explain behavior through various innate constructs. The majority of these early attempts were not empirically testable because of their manner of construction, primarily subjective interpretation (Arkes and Garske, 1982). The lack of empirical findings and of perceptible progress in explaining human behavior resulted in a shift of the research focus away from behavioral explanations based on innate origins. Recent advances in medical research, however, have provided the impetus to reexamine the influence of biological composition in behavior motivation (though not to the exclusion of the learned component).

As a result of these medical advances, the need for sensation is gaining increasing attention in several fields of learning (e.g., Zuckerman, 1979; Logue and Smith, 1986; Ragu, 1980). Sensation is "a need for varied, novel, and complex sensations and experiences, and willingness to take physical and social risks for the sake of such experiences" (Zuckerman, 1979, p. 10). The theory of a need for sensation is that differences in brain chemicals — norepinephrine and dopamine — will directly affect the behavior of an individual in a predictable fashion. Research findings suggest that this need arises from innate origins (Zuckerman, 1983).

Relationships have been observed between the need for sensation and several behaviors, many of which concern home economists. Such activities include consumption activities (Mittelstaedt, Grossbart, Curtis and DeVere, 1976; Ragu, 1980), food preferences (Logue and Smith, 1986), drug use (Kaestner, Rosen and Appel, 1977), and sexual activities (Zuckerman, Neary and Brustman, 1970). Hence, the need for sensation appears to support the existence of a higher level, nonsurvival-oriented intrapersonal need. In addition, although its mean strength and distribution may vary across countries and societies, its genetic basis frees the need of sensation from the societal limitations which exist with needs originating in the environment (Birenbaum, 1986; Zuckerman, Eysenck & Eysenck, 1978).

Interpersonal Needs

The existence of biologically based higher-level needs does not preclude the existence of, or the potential importance of, environmentally induced needs. To the contrary, they may exhibit equally as strong an effect upon resulting behavior as do biologically based needs. The origin of environmentally induced needs is the learning process; these needs are acquired through the interpersonal acculturation process within a society.

One such hypothesized environmentally induced need is uniqueness, or a desire to be a different human being, not just "another face in the crowd" (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). The need for uniqueness is based on the theory that the self-perceived difference between individuals and their peers affects the emotional and behavioral actions of individuals in a predictable fashion (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). As such, instead of being rooted within brain chemistry (as is the need for sensation), the need for uniqueness is hypothesized to be rooted in the social comparison process, one by which individuals compare themselves with others (Festinger, 1954). One example of this is the manifestation of the comparative function of reference groups: groups and/or individuals who may influence behavior by creating social norms upon which individuals can base their actions (Kelly, 1952); these reference groups provide individuals with a frame of reference from which future uniqueness can develop.

Of value to home economists is the relationships between the need for uniqueness and a number of emotions and behaviors: consumption endeavors (Grubb and Hupp, 1968), activity performance level (Snyder and Fromkin, 1980), valuation of scarcity (Fromkin, Olson, Dipboyle and Barnaby,1971), attitudes and beliefs (Snyder and Fromkin, 1980), with the character of social networks (Weinraub, Brooks, and Lewis, 1977). Unlike the need for sensation, there is no evidence to validate the intersocietal existence of the need for uniqueness (Snyder and Fromkin, 1980).

Summary

The research of Zuckerman and Snyder & Fromkin adds support for the existence of higher-level, nonsurvival-oriented needs in addition to the basic survival-oriented needs; the research further suggests that these higher-level needs arise from innate and environmental origins. Acknowledgement of the existence of these needs would provide Home Economics researchers and practitioners with additional understanding of the interactions of individuals and families and their interaction with the environment, e.g., financial and purchasing activities and child education and acculturation.

Cross-cultural research and comparisons require a note of caution. Although lower-level needs (pertaining to physical survival) and the intrapersonal higher-level needs are universal across cultures, interpersonal higher-level needs are environmentally induced and, thus, are likely to vary across different cultures.

Continued on page 9

Dr. Burns is Assistant Professor, Department of Consumer Sciences and Retailing, School of Consumer and Family Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Basic Needs Approach in Housing for the United States

L. Gertrude Nygren

Because we accept the premise that human beings have a right to life, our country offers a claim to the resources of the nation. But how should we define the nature and extent of the right to housing? This paper will describe the basic-needs approach in response to this question.

The right to life is a promise of survival to make self-sufficiency available. The generic basic human needs (physiological and safety/protection) are essential to fulfill that right, and an ample, safe supply of food, water, air, and provision for housing and clothing are the specific requirements.

If the poor, many of whom are physically and mentally ill, do not have access to adequate dwelling space, they face a life threatening situation. Not only is the right-to-life premise being violated, but for citizens in this affluent society it is a painful and embarrassing realization that the "homeless" numbers have increased.

The approach to ameliorating the housing problem is being debated by representatives of diverse institutions without agreement on what steps to take. No monetary policy, no technical process, and no legal procedure alone can meet the problems of the shelterless, houseless, homeless, and poorly housed unless the policies are guided by the fundamental needs of people.

Communication about housing has been hampered because a number of terms have neither been precisely defined nor consistently applied. For this reason, several terms will be explained as they are used in the following discussion. Housing or dwelling space refers to any form of enclosed space, occupied to accommodate daily living. Shelter, house, and home are described in the text as three types of housing. The shelterless, houseless, and homeless correspond to the above classification and refer to people without that form of housing.

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS

Most authorities seem to agree that basic human needs are fundamental requirements for an adequate quality of life. They also consider physiological and safety needs to be essential for physical health, but consensus on needs for affection and an overarching theory including psychosocial needs have been elusive. However, knowledge of some requirements for people to survive and to thrive gives motivation to continue the search. For the purpose of this paper generic basic human needs are defined as the fundamental and most common requirements to sustain physical and psychosocial health.

Basic dwelling needs include accommodations for air, water, heat, and sanitary facilities; protection from damaging natural elements; security from hostile intruders; and safeguards from fire and toxic substances. Provisions for access to medical facilities, food, clothing, toiletries, and health maintenance supplies are also essential for physiological well-being.

Housing serves a need for protection (see Nygren, p. 8 in this publication) and is classified under that title with safety. Important instrumental needs related to protection (e.g., soundness, location, and services) determine whether a dwelling space creates security. Feelings such as belonging or alienation, worth or inferiority, and progress or regression are other responses generated by the characteristics of housing. Housing is not neutral; it either does or does not meet the goals of physical and psychosocial health. The basic-needs approach is subject to criticism by purists; although the above human responses appear under different titles, they are seldom questioned as human needs.

SHELTER

Definition

Shelter refers to a human dwelling space which meets the minimum needs for survival. Publicly and privately supported shelters provide occupancy at the discretion of the administrative agency. Permanent shelters are available as long as the rules are followed, and the occupants are necessarily subject to a high degree of regulation. Usually the personal space is limited, and all but spaces reserved for families are sex segregated. Transition shelters serve primarily the physical needs of individuals and families for several weeks or until other accommodations can be located. The location of transitional shelters known as *safe houses* that serve abused wives and children are not revealed to the general public. Some shelters are equipped to serve meals; others rely on charitable organizations or place the responsibility of obtaining food on the shelter occupants themselves. Jails, prisons, and hospitals, though they have some characteristics of houses, are usually classified as shelters because of the restrictions on freedom.

Descriptions of People Without Shelter

Persons without shelter can be described as poor or abandoned adults or children. Except for the latter, they are stereotyped as street people or as perennial vagrants, addicts, and the unemployable. In truth, such individuals are joined by intact and single-parent families and represent a full range of ages, states of physical and mental health, intellect, education, abilities, and cultural-ethnic backgrounds. In periods of rapid socio-economic transition people without shelter include victims of unfavorable circumstances. The shelterless also include individuals hiding from the law, others who are inclined to waste their personal resources, and those who choose to live unencumbered by responsibilities.

The number given as shelterless are, at best, only estimates. The numbers vary from season to season, from upturns to downturns in employment opportunities, and from massive losses or gains in housing units and immigration rates. Because this population is without identifiable addresses, it is difficult to obtain accurate census data.

Requirements for Shelters

To qualify as adequate, a shelter must be tight, sturdy, and as fireproof as possible. It has to provide for ventilation, hot and cold running water, controlled heat, and interior circulation space. Other basic shelter needs are natural and artificial light, sanitary facilities, clean and supportive beds, seating, and storage for the

Dr. Nygren is Professor Emerita, Department of Human Environment and Design, College of Human Ecology, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

protection of personal possessions. Space for daytime activities is desirable for adults but essential for young children. Divided areas to segregate older children and adults by sex is a social demand that must be met. In most communities these characteristics are defined in performance standards, codes, and ordinances.

The selection of sites for shelters requires thoughtful consideration of the social and physical environments for potential clients. It is important to avoid obnoxious odors, highly disruptive noises, and unsightly and hazardous settings. Shelter units of modest size are easier than large ones to administer, to maintain, and to gain neighborhood acceptance. Shelter furnishings must be of sturdy construction and finish even if aesthetic quality has to be sacrificed.

Well-designed and maintained shelters are sufficient to sustain physical health for the strong. By definition shelters do not provide accommodations for individuals needing special care. Older children without parents can be accommodated temporarily, but shelters cannot fulfill their needs for socialization, occupational training, and formal education. Mothers with children require day-care accommodations to allow them to look for work or to participate in training programs.

Basic shelter serves a vital but limited function. A form of shelter needs to be available at all times for the deserving and undeserving and offered indefinitely for those who abide by the regulations and who, for various reasons, are unable to acquire dwelling space for themselves.

Single able-bodied adults without financial means should have access to shelters but not houses. Though this policy may sound cold and arbitrary it does extend the right of survival to this population. The alternative is to overburden public and private funds and foster the dependency of the healthy at the expense of other less able individuals and families. Some persons will reject the offer of shelter and will continue to live without identifiable dwelling space. They have a right to do so as long as they do not endanger the lives of others.

HOUSE

Definition of House

Although a house is often perceived to be a single detached unit, the concept also refers to a room, apartment, or condo in single or multiple units. Even some care facilities and detention institutions are included under the definition of houses. Admittedly, a gray area exists in classifying some facilities because not all of the characteristics of either housing or shelter are present.

A house is a social artifact which means it is shaped by many institutions. Dovey (1985) clarified this concept by the following statement:

> *. . . the house is property and the home is appropriated territory. In the modern world, the house is a commodity involving substantial economic commitment. It is an investment of economic resources that yields profit and power. As such, the house has become increasingly similar to other products—being bought and sold, used, and discarded like a car or washing machine (p. 53).*

Dovey added that

> *The house is a tool for the experience of home. Yet the increasing commoditization of the house engenders a confusion between the house and home because it is the image of home that is bought and sold in the marketplace (p. 54).*

Houses differ in several respects from shelter. The occupants have a legal right to occupy a living space according to predetermined terms or as long as qualifying criteria are met, and the regimentation present in even modest-sized shelters is replaced by specified responsibilities. Houses afford opportunities for increased privacy; supply space for personal possessions and may or may not include accommodations for laundry, food stores, and food preparation; provide space for more personal items and greater variety in types of furnishings; offer possibilities for individualization; and are instrumental in the formation of a home.

Descriptions of People Without a House

The houseless, including people in shelters, have not acquired a legal right to occupy a personal dwelling space. Because various social programs give preference to houses for the elderly, families with young children, the ill, and handicapped, there are fewer of them without dwelling space. Nevertheless, the houseless are composed of families and individuals in all states of health and at every age.

It must be recognized that people with houses are not necessarily housed adequately. Too many people in cities and rural areas live in crowded, unsanitary, and unsafe structures which increase their vulnerability to disease and even death. The houseless do not comprise the housing problem alone, the ill-housed also contribute to this dilemma.

Requirements for a House

Houses must provide all of the requirements described for shelter plus interior space to allow families to have sleeping areas that separate parents from children and older children by sex. Space is also required to enable families to interact, especially at meal times. Study space and convenient access to exterior grounds are required for children. The amount and type of space are determined by the number and composition of the household unit. Because very young children need close supervision, they are at risk in quarters above the second level. Children require protection from heavy traffic, violence, and other dangerous situations. The building must have sturdy construction, and the exterior ought to be attractive and a source of pride.

The elderly, as well as persons with severe deficiencies, require a variety of house types. Many will not survive without close supervision, though others with less serious problems can live relatively independent lives when supportive services are readily available. Sleeping rooms, small apartments, or rooming houses of modest cost are among the possible options for the adequate housing of young singles and childless couples.

Healthy adults and older children are advantaged if they live relatively close to choices for training, rehabilitation, and employment. Admittedly this concern is not to satisfy the basic need for survival but rather to enhance opportunities for becoming self-sufficient. People benefit in their social relations if they live within communities where they are likely to be accepted and where churches, schools, and other community organizations are conveniently located.

If consideration is given to density, character, proximity, convenience, and diversions, the setting contributes to the accomplishment of basic higher level needs. In summary, houses must fulfill the basic physiological and safety needs, and the characteristics of houses and their settings should permit the achievement of psychosocial needs.

HOME

Definitions of Home

Hayward (1977) defined home as a core of meanings, each of which has a unique value. Variations arise in values accorded these meanings because they are formulated on the basis of sociological, psychological, and physical events experienced individually. Hayward concluded that a home is better understood as a relationship with the environment, not the environment itself. Dovey stated that ". . . a house is an object, a part of the environment; home is best conceived of as an emotionally based and meaningful relationship between dwellers and their dwelling places" (1985, p. 34).

Hayward (1977) believed that people translate a structure into a refuge, a locale for communication and activity, a mental storehouse of significant events, and a reference point in the context of the near and more distant environment. His research revealed that the conceptual meaning of home was associated with nine dimensions: intimate others, social network, self-identity, a place of privacy and refuge, continuity, a personalized place, a base of activity, childhood home, and physical structure. According to Hayward, the concept of home is often misused. Word combinations coined by commercial enterprises (e.g., motor home, manufactured home, and home builders) promise a home but deliver a house. Dovey (1985) noted that home ownership implies house and home to be synonymous terms. In his essay Dovey suggested three themes for understanding the phenomenon of home.

> *The first consists of various kinds of order through which we are oriented in the world. The second is the processes of identification through which we connect with our world in a meaningful way. The third theme is that of dialectic processes that describe an essential dynamism in the process of becoming a home (1985, p. 34).*

He admitted that home has intangible concepts which make its verification difficult.

From a phenomenological perspective, Bachelard (1969) viewed home as a place for intimacy and solitude. He sought deeper understanding that extended beyond description to find attachments to the primary function of inhabiting. He believed that the house was "the human being's first world" (p. 7) and that the past follows one to any subsequent house. Bachelard endorsed an old saying, "We bring our *lares* with us" (p. 5).

Not all families in need of housing are without a concept of home. The story is told of a young couple and their child who, in searching for a place to live, encountered an older friend who said, "It's too bad you don't have a home." The child responded, "Oh, we have a home; we just don't have a house to put it in." Such a differentiation could not be understood by many adults.

Description of People Without a Home

Individuals and families may possess enclosed living quarters, a house, and be considered as homeless. Living space only makes home a possibility; it does not create one. The confusion between house and home is understandable when home is only viewed as a structure. Dovey (1985) called homelessness the loss of meaningful intangibles resulting from rationalism and technology. It may be added that homelessness is never knowing the intangibles that make a home.

When we consider the current social problems (e.g., crime, addiction, abuse, and child neglect), we should ask whether meeting survival needs is enough. What other needs are wanting? And do unfilled needs offer a partial explanation for the behaviors named above? Does the absence of a home play a part in the direction of human lives?

The answers to these questions cannot be given with complete assurance. For example, if a child moved frequently from one location to another, was never able to feel a part of the community, and possessed only a limited knowledge of the immediate environment, it is unlikely that the child will be able to understand the full meaning of home as an adult. If the child had difficulty in establishing a grade level in school, in participating in group activities, and in forming friendships, it is unlikely that the child will be able to develop healthy relationships, to correctly interpret motives of others, or to make autonomous decisions. The lack of emotional ties to people and to the surroundings affect the ability to value relationships and to become attached to the intangible qualities that form a home.

Rene Dubos (1968) commented that juvenile delinquents do not behave antisocially to be deliberately wicked. They act for immediate satisfaction, live in the present, and are incapable of relating to others or to the past or future. As a consequence they see no significance in life and no reason to develop a sense of responsibility.

The forced removal of adults from their long-term residences to make way for private and public developments has been a common practice, and it was assumed that a new house was a generous replacement and enough to satisfy their physiological and psychosocial needs. We know that this disruption had a traumatic effect on some people, especially the elderly who lost their homes. As Dovey and Bachelard indicated, the formation of a home is emotionally based and dependent upon meaningful relations in social, physical, and historical terms.

Requirements for Homes

The physical structure and the required services are the same for home as for a house. By definition, we know that a house does not make a home; people *make* homes. Individuals who have never known a home do not understand the effort required to create one. If the childhood residence did not engender positive images for children, they would have difficulty in perceiving the structure as a place of refuge and locus of communication and contextual meanings. Understanding the intangible nature of home becomes almost impossible without help.

Our nation has never supported preparation for home or family life in any consistent manner. This lack of commitment is shared by schools and universities as well as formal and nonformal adult education programs. Though some religious institutions promote home and family life, most lack a comprehensive approach that attends to physical and psychosocial needs. A case could be made for the position that preparation for home life could reduce many of today's social problems.

IMPLEMENTING THE RIGHT TO HOUSING

Past Experience

Former federally supported housing programs provided for the essential needs for physical health within the house. Policy ignored the fact that normal development requires consideration of the exterior space in filling the housing needs. In the high-density projects, children were often at risk outside of their own quarters, and middle-aged children were deprived of adequate space to gain large muscle development. Teenagers had few opportunities for employment and for strenuous recreational activities that enhance physical and psychological well-being. Adults and young people suffered because networks of friends, associates, and social affiliations beyond the housing projects were difficult to establish or maintain.

In the interest of economy, interior space was minimal at best. Storage space was inadequate, particularly for food. The space allowance in these units was too limited for even the medium-sized families to eat together on a daily basis. Economizing measures proved to be ill-advised because space restrictions discouraged the family interaction that can take place at mealtime and drove children and teenagers to the street for play activities. High-density housing developments could be constructed without recreational areas for the use of middle-aged and older children, leaving them with a lot of time and nothing constructive to do. Another drawback was that in highly concentrated living areas, low-income families were unable or not inclined to help people they hardly knew. A sense of community and commitment to the welfare of each other did not develop.

Residents of public housing do not always take care of their dwellings for the following reasons: lack of pride resulting from being identified as poor by the housing choice, restrictions that limit individual expression, deficiency of management skills, limited means and knowledge to make their houses attractive, and little value attached to the house. High-rise apartments do not create feelings and carry symbols of home, and this may be a reason for acts of destruction in high-rise housing units. To counter the detrimental effects of past public housing programs, potential occupants must be involved in the processes of planning, implementing, and managing of their houses so that they have a sense of power.

Factors Contributing to the Lack of Affordable Houses

Costs and the availability of housing make this human need unaffordable for substantial numbers of middle-income households as well as those at poverty levels. Housing costs have risen faster than the average income, and new houses have to absorb the higher costs of land development and regulatory controls. The dollars required for down payments and for current interest rates keep some potential buyers out of the market.

Fewer modest-priced houses and more luxury-type condos and single units are being produced at this time than in previous periods of relative prosperity. Developers cognizant of the recent less-favorable tax structure choose to build units which promise the greatest profits. Other factors in reducing the low-cost housing stock are the massive demolition of low-cost rental units and condo conversions. Main (1988) concluded that New York and other cities have a shortage because the market system is too regulated. As a result landlords and developers fail to build or renovate structures. The perception that the shortage of housing is due to lack of new construction is false; instead this problem arose because low-cost housing is in short supply, especially in large and border cities. Other contributing factors include the population increase, the rising cost of housing, and the growing percentage of poor individuals and families.

The Status of the Housing Supply

Reports from surveys by governmental agencies, concerned individuals, and university teams give different answers to the question of the housing supply. Thomas J. Main summarized the situation of the shelterless in his article, "What We Know About the Homeless" (1988). He quoted a 1984 HUD study which compared favorably with the 1986 Harvard University cross-check of the HUD report by Freeman and Hall. The figure of 400,000 "homeless," confirmed by several additional city surveys, is considerably lower than the numbers cited by several advocates of the shelterless.

Main believed that "homelessness is a much *smaller* problem, in terms of the number of people affected by it, than is commonly thought, but is more *intractable* than advocates understand" (1988, p. 31). He based this statement upon the numbers in that population who have medical or behavioral afflictions or both. Thus, the United States is facing a health service as well as a housing problem.

Approaches for Acquiring Houses

Main (1988) insisted that most of the shelterless could be accommodated in existing shelters and houses if given time and efficient location services. He therefore discounted the need for "radical systemic measures." A reduction of regulations and improved income supports could bring substantial relief to the housing problem. Although Main presented strong evidence for his contentions that there is no nationwide housing shortage, local providers of housing insist that they do not have enough beds or units. Because there are pockets of deficiencies, local surveys should be conducted to describe the extent of the problem. Then, with the facts in hand, citizens could make realistic plans to address their situation.

Programs for acquisition, renovation, and building of houses have been initiated by groups of concerned individuals, churches, and benevolent organizations who donate know-how, time, energy, and money to the endeavors. These grassroot initiatives reduce the bureaucratic and operational costs associated with state or federal projects.

It is impossible to envision how the American poor can be adequately housed without federal dollars to augment state and local contributions. The commitment to address housing needs is likely to be maintained over time if there is local involvement in housing programs through contributions of land, structures, donated labor, and funds. And this is an important policy requirement for future housing legislation.

Whether new single or multiple houses are more feasible depends upon local factors, i.e., user preference, desirability of locations, and cost. High-rise and high-density projects are untenable for families with children, unless dependable supervision is provided. Though the goal is to match the supply of houses to the need, shelters are the most urgent housing need in many large cities to protect endangered segments of the population. Shelters are needed also to provide temporary accommodations for people in crisis.

SUMMARY

This paper has discussed the basic-needs approach as it relates to the specific need of housing. Physiological, safety, and affection needs are usually included as requirements for survival. Although not as well accepted, a feeling of worth and self-fulfillment manifest themselves rather clearly as goals fulfilled by housing.

The right-to-life premise was identified as a social norm, and the discussion below will summarize what that means to housing. For healthy adults, this commitment to housing can be filled by shelters that meet their physical needs. Though rehabilitation, job training, and education exceed the requirements for sustaining life, they should be available to break the cycle of poverty and dependency. Shelters are not sufficient to meet the physical needs of the physically and mentally ill who require houses with custodial and medical care.

Housing for families with children must satisfy more than the physical and safety needs. It is unrealistic to expect that a move from poor to adequate houses will make a law-abiding citizen out of a drug dealer or an accountable parent out of an alcoholic; a house cannot perform remedial functions. Well-designed houses, located in accepting communities, provide a supportive setting for parents to care for, interact with, supervise, discipline, and encourage their children. Whether older children achieve benefits depends upon their response to parental influence.

Though some mothers and fathers receive preparation for parenting from churches, parent organizations, support groups, special courses, and the media, they may need help in acquiring a house. Undeniably, other parents are unable to provide the specific basic need of housing and are totally unaware of how to serve the psychological and social needs of their offspring. As a consequence, the formation of a home with all of its intangible meanings is unachievable. The rights of Americans may not include preparation for forming a home (homemaking), but the costly cycle of homelessness will be perpetuated unless the home is valued for its contribution to social goals.

Today the word homeless is used to refer to those persons who roam the streets, parks, public buildings, and isolated places. They are homeless, and many of them will remain so even if they have houses. Thus, housing policies must not promote the expectation that homes can be provided. The definitions of shelterless, houseless, and homeless clearly indicate that it is inaccurate to define "the homeless" as the housing problem. These terms clarify the dimensions of housing deficiencies and identify characteristics of housing that will

Continued on page 23

Human Needs in Housing Revisited

Maie Nygren

An old saying one hears with increasing frequency these days is "What goes round, comes round." Applied to human needs in housing, this means the time is ripe for the *basic principles of healthful housing,* established nearly 50 years ago, to again be brought to the forefront by consumers themselves, consumer advocates, and by various components of the housing industry. The source of these basic principles of healthful housing was the American Public Health Associations' (APHA) Committee on the Hygiene of Housing (1939).

For too long, the building industry has hoodwinked American consumers into believing that an array of architectural or design features are what they need. In actuality, however, the features or designs it promotes are aimed at evoking the consumer's need for status. Consider, for example, the kinds of words and phrases to be found typically in builders' and developers' promotional advertisements: brass fixtures, gourmet kitchen, formal living room, impressive vaulted and cathedral ceilings, tiled and mirrored wet bar, or luxury master suites with oversized marble tub, separate shower, and dual vanities. The list goes on but with no mention about the healthful quality of the housing unit advertised.

The irony about builders and developers promoting dream castles is that there is no assurance they will meet a consumer's basic needs any better than a house that has none of the exotic features promoted in advertisements. On the contrary, evidence mounts almost on a daily basis that many housing environments—old and new alike—are not healthful places to be. For example, in trying to promote energy efficiency while providing a thermal environment that will both avoid undue heat loss and permit adequate heat loss, the building industry weatherized houses to make them as air-tight as possible. Windows were fixed, and air conditioning systems were installed. Emanating from those solutions, along with an increased usage of plastics and other synthetic structural or finishing materials, are such phenomena as Legionnaire's Disease and the Sick Building Syndrome.

At the time the principles of healthful housing were developed, the major housing problems confronting our nation were slums in the cities and lack of indoor plumbing in rural areas. At least one-third of the nation was considered to be living in housing defined as being substandard, that is, without indoor plumbing or having defective heating, electrical, or sewage systems. Of that one-third, many also lived in crowded conditions. The scientific studies used by the doctors, architects, sociologists, public health specialists, epidemiologists, and others who constituted the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing were predominantly concerned with the relationships between physical conditions of slum environments and the lack of indoor plumbing with such health conditions as tuberculosis, syphillis, gonorrhea, other contagious diseases, infant mortality, and mental illness. It is easy to see, therefore, why three of four types of human needs identified by the Committee pertain to the physiological needs of the human body.

Human Needs Identified

Four types of human needs identified by the Committee were a) Fundamental Physiological Needs, b) Fundamental Psychological Needs, c) Protection against Contagion, and d) Protection Against Accidents. From these types, the Committee delineated 30 principles of healthful housing, each of which was based on a discrete human need. Those human needs are as apropos today as they were in 1939.

Fundamental Physiological Needs

The human needs that were classified as Fundamental Physiological Needs include a thermal environment which will avoid undue heat loss and permit adequate heat loss from the human body, an atmosphere of reasonable chemical purity, adequate daylight, artificial illumination without glare, direct sunlight, absence of excessive noise, and adequate space for exercise and play of children. In an updated version of these principles of healthful housing, the APHA's Program Area Committee on Housing and Health (1971) added another human need, shelter against the elements.

In terms of an atmosphere of reasonable chemical purity, it is highly probable that a larger proportion of housing units met that need 50 years ago than is the case today. Doctors and scientists in developed nations are now warning that indoor air pollution is an even greater threat to health than outdoor air pollution, primarily because of the proportion of time (80-95 percent) one spends indoors. Findings (Greenfield, 1987) from a study conducted by the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission revealed that in contrast to less than 10 volatile organic compounds found in the air outside of 40 monitored homes, from 20-150 were found inside. Indoor air pollution is viewed by many (Greenfield, 1987; Grove, 1987; Kirsch, 1983; Murphy, 1985; Nero, 1988) as a more critical problem than outdoor air pollution because many of the pollutants, virtually odorless and colorless, are detectable only with scientific equipment. Most residential occupants, moreover, do not have the vaguest idea about the chemical compositions of the numerous consumer products they bring into their homes, how to use them safely, nor what the term outgassing means (Rousseau et al, 1988).

Many indoor pollutants identified in the 40 homes monitored by the Consumer Products Safety Commission emanate from building materials and systems used by the building industry today, e.g., plastics, paints, varnishes, stoves, heaters, furnishings, insulation materials, and pressed wood products. Some of the more frequently discovered indoor pollutants that emanate from building materials or the soil itself are formaldehyde, nitrogen oxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon tetrachloride, tetrachloroethane, tricholorethane, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB), and radon (a radioactive gas).

Unfortunately, the remedies proposed to ameliorate or abolish some indoor pollutants create problems related to energy conservation, e.g., opening windows. It appears, therefore, that more attention and education must be directed toward building homes with a so-

Dr. Nygren is Professor Emerita, Consumer and Family Studies/Dietetics Department, San Francisco State University.

lar energy orientation and appropriate ventilation systems.

Particulate contaminants, such as asbestos and lead, are other indoor pollutants. Asbestos is especially hazardous for children who are more likely to come in contact with asbestos dust that falls on floors because asbestos was used extensively in schools built during the period 1945-78. According to Peters (1988), surveys conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) revealed that friable asbestos exists in 44,000 public and private schools as well as thousands of public buildings and private homes throughout the country. Children who live in a home and attend a school constructed with asbestos containing materials probably are exposed to that hazard, on average, 90-95 percent of each school day.

Lead impurities in the air, much of them coming from automobile use of leaded gasoline, also are an especially vicious threat to children, particularly those who live or play near heavily traveled streets or freeways or for whom streets are their playgrounds. Because the impurities fall to the ground or pavement, they can be carried inside on the soles of shoes and then become a part of household dust. When they come into direct contact with skin or clothing, impurities eventually are absorbed into the bloodstream and then begin the damage to body and mind. In urban and suburban localities across the nation, the incidence of lead poisoning among children has been increasing. Although the campaign to eliminate lead from gasoline has diminished lead poisoning in the adult population, children are much more susceptible to it than are adults.

Lead, as a pollutant, is not just airborne. According to Wellborn (1986), EPA studies revealed that kitchen taps in the homes of one in five Americans discharge water containing excess levels of lead. Some of this lead leeches from lead piping, generally found in very old buildings, and some from solder used to join copper tubing. Moreover, in many houses, especially those built before 1950, surfaces inside and out were covered with lead-based paint. As it deteriorates, paint falls to the floor or ground in the forms of chips or dust, and eventually, may be washed into ground wells by rain or melting snow.

Protection Against Contagion

The human needs, classified as Protection Against Contagion, include a safe water supply, toilet facilities of such character as to minimize the danger of transmitting disease, protection against sewage contamination of interior surfaces, sanitary conditions within the vicinity of the dwelling, facilities for the sanitary and safe storage of foods and beverages, and sufficient space in sleeping rooms to minimize the danger of contact infection. In rural areas, a water supply of safe, sanitary quality still may be an unmet need given the millions of septic tanks that discharge waste into the ground. In most urban and suburban areas, by virtue of municipal water systems that have explicit standards and conduct periodic tests, the need for a safe, sanitary supply of water has been met fairly well.

In an era when both urban and suburban residents assume their water to be safe, it is disturbing that reports across the nation proclaim the discovery of toxic chemicals in ground wells and underground aquifers. Many of these toxic chemicals have leaked accidentally from so-called leak-proof underground containers or have been disposed of illegally along roadsides, in ponds, or at legal dump sites. Sources of such contaminants, ranging in distance from less than 100 feet to over 50 miles, include leaking tanks at neighborhood gasoline stations, toxic waste depositories, agricultural pesticide programs, and rain or snow or flood waters draining off streets and parking lots. The jury is still out on water distribution systems constructed of plastic piping. Research exists to show that toxic chemicals from such piping also leech into water. The consequences of these chemical contaminants are suspected to be miscarriages, birth deformities, stillbirths, and malignancies, as well as a host of other physical discomforts.

In terms of absence of excessive noise, findings from research increasingly show harmful effects. Noise (defined as unwanted sound), if excessive, unexpected, and/or long term, not only can have dramatic impacts on auditory systems, it also may have substantive effects on one's cardiovascular system in the form of elevated blood pressure and heart rate and hypertension (Cohen et al., 1981b; Dejoy, 1983, 1984; Lukas et al., 1981; Peterson et al, 1984).

Of equal import is a growing body of research that shows a relationship between noisy environments and cognitive development, sensorimotor development, task achievement (such as solving a puzzle within a given time frame), verbal skills, and reading achievement of children from infancy onward (Cohen et al., 1981a, 1981b; Dejoy, 1983, 1984; Green et al., 1982; Hambrick-Dixon, 1986; Lukas et al., 1981; Wachs, 1971, 1979). Unfortunately, as our world becomes more mechanized, sources and decibel levels of noise are increasing. As rising land costs force people to share common walls, soundproofing of household appliances and between rooms and housing units is an imperative. Housing units adjacent to heavily traveled roads and freeways or parallel to or under air corridors and landing strips must be prohibited.

Protection Against Accidents

The classification, Protection Against Accidents, includes the following human needs: freedom from accidents due to structural collapse, absence of conditions likely to cause fire or promote its spread, facilities for escape in case of fire, protection against danger of electrical shocks and/or burns, protection from gas or other heating fuels, protection against falls and mechanical injuries, and absence of hazards related to vehicular traffic. Of the four classifications of human needs, these appear to have been met most successfully, except for people living in dilapidated buildings in rural areas and in communities where codes do not exist or are not enforced or for those who were seduced into buying a home with a sunken living room, dining room, or conversation pit.

In all probability, the needs classified as Protection Against Accidents have been met best because materials, systems, and construction processes prescribed for meeting them can be tested and are more easily codified than is the case for the other three classifications of needs. In fact, building and housing codes in most communities focus on these needs. Moreover, revised specifications for materials, systems, and construction processes aimed at meeting these needs can be achieved relatively easily as new materials and systems are developed by industry.

Fundamental Psychological Needs

The human needs that were classified as Fundamental Psychological Needs include adequate privacy for the individual, facilities or features that foster normal family and community life, facilities or features that allow the performance of household tasks without undue physical and mental fatigue, facilities or features for maintaining cleanliness of the dwelling and the person, qualities in the home and its immediate environs that evoke aesthetic satisfaction, and concordance with prevailing social standards. Since the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing developed its listing of fundamental psychological needs, a number of studies from the fields of ergonomics and environmental psychology have yielded significant findings and concepts that have relevance to this classification.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, otherwise known as NASA (1985), has been diligently applying psychological needs to the design of space capsules and space stations. Concepts from environmental psychology, especially, appear to be basic components of the human psyche and, thereby, are relevant to a discussion of human needs in housing. Miller and Schlitt (1985), for example, identify the following personal needs: control of space/territoriality and the ambient environment, privacy, identity, security, order, variety of stimulation, aesthetics, choice, sociability. Some of these personal needs, according to Miller and Schlitt, are functions of other needs, e.g., territoriality as a function of control, identity, and order; and privacy as a function of identity and order. Other psychological needs identified by various authors (Dovey, 1985; Dubos, 1968, Lemkau, 1976; Montgomery, 1967; Sommer, 1969; and Taylor and Brower, 1985) include personal space, self-worth, continuity, rootedness, diversity, status, connectedness, and contact with nature.

Maslow's Theory and Housing Needs

Although Abraham Maslow (1954) published his list of basic human needs and his theory about the prepotency of those needs a number of years after the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing completed its task, it is interesting that the human needs addressed by the Committee embrace the first three, if not four, of the five needs Maslow identified, i.e., biological, safety and security, belongingness and love, esteem of self and others, and self-actualization. It is conceivable that the fundamental psychological needs delineated by the Committee, when combined with the needs identified by Miller and Schlitt and others, will constitute a more complete compendium of psychological needs which would bring the framework of human housing needs into closer accord with Maslow's theory.

Conclusion

In an era when increasing numbers of individuals and families are priced out of the housing market, especially in cities where expansion of boundaries is not possible and "homelessness" is a major problem, it behooves us as a society to rethink our housing priorities. Calandra (1989), citing data from a study made by the California Association of Realtors, noted that, for the nation as a whole in December, 1988, only 48 percent of the households could afford the median-priced home. In contrast to this, only 10 percent of households in the Bay Area could afford this level of housing, and his data excluded San Francisco, Oakland, and parts of San Mateo where percentages are even lower. Reder (1988) estimated that 28 percent of all households are experiencing significant problems in meeting their shelter needs. It is difficult to know whether the National Coalition for the Homeless report that ". . . upwards of 3 million men, women and children are homeless and the number is continuing to grow exponentially—by as much as 25 percent a year" (Reder, 1988) or more conservative governmental estimates accurately assesses the amount of homelessness.

Given the conditions exemplified by these data, fundamental human needs in housing must again become the paramount criteria for designing, evaluating, building, and/or marketing housing. As environmental stressors mount and research continues to clarify the relationship between one's housing environment, one's physical and psychological well-being, and one's behavior, it is incumbent upon consumers, consumer advocates, builders, and developers, as well as policy makers, to become as knowledgeable as possible about how an environment, as a whole, and its various components can have either a deleterious or a positive effect on those within it. It is time for everyone concerned with the production, marketing, and consumption of housing to focus in concert on its healthful dimension rather than on exotic features which guarantee little but higher cost and contribute indirectly to the homeless problem. Consumers, especially, must become aware of their rights in terms of the implied warranty of habitability.

Findings from a wide variety of studies raise a number of questions about the housing product and the processes by which it comes onto the market and is maintained. For example, what is the best mechanism for increasing the probability that our nation's housing meets basic human needs; that both existing and new housing units are free from toxic gases and particulate contaminants; that water systems not only are free from biological impurities but from toxic contaminants as well; that either on the streets or in neighborhoods, excessive noise does not exist during any hour of the day? Who should be responsible for guaranteeing the healthful dimension of housing? What processes need to be implemented to ensure that as new products, appliances or audio-visual units come on the market, they will not have harmful effects on people? How can the building industry be persuaded that healthful housing which meets basic human needs should be the product advertised, not status features nor dream castles? What process or processes need to be implemented to ensure that housing defined as healthful is based on human needs and is in concordance with the latest findings from research and with the latest in building technology?

The intent of this discussion has been to present two major ideas. The first is that healthful housing is not a visibly high priority among builders and developers and that it probably is an assumed quality on the part of consumers. The second major idea is that providers of housing—builders, developers, and merchandisers—and consumers, as well, have a lot to learn about the various impacts housing environments can have on people. Some questions have been raised in terms of how these conditions can be changed. It is clear that both research and educational programs are needed but of what type, at what levels, and by whom? The final question, what role or roles can home economists play in finding answers to the questions posed above and in ensuring that housing units are designed and built to support the health and well-being of individuals and families?

References

American Public Health Association, Committee on the Hygiene of Housing. (1939). *Basic principles of healthful housing*. New York: American Public Health Association.

American Public Health Association, Program Area Committee on Housing and Health. (1971). *Basic health principles of housing and its environment: APHA-PHS recommended housing maintenance and occupancy ordinance*. Washington, D.C.: American Public Health Association.

Calandra, T. (1988, January 31). Housing affordability: Grim outlook for state. *San Francisco Examiner*, D-1.7.

Cohen, S., Evans, G. W., Krantz, D. S., Stokols, D. & Kelly, S. (1981a). Aircraft noise and children: Longitudinal and cross-sectional evidence on adaptation to noise and the effectiveness of noise abatement. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 40*, 330-345.

Cohen, S., Krantz, D. S., Evans, G. W., & Stokols, D. (1981b). Cardiovascular and behavioral effects of community noise. *American Scientist, 69*, 528-535.

Dejoy, D. M. (1983). Environmental noise and children: Review of recent findings. *Journal of Auditory Research, 23*, 181-194.

Dejoy, D. M. (1984). The nonauditory effects of noise: Review and perspectives for research. *Journal of Auditory Research, 24*, 123-150.

Dovey, K. (1985). Home and homelessness. In I. Altman & C. M. Werner (Eds.), *Home environments* (pp. 33-64). New York: Plenum Press.

Dubos, R. (1968). Our buildings shape us. In C. S. Wedin & L. G. Nygren (Eds.), Housing perspectives: Individuals and families (pp. 3-16). Minneapolis: Burgess.

Green, K. B., Pasternack, B. S. and Shore, R. E. (1982). Effects of aircraft noise on reading ability of school-age children. *Architecture and Environmental Health, 37*, 24-31.

Greenfield, E. J. (1987). *House dangerous: Indoor pollution in your home and office—and what you can do about it!* New York: Vintage Books.

Grove, N. (1987, April). Air: An atmosphere of uncertainty. *National Geographic*, pp. 502-537.

Continued on page. 23

Clothing: A Basic Human Need?

Elaine L. Pederson

The purposes of this paper are to explore needs, basic needs, and basic human needs in relation to clothing[1] and its uses and to consider the question of whether clothing is a basic human need. An understanding of needs is warranted because they are important factors in the achievement of quality of life and other desirable ends (Watt, 1982).

Needs

There are several words in common usage that mean the same or take the place of the word need. Behavioral psychologists tend to refer to the concept as drives. Economists call them wants, choices, and demands (Leiss, 1976). Needs are associated with the concept of necessity— what is necessary to be human (Galtung, 1980). Stated simply, need is "a requirement . . . necessity arising from the circumstances of a case. . . ." (Urdang & Flexner, 1968, p. 890). Mallman (1980) defined need as "a generic requirement that all human beings have in order not to be ill" (p. 37). Lederer (1980) supported this view by his description of universal characteristics of needs: the requirements for survival and the conditions necessary for human functioning and for avoiding illness. However, he stated that needs within an historical and social context must be defined more subjectively.

Basic Needs

If basic needs are defined as those critical for survival or life maintenance, there is no distinction between the requirements of human beings and other animals. For example, food and water are required for the continuation of life, and sexual activity is essential for sustaining the species. Klineberg (1980) included social stimulation and contact along with the biological needs necessary for survival. Basic human needs require the addition of psychological and social needs for an adequate quality of human life. The difference between basic needs and basic human needs is explained in this manner.

Dr. Pedersen is Assistant Professor, School of Home Economics, University of Nevada-Reno.

Basic Human Needs

Galtung differentiated among needs, wants, wishes, desires, and demands and defined universal needs as "something that has to be satisfied at least to some extent in order for the need-subject to function as a human being" (1980, p. 60). He noted that it cannot be assumed that individuals are conscious of all of their needs. Basic human needs may be classified into such categories as security (against violence), welfare (the avoidance of misery), identity (the avoidance of alienation of misery), identity (the avoidance of alienation), and freedom (the avoidance of repression).

Except for those basic needs necessary to maintain life Klineberg (1980) believed that needs vary among individuals due to cultural variables or individual experiences. It is the cultural variations in need satisfaction that confound the discussion of universal human needs. Failure to satisfy basic needs may not only lead to physical problems but to psychological ones as well. Some basic human needs identified by Klineberg (1980) include affiliation, freedom of expression, recognition, autonomy, acquisition, achievement, and order. Mallmann (1980) used the term vital needs to refer to a "group of independent needs whose satisfaction guarantees human beings the indispensable physiological and psychological vigor needed to live and . . . grow, and perfect" (p. 38). His definition of vital needs described fundamental or basic human requirements or needs.

Maslow (1954) is most often referred to in discussions of basic human needs (Lederer, 1980) and to needs related to clothing. Maslow's hierarchy of needs starts with the need to satisfy the body's basic physiological requirements for existence. This is followed by safety, belongingness, and self-esteem. Self-actualization can only begin after the above needs have been at least partially satisfied.

Influence of Culture

The fulfillment of needs is dependent upon physiological and cultural factors. Food is a basic physiological need, but the type of food eaten for survival is related to cultural definitions of food. Americans, for example, do not usually recognize insects as food, and most would probably die of starvation, even though surrounded by this food source.

With regard to clothing one might assume it would always be a basic need in extreme climates. However, some cultures, in adapting to their harsh environment, have selected other means, generally shelter, as protection. Some groups (pre-Western contact) existed in extremely harsh physical environments with what would be considered insufficient protection by Western standards. Thus basic human needs are the same across cultures, but the satisfiers[2] are apt to vary. Social and cultural factors are integral to the satisfaction of human needs, including basic human needs (Klineberg, 1980; Lederer, 1980; Leiss, 1976).

Is Clothing a Basic Human Need?

The appellation of clothing as a need is dependent upon the definition of need. In most cases clothing would be labeled a need satisfier rather than a need. Clothing is sometimes cited as a need when discussing motivating factors influencing clothing behavior (Creekmore, 1963; Kaiser, 1985; Ryan, 1966; Storm, 1987). If needs are defined as "prerequisites for the achievement of some end-state which is . . . desirable" (Watt, 1982, p. 533), clothing can be defined as a need. Clothing is, however, a cultural artifact that can satisfy many types of needs (Roach & Eicher, 1973). Because there are a variety of cultural solutions to life maintenance, clothing cannot be described as essential even though it may be used by some to maintain life. Therefore, the answer to the question posed in the title is that clothing is not a basic human need since it is not consistently required cross-culturally for life maintenance. Table 1 illustrates the various needs related to clothing. This is not a definitive list nor is there any particular order.

Clothing as a Satisfier of Physical Needs

Clothing is not required for the fulfillment of the physiological needs, although clothing is one of the cultural artifacts that can protect the individual and satisfy the safety need. When individuals venture outside in a harsh

Table 1. Physical and psychosocial needs and clothing satisfiers.*

Needs	Need Component	Clothing Satisfiers
Physical	protection	
	climate	windbreakers, insulation, protection from radiant heat
	bodily harm	padding, helmets, fireman's clothing
	health risks	surgeon's mask, pesticide protective clothing
Psychosocial		
	protection/security	rabbit's foot, amulet, St. Christopher medal
	affiliation/belonging	clothing similar to the group, uniforms
	esteem	expensive clothes, designer clothes, art clothing, hunting trophy, karate black belt, badge of office
	freedom of expression	teenage boy with a pierced ear, new or unusual style of dress
	recognition	fur coat, unusual or expensive jewelry, **not** wearing noticeable garments, military uniform
	autonomy	child's easy to fasten garments and right to select own clothing
	acquisition	ability to buy and acquire own personal taste in clothing
	achievement	fur coat, three-piece suit, badges or medals
	order	ability to take care of one's clothing
	self-concept	clothing style reinforces self-concept

***adapted from Galtung (1980).**

winter environment, clothing is one of several means of protection from hypothermia. In a hot, dry desert climate, clothing can help to save the individual from overexposure. Other means of protection are also available, such as a shelter of some sort. In today's world of rising fuel costs and potential energy boycotts, clothing can be thermal protection if thermostats are lowered. Clothing is frequently used to protect health whether it be a surgeon's mask, a field worker's clothing for protection against pesticides, a fireman's protective dress, or protective sports clothing.

Clothing as a Satisfier of Psychosocial Needs

Clothing may satisfy the need for physical protection and security, but it also provides psychological protection and security. Amulets and other charms provide the wearer with an important sense of security and protection in the social milieu. Love and belongingness needs are partially met through apparel that conforms to the group norm. Clothing that helps the individual feel important or better about oneself or gives status is an enabler for achieving the esteem need. This may be fulfilled by wearing expensive clothes, designer clothes, or some other type of garment or accessory which will earn the individual recognition. Specific items of apparel may symbolize an act that earns the individual respect (e.g., black belt in karate, medals, or the rodeo trophy buckle). Clothing plays an important role in one's belief in self. When mentally ill patients improve their grooming, doctors regard this as evidence of recuperation (Ryan, 1966), and enhancement of one's appearance has been found to improve a chemotherapy patient's outlook (Mulready, Lamb, & Walsh, 1982).

Clothing satisfies affiliation, recognition, autonomy, and acquisition needs. Teenagers and adults frequently use clothing as a means of identifying their affiliation with a particular group. Clothing is used as a means of expression—a common subject of parent-child disputes involves the child's desire for freedom of expression. A special hair style, a military uniform, unusual or expensive jewelry, a fur coat, or not wearing noticeable garments—all may provide the individual with a means of achieving recognition. Clothing is a satisfier for autonomy if young children are allowed to choose their own clothes and if they are easy to put on. Clothing, among other material possessions, can help satisfy the acquisition need. Clothing symbolizes certain types of achievement, e.g., badges earned in scouts, a three-piece Brooks Brothers business suit. Control of one's budget for clothing and one's clothing storage space function as a satisfier for the need for order, as can well-pressed, well-fitted, coordinated clothing. Even though clothing has the potential to satisfy many psychosocial needs, Kaiser (1985) stated that individuals may not need clothing to gain self-esteem nor for self-actualization.

Summary

Clothing is generally accepted as an important good but is not always recognized for all of its possible contributions to human life. Knowledgeable professionals can raise the awareness of the many ways clothing helps to satisfy the needs of people. Because the satisfaction of survival needs is not sufficient to provide a quality existence, psychosocial needs become an area worthy of educational and research emphasis. Further theoretical consideration is necessary to bring clarity to essential needs of human beings and to the related functions of clothing.

Footnotes

[1]The term clothing is used predominantly throughout this paper. The author has selected this term because it is most easily understood by those in areas other than clothing and textiles. However, it is used in a very broad sense to include appearance, ornament, adornment, dress, and cosmetics. In some cases it has been used as a synonym for dress which has been defined to include the act of covering the body as well as the apparel and adornment products placed on or attached to the body (Roach & Eicher, 1965).

[2]Need satisfiers can be defined as elements any of whose use fulfills a need.

References

Creekmore, A.M. (1963). Clothing behaviors and their relations to general values and to the striving for basic needs (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 24*(4), 1599.

Galtung, J. (1980). The basic needs approach. In K. Lederer, J. Galtung, and D. Antal (Eds.). *Human needs* (pp. 55-125). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

Kaiser, S.B. (1985). *The social psychology of clothing.* New York: Macmillan.

Klineberg, O. (1980). Human needs: A social-psychological approach. In K. Lederer, J. Galtung, & D. Antal (Eds.) *Human needs* (pp. 19-35). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

Lederer, K. (1980). Introduction. In K. Lederer, J. Galtung, & D. Antal (Eds.). *Human needs* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

Leiss, W. (1976). *The limits to satisfaction: An essay on the problem of needs and commodities.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mallmann, C.A. (1980). Society, needs, and rights: A systemic approach. In K. Lederer, J. Galtung, & D. Antal (Eds.). *Human needs* (pp. 37-54). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper & Row.

Mulready, P.M., Lamb, J.M., & Walsh, R.G. (1982). Cosmetics therapy for female chemo-therapy patients. *Research report summary.* American Home Economics Association.

Roach, M.E., & Eicher, J.B. (1965). *Dress, adornment and the social order.* New York: Wiley.

Roach, M.E., & Eicher, J.B. (1973). *The visible self: Perspectives on dress.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Ryan, M.S. (1966). *Clothing: A study in human behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Storm, P. (1987). *Functions of dress: Tools of culture and the individual.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Urdang, L. & Flexner, S.B. (1968). *The Random House dictionary of the English language* (College Ed.). New York: Random House.

Watt, E.D. (1982). Human needs, human wants, and political consequences. *Political Studies, 30,* 533-543.

Workers at Risk: The Role of Home Economists in Meeting Basic Needs with Protective Clothing

Susan M. Watkins

Though home economists have traditionally treated food, clothing, and shelter as three distinct needs, clothing and shelter in many instances have merged in today's world. Because of a number of dramatic technological developments in textiles and clothing during the last several decades, numerous items of clothing now possess protective capacities that used to be reserved for buildings and vehicles. More than ever before, clothing is a factor in human survival. Survival in outer space exploration and deep sea diving, in environmental disasters such as forest fires, in technologically induced crises such as chlorine gas spills, and in hazardous industrial environments has been virtually secured if the proper protective clothing is worn.

Protecting people with clothing is often thought to be a technological problem that should be left in the hands of designers and manufacturers. In truth, there are a variety of problems associated with protection, and they can only be solved through the efforts of various individuals at many levels. The availability of effective protective clothing is not enough, even if psychosocial as well as physical needs were considered in their development. Clothing must actually be worn, and even then it is only effective if it is used properly. Proper use of protective clothing rests not only in features of the design but in psychological, social, political, and economic elements related to the microcosms in which individuals live and work. It is my position that home economists, as individuals who are concerned about human survival, have a responsibility to work not only toward research that will help establish effective design development but toward conditions in which ultimate users, e.g., workers, are actually protected. In many factories today, workers face a risk of harm, and we have the knowledge and technical capacity to drastically reduce or perhaps even eliminate that risk. But what is our best route to achieving the goal of protecting workers from harm in the workplace?

Dr. Watkins is Professor of Apparel Design, Department of Textiles and Apparel, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. end risk

Protective Clothing in the Workplace

Protective clothing may appear in a work situation if its use is required by the company or by other institutional or governmental requirements as a prerequisite for holding a job; if company management makes it available to workers who wish to wear it; if informed workers demand it as an employee benefit; or if workers are concerned enough to provide it for themselves. In some societies, it is conceivable that government or public interest groups might become concerned enough to procure garments and provide them to those at greatest risk. In all of these cases, the actual decision to wear protective clothing comes from one of two sources: either the worker chooses to wear protection or the use of protective clothing is imposed on the worker by someone else.

The impetus for the use of protective clothing has a bearing on the direction our efforts should take because it raises questions about the rights of workers, employers, and others concerned with risk in the workplace. If protective clothing designers and other home economists concerned with human safety choose to accept some of the responsibility for the fate of workers who are at risk, at least some of their concerns are morally and not legally motivated. In order to determine the moral course for our actions, then, we must identify the rights of the parties involved and work to support them through our activities. In the case of workers' use of protective clothing to prevent risk to their survival, we are presented with two basic questions with regard to rights: 1) Do companies (or federal or state agencies) have a right to require workers to wear protective clothing? and 2) Do workers have the right to demand that employers provide adequate protective clothing for them in work environments where risk of physical harm exists? The exploration of these questions should provide some guidance for appropriate action.

Rights and Basic Needs

Rights are a relatively modern phenomenon. Prior to the 17th century, people were assumed to have duties but not rights. During the 18th century, the United States Bill of Rights and several European counterparts established personal natural rights that government should guard (Edwards, 1967). These documents and the work of a number of prominent philosophers established the widespread assumption that people have some rights, such as the right to liberty and the right to life, that governments may not override. Though all rights are not universal and, as Gibson (1983) said, may "change their shape" due to "continuously changing historical circumstances" (p. 131), the rights to liberty and life have remained a significant part of many cultures and societies and thus should carry substantial weight in an analysis of any worker's situation.

The right of one individual implies responsibilities on the part of other people. At the very least, having a right justifies the demand that other people not interfere with its exercise as long as no one else's rights are violated. At most, others may be required to provide for a variety of human needs, as various declarations of human rights would grant, e.g. adequate amounts of food, clothing, and shelter for all people (Edwards, 1967). Natural rights are independent of considerations of the moral value of an act that an individual might commit or the consequences of that act except as it impinges on the natural rights of others (Edwards, 1967). Many aspects of human rights, on the other hand, rest heavily on the morality of our positive acts toward others.

H.L.A. Hart (1979), in his essay, "Are there, any Natural Rights?," stated that "if there are any moral rights at all, it follows that there is at least one natural right, the equal right of all men to be free" (p. 14). John Rawls (1971), in his classic work, *A Theory of Justice*, judged freedom to be an individual's most important right and stated that justice is best served when departures from a policy of equal liberty for each person are not allowed,[1] even when greater social and economic advantages would result (p. 61).[2] Thompson (1980), discussing compulsory medical treatment, stated that "the patient's own harm cannot justify interference" as illustrated by a Jehovah's Witness' right to refuse a blood transfusion. He qualified this, however, by stating that "a patient can be compelled to accept medical care if it is necessary to prevent harm to other people, especially children, or to protect public health" (p. 261). Lyons (1979) stated that Mill believed that "the only reasons we should entertain . . . support of coercive social interference is the prevention of harm to people other than the agent whose freedom may be limited," and that the welfare of a society is best served in the long run if this is so (p. 176). Gibson (1985) said that autonomy, i.e., self-determination or freedom to make a choice—even a bad one, "has for us intrinsic value. That is why, even in circumstances where the potential negative consequences of a person's own choice clearly outweigh the potential benefits to that individual and to others, it often is not justifiable to override that person's choice" (p. 143).

If viewed from the standpoint of basic needs, these statements about rights could be interpreted to indicate that the right to free choice is a human need perhaps even as basic as the need for physical survival. If, as Gibson stated, it is not justifiable to override an individual's freedom to make a choice—even if the choice would lead to that individual's physical harm, individual autonomy rises to a very high point on the basic needs hierarchy.

This rather simplistic approach to the relationship between rights and needs appears, however, to ignore some of the complexities of the relationship, especially its universality. Though Galtung and Wirak (1976) believed that there can be no universally agreed-upon list of specific needs, they set forth two general criteria to designate something as a universal need: "1) If it is a necessary condition for a human being to exist. . . ." and/or "2) If it is a necessary condition for a society to exist over a longer period of time . . . " These definitions of need have as their basis the authors' assumption that to be human involves having the capacity for personal growth. They define existence at two levels: at the level of the physical being and at the level of what beings "fight for" (p. 43). The latter would, for many individuals, include the right of free choice.

Maslow categorized both physical and social needs as basic. His writings provided additional support for potential relationships between needs and rights (Lowry, 1973). Discussing safety needs as among the most basic, he stated that "they may serve as almost exclusive organizers of behavior . . . " and that for some individuals "Practically everything looks less important then safety, (even sometimes the physiological needs . . .)" (p. 154). He believed that many adults have been largely satisfied in their safety needs by counting on society to protect them from harm. It is clear that, when individuals are threatened, they mobilize their resources to preserve their hold on this basic need.

If safety needs are among an individual's most basic needs and individuals have the right to act autonomously to preserve their basic needs, the ability to decide upon and meet the requirements for one's individual safety is both a need and a right. Indeed, Maslow listed the "freedom to do what one wishes so long as no harm is done to others" as one of the "preconditions" for the basic satisfaction of needs without which the satisfaction of basic needs is "quite impossible, or at least, very severely endangered" (Lowry, 1973, p. 163).

If we apply these viewpoints on needs and rights to the question of workers' rights, they indicate that workers *should* have the right to choose whether or not to wear protective clothing because their decision affects the health of their own bodies, over which they should be allowed to exercise autonomy.[3] According to Rawls (1971), these rights would take precedence even over the company's rights to economic and social health, i.e., their concerns about litigation or rising insurance costs or bad public relations because the right of an individual to be free supersedes potential economic and social advantages.

However, as Mill (Lyons, 1979) and Thompson (1980) pointed out, risks to those other than the worker must be considered. We must look at the practical aspects of a typical worker in a hazardous environment. In many cases, factory workers who deal with toxic materials and refuse to wear protective clothing may transport the materials home on their work clothing and, through the family wash, transmit them to the clothing of other family members. An astronaut, who refuses to wear protective clothing, risks death and endangers the crew. Thus, true adherence to the notion that individual rights should only be constrained if they impinge on someone else's rights would dictate that each hazardous situation be explored to determine those cases in which risk to an individual is truly self-contained.

In addition, freedom to make a choice depends upon there being a genuine and informed choice to be made. In making the choice, is the worker aware of the consequences of the choice? Is it a free choice or is it constrained by social or economic conditions, i.e., do workers choose not to wear protection or are they just too poor to afford it? Rawls (1971) said that the "inability to take advantage of one's rights and opportunities as a result of poverty and ignorance, and a lack of means generally" affects the value of individual rights (p. 204). Thus, workers who refuse to wear protection because they are ignorant of the hazards and those who choose to wear protection because they would lose their jobs otherwise are not fully enjoying their right to free choice.

If employees have exercised free choice and choose to wear protective clothing, do they also have the right to demand provision of that clothing by the employer? If an employee has a natural right to life, an employer would seem to have a responsibility not to impose risks of death. But is that responsibility a negative one which requires only that the employer refrain from imposing risks on unsuspecting workers, or is it a positive one that requires that the employer provide protection from that risk? One might say that positive and negative responsibilities are one and the same in this case—that in order not to impose risks, employers must provide some form of protection. Although theoretically, since an employer has not captured employees and chained them to their workstations, a worker is free to reject a job that involves too much risk.[4] We may need to look at negative and positive responsibilities from the viewpoint of consent. If employees are informed of and have freely consented to accept the risk that a job entails, the employer has not truly imposed the risk on them.[5] In order to determine a reasonable assessment of an employer's responsibilities, then, the task becomes one of exploring a combination of right-to-know and free-choice issues related to the workplace.[6]

It seems clear that employers have, whether knowingly or unknowingly, freely set up conditions of risk in the workplace and that they are responsible for monitoring those conditions of risk.[7] However, if an employer's responsibility is simply not to impose a risk on a worker's right to life, then it does not seem to follow directly that specific actions can be demanded of an employer to fulfill that responsibility. It appears that employers do not have the specific responsibility to provide protective clothing for workers in hazardous situations. Their responsibilities lie under a much broader umbrella than the specific provision of protection demanded by individual workers. If employers are to take on responsibility, they must have the autonomy to develop what they consider to be the most responsible plan of action for all of their employees. Surely, it is untenable to require them to be accountable to each employee's choice of method of protection, although they may choose to honor each employee's request. Employers must view the entire picture of risk and decide on the best allocation of their resources in solving the problem for all of their employees. In some cases, this may mean choosing to avoid worker risk through factory renovation or changing the items produced on the assembly line or the processes and materials used to produce them rather than providing specific types of protective clothing.

Though employers should not be bound by employees to specific actions, they should fulfill their basic responsibility not to impose risks by providing information and resources to aid employees to be fully free of risk in the workplace. In general, employers should 1) clearly delineate the hazards present in the work environment, 2) provide information on the short- and long-range effects of these hazards on the health of workers and those who come into contact with them outside the work environment, and 3) provide state-of-the-art information on methods used to protect workers from the hazards so that employees themselves could make good decisions about appropriate protection.

If risk is present in the workplace, an employer could provide resources to employees in two ways: 1) Employers could provide protection by autonomously allocating the firm's resources to purchase specific protective devices (whether they be building partitions, ventilation systems, items of protective clothing, etc.) to protect all employees at risk or 2) Employers could decide to allocate grants to each employee in a "protection allowance" (or an increase in wages that could be applied to personal protection) in order to let the employees secure their own forms of protection. The resources provided should be adequate to secure protection and eliminate risk in accordance with current research on the hazards and state-of-the-art protective devices.

With these options, employers have the right to choose how to fulfill their responsibilities, yet the employee maintains the right to choose whether to wear protective clothing and, if so, what to wear. If an employer provides protective clothing, fully informed employees can choose to accept or reject it, the latter forcing them to rely on their own resources to provide protection, change jobs, or request a transfer to a less hazardous area. If an adequate allowance is offered by the employer, employees have full freedom to choose their own form of protection. Since risks to individuals from the same hazard differ widely and individuals from different cultures and walks of life differ greatly in their life plans, the provision of information and resources would allow workers in any society to act autonomously to determine their own protective needs and fulfill their individual desires for protection.

Problems with free choice for the employee occur if there is disagreement over what constitutes adequate protection. In some cases, employees may not feel that choices are truly free if the protection chosen by an employer seems inadequate or the allowances provided by employers do not allow them to purchase the level of protection they feel is necessary. In this respect, employers' responsibilities may be fulfilled best by allowing informed employees to take an active part in company decision making about the allocation of resources for prevention of worker risk.

If we look at the worker's situation from a typical human rights approach, the responsibility for the provision of protection to those at risk is given far broader assignment than, a specific person, e.g., an employer. It extends to all of humankind (Edwards, 1967). Therefore, although employers have primary moral responsibility for the provision of protection for their employees, it is clear that others should take on some of the responsibility as well. Designers and other home economists who have the capacity to provide assistance to workers fall among that group.

The Role of the Home Economist

Although attempts to answer the originally posed questions have merely skimmed the surface of issues concerning workers' needs and rights, even this very basic exploration points to a number of directions for our efforts.

First, there is a clear need for basic research because there is considerable support for the premise that workers could choose not to wear protective clothing and that it would be their moral right to do so. We should be playing an important role in identifying, through our research, the consequences of that choice in respect to the individual worker and to others involved with the worker's activities in and outside of work. We can, in other words, help to determine the basic hazards, identify when risk to a worker is truly self-contained, help to establish sensible procedures for protecting individuals when hazards are not self-contained, and determine the effectiveness of various methods of protection.

In addition, research that establishes the benefits of a variety of approaches to worker safety could help alert employers to their company's options in dealing with risks to workers. Often, protective clothing provides a very positive economic option of which employers are not aware, i.e., it is often cheaper to provide protective clothing than to make structural changes in a factory and, in some cases, it may be cheaper to provide it for all of a firm's employees than to deal with litigation costs after even one employee is injured. We must work toward interdisciplinary research to establish the costs/benefits, in human and economic terms, of various approaches to protecting workers from hazards in the workplace.

Second, we have the capacity to provide an educational role. We can make a major impact on worker health by educating workers, employers, and others in society about the hazards faced in the workplace and the types of protective clothing available to minimize risks from these hazards. Educating all of the parties concerned opens the door for collaborative efforts, such as worker participation in company decisions that affect their protection. Our biggest challenge is to educate, not merely to provide information. Workers' educational levels, attitudes, and longstanding traditions concerning personal protection often work against acceptance and real understanding of information presented to them. We need to develop educational programs that will be understood by workers and will motivate them to protect themselves. The Cooperative Extension Service is a logical vehicle to implement an educational program and to interpret research on topics related to worker health. Our international networks could help us translate and adapt our programs to meet the physical and social needs of other cultures.

Third, we must monitor the side effects of our research and development. While research in this field can provide much to help the worker, it could also provide ammunition to be improperly used to generate political, economic, and legal changes that work to the detriment of those at risk. For example, because hazards in the workplace have become more clearly identified and government agencies have stepped in to protect workers, firms in this country have solved their problems with regulations by moving their operations to poorer, unregulated areas of other nations, where the hazards are simply dumped on uninformed, unprotected workers (Shue, 1981). This is but one side effect that could occur from even our best efforts to provide a solid knowledge base for decision making. In this respect, there is much to be done through our international networks.

Finally, we need to examine the conflict of moral and legal aspects of the workplace. If current legal restrictions pose dilemmas for the moral course this paper sets forth, then we may need to become active in supporting regulations that reduce risk in a more ethical fashion.

Clothing is a basic human need which has begun to assume an even greater role in assuring human safety and survival in many work environments. Protecting workers with clothing involves a wide variety of interdisciplinary research efforts and demands our best efforts in establishing educational programs that reach workers at risk. As home economists, we are uniquely qualified to address the multifaceted problems of worker safety and to reach workers through our established educational networks. As professionals and as members of the human race, we have a moral responsibility to do so.

Footnotes

[1]For a discussion of rights as consequences of liberty and rights as consequences of equality, see Dworkin (1984).

[2]Though Rawls later qualifies his remarks on liberty by raising the possibility that less extensive liberties and unequal liberties may be acceptable under certain historical and societal conditions, his comments appear to be aimed at political freedoms that impinge on public welfare, not on the freedom of individuals to exercise control over their own bodies except as such control relates to the mentally or physically incompetent (1971, pp. 245-249).

[3]For a discussion of individual rights within the boundaries of one's own body, see Railton (1985).

[4]Economic considerations may put a dent in this theory by not making job rejection a truly free choice.

[5]For an excellent account of the moral significance of consent when workers are at risk, see Gibson (1985). This document looks at the role of consent in cases where air pollution poses a risk to human health.

[6]For a discussion of these issues in relation to consent in the workplace, see Baram (1985).

[7]For a discussion of one's responsibility for nondeliberate acts, see Postema (1983).

References

Baram, M. (1985). The role of consent in managing airborne health risks to workers. In M. Gibson (Ed.), *To breathe freely: Risk, consent, and air* (pp. 186-197). Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.

Dworkin, R. (1984). Rights as trumps. In J. Waldron, *Theories of rights* (pp. 153-167). New York: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, P. (Ed.). (1967). *Encyclopedia of philosophy* (Vol. 7). New York: MacMillan and Free Press.

Galtung, J. & Wirak, A. (1976). *Human needs, human rights, and the theory of development*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Gibson, M. (1983). *Worker's rights*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.

_______________ (1985). Consent and autonomy. In M. Gibson (Ed.), *To breathe freely: Risk, consent, and air* (pp. 141-168). Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.

Hart, H.L.A. (1979). Are there any natural rights? In D. Lyons (Ed.), *Rights* (pp. 14-25). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lowry, R. (1973). *Dominance, self-esteem, self-actualization: Germinal papers of A.H. Maslow*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Lyons, D. (1979). Human rights and the general welfare. In D. Lyons (Ed.), *Rights* (pp. 174-186). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Postema, G. (1983). Self-Image, integrity and professional responsibility. In D. Luban (Ed.), *The good lawyer: Lawyers' roles and lawyers' ethics* (pp. 286-314). Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Railton, P. (1985). Locke, stock and peril: Natural property rights, pollution, and risk. In M. Gibson (Ed.), *To breathe freely: Risk, consent, and air* (pp. 89-123). Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.

Shue, H. (1981). Exporting hazards. In P. Brown and H. Shue (Eds.), *Boundaries: National autonomy and its limits* (pp. 107-145). Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.

Thompson, D. (1980). Paternalism in medicine, law and public policy. In D. Callahan and S. Bok (Eds.) *Ethics teaching in higher education*. New York: Plenum Press.

Continued from page 17

Kirsch, L. S. (1983). Behind closed doors: The problem of indoor pollutants. *Environment, 252*, 16-42.

Lemkau, P. V. (1976). Housing and health. In C. S. Wedin & L. G. Nygren (Eds.), *Housing perspectives: Individuals and families* (pp. 145-168). Minneapolis: Burgess.

Lukas, J. S., Dupree, R. B., & Swing, J. W. (1981). *Effects of noise on academic achievement and classroom behavior* (Report No. FHWA/CA/DOHS-81/01). Sacramento: California Department of Transportation.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Miller, W., & Schlitt, J. K. (1985). *Interior space: Design concepts for personal needs*. New York: Praeger.

Montgomery, J. E. (1967). Human needs in housing. In *Proceedings of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers Seminar on Economy Housing* (pp. 5-9). St. Joseph, Michigan: American Society of Agricultural Engineers.

Murphy, J. (1985, July 22). The colorless, odorless killer. *Time*, p. 72.

Nero, A. V. (1988, May). Controlling indoor air pollution. *Scientific American*, pp. 42-48.

Peters, S. (1988, September/October). The A B C 's of asbestos cleanup. *Sierra*, pp. 27-29.

Peterson, E. A., Augenstein, J. S., Hazelton, C. L., Hetrick, D. & Levene, R. M. (1984). Some cardiovascular effects of noise. *The Journal of Auditory Research, 24*, 35- 62.

Reder, N. (1988, August). The crisis of unmet needs: The search for low-cost housing. *The National Voter*, pp. 4-8, 19.

Rousseau, D., Rea, W. J. & Enwright, J. (1988). *Your home, your health and well-being*. Berkeley: Ten Speed Press.

Sommer, R. (1969). *Personal Space: The behavioral basis of design*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Taylor, R. B., & Brower, S. (1985). Home and near-home territories. In I. Altman & C. M. Werner (Eds.), *Home environments* (pp. 183-212). New York: Plenum Press.

Wachs, T. D., Francis, J. & McQuiston, S. (1979). Psychological dimensions of the infant's physical environment. *Infant Behavior & Development, 2*, 155-161.

Wachs, T. D., Uzgiris, I., & Hunt, J. McV. (1971). Cognitive development in infants of different age levels and from different environmental backgrounds. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 17*, 283-317.

Wellborn, S. N. (1986, November 24). Pouring lead from the tap. *U. S. News and World Report*, pp. 70, 71.

Continued from page 14

fulfill the right-to-life premise. It is up to the public to determine how to sustain that right for future generations.

What are the roles for the profession and home economists in assuring sound housing policies for this country? Because home economists have the training and experience, they have a responsibility to enable individuals and families to participate in the formation of social goals to meet the human needs for housing. Another important role for home economists is the promotion of home and family education for children, youth, and adults in formal, nonformal, and special programs, including the media. And they need to convince legislators, school officials, and church and community leaders of the apparent relation between social problems and the ability to establish and maintain a home. The profession has a responsibility to study and to propose action regarding the current challenges to people and their living environments. Thus the role possibilities are challenging, and professional action depends on the strength of the values of home economists and on their will to respond.

References

Bachelard, G. (1969). *The poetics of space*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Dovey, K. (1985). Home and homelessness. In I. Altman & C.M. Werner (Eds.). *Home environments* (Vol. 8). New York: Plenum Press.

Dubos, R. (1968). *So human an animal*. New York: Charles Scribner.

Hayward, G. D. (1977). Social research and concept of home. *Housing Educators Journal, 4* (3), 7-12.

Main, T. J. (1988, May). Commentary: What we know about the homeless. *Journal of Thoughts and Opinions on Contemporary Issues*, 26-29.

HOME ECONOMICS FORUM — Volume 3, Number 2, Spring 1989
P.O. Box 247, Haslett, MI 48840-0247

Official Publication of Kappa Omicron Phi, Inc. and Omicron Nu Society, Inc., National Home Economics Honor Societies — Members, Association of College Honor Societies

Home Economics FORUM is a refereed semi-annual publication serving the profession of Home Economics. The opinions expressed by authors are their own and do not necessarily reflect the policies of the societies. A 3-year subscription for non-members is $15.00 or a 5-year subscription is $20.00. Members should give chapter, initiate name, and year of initiation when corresponding about the subscription.

OMICRON NU SOCIETY, INC.
P.O. BOX 247
HASLETT, MI 48840-0247

HASLETT MICHIGAN 48840

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 8