J.W. Byler and Stephen Gale, University of Pennsylvania

1. INTRODUCTION

Population movements are obviously related to changes in the demand for housing: they are, for example, both a cause of housing starts, vacancies, and changes in occupancy, as well as an effect of shifts in housing policies, zoning changes, and the cost of housing units. Aside from studies on interregional migration patterns, however, very little is known about the detailed character of the linkages between individual (and household) movement propensities and related shifts in occupancy conditions. As part of a general research effort on this issue, in this paper we shall offer a preliminary analysis of one portion of the population which may be regarded as having a high latent demand for housing, (i.e., that subpopulation whose potential for demanding future housing is not necessarily reflected by their present status in the housing market).

Current research on migration and the demand for housing has usually assumed that the migrating or housing consuming unit is relatively homogeneous in the sense that the family unit acts as a whole. As such, the determination and interpretation of the causes and effects of migration has usually been based on information concerning the economic, demographic, and social conditions of heads-ofhouseholds; the head-of-household is, in effect, treated as if he or she embodies the family unit's stage in the life cycle, income, educational at-tainment, occupational class, and so on.³ For certain purposes, this may provide a sufficient characterization. but at the local level where a knowledge of the short-term, sequential variations in housing demand is crucial for many planning purposes, there is also a need to understand the differential characteristics of the several parts of households, their predilections toward independent household formation, and their concomitant effects on the demand for housing.

The process of household formation is clearly very complicated. On the one hand, it is a function of the aging process, marital patterns, and other purely demographic conditions. And, on the other hand, it is related to the economic, social, and kinship status of the members of a household unit: children over 18 years of age may reside_at home during their post-secondary education; widowed relatives may join an extended family unit to gain economic security; unrelated individuals may form some sort of cooperative arrangement, and so on. In each case, the composition of the household aannot be treated in the usual homogeneous fashion. The varying needs and propensities for movement and housing consumption of the several parts of the household must all be treated separately in order to assess the overall prospects for future housing consumption. In effect, within each household there exists the components for several kinds of latent conditions for housing demands which must be accounted for in any assessment of present and future occupancy conditions.

One further point should be mentioned here. Within what we have called lodgers with respect to a latent demand for housing, there is also a "true" lodger population: individuals unrelated to other members of a household who, even while comprising family units of their own, have shosen to obtain dwelling accomodations (such as a room) from a family in return for a rental fee. Though the present study includes these individuals, it should be kept in mind that the notion of latent demand is not directly applicable in such cases; "true" lodgers have already expressed their housing consumption needs and, while opting for somewhat similar accomodation to those persons we have termed lodgers, they cannot be presumed to be acting for the same kind of reasons as the remainder of the sub-population.

The purposes of the present study are thus: to describe the characteristics of the lodger population for one metropolitan area in order to identify its component subgroups and to examine the attributes of the households and dwelling units within which these subgroups reside. Of specific interest are the age, sex, and employment distributions of the lodgers. In addition, this investigation will explore sources of variation in the occupancy patterns of the lodger subpopulations. which result from differences in the value and tenure status of their dwelling unit and in the race, sex, age, income, and marital status of the heads-of-households of these units.

2. DATA AND METHODS

Until quite recently, the analysis of the links between individual movement propensities and the characteristics of the housing units consumed has depended on rather oblique inferences from the aggregate cross-sectional properties of data from the decennial federal census. However, under funding from national, state, and local agencies. Wichita-Sedgwick County (Kansas) has recently developed a yearly enumeration of population and housing characteristics for the whole of the city-county area which provides an extremely rich micro-level data base for the analysis of population movements, household formation patterns, changes in occupancy structure, and so on.⁴ More specifically, the records currently available permit the identification of those individuals who reside as lodgers within a household unit, together with their ecomomic and demographic characteristics, the nature of the household unit and dwelling unit in which they reside, and portions of their past residential mobility experience. In effect, this data source provides the basis for the development of descriptive indices of the joint distribution of lodgers, their characteristics, their kinship patterns, and the kinds of structures they occupy-as well as the capability of identifying the changing characteristics of these individuals.

For the present examination we have obtained the following information for all lodgers for the enumeration year 1973:

(i) The name, age, sex, and employment status of each individual in Wichita-Sedgwick County who is eighteen or over, resides within a household of which he or she is not the head, and is not the spouse of the head-of-household.

- (ii) The race, sex, age, income, and marital status of the head-of-household.
- (iii) The relationship of the lodger to the head-of-household.
- (iv) The number of lodgers in the household.
- (v) The value, tenure status, and the number of families in the dwelling unit.

From each of these characteristics, models of data, in the form of multi-way contingency tables; have been tabulated as the principal descriptive indicators.5 The relevant tables are presented in Section 3. Analysis of these data includes (a) an interpretation of the tables and (b) an examination of classes of homogeneities in the tables 6 using the methods developed by Goodman and others. Again, our intent here is to provide only some preliminary insights into the characteristics of the lodger subpopulation and some characteristic differences among the several parts of this subpopulation.

3. INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS

The magnitude of the lodger population is, perhaps, its most important attribute with respect to its potential for effecting the future demand for housing. The 1973 Wichita-Sedgwick County Enumeration recorded 27,391 persons fitting the definition of what we have termed lodgers. This is approximately 13% of the total population of Sedgwick County, and 22% of that portion of the total population of the county over 18 years of age. Additionally, it represents a potential 25% increase in the total number of households in the county-i.e., if all of the lodgers were to form their own single-person households. Though this eventuality is improbable, it is quite likely that a significant fraction of this group of people will seek independent accomodations within the next few years. With respect to their latent demand for housing, then, it is clearly of importance to determine which kinds of current lodgers will move into the housing market and in what numbers. And, while the available cross-sectional data cannot provide estimates of this longitudinal aspect of the latent demand for housing, we are able to identify several subgroups of lodgers which appear to have differential rates of demand for independent housing accomodations.

Even a cursory inspection of the age distribution of the lodger population suggests the nonhomogeneity of this group (See Figure1.). Fortyfour percent of the lodgers are under 21 years old; fully two-thirds are less than 26; another seven percent are between 26 and 36; the remaining 30% of the lodger population is fairly equally apportioned in the age range from 36 to 85. When disaggregated by the relationship of the lodger to his head-of-household, the graph of the age distribution provides an indication of the existence of several distinct subgroups within the lodger population. Thus, nearly 38% of the entire group is made up of children, aged 18 to 20, living with at least one of their parents.

Another 16% of the group are children aged 21 to 25, living with at least one of their parents. From age 51 on, however, children living at home are increasingly out-numbered by other related lodgers. The age distribution of related indi-

viduals other than children has a bimodal form somewhat different from that of unrelated individuals: it drops off from a peak in the lowest age group, rising again after age 35 to another peak between 76 and 81. The distribution of the non-related lodgers, on the other hand, peaks early, between age 21 and 25, drops until age 46 when it again begins to rise, reaching another peak between age 61 and 65. The steep drop in numbers of both related and non-related lodgers after the age of 25 suggests high rates of movement into the housing market for those beyond this age.

Clearly, the trough in the middle years, between age 36 and 46, reflects that period in one's life when one is least likely to be a member of the lodger population; by then most children appear to have left their parents' home to establish their own. Moreover, the large group of non-related boarders 18 to 25 years of age suggests a staging period during which many young people leave their parents' home, yet are either unwilling or unable to establish their own independent households. The second peak in the distribution of non-related lodgers indicates older persons moving into true boarding situations, while the corresponding peak in the distribution of related lodgers other than children indicates elderly persons moving into extended family situations.

The joint distribution of the lodger subpopulation's age and sex with their employment and kinship status (Table 1) provides additional information on the characteristics of the subgroups of the lodgers. Marked differences now appear in the distributions with regard to the sex of the lodgers. For example, female lodgers constitute a smaller persentage of the total female population age 18 to 45 than do male lodgers in the same age group. After age 45, however, the reverse is true: females are more likely than males to be lodgers. Additionally, for lodgers related to the head-of-household a higher percentage of the women than the men are not in the labor force, regardless of the age category; the accompanying absence of income also suggests that female lodgers would be less likely to enter the housing market to seek independent accomodations in the future.

Of the lodgers over 18 who are living with their parents, 40% are males between age 18 and 21 and 30% are females between age 18 and 21. While the number of both male and female lodgers drops off beyond this age, it falls more rapidly for males than for females. (See Table 2.) Also, the distribution of females in this group is bimodal as opposed to the unimodal distribution of the comparable group of males.

Elderly female relatives other than children of the head-of-household constitute the largest group of lodgers other than children age 18 to 35. Women lodgers far out-number male lodgers in the over 65 age class. Note, however, that this difference is not merely a reflection of the differential survival rate for males and females. Women in this age class represent 5% of the total female population over age 65, whereas the men represent only 1.9% of the total males over age 65. Two factors other than the differential survival rate might be presumed to be associated with this discrepancy. First, there may be a cultural bias in the definition of the head-ofhousehold; in those households where an older man is living with his son or daughter, there may be a tendancy to regard the older man as the head of the household and the child as the lodger, while in similar households where the elderly parent is female she may be regarded as the lodger and her child as the head of the household. Second, elderly men may live by themselves to a greater extent than do older women.

For the non-related boarders, what we have termed the "true" lodgers, differences with respect to sex are not as apparent as those exhibited in Table 1. For example, the age distributions are bimodal for both males and females and the distribution peaks in the 18 to 21 year old category for the females, while it crests in the 22 to 35 category for the males. Furthermore, the distribution with regard to employment is virtually the same for all age categories except over age 65 where a larger percentage of men are in the labor force. Otherwise, most members of each age and sex class are active in the labor market; a majority of these are employed full time.

As the foregoing discussion indicates, the lodger population consists of several subgroups which may be characterized by different distributions with respect to age, sex, employment and kinship status. Moreover, it also appears that there are strong dependencies among these variables (i.e., in the sense that any one or even any single combination of two or three attributes is not sufficient to describe the general characteristics of the lodger population as a whole). This point is further supported by the application of Goodman's tests for properties of multi-way contingency tables; with the data in Table 1 we obtain a X^2 value of 34.33 with 30 degrees of freedom for the model which includes all second order interactions; the best model with fewer terms gives a p-value of only .003, thus indicating that only the model in which each triple of variables are jointly co-dependent would suffice to estimate the table.

Given the non-homogeneity of the lodger population, we now turn our attention to the occupancy patterns exhibited by this group. In terms of the future demand for housing, the current occupancy patterns of lodgers are important for at least two reasons. First, previous experience to some degree conditions one's expectations and desires; the future demand for housing by present members of the lodger population may therefore be in part regarded as a function of current occupancy patterns. Second, the heterogeneity of the lodger population suggests that the housing market is currently meeting a variety of needs for this group; lodgers may therefore be presumed to respond in a variety of ways to differential changes in the supply of the various components of the housing market. In short, shifts in supply may both encourage and discourage shifts in the demand for independent accomodations by both the lodgers themselves and the population as a whole.

Our investigation of the current occupancy patterns of lodgers falls into two parts: a discussion of the kinds of <u>households</u> within which lodgers reside and an examination of the kinds of <u>dwelling units</u> characteristic of these households.

The previous discussion of the subgroups of the lodger population suggests that the propensity to be a lodger is, in part, a function of one's life cycle stage. Using the head-of-household as a surrogate for his life cycle status, it appears from Figure 2 that the propensity to provide housing for lodgers is similarly related to the household's status in the life cycle. By dividing the total lodger population into the kinship classes, it becomes evident that the various age groups of householders contribute differentially to previding housing for each of these groups. Young persons aged 18 to 25, for example, provide the bulk of the housing for non-related individuals. After this initial peak, the distribution of non-related lodgers drops off to a fairly constant level with respect to the age of the householder. The graph of the number of children lodging with parents of a given age, on the other hand, peaks much later, in the age 46 to 50 year old range, falling off rapidly after age 50. The bulk (64%) of the children living with their parents after age 18 are, as one would expect from their own age distribution, 23 to 30 years younger than their parents; the drop in the number of children living at home is then reflected by the corresponding decline in the number of children residing with parents over age 50. The number of related individuals other than children rises steadily, peaking in the 56 to 60 year old range (for the heads-of-households). Assuming a generational period of approximately 25 years as suggested above, this bulge probably reflects elderly parents sharing accomodations with their off-spring.

In addition to the age of the head-of-household, marital status is an important component of life cycle status. We might, for example, expect that the presence or absence of a spouse for the head-of-household would influence the propensity to house lodgers. The distribution of the relationship of the lodger to the householder with respect to the presence or absence of a spouse for the householder (Table 3) indicates no real differences between the three groups when a spouse is not present. When a household's spouse is present, however, the lodgers are almost exclusively (96%) related individuals; by far the largest group of these lodgers are children of the head-of-household. The distribution of the number of lodgers in a household is also highly dependent on the presence of the spouse. Households where no spouse is present are more likely to have three or more lodgers than are those where the householder's spouse is present. (See Table 4.)

The sex of the head-of-household appears to have little effect on the number of lodgers housed, though it does appear to influence the kind of lodgers one takes in. The distribution of the number of lodgers in a household is virtually the same for both male and female headed households (Tables 5 and 6): approximately 82% of the households headed by each sex have no lodgers; 16.7% have one or two lodgers; around 1% of each group house three or more lodgers. Female headed households are much more likely than are male households to consist of non-related lodgers and relatives other than children over age 18.

The differences in the kind of lodgers a householder boards is additionally related to his own race. In households headed by whites, 68% of the lodgers are children over age 18, while this is true for only 60% of black households. Instead, 30% of the lodgers in black homes are relatives other than children, while the comparable figure for whites is only 18.5%. This suggests that blacks are more likely to live in extended family situations than are whites. Additionally, the distribution of the number of lodgers by race of the head-of-household indicates that a higher percentage of black households board lodgers in all kinship classes than do white households.

The distribution of the number of lodgers by the relationship of the lodger to the head-ofhousehold (Table 7) indicates that in a majority of cases the lodger is a child living in a household with just his parents. The next largest group is households with one child over 18 living with his parents and one other lodger, Relatives other than shildren and non-related lodgers similarly tend to be the only boarders in a household.

The heterogeneity of the lodger population would not lead us to expect the existence of a simple relationship between family income and either the number or kinship relation of the lodgers in a household. Nevertheless, both lower and upper income families house lodgers as a higher rate than do families in the lower-middle income bracket (Table 8.). As income increases, however, the percentage of the lodgers who are children over 18 tends to increase (Table 9.), while the percentages of both other related and non-related lodgers decrease as income increases. We should emphasize that the data reflect total family income and not solely that of the head-ofhousehold; a large percentage of the lodgers who are children over 18 are employed and would be contributed to the family income, while elderly; unemployed other relatives and non-related individuals would usually not be contributing directly to the total family income.

Having examined the kinds of households within which lodgers reside, we now turn to an examination of the kinds of dwelling units characteristic of these households. Nearly 80% of the housing units in Wichita-Sedgwick County are single family homes. Thus, it is not surprising that most of the lodgers live in single family units. It is thus interesting to note that, even in light of this fact, a higher percentage of the single family homes house lodgers than do multiple family units. Children over 18, for example, are more likely to reside in single family dwellings than are other relatives or non-related lodgers (Table 10.). Controlling for the total number of units which are owned and of those which are rented, households with lodgers are about half as likely to live in rented accomodations as in owned quarters (11.5% and 22.6%, respectively). Related lodgers tend to live in accomodations owned by the householder whereas non-related lodgers are more likely to live in rented quarters (Table 11.). The latter trend is also reflected in the distribution of the number of lodgers with respect to the value of owned housing units and with respect to the monthly rent of leased accomodations: for owned units, the percentage of households with three or more lodgers remains more or less constant, while that with one or two lodgers increases as the value of the home increases (Table 12.). For rented units the distribution of households in terms of the

number of lodgers is virtually the same for all rental categories (Table 13.).

4. CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing analysis has detailed the nonhomogeneities in the characteristics of the lodger population for Wichita-Sedgwick County, Kansas. In addition, it has indicated some of the characteristic occupancy patterns of the lodgers relative to demographic and economic attributes of the households and dwelling units within which they reside. Other available evidence suggests, for the most part, that, in terms of a large number of socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, the Wichita area is typical of many other American cities of similar size.⁷ Therefore, while the inferences of this study are specific to Wichita in 1973, it may be surmised that these results are applicable to other cities as well. Note also that, due to the cross-sectional nature of the available data, we have not attempted to estimate the differential latent demand for housing of the various sub-groups identified for the lodger population. Although such an analysis would be difficult with the kinds of data available from the Federal decennial census (i.e., in that it is neither sufficiently detailed nor capable of being structured as longitudinal records), the records of the Wichita Enumeration provide such a data base. As the files for the enumeration become available for years subsequent to 1973, it will thus be possible to calculate rates of movement of the subgroups of lodgers into the housing market.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹See W. G. Grigsby, <u>Housing Markets and Public</u> <u>Policy</u>, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963).
- ²For a description of this program see S. Gale and E. G. Moore, "A Research Program for the Description and Examination of Occupancy Shifts and Neighborhood Change," Working Paper No. 1, Research on Metropolitan Change and Conflict Resolution, Peace Science Department, University of Pennsylvania, (Philadelphia: 1973).
- ³M. H. David, <u>Family Composition and Consumption</u>, (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1962).
- ⁴See R. A. Gschwind, "The Intergovernmental Enumeration, Wichita-Sedgwick County, Kansas, 1971-1973", Working Paper No. 2, Research on Metropolitan Change and Conflict Resolution, Peace Science Department, University of Pennsylvania, (Philadelphia: 1973), for a detailed account of the properties of these data.
- ⁵See E. G. Moore and S. Gale, "Comments on Models of Occupancy Shifts and Neighborhood Change," In E. G. Moore (ed.), Models of residential Location and Relocation in the City (Evanston: Northwestern University Studies in Geography, No. 20, 1973), pp. 135-173.
- ⁶Goodman, L., "Analysis of Cross-Classified Data: Independence, Quasi-independence and Interactions in Contingency Tables with or without Missing Events," Journal of the American Statistical <u>Association</u>, vol. 63 (1968), pp. 1091-1131 and also S. E. Fineberg, "The analysis of incomplete multi-way contingency tables," <u>Biometrics</u>, Vol. 28, (1972), pp. 177-201.

⁷R.M. Berger, "Wichita in a System of Cities," Working Paper No. 6, Research on Metropolitan Change and Conflict Resolution, Peace Science Department, University of Pennsylvania, (Philadelphia: 1974).

Table 1A. Distribution of children over 18 with respect to age, sex, and employment status.

	EMPLOYMENT				
		full- time	part- time	unemp	not in force
MALE	18	627	631	83	688
	19–21	1625	897	122	960
	22–35	1408	349	88	404
	36–45	137	49	13	47
	46–65	78	10	4	40
	66 ⁺	2	0	0	5
FEMALE	18	342	569	57	778
	19–21	858	762	180	1041
	22–35	658	142	49	330
	36–45	90	31	2	29
	46–65	107	19	3	73
	66 ⁺	7	1	1	51

Table 1B. Distribution of other related lodgers with respect to age, sex, and employment status.

		EMPLOYMENT				
		full- time	part- time	unemp	not in force	
	18 19 - 21	52 112	41 24	12 11	53 26	
MALE	22-35	224	19	12	34	
	36-45 46-65	47 69	1	0	13 55	
	66+	33	5	4	164	
	18	16	32	11	112	
	19 21	63	36	11	55	
	22-35	101	19	11	64	
	36-45	31	4	1	22	
	46-65	123	15	3	201	
	66 ⁺	53	19	11	818	

Table 1C. Distribution of non-related lodgers with respect to age, sex, and employment status.

EMPLOYMENT

		full- time	part- time	unemp	not in force
MALE	18 19–21 22–35 36–45 46–65 66 ⁺	43 292 461 49 41 58	14 71 68 4 6 5	10 11 16 1 0 1	27 63 55 0 23 39
FEMALE	18 19–21 22–35 36–45 46–65 66 ⁺	48 211 256 27 64 54	20 67 30 1 6 3	9 17 11 0 1	33 66 32 6 34 85

Table 2. Distribution of lodgers with respect to age, sex, and relationship to head-of-household.

		AGE					
	18 19-	21 22-3	35 36 - 45	46 65	66+		
CHILDREN OVER 18							
male 256	51 38	812 234	19 246	132	11		
female 18	50 29	016 124	io 152	255	234		
O THER RELATIVES							
male 15	51 '	68 28	32 61	130	206		
female 18	31	59 36	53 56	343	911		
NON-							
RELATIVES							
male 10)3 <i>L</i>	150 62	26 57	77	147		
female 1	14 3	34 34	16 38	117	168		

Table 3. Distribution of lodgers with respect to marital status of head-of-household.

	MARITAL STATUS		
CHILDREN OVER 18	Spouse not present 3304 (37•5)	Spouse present 15090 (81.2)	
OTHER	2560	2830	
RELATIVES	(29•1)	(15•2)	
NON-	2943	664	
RELATIVES	(33•4)	(3•8)	
TOTAL	8807	18584	

Table 4. Distribution of number of lodgers in household by marital status of head-of-household.

		MARITAL	STATUS
		Spouse not present	Spouse present
NUMBER OF LODGERS IN HOUSEHOLD	1	4806 (74•4)	10360 (74•1)
noophionp	2	1197 (18•5)	2864 (20•5)
	3	302 (4•7)	581 (4•2)
	4 ⁺	151 (2•3)	165 (1•2)
	total	6456	13970

Table 5. Distribution of types of lodgers with respect to sex of head-of-household.

	SEX OF	HEAD-OF-HOUSEHOLD
CHILDREN OVER 18	male 15409 (73.0)	female 2829 (46.9)
OTHER RELATIVES	3513 (16•7)	1821 (30•2)
NON- RELATIVES	2172 (10•3)	1386 (23.0)
TOTAL	21094	6036

Table 6. Distribution of number of lodgers with respect to sex of head-of-household.

	SEX OF	HEAD-OF-HOUSEHOLD
	male	female
NUMBER OF LODGERS IN HOUSEHOLD	1 11728 1 (74•1)	3286 (74•6)
10000EllowD	2 3229 (20•4)	795 (18•0)
	3 655 (4•1)	218 (4•9)
	4 ⁺ 207 (1.3)	108 (2•5)
tot	al 15819	4407

Table 7. Distribution of number of lodgers in household by the relationship of the lodger to the head-of-household.

	NUMBER	OF LO	DGERS IN	HOUSI	THOLD
	1	2	3	4+	total
CHILDREN OVER 18	10643	2822	533	111	14109
OTHER RELATIVES	2626	720	223 [.]	141	3710
NON- RELATIVES	1897	519	127	60	2603

Table 8. Distribution of number of lodgers in household with respect to family income.

		FAMILY INCOME				
		under \$4000	\$4000 \$9 , 999	\$10 , 000 ⁺		
NUMBER OF LODGERS IN	· 0	85.8%	92•2%	86.6%		
HOUSEHOLD	1 <u>-</u> 2 3 ⁺	13•2% 1•0%	7•4% 0 _• 4%	12 .7% 0 . 7%		

total sample size: 101,681

Table 9. Distribution of types of lodgers with respect to family income.

	FAMILY INCOME				
	under \$4000	\$4000 <u>-</u> \$9 , 999	\$10 , 000 ⁺		
CHILDREN OVER 18	733	2756	6878		
OTHER RELATIVES	526	1146	1026		
NON- RELATIVES	414	738	722		
TOTAL	1673	4640	8626		

Table 10. Distribution of types of lodgers with respect to the number of units in structure.

NUMBER OF	UNITS
SINGLE FAMILY	MULTI- FAMILY
13038	815
3709	676
1880	1293
18627	2784
	NUMBER OF SINGLE FAMILY 13038 3709 1880 18627

Table 11. Distribution of types of lodgers with respect to tenure status of dwelling unit.

	TENURE		
CHILDREN OVER 18	OWNED 14627 (75•8 <u>)</u>	rented 2414 (39•3)	
OTHER RELATIVES	3566 (18•5)	1495 (24•3)	
NON RELATIVES	1116 (5•8)	2231 (36•3)	
TOTAL	19309	6140	

Table 12. Distribution of number of lodgers in household with respect to the value of owned units.

NUMBER	OF	LODGERS
--------	----	---------

	0	1-2	3+
VALUE\$0-\$4,999	88.4%	10.7%	0.9%
\$5,000-\$9,999	85.3%	13•7%	1.0%
\$10,000-\$14,999	83.3%	15.8%	0.9%
\$15,000-\$19,999	82.6%	16.5%	0.9%
\$20,000-\$24,999	80.9%	18.1%	1.0%
\$25 , 000 ⁺	80.1%	18.8%	1.1%

total sample size: 74,476

Table 13. Distribution of number of lodgers in household by monthly rent.

	NUMBER C	OF LODGEN	RS
	0	1-2	3+
^{RENT} \$0-\$49	88.3%	11.1%	0.6%
\$50-\$99	90.2%	9•2%	0.6%
\$100-\$149	88.6%	10.6%	0.8%
\$150 \$199	86.7%	12.7%	0.6%
\$200+	88.1%	10.8%	1.1%

total sample size: 39,625