Evidence of their monthly household income and its source, the absence of urban property, and the time spent in the city. It is equally difficult for the project authorities to verify the information supplied by the applicants. Evaluations of sites-and-services schemes show that many plots in a scheme fall into the hands of middle-income groups that may not be in immediate need of housing or that buy the plot for speculative purposes.

Community spirit is generally stronger in squatter settlements than in sites-and-services schemes. Squatter settlements develop more gradually, and squatters often face the common threat of eviction, which is absent in sites-and-services schemes. Squatter settlements are often populated by families bound by ethnicity, religion, occupation, caste, or region of origin, whereas allottees in sites-and-services schemes come from different parts of the city and are selected on an individual basis. This is an obstacle for the creation of building groups and neighborhood communities. A considerable effort by community organizers is required to form groups able and willing to jointly work on the construction of houses for the group members.

The idea that squatters construct their houses through self-help labor is only partially true. Squatters may build their first, temporary shelter themselves, but many tend to leave a consolidation of the house to hired craftsmen. These can produce better-quality work than the household members, who usually lack construction skills and whose earnings from their normal work often exceed the monetary value of participation in construction work as unskilled laborers. They are better off doing their usual job and using the money earned to pay the craftsmen to work on their house, providing, at most, unskilled labor. If project authorities promote self-help construction and the formation of building groups, the costs of training and supervision may be considerable.

Land forms an important part of the cost of a plot in a sites-and-services scheme, so most projects are located in the urban fringe, where land values are low. The distance between the scheme and the existing service networks makes off-site infrastructure expensive. Such costs may be only partially charged to the allottees, because the infrastructure also benefits other city dwellers, but its construction is sometimes delayed until the area is further developed, making the sites-and-services scheme practically unlivable for an extended period of time. Transportation costs to the centers of employment tend to be high, which forms another obstacle for the urban poor to move to a sites-and-services scheme.

Sites-and-services schemes are often inappropriate for women-headed households. Women who are the head of a household may not meet such eligibility criteria as a minimum household income and a regular employment; in some countries, women may not even have the right to own property. Because illiteracy levels are often higher among women than among men, women have less access to information about a new sites-and-services scheme and face more difficulties applying for a plot. Conditions for self-help construction and speed of consolidation often do not take into account the multiple roles of women, and the house and settlement designs are often ill suited for the home-based, income-generating activities on which many women depend. The remote location of many sites-and-services schemes places a particularly heavy burden on women; they often work part-time and need rapid and cheap access to the place of employment. (See also: Third World Housing)

—Kioe Sheng Yap

Further Reading


Size of Unit

Size of unit is any measure of the amount of private, indoor space accessible to household members. Analysts sometimes use unit size as a measure of quality of life. Hence, size can be measured along any dimension thought to give rise to utility: for example, floor area, design and layout, or facilities and features. To illustrate, consider four measures incorporated into the 1991 American Housing Survey (AHS; see Table 26).

One measure is the number of rooms. In general, a room is a livable, interior space separated from other rooms by walls. The AHS counts bedrooms, living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, recreation rooms, permanently enclosed porches suitable for year-round use, lodgers’ rooms, and other finished and unfinished rooms. Also included are rooms used for offices by a person living in the unit. An L-shaped space or other multipurpose space (e.g., a living-dining area or kitchen-den area) is counted as one room only, unless a space is separated from adjoining rooms by built-in floor-to-ceiling walls extending at least a few inches from the intersecting walls. Movable or collapsible partitions or partitions consisting solely of shelves or cabinets are not considered built-in walls. By convention, bathrooms are not counted as rooms.

A second measure of dwelling size is number of bedrooms. The AHS includes any rooms used mainly for sleep-
TABLE 26 Size of Dwelling, by Tenure of Household, Occupied Private Dwellings, United States, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Rented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All year-round occupied dwellings</td>
<td>63,544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By number of rooms (% of all dwellings):

- 1 room: 63,544, 2%
- 2 rooms: 34,150, 3%
- 3 rooms: 63,544, 22%
- 4 rooms: 63,544, 32%
- 5 rooms: 63,544, 23%
- 6 rooms: 63,544, 12%
- 7 rooms: 63,544, 5%
- 8 rooms: 63,544, 12%
- 9 rooms: 63,544, 10%
- 10 or more rooms: 63,544, 4%

Median rooms: 6.2, 4.2

By number of bedrooms (% of all dwellings):

- None: 63,544, 0%
- 1 bedroom: 63,544, 3%
- 2 bedrooms: 63,544, 43%
- 3 bedrooms: 63,544, 20%
- 4 or more bedrooms: 63,544, 32%

Median bedrooms per dwelling: 3.0, 1.9

By complete bathrooms (% of all dwellings):

- None: 63,544, 0%
- 1 bathroom: 63,544, 72%
- 1 and a half bathrooms: 63,544, 10%
- 2 bathrooms or more: 63,544, 17%

Median complete bathrooms per dwelling: 3.0, 1.9

Single detached and mobile homes (% of all dwellings reporting):

- Less than 500 square feet: 52,480, 8%
- 500-749 square feet: 52,480, 11%
- 750-999 square feet: 52,480, 18%
- 1,000-1,249 square feet: 52,480, 32%
- 1,250-1,499 square feet: 52,480, 18%
- 1,500-1,999 square feet: 52,480, 4%
- 2,000-2,499 square feet: 52,480, 4%
- 2,500-2,999 square feet: 52,480, 3%
- 3,000-3,999 square feet: 52,480, 3%
- 4,000 square feet or more: 52,480, 2%

Median square footage: 1,814, 1,270

SOURCE: American Housing Survey for the United States in 1993, Table 1A3.

NOTE: The American Housing Survey does not include households in group quarters.

The type and quality of slave housing varied greatly according to region, size of the slave labor operation, and the type of slave labor enterprise. However, during the slave era in the United States (1619-1863), most slaves who worked in the fields on plantations lived in groups of as many as a dozen in crudely constructed, sparsely furnished, one- or two-room log cabins.

The first Africans came ashore in Virginia in 1619, where both Africans and Indians were enslaved during the 17th and early 18th centuries. Although one-third of the 5,500 slaves recorded in South Carolina in 1710 were Indians, after 1720, because of disease and deaths associated with Indian wars, Africans constituted the overwhelming majority of slaves in that state. The housing of slaves in both Virginia and the Carolinas, however, reflected structural influences of both Africans and Indians (e.g., open temporary cabins, clay walls, cribbed log walls, stick and clay chimneys, and hearths in the middle of the floors), as well as of Europeans.

Slaves were one of the most rapidly growing segments of the population, increasing from less than 700,000 in 1790 to more than 2 million by 1830 and to 3.9 million by 1860. Most slaves lived on plantations that harvested tobacco (Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina), rice...