# CONSUMER PREFERENCES FOR WOOD FRAMED HOUSES

**Vladislav Kaputa**
**Ján Parobek**

Dept. of Marketing, Trade and World Forestry
Technical University in Zvolen

# METHODS

- Research was carried out during the years 2008-2009
- Non-probability sampling (purposive sampling)
- 300 questionnaires were distributed
- Total Design Method (TDM)
- Questionnaire structure
- Frequency and contingency tables
- United Factor (UF)

| Sex | Age | Achieved education | United factor (UF) |
|---|---|---|---|
| MEN | 18 – 30 years | primary school | 111 |
| | | high school | 112 |
| | | university | 113 |
| | 31 – 55 years | primary school | 121 |
| | | high school | 122 |
| | | university | 123 |
| | over 55 years | primary school | 131 |
| | | high school | 132 |
| | | university | 133 |
| WOMEN | 18 – 30 years | primary school | 211 |
| | | high school | 212 |
| | | university | 213 |
| | 31 – 55 years | primary school | 221 |
| | | high school | 222 |
| | | university | 223 |
| | over 55 years | primary school | 231 |
| | | high school | 231 |
| | | university | 233 |

# Results

Response rates of individual rounds of questioning

| Round of questioning | Absolute number of the respondents | Response rate |
|---|---|---|
| 1st round | 117 | 39 % |
| 2nd round | 159 | 53 % |
| 3rd round | **180** | **60 %** |

# Significance of criterions of new constructed houses

| Criterion | Answer | | | UF analysis results Subgroups with the biggest share of respondents assessed criterion as *very important* or *important* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Very important, important* | *Uncommitted attitude* | *Not important, not at all important* | |
| Cost saving | 69,7 % | 20,8 % | 9,5 % | 113, 123, 213, 132 |
| Material | 74,2 % | 20,2 % | 5,6 % | 213, 232, 223, 112, 113 |
| Durability | 77,0 % | 15,7 % | 7,3 % | 222, 232, 112 |
| Aesthetics | 77,0 % | 20,2 % | 2,8 % | 213, 232, 133, 112, 123, 212 |
| Construction time | 35,0 % | 36,7 % | 28,3 % | 133, 132 |
| Environmental factors | 39,9 % | 37,6 % | 22,5 % | 223, 112, 222 |

## Significance of criterions of wood framed houses

| Criterion | Answer | | | UF analysis results Subgroups with the biggest share of respondents assessed criterion positively |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very positively, positively | Uncommitted attitude | Negatively, very negatively | |
| Construction costs | 37,6 % | 36,5 % | 25,9 % | 223 |
| Risk of fire | 22,5 % | 21,3 % | 56,2 % | *negative assessment: 112, 213, 113 |
| Acoustic attributes | 57,9 % | 28,1 % | 14,0 % | 223, 133, 123 |
| Thermo-insulating attributes | 70,8 % | 21,9 % | 7,3 % | 133, 213, 122 |
| Durability | 45,0 % | 37,6 % | 17,4 % | 222, 232 |
| Environmental factors | 51,7 % | 35,4 % | 12,9 % | 232, 122, 123, 212 |
| Enjoyable living | 84,3 % | 12,4 % | 3,4 % | 232, 133, 132, 123 |
| Aesthetics | 74,7 % | 19,7 % | 5,6 % | 113, 232 |

# Conclusion

- Most of respondents have not a clue about the costs of wood framed houses construction
- "Risk of fire" is the most negatively perceived attribute – more than half of respondents
- Mostly non-material attributes of wood framed houses are considered as *important*
- Some attributes of wood framed houses are still "unknown" for consumers
- Specific target group