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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND THEORY

This study of representative mobile home parks of Franklin County, Ohio, is an attempt to assess the adequacy of such parks as residential environments. More specifically, it is an effort to understand mobile home parks as residential neighborhoods and to measure the varying degrees of satisfaction and interaction experienced by the residents of different categories of parks.

This study has both theoretical and practical significance. The neighborhood is one of the oldest topics of interest to urban sociologists, and the creation of satisfying neighborhoods has been a long-sought objective of urban planners and social reformers striving to counteract the impersonality and segmentation alleged to characterize modern urban existence. It is true that several urban sociologists have tended to minimize the importance of neighborhoods as social facts in modern large-scale societies, and that communities created according to the blueprints of neighborhood-minded planners have not restored the neighborliness of the assumed age of community.¹

¹
Yet, the quest for community continues, and, at least under certain conditions, mobile home parks seem to provide favorable conditions for the establishment, on a small scale, of what Suttles has called "emerging artificial neighborhoods."^2

On the practical level, there is a genuine need to understand the rapidly increasing phenomenon of mobile home park living in the 25,000 parks currently in operation in this country.

The sustained growth of the mobile home industry has been one of the most remarkable developments in American housing in the last two decades. This phenomenon is a response to the challenge created by the failure of the conventional housing industry to provide adequate shelter to the moderate-income strata of our population at a time when demographic and cultural factors were placing unprecedented demands on the industry. While soaring prices have gradually placed the traditional ideal of the single-family home out of reach of a large segment of the American population, singularly stable costs, made possible by technological breakthroughs and the benign neglect of housing-code officials, have made the mobile home an acceptable alternative to some three and a half million American households.
The average mobile home has more than tripled in size in the last two decades, and now includes all the kitchen and bathroom facilities found in conventional homes. Purchasers of the most widely produced models now have as much floor space at their disposal as the owners of the original Levittown Cape Cods had in 1948, and they can easily obtain "double-wides" with more than twice the floor space.

Unfortunately, the development of mobile home parks, especially in the northern half of the country, has not kept pace with the improvements made in the quality and size of the mobile homes themselves. Many of the roadside camps established during the Great Depression and World War II remain in operation, and while most of the newer parks tend to be larger, more spacious, and better provided with amenities, they are often a far cry from the idyllic living environments depicted in trade publications.

Since an increasing proportion of the nation's mobile home dwellers live in parks, it is important to examine the social structures and associational patterns which prevail under the very special combination of home ownership and lot rental which characterizes these parks. It is particularly important to gain insights into the residents' perceptions of their situations marked by
physical and behavioral constraints and to appraise the
differential impact these special aspects of park living
may have on the satisfaction levels and the interaction
rates of people of diverse demographic, socio-economic
or cultural categories.

Sociological Perspectives on Residential
Neighborhoods: Applications to
Mobile Home Parks

The pioneers of urban ecology in the United States
devoted considerable attention to the neighborhood. Park and his associates applied to the sifting and sorting of human populations in large cities several of the key concepts used by the plant ecologists of their day. They understood the mindless processes of competition, invasion, succession, and segregation as giving rise to "natural areas" which were made more visible by physical boundaries like rivers, highways, and railroad tracks. Since the most readily discernible "natural areas" of the classical ecologists were inhabited by easily recognizable ethnic groups burdened with pronounced levels of social disorganization, neighborhood studies quickly became a series of explorations of a congeries of social problems.

Surely, economic competition, which featured so prominently in works of the Chicago School of urban
sociology, accounts in large measure for the location of most of the trailer camps which emerged during the Great Depression. The relegation of such camps to noisy, crowded, unsanitary commercial zones or to poorly drained fields or hazardous flood plains is indicative of the unfavorable competitive position of trailer-camp people at that time. To a considerable degree, economic competition continues to hamper the location of parks in or near conventional residential areas. It is also informative to note how many parks are located on the "wrong side" of tracks, streams, and highways.

As helpful as they may be in helping to explain the location of the older trailer courts or even many of the newer parks, the concepts advanced by Park and his colleagues are of little use in understanding the characteristic social structures of mobile home parks.

Suttles' discussion of "emerging artificial neighborhoods" can contribute significantly to an understanding of these special structures. The "artificial" or "contrived" neighborhoods described by Suttles are large, planned residential areas, particularly in urban renewal projects, characterized by very distinct boundaries, unified architectural design, and a single source of ownership or rental. They generally have distinctive names, ready-made images or identities, and high levels of
homogeneity, influenced by the size and price of the units and often maximized through unified screening procedures. It is easy to see mobile home parks as miniature versions of these "artificial neighborhoods."

It is clear that the owners and managers of mobile home parks, like the developers of large urban tracts, become image-makers, gate-keepers, rule-enacters and enforcers, and thus control most of the variables which influence people's decisions to move into a residential area. Park operators determine the size of the parks, levels of physical and functional proximity, the availability or absence of shared facilities and services, the presence or absence of children and pets, and, directly or indirectly, the socio-economic statuses and cultural homogeneity of the residents.

In trying to ascertain the levels of satisfaction and interaction in parks of various degrees of excellence, it will be important to keep in mind not only the variables controlled by the park operators, but also the very fact that these men occupy such dominant positions vis-a-vis their tenants. One would expect that factors like education, income, and family status would have a bearing on the feeling of "relative deprivation" experienced at the constraints imposed on park dwellers.
Suttles' insistence on seeing "artificial neighborhoods" as parts of larger social systems is even more germane to the small residential enclaves which are the object of the present study. Informal interaction with one's neighbors is normally one of many forms of social participation. It is important to remember, in any study of neighboring behavior, that age, levels of familism and socio-economic status influences the radius of one's social participation. The person who seems indifferent to the neighborhood is not necessarily a social isolate. He may be very active in the affairs of the larger community or in a number of specialized voluntary associations.6

The recognition of the fact that neighborhoods no longer have the salience they had in earlier, more rural societies distinguishes writers like Suttles, Greer, and Keller from men like Perry, Tylor and Mumford, who, distressed by what they saw as the nefarious impact of urbanization, argued for the creation of new towns and for the restoration in large cities of the physical and social conditions which would allow urban dwellers to enjoy the primary modes of association which had characterized traditional village communities.7

The major objectives of these early promoters of the neighborhood unit plan have been aptly summarized by
1-introduce a principle of physical order into the chaotic fragmented urban aggregate; 2-reintroduce local, face-to-face types of contacts into the anonymous urban society, thereby helping to regain some sense of community; 3-encourage the formation of local loyalties and attachments and thereby offset the impact of extensive social and residential mobility; 4-stimulate feelings of identity, security, stability, and rootedness in a world threatening such feelings on all sides; and 5-provide a local training ground for the development of larger loyalties to city and nation.8

Perry had hoped to achieve these objectives by making the elementary school the focal point of each neighborhood, by eliminating through traffic within the neighborhood itself, by confining shopping areas to the corners of the different neighborhoods, and by providing space for small parks in each one of those neighborhoods.*

Keller has pointed out several reasons why the neighborhood unit in its original, all-inclusive sense, failed to meet the high expectations of its advocates.9 The population needed to support an elementary school is too small to support many of the economic services needed by that population and too large to facilitate the face-to-face interaction envisioned by the planners. Excessive attention given to families with young children apparently leads to the neglect of the elderly, the childless, the unmarried. Neighborhoods generally fail
to attract a cross-section of the population and thus tend to evolve into economically segregated areas.

This study is not designed to give to the residential neighborhood a salience it no longer has. Most social interaction for the vast majority of the population transcends the confines of the neighborhood. The automobile, the telephone, the mass media and the multiplication of specialized services of all kinds make people more independent from one another for information, help, and casual interaction. Relatives, friends, and even co-workers are more important than neighbors in the social activities of most people. As Greer points out, the enlarged scale of social interaction which characterizes modern societies reduces the neighborhood to a mere physical location which can become a social fact only under certain favorable conditions.

It does seem, however, that mobile home parks do provide a number of these conditions, and that they can confer on their residents some of the benefits sought by the would-be restorers of the more comprehensive neighborhood unit plan. Parks provide their residents with small, clearly defined local areas with which they can identify. The physical and functional proximity of the park dwellers and the existence of shared facilities can be conducive to face-to-face interaction. The
segregation of parks from other residential areas and from other forms of land use can promote a sense of security and tranquility, and the absence of through traffic, and of most forms of commercial enterprise, along with the existence of recreational areas within the parks, can surely contribute to enhancing residential satisfaction and neighborly interaction among the park residents.

It remains to be seen how these very special characteristics of mobile home parks will be perceived and appreciated by people of varied conditions and backgrounds.

**Historical Development**

The history of mobile homes is long and varied. North American Indians, African Beduins, the Mongols, Eskimos, all made extensive use of portable shelters, and in fact, some of them still do. The case of the Vikings is particularly interesting, since they used their means of transportation, their ships, as the principal components of their temporary homes. More recently, and closer to home, some six generations of American settlers made extensive use of Conestoga wagons as vehicles and shelters as they moved across the prairies and mountains and into the Far West. During the second half of the nineteenth century, thousands of rail workers
and supporting personnel were housed in box cars modified to serve as sleeping quarters, kitchens, and stores.16

Very soon after the invention of the automobile, enterprising motorists started harnessing trailers onto their "horseless carriages."17 By the early 1920's, trailers equipped with twin beds, an ice box, and storage space were being marketed for less than two-hundred dollars. By the mid 1920's, bona fide house trailers had appeared, and within a decade were serving as more or less permanent living quarters for some 300,000 Americans. The demand for new, low-cost housing created by the numerous population shifts of the World War II years was a major factor in turning the fledgling trailer industry away from the recreational vehicle orientation to the industrialized housing enterprise it has become. More and more emphasis was placed on increased size, comfort, and permanence. Dramatic increases in mobile home sales have accompanied the rapid expansion and improvements in the homes themselves. Ten-foot wide models were introduced in 1955, twelve-foot wide models in 1962, and fourteen-foot wide models, introduced in 1969, will soon account for twenty percent of the market. "Double-wides" consisting of two sections joined horizontally at the site, but retaining their individual chassis, now account for some eighteen percent of the
sales. Mobile homes now comprise over ninety percent of the new single-family housing being sold for less than twenty thousand dollars. 18

Except in rural areas, and in and around small towns, most mobile homes are now being located in parks whose history roughly parallels that of the homes themselves.

The first trailer camps, characterized by overcrowding, poor sanitation, and high transiency were simply squatter settlements produced by the economic dislocations of the Great Depression. 19 With the outbreak of World War II, and in the years immediately after the war, the demands of war-related activities and construction projects brought into being a number of small and medium-sized camps often located behind filling stations or near farm houses on which camp dwellers depended for sanitation facilities. Some of these settlements persist to this day, but most disappeared with the exigencies which had brought them about. Living conditions in these camps were often Spartan, but, especially among construction workers who frequently renewed acquaintances and friendships from one worksite to the other, considerable interaction occurred, and rather high levels of residential satisfaction were maintained. 20
Some of the very early trailer settlements were far from being the "instant slums" depicted by certain detractors. Especially in warmer regions, as early as 1936, retirement communities of trailer dwellers were established and provided with what were, for that time, respectable levels of physical comfort and exceptional opportunities for neighborly interaction. But even the very best trailer courts of the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's, unless they have been drastically remodelled in the last fifteen years, are unsuited for the wider, longer units now coming off assembly lines.

A new type of mobile home park is emerging, in response not only to the increased size of the homes themselves, but especially in response to phenomenal and sustained increases in the number of new units being produced and sold annually. The growing difficulty of locating mobile homes on individual lots in or near large cities has created unprecedented demands for park space, and the rising expectations and more adequate means of potential park dwellers, along with stricter regulation by public officials, have led to the development of more spacious, better planned, and better equipped parks. Most of these are being established by persons involved in the sale of mobile homes, since the lack of acceptable park spaces has been a major deterrent to the
further growth of the mobile home industry. Statutory requirements in many areas, and sound business practice in many cases have also contributed to improved park standards. Newer developments tend to have well over ten acres, at gross densities of six to eight units per acre, and generally accommodate between one hundred-fifty to two hundred sites. They have paved streets, sidewalks and off-street parking, underground utilities, green areas, playgrounds, swimming pools, laundromats, community buildings and occasionally, a grocery store.

These newer parks tend to have relatively stable populations which unlike the denizen of the earlier camps and courts, voluntarily select mobile home park living as temporary or permanent alternatives to apartment renting or conventional home ownership. The decision to forego conventional housing involves a certain degree of commitment to the mobile home park way of life, and is expected to be associated with higher levels of residential satisfaction.

A variety of researchers have examined diverse aspects of mobile home park living in the past forty years. A glimpse at some of their findings will contribute to a better understanding of the current situation.
Review of Previous Research

Much like the early studies of urban neighborhoods, most of the pioneering investigations of trailer camps focussed on the assumed social disorganization of trailerite families. In view of the fact that these predominantly journalistic surveys were made at the height of the Great Depression, when desperate families of unemployed or underemployed migrants were camping on vacant lots in rickety six-by-twenty-five foot trailers, it is not surprising that Fuller and Meyers could illustrate the usefulness of the historical approach to the study of social problems by retracing the emergence of such camps and analysing the various phases on the community's response to the "threat".26

The image of trailer camps as portable slums was deeply engraved in public opinion, and throughout the 1950's, studies continued to center on expected links between the geographic mobility and cramped quarters of the residents and the resultant social disorganization, in spite of the fact that by that time, the drifters' camps of the 1930's had been largely replaced by the trailer courts of military personnel, construction workers, and their families. Wellington's study of some construction sites in Pennsylvania and Ohio is aptly summarized in the long title of his short article on the
subject: "Trailer Camp Slums, a New Kind of Slum: The Permanent Trailer Camp Offers All the Bad Features of the Urban Blighted Area, None of the Advantages for Which Trailers Were Made."  

Other investigators who had entertained the same presuppositions, however, came to different conclusions. Whyte, Hager, and Schorr, in separate studies, failed to find any marked degree of instability or disorganization in the trailerites which they visited. Similarly, the Wichita-Sedgwick County, Kansas, Metropolitan Area Planning Commission concluded from its study of trailer courts of the area that they were not special burdens for educational administrators, welfare boards, or police and fire departments.

There are two notable exceptions to the problems orientation of the studies of mobile home dwellers of the 1950's. In his research at the Bradenton Trailer Park in Florida, Hoyt interviewed 194 male household heads out of a total of 1093 dwelling units to discover why they had opted for mobile home park living, what features they found most satisfying, and what level of participation there was in the varied activities of the park community.

He found that the residents, most of whom were of rural background, and 92.8% of whom were retired or
quasi-retired, had originally been attracted to the Bradenton Trailer Park because of the climate of the area, and the economy and ease of maintenance of mobile homes, but once they had become park dwellers the aspects which satisfied them most were the peacefulness of the park and the numerous opportunities they had for interaction with people "like themselves". The sociability features were of special appeal to those who had been self-employed, while the tranquility and mutual concern of park dwellers for one another were especially pleasing to the others. Hoyt found a broad range of activities in the park, ranging from church services, Bible classes, song fests, choir rehearsals, dances, and movies, and a remarkably high level of active participation among a cross-section of residents, many of whom would have been self-conscious about indulging in such "adolescent" activities in a less homogeneous setting.

Carnevale's investigation of a matched sample of fifteen mobile home households and fifteen households from a conventional neighborhood in Arizona revealed that the mobile home families in her tiny sample had exchanged 139 home visits as compared to 44 visits by the conventional housing control group. She concluded that "the trailer court is more a 'social unit' than the fixed-home neighborhood." She also found that the
mobile home dwellers were more inclined to cooperation than competition, and oriented to present satisfaction more than toward future goal achievement.  

During the 1960's, a number of surveys were sponsored by the mobile home industry and at least two were made through publications of interest to mobile home dwellers. Generally these surveys lack theoretical underpinnings, and even the information which they yield on socio-economic and demographic distributions tends to be skewed by their concentration of top-rated parks and/or the readership of publications read only by a small, unrepresentative fraction of the mobile home park population.

Moore's 1962 sampling of 167 households also limited itself to parks of better quality. He divided his sample according to the major stages of the family life cycle in different regions of the country, but only the results pertaining to those in the first phase of married life have been published. He found a preponderance of couples from small-town, blue-collar backgrounds for whom the prospect of the immediate ownership of a fully equipped home at moderate cost was more appealing than the thought of renting an apartment or, less frequently, of buying a modest conventional home in a neighborhood they could afford. In sharp contrast to the studies of older
mobile home park dwellers, the sociability aspects of the residential site received no attention.  

Gillies also divided the population of the twenty-five Southern California parks which he studied according to phases in the family life cycle. He found that the retired, semi-retired, and "empty-nest" couples still in the labor force tended to live in service-oriented parks often located outside central cities, and that these older individuals or couples tended to be park dwellers by choice, rather than sheer economic constraint. Most of the parks were reserved for adults, and many of the residents, who spent little of their time outside the parks, devoted much of their leisure to gardening, card-playing, shuffleboard and casual neighboring. Younger couples, on the other hand, tended to live in housing-oriented parks which, for the childless in particular became dormitory enclaves. Very little attention was given to interaction with night-dwellers. Economy, easy maintenance and distance to work were prime considerations. Young couples planning to raise families, and couples who already had children, were inclined to see park residence as an unfortunate waiting period until they could afford to move into a home of their own.

Gillies' findings were probably influenced by the fact that all the parks in his study were at least
average in quality and included many of superior rating. In a survey of retired park residents in Tucson, Arizona, Buck examined 42 of the 150 parks of the area, making sure that his sample included some of the worst parks as well as some of average and very high quality. Of the 158 respondents, fifty-seven listed economy as the prime advantage of park living, forty indicated ease of maintenance, and thirty-four named opportunities for frequent interaction as the principal benefit. Thus, in spite of the absence of young couples in the sample, economy and easy maintenance emerged as key motives for mobile home park living when persons of modest means were included in large numbers.35

By far the most complete and useful examination of the mobile home phenomenon is Drury's Mobile Homes: The Unrecognized Revolution in American Housing.36 In a thorough review of previous research on the subject, an analysis of changes in population composition, goals, aspiration, life-styles and attitudes vis-a-vis family life, leisure, and residential stability, along with an account of the evolution of the manufacture, marketing and financing of mobile homes, and an examination of institutional forces which have abetted or hindered the development of the mobile home industry, including the creation of new parks, she surveyed the phenomenal
expansion of the industry since World War II.

She concluded that the definition of the mobile home as a vehicle allowed it to escape the basic conservative constraints of the various interests operative in home construction, marketing, taxation and zoning at times when demographic and normative changes were creating unprecedented demands for moderately priced, compact, and complete housing packages. She saw mobile homes as providing a valuable apprenticeship in home ownership for young couples with modest incomes, and as making continued self-reliance possible for elderly persons who would otherwise be overworked or "overhoused" in larger conventional homes.

Mobile home living as a preparation for regular home ownership was also investigated by Knight, who compared matched samples of young couples from better quality parks and from conventional housing tracts in the Greater Chicago area. He found that while there were marked differences between the two categories as to their attitudes toward mobile homes as living quarters (fewer than five percent of the regular home owners would even consider mobile home living), both groups were in accord as to the ideal housing mode. In spite of the fact that 65.9% of the park dwellers were satisfied with their accommodations, only 7.8% considered mobile homes as the
most desirable types of shelters, as compared to 85.7% who place conventional single-family homes in that category. It should be noted, however, that spatial constraints rather than neighborhood characteristics provided the mobile home residents with the incentive to save toward the purchase of a regular house.\textsuperscript{38}

Knight, like Drury, points out that there are still numerous gaps in what is known about the very special neighborhood environment found in mobile home parks.\textsuperscript{39} Their own studies gave more attention to the reactions of people to the mobile homes themselves than to their response to the social structures and associational patterns of the parks. Most of the more recent inquiries have focussed attention on parks of superior quality and have not given systematic attention to the factors associated with satisfaction with mobile home parks as locales in which gratifying social interaction can occur.

\textbf{Site of the Research}

One of the important reasons for selecting Franklin County as the site of this project is that it contains several of the smaller, older parks which academic researchers have tended to neglect, as well as some of the newer, larger parks which have been receiving most
of the attention. Furthermore, concentration on the parks of the Greater Columbus area facilitated contacts with officials, park operators and residents, thus maximizing opportunities to supplement quantitative data with personal observation and informal inquiries. It is worth noting, too, that Ohio has one of the largest mobile home populations in the nation, ranking behind Florida, California, Texas, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania, in that order. 40

**Hypotheses Concerning Variations in Satisfaction Levels and Interaction Rates in Mobile Home Parks**

This investigation of mobile home parks seeks to discover patterns of variations in the general satisfaction of park dwellers with the friendliness, security, tranquility and autonomy which they find in their residential settings and in informal interaction with those with whom they share the advantages and constraints of mobile home park living.

Selection of the ten hypotheses which will be formulated was made specifically to test generalizations advanced by previous researchers of the urban neighborhood, like Caplow, Nohara, Gans, and Greer, or by investigators of mobile home park environments like Hoyt,
Gillies, and Johnson, whose findings will be alluded to as each hypothesis is stated.

The key independent variables used in this study are those which have often been considered by students of neighborhoods, including mobile home parks: socio-economic status, familism, age, homogeneity and residential stability. It is anticipated that each of these variables is likely to be affected by the spatial constraints of the mobile homes themselves, the "limited liability" aspects so conspicuous in mobile home park tenancy, by the crucial role played by park operators in screening applicants, formulating and enforcing regulations, and, of course, by the persistence in the minds of the great majority of Americans, of the ideal home as the conventionally built, single-family, fully owned home located on a large lot in a desirable neighborhood. 41

Living in one's own mobile home located on a rented lot represents a compromise between conventional home ownership and apartment renting. While the quality of one's residence and neighborhood has long been recognized as a criterion of one's socio-economic status, it seems that even the most prosperous of the persons living in the best of parks preserves the "master status" originally acquired by the trailer camp denizen of the 1930's. The heritage of history, and the persistence of
many of the older courts make it easy for urban planners and public officials, as well as the general population to label mobile home park living as something less than respectable. 42

Yet, there are enormous differences among mobile home parks, much like there are important variations in the quality of suburban developments. It is anticipated that, in general, persons of higher socio-economic status will live in the better parks and will enjoy higher levels of residential satisfaction. This expectation is strengthened by the fact that such persons would normally have broader choices in housing opportunities and could more easily redress a situation which they found unsatisfactory.

Caplow, Stryker and Wallace, in their study of San Juan, Puerto Rico, and Nohara, in his study of St. Louis, Missouri, both emphasized the relationship between socio-economic status and residential satisfaction and neighborly interaction. 43 Nohara, however, qualified his statement by pointing out that the social context in which the individual or family is located may have an impact quite independent of the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the people involved. It is expected that the peculiar social structure of mobile home parks could have such an influence on
satisfaction levels and interaction among park dwellers. In spite of these reservations, it is anticipated that:

\[ H_1 \] The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as the socio-economic status of the park residents rises.

\[ H_2 \] The rate of interaction with neighbors increases as the socio-economic status of the park residents rises.

Satisfaction with one's neighbors does not necessarily lead to neighborly greetings, visits or help, or to the formation of firm friendships within the neighborhood, but it can safely be asserted that persons who are dissatisfied with their neighbors are less likely to engage in pleasant interaction with them. Gulick found small but consistent correlations between satisfaction with one's neighborhood and levels of neighborly activity.\(^{44}\)

While Caplow and his colleagues, as well as Nohara, found socio-economic status to be the key variable associated with neighborhood satisfaction and interaction, Greer saw it as a secondary factor and found familism to be the most crucial variable "producing associational patterns."\(^{45}\) He deemed that a preponderance of non-working mothers, the presence of children, and high levels of home ownership would lead to life styles characterized by more frequent informal interaction with those
living in the immediate vicinity.

On the other hand, mobile home parks generally rank low on these indicators of familism, and indeed, in many parks, familism can be considered a form of deviance. Many parks managers refuse to admit households with children, or limit their tolerance to those with preschoolers. Woodall rating criteria suggest that "five-star" awards rarely go to parks to which children are admitted. Even in regular neighborhoods, children often increase the vulnerability of neighbors to one another, and what Greer has called "intersecting trajectories of action" are more likely to become occasions of tension and hostility. It is therefore expected that:

\[ H_3 \] The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods decreases as the levels of familism in the parks rises.

\[ H_4 \] The rate of interaction with neighbors increases as levels of familism in the parks rise.

If indeed the precarious situation of young families in mobile home parks is aggravated by the high levels of physical proximity which obtain in most parks, the condition of those at the other end of the family life cycle is affected in the opposite way. Hoyt, Gillies, and Johnson all concluded that the retired and quasi-retired population of mobile home parks found the small-scale social participation facilitated by the very density that
the younger, more familistic couples found confining. It is therefore considered likely that:

\[ H_5 \] The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as the age level of the parks' residents increases.

\[ H_6 \] Interaction with neighbors increases as the age level of the parks' residents increases.

This expected increase in the satisfaction levels and interaction rates would probably be more striking in parks for adults only, or in those with separate sections for adults. Probably the most solidly established generalization on the topic under study is the necessity of homogeneity for neighborhood satisfaction and interaction. Gans asserts, "Where people are homogeneous, they socialize; where they are heterogeneous, they do little more than exchange polite greetings." He sees homogeneity as particularly helpful in providing opportunities for mutual visiting and friendship formation for those who want it in their immediate vicinity. Mobile home parks do tend to be quite homogeneous on demographic and socio-economic variables, but there are important differences among park operators as to the attention paid to the attainment or preservation of this homogeneity. It is anticipated that:

\[ H_7 \] The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as park homogeneity increases.
H₈ The rate of interaction with neighbors increases as park homogeneity increases.

Research on the association between residential stability and neighborliness is relatively scarce and quite inconclusive. Nohara and Rossi both found positive correlations between stability and frequency of interaction, but Caplow and Rosow failed to confirm such patterns. In his study of Levittown, Gans found that the initial high frequency of neighboring dropped when neighbors found themselves to be incompatible, but maintained itself in the more homogeneous sections of the suburb. Since individual parks tend to be quite homogeneous, it is expected that:

H₉ The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as the residential stability of the park residents increases.

H₁₀ The rate of interaction with neighbors increases as the residential stability of the park residents increases.

The next two chapters will outline the processes used in verifying these hypotheses, and will summarize the results of the statistical operations involved in the attempts at verification.
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46. Cf. Packard, A Nation of Strangers, pp. 99-100, 130. See also Appendix C.


CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes an explanation of the sampling procedures used to obtain a representative sample of mobile home park dwellers, an outline of the methods used in gathering the needed information, and a discussion of the approaches used in analysing the data.

Sampling Procedures

A list of the parks in operation in Franklin County in May, 1973, was obtained from the Trailer Tax Division of the Franklin County Auditor's Office. Of the sixty-three parks listed, three were excluded because they were just getting into operation, and one tiny "trailer court" was omitted because it was going out of business.

To assure a representative sample of the remaining parks, a stratified list was composed, using the classification contained in the most recent edition of the Woodall Mobile Home Park Directory. This rating system, based on an annual inspection of all the parks in the country with fifteen or more mobile home households,
grades the parks as to physical design, management practices, available service and recreational facilities, and overall appearance. Almost half of the twenty-five thousand parks of the nation are excluded as failing to meet Woodall's minimum standards. The others are graded on a one-to-five-star scale. Most rated parks fall into the one, two, or three-star categories, with few parks outside resort and retirement areas receiving the four or five-star accolade. At the time of the park selection for this survey, only one park in the state of Ohio had obtained a five-star rating, and no park in Franklin County had been judged worthy of the four-star award.²

The parks in the county were ranked according to their Woodall rating, and within each category, were ordered according to the number of lots they contained. A number was then chosen at random to provide a starting point on the list, and every third park was selected, supplying a thirty-three percent sample of the parks of the county.

For the selection of the households in each park, every fourth name on the mailing list of the Trailer Tax Division of the Franklin County Auditor's Office was picked, after a starting number had been drawn by lot, thus giving a twenty-five percent sample of the population of the twenty parks to be studied, and an eight
percent sample of the mobile home park population of the county. For the few parks in which the mobile homes as well as the lots could be rented, the same procedure was used with the listings in the *Columbus City Directory* and the *Columbus Suburban Directory* published annually by the R.L. Polk Company.\(^3\)

The resulting pool of park dwellers was divided into three categories: 121 households from three-star parks, 151 from two and one-star parks, and 136 from the parks which did not meet Woodall minimum standards.

**Collection of the Data**

The basic instrument used in gathering information for this research project was a nine-page questionnaire sent to the 408 households in the sample. (See Appendix A) A one-page factual information questionnaire was also sent to the operators of each of the mobile home parks under scrutiny. (See Appendix B) The information thus obtained was supplemented by at least one visit to each of the twenty parks, conversations with most of the operators, and with some of the residents either in person or by telephone, and interviews with representatives of the Ohio Mobile Home and Recreational Vehicle Association, the Department of Economic and Community Development Planning Subdivision, the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning
Commission, and various city and county officials.

The Mobile Home Residents' Questionnaire

The study of satisfaction levels and interaction rates among park dwellers entailed the use of a questionnaire designed to yield measurable expressions of satisfaction and interaction. None of the previously published scales was found suited to the special situation of mobile home park populations, since these locales are much smaller and less comprehensive than those involved in other community studies, and since the special form of tenure in mobile home parks, the combination of shelter ownership and lot rental, entails certain limitations to household autonomy which invited special attention.

Meyers' "Mobile Home Park Social Solidarity Scale," adapted from Fessler's "Community Solidarity Index," provided a number of useful items, but the special focus of Meyers' research, the reaction of park dwellers to perceived discrimination at the hands of the larger community, precluded the outright replication of his instrument. Eight items were borrowed and adapted from the questionnaire devised by Knight for his comparative study of mobile home and conventional home owners, and
two items were gleaned from Packard's study of community spirit in Azusa, California, and Glenn Falls, New York. Most of the items were therefore prepared specifically for this survey, either to elicit the park residents' opinions or to yield some component of neighborhood satisfaction or some expression of neighborliness. Fifty-two of the items were in a Likert format, inviting answers ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with the usual three intermediate levels of response. Six items were short check lists, and four required brief, open-ended answers. An introductory section was designed to provide the demographic and socio-economic data needed for correlation purposes.

The entire instrument was tried on a number of colleagues, under-graduate students, including four mobile home dwellers, and a few friends and acquaintances from non-academic occupations, mostly to detect and clarify potentially ambiguous statements. Severe limitations of time and resources precluded a more formal pretest of a pilot study.

The first mailing, sent to 408 households, yielded 159 usable responses, and a follow-up cover letter and a second copy of the questionnaire produced twenty-two additional replies. A dozen poorly filled questionnaires are not included in these returns, since they were deemed
too incomplete to be helpful. Unopened return mail and subsequent investigation revealed that seventy-four of the original sample had moved and two had died. Thus, usable replies were received from 44.4% of those on the original list, and 54.5% of those actually contacted. Sixty-one of the 121 households in the highest quality parks responded, seventy of the 151 in the middle category, and fifty of the 136 in the non-rated parks participated in the survey.

In designing the questionnaire, it had been anticipated that, besides yielding a general satisfaction score, the items would cluster around certain more specific aspects of satisfaction, like satisfaction with levels of security and tranquility, of friendliness and sociability, and of autonomy enjoyed by the park population. Factor analysis was performed on all the Likert-format items to see whether the expected clusters would develop, and to provide for the addition or deletion of items, according to the outcome of the analysis.8

Both orthogonal and oblique rotations were effected, extracting fourteen, nine, and six factors in succession to determine those which would demonstrate acceptable consistency. On the basis of the rotated factor matrices thus obtained, six factors were provisionally retained: autonomy, friendliness, security, sociability,
tranquility, and general satisfaction. Individual items which did not consistently have correlation coefficients of .45 or more with one of the factors were dropped from the scale.

The twenty-six items retained after factor analysis were grouped as follows:

**Autonomy**

12. We find most of the rules and regulations in this park reasonable.

24. It is easier to get streets, sewers and similar items fixed in this mobile home park than in regular city neighborhoods.

42. Mobile home parks all have at least one thing in common: You're really not your own boss!

49. Park operators often take unfair advantage of park residents.

50. We would probably stay in this park longer if we had more freedom on our own lot.

**Friendliness**

1. Most of the people in this park are very friendly.

3. Most of the people in this park are very much like us.

6. Mobile home park people are more friendly than neighbors in regular housing developments.

8. Most of the people in this park know how to mind their own business.

18. Real friends are hard to find in this park.
39. In an emergency, like a sudden illness or an accident, we are sure that we could count on several of our neighbors to go out of their way to help.

47. Most of our neighbors are just about what we think neighbors should be.

Security

14. Our mobile home park neighborhood is safer than regular neighborhoods we could occupy at similar costs.

15. We have more privacy here than we would have in most apartments we could afford to rent.

31. Mobile home parks are preferable to apartments because of their better facilities for outdoor living.

43. One good feature about mobile home parks is that we have fewer worries about being assaulted or robbed.

Tranquility

39. This park is peaceful and quiet.

41. We feel that this park is too crowded.

44. Noise from neighboring lots bothers us.

46. Not enough people around here seem to care how the park looks.

Sociability

20. It is important to us to have neighbors who like to exchange home visits.

23. We prefer a small lot, since that allows more space for common recreation areas and other park facilities.

38. The people in this park should get together two or three times a year to get to know one another and develop community spirit.
General Satisfaction

10. We feel very much at home here.

40. We would definitely recommend this park to friends who would be looking for a lot.

52. All in all, we think that this park is a very good place to live.

These statements were then subjected to an item analysis and scale reliability program developed by Johnson, McCabe and Greene from the Kuder-Richardson Equation 3 for scale reliability. For item analysis, the sums of all the respondents' scores on all items are combined into a grand total, and finally, the sum of all the respondents' scores on each item is removed from the grand total and is correlated against the new subtotal. To obtain scale reliability, the variance in the total score attributable to internal consistencies is computed and then expressed as a portion of the total variance of the total score.

The resulting scale had a reliability index of .90, but two of the three items in the sociability cluster had correlations inferior to the .30 indicated as acceptable by the program designers. Sociability was therefore dropped as a component of the scale, and the new twenty-three item Mobile Home Park Neighborhood Satisfaction Scale had a reliability index of .92.
Item analysis was also performed for the items in each of the subscales, and the Kuder-Richardson reliability index was computed for each of them, including the sociability subscale, which was excluded from the total scale. The following reliability indices were obtained: Autonomy, .75; Friendliness, .83; Security, .67; Tranquility, .73; General Satisfaction, .77; and Sociability, .41. Individual item correlations with their subscales and with the total scale are given in Table 1.

The four items dealing with neighboring practices were not incorporated into a scale, because it was felt that they focused on very disparate manifestations of neighborliness. Respondents were simply asked to check off the number of their "best friends" who lived in the same park, the frequency of casual conversations with nigh-dwellers, of longer social visits, and of neighborly help given or received during the previous three months. It was not assumed that the replies to the four questions would covary.

The responses to the open-ended items were considered separately, for the insights they could furnish on the rest of the questionnaire. Likewise, the one-page series of questions sent to the park operators, the visits to the parks, and conversations with park personnel, representatives of the industry, and of state,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Score</th>
<th>Subscale Score</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>Tranquility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>Tranquility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Tranquility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>Tranquility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
county, and municipal agencies, were all considered ancillary to the qualitative data culled from the residents' responses to the nine page questionnaire.

Analysis of the Data

The park dwellers' responses were coded and placed on punch cards for tabulation, a study of frequency distributions, and analyses of patterns of relationships among selected variables. As with the factor analysis operations mentioned previously, all computations were made according to the procedures outline in the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*.

In general, the format of the questionnaire had already provided for grouping the data concerning demographic and socio-economic variables to be used for cross-tabulations with the satisfaction scale and subscales as well as with the separate items concerning neighboring practices. Sums for the scale and subscales were computed from the scores on the Likert scale items, after making the necessary transpositions to count "least satisfied" for one, and "most satisfied" for five. The totals for the scale and subscales were then clustered into three groupings, as evenly as the data allowed, indicating low, medium, and high levels of satisfaction.
Likewise, for manifestation of neighborliness; the frequency of casual conversations, of longer visits, of reciprocal help, and the number of best friends in the park, were grouped to express low, medium, and high rates of neighborly activity.

Both Spearman and Kendall rank-order correlations were computed between the variables involved in testing the various hypotheses, since the program presented in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences allows both correlations to be obtained from a common "run". The Kendall tau, rather than the Spearman r are reported since, although the tau values tend to be somewhat lower than the Spearman r's, they are considered more meaningful when, as in the present correlations, a relatively large number of cases is divided into a small number of categories.\(^{10}\)

Pearson correlations were also obtained to allow for a consideration of the impact of intervening variables on the zero-order correlations, through the procedures listed for the computation of partial correlations.\(^{11}\) For all the correlations obtained, a \(p < .05\) in a one-tailed test was considered significant.
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1. Woodall Mobile Home and Park Directory, pp. 5-6. See Appendix C.

2. One park in Franklin County, in the process of re-building when the 1973 edition was being prepared, received a four-star rating in the 1974 edition. It was not part of the sample used for this study.

3. Columbus City Directory and Columbus Suburban Directory, passim.


8. The factor analyses were performed according to programs developed in Nie, Bent, and Hull, SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, pp. 208-244.

9. Johnson, McCabe, and Greene, "Item Analysis."


11. In computing all correlations, "pairwise" rather than "listwise" deletions for missing data were made. See Nie, Bent, and Hull, SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, pp. 284-285.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

This chapter offers an overview of the findings of the mobile home park residents' survey, and presents the results of the test made of each of the hypotheses outlined in the first chapter.

Overview of the Survey Results

Before undertaking to test the previously listed hypotheses, a cursory summary of the factual data gathered by means of the park residents' survey is deemed helpful to the understanding of the outcomes of the various tests of the hypotheses in question.

A salient feature of the mobile home households included in this study is their small size. The typical Ohio household, according to the 1970 census, is made up of 2.8 persons. For mobile home households, this figure is 2.3 persons. Unfortunately, the Census Bureau does not distinguish between mobile homes located in parks and those sited on individually owned or rented lots. The mean number of occupants of the households covered by
this survey was 2.0. Of the thirty-nine households with children, twenty-seven had only one child, ten had two children, one had three, and another, four. Thirty-one of these children were of pre-school age, seventeen were of school age, and six were older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY THE NUMBER OF OCCUPANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 181)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age distribution of the park dwellers was also different from that of the population of conventional neighborhoods, showing an overrepresentation of households in the early or in the late phases of the family life cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY THE AGE OF THE HEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 181)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below 35</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>Over 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This age distribution helps explain not only the large proportion of small households, but also the high percentage of household heads listed as retired or disabled, and the relatively low average family income for 1972, $8,700. This figure was also depressed by the fact that fifteen of the household heads were full-time university students. It would have been considerably lower had it not been for the very high rates of employment among the mobile home park housewives. Half of those neither retired nor disabled indicated that they held full-time jobs, and a third of the others were employed part-time.

### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $2000.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000. to $3999.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4000. to $5999.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6000. to $7999.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8000. to $9999.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10000. to $11999.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12000. to $13999.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14000. to $15999.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $16000.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The low income figure also reflects the generally modest occupational levels of the population under study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial, proprietor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, clerical</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, foremen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled, service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired, disabled</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational achievement, measured in number of years of formal schooling completed, is greatly influenced by the age distribution of the park residents. The college and university attendance figures are inflated by the fact that five of the respondents lived in a small north side park reserved exclusively for married university students, and two of the other parks in the sample were within fairly convenient commuting distance from the Ohio State University Campus.
TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY THE EDUCATION OF THE HEAD
(N = 179)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond B.A. or B.S.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures on residential stability present a combination of relatively low past and current stability and comparatively high anticipated stability. Thirty percent of the household heads were born outside Ohio, half of them in Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia. At the time of the survey, eleven had lived at their current location less than a year, 107 had been living at their present location for from one to four years, and forty-four had occupied their present site for from five to nine years. Nine had not moved in the past ten to fourteen years, eight had not changed their place of residence in the past fifteen to nineteen years, and two had been at the same lot for two decades and more.
Twenty-five had moved from other mobile home parks; fifty-two from apartments; twenty-five, from rented homes; thirty from their parents' homes, and a surprising forty-four had moved to their park from conventional homes which they had owned.

Forty percent of the respondents indicated that they were planning to move within the next four years, and another seven percent, at some later date. More than half, however, had no such plans for the foreseeable future, and only forty-six respondents stated that they were saving money toward the purchase of a conventional home.

Overwhelmingly, park dwellers found their geographic locations within Franklin County convenient. This was particularly true with regard to shopping facilities. It is interesting to note that none of the influences which compelled park developers to locate outside city limits and near major traffic arteries were much the same as those which led to the subsequent establishment of shopping centers in those same general areas. Access to jobs, recreational facilities, and even to schools was also favorably viewed by most of the respondents.

It should be noted that park residents were generally pleased with their parks as neighborhoods (Items 10, 40, 52), found them reasonably quiet (2, 7) and
safer than comparatively priced conventional settings (14, 43). In general they did not feel too crowded (4) or deprived of personal or family privacy (8, 15).

Most park residents expressed their belief that their mobile home neighborhoods are more friendly than conventional residential enclaves (1, 6, 18), and felt that they could count on several of their neighbors to go out of their way to help them in case of an emergency (39). Like other people in most neighborhoods, they did not expect interaction with nigh-dwellers to be intensive (25), yet, more than a third of the respondents indicated that they considered it important to have neighbors with whom they could exchange home visits (20).

Park residents did not seem particularly resentful of the limitations placed on them by park operators. It is true that forty percent agreed with the statement, "Mobile home parks all have at least one thing in common; you're not really your own boss!" What is surprising to an outsider is that more than half disagreed. A quarter of the respondents thought that park operators often took advantage of their tenants, but more than half did not think that this was true (49), and a solid majority found that the rules and regulations imposed by management were reasonable (12).
Many indicated an awareness of the poor image that mobile home dwellers have in the eyes of their fellow-Americans (41), and more than half expressed some sensitivity about outsiders referring to their mobile homes as trailers (36). Yet, most had the impression that their relatives thought that their living in a mobile home park was a good idea (26).

One opinion which was widely shared by park residents is that their special neighborhoods are poor places in which to raise families. While 144 respondents saw the parks as good for young childless couples (27), and 150 considered them satisfactory for retired couples (30), only fifty-one considered them adequate locations for pre-schoolers (28), and only twenty-four saw them as suited for teen-agers (29).

Tests of the Hypotheses

From previous research on mobile home parks, and from generalizations made by sociologists who have studied neighborhood phenomena, which were reviewed in the first chapter of this study, five major categories of factors have been retained for the formulation of the ten hypotheses which have been stated, and which will now be systematically tested: socio-economic status, familism, age, perceived homogeneity, and residential
stability. The remainder of this chapter presents the outcomes of the tests of the ten hypotheses, using the above-mentioned factors as independent and/or control variables, and using satisfaction levels and interaction rates as dependent variables.

In testing each hypothesis, the mobile home parks rather than the individual households are considered the basic units of analysis. Correlations using households as units of analysis will generally be mentioned only when they are of special interest, but they are listed in Appendix D for possible further examination.

\[ \text{H}_1 \] The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as the socio-economic status of the park residents rises.

No effort was made to develop a single index of socio-economic status, since income levels appeared to be so much more closely linked with the work status of the wife than with the educational or occupational background of the household head. The three measures were therefore used separately, as was the Woodall rating of each park, mentioned in the first chapter.

Rank-order correlations between income, occupation, and education on the one hand and neighborhood satisfaction on the other, turned out to be negative, and all at the .05 level or better. Partial correlations,
however, controlling for age, number of persons per household, number of children, and work status of the wife, were not significant at the same minimum level of acceptability. Correlations using the Woodall ratings as independent variable and satisfaction levels as dependent variables were positive and significant at the .002 level even when the same control variables for age and familism were applied. (Cf. Appendix D, Table 7).

The first hypothesis is rejected, since the anticipated positive correlation between the more habitually used indicators of socio-economic status, income, occupation, and formal education, and neighborhood satisfaction failed to materialize. The surprising negative 0-order correlations between the traditionally used socio-economic status indicators and residential satisfaction are attributed to the fact that these variables correlate positively with the size of households and the number of children per household, which, for the population under study, drastically reduces satisfaction, and negatively with age, perceived homogeneity and projected stability which this research will show to be closely associated with high levels of satisfaction with mobile home park living. The Woodall ratings, on the other hand, correlate negatively with the number of occupants and the number of children per household, and
positively with age, homogeneity, and residential stability. Table 35 in Appendix D summarizes these correlations between the various independent and control variables used in testing these hypotheses. It is also more than likely that the superior management practices normally to be found in highly rated parks would be conducive to higher satisfaction rates among the residents. (See Appendix C).

$H_2$ Interaction with neighbors increases as the socio-economic status of the park residents rises.

The procedures used in testing the first hypothesis were repeated in testing the correlation between the same indicators of socio-economic status and four manifestations of neighborly interaction: the frequency of casual conversations, of somewhat prolonged visits made or received, of help given or accepted, and the relative number of one’s best friends living in the same mobile home park. (Cf. Appendix A, Items 54 to 57).

Generally, when parks are the units of analysis, correlations between the selected indicators of socio-economic status, except for the Woodall ratings, tend to be negative, but the only ones which remain so at acceptable significance levels when controls are introduced for age and familism are the correlations between
income and occupation on the one hand, and the frequency of visitation on the other. Woodall ratings correlated positively with each of the four manifestations of neighborliness, but not at acceptable levels of significance when the controls for age and familism are inserted. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 9, 11, 13, and 15).

When households, rather than parks, are used as units of analysis, education correlated positively with three of the selected neighborly activities at the .05 level or better: casual conversations, home visits, and mutual help. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 10, 12, and 14).

On the basis of the preponderance of the evidence, the second hypothesis, anticipating positive correlation between socio-economic status and manifestations of neighborliness, is rejected. It seems that the structural features of mobile home parks and the value systems of their residents, both discussed in the final chapter of this study, are salient enough to contravene the generalizations advanced by Caplow, Stryker, and Wallace, as well as by Nohara, on the positive association between socio-economic status on the one hand, and neighborhood satisfaction and interaction on the other. 2
The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods decreases as levels of familism in the parks rise.

As in the case of the socio-economic indicators, no single measure of familism was devised. Three variables were used: the number of persons per household, with single individuals deemed least familistic; dyads, second; and couples with children, most familistic; the number of children currently living with their parents; and the participation of the wife in the labor force, with full-time work considered least familistic; part-time work, second; and non-participation in the labor force, most familistic. There is some redundancy between the number of persons per household and the number of children in those households, but because of the high number of single-individual households (almost thirty percent) and the relatively few couples with children (just over twenty percent) it was felt that both measures should be kept.

The third hypothesis, on the inverse relationship between familism and satisfaction, is substantiated when the number of occupants and the number of children are used as independent variables, but the wife's participation or non-participation in the labor force seems to have very little impact on residential satisfaction in
mobile home parks. Controlling for age, income, occupation and formal education, the size of the household and the number of children correlates negatively with satisfaction. Fourth order correlations of -0.233 and -0.228 respectively were obtained, both significant at the .002 level. (Cf. Appendix D, Table 17).

H₄ Interaction with neighbors increases as levels of familism in a park rise.

Correlations were computed for each of the four selected manifestations of neighborliness with each of the three indicators of familism. None of the correlations using the parks as units of analysis indicated positive associations at acceptable levels of significance. Indeed, correlations tended to be negative, two of them at the .05 level. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 19, 21, 23, and 25).

Rank-order correlations between the three measures of familism on the one hand, and two of the manifestations of neighborliness on the other, (mutual visits and reciprocal help) are positive at convincing levels of significance when households are used as units of analysis. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 22 and 24). An examination of the responses of the thirty-seven households with children reveals that there is very little difference in
the patterns of interaction with neighbors when the children are past school-age. Couples with only one pre-school child do visit and help one another more frequently, while those with more than one pre-schooler or with one or more school-age offspring interact less frequently. The discrepancy in the direction of the association on the dependent variables according to the units under consideration (parks or households) is explained by the fact that the majority of the school age children of the young families with more than one pre-schooler is concentrated in very few of the parks, while the couples with only one young child are much more widely distributed.

The fourth hypothesis is rejected, not only because parks are considered the main objects of this study, but also because the positive correlation between indices of familism and manifestations of neighborliness fell below minimum levels of significance when controls for age and socio-economic status were introduced.

\[ H_5 \] The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as the age level of the parks' residents increases.

Using parks as units of analysis, with age as the independent variable and general satisfaction as the
dependent variable, rank-order correlation was +.298, significant at the .001 level. With households as units of analysis, the rank-order correlation was +.301, also significant at the .001 level.

Partial correlations were equally convincing. Controlling for income, occupation, education, number of occupants, number of children, and work status of the wife, sixth-order correlations were +.275 for parks and +.264 for households, both significant at the .001 level. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 27 and 28).

The fifth hypothesis is therefore accepted.

\[ H_6 \] Interaction with neighbors increases as the age level of the parks' residents rises.

Correlations between age and the four selected indicators of neighborliness were also positive, but not uniformly at the same high levels of significance. Rank-order correlations for parks were all significant at the .05 level. Partial correlations, controlling for the six variables used in testing the fifth hypothesis were also in the expected direction, and significant at the .01 and .05 levels for the frequency of mutual visits and reciprocal help respectively. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 26 and 27).

The sixth hypothesis is therefore accepted.
The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as park homogeneity increases.

It is even more difficult to obtain a single criterion for homogeneity than it is to find single satisfactory indicators of socio-economic status or of familism. As Gans has pointed out, homogeneity with regard to one criterion can shield important differences with regard to other equally meaningful criteria. Perceived homogeneity was therefore selected as the independent variable in this effort to determine the convariation between homogeneity and neighborhood satisfaction.

The responses of the park residents to Item 3 of the questionnaire, "Most of the people in this park are very much like us," were distributed as follows: thirteen strongly disagreed, thirty disagreed, fifty did not commit themselves, seventy-one agreed, and seventeen strongly agreed. Values of one to five were assigned to these responses as indicating increasing levels of perceived homogeneity.

Rank-order correlations between homogeneity and neighborhood satisfaction were +.391 and +.543 for parks and households respectively. Partial-order correlations, controlling for age, income, occupation, education, number of occupants, number of children and work status
of the wife, yielded coefficients of +.372 for parks and +.518 for households. All these correlations are in the anticipated direction and are significant at the .001 level. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 29 and 30).

The seventh hypothesis is therefore accepted.

$$H_8 \quad \text{Interaction with neighbors increases as park homogeneity increases.}$$

Employing the same measure of homogeneity as was used in testing the seventh hypothesis, correlations were computed between that measure and the four selected indicators of neighborliness. All were in the expected positive direction and most were at highly acceptable levels of significance, even with the previously used controls for age, socio-economic status and familism. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 29 and 30).

The eighth hypothesis is therefore accepted.

$$H_9 \quad \text{The level of satisfaction with mobile home parks as neighborhoods increases as the residential stability of the park residents increases.}$$

Both current and projected residential stability were used as independent variables in testing this hypothesis. The time which had actually been passed at the present location was used to measure current stability, and the length of time the residents anticipated remaining at their present location was used to indicate
Correlations between current residential stability and satisfaction were generally positive, but, except for the rank-order correlation using parks as units of analysis, levels of significance were not acceptable. On the other hand, correlations between projected stability and residential satisfaction were all positive and significant at the .001 level, even with controls for age, socio-economic status and familism. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 31, 32, 33, and 34). The hypothesis being tested would therefore have to be divided into two statements. The first, dealing with the correlation between current stability and satisfaction is not substantiated by the data, but the second, pertaining to the positive correlation between projected stability and mobile home park neighborhood satisfaction is cogently confirmed.

**H**₁₀ Interaction with neighbors increases as the residential stability of the park residents increases.

Again, both current and projected stability were considered, and the usual four aspects of neighborly interaction were examined. The pattern which had appeared in testing the ninth hypothesis was repeated in verifying the tenth.
Correlations between current residential stability and neighborliness were in the expected direction, but well below acceptable levels. Those between projected stability and manifestations of neighborly interaction were higher. Using parks as units of analysis, rank-order correlations were all significant at the .05 level or better except for frequency of reciprocal help. Partial correlations, controlling for age, socio-economic status, and familism, were also positive and significant at the .05 level or better except for the association between anticipated stability and the number of "best friends" in the park which was just short of the .05 mark. (Cf. Appendix D, Tables 33 and 34).

Like the ninth hypothesis, the tenth is therefore divided into two statements. The hypothesis is not accepted when applied to current residential stability, but it is accepted as it applies to the positive association between projected stability and manifestations of neighborliness.
NOTES: CHAPTER III

1. United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Census of Housing Subject Reports, Mobile Homes, pp. 1, 3, 210-211.


CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a brief recapitulation of this study, develops some theoretical implications dealing with neighborhood satisfaction and interaction, suggests some practical applications, points out certain limitations of the project, and outlines a few possible topics for future investigations.

Summary

This research was designed to ascertain the adequacy of a broad range of mobile home parks as neighborhoods and to test the applicability of previously stated generalizations concerning neighborhood satisfaction and social interaction to such parks.

The response to the questionnaire items dealing with neighborhood satisfaction leaves no doubt that the park dwellers show a high level of satisfaction with their residential environments and thus refuse to share the persistent disparagement with which functionaries and the general public continue to view mobile home
living. This satisfaction is hardly surprising. Only nine respondents indicated that they were living in parks because no other housing was available, so that it is clear that the vast majority of park dwellers saw their particular choice of living milieu as an affordable alternative to renting apartments or owning conventional homes.

The replies to the check list items (64 through 67) also revealed that the parks were the sites of considerable neighborly interaction including frequent casual conversations, a fairly high frequency of mutual home visits and reciprocal help. All these instances of manifest neighborliness seemed firmly established on a mutual trust which forms the basis of what Mann called latent neighborliness.

A major part of this research effort was a series of empirical tests of frequently advanced generalizations on the correlates of residential satisfaction and neighborly interaction. It was found that neither socio-economic status nor familism was related to either satisfaction or interaction in mobile home parks. On the other hand, age and perceived homogeneity both seemed to have a significant positive impact on these two dependent variables, as did projected, as contrasted to current, residential stability.
Theoretical Implications

Failure to confirm the positive correlations between socio-economic status and neighborhood satisfaction and interaction which Caplow, Stryker and Wallace had established in their study of San Juan, Puerto Rico, and which Nohara had found in St. Louis, Missouri, warrants an explanation. Not only did persons of higher socio-economic status turn out to be less pleased with their parks, but they scored lower on each of the satisfaction subscales: autonomy, security, friendliness, tranquility and general satisfaction.

A closer examination of specific items in each subscale suggests that persons of higher incomes, occupational categories or education also tend to have higher expectations and, in spite of objectively better situations, may experience less satisfaction in their park environments. For instance, item 12 in the autonomy subscale pertaining to the reasonableness of park rules and regulations would be judged differently by the person accustomed to the freedom of the conventional single-family home than by one used to the contraints of apartment living. Likewise, item 15 in the security subscale, pertaining to the higher levels of privacy available in mobile home parks, would be judged more favorably
by the person whose only alternative to the park was an obsolescent apartment in a changing neighborhood than by one fully capable in renting or owning a home at a more desirable location. Similarly, given the generally low levels of income, occupation and education in mobile home parks, persons of modest means or achievement would be more likely to express agreement with item 47 in the friendliness subscale, "Most of our neighbors are just about what we think neighbors should be." Surely, sensitivity to noise levels, referred to in item 44 in the tranquility subscale, would vary with one's previous residential experience.

These representative items from the survey instrument at least suggest that the special features of mobile home park neighborhoods would be less compatible to the value systems and norms of middle class households than those of persons of lower socio-economic status.

The generally negative correlations between socio-economic status and levels of neighborly interaction can also be explained by a distinctive feature of mobile home parks as neighborhoods, viz., their smallness. Parks are minuscule areas of social contact. The generalizations concerning the more active social participation of persons of higher socio-economic status would seem to be more applicable to larger residential groups.
than the dozens or even hundreds of households found in all but the very largest parks in this country. In fact, Greer has pointed out that the lower the occupational and educational level, the smaller the scale of an individual's participation. The radius of interaction within a typical mobile home park would then be more suited to persons of modest socio-economic status.

The present study did confirm previous research, notably that of Caplow, Stryker and Wallace concerning the negative correlation between high familism and neighborhood satisfaction. The high physical density of most mobile home parks makes neighbors particularly vulnerable to one another's children. Two parks, which contain some forty percent of the children in the sample in this research scored by far the lowest in satisfaction on all of the subscales. The single pre-school child, or the children of post-school age did not have any disruptive impact, but the presence of more than one pre-school child or of school-age children was very clearly linked to low satisfaction scores.

A similar pattern is discernible in the interplay of familism and neighborly interaction. Households with a single pre-schooler had higher than average scores on the frequency of mutual visitation and reciprocal help, while those with more than one pre-school child or with
one or more school-age children tended to score lower.

The sample of park residents contained a relatively large minority (29.8%) of single individuals. Contrary to Nohara's finding that being married is consistently related to neighborliness, no significant differences emerged in the neighboring practices of the currently unmarried and the married when no children were present. Perhaps the fact that both groups had the same occupancy status, owning the shelter and renting the lot, eliminated some of the differences that usually appear when predominantly home-owning families are compared with predominantly renting single persons.

For both clusters of independent variables considered thus far, Blau's observation that "the same status may have different consequences depending on its prevalence in the social structure" is very pertinent. If persons of higher socio-economic status or of pronounced familism are a decided minority in the mobile home park neighborhoods under examination, their very condition of minority can well be a factor in their lesser degree of satisfaction or their lower interaction rates. The structural context, as well as the differences in values and norms mentioned above have a bearing on levels of satisfaction and interaction.
Age and homogeneity were much more closely tied to neighborhood satisfaction and interaction than socio-economic status and familism. Hoyt, Gillies and Johnson all found the parks which they had studied extremely congenial to the elderly whom they provided with compact quarters near ground level, reduced housekeeping and groundskeeping responsibilities, and opportunities for contact with potential friends. Positive correlations between increasing age and levels of satisfaction were significant for each of the subscales: autonomy (.02), security (.003), tranquility (.004), friendship (.001), and general satisfaction (.004), indicating that the social, as well as the physical surroundings in which they lived were pleasing to them.

The positive correlations between age and neighborly interaction were significant for frequency of mutual visits (.01) and reciprocal help (.05), thus confirming Keller's conclusion from previous studies that the elderly tend to make their social contacts within neighborhood settings. The radius of interaction tends to decrease with age, even when socio-economic status and familism are introduced as control variables.

Correlations between perceived homogeneity and satisfaction with the autonomy, security, tranquility and friendliness enjoyed by park residents were even
higher than those between age and satisfaction on the same subscales, thus verifying Caplow, Stryker, and Wallace's findings in their study of Puerto Rican neighborhoods. Correlations between homogeneity and varied manifestations of neighborliness confirm Gans' observations on the need for homogeneity to facilitate sustained neighborly interaction. The high levels of density which prevail in most parks makes homogeneity even more important than in conventional neighborhoods.

Nohara's contention that current residential stability is one of the few predictors of neighborliness was not confirmed in this research project. In the mobile home parks which were examined, current stability correlated poorly with satisfaction levels or interaction rates. It would seem, that as Rossi and Knight both point out, families move within a municipal or metropolitan area much more in response to spatial needs than in reaction to dissatisfaction with the social aspects of one's neighborhood. Parks occupied by young couples with pre-school children are obviously way-stations to conventional housing developments, quite regardless of the levels of satisfaction these young couples experience with what they know to be an intermediate phase in their housing accommodations.
It seems that it is precisely this absence or presence of commitment to mobile home park living that generally distinguishes young, growing families from "empty-nest" and retired couples who have opted for this particular form of neighborhood. While in most locations commitment to the neighborhood is linked to home ownership and familism, in mobile home parks it entails the absence of growing children and a decision to forego conventional home ownership. Projected stability correlates much more highly with neighborhood satisfaction and interaction than current residential stability, especially when controls are introduced for age, familism, and socio-economic status.

**Practical Applications**

The findings of this research project can be of considerable practical import. Mobile homes, which the 1940 census enumerated along with railroad cars, tents, and shacks have now come of age. They received belated recognition in a special report prepared by the Census Bureau for the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1967, and in a special message to Congress by President Nixon in April, 1970. Also in 1970, for the first time in the history of the Bureau of the
Census, a special volume on mobile homes was published as part of the Census of Housing. In the three decades between 1940 and 1970 mobile homes had progressed from accounting for 0.4% to 2.6% of the nation's dwelling units.\textsuperscript{19}

This survey had demonstrated that most of those who select this form of housing environment find it economical, safe, and generally satisfying at the particular phase of the family life cycle at which they find themselves.

Decreasing household sizes, resulting from reduced birth rates and a growing tendency of young adults and elderly couples to maintain their own households, belie the popular stereotype of the typical home as made up of "mom, dad, and the kids."\textsuperscript{20} For the growing number and proportion of American couples in the early or in the late stages of their marriages,\textsuperscript{21} the cultural ideal of owning their own single-family home on a large lot is not realizable.\textsuperscript{22} For many, a mobile home in a park is a practical short or long term solution.

Foote has pointed out that the notion of housing as shelter and space is giving way to "a minimum wrapping for a complicated array of mechanical equipment and appliances."\textsuperscript{23} Blue-collar people in particular do not attach to home ownership in a prestigious neighborhood
the symbolic value which many middle class people do.\textsuperscript{24} In judging the adequacy of mobile home settings, it is incumbent upon white-collar critics to bear in mind the admonitions of Rosow, Gans, Keller, and others against imposing their aesthetic standards on those whom they are studying.\textsuperscript{25} There can be no denying that many mobile home dwellers, including several in this sample of Franklin County residents, live in aged trailers in rather shabby surroundings, but there are no indications that they are saddled with problems of social disorganization and crime victimization characteristic of slum neighborhoods. On the contrary, they express satisfaction at the security, tranquility and friendliness of their parks.

There has been a tendency for regulatory bodies to ignore mobile home parks completely, to exclude them entirely, or to regulate them so severely as to make the development of new parks well-nigh impossible.\textsuperscript{26} On the other hand, in Franklin County, as in many other political subdivisions, indefinite continuance on non-conforming parks means that for decades old trailer courts can maintain densities of over thirty trailers to an acre, while new parks are limited to six or seven. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that Chapter 3733 of
the Ohio Revised Code preempts the regulation of mobile home parks, municipalities continue to impose more stringent standards on lot sizes, recreation facilities, off-street parking spaces, and specifications on street, sidewalk, patio and runway dimensions.²⁷

The arbitrary imposition of unduly stringent requirements on park developers drives costs up and discourages the construction of parks in all but the most remote and least desirable areas. Persons of modest means, particularly the elderly, are forced to locate in non-conforming, over-crowded parks where full occupancy guarantees high profits for maintaining inferior parks and inadequate facilities and services.²⁸ Under the terms of the present legislation, any substantial alteration of existing parks must bring those parks to the standards of the 1971 state law. A park owner could double the size of each lot by removing half the trailers from their sites, but could still fall short of the now required 3600 square feet per lot. Small wonder that he chooses to continue indefinitely under the old and remunerative non-conforming levels of density, physical safety and comfort. Ways should be found to encourage efforts to upgrade the older parks even when they cannot be brought all the way up to the newer, more demanding standards of excellence.
This study also points to a possible dysfunction of the ever increasing dimensions of the mobile units themselves. Nearly half the units being produced today, including the growing number of double-wides, are from fourteen to twenty-four feet wide, and from sixty to seventy-two feet long. Their sizes easily allow for three or four bedrooms and thus they can accommodate larger families than have heretofore been found in significant numbers in mobile home parks. In view of the demonstrated vulnerability of mobile home dwellers to one another's children, it seems that the multiplication of larger homes locatable in parks could attract a population poorly suited for the higher physical density of most parks. Besides, any notable increase in the number of school-age children in mobile home parks would be sure to bring even stronger opposition to the existence of these parks on the part of tax-conscious citizens from conventional developments.29

This study also strongly suggests that it would be unwise to strive to promote greater degrees of heterogeneity in mobile home parks. Not only did the survey confirm positive correlations between perceived homogeneity on the one hand and neighborly satisfaction and interaction on the other, but a number of answers to the open-ended questions, especially items 61 and 62, pointed
to the strong possibilities of tension and conflict between neighbors of different ages, family situations or regional origins. Special suspicion and hostility was manifested to the few occupants who rent rather than own their mobile homes in those few parks where such an arrangement is allowed. The renters are seen by the others as transients who have no interest in making the park a livable community.

Responses to open-ended questions, and conversations with park operators and residents indicate that in parks characterized by the higher levels of satisfaction, the managers were acutely aware of the need to screen out applicants whose life styles would diverge from that of the majority. In contrast, parks marked by lower levels of satisfaction tend to have managers who fail to give attention to their gate-keeping function. Gans' warning against instituting heterogeneity in social and political units poorly equipped to handle the consequences of conflict is eminently applicable to mobile home neighborhoods.

Is it possible that people in homogeneous parks could become too involuted or self-absorbed? Packard saw the creation of "one-layer" communities, including the development of huge mobile home parks for the elderly as misguided, socially corrosive and crippling
cop-outs from responsible community involvement. Gans also warned against the stultifying impact of isolating age or income strata of people in ways that tended to limit their horizons and freeze them in their ways.

The mobile home parks examined in this study are much too small to isolate their occupants from the larger community in the sense discussed by Packard or Gans. Most have laundromats, several have more or less clearly defined recreation areas, two have small grocery stores, and one even has a tiny chapel, but none could be seen as an all-encompassing neighborhood of the kind proclaimed by the early advocates of the neighborhood concept. Surely, the park dwellers responding to this survey did not feel that living in mobile home parks cuts people off from the rest of the city. Only nineteen agreed with this statement (item 17) while one hundred twenty-one dissented. It is also clear, from responses to item 54 that most of the park dwellers had the majority of their best friends outside the park.

In view of the low salience of the neighborhood in the social interaction of most people, there seems little danger that large numbers of park residents will develop any degree of pathological isolation from their larger communities. It is probably true that some parks may tend to become the "total world" of some of the oldest,
less mobile residents, but that seems to be a rather normal aspect of the disengagement process which the very old undergo in most other residential environments. Even then, it is worthy to note that the most commonly encountered response of the elderly to item 59 of the questionnaire was some variant of, "What I would miss most if I had to leave this park is the wonderful friends and neighbors I have here."

Even for the elderly, it seems that mobile home parks, like other urban neighborhoods, are small-scale communities of limited liability and commitment where involvement is partial, segmented, and integrated into the structures and processes of the larger community.

One feature of mobile home parks which sets them off from other residential settings is the prominence of the operators in shaping their physiognomies. It is clear that the relationships between park operators and tenants are characterized by gross inequalities of power. Subject only to limitations set by state and local officials, operators have considerable latitude in determining most of the factors likely to promote or hinder residential satisfaction and friendly interaction in their parks.

Not only can the park operator make rules and regulations with little or no consultation from the
residents, but he is also the enforcer of the same rules and the sole judge of acceptable levels of compliance and of sanctions to be imposed.

In practice, owners make and enforce regulations in ways that will allow them to operate profitably both on the short and long term. It is not surprising that most of the complaints voiced in response to open-ended questions revolved around what tenants considered unfair business practices: alleged kickbacks from mobile home dealers to park owners, excessive entry fees sometimes disguised as inflated set-up charges, exorbitant prices and/or monopoly control on repairs and the provisions of LP gas, heating oil, water and electricity, refusal to allow the sale of one's mobile home without immediately removing it from the park, or failure to provide the levels of services and upkeep tenants thought they were entitled to. Other grievances centered around alleged failures to enforce rules consistently and impartially.

There seems to be an impression, among those voicing complaints, that it is hazardous to criticise management or to seek redress from public officials. Mobile home sites are generally held without specific leases, and thus far, legislation protecting tenants in conventional housing has not been applied to mobile home owners who rent their home sites. It would seem
that this situation, presently under litigation in a neighboring county, calls for speedy redress. Once a unit is installed in a park, moving it to another mobile home park is not only costly, but when the move is dictated by an eviction notice or alleged harassment of a recalcitrant tenant, it can be extremely difficult. Park spaces in good locations are at a premium, and operators seem to prefer to keep them for the buyers of their own units or of those of other dealers with whom they often have special arrangements.

Considering the enormous potential for abuse under this condition of grossly unequal power, it is surprising that so few in the sample under scrutiny felt unduly deprived of autonomy (item 42) or exploited by management (49). Eighty-five percent indicated that they found park rules reasonable (12) and eighty percent stated that they would prefer stricter enforcement of the rules governing noise levels and park appearance (34).

None of the parks included in this study had any kind of organization for collective action to promote the tenants' interests. An attempt was made, in the summer of 1973 to mobilize such a group in one of the newer, larger parks in southwestern Franklin County to resist the imposition of extra charges and to force the managers to provide allegedly promised services, but the
major effect of effort seems to have been to split the residents into factions with only a minority participating in the abortive rent strike.

It would seem that the small scale of most parks, the high degree of propinquity under which people live, and the generally low level of experience with collective action found among mobile home dwellers would make the institution of conflict in such settings somewhat hazardous. On the other hand, almost ninety percent of those who expressed an opinion on the subject stated that they thought that adults should be consulted before the addition or alteration of park rules (37). It seems that some way should be devised to institute systematic consultation with park residents on matters of common concern.

Apparently one of the factors clouding correlations between the variables in the series of hypotheses examined in this study was the differential impact that management practices had on the tenants' satisfaction and interaction scores. In general, more cordial relations prevailed when management and ownership were in the same hands, and when the manager lived in or very near the park and was easily accessible to the residents. Hired managers, especially those working for out-of-town owners, gave the impression of being caught in a
rather constant crossfire between their employers and their tenants. In parks with the lowest rates for satisfaction, these managers were extremely reluctant to discuss any aspect of the situation, alleging orders from owners not to reply to inquiries from researchers or representatives of the news media. With one notable exception, the most competent managers refused to rent trailers and generally showed concern for avoiding situations that would bring people of radically different ages, family conditions or life styles into close proximity. The least successful seemed unaware of the importance of such details, and judging from their tenants' written or oral complaints, seemed more inclined to try to exploit the park residents financially. These variations in approaches to their manager roles were found in some of the parks with high Woodall ratings as well as some of those deemed below minimum physical standards of acceptability.

Limitations of the Study

Since this project was designed specifically to study a very special type of contrived mini-neighborhood, and to test a series of hypotheses on variables related to satisfaction and interaction in those settings, the
findings are probably not generalizable to conventional housing developments where boundaries are less sharply defined, densities considerably lower, and power and control much more diffuse. Indeed, the findings may be only partly suited to the gigantic resort-retirement mobile home communities of California, Florida, Arizona and other sunshine states where park activities absorb much more of the energies of the residents than the basically housing parks which were the subjects of this investigation. Nor would it be entirely appropriate to transpose the findings to the clusters of mobile home developments to which so many persons have been constrained to move after floods and other natural disasters.

Even in testing the findings of this study in other metropolitan areas similar to Columbus, it should be remembered that the limitation of the park sample to Franklin County tends to overrepresent older, smaller parks of pre-1955 vintage, since a number of the larger newer parks of the Columbus Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area have been built in the counties immediately adjacent to Franklin County in all directions. Fortunately, this possible distortion was at least partly corrected by the slightly lower response rate from residents of the smaller, older, more crowded parks within or immediately outside the central city.
Suggestions for Future Research

As in other research projects like this one, several questions were raised, or at least approached without being investigated. The following topics seem to call for future attention.

Why are there so few Black families in mobile home parks? Census figures for 1970 indicate that Blacks account for some two percent of mobile home households nationally, and for less than one percent of the Ohio mobile home population. Unfortunately, these figures do not distinguish park occupants from those whose mobile homes are on individual lots. Visits to at least forty of the parks in Franklin County, including all those in the sample under scrutiny revealed only two Black households, neither of which was included in the survey. Conversations with several park managers strongly suggest that many of them seem to consider the exclusion of Blacks as one of their duties as "gatekeepers". The next door neighbor of one of the Black families indicated that it had taken the threat of a lawsuit to convince the manager to accept the Blacks couple and their pre-school son, and that the manager seemed intent on finding reasons or pretexts to force the young family out of the park.
Could some mobile home parks be white havens for people escaping changing neighborhoods in central cities? Or simply do the conditions obtaining in mobile home parks have even less appeal to Blacks than they have for the majority of Whites?

Also of interest is the remarkable scarcity of Italians, Poles or other representatives of the New Immigration in the mobile home parks of Franklin County. Of the 408 names on the original mailing list for this survey, only five could be considered Italian and only six Eastern European. Most of the names, especially those from older, smaller parks have an unmistakable Anglo-Saxon, Protestant ring. If a similar distribution were to be found in studies in other locations, it would be interesting to probe certain ethnic value orientations which increase or reduce the appeal of mobile home park living.

An other aspect of mobile home living that will call for future study is the rather recent rise of parks organized on the condominium principle whereby the residents acquire title to their lots as well as access to jointly held facilities, recreation areas, meeting rooms, and other amenities. Not only are these park dwellers entitled to a voice in deciding policies and regulations, they are also shareholders in community-owned
utility systems and have the opportunity to profit financially from the success of the park operation.

Few of these parks exist outside retirement areas, but at least two have started just outside Franklin County, and seem well on their way to successful operation. It would be worthwhile to examine levels of satisfaction and of neighborly interaction in such parks after they have been in operation for a few years to see whether the greater commitment to mobile home park living which they imply, and a more responsible sharing in the shaping of the quality of life in the park which they entail, will lead residents to the creation of residential enclaves characterized by autonomy, mutual trust, and general satisfaction.
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MOBILE HOME RESIDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE
MOBILE HOME RESIDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Household Information

This information will be used only for statistical purposes. In no case will any other use be made of your answers.

1. Number of persons living in mobile home: ___

2. Age of head of household: under 20 ___ 20-34 ___
   35-49 ___ 50-64 ___ 65 and over ___

3. Number of pre-school children: ___

4. Number of school-age children: ___

5. Number of children finished school, living at home: ___

6. Is husband employed? Yes, full-time ___ Yes, part-time ___ No ___

7. Is wife employed? Yes, full-time ___ Yes, part-time ___
   If not employed, check one of the following: housewife ___ student ___
   retired ___ disabled ___ deceased ___ other ___

8. Highest grade completed by head of household (check only one)
   Elementary: 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___ 6 ___ 7 ___ 8 ___
   High School: 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___ 6 ___
   College: 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___ 6 or more ___

9. Occupation of head of household (be as specific as you can) ________________________________

10. Was head of household born in Ohio? Yes ___ No ___
    If no, please indicate state of birth: ________________________________

11. Do you own or rent your mobile home? Own ___ Rent ___

12. How large is your mobile home: Length ___ feet
    Width ___ feet

13. How large is your lot? Length ___ feet Width ___ ft.
14. How long have you lived at your present mobile home site? Less than a year____ 1 thru 4 years____ 5 thru 9 years____ 10 to 14 years____ 15 thru 19 years____ 20 years or more____

15. Had you lived in a mobile home before? Yes____ No____
If yes, check one; same park, different lot____
other park, same county____
other park, different county____

16. Before you moved to your present home site, where did you live? Parents' Home____ Owned home____
Apartment____ Other mobile home elsewhere____
Rented home____ Other (specify)____________________

17. Do you plan to move out of this park in the foreseeable future? Yes, within a year____ No, we don't think so____
Yes, in 1 to 4 years____ Yes, in 5 or more years____

18. If and when you move, it will probably be to:
another mobile home park____ a single-family home____
an apartment____ we plan to buy____
a rented home____ a condominium____
other (specify)____________________

19. Why do you live in a mobile home rather than in a more conventional dwelling, such as a house or apartment? (Check as many answers as may apply)
Economy____ No other housing available____
Easy maintenance____ Prefer mobile home____
Need to move often____ park neighborhood____
Can't stand apartments____ Other (specify)____________________

20. Compare your present location to your previous one. Neighborhood shopping is now: more convenient____
less convenient____ about the same____

21. Distance to recreational facilities is now: shorter____ longer____ about the same____

22. Location of household head's job is now: more convenient____ less convenient____ about the same____
23. Location of schools is now: more convenient____ less convenient____ about the same____ doesn't matter____

24. What was the total income, in 1972, of all members of this family?
   below $2000. _____
   between $2000. and $3999. _____
   between $4000. and $5999. _____
   between $6000. and $7999. _____
   between $8000. and $9999. _____
   between $10000. and $11999. _____
   between $12000. and $13999. _____
   between $14000. and $15999. _____
   between $16000. and $19999. _____
   over $20000. _____

25. About how many people were there in the village, town or city in which you spent most of the first 18 years of your life?
   less than 250 _____
   25,000 to 100,000 _____
   250 to 2500 _____
   100,000 to 500,000 _____
   2500 to 25,000 _____
   500,000 or more _____

Mobile Home Resident's Questionnaire

Listed below are statements about mobile home parks in general and about your park in particular. For each statement, please check the expression which best represents your honest opinion. Throughout the survey, "we" means the adults in your home.

1. Most of the people in this park are very friendly.
   ___ strongly agree ___ agree ___ don't know ___ disagree
   ___ strongly disagree

(NOTE: For the purpose of marginal adjustment in this dissertation, hereafter in this section of the questionnaire, "strongly agree" will be shown as "str. ag." and "strongly disagree" will be shown as "str. dis.")

2. This park is peaceful and quiet.
   ___ str. ag. ___ agree ___ don't know ___ disagree ___ str. dis.
3. Most of the people in this park are very much like us. 
   __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
4. We feel that this park is too crowded. 
   __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
5. We wish we could get to know our neighbors better. 
   __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
6. Mobile home park people are more friendly than neighbors in regular housing developments. 
   __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
7. Noise from neighboring lots bothers us. 
   __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
8. Most of the people in this park know how to mind their own business. 
   __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
9. Not enough people around here seem to care how the park looks. 
   __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
10. We feel very much at home here. 
    __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
11. Mobile home parks without children are not really complete neighborhoods. 
    __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
12. We find most of the rules and regulations in this park reasonable. 
    __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
13. Most of the people in this park keep too much to themselves. 
    __str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
14. Our mobile home park neighborhood is safer than regular neighborhoods we could occupy at similar costs.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

15. We have more privacy here than we would have in most apartments we could afford to rent.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

16. Shared park facilities like laundromats and recreation areas help promote neighborliness in mobile home parks.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

17. Living in mobile home parks cuts people off from the rest of the city.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

18. Real friends are hard to find in this park.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

19. Our mobile home park is like a miniature suburb.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

20. It is important for us to have neighbors who like to exchange home visits.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

21. We would not live in a mobile home if we could afford to own a regular home.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

22. It is important for us to be able to move our home as easily as possible.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.

23. We prefer a small lot, since that allows more space for common recreation areas and other park facilities.

__str. ag. __agree __don't know __disagree __str. dis.
24. It is easier to get streets, sewers and similar items fixed in this mobile home park than in regular city neighborhoods.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

25. To us, good neighbors are people with whom we can chat with briefly once in a while, but who don't expect mutual visits to one another's houses.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

26. Most of our relatives think that living in a mobile home park is a good idea.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

27. This park is a good place for your childless couples.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

28. This park is a good place to raise pre-school children.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

29. This park is a good place to raise teen-agers.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

30. This park is a good place for retired couples.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

31. Mobile home parks are preferable to apartments because of their better facilities for outdoor living.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

32. As much as possible, managers should try to get retired people and young families in separate sections of mobile home parks.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

33. We hate to have people refer to our mobile homes as "trailers."

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.
34. Managers should be more strict with people who are noisy or who neglect their lots.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

35. Swimming pools and meeting halls cost money, but they are worthwhile additions to parks.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

36. People don't stay in this park long enough to become good friends.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

37. Adult park residents should be consulted before rules are added or changed.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

38. The people in this park should get together two or three times a year to get to know one another and develop community spirit.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

39. In an emergency, like a sudden illness or an accident, we are sure that we could count on several of our neighbors to go out of their way to help.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

40. We would definitely recommend this park to friends who would be looking for a lot.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

41. Many people seem to look down on anybody who lives in a mobile home park.

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.

42. Mobile home parks all have at least one thing in common: you're really not your own boss!

str. ag. agree don't know disagree str. dis.
43. One good feature of mobile home parks is that we have fewer worries about being assaulted or robbed.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

44. The longer we stay in this park, the less we resent the rules and regulations.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

45. We are currently putting money aside towards buying a new home.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

46. If people are going to live in a neighborhood for only a short while (less than three years) there is not much sense in trying to make friends there.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

47. Most of our neighbors are just about what we think neighbors should be.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

48. We often wish we had located in a larger park.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

49. Park operators often take unfair advantage of park residents.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

50. We would probably stay in this park longer if we had more freedom on our own lot.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.

51. The way prices are going up, we've just about given up the idea of buying a conventional single-family home.

_str. ag.  agree  _don't know  _disagree  _str. dis.
52. All in all, we think that this park is a very good place to live.

_str. ag. _agree _don't know _disagree _str. dis.

Answer each of the following questions to the best of your ability.

53. What do you consider your neighborhood? (check one)
   _____ the whole mobile home park
   _____ only the section of the park closest to us
   _____ not only the park, but the area in which it is located

54. Of your six "best friends" how many live in your mobile home park?
   0   1   2   3   4   5   6

55. About how often do you talk with any adults not of your household among your park neighbors?
   every day____ 2 or 3 times a month____
   several times a week ____ hardly ever____
   about once a week ____

56. In the last three months or so, how often have you spent all or a major part of an afternoon or evening either as host to one or more neighbors or as guest in their mobile home?
   0   1   2   3   4   5   6 or more____

57. In the last three months, how often have you and/or your spouse helped a neighbor or have been helped by a neighbor in some repair job, landscaping, installation, or similar project?
   0   1   2   3   4   5   6 or more____

58. Which park facility is most important to you in your park? (check one)
   Laundromat ______ (cross out the name of any facility which your park does not have)
   Grocery store ______
   Meeting room ______
   Recreation area ______
   Swimming pool ______
   Other (specify) ____________________
59. What aspect of your mobile home park would you miss most if you had to move away? (In just a few words)

______________________________________________________________

60. What aspect of your mobile home park would you be happiest to get away from if you had a chance to move out?

______________________________________________________________

61. If you had a chance to move into another mobile home park, what aspect of that park as a neighborhood would you check most closely before moving in?

______________________________________________________________

62. Add here any additional comment you may wish to make, or which you may feel is useful in this research project.

______________________________________________________________

Now that you have completed the survey, would you kindly check to make sure that you have answered all questions? Thank you again.
APPENDIX B

MOBILE HOME PARK OPERATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE
MOBILE HOME PARK OPERATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Total number of mobile home lots in park: 

2. Number of lots currently occupied: 

3. Number of additional lots now under development or scheduled for development in the next three years: 

4. Number of acres within park boundaries: 

5. Number of mobile homes rented, rather than owned by occupants: 

6. Is your park for adults only? Yes____ No____ 

7. If children are allowed, is a section set aside for adults only? Yes____ No____ 

8. Please indicate the facilities available in your park: 
   Laundromat _____ Meeting Hall _____ 
   Swimming Pool _____ Recreation Room _____ 
   Recreation area _____ Other (specify) _____ 

9. What is the average monthly rental charge for those who own their mobile home? $____ 

10. Please check additional services covered by rental charge: 
    Trash and garbage removal: __   Water:__
    Snow removal from streets: __   Electricity:__
    Lawn care for lots: __  Other (specify):__

11. Do you, or anyone connected with the ownership of the park own or operate a mobile home sales lot? 
    Yes, on premises____  No____ 
    Yes, at other location____
12. To the best of your knowledge, how long has your park been in operation? (Include years under former owners).

13. What do you consider your biggest problem, as far as state, county, or city regulations are concerned?

14. What do you consider your biggest problem as far as park residents are concerned?

15. Please use reverse side for any additional comments.
APPENDIX C

WOODALL RATING CRITERIA FOR MOBILE HOME PARKS
WOODALL RATING CRITERIA FOR MOBILE HOME PARKS*

One-Star Park: The most important consideration for a one-star park is overall appearance. If it is not a decent place to live, it will not be listed in Woodall's Directory.

The following are general requirements:

A. Fair overall appearance

B. Patios or all-weather areas on most lots. May be concrete, asphalt, wood, or some suitable material.

C. Grass, rock or shell to cover ground.

D. Streets fair to good. May be dirt, asphalt, or gravel in reasonable condition.

E. Restrooms clean, if any.

F. Adequate laundry or laundromat nearby.

G. If fences allowed, must be neat.

H. Mail service.

I. Homes may be old models but show evidence of care.

J. Manager available some hours of each day.

Two-Star Park: In addition to the requirements for a one-star park, a two-star park will have the following:

A. Landscaping—some lawns and shrubs.

B. Streets in good condition. Must be dust free of crushed rock, gravel or shell minimum.

C. Neat storage.

D. Well equipped laundry or laundromat nearby.
E. Park free of clutter, such as old cars and other abandoned equipment.

F. Well maintained and managed.

Three Star Park: What a three-star park does it does will but not as uniformly as higher rated parks. Many three-star parks were once higher rated, but original construction does not allow for today's 10-foot, 12-foot, and double wides or the 55-foot and 60-foot lengths. If children are allowed, there should be adequate play area. However, the disarray caused by children may at times be the determining factor that keeps a three-star aprk at that level when otherwise it could be rated higher.

In addition to the requirements for a one and two-star park, a three-star park must have the following:

A. Good general appearance.
B. All mobile homes must be in good condition.
C. Awnings and cabana rooms on some homes in southern areas.
D. Some spaces for large mobile homes.
E. Paved or hard surfaced streets.
F. Off-street parking or streets wide enough for safe on-street parking.
G. Good lawns or substitute throughout, shade trees, some shrubs where climate permits.
H. Concrete patios or the equivalent on all lots.
I. All lots neat and attractive.
J. All park buildings in good repair.
K. Good management.

Four-Star Park: Four-star parks are luxury parks. In addition to the requirements for a one, two, and three-star park, a four-star park must have the following:
A. Good landscaping.
B. 75-98% of homes skirted with metal or vinyl skirts, concrete block, ornamental wood or stone.
C. Paved streets, edged or curbed.
D. Uncrowded lots.
E. Underground utilities if permitted by local conditions and authorities.
F. Most tanks, if present concealed.
G. Any hedges or fences must be attractive and uniform.
H. Awning, cabanas, or proches on most homes in southern areas. (Excepting double-wide units)
I. Most lots to accommodate large mobile homes. No 8' wide homes.
J. Where row parking of homes exists, all must be lined up uniformly.
K. If park accepts children, it must have play area.
L. Community hall and/or swimming pool and/or recreation program. If a park is four-star in all but this requirement, the fourth star will be printed as an open star indicating a four-star park without park-centered recreation.

Five-Star Park: Five-star parks are the finest. They should be nearly impossible to improve. Their quality must be diligently maintained. In addition to the requirements for a one, two, three and four-star park, a five-star park must have the following:

A. Well-planned and laid-out spacious appearance.
B. Good location in regard to accessibility and desirable neighborhood. In some locations, park should be enclosed by high hedges or ornamental fence.
C. Wide paved streets in perfect condition. Curbs or lawns edged to streets, sidewalks (from street to home), street lights, street signs.

D. Homes set back from street.

E. Exceptionally attractive entrance and park sign.

F. Patios at least 320 sq. ft. (Except double-wide units).

G. Paved two-car off-street parking such as carports or planned parking.

H. All homes skirted with metal skirts, concrete block, ornamental wood or stone.

I. Awnings, cabanas or porches on all homes.

J. All hitches concealed. Any existing tanks concealed.

K. Recreation, some or all of the following: swimming pool (excepting areas with long, cold winters), shuffleboard, horseshoe pitching, golf course, hobby shop, hobby classes, games, potlucks, dances or natural recreational facilities.

L. Beautifully equipped recreation hall with kitchen. Room for community gatherings, tiled restrooms, etc.

M. Uniform storage sheds or central storage facilities.

N. All late-model homes in excellent condition.

O. At least 60% occupancy in order to judge quality of residents, which indicates park's ability to maintain a five-star rating between inspections.

P. All empty lots grassed, graveled or otherwise well maintained.

Q. If pets or children are allowed, there must be a place for them to run and play without cluttering the streets and yards. Most five-star parks are for adults only.
R. Superior management interested in comfort of residents and maintenance of park.

Woodall Mobile Home and Park Directory, pp. 5-6.
APPENDIX D

CORRELATION TABLES
## CORRELATION TABLES

### TABLE 7

**CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (PARKS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=180)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=178)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=163)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.095 .029</td>
<td>-.196 .004</td>
<td>-.095 .114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.094 .030</td>
<td>-.075 .114</td>
<td>+.008 .467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.238 .001</td>
<td>-.169 .012</td>
<td>-.092 .120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall</td>
<td>+.205 .001</td>
<td>+.289 .001</td>
<td>+.235 .002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8

**CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (HOUSEHOLDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=153)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.101 .026 (170)</td>
<td>-.114 .070 (168)</td>
<td>-.007 .465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.147 .002 (169)</td>
<td>-.127 .050 (169)</td>
<td>-.018 .412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.096 .028 (179)</td>
<td>-.113 .065 (177)</td>
<td>+.008 .461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9

**CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF CONVERSATIONS WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (PARKS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=175)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=173)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=163)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.073 .077</td>
<td>-.067 .191</td>
<td>-.019 .404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.011 .413</td>
<td>-.043 .288</td>
<td>-.075 .170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.020 .398</td>
<td>-.020 .398</td>
<td>-.002 .492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall</td>
<td>+.070 .086</td>
<td>+.114 .067</td>
<td>+.068 .201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10

**CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF CONVERSATIONS WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (HOUSEHOLDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=153)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=165)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=153)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>+.054 .152 (167)</td>
<td>+.079 .156 (165)</td>
<td>+.168 .018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.043 .208 (164)</td>
<td>-.019 .404 (162)</td>
<td>+.092 .126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.074 .072 (175)</td>
<td>+.086 .130 (173)</td>
<td>+.174 .015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11

**CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF VISITS WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (PARKS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=174)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=172)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=163)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.145 .002</td>
<td>-.156 .020</td>
<td>-.163 .018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.122 .009</td>
<td>-.149 .025</td>
<td>-.144 .033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.091 .038</td>
<td>-.019 .400</td>
<td>-.030 .349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall</td>
<td>+.081 .057</td>
<td>+.113 .069</td>
<td>+.129 .054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12
CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF VISITS WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (HOUSEHOLDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=153)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.032 .273 (167)</td>
<td>-.052 .253 (163)</td>
<td>-.051 .265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.022 .342 (163)</td>
<td>-.031 .349 (161)</td>
<td>-.014 .432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>+.140 .003 (174)</td>
<td>+.171 .012 (172)</td>
<td>+.171 .003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13
CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF MUTUAL HELP WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (PARKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=160)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=163)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.076 .070</td>
<td>-.107 .082</td>
<td>-.120 .063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.152 .002</td>
<td>-.113 .071</td>
<td>-.020 .370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.019 .354</td>
<td>-.045 .278</td>
<td>-.026 .370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall</td>
<td>+.093 .036</td>
<td>+.122 .056</td>
<td>+.118 .072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 14
CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF MUTUAL HELP WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (HOUSEHOLDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=153)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>+.031 .279 (164)</td>
<td>+.002 .488 (163)</td>
<td>-.015 .426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.119 .012 (161)</td>
<td>-.165 .018 (159)</td>
<td>-.168 .018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>+.088 .043 (171)</td>
<td>+.107 .081 (169)</td>
<td>+.143 .038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 15

**CORRELATIONS OF "BEST FRIENDS" IN THE PARK WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (PARKS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=173)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=171)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=163)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.120 .010</td>
<td>-.089 .123</td>
<td>-.014 .430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.054 .154</td>
<td>-.015 .423</td>
<td>-.051 .259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.140 .003</td>
<td>-.127 .048</td>
<td>-.094 .114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodall</td>
<td>+.067 .094</td>
<td>+.049 .261</td>
<td>+.039 .317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 16

**CORRELATIONS OF "BEST FRIENDS" IN THE PARK WITH INDICES OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (HOUSEHOLDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=153)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.119 .012 (165)</td>
<td>-.157 .022 (163)</td>
<td>-.036 .326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-.159 .001 (163)</td>
<td>-.183 .010 (171)</td>
<td>-.028 .364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.123 .002 (173)</td>
<td>-.123 .054 (171)</td>
<td>-.017 .416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 17

**CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION WITH INDICES OF FAMILISM (PARKS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=180)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=178)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.223 .001</td>
<td>-.295 .001</td>
<td>-.233 .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.235 .001</td>
<td>-.223 .001</td>
<td>-.228 .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>+.010 .419</td>
<td>+.040 .296</td>
<td>-.016 .420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18
CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION WITH INDICES OF FAMILISM (PARKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=180)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=179)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.195 .001</td>
<td>-.270 .001</td>
<td>-.138 .043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.220 .001</td>
<td>-.308 .001</td>
<td>-.174 .015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>+.010 .423</td>
<td>+.030 .345</td>
<td>-.081 .158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 19
CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF CONVERSATIONS WITH INDICES OF FAMILISM (PARKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=175)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=173)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.049 .169</td>
<td>-.127 .047</td>
<td>-.143 .038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.024 .317</td>
<td>-.097 .101</td>
<td>-.034 .359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>+.020 .308</td>
<td>+.069 .183</td>
<td>+.069 .196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20
CORRELATION OF FREQUENCY OF CONVERSATIONS WITH INDICES OF FAMILISM (HOUSEHOLDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=176)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=174)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.052 .155</td>
<td>-.050 .257</td>
<td>+.009 .454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.040 .215</td>
<td>-.147 .026</td>
<td>-.034 .339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>+.120 .009</td>
<td>+.112 .069</td>
<td>+.086 .144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=174)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=172)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.062 .111</td>
<td>-.088 .125</td>
<td>-.117 .073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.046 .184</td>
<td>-.136 .037</td>
<td>-.138 .042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>-.027 .300</td>
<td>+.091 .117</td>
<td>+.065 .209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=175)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=173)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>+.113 .013</td>
<td>-.071 .176</td>
<td>+.124 .061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>+.126 .007</td>
<td>+.047 .267</td>
<td>+.106 .095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>+.133 .005</td>
<td>+.088 .122</td>
<td>+.086 .144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=171)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=169)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.101 .425</td>
<td>-.003 .483</td>
<td>-.061 .224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.027 .300</td>
<td>-.087 .128</td>
<td>-.093 .124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>-.064 .108</td>
<td>+.139 .035</td>
<td>+.114 .079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 24

**Correlation of Frequency of Mutual Help with Indices of Familism (Households)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=172)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=170)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>+.124 .008</td>
<td>+.098 .101</td>
<td>+.074 .179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>+.066 .099</td>
<td>+.037 .316</td>
<td>+.055 .249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>+.094 .034</td>
<td>+.080 .150</td>
<td>.000 .499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 25

**Correlation of "Best Friends" in the Park with Indices of Familism (Parks)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=173)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=171)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.118 .011</td>
<td>-.144 .030</td>
<td>-.080 .196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.075 .073</td>
<td>-.091 .117</td>
<td>-.009 .458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>-.023 .327</td>
<td>-.019 .404</td>
<td>-.057 .240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 26

**Correlation of "Best Friends" in the Park with Indices of Familism (Households)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau (N=174)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N=172)</th>
<th>Fourth-order (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>-.034 .255</td>
<td>-.040 .300</td>
<td>+.069 .195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.074 .074</td>
<td>-.061 .212</td>
<td>+.022 .391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's work</td>
<td>+.183 .001</td>
<td>+.200 .004</td>
<td>+.119 .070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 27
CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH THE AGE OF THE RESIDENTS (PARKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Sixth-order (N=152)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>+.298 .001</td>
<td>(178)</td>
<td>+.365 .001</td>
<td>(179)</td>
<td>+.275 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations</td>
<td>+.115 .012</td>
<td>(175)</td>
<td>+.116 .063</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>+.085 .147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>+.138 .004</td>
<td>(174)</td>
<td>+.141 .032</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>+.190 .009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>+.094 .033</td>
<td>(171)</td>
<td>+.133 .041</td>
<td>(169)</td>
<td>+.156 .027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friends</td>
<td>+.087 .044</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>+.104 .087</td>
<td>(171)</td>
<td>+.034 .336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 28
CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH THE AGE OF THE RESIDENTS (HOUSEHOLDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Sixth-order (N=152)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>+.301 .001</td>
<td>(181)</td>
<td>+.371 .001</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>+.264 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations</td>
<td>+.119 .009</td>
<td>(176)</td>
<td>+.178 .009</td>
<td>(174)</td>
<td>+.238 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>+.023 .326</td>
<td>(175)</td>
<td>+.030 .345</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>+.124 .062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>-.004 .471</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>+.028 .360</td>
<td>(170)</td>
<td>+.072 .186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friends</td>
<td>+.223 .001</td>
<td>(174)</td>
<td>+.243 .001</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>+.127 .058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 29
**CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH THE HOMOGENEITY OF THE RESIDENTS (PARKS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall tau (N)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N)</th>
<th>Seventh-order (N=150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>+.391 .001 (180)</td>
<td>+.386 .001 (178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>+.087 .040 (175)</td>
<td>+.130 .044 (173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>+.168 .001 (174)</td>
<td>+.205 .003 (172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>+.210 .001 (171)</td>
<td>+.234 .001 (169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friends</td>
<td>+.090 .040 (173)</td>
<td>+.080 .147 (171)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 30
**CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH THE HOMOGENEITY OF THE RESIDENTS (HOUSEHOLDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall tau (N)</th>
<th>Pearson r (N)</th>
<th>Seventh-order (N=151)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>+.448 .001 (181)</td>
<td>+.543 .001 (179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>+.139 .003 (176)</td>
<td>+.145 .027 (174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>+.173 .001 (175)</td>
<td>+.201 .004 (173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>+.178 .001 (174)</td>
<td>+.214 .002 (170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friends</td>
<td>+.259 .001 (174)</td>
<td>+.298 .001 (172)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 31
CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH CURRENT STABILITY (PARKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>Seventh-order tau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>+.144</td>
<td>+.104</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>+.048</td>
<td>+.021</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>+.056</td>
<td>+.067</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>+.042</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friends</td>
<td>+.050</td>
<td>+.099</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 32
CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH CURRENT STABILITY (HOUSEHOLDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kendall tau</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>Seventh-order tau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>+.019</td>
<td>+.046</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>+.151</td>
<td>+.176</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>+.106</td>
<td>+.104</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>+.043</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friends</td>
<td>+.222</td>
<td>+.154</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 33

**CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH PROJECTED STABILITY**  
*(PARKS)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall tau</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>Seventh-order tau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>+.355 .001 (180)</td>
<td>+.459 .001 (178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversation</strong></td>
<td>+.147 .002 (175)</td>
<td>+.192 .006 (173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visits</strong></td>
<td>+.157 .001 (174)</td>
<td>+.197 .005 (172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Help</strong></td>
<td>+.077 .068 (171)</td>
<td>+.096 .105 (169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Friends</strong></td>
<td>+.127 .007 (173)</td>
<td>+.172 .012 (171)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 34

**CORRELATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AND INTERACTION WITH PROJECTED STABILITY**  
*(HOUSEHOLDS)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall tau</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>Seventh-order tau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>+.357 .001 (180)</td>
<td>+.433 .001 (178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversation</strong></td>
<td>+.097 .028 (175)</td>
<td>+.141 .031 (173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visits</strong></td>
<td>+.007 .444 (174)</td>
<td>+.031 .343 (172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Help</strong></td>
<td>+.034 .252 (171)</td>
<td>+.086 .132 (169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Friends</strong></td>
<td>+.101 .025 (173)</td>
<td>+.087 .128 (171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Income</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Occupation</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Woodall</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Occupants</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wife's Work</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>-.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age</td>
<td>-.372</td>
<td>-.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Homogeneity</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. C.Stability</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. P.Stability</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall tau of .154 and higher, significant at .001 level; of .119 to .145, significant at .01 level; of .083 to .115, significant at .05 level.
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