

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NEIGHBORING
IN A MOBILE-HOME NEIGHBORHOOD
AND A FIXED-HOME NEIGHBORHOOD

by

Jessie B. Carnevale

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 6 1

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotation from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in their judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Josie B. Carnevale

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

Robert C. Stone

ROBERT C. STONE
Professor of Sociology

April 27, 1961
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The planning and carrying out of this study has placed the writer in debt to many persons.

I am especially grateful to Professor Robert C. Stone, my Major Professor and Thesis Director, and to Professor Raymond A. Mulligan for their valuable assistance and guidance without which this thesis would not have been possible.

I wish, also, to acknowledge the encouragement and advice received from Professor Donald S. Klaiss and Professor Roger I. Yoshino.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Corneveau of Solana y Sombra Trailer Park who provided the writer with a letter of introduction which greatly facilitated the collection of data.

J. B. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| The Mobile Home in America | 1 |
| Types of Trailer Courts in Tucson. | 7 |
| II. THE NATURE OF THE STUDY. | 15 |
| Statement of the Problem | 15 |
| Instrument and the Method. | 18 |
| The Samples. | 24 |
| III. RELATED STUDIES. | 29 |
| Trailer Parks. | 29 |
| Neighborhoods and Neighboring. | 30 |
| IV. GENERAL FINDINGS | 35 |
| Factors Governing Trailer Residence. | 35 |
| Financing and Taxation | 36 |
| Who lives there? | 37 |
| Rules and Regulations. | 38 |
| Length of Residence. | 40 |
| Advantages and Disadvantages of Trailer Living | 44 |
| Factors Governing Residence in the Fixed- Homes Neighborhood | 45 |
| Financing and Taxation | 45 |

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Accommodations | 46 |
| Who lives there? | 47 |
| Rules and Regulations. | 47 |
| Advantages and Disadvantages of Fixed-Home Living | 50 |
| Characteristics of the Families. | 50 |
| Ages of Children | 50 |
| Ages of Parents. | 53 |
| Education of Parents | 55 |
| Occupations of Parents | 56 |
| Church Affiliation | 59 |
| Objections Raised to Trailer Families. | 60 |
| Images and Stereotypes | 61 |
| V. INCIDENCE OF NEIGHBORING | 63 |
| Participation in Formal Associations by Male Parents. | 69 |
| Participation in Formal Associations by Female Parents | 71 |
| Planned Activities Participated in by Number of Mentions. | 72 |
| Reciprocal Visitation Patterns of Fixed- Home Families. | 75 |
| Reciprocal Visitation Patterns of Trailer Families | 76 |
| Mutual Aid | 77 |
| Visiting Outside the Neighborhood. | 80 |
| Political Participation. | 81 |

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| VI. RESULTS. | 83 |
| VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. | 86 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 93 |
| APPENDIX | 98 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | PAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES BY TYPE OF DWELLING, 1958. | 40 |
| II. MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED ADVANTAGES AND DIS-ADVANTAGES OF TRAILER LIVING BY SELECTED TUCSON TRAILER DWELLERS, 1959 | 44 |
| III. MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED ADVANTAGES AND DIS-ADVANTAGES OF FIXED-HOME LIVING BY SELECTED TUCSON HOME DWELLERS, 1958 | 50 |
| IV. AGES OF CHILDREN OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN TRAILERS AND FIXED HOMES, 1958 . . . | 52 |
| V. AGES OF PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958 . | 53 |
| VI. EDUCATION OF PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958. | 55 |
| VII. OCCUPATIONS OF PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN FIXED HOMES AND MOBILE HOMES, 1958. | 57 |
| VIII. CHURCH AFFILIATION OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN FIXED HOMES AND MOBILE HOMES, 1958 . | 59 |
| IX. PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL ASSOCIATIONS BY MALE PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958 | 69 |
| X. PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL ASSOCIATIONS BY FEMALE PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958 | 71 |
| XI. PLANNED ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN BY NUMBER OF MENTIONS MADE OF EACH ACTIVITY | 72 |
| XII. FIXED-HOME FAMILIES--RECIPROCAL VISITATION PATTERNS | 75 |

| TABLE | PAGE |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| XIII. TRAILER FAMILIES--RECIPROCAL VISITATION PATTERNS | 76 |
| XIV. MUTUAL AID PARTICIPATED IN BY NUMBER OF INCIDENTS MENTIONED. | 78 |
| XV. VISITING OUTSIDE THE NEIGHBORHOOD BY SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES. | 80 |
| XVI. POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958. | 81 |

CHAPTER I

THE MOBILE HOME IN AMERICA

Mobile home ownership is on the rise in the United States with more than 3,000,000 people living in 1,000,000 such homes.¹ If the present mobile home population continues to increase, mobile home living cannot be overlooked in the future plans of urban ecologists, tax officials and other groups who are responsible for economic and efficient functioning of public facilities.

California has the greatest concentration of trailer parks of any state in the Union, with Florida in second place and Arizona third. There is a growing trend toward the use of trailers by many persons as a part of the "permanent" housing supply, rather than primarily as tourist accommodations.²

The California State Division of Immigration and Housing, as far back as 1937, recognized the problems created by a transfer of families to mobile homes. Half-empty

¹Edward L. Wilson, "Mobile Life" (Chicago: Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 1958), pp. 126-127.

²Planning Advisory Service, "The Changing Function of Trailer Parks" (Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1956), p. 1-2.

schools and other public service organizations which were established at great cost to many communities were deserted by families who chose to live in trailers rather than in conventional homes. This case illustrates the necessity for local groups, governmental units, and public officials in certain communities to be ready for possible changes in community services which mobile home living brings about. It is estimated that over three million people have selected this mode of life in America.³

People living in trailers pay their way by working at their trades, at odd jobs and in agricultural and constructional pursuits. The trades include plumbers, sheet-metal workers, textile workers, electricians, carpenters, painters, masons, auto mechanics, radiomen, in fact, all trades. These people buy autos, parts, accessories and, in addition, everything normal families require. In this sense they are a source of revenue to the merchants of the towns to which they migrate. The auto and trailer become vital necessities of life to trailerites, and the cost of their operation and maintenance, in many cases, cuts deeply into family budgets. Mobile home owners serve an economic purpose or they could not exist.

³Kyber Forrester, "Trailers Bring Families and Problems," Nations Business, (February, 1937), pp. 32-34.

Alvin L. Schorr, a social worker from the Family Service Association of America found that mobile-home families are good credit risks with a strong sense of community pride. He quotes Don J. Hager, a sociologist, who made the following observation, "The mobile families possess characteristics that are generally prized by all American communities-- sobriety, occupational skill and reliability, family stability, and a genuine interest in contributing to and improving the community in which they live."⁴ Schorr also quotes William H. Whyte who said, "Profound as the consequences of mobility have been, the one most expected has not come about. The transients are not plagued by instability and loneliness."⁵

Taxpayers have an interest in mobile homes. The taxpayer in a community that is losing its population through mobile home living is left to "hold the bag" for such public costs as highways, schools, police and political systems which, in turn, are governed by ordinances and constitutions not easily or quickly repealed. Taxpayers have also pointed out that the trailer which is being towed pays no fuel tax yet it pulverizes the road. Consumption of fuel rarely rises in direct ratio to increased tonnage.⁶

⁴Alvin L. Schorr, "Families on Wheels," Harper's Magazine, (January, 1958), pp. 71-75.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Richard L. Neuberger, "Who Shall Pay for our Roads?" Harper's Magazine, (October, 1957), p. 87.

Others who might be interested are those whose property adjoins or is in the same area as trailer courts. For many reasons, such as vested interests or prejudice, they view trailerites as undesirable burdens on the community.

On the positive side there are those groups who are interested in promoting tourist trade and mobile home living with a view to furthering the expansion of the local economy. The use of the term "trailerite" today assumes a much different connotation than it had in the early days of mobile-home living. Today's trailerite may be a millionaire, e.g., the Shah of Iran uses an elaborate one in the oil fields. The term may also refer to a family with a moderate income or an indigent family or individual trying to escape from an unsuccessful job or no job at all.

The reason many people first "hit the highway" in the early thirties was an attempt to find work and get away from perpetual public welfare relief. Now, however, trailer courts are homes for retired people living on fixed but adequate incomes, young people who attend universities and colleges, servicemen, blue-collar workers, and many well-to-do people who find the informal life easy and satisfying. Expenditures for trailers have been climbing since World War II, when such dwellings were introduced as emergency housing. Sales have jumped from \$39 million in 1945 to \$500

million in 1957.⁷ The 1956 ratio of mobile-home sales to conventional housing is one to nine.⁸

In addition to the fact that this type of home is designed to be readily moved, the trend to trailer living would seem to be an invasion of the housing market for low-priced, prefabricated housing.⁹

Mobile homes offer a wide range of choices for families of different sizes. The most common lengths are 35-55 feet, and such units are available up to widths of 10-12 feet. They have one, two or three bedrooms, including both single or double levels. Some factories fabricate panels which may be attached to the mobile home in order to add an additional room. Two manufacturers in California offer expandable homes. They are 8 feet wide for highway travel and expand to a width of 15 feet for living purposes. The expandable section telescopes over the main section and can be extended in one to three hours. When set up, these trailers look somewhat like a small house because they have

⁷"Trailers or Mobile Homes," Consumer's Research Bulletin, (April, 1957), pp. 9-12.

⁸"The Mobile Home Isn't so Mobile Any More," Business Week, (March 16, 1957), p. 44.

⁹K. Anderson, "Trailer Home Folds for Travel," Popular Mechanics, (August, 1957), pp. 90-92.

10
a gable roof.

Since there are nearly 300 manufacturers, each of whom makes several models, the prospective buyer can usually find the floor plan of his choice. The expandable model sells completely furnished for about \$5,000.¹¹ Trailerites frequently ask, "Where else can one buy a new home, of 15 feet by 35 feet dimensions, completely furnished and containing all the conveniences of a conventional home for such a low price?"

There are other things to be considered than the economy angle in trailer living. Escape may be a powerful factor in some families' desire to move; that is, escape from the tedium of everyday life, escape from an unhappy adjustment to a certain locality, loss of a job, or for those whose occupations involve frequent moves, a trailer is a natural solution to a housing problem.

Of the home-type trailers sold in 1957, 50 per cent were bought by transient skilled workers such as those employed on the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Military personnel made up about 26 per cent of the total, and retired folk were responsible for another 15 per cent. The "young-married and miscellaneous" category accounted for the

¹⁰"Trailer, or Mobile Homes?" Consumer's Research Bulletin, (April, 1957), pp. 9-12.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 11-12.

remaining 9 per cent. This breakdown does not include such trailers as those used exclusively for travel or for vacations such as the small one-bedroom models that are from 12 to ¹² 25 feet long.

Mobile home living is a growing development in the social structure of American society. It meets the needs and desires of many individuals and couples, from the construction worker who builds today's vast projects to the retired Army major who lives alone but desires the company of many. It is conceivable that this casual way of life will increasingly appeal to many people in various walks of life, and, if so, it will bring about important changes in our social, political, and business systems. For example, it may be pointed out that in order to prevent the disenfranchisement of mobile home residents and their right to public assistance, the legal definition of settlement in most of our states will have to be altered.

TYPES OF TRAILER COURTS IN TUCSON

The 1958 edition of Woodall's Mobile Home Park Directory ¹³ listed 14,000 trailer parks throughout the

¹²"The Mobile Home Isn't so Mobile Any More," op. cit., p. 28.

¹³Woodall's Mobile Home Park Directory (Chicago: Woodall Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 18-48.

United States, Canada, Alaska, and Mexico. Tucson has 120 courts with accommodations for 4,142 trailers.

What constitutes a trailer court? Both the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Public Health Service define a trailer court as any plot of ground upon which two or more occupied trailer coaches are located. This means that trailer parks of all sizes and conditions come under the terms of the zoning ordinance. In Arizona, the zoning ordinances permit trailer parks to be located in specified commercial and industrial zones only.

The condition of these courts does vary as Woodall's rating system indicates. Woodall's qualified representatives, trailerites themselves, rate parks on the basis of what they find at the time of inspection.

There are basic features or combinations of features which a park must possess to earn a particular rating. However, the system of rating is kept flexible enough to allow for wide differences in park facilities. For example, a park lacking one facility may make up for it by having another. The cost and condition of the facilities at the time of inspection are also taken into consideration. Basic needs of a park include: space to park, electricity, sewer connections, and restrooms.

The Star Rating System: This system of rating by stars represents facilities and appearance over and above

the basic needs mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

No Star Rating: A park with few or no sewer connections which also shows no "reasonable" investment for facilities does not qualify for a star. Reasonable is defined by Woodall's but the inspectors who live and travel in trailers and who have seen thousands of parks all over the country are experienced in their ability to judge within a close range into which category each park falls. A poor appearance and rundown equipment can hold a park down to a no-star rating in spite of the number or kinds of facilities it has. Many times poor management gives a park a lower rating than its facilities indicate.

One Star Rating: A one-star rated park will include some extras above sewer connections and fair landscaping. These extras might include patios, recreation facilities, or a nice location.

It may not necessarily have paved roads, but other facilities must be adequate according to the judgment of the inspectors. If the number of facilities or the quality of facilities were not lacking, the one-star court would be rated higher.

Two Star Rating: These have better landscaping, good roads, preferably paved, attractive laundry-utility accommodations. New parks with two stars very often have the facilities required for higher-rated courts, but because

of lack of landscaping they are still rated two star.

In the case of older parks, the streets might be too narrow and the lots too small to qualify for a high rating, even though the appearance might be evaluated as excellent.

Three Star Rating: These courts border on the luxury class. Most of the lots have patios, are well landscaped, and the roads are paved.

There must be recreational facilities or outstanding features incorporated into the individual lots.

Four Star Rating: Many extras are provided by those parks rated as four star. Roads, cement work such as sidewalks and paved patios, buildings and landscaping are more costly.

Recreational features include a nice club room, possibly a shuffle-board and a swimming pool. A four-star park reflects superior management and is deluxe in appearance and facilities.

Five Star Rating: It represents the ultimate in mobile home living. All features must be of the very best money can buy. Most of these parks have cost over one-half million dollars to build.

Tucson has only one five-star park, that is, Solana y Sombra on Grant Road. It was visited by the writer, who found it to have all the attributes a five-star rating would

indicate. It accommodates over 90 trailers, has a lovely swimming pool alongside of which is a shuffleboard court, and a clubhouse where guests of the park play cards. Parties, movies, and dancing take place here with many of the tenants entertaining outside visitors in the clubhouse.

The streets in this court are paved; there is an abundance of shrubbery, and the landscaping is kept in neat condition by two permanently-employed landscape men. These services are included in the space rental. There are laundry and storage facilities of the most modern kind. Garbage cans are buried in the ground. Activities which are planned by the management are numerous and of a variety to appeal to all ages and sexes. Square-dancing, bingo, birthday parties, anniversaries, celebrations for all the holidays of the year leave no room for dull moments. Children swim in the pool at definite hours of the day where they may splash and play to their hearts' content without impinging on the adult activities, which are scheduled at other hours. Many of the parties are of the family type, to which the children are invited. Some of the functions, however, are exclusively adult, such as costume balls and bridge games. (For these services and extras, the tenants at Solano y Sombra pay on the average of \$40, with rentals ranging from \$27.50 to \$60.00 per month.) All utilities are underground in this court, which is a luxury which even the most expensive fixed-home

community in Tucson does not enjoy. In addition to laundry and storage facilities, there are public and private tiled baths. City bus service is available at the entrance to the park.

Another court visited by the writer was Crescent Manor, a three-star court located at 1150 West Prince Road. The families with children who lived in the family section were interviewed. An inspection of the grounds revealed modern neat restrooms with tubs and showers. Clothes lines are provided for each trailer space, and electricity and sewers were some of the other facilities provided the tenants. Parking for the trailers is on a circular plan; the trailers had patios; the court is near the bus lines and is close to shopping and schools. The entertainment which is planned, as in the five-star court, ranges from shuffleboard to dancing and potluck suppers.

Sleepy Hollow Trailer Ranch was the third court at which interviews were made. It is said to have the greatest number of accommodations provided by any court in Arizona. It is a four-star court, located at 615 West Alturas Street, which accommodates about 400 trailers. The base lot rental includes such facilities as natural gas, city sewers, modern laundries, fenced drying yards, tiled showers each with private dressing room, a Blue-Lake swimming pool, four official shuffleboard courts, a complete children's playground,

a covered ramada for roller skating, paved streets, well-soft water, 220 volt wiring, lawns, shade trees, and flowers year-round. There are 240 paved patios, but it is assumed that the rental for a site with a patio is higher. There is a school bus operated by the ranch. Recreation is planned for each night, the year-round. Instruction in square dancing is given three afternoons and one evening a week. Other activities include arts and crafts, card tournaments, bingo, movies, colored slides, teen dances, round and ballroom dancing, as well as the usual potlucks.

At the other end of the continuum, the writer visited two lower-class courts. One of them was immediately off North Stone Avenue in back of a garage.

The manager's wife was obliging and willing to let the writer look around. The trailers were home-made or second-hand run-down affairs. The land appeared to be haphazardly occupied, the trailers parked every which way, without any particular design or pattern prevailing. This was in contrast to the other parks visited which arranged their trailers in angular fashion¹⁴ or circular angle.¹⁵

¹⁴Angular parking means the trailer is arranged diagonally across the square or oblong lot.

¹⁵Circular angle means that the trailer lots form a circle and the trailer is then placed diagonally on it.

Most of the trailers had washing machines outside adjacent to the trailers--there were no patios, no landscaping, or shrubbery. One lone pepper tree drooped forlornly over the manager's house, which had an unkempt, lean-to appearance. Flies swarmed around the over-turned garbage cans, which had seen better days as oil drums.

What the writer saw in the way of patched-up, make-shift repairs, rusted roofs and sides, dusty alleys and paths, children with runny noses and one-piece outfits of tattle-tale gray underwear, left her feeling depressed with the knowledge that, as with fixed homes, trailer homes also have their slums. It must be acknowledged at this point, however, that the middle-class and upper-class courts outnumbered the low-class courts in Tucson.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to provide data about neighborliness and its causes by comparing two groups in differing circumstances, the mobile-home dweller and the conventional fixed-home dweller. Two groups of fifteen families each were matched on income, occupation and numbers of children.

The hypothesis to be tested is that mobility and neighboring are positively correlated. This is in contradiction to many studies which claim that mobility reduces neighborliness. Gist found that ". . . wherever mobility takes the form of frequent changes of residence, neighborhood life tends to decline because individuals and families have insufficient time to become established" ¹

A problem that presented itself with respect to this hypothesis was to provide measurable indices of the phenomenon of neighborliness. Neighboring was assumed to be of unit character, but in the construction of an index of neighborliness such activities as mutual aid, visiting and

¹Noel P. Gist and L. A. Halbert, Urban Society, Third Edition (Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1948), pp. 272-273.

entertaining, and lending and borrowing indicated that this assumption was false. Although neighborliness encompasses many behaviors and activities, to engage in one type of behavior does not necessarily engender another type of behavior. For example, lending money was not a consequence of visiting and entertaining. Moreover, a high frequency in one type of activity did not assure a high frequency in all other activities.

The indices used also showed some facets of neighborliness to have pattern, function, and intensity. The pattern of some of the planned activities was repeated over various intervals of time. Mutual aid as practiced within the court had consequences concomitant with this activity. Intensity, as it is used in this study, refers to the degree of personal obligation felt by the respondents, and demonstrated by the types of activities performed.

The mobility factor further confounded the problem because of its dual meaning. It is not only the families themselves who are mobile, but, in the case of the trailer-ites, the homes are moved as well. This fact of the mobility of residence gives rise to the establishment of the trailer court and the types of relationships found within it. Because of the social definition given the court as a way of life by these mobile families, the resultant interaction operating in the court is contingent upon this aspect of

mobility. Mobility, meaning length of residence, must be differentiated from the mobility of homes which gives rise to court living.

Data were based on the frequencies of specific activities reported by the respondent, thus avoiding the difficulty of answers such as "frequently," "seldom," or "almost never."

It was impossible, for practical reasons, to investigate all of the variables which might operate to influence neighborliness, and no claim is made for the completeness of the list.

The following general conclusions were made:

1. Certain factors common to trailer court living were most significant in influencing the incidence of neighboring, i.e., the role of the manager in initiating interaction and the fact that the trailer court as an ecological and social unit served to limit neighboring within its physical boundaries.
2. Length of residence and mutual aid were positively correlated for both groups.
3. A difference in the kinds of mutual aid given was found for the two groups.
4. Length of residence was not correlated with the amount of visiting done within the neighborhood.

5. An inverse relationship was found for visiting outside the court and length of residence. The longer the period of residence, the fewer visits made outside the court by the mobile-home dweller.

It is recognized that thirty cases provides little basis for generalization. This study does, however, outline a procedure and identifies variables such that the validity can be easily checked through the use of a larger sample.

The Instrument and the Method

The instrument is a questionnaire designed to explore some of the many causes which combine or independently affect neighborliness. What are the possible causes of increase or decrease in intimacy and friendship between neighbors? Ideally, every characteristic of neighborliness in each trailer court and in a comparable number of fixed homes neighborhoods should be catalogued and only the common ones extracted. Such an ideal is unattainable for obvious impractical reasons. With this in mind, a set of behaviors considered to be representative of neighboring was included in a questionnaire. Items from Bernard's Neighborliness

²Jessie Bernard, "An Instrument for the Measurement of Neighborhood, with Experimental Application," (Ph. D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Washington University, St. Louis, 1935).

Instrument were suggestive, as were ideas suggested by sociologists at the University of Arizona.

The questions were phrased in such a way as to facilitate quantifying the results. Since no check was made on the accuracy of the responses, answers to certain questions, (such as question 26)³ may be expressions of opinion rather than of fact or actual behavior.

The term neighborliness as used in this paper is synonymous with neighboring and has three dimensions: intensity, frequency, and pattern. The first dimension reveals the intimacy or moral obligation involved in the interaction; the second concerns the number of times within a specified period that the interaction occurs; and the third refers to the configuration or design which the interaction takes as it re-occurs or is repeated.

The word "neighborhood" was not specifically defined for any of the respondents, but as the interviewing progressed it became evident that the fixed-home families conceived as neighbors only those families living within one block in any direction from their own residential site. That is, all homes located that distance from them. The trailerites, on the other hand, considered their neighborhood to be the

³Question 26 reads: "How do you think people in fixed-homes feel about trailerites?"

trailer court, and during the interview the majority of respondents made it emphatic that they considered all the tenants in the court as their neighbors. Part of this is probably attributable to the fact that the families in the court use common laundry facilities and room, playground, swimming pool, and post office where they meet daily. The daily interaction, because of its repetitive nature, serves to build up a network of relationships in which recognition of faces and greeting by name is a common phenomenon.

The question of weighting items is still a controversial one among those engaged in test construction design. Weighting according to such techniques as are available gives a continuous rather than a discrete series, with the distance between units theoretically accepted as being equal. However, in actual practice, it cannot be said that the distance between one and three in every instance is the same as the distance between three and five. It is assumed, therefore, that the results obtained by using weighted instruments are not any more reliable than those obtained in unweighted instruments. This is substantiated by Hirshstein who found that ". . . the results secured by weighted instruments are neither more reliable nor necessarily different from those secured by unweighted ones."⁴ Furthermore, the scoring

⁴Bertha T. Hirshstein, Evaluation of Methods of Evaluating Character Test Items (M. A. Thesis, Washington University, 1930).

of a weighted instrument is often rendered cumbersome and unwieldy as well as difficult. One of the criteria of a good instrument or test is that scoring be kept relatively simple and not too time-consuming. Because of the assumptions involved in weighting and the difficulties inherent in weighted scoring, it was deemed desirable, after much consideration, to give the same value of one to all items in the questionnaire. In reading a table, therefore, the reader should keep in mind that a score of 5 means that a particular kind of neighboring was mentioned 5 times by the group receiving the score.

Thirteen questions from Bernard's scale were selected to measure neighborliness. These included items 10 through 22. Questions 1, 2, and 3 were included to measure mobility of residence. Questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 were chosen to determine educational and occupational levels of parents. Questions 8 and 9 dealt with the religion of the parents. Questions 23, 24, and 25 were intended to illustrate participation in activities of a non-social nature. The replies yield information regarding interest and involvement in the greater community of Tucson. Two questions, 26 and 27, were selected to secure information on attitudes and stereotypes. The remaining 8 questions, 28 through 35, deal with the reasons people have for choosing to live in trailers or in fixed homes. In several instances, answers to the questions

were combined into single tables as indicated.

The questionnaire is by no means perfect. There is much to be done in rewording and recasting of items. For example, questions could be re-numbered in such a way as to secure a numerical answer which could be easily coded. Some of the items have been of doubtful value for this study. Item 36 was of no value because there are no organizations for betterment of the community in either of the two neighborhoods. This item might be of more value in a larger representative sample. Questions 30, 33, 34, and 35 did not discriminate because the answers received to these questions were comparable to the replies made to questions 31 and 32. However, the writer would like to state that questions 30, 33, 34, and 35 were added deliberately with the thought in mind that they might serve as a check against the questions having to do with advantages and disadvantages found in both types of residences.

The interviewing was done by one individual, the writer, a student at the University of Arizona, on a house to house basis. It was felt that this results in greater consistency. In order to obtain fifteen families in each group of dwellers who were of comparable socio-economic status and who had two children per family, it was necessary to interview 37 trailer families and 42 fixed home families before the writer was satisfied that the matching was suitable.

The first part of the interview was done by means of the questionnaire, but the final data concerning such personal details as ages of the parents, the income earned, marital status and ages of children, was reported at the end of the interview. This was done for purposes of establishing rapport. The personal data was recorded on a card, making it possible for the respondent to check off those categories best fitting his situation.* This approach seemed to put the respondents at ease and it is believed that the information so obtained was honestly given to the best of the respondent's knowledge. One woman remarked that it seemed less personal to fill out a card than to have to talk about age, etc. Only one respondent in all 72 families interviewed refused to check the category related to income.

All available records and useful brochures pertinent to the study were utilized. The problem of anti-neighborliness (neighborhood hostilities) deserves consideration but was not undertaken in this project. Some of the trailerites discussed it when they emphasized the fact that children play outdoors a good deal and have to learn to adjust and get along with the others very early in life. One woman in a fixed home mentioned the fact that there was enough discord in the neighborhoods with large patios and yards and she couldn't see how people in courts managed fights between

*See p. 98 of Appendix.

children. Items bearing on this point would provide information which might yield negative neighborliness scores.

One trailer family refused to be interviewed because of a sick baby, and two families in fixed homes refused to be interviewed, one on the grounds that her husband was napping, while the second simply refused to be bothered. It is assumed that since ages of the children was not kept constant, the numbers and kinds of relationships would vary from family to family. That is to say, those families having children of school age would be likely to have more contacts outside the neighborhood than those families with infants or pre-school children. A difficulty became apparent with regard to the questions dealing with varying types of interaction. Does the entertaining at coffee or dinner represent the same degree of friendship as having a daily chat?

Another ambiguity which might exist lies in the difficulty of determining whether or not the respondents considered the neighborhood children in their responses. The interviewer constantly reminded the respondents to include children in their responses. However, since the questions were pertinent to whole families, it is hoped that no material error is involved.

The Samples

Considerable thought was given to the idea of

randomizing the sample, but in view of the difficulty of matching groups, a simple area sample was selected on a house-to-house basis of families having two children and having a male head of household who was in residence at the time of the interviews. The interviews were conducted from the beginning of June, 1958, through the month of December, 1958.

Original data collected concerning 17 families living in a trailer court were not considered satisfactory because the respondents were overwhelmingly representative of the lower classes as indicated by income and occupation.

It seemed advisable to select a trailer park which accommodated people of the middle classes. In doing this, it was assumed that the middle class is typical of the greatest numbers of people living in trailer homes. Thus it would be more representative of the true trailer population than the trailer families of the lower class.

Woodall's Directory was useful for background and descriptive information which led to the choice of the Sleepy Hollow Trailer Ranch families.

A total of 62 interviews, 20 of the trailer families, and 42 of fixed-home families, provides the basis for the final matched groups of 15 families each. The remaining thirty interviews, matched for family size and socio-economic

status,⁵ are the basis for the tabulations which are reported in this paper. The interviews with the trailer residents were supplemented by observation, data in the records of the trailer court made available to the investigator by the management, and informal interviews with leaders and other persons in the mobile home community. Comparable information was not available in the fixed-homes neighborhood.

Many "trial and error" attempts were made to interview families in the Swan Way area of town. The researcher is familiar with the sub-divisions there and she knows the various types of occupations held by the residents, as well as the original cost of the homes.

Her first choice was an area of houses originally costing \$7,500 to \$8,000 because the trailers ranged in a comparable price bracket. However, it soon became apparent that both parents are out working during the day in many of these homes along Scarlett and Timrod Streets. On one of the streets, ten out of fourteen pairs of parents were away at places of employment.

The researcher then decided to work her way into a higher-cost neighborhood on the assumption that people who could afford the more expensive homes could also afford to keep the mother at home. Her assumption proved to be correct.

⁵As indicated by income and occupation.

The homes which the researcher chose to approach for interviewing of the occupants were picked on the basis of external evidence of children such as bicycles, wagons, and other toys and equipment.

The procedure was to go to the Sleepy Hollow Trailer Ranch, located at 615 West Alturas Street, Tucson, and interview on the basis of contiguity and availability the parents of those families living in the family area.⁶ The procedure was the same for the fixed-home neighborhood of single dwellings which includes that tract of homes bounded on the north by Broadway, on the south by East Scarlett Street, on the east by Rosemont Boulevard, and on the west by Swan Road.

Whether or not the mode of entree biased the results as far as the present project is concerned, it is impossible to say. Since a significant part of this study deals with observing what relationships exist between certain activities and mobility of residence, the chief contribution will lie in its value as suggestive, illustrative material rather than its use for purposes of generalization. The findings in the following chapters apply only to the present study. In any event, they are of such a nature as to lend themselves

⁶Specific geographic areas are set off for families with children. These are usually to the back of the trailer park.

to further verification or disproof. They are presented with recognition of the pitfalls and possible limitations inherent in the methods employed.

CHAPTER III

RELATED STUDIES

Trailer Parks

There is a dearth of research on trailer park living. Donald Olen Cowgill¹ and G. C. Hoyt² are responsible for two of the more comprehensive studies which are worthy of mention. Both of these works are descriptive reports of trailer life, taking into consideration the cost of living in a trailer court, occupation of the trailerites, age, monthly income, racial classification, marital status, and reasons for living in a trailer court as expressed by the respondents. Hoyt emphasized the life of the retired in trailer parks, whereas Cowgill investigated a population of trailer people that included all age groups. Other studies of trailers and trailer parks are of the commercial variety which stress economic factors and which are sales-oriented. They were of little value to the problem involved in the present study.

¹Donald O. Cowgill, Mobile Homes, A Study in Trailer Life (Springfield, Missouri: Elkins-Sywers Company, 1941).

²G. C. Hoyt, "The Life of the Retired in a Trailer Park," American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1954), pp. 361-70.

Neighborhoods and Neighboring

Theodore Caplow and Robert Forman³ jointly devised a Neighborhood Interaction Scale, similar to scales developed by Moreno,⁴ which facilitates the diagnosis of social relationships and the graphic analysis of group organization.

It differs from Moreno's scale in being, presumably, a report of actual interactional behavior rather than interactional preference. Answers were sought on the level of a face-to-face neighborhood, which, he says, may be considered as either the smallest of locality groups or as the largest of the primary groups. Caplow and Forman feel that the importance of the neighborhood as a unit of investigation lies in the double aspect approach; from the ecological and interpersonal elements of neighboring, that is to say, as a locality group as well as an interpersonal process.

The major instrument was a Neighborhood Interaction Scale designed to measure the amount of informal interaction between the responding family and each of its neighbor families.

The area of the study was the University Village, a student housing project owned and operated by the University

³T. Caplow and R. Forman, "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community," American Sociological Review, (1950), p. 357.

⁴J. L. Moreno, Who Shall Survive? (Washington: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., 1934), p. 435.

of Minnesota. They used a homogeneous and clearly-defined residential area in which they interviewed 50 families over a four-week period in the spring of 1949. Each respondent family described its relationship to every one of the other families in the block of 50 family dwelling units, as well as to families in other blocks of the village.

Neighborhood Interaction Scale

Scale Value

0. Do you know their names or faces?
1. Recognize them on the street, but only a greeting acquaintance.
2. Stop and talk with them outside regularly (only one adult from each family).
3. Stop and talk with them outside regularly (all adults involved).
4. Mutual aid and/or community activities (involving one adult).
5. Mutual aid and/or community activities (involving all adults).
6. Mutual visiting and entertaining in each others houses, including drinking and dining.

The intervals between the scale values were not determined by the authors, but they believe the rank order to be correct.

Caplow and Forman concluded that where the neighborhood and the interest of the group in the neighborhood coincide, there will be a high degree of association, regardless of whether the milieu is urban or rural, stabile or

mobile. Conversely, isolation and immobility do not of themselves foster social participation.

Peter H. Mann, in his study "The Concept of Neighborliness,"⁵ writes that neighborliness can be better understood by considering it as being composed of two factors--manifest and latent neighborliness. Manifest neighborliness consists of overt forms of social behavior such as mutual visiting, and latent neighborliness represents the favorable attitudes which result in positive action in cases of emergency.

Mann reports that a high degree of manifest neighborliness is objectionable. Too much neighboring of the kind that involves visiting or entertaining can detract from the relationship. It can lead to difficulties which result in hostility and avoidance of neighboring. This avoidance of neighboring he calls negative manifest neighborliness.

Mann also refers to a negative latent neighborliness. When people do not respond with appropriate sympathetic-type actions in case of emergencies, it is considered to be negative latent neighborliness.

After reading Mann's description of negative manifest neighborliness and negative latent neighborliness, it seems

⁵Peter H. Mann, "The Concept of Neighborliness," American Journal of Sociology, (November, 1954), pp. 163-168.

that he is talking about what other researchers refer to as anti-neighborliness.

Smith, Form, and Stone, in a study of "Local Intimacy in a Middle-sized City,"⁶ reported that people with higher local intimacy tend to move less and, if they move at all, they move within the area in which they already reside. They concluded that local intimacy develops as a result of residential stability and that spatial mobility makes for city-wide ties rather than local ties.

Others who have studied the concept of neighboring or neighborliness are Jessie Bernard, "An Instrument for the Measurement of Neighborhood, with Experimental Application,"⁷ Charles D. Bolton, "Factors Associated with Neighborliness in a Suburban Community,"⁸ and Paul Wallin, "A Guttman Scale for Measuring Women's Neighborliness."⁹ The limitation of

⁶J. Smith, W. Form, and G. Stone, "Local Intimacy in a Middle-sized City," American Journal of Sociology, (November, 1954), p. 283.

⁷Jessie Bernard, An Instrument for the Measurement of Neighborhood, with Experimental Application (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Washington University, St. Louis, 1935).

⁸Charles Bolton, Factors Associated with Neighborliness in a Suburban Community (A. M. Thesis, Stanford University, 1948).

⁹Paul Wallin, "A Guttman Scale for Measuring Women's Neighborliness," American Journal of Sociology (November, 1953), pp. 243-246.

these studies is the failure of the investigators to relate their problems to any larger theoretical framework. That is to say, they have not linked their findings to other sociological constructs and much research on the subject is a recitation of examples of interpersonal relationships between families.

It is hoped that some of these inadequacies will be corrected in the present study by presenting basic data about neighboring as it occurs in both mobile-home and fixed-home neighborhoods, and by exploring the relationships between selected factors which might affect neighborliness, such as occupation, education, and length of residence.

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL FINDINGS

Factors Governing Trailer Residence

High rents, excessive land values, high property taxes, and the shortage of satisfactory housing for people with children forces many families to seek dwelling units which present a less formidable financial burden. A new trailer costing \$5,000 uses the same equipment that goes into modern houses. Everything a family of three or four might want or need can be theirs in a trailer--washing machine, dryer, radiant heat, eye-level oven, disposal, indirect lighting, or wall-hung refrigerator.

Kitchens are large enough to seat four people and leave the hostess enough room to maneuver from sink and range to table. Even central air-conditioning and fireplaces, although not standardized equipment, can be added¹ at extra cost.

One thing trailer dwellers like about their homes is the price. Many trailers cost between \$2,000 and \$7,500, with the superdeluxe models being priced higher. The average

¹"Homes on Wheels," The Changing Times, The Kiplinger Magazine, (June, 1957), pp. 21-23.

sale price of a trailer is \$4,500. For this price a family can purchase a trailer that is the equivalent of a three- or four-room apartment that rents in most cities for \$100 to \$125 a month unfurnished, whereas the trailer comes fully equipped.² Trailer families often ask "What kind of a conventional house can you buy for \$4,500?"

Financing

Financing terms are quite conservative for new trailers, with 25 per cent of the cost required as a down payment and five years to pay the balance. Used trailers require one-third of the cost as a down payment with three and one-half years to pay the balance.

Taxation

Trailers may be taxed as personal property--a levy which is low when compared with real estate taxes, or they may be licensed. The average cost of the license is about \$100 annually. In addition to this, park owners are taxed on improved land. The five-star court visited by the researcher had concrete patios, graveled parking areas, natural gas, underground electricity conduits, paved roads, sewerage, and other modern facilities. These improvements add to the taxable value of the land.

²Ibid., p. 22.

Who Lives There?

The families of those parks visited and studied were composed of people of varied backgrounds and traditions. Trailer folks are mostly married people, with many of them being on the young side. Nearly half are 20 to 45 years old. Only about 22 per cent are over 65 and less than 20 per cent are retired. There was only one divorced man who occupied a double-decker trailer with his four children. Major occupations of chief wage earners included those who were self-employed in such capacities as writers, radio and television service, army and air force personnel, construction workers, and salesmen. The five-star court boasted such personalities as a retired editor of McGraw Hill Publishing Company, a retired Vice-President of the Valley National Bank, and a retired air force major. Other residents were college students and those employed in skilled and white-collar occupations.

The average income per trailer-family is about \$5,500, comfortably above the national average for families in general. In 79 per cent of the cases interviewed by the Trailer Coach Association, the income for trailer families comes from the male head of the family. It was also found that few trailer wives are employed.³ Of trailer families

³Ibid., pp. 21-23.

interviewed in Tucson, the average income was approximately the same as reported in the above survey.

Rules and Regulations

Regulations are fairly well standardized from court to court. Sites are allotted according to expected length of residence, trailer type, and whether or not the family has children. No pets are allowed. The longer the expected stay, the more likely it is that the resident will be placed on a more desirable site; that is to say, it will be nearer to the front of the court where the choicest sites are located and the most expensive and luxurious trailers are housed. Courts are divided into two areas, one for adults and the retired, and one area, usually located to the back of the court, for families with children. Playgrounds and equipment are provided as part of the service, and special swimming hours before and after lunch are set aside exclusively for children. Children are not permitted to run unescorted into the adult area, but are brought together with adults on many special occasions such as holiday celebrations, birthday parties, and potluck suppers. With these kinds of activities taking place daily, children do participate and mingle with adults, even though highly supervised.

The more elaborate, expensive trailers are allotted spaces near or at the front of the courts for two reasons.

One is the obvious fact that a handsome trailer will attract comparable guests and trailers, and second, the more expensive a trailer, the larger and more cumbersome it is likely to be. Therefore, it is more easily parked and installed near the large open areas and roadways at the entrances to the parks.

Those trailers which are considered transient and likely to move on in a short period of time or to stay only overnight are parked in special areas provided for easy accessibility, exit, and entrance, but are to the rear or side of the courts.

Notice to vacate must be given the management, and expected length of stay is provided for on the registration forms which each tenant files when he takes residence. A minimum of one to two weeks notice is required of those who are considered permanent--that is to say, those who originally intended to stay a full season or more.

Table I shows that at the extreme high end of the occupancy continuum, two families, one living in the fixed-homes neighborhood and one from the trailer court had occupied their present sites for a period of 84 months each. At the low end, two trailer families had been on their sites for only two months each, while the fixed-home family with the lowest length of residence had been on its site for six months.

TABLE I

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
BY TYPE OF DWELLING, 1958

| Number of Months | Families | |
|------------------------|----------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed-home |
| 84 | 1 | 1 |
| 60 | 1 | 2 |
| 48 | 0 | 3 |
| 42 | 0 | 1 |
| 36 | 1 | 1 |
| 24 | 3 | 3 |
| 18 | 0 | 2 |
| 14 | 1 | 0 |
| 12 | 4 | 1 |
| 10 | 1 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 15 | 15 |

The mean length of residence for trailer families is 22.3 months, while the mean length of residence for fixed-home families is 36.8 months of continuous residence.

According to Table II, there were 36 responses favoring living in trailers and 11 responses concerning the disadvantages of trailer life. Recreational facilities and good will of the neighbors tied for first place. Concern about play areas and other conditions favorable to raising children had priority with the younger couples as well as with the older groups who feel that good recreational facilities make it easier to control the children. Some of the

comments were as follows:

They (the children) have to learn to get along because of the closeness of every trailer and every family; a child learns to get along early or he's an outcast.

There is very little, if any, fighting. I have never seen any actual fist-fighting or teasing among any of the children.

Where else can I have a swimming pool at the price of \$6,000 for a home and \$20 a month rent? Show me where my kids can have the completely equipped playground like they have here. And I know if my kids get sick, any one of my neighbors will be right there to take me to the doctor with them.

The fact that housekeeping is much simpler was mentioned in 6 out of 36 responses. Upon further questioning, however, the simplicity of the housekeeping was somewhat overestimated. It was more a matter of constantly putting away things and the training of children and adults in self-discipline. It appeared to this observer that only one thing at a time could be out of place or mayhem would result. One woman remarked:

In a trailer you don't dare let things go. Either you put things back in their rightful places or you're overcome in a very short time by an avalanche.

It is true that the trailers are designed very compactly and efficiently with every available inch of space utilized to the fullest advantage, but this compactness and the built-ins result in an efficient type of housekeeping not usually found in the average fixed home. Other

things being equal, however, without conscientious attention to "picking up," it is doubtful that the trailer is much easier to keep clean than a fixed home run on the same basis. Another consideration in the choice of trailers for living was the economic one which was mentioned in 4 out of 36 responses. Since it is the economy angle which is stressed to the buying public by trailer manufacturers, it was surprising to find so few families who mentioned it.

It appears, then, that psychological factors, that is, non-utilitarian factors, enter into the choice of trailer living over conventional home living as indicated in this response:

Everybody lives in homes because there's no place else to live, but people who live in trailers--they choose to do it.

Discussing the disadvantages of life in trailers, the highest number of responses, 6 out of 36, said they felt there were no disadvantages involved.

I like living here and I wouldn't move into a house for anything. There is no fault that I can find with it at all. If we don't like our neighbors, we can just pick up and go elsewhere. You can't do that in a house. I'm perfectly satisfied and very happy here.

The most frequently mentioned disadvantage was the lack of yard space. This is consistent with responses given by fixed home dwellers when they referred to trailers. They specifically mentioned they wanted "my own yard." Three

complained of the lack of space for purposes of complete privacy. In order to get to a bathroom, it is often necessary to go through a bedroom, and if a person is sick or wants to retire early, it is a distinct disadvantage.

About the good will, one woman said:

There is just more friendliness, more feeling for the other guy here. I remember back home in Ohio how Ma and Pa hardly said more than "hello" to our neighbors. It's different here and we like it better.

Some people seemed proud to say that they never sit in the ramada without having company. Others mentioned the fact that no one stops for a prolonged visit without a specific invitation, and no one enters a trailer without knocking and being invited in. If doors are closed, it is taken to mean that privacy is desired and people are left alone unless an emergency arises.

TABLE II
 MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED ADVANTAGES AND
 DISADVANTAGES OF TRAILER LIVING
 BY SELECTED TUCSON TRAILER DWELLERS, 1959

| Advantages | Number of Responses |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Economy | 4 |
| Recreational facilities | 9 |
| Camaraderie, sociability, mutual aid, and good will | 9 |
| Simplicity, informality, relaxed living | 3 |
| Mobility, can choose your neighbors, free, no ties | 3 |
| Compactness, ease of housekeeping | 6 |
| Extra services provided (exterminating, gardening, tools) | 2 |
| | <hr style="width: 20px; margin: 0 auto;"/> |
| Total | 36 |
| Disadvantages | |
| Too small geographically | 4 |
| Trailer too small | 2 |
| Lack of privacy within trailer | 3 |
| Prefer conventional home | 2 |
| | <hr style="width: 20px; margin: 0 auto;"/> |
| Total | 11 |
| No disadvantage | 6 |

Factors Governing Fixed Home Residence

As expressed by the occupants: As in the case of the trailerites, the people living in the neighborhood investigated all owned their homes. That is, they were all paying off mortgages on homes they had bought for the purpose, as they put it, of building up some equity. They maintained that rentals are high in Tucson, many landlords refused to rent to people with children, and having a dog or cat was out of the question. Because of these drawbacks, the families felt they were better off buying a home even if it meant moving in a year or two and having the bother of selling the house. Many of the homes had the major appliances included in the purchase price and central cooling and heating are considered standard equipment to all new homes in Tucson. The cost of the fixed homes investigated in this study ranged from \$8,750 to approximately \$22,500, although they were originally built to sell for \$7,900 through \$14,000.

Financing and Taxation.

Financing terms are more liberal on these homes than on trailers, with very low down payments, especially in the case of veterans. Down payments average anywhere from about \$500 to \$2,000 with 15 to 25 years to pay the balance.

Unlike trailer taxes, which can be taxed as a vehicle at \$4 per \$100 evaluation, the fixed home is taxed about \$9.60 per \$100 evaluation and has in the past been taxed as high as \$11 per \$100 evaluation. If the trailer is taxed as a home, the rate rises to the same level as that for the fixed home. However, the choice of how the trailer is to be assessed and taxed is left to the trailer owner and he naturally chooses to be taxed as a vehicle. Taxes on the homes seen in this study ranged from \$220 annually to \$480 annually.

Accommodations

Lot sizes in the conventional homes were larger, the average lot size being approximately 5,000 to 6,000 square feet, whereas the lot size of a trailer site is about 2,500 square feet. Most fixed homes have masonry or brick patio walls, natural gas, water, sewerage, telephone, and other facilities common also to trailer parks.

Two tremendous advantages that are found in better trailer parks which are not found in cheaper fixed homes are sidewalks and paved streets and underground electricity conduits. Sometimes the grass and a few shrubs are in when the buyer takes over a new home in the fixed homes development, but in the very inexpensive houses, shrubs are scarce and very often grass is non-existent. The developments seen in this study did not have playground facilities and garbage

pails are evident in the front yards of many of the homes for as long as 24 hours. There is not, needless to say, any free exterminating service or lawn care or any of the extras included in the service provided by the better trailer parks. There are not any recreational facilities provided by the developers of these subdivisions nor have the tenants organized any groups to lead in any effort to provide themselves with the necessary funds and plans for such facilities.

Who Lives There?

In the subdivisions studied, the sample included people from all walks of life and various kinds of occupations. After questioning many of the respondents about the neighborhood families, it was ascertained that they consisted of plumbers, craftsmen, factory workers, salesmen, small business men, nurses, secretaries, radio and television repairmen, construction workers, air force and army personnel. There were also some retired people, but most of these couples were occupying the lowest priced houses. All of the fixed home occupants were married and consisted of various age groups.

Rules and Regulations

Other than the usual restrictive covenants governing size of lot, minimum distance between homes, and R1 zoning,

there were not standardized rules governing residence in these subdivisions. There were no clubs or organizations for betterment of the neighborhood, and it was assumed that if one paid his mortgage and taxes and generally conducted himself in accord with the folkways and mores of the neighborhood, he was completely acceptable. There were many pets, such as dogs and cats and birds; the cats and barking dogs often being unleashed, running rampant through the neighborhood.

The yards, patios, and general appearance of the fixed homes was a matter of personal taste or whim. Some had very nicely kept lawns and shrubs, with the houses adjoining looking neglected, many homes having yards that were dry, brown, and dusty. Bicycles could be seen strewn where they last fell. A three-wheeled wagon was lying haphazardly in the middle of the street, and various and sundry other play objects were cluttering up the walks.

In Table III, the desire for privacy was the advantage mentioned most frequently in a fixed home. All of the advantages mentioned were of a non-utilitarian nature having a social-psychological basis. It is clear that these are prime factors in motivating people to live in conventional homes rather than elsewhere.

The most frequently mentioned disadvantage was the higher cost of living in a fixed home. A typical response

was:

They (the trailerites) get everything included in their monthly payments, the furniture, the yard work, the swimming pool, etc. They don't pay the same taxes neither.

The two groups reported about in the same proportion on the fact that there are no disadvantages in living in their respective kinds of homes. The trailerites had six responses of "no disadvantage" while the fixed homes reported 5 responses of "no disadvantage." Both groups reported eleven disadvantages. There is a big difference in the number of advantages reported by the respondents. The trailerites reported 36 and the conventional homes reported 20 advantages.

TABLE III

MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED ADVANTAGES AND
DISADVANTAGES OF FIXED-HOME LIVING
BY SELECTED TUCSON HOME-DWELLERS, 1958

| Advantages | Responses |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Quiet | 3 |
| Privacy from neighbors | 6 |
| My own yard | 4 |
| Sense of security | 1 |
| More stable | 3 |
| More room | 3 |
| | — |
| Total Advantages | 20 |
| Disadvantages | Responses |
| Not so friendly | 2 |
| Fixed homes are scarce | 2 |
| Noisy | 2 |
| More expensive to operate | 4 |
| You're a slave to a fixed home | 1 |
| | — |
| Total Disadvantages | 11 |
| No disadvantages | 5 |

Although the median age was 8.96 for the trailer children and 10.7 for the fixed-home children, the greater difference was shown when the mode was calculated for each group. The modal age was 8-10 years for the trailer children and 12-14 years for the fixed home children. The average age then was 9 and 13 years respectively. This difference of four years, combined with the fact that there were two children of nineteen found in the fixed homes, seems to indicate a tendency for people with older children, that is, children of adolescent years, to occupy conventional homes. This is quite apparent when one notes that there were only six teenagers in the court while there were 13 teenagers in the conventional homes. Many of the respondents brought this fact out in their responses to the question of advantages to be found in fixed-home living. Some of the parents expressed it this way:

The people here are professional or small business people. You can't find them like that in trailers.

We were mobile when it was an advantage to be mobile. I felt I'd better stay mobile as long as we were uncertain and being shifted in business. I am now employed here and we like it well enough to stay in Tucson. It's an injustice to children to live in trailers. They like to bring children for over night. It's difficult to entertain like that. The togetherness is exaggerated--it's compression. It's OK for a couple or so when they're older. I always thought people in trailers were drifters and lowlifers. But in a high class neighborhood, it's nice. But as long as the children are growing up, we'll stay in this home. We will later retire back into a trailer.

A comparison of ages of children from trailer or fixed-home families is shown in Table IV:

TABLE IV
AGES OF CHILDREN OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
LIVING IN TRAILERS AND FIXED HOMES, 1958

| Age Group | Families | |
|------------|----------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed Home |
| 0-2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2-4 | 0 | 3 |
| 4-6 | 3 | 1 |
| 6-8 | 3 | 4 |
| 8-10 | 11 | 3 |
| 10-12 | 6 | 5 |
| 12-14 | 5 | 8 |
| 14-16 | 1 | 3 |
| Other (19) | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 30 | 30 |

According to Table V, there was a tendency for the parents who occupy fixed homes to be older than those parents living in trailers. The modal age for trailer parents was 30-35 for both the male and female. The modal age for fixed home male parents was 40-45 and for the female parents it was 35-40. These figures are consistent

with the findings in the children's age groups, that is to say, as children approach teen age, it is more likely that they will be occupying fixed homes. Another reason for finding the older age groups living in fixed homes might be due to the fact that as the parents grow older they also achieve more experience, tenure, etc., resulting in a higher economic status which would enable them to afford a conventional home.

TABLE V

AGES OF PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958

| Age Group | Trailers | | Fixed Homes | |
|-----------|----------|------|-------------|------|
| | Husband | Wife | Husband | Wife |
| 20-25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-30 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 30-35 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 35-40 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| 40-45 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 45-50 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-55 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |

Quite a few responses revealed the fact that parents feel it necessary to provide their children with more conventional housing and surroundings. Two or three of those families who were presently living in trailers indicated that at some future time, when the children were older, they might be inclined to move into a conventional home. Two respondents expressed it this way:

When the children get older, it's nice to move into a home. Oh, a trailer is fine for a couple, but a private home is nice. The main reason is for the children.

Because the children are big now we are in a home. We had four trailers--plenty of room. But now the children go to the University and high school. It's our place now to have a home.

It is interesting to note that what was good enough for the parents is not good enough for the children as they grow older. The parents are prone to attach a higher status of living in a home even when they haven't actually verbalized the word "status." They imply here that something in trailer living is lacking which is to be had in conventional-home living. The following remarks made by a woman occupying a very modest home reveals an awareness of class distinction:

Trailers are in areas I don't want to live in, and my children wouldn't meet the same people there as they do living here.

With respect to education of parents, Table VI shows that there were equal numbers of wives and husbands in the

mobile homes who had completed high school. One of the trailer wives had not only completed her M. A. in chemistry but is a Ph. D. candidate.

The modal number of years of formal education for the trailer-home parents was a completed four years of high school. The modal number of years for the fixed-home parents was 1-3 years of college. All averages given throughout this study are based on ungrouped data.

TABLE VI

EDUCATION OF PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958

| Grades Completed | Trailer | | Fixed Homes | |
|----------------------|---------|--------|-------------|--------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1-8 grades | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 9-11 grades | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| High school graduate | 6 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| 1-3 years of college | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| Bachelor's degree | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Master's degree | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |

The tendency in this study is for the woman to marry either at the same education level or into a higher one. This is in agreement with previous studies in this area. It also has been established that, other things being equal, the person with the higher education has greater earnings potential than the one with less formal education. This being the case, it is probable that those occupying the fixed homes in this study have greater earnings potential and that they can afford to take on the responsibility of buying a fixed home.

Many fixed home residents commented that life in a trailer is "low" class. For these people, it is conceivable that the conventional home symbolizes a higher class. It is conceivable, also, that having had a higher education, they have also learned to feel the need for things considered to be of higher status value.

The data in Table VII shows that there is no great difference between the types of occupations of the two groups of parents interviewed in this study. According to the United States Census classification, approximately half of all male heads of families in the sample were engaged in professional, technical, or kindred occupations. The remaining males and females were spread over the other types of occupations equally as well.

TABLE VII

OCCUPATIONS OF PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
LIVING IN FIXED HOMES AND MOBILE HOMES, 1958

| Occupation | Trailers | | Fixed Homes | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|--------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Professional, technical and kindred workers | 8 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Clerical and kindred workers | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Salesworkers | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Craftsmen, Foremen, and kindred workers | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Operatives and kindred workers | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Service workers, except private household | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Housewives | 0 | 11 | 0 | 12 |
| Total | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |

This equality of occupation is due largely to the fact that an effort was deliberately made to match the families on the basis of socio-economic status. Occupation is one of the best single indices of status, and in this case it resulted in similar types of occupations for both groups.

An interesting point was discovered when it was found that many female parents from conventional homes were employed full time outside the home. Within two blocks of homes that had originally sold for about \$8,000, fourteen mothers out of 32 homes were working. These homes were comparable in cost to many of the trailers visited by the interviewer. Yet those families living in conventional homes frequently complained about the higher cost of maintaining a fixed home in comparison to the maintenance of a trailer. This economic factor is likely to be important and their ability to buy and live in conventional homes depends on the extra income earned by the wives. Taxes in Tucson are inequitable--two houses of equal value are often taxed differently. It is cheaper to live in a trailer court where utilities and services are included in a very nominal monthly rental charge for the trailer site than to live in a conventional home where the owner has to pay for water, gardening, utilities, and any additional services he needs. The trailer court owner gets a special utility rate which results in a saving that he can pass on to the tenant. The desire for vertical mobility by the conventional home owners is quite evident in their various replies and the most practical way to achieve this mobility is through occupations and income. This income is increased if the wife is employed.

When asked about church affiliation, the trailerites' replies illustrated the fact that there were no Catholics or Jews among those interviewed. There were five Catholics families among the families living in conventional homes. Methodists were evenly distributed among both groups, there being five families in each neighborhood of that denomination. This information is shown in Table VIII.

As far as religious orientation is concerned, the trailerites were much more heterogeneous as a group than were the fixed home residents. Only one family, a trailer occupant, reported not having any religious affiliation. Nine different religions were reported by the trailerites and five by the fixed home families.

TABLE VIII

CHURCH AFFILIATION OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
LIVING IN FIXED HOMES AND MOBILE HOMES, 1958

| Religion | Families | |
|-------------------|----------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed Home |
| Catholic | 0 | 5 |
| Jewish | 0 | 0 |
| Methodist | 5 | 5 |
| Baptist | 3 | 2 |
| Lutheran | 1 | 0 |
| Pentecostal | 1 | 1 |
| Mormon | 1 | 0 |
| Unitarian | 1 | 0 |
| Brethren | 1 | 0 |
| Latter Day Saints | 1 | 0 |
| Presbyterian | 0 | 2 |
| None | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total | 15 | 15 |

Objections Raised to Trailer Families

The investigation revealed the fact that many of the fixed home residents raised several objections against the "transient trailer camp" families. The nature of these complaints is as follows:

1. The trailerite is displacing a permanent resident by competing in the labor market, and the money he earns is a drain on local resources.
2. He pays less taxes than fixed-home residents but reaps benefits comparable to the "permanent resident."
3. The trailerite is not likely to settle in the community permanently; therefore, he is not likely to be interested or concerned in the problems and ideals of Tucson or Arizona.

The information gathered in this study indicates that, although there is some truth in the objections raised, the data show that the fixed-home dweller ignores or is unaware of some of the issues and possible accompanying advantages of having trailer residents in the community.

Question 27, which reads "Where do you do your shopping for necessities, luxuries?" was answered unanimously by all the respondents as "Tucson." The money which these people earn is spent locally. Furthermore, the retired who live in trailers and who have moved here from other states receive their pensions and other income here and spend it here. Even though the trailerite is paying less taxes than the fixed-home owner in most cases, he is, nevertheless,

paying taxes, which the many home-renters are not, and against whom no criticism is levelled. It is true, however, that the greater part of the tax burden is borne by the fixed-home dweller.

With respect to the complaint regarding personal involvement in the greater community of Tucson and the State of Arizona, the results show that the trailerites were interested equally as well as the fixed-home residents interviewed. There was no great difference in the voting habits of the two groups, and participation in formal organizations in the greater community were similarly matched. The significant difference in attendance and participation was between the sexes and not the two groups.

Images and Stereotypes

Another finding pertains to images and stereotypes. The trailer court residential area is commonly visualized as being populated by people of low income, poor education, blue-collar type families who are extremely transient and low class. A fixed-home resident expressed her feelings of superiority thusly:

We lived in Alaska in a trailer out of necessity. Thank goodness, the children were younger then and we were just starting out. The type that wanted to live in one permanently I would not like to associate with them. My opinion is that I would not like to associate with those satisfied with trailer life. Trailers are run down easily. They get shabby and turn into slums.

And still another:

. . . you might as well be a gypsy--you don't have your own yard. People here all seem very nice .
. . it's mainly for the children's sake that we live in a home.

Although there are courts in Tucson which house very low income families, they are in the minority in number and are the exception rather than the rule.

The data gathered in this study indicated that the mobile-homes court was similar in such traits as education, occupation, and income to a middle-class fixed-home neighborhood.

CHAPTER V

INCIDENCE OF NEIGHBORING IN THE TRAILER COURT AND THE FIXED-HOME NEIGHBORHOOD

The data relevant to neighborliness are given in Tables IX through XV with the activities presented under two categories; the number of trailer families and the number of fixed-home families participating in or mentioning the activity.

Because of the nature of the items used to define neighborliness, the number of families living in a respondent's neighborhood might influence the possibility of his being able to neighbor. For this reason, the fixed-home area which was chosen by the interviewer was one which was densely populated in the sense that every available lot had a house on it. Even though the yards in many instances are larger than the yards in the trailer court, physical proximity of the homes was much the same in pattern in both cases because each family had families living on both sides of it, in back of it, and across the streets, as well as in adjacent blocks.

Another factor which might introduce bias into the results obtained is the age composition of the neighborhood.

The amount of neighboring might be at a lower level in the case of very old people or the very young. It is also conceivable that children are important in forming relationships because of the common interests shared between families having them. Furthermore, the socio-economic status of the respondents would presumably affect the desire to enter into certain kinds of neighboring, such as mutual aid. One woman mentioned that she and her family were not interested in giving or receiving from their neighbors--she preferred to have her friends outside the court. Because of these foregoing reasons, the families interviewed were selected on the basis of having two children and were further matched on income and occupation.

It is recognized that there are many other factors which operate to inhibit or encourage interaction between families, but it was impractical to consider all of them.

The questions "Do you borrow money from your neighbors?" and "Do you lend money to your neighbors?" were answered in such a variety of ways that it was impossible to tabulate the data in a statistically meaningful way. Nevertheless, it was evident from the answers received that many of the respondents in both groups had previous experience which taught them not to lend money or borrow money. One woman in a fixed home said:

I'd rather make a gift of five dollars to someone who needs it than to lend it to them and then have them forget to pay it back. At least I would be the one making the decision on what to give and I wouldn't be made a fool of.

Three families in fixed homes did borrow and lend money and five trailer families made loans reciprocally. Eight families in the fixed homes said they would not lend or borrow and two in the trailer court refused to lend or borrow. Summarizing the results, it was evident that those who admitted they would lend and borrow were very specific about saying "only change or a small amount" or "a few cents for the children's lunch." There were some families who said they had made small loans but that they would not ever want to borrow for themselves. One trailer family offered to lend a trailer neighbor a hundred dollars which he accepted but which he promptly returned the following day. This was the only instance of a large sum exchanging hands.

Question 36 revealed that neither of the neighborhoods had an organization for community betterment.

Answers to questions 16 and 17 were coded into Table XII and XIII under the heading "Reciprocal Visitation Patterns."

Question 23, "In what town do you shop for necessities, luxuries?" was answered by all families in both groups in the same way. All of them buy everything in

Tucson, even their major appliances, cars, trailers, and luxury items such as furs and jewels. A majority of the respondents were specific in adding that, although they shopped in Tucson, it was not always done in the downtown business center. Most of their purchases were made in the outlying shopping centers adjacent to their immediate neighborhoods. When they were asked if they ever went to Phoenix or Los Angeles, they answered in the affirmative but added that the tour was not in the nature of a shopping trip and anything that was purchased there was by way of being incidental rather than the main objective of the trip.

All of the families in both groups answered that they subscribe to one of the two Tucson daily papers and all of the trailer families received the Mobile Monitor, a monthly publication sent gratis to them by the Monitor Publishing Company. Other subscriptions ranged from the scientific and professional magazines to popular magazines such as the Ladies Home Journal, and the numbers varied from two to as many as eight for the trailer families and seven to the highest subscriber in a fixed home.

Questions 26 and 27 concerning stereotypes brought forth the expected types of answers, to wit:

I don't really know any personally, but it's my impression they are lower class.

They are not our kind. They're transients, fly-by-night and shiftless.

They strike me as people not even in the middle class . . . they're transients, cruddy looking.

As far as self-images were concerned, the trailerites responded in such a way to indicate that they were aware of the attitudes and images held by conventional home residents. For example:

They don't think well of us. They think we don't pay taxes. I think they're jealous of us. They begrudge us an easy life and they haven't the spunk to get out of their tied-down homes. The average person knows nothing about us and cares less to find out.

Another trailerite said:

They seem shocked. My aunt lives in Scottsdale and her patio is twice as large as my trailer. They don't know how we manage. She's shocked!

Some of the conventional home residents took exception to the usual images and prejudices, but this was due to the fact that they had either lived in a trailer or knew people who are living in trailers.

We lived in a trailer back there for about eight months down in California, and I made many, many friends. We had a real fine time. Everybody knew everybody else. It was just real, real nice. They did not seem to be too transient. They have settled and were there when we left. We kept in touch, but it's been twelve years since we lived there.

One woman had this to say:

Well, I have no feelings about them; they are as good citizens as others. We have had some friends from trailers. They eventually move into a home.

Another in a similar vein:

I don't have any feeling at all about them. I have not had occasion to meet any except last year at the hospital a roommate of mine was from a trailer. I couldn't see no difference from us.

Answers to questions 20 and 21 were divided into four categories: male trailerite participation in formal organizations, fixed-home male participation in formal organizations, trailerite female participation in formal organizations, and fixed-home female participation in formal organizations. These data are shown in Tables IX and X.

Item 21, "Name the organizations of which you are a member, (school, club, fraternity, political, business)." did not discriminate. The replies were the same as those given in question 20.

Each table will be discussed in turn with illustrations and comments of respondents included.

According to Table IX, male participation in formal organizations varied from membership in lodges and professional clubs to membership in PTA. Both groups had the largest number of members in the PTA. It is logical to assume that this is so because the Parent-Teachers Association is related to the welfare and needs of their children. Both groups had three memberships in professional organizations. There was no great difference in the number of the formal association memberships between the trailer male parents or fixed-home male parents, the total number

reported for the former being 30 and for the latter being 28.

As far as these data go, it appears that membership in formal associations is not a function of trailer court living, but it can be assumed that this kind of behavior is motivated by the immediate needs of members of the family rather than by camaraderie.

TABLE IX

PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL ASSOCIATIONS
BY MALE PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958

| Type of Association | Families | |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed-Home |
| Unions | 5 | 2 |
| Parent-Teacher Association | 7 | 11 |
| Scouts | 3 | 2 |
| Professional and Business Clubs | 3 | 3 |
| YMCA | 1 | 1 |
| Lodges | 11 | 9 |
| Total | 30 | 28 |

It is interesting to note in Table X that there is a difference of only one between the memberships held by both groups of women. The significant difference lies between the male and female memberships, this difference being 19 fewer memberships in the case of the trailer women and 18 fewer memberships in the case of the fixed-home wives. It is conceivable that women tend to restrict their activities to the home except in such instances which bear directly on the welfare of the family. The above results refer to all associations of a quasi-social, business-oriented, or fraternal nature mentioned by respondents, except church.

Another difference found was that of the number of PTA memberships among the women. Seven trailer families, that is of both husbands and wives, held PTA memberships and were actively engaged in their school affairs, whereas eleven families in conventional housing belonged to the PTA. Does this difference of four fewer memberships in PTA show a laxity on the part of the trailer parents to participate in school activities? Does it also indicate apathy to problems of taxation, insufficient school rooms, inefficient school teachers, lack of playground equipment, etc., as is so often mentioned in the complaints of conventional home owners against the trailerites?

TABLE X
 PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL ASSOCIATIONS
 BY FEMALE PARENTS OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
 LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958

| Type of Association | Families | |
|---------------------|----------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed-Home |
| PTA | 7 | 11 |
| Brownies | 1 | 0 |
| Professional | 2 | 0 |
| YMCA | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 11 | 12 |

This data does not permit such generalizations, but a study of a much larger number of families would be useful in ascertaining such information. As far as the total number of associations by female parents is concerned, the two groups are fairly evenly matched.

Figures in Table XI reveal that there is a greater frequency of participation by the trailer families in informal planned activity on a voluntary basis. Two trailer families reported no participation in the planned activity of the neighborhood. All of the families in the fixed-homes reported that their children attended all of the birthday

parties in the neighborhood. The above data indicates that with the exception of a few barbecue-type dinners and the children's parties, there was no other kind of planned social activity engaged in by fixed-home residents within their respective neighborhoods. The role of management planning in recreational activities of the trailerites is illustrated here.

TABLE XI

PLANNED ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN BY NUMBER
OF MENTIONS MADE OF EACH ACTIVITY

| Activity | Regular Activities | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed-Home |
| Potlucks, barbecues | 13 | 4 |
| Parties, holiday festivities (including children's birthday parties) | 13 | 15 |
| Dancing | 7 | 0 |
| Cards | 7 | 0 |
| Bingo | 11 | 0 |
| Hobbies | 10 | 0 |
| Total | 61 | 19 |

It is quite possible that the trailerite might be less active if his recreational activities were not planned for him. The manager coordinates the activities and stimulates enough interest among the families to establish a

more or less continuous round of activity, which, on the surface, appears to be spontaneous. Whether or not this same degree of activity exists in courts which have no planned recreation is not known.

A second reason for the apparent greater amount of participation on the part of the trailerites might be due to the many facilities provided in the court. These facilities which include swimming pools, clubhouses, playgrounds, etc., are centers of attraction and meeting places for the residents.

With the exception of attendance by children at birthday parties, all but four of the fixed home residents reported that they did not have any other planned activity for the neighborhood and its residents. The four who engaged in planned activity within their neighborhoods had an informal kind of backyard barbecue three or four times a year. The planned activity in the court is on a daily, weekly, and bi-monthly basis depending upon the activity.

It can be concluded from these data that the greater incidence of planned activities participated in by trailerites is a function of the trailer court brought about by the deliberate planning of the management. It is not altogether spontaneous, furthermore, in the sense that the management very often acts as an intermediary in introducing newcomers to the older established tenants. There

is, nonetheless, a great deal of sociability, but it is of a quasi-organized nature within an informal setting. This special condition attendant with living in trailer courts may explain, at least in part, the greater degree of participation in planned activities by the trailer families.

The figures in Tables XII and XIII show that reciprocal visiting is practiced to a greater extent by neighbors within the trailer court than by neighbors in the fixed homes. The types of social relations range from simple "having a cup of coffee" to the complex type of interaction involved in dining. Only four families in the conventional homes exchanged dinners and breakfasts, while the trailer homes families reported 19 exchanges of brunch, lunch, or dinner. The reciprocity was not done entirely on an equal basis, since several of those who did this type of entertaining explained that although they had had the "Joneses" for dinner, they in turn had been back for Sunday brunch and so on. The number 3 under "dessert, coffee, beverage" means that family number 1 had exchanged dessert, coffee, or beverage with 3 other families during the month.

The difference in the numbers of mentions given by both groups is contrary to what was expected, especially in view of the fact that so many of the fixed-home respondents so frequently mentioned lack of space for entertaining as being a big drawback in trailer living. It appears

that life in a trailer is a matter of definition for many conventional home dwellers. For them life in a trailer is undesirable because of previous images and stereotypes not because of actual fact. One family in each group was a social isolate in so far as reciprocal visiting was concerned. The trailer family chose not to participate, but the fixed-home family appeared to be rejected on two grounds: (1) they were renting, and (2) the children of that family were neglected and the home and yard had an unkempt look.

TABLE XII

FIXED-HOME FAMILIES--RECIPROCAL VISITATION
PATTERNS (Within a month)

| Family | Dessert Coffee Beverage | Brunch Lunch Dinner | Picnics Cookouts | Movies Drive-ins | Total |
|--------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|
| 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 12 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 31 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 44 |

TABLE XIII

TRAILER FAMILIES--RECIPROCAL VISITATION PATTERNS
(Within a month)

| Trailer Family | Dessert Coffee Beverage | Brunch Lunch Dinner | Picnics Cookouts | Movies Drive-ins | Total |
|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|
| 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| 4 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 5 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 |
| 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 9 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| 11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| 14 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 22 |
| 15 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 |
| Total | 88 | 19 | 17 | 15 | 139 |

These data illustrate that there is a tendency on the part of both groups to engage in all types of mutual visiting, even though it happens in varying degrees. The greater frequency of relationships on the part of the trailerites cannot be explained on the basis of these small numbers, but it is plausible that the ecological setting of the court serves to delimit the area and its occupants in such a way as to deter the establishment of the primary-type activities outside the court.

Paul Wallin found that ". . . suburbanites do not seek the company of their neighbors in their recreational pursuits." Whether or not this tendency is indicated by the difference of almost 100 more mutual visits between the two groups is not known, but for these data, the difference is at least suggestive of the same conclusion.

The data in Table XIV refers to mutual aid. As the responses were being received, it became obvious to the interviewer that the amount of mutual aid given and received by mobile-home residents was greater than that given or received by the fixed-home residents. Furthermore, the impression gained from the data is that fixed-home relationships were of a less obligatory nature and more a matter of choice, whereas the relationships in this trailer court are based on a need for mutual aid. The amount of labor assistance given to all trailerites in setting up their trailers, the help given in cases of sickness, such as cooking and doing the laundry, indicate the difference in the kinds of mutual aid found in the two neighborhoods.

TABLE XIV

MUTUAL AID PARTICIPATED IN BY NUMBER OF INCIDENTS MENTIONED

| Kind of Service Performed | No. of mentions | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed-Home |
| Baby sitting | 14 | 6 |
| Telephone messages, accepting packages | 12 | 8 |
| Caring for animals, plants | 14 | 2 |
| Exchange and loan of tools, books, housewares | 14 | 13 |
| Doing Laundry | 3 | 0 |
| Provide transportation | 13 | 13 |
| Nursing care | 5 | 0 |
| Provide food--cooking | 8 | 0 |
| Labor (all-around assistance) | 14 | 3 |
| Total | 97 | 45 |

Among the conventional home dwellers, the mutual aid relationships existed only between families who deemed themselves to be of equal status. This was contrary to the trailerites who engaged in mutual aid relationships with any and all comers. A woman living in the fixed-home neighborhood had this to say:

We baby sit with the people in the next block. (She pointed out a specific house.) Her husband goes to the University at night with mine and we both were nurses before we were married.

An attitude of expectancy regarding aid was expressed by many of the trailer families. They expect their neighbors to come to their aid when they find themselves in extraordinary circumstances. When a mobile family moves in, it is usual that the men of the court assist in the setting up of the trailer and ramada, while a few of the women bring drinks or food, and still others help with the children. The family receiving the assistance does not expect to pay for it, but will, in its turn, be available when other families move or need help. No one of the trailer families expressed any hesitancy in seeking aid in such emergencies as occur during sickness, unemployment, etc. This would denote an obligatory aspect about these neighboring relations. Heberle discusses similar findings on studies made in Europe in his publication, "The Normative Element in Neighboring Relations."¹ The fact that there is mutual assistance involved in pleasant circumstances as well as in unfortunate situations signifies a reciprocal relationship on two levels: the social level, and the emergency level. Certainly cooking for a potluck supper is different from cooking for a sick family--but both types of relationships exist in the trailer court.

¹Rudolph Heberle, "The Normative Element in Neighborhood Relations," Pacific Sociological Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, (Spring, 1960), pp. 3-11.

Table XV shows that there is a substantial difference of 25 families visited regularly outside the neighborhood by families from conventional housing. Three families in the court have no friends or relatives whom they visit outside the neighborhood, and two families in the fixed homes do not visit outside the neighborhood. There was no significant association between length of residence and the amount of outside visiting done by fixed-home people, but there was a very high negative correlation of $-.88$ for the court families. That is to say, as length of residence in months increased, the tendency to visit outside the court decreased.

TABLE XV

VISITING OUTSIDE THE NEIGHBORHOOD BY SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958

| Location | No. of Families Visited | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| | Trailerites | Fixed-home Residents |
| Regular visits outside trailer court to friends and relatives | 54 | 0 |
| Regular visits made outside the fixed-home neighborhood to friends and relatives | 0 | 80 |
| Families who do no visiting outside their neighborhood | 3 | 2 |

It seems plausible that the trailer court, being a definable

ecological unit, serves to restrict the interaction to the court itself, whereas the fixed-home neighborhood with its vastly amorphous boundaries lends itself to wider and broader physical areas and contacts with more families. Further implications of this negative finding will be discussed in the conclusions.

TABLE XVI

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION OF SELECTED TUCSON FAMILIES
LIVING IN MOBILE HOMES AND FIXED HOMES, 1958

| Activity | Families | |
|------------------------------|----------|------------|
| | Trailer | Fixed-home |
| Vote regularly | 7 | 8 |
| Not even registered | 2 | 2 |
| Expect to vote in the future | 4 | 0 |
| Do not vote | 2 | 4 |
| No answer | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 15 | 15 |

When questioned about political activity, Table XVI indicates that there were equally as many in both groups who vote regularly. More fixed-home families do not vote at all, and one respondent in the fixed-home neighborhood refused to answer because she said she didn't know just what they would do.

Neither of the two groups had members who had at any time held office or who anticipated holding an office.

The only real difference in the voting habits of both groups was the fact that four trailer families intended to vote in the future, whereas the 6 families who do not vote expressed their apathy in much the same way as the woman who said:

What's the use of voting? They'll put in whoever they want anyway, and who am I going to vote for? One politician is as bad as another; they're all crooked.

The figures in Table XV show a slightly greater tendency on the part of the trailerites, as verbalized, to participate in Tucson's political affairs than do the fixed-home residents. An interesting fact came to light when it was found that, in these two groups, when one parent voted, the other parent voted also, and vice versa.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

The measures given throughout this study are based on ungrouped data. The number of months of continuous residence yields a mean of 36.8 months for fixed-home families and 22.3 months for the mobile-home families.

There was a much higher rate of reciprocal visiting by the trailer families, but there was no significant correlation between length of continuous residence on one site and reciprocal visiting within the neighborhood. The actual figures were 139 visits exchanged by trailer families within the court in a month's time, whereas the fixed-home families exchanged visits only 44 times within the same period.

Rho was calculated for the other variables studied. A positive correlation of .789 was found between mutual aid and length of residence for the trailerites. With two df., this was significant for the trailerites. Mathematical corrections were calculated for tied ranks according to Siegel's formula,¹

$$T = \frac{t^3 - T}{12}.$$

¹Sidney Siegel, Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), p. 207.

Rho dropped to .78, which is still significant at the .01 level. A positive association was also found between mutual aid and length of residence for the fixed-home families with a rho of .542, being significant at the .05 level.

A correlation of .552, significant at the .05 level, was found between mutual aid and reciprocal visiting in the case of the court. There was no association found between the reciprocal visiting patterns and mutual aid in the fixed homes. As noted before, the aid given and received by mobile-home residents was more than twice that given or received by the fixed-home families. Although there was no correlation between length of residence and visiting outside the neighborhood for the fixed-home families, a very high negative correlation of $-.88$ was found for the trailer court residents. This is significant at the .01 level.

Rho was calculated for all the variables investigated, but no other significant relationships were found. The results obtained for these data were quite inconclusive, but there was a tendency of high participation in one area to be accompanied by high participation in other areas for 3 families. For example, a Baptist family which rated higher than any other family on mutual visiting also rated very high on membership in formal organizations and visiting outside the immediate neighborhood. Of the trailer families,

a Methodist family who rated highest on mutual visiting also was very high on mutual aid and membership in formal organizations.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The social interaction of two groups of families was studied in two different neighborhoods, one a mobile-home court and the other a conventional fixed-home neighborhood. From an initial selection of 79 families, thirty families were finally matched on numbers of children and on economic status as indicated by income and occupation. Their behavior toward their neighbors was described and analyzed. Specifically, this study has dealt with (1) the neighborhoods and their residents, (2) the programs of social activities and the extent of participation in them, (3) the values and reasons reported to have most significance and given in support of the preference for a trailer or a fixed home, and finally, (4) the advantages and disadvantages of mobile home living as reported by the residents.

It is commonly believed that trailer residents are more mobile residentially than conventional-home dwellers. Although the figures indicate a much higher rate of residential mobility, it does not support the usual stereotype held by people of extreme transiency on the part

of the trailerite.¹ An indication of the tendency to stability of residence is the fact that more than half of the court families had some sort of permanent structure added to their trailers.

This precludes moving them frequently, if at all, and in the event of a move, the permanent structure becomes the property of the management. In some cases a ramada was added; in one instance a permanent living room was being built on; many lots have concrete ramadas, and awnings had been installed at the expense of the resident.

In exploring the incidence of mutual aid, some revealing material regarding the content of mutual aid was found. This content pattern varied with the ages of the couples. Generally speaking, the earlier the stage in the family cycle, the more the patterns of mutual aid involved such chores as child care, emergency transportation, communication, etc.; the later the stage in the family cycle, the more frequently the patterns of mutual aid involved care of material objects, property, etc., such as acceptance of packages, leaving of keys, watering plants. This was true for both neighborhoods, and, since families in the court were, on the whole, younger than the fixed-home residents, it is probable that the higher incidence of child care is due to this factor.

¹See page 40 for lengths of residence.

Judging from the responses made by those interviewed, the higher frequency and kinds of mutual aid exhibited by the trailerites were not acceptable to the fixed-home families, and help in a crisis or emergency situation would not be forthcoming with very much enthusiasm. This raises the questions of why trailerites expect such aid and why they reciprocate benefits. Is it due to internalization of a common folkway which morally obligates them to give help of all kinds, or is it a specific personality type that is drawn to trailer court living, and hence is the cause of the interaction patterns found in these situations? The present study design did not make it possible to isolate and measure the effects of these two factors.

Smith, Stone, and Form² found a greater tendency for people with higher local intimacy to move less and to move within the area where they live. They concluded that local intimacy develops as a result of residential stability.

It is clear that there is a substantial difference between the two neighborhood groups in reciprocal visiting patterns, but no significant correlation was found, and the relationship between the two variables, length of residence and reciprocal visiting is tenuous. The findings, in this

²J. Smith, W. Form, and G. Stone, "Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City," American Journal of Sociology, (November 1954), pp. 276-284.

instance, confirm those of Sweetser³ who said that there is very little direct association between mobility and social isolation of the neighborhood. To say, therefore, that mobility is the cause of decline in neighboring is, to say the least, oversimplifying the problem.

In the case of length of residence and mutual aid, however, the high positive correlations found for both groups indicate that the intensity of neighboring increases as the length of residence increases. That is to say, the higher the length of residence, the higher the degree of mutual aid for both groups. Although there was no relationship found between length of residence and visiting outside the neighborhood for the fixed-home residents, the inverse relationship found for the trailer families confirms the assumption that the court tends to satisfy the need for neighboring within its own ecological boundaries. It may be tentatively suggested, at this point, that the trailer court is more a "social unit" than the fixed-home neighborhood. It is the impression of the interviewer that, in the case of the trailer families, no special mechanisms are necessary to initiate or maintain this system of congenial gratification involving visiting neighbors. The response

³Frank L. Sweetser, "A New Emphasis for Neighborhood Research," American Sociological Review, (July, 1942), pp. 525-533.

on the part of the trailerites seemed to be of a more spontaneous nature than that of the fixed-home families.

It is clear from these data that there is an important difference in the frequency with which residents of the court and those of the fixed-home neighborhood engage in both mutual aid and mutual visiting with families from the neighborhood. It is also clear that the court performs certain functions for its members which the fixed-home neighborhood does not. The major types of informal organizations, such as the card groups and the dancing classes, provide the framework for immediate and continuing gratification of its members' needs. These informal groups serve a function for their individual participants through activities self contained within the court itself. More specifically, they provide the individual with the opportunity to partake in recreational activity which is of direct interest to him for the special objectives inherent in the activity, such as learning to dance or to swim. They also provide the satisfaction of fellowship contacts. None of the organizations found in the court were of the status-conferring type such as would be true of the Masons.

For the most part, then, the participants seem to be oriented to the satisfaction derived in the present rather than in some future goal, and in cooperating rather than in competing.

In summary, the following questions were raised and the following answers obtained:

1. Does mobility of residence operate to increase neighborliness?

There was a higher frequency of neighboring activity within the trailer court. Since the fact of trailer court and trailer-court living arises out of mobility of residence, it may be said that this aspect of mobility tends to increase neighborliness.

In addition to this finding, it was demonstrated that neighboring is not unidimensional but multidimensional, and that participating in one type of neighboring activity does not imply participating in another type of neighboring activity. a family may visit but not lend money and still be neighborly.

When the factor of mobility pertaining to length of residence was distinguished from the mobility of dwelling which begets trailer court life, it became clear that the social interaction within the court was contingent upon this latter aspect of mobility. Thus, it outweighs length of residence as a contributing factor to neighborliness.

Added to the higher frequency of neighboring, found in the trailer court is the difference in the types of mutual aid. The young and middle-aged families living in the court gave and received aid that entails much service and time, whereas the older people living in the fixed-homes exchanged aid of a more casual and incidental nature.

2. Does the court setting serve a specific function for the families living there?

Specifically, in this study, interaction between the court families was much more frequent than between families in the fixed-home neighborhood.

Thus, it seems that the higher incidence of social behavior is evoked by the ecological

setting as well as by the planning on the part of the management of recreational activities. The above phenomena were illustrated and some of their implications noted. The assumption was that, as a residential setting becomes an ecological entity, the need for outside-the-area contacts would be reduced. The trend of the data was toward confirmation of the assumption.

3. Does a greater frequency of neighborliness occur among trailer court families than in fixed homes?

The expectation was that there would be a higher rate of relationships within the neighborhood of trailer homes than within the fixed-homes neighborhood. The data indicate that this was so and the results are taken as corroborating the major hypothesis in this particular study.

Because the data are derived from the reactions of a small number of respondents, the results can be considered as merely indicative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources Cited

Books

- Cowgill, Donald O. Mobile Homes, A Study of Trailer Life. Springfield, Missouri: Elkins Swyers Company, 1941.
- Gist, Noel P., and L. A. Halbert. Urban Society. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1948.
- Moreno, J. L. Who Shall Survive? Washington: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, 1934.
- Riemer, Sven. The Modern City: An Introduction to Urban Sociology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.

Periodicals

- Anderson, K. "Trailer Home Folds for Travel," Popular Mechanics, (August, 1957), pp. 90-92.
- Bernard, Jessie. "An Instrument for the Measurement of Neighborhoods, with Experimental Application," Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertaion, Washington University, 1935.
- Caplow, T., and R. Forman. "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community," American Sociological Review, (June, 1950), pp. 357-366.
- Forrester, K. "Trailers Bring Families and Problems," Nation's Business, (February, 1937), pp. 32-34.
- Heberle, R. "The Normative Element in Neighborhood Relations," Pacific Sociological Review, (Spring, 1960), pp. 3-11.
- "Homes on Wheels," Changing Times, (June, 1957), pp. 21-23.
- Hoyt, G. C. "The Life of the Retired in a Trailer Park," American Journal of Sociology, (January, 1954), pp. 361-370.

- Mann, P. H. "The Concept of Neighborliness," American Journal of Sociology, (November, 1954), pp. 163-168.
- "Mobile Home Isn't so Mobile Anymore," Business Week, (March 16, 1957), pp. 44-46.
- Neuberger, R. L. "Who Shall Pay for our Roads?" Harpers, (October, 1952), pp. 86-91.
- Reimer, Sven. "Hidden Dimensions of Neighborhood Planning," Journal of Land Economics, (May, 1950), p. 2.
- Schorr, A. L., "Families on Wheels," Harpers, (January, 1958), pp. 71-75.
- Smith, J., W. Form, and G. Stone. "Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City," American Journal of Sociology, (November, 1954), p. 283.
- Sweetser, Frank L. "A New Emphasis for Neighborhood Research," American Sociological Review, (July, 1942), pp. 525-533.
- "Trailers or Mobile Homes," Consumer's Research Bulletin, (April, 1957), pp. 9-12.
- Wallin, P., "A Guttman Scale for Measuring Women's Neighborliness," American Journal of Sociology, (November, 1953), pp. 243-246.

Yearbooks and Catalogues

- Mobile Life. Chicago: Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 1958.
- Planning Advisory Service. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, 1956.
- Woodall's Mobile Home Park Directory. Chicago: Woodall Publishing Company, 1957-58.

Theses

- Bolton, Charles. "Factors Associated with Neighborliness in a Suburban Community," A. M. Thesis, Stanford University, 1948.

Hirshstein, Bertha T. "Evaluation of Methods of Evaluating Character Test Items," A. M. Thesis, Washington University, 1930.

Sources Used But Not Cited

Books

Burgess, Ernest (Editor). The Urban Community. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1926.

Chapin, F. Stuart. Experimental Designs in Sociological Research. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939.

Cooley, Charles H. Social Organization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Dornbusch, Sanford M., and Calvin Schmid. A Primer of Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1953.

Hare, Paul, Borgatta, Edgar F., and Robert F. Bales. Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction. New York:

Hatch, David, and Mary G. Hatch. Under the Elms: Yesterday and Today. Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1949.

McCormick, Thomas C., and Roy G. Francis. Methods of Research in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Harper Brothers, 1958.

MacIver, Robert M. Community. New York: Macmillan, 1917.

MacIver, Robert M., and C. H. Page. Society: An Introductory Analysis. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1955.

Murdock, George P. Social Structure. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

Ogburn, William F., and Meyer F. Nimkoff. Sociology. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1940.

- Park, Robert Ezra. Human Communities. Glencoe: Glencoe Free Press, 1952.
- Ross, Murray G. Case Histories in Community Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and M. O. Wilson. Group Relations at the Crossroads. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.
- Siegel, Sidney. Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1956.
- Smith, T. Lynn, et al. Social Problems. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1956.
- Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939.

Periodicals

- Dodd, S. C. "A System of Operationally Defined Concepts for Sociology," American Sociological Review, (October, 1939), pp. 619-634.
- Gartner, J. "All About Trailers," Review Consumer's Research Bulletin, (May, 1955), p. 27.
- Good, H. "Here's a Fair Idea of What it Costs to Live in a Trailer," Good Housekeeping, (November, 1956), pp. 62-63.
- Martin, H. H. "Don't Call Them Trailer Trash," Saturday Evening Post, (August 2, 1952), pp. 24-25.
- "New Nobility in Mobility," Life, (December 10, 1956), pp. 112-118.
- Railton, A. R. "Trailers are Stay-at-homes Now," Popular Mechanics, (December, 1953), pp. 136-143.
- Timasheff, N. S., "Basic Concepts in Sociology," American Journal of Sociology, (September, 1952), pp. 176-186.
- Timasheff, N. S. "Definitions in the Social Sciences," American Journal of Sociology, (November, 1947), pp. 201-209.

"Trailer Facts," American Magazine, (July, 1952), p. 86.

"Trailer Life," Time, (November, 1952), pp. 111-113.

"Trailers: More and More Americans Call them Home," News-week, (August 25, 1952), pp. 40-70.

Wylie, K. "Look What's Happened to Trailers," Popular Science, (June, 1954), pp. 116-120.

Newspapers

Mobile Monitor. Tucson: Monitor Publishing Company, (September-October, 1958).

Arizona Mobile Citizen. Phoenix: Arizona Trailer Publications, (June 16, 1959).

Census Data

"Characteristics of the Population," Census of Population, Part I, United States Summary, (1950), pp. 1-102.

APPENDIX

Form for Determining Personal Data

Your identity and the information you are about to give will be kept strictly confidential. Please indicate in the allotted space that category which best describes your situation.

Age at last birthday:

Husband _____

Wife _____

Children _____

Occupation:

Husband _____

Wife _____

Annual Income:

\$4000-4500 _____

4600-5100 _____

5200-5700 _____

5800-6300 _____

6400-6900 _____

7000-7500 _____

Other _____

Marital Status:

Married _____

Divorced _____

Widowed _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long has your family lived in Tucson?
2. How many times have you moved within Tucson?
3. How long have you lived on this site?
4. How far did you go in school? (Asked of the female head)
5. How far did your spouse go in school?
6. What is your regular occupation? (Female)
7. What is your husband's regular occupation?
8. What is your religion?
9. What is your husband's religion?
10. With how many families do you exchange such services or favors as taking telephone messages, packages, keys?
11. With how many families do you exchange such services or favors as baby sitting, caring for plants, caring for animals?
12. With how many families do you exchange things such as tools, books, housewares?
13. To how many families have you loaned money?
14. From how many families have you borrowed money?
15. With how many families do you exchange gifts?
16. With how many families do you mutually visit within the neighborhood for dessert, breakfast, dinner, beverage? (within a month).
17. With how many neighbors do you go to the movies or on outings together? (within a month).
18. With how many families do you visit regularly outside the neighborhood for coffee, dessert, dinner, beverage?
19. How many business friends do you entertain during the month?

20. How often do you attend planned activities in the greater community? (club, political, business, school, within a month).
21. Name the organizations of which you are a member. (fraternal, recreational, labor, political).
22. How many planned activities do you attend in your neighborhood? (card parties, holiday festivities, potlucks, etc.).
23. In what town do you shop for luxuries? necessities?
24. To what newspapers and publications do you subscribe?
25. Do you vote in Tucson?
26. How do you think people in fixed homes feel about trailerites? (asked of trailerite)
27. How do you feel about trailer parks and their residents? (asked of fixed-home residents)
28. What do you like best about mobile-home living? (asked of trailerite)
29. What do you dislike most about mobile-home living? (asked of trailerite)
30. Why are you living in a trailer?
31. What do you think are the advantages of living in a fixed-home as compared to trailer living? (asked of both groups)
32. What do you think are the advantages of living in a trailer as compared to fixed-home living? (asked of both groups)
33. What do you like best about living in this neighborhood? (asked of fixed-home dweller)
34. What do you dislike most about living in this neighborhood? (asked of fixed-home dweller)
35. Why are you living in a fixed home?
36. Do you belong to an organization for community betterment?