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ABSTRACT: Observational and survey data were collected from a pre-World War I and a post-1970s neighborhood to assess the influence of push and pull forces away from front porch use. The findings indicate that the most important factors in reducing front porch use are design issues having to do with the small size of porches, the attractiveness of the backyard, and lifestyles that no longer support front porch use. Implications for design, including support of New Urbanist design principles, are discussed.

The front porch as a design element is receiving increased interest from planners and designers, especially New Urbanists (for examples, see Adler, 1995; Calthorpe, 1993; Christoforidas, 1996; Duany & Plater-Zyberk, 1991; Kunstler, 1996; “Neighborhoods reborn,” 1996). In times of perceived decline in sense of community, porches are one of many elements put forth to try to reverse this trend. However, little empirical work has documented the use of front porches or the reactions of residents to the front porches of their homes. In one such study, Brown, Burton, and Sweaney (1998) compare uses of the front porch from an earlier time period to the present to provide some evidence as to the diverse potential of front porches to provide a flexible behavior setting. Brown et al. claim that the use of front porches has declined and set up possible hypotheses about the causes of this decline, including what they call push forces and pull forces (p. 591). This study documents actual front porch usage with observational data from houses built pre-1920 and post-1970 and assesses the importance of push and pull forces in amount of porch usage with observational and survey data.
DECLINE IN FRONT PORCH USE

Historically, the front porch enjoyed a period of popularity around the turn of the previous century. In the late 1800s, porches became a “universally accepted feature of the American home” (Kahn & Meagher, 1990, p. 5). Ornamentation, size, and furniture (including wicker furniture, rocking chairs, and porch swings) all corresponded with the great amount of front porch use during this time period. Housing styles, particularly the Victorian style built during this time, routinely included front porches. The popularity and predominance of porches remained high until World War I (WWI), when housing styles changed and the front porch was gradually replaced by rear and side porches. Many of the popular housing styles built after WWI, including Tudor, Spanish, and colonial, did not have porches in front. Later in the century, even rear and side porches were replaced with back patios and decks or indoor play spaces such as the den or family room (Kahn & Meagher, 1990).

Actual porch use followed these design trends, and gradually, during the 1900s, front porch behavior dwindled (Brown et al., 1998; Kahn & Meagher, 1990). One might question whether it was simply physical determinism that led to the demise of front porch use or whether there were other factors that were influential. The following is a summary of evidence about factors leading to the decline of front porch use, which have been separated into push and pull forces, as named by Brown et al. (1998).

PUSH FORCES

Push forces are those characteristics of the porch or surrounding environment that make the porch undesirable or unlikely to be used. Some of these forces are the small size of the porch, the amount of traffic on the street, the amount of noise coming from the street, undesirable weather conditions, and too many insects.

The Automobile’s Effect on Front Porch Use

Americans’ love of the automobile changed the way in which we live, work, and play. The automobile affected the design of homes and streets and, hence, the porch as well. The car is seen as the culprit for several of the push factors influencing the decline of front porch use.

By the 1920s, cars were being seen as necessities rather than as recreational vehicles, and the ensuing exhaust fumes, noise, and dirt created by these cars on the street led to a front porch environment that was less than
idyllic and even unhealthy (Palen, 1995). As people stopped walking to work or for leisure and started using their cars for transportation, the pedestrian streetscape became deserted. According to Palen (1995), by the 1930s, more than half of commuters were driving to work. Replaced by the car, pedestrian life on the street eroded and rendered the front porch pastime of observing pedestrian behavior something from a bygone era. As cars became more common and traffic and noise increased, porch use continued to decline (Kahn & Meagher, 1990).

Another effect of the automobile was the increased predominance of garages on the streetscape and the ensuing reduction in front porch size. Originally the garage was a small detached building located at the end of a narrow driveway in the back of the house or alley. But as the car gained importance in our lives, the garage gained size and stature in the design of our homes (Rowe, 1991). From 1969 to 1990, the number of vehicles per household increased 105% and the National Association of Home Builders reports that by 1990, 72% of newly built, single-family detached houses had at least a two-car garage and 14% had a three-car garage (Langdon, 1994, p. 149). As the garage became more prominent, the front porch disappeared. The garage is now our most commonly used route to the street, and the porch (if there is one) does not even have direct access to the street anymore but is accessible only by a sidewalk or path from the driveway (Southworth & Owens, 1993). As Langdon (1994) reported, “Streets are nothing more than wall-to-wall garage doors, often with no signs of habitable life visible from the sidewalk. It is frequently difficult to find the entrance to the home” (p. 150). The size of the front porch in homes with large garages is then quite small. And as Kunstler (1996) stated, these porches are merely “cartoon porches” without any real functionality that are tacked onto homes for “curb appeal.” Hence, the garage has displaced the porch as our entrance to the streetscape and rendered the porch very small or banished it completely from modern home design.

The Outdoors’ Effect on Front Porch Use

Weather conditions such as too much sun or an uncomfortable temperature are also push forces against porch use. Porches that are narrow in design or that face the east or west may suffer from too much sun or heat during peak sun periods. Without awnings or other enclosures, or adequate depth, sun and heat on the porch are factors that make porch use less desirable. In addition, in more northern localities, front porches without temporary enclosures against the cold are less desirable when inclement weather is predominant (Kahn &
Meagher, 1990). Victorian porches of the late 1800s were often enclosed during the winter months by temporary glass panels. With the size of porches decreasing after the 1920s and the style of porches changing, it is more likely that porches will not be adequately protected from uncomfortable weather conditions.

Porch use may also be hindered by insects on the porch. Screened-in porches such as those currently popular in Florida are an answer to this problem. However, with the small size of porches and changed styles of houses, it is less likely that front porches will be screened in or have the ability to be temporarily screened in (Kahn & Meagher, 1990). In addition, in our more interior-focused lifestyles, dislike and fear of insects may well be greater now than in previous eras.

PULL FORCES

Pull forces are social and technological factors that take people away from the front porch. Some of these pull forces include more indoor lifestyles, busy lifestyles with jobs with long commutes, and homes that are focused on the backyard.

Indoor Lifestyles’ Effect on Front Porch Use

At the turn of the previous century, porches were seen as a way to cope with hot and humid conditions in the house. Being outdoors was a relief from the heat and the porch provided the space and the accoutrements needed (including furniture and later, screens to protect from insects) to enjoy the outdoors. However, with technological advancements after WWI, porches ceased to be a necessity. Americans continued to suburbanize and withdraw from the outdoors with the advent of air conditioning, television (and more recently the VCR), video games, and the Internet (Gumpert & Drucker, 1998; Kahn & Meagher, 1990; Mugerauer, 1993). The pull of the interior lifestyle is an environment that is completely controlled by the user. The power to set the temperature at 70°, light up the house, and watch people live their lives on television with the touch of a button changed the way in which Americans spent their leisure time. This “cocooning” of Americans led to the further demise of the front porch (Popcorn, 1991). One no longer needed to observe the neighbor next door because one could watch The Honeymooners on television and feel as though one knew them as neighbors (Jackson, 1985).

Video games and the Internet provide even more opportunities for cocooning. According to a recent report by the federal government, 22.2% of
Americans have Internet access from their homes, and this number is growing (National Telecommunications and Information Administration and Economic and Statistics Administration, 1999). How does and will this use of the Internet affect the amount of social interaction people have with their geographical neighbors? Brill (1989) suggests that the Internet (and chat rooms) provides a different type of social interaction that happens through channels of communication instead of in a physical space. Another recent study by the Gomez Advisors (Bonisteel, 2000) examined the effect of Internet use on life at home and work. The results showed that 25% of Internet users said that the Internet had decreased the amount of time they spend reading the newspaper, 46% said that it decreased the amount of time they watch television, and 10% said the Internet reduced the amount of time they spend with their families. These findings show that the Internet has and will continue to have a large impact on how Americans live their lives. These interior activities take away time that could be spent socializing or relaxing on the porch.

Also, the size of homes has increased, making the inside of the house more attractive than before. Homes designed with playrooms, family rooms, and dens make indoor play areas more attractive with controlled temperatures and light than the outdoor environment of the porch (Jackson, 1985; Rowe, 1991).

Busy Lifestyles’ Effect on Front Porch Use

In addition to the interior lifestyle, Americans also lead very busy lives. Our increasingly suburban lifestyle leads to longer commutes to work and other activities. As Brown et al. (1998) state, “The physical distance between the suburbs and necessities of life means that much time is spent commuting, working, or in shopping and leisure outside the neighborhood, and little time is spent at home cultivating neighborly ties” (p. 583). The average commute time to work in Chicago is approximately 38 minutes, and these minutes are not spent in the company of others on public transportation but rather driving alone in a car (Langdon, 1994). That means more than an hour per day driving, taking away from time at home.

Also, there is a larger percentage of women in the wage-earning workforce than previous eras (Kessler-Harris, 1982; U.S. Department of Commerce, 1997). With approximately 60% of married women in the workforce, many of whom have preschool children, this means less time that
women and children are spending at home and, hence, less time free to use the porch (Langdon, 1994).

Lastly, according to some researchers, the time spent at work has expanded. According to Schor (1991), the problem is “not only that more people are working, but that they are working more” (p. 29). She contends that Americans are working 163 hours more per year than the average American worker in 1969. Schor attributes this increase to both longer weekly schedules and more weeks of work. For some, cutbacks in the workforce cause those who are still employed to work longer hours. This, all in the face of the fact that the amount of hours doing household work has not changed significantly over this same period of time. With men and women working harder and longer, and then taking longer to get home from work, and then having to complete household chores, the amount of time left in the day to enjoy the front porch is reduced to practically none.

Use of the Backyard and Deck’s Effect on Front Porch Use

Housing styles have changed, and where the front porch was seen as a necessity before 1920, now the suburban home focuses itself on the backyard and patio or deck (Kahn & Meagher, 1990). The arrangement of the interior of the house with more informal rooms toward the back of the house seamlessly leads the residents to the less formal backyard for recreation (Rowe, 1991). Extensive backyards with children’s play equipment and decks or patios with furniture and grills make backyard spaces more attractive than the front porch. As we become more private-focused, the privacy and informality that the backyard provides is much more attractive than the more public and formal front porch (Jackson, 1985).

Another attraction of the backyard may be the privacy that it affords. Gumpert and Drucker (1998) state that there has been a consistent increase in the value of personal privacy since the 1970s. This concern for privacy is reflected in the design of houses to meet the desire of people to have privacy. Along with the desire for privacy is also increased concern with personal safety. Backyards provide a safe place for children to play, to sit without fear of intrusion, and a safe place to leave belongings. The front porch in its “publicness” cannot provide a high level of privacy or safety from the street.

This study attempts to assess how much influence these push and pull factors have on modern-day front porch use. To find houses with large front porches (to assess the effect of size of porch on use) a neighborhood built
before the 1920s was chosen as well as a newer neighborhood built after 1970. Comparisons between these communities as well as an assessment of the influence of these push and pull forces will be made.

### METHOD

#### SAMPLE NEIGHBORHOODS

Front porches on houses built before the 1920s tended to be larger than porches built after that time period. In an effort to understand the effect of size of porch on the dependent variables, two neighborhoods were chosen in a small Midwestern city. One neighborhood, called the older neighborhood, consists of homes built around the turn of the previous century (representing the pre–WWI era). This neighborhood is located close to the urban center. The second neighborhood, called the newer neighborhood, is in a more suburban location with houses built after 1970 (representing the suburban era). These neighborhoods were chosen because of their similarity in size, density, setback from the street, and median housing cost, while differing on average size of porch. The setback was 35 feet for the older neighborhood and 38 feet for the newer neighborhood. Porches in the older neighborhood ranged from 8 to 144 square feet with a mean of 49.3 square feet and in the newer neighborhood from 6 to 120 square feet with a mean of 32.2 square feet. As seen in Table 1, there was a significant difference in average porch size and the average amount of furniture on the porch between the older and newer neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Newer Neighborhood</th>
<th>Older Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of porches in neighborhood</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of porches observed for study</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average size of porch in square feet</td>
<td>32.2 (21.6)</td>
<td>49.3 (34.3)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of pieces of furniture on porch</td>
<td>0.7 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.2 (1.8)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of observations on porch per day</td>
<td>0.8 (0.1)</td>
<td>1.2 (1.2)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average self-reported hours spent on porch per week</td>
<td>2.8 (4.0)</td>
<td>6.2 (6.7)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Standard deviations are in parentheses. *t* test shows significant differences between neighborhoods at the following: *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

### TABLE 1

Sample Characteristics From Observation and Self-Report Data

---
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neighborhood samples. Observers recorded the total number of porches in each neighborhood and then by use of systematic random sampling (for example, selecting every third house with a porch) selected approximately 40% of all of the porches in each neighborhood to be included in the sample.

**OBSERVATIONAL DATA COLLECTION**

Observations of front porch activity were collected for a 1-week period during the month of July. July was chosen because we were interested in porch use when usage was presumed to be highest, and the weather in this Midwestern city tends to be fair during this month of the summer season. Observers recorded the number of actors, whether the actor was an adult or child, and type of activity on the front porches in each neighborhood. Each hour, in the 11 hours between 9:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., observers recorded whether anyone was using any of the 41 observed older neighborhood porches or the 60 observed newer neighborhood porches. The observational hours were chosen to maximize observation of front porch activity without compromising observer safety during the dusk and night hours. Average daily front porch use for the older neighborhood was 1.2 uses per porch per day, and 0.8 uses per porch per day for the newer neighborhood (see Table 1). Common observed uses included just standing or sitting and watching, reading, talking on the phone, and cleaning.

**SURVEY DATA COLLECTION**

A mail survey was conducted of the residents in the observational sample. The survey consisted of questions assessing the amount and type of use of the front porch, as well as the importance of listed push and pull factors in keeping residents from using their front porches more often. Types of front porch use and factors that keep residents from using their front porches were assessed with open-ended questions: “During this summer, what are some of the activities that you and your family do on the front porch?” and “What are some of the things that keep you and your family from using your front porch more often?” The amount of influence that push and pull factors had on keeping residents from using their front porch was assessed by respondents rating the listed push and pull factors’ effect on front porch usage using a scale ranging from 0 (did not affect porch use at all) to 5 (affected porch use a lot). The survey also assessed whether the house had air conditioning, with 84% of the older neighborhood and 90% of the newer neighborhood sample responding positively. Although the focus of this study was on design, the reader should
keep in mind that differences between the two neighborhoods could be due to a combination of design and social composition factors. The response rate was 61%.

RESULTS

FRONT PORCH USE

As seen in Table 1, in addition to the significant differences in average porch size, there were significant differences in the average amount of furniture on the porch, average daily observations on the porch, and average self-reported weekly porch use between the older and newer neighborhoods. As expected, the older neighborhood sample had significantly larger front porches, with significantly more furniture on them. In addition, both the observational and self-report data showed significantly more use of front porches in the older neighborhood versus the newer neighborhood. Average self-reported front porch use in hours per week was 6.2 for the older neighborhood and 2.8 for the newer neighborhood.

The most common front porch activities reported in an open-ended question included reading, sitting and talking with family, relaxing, visiting with friends or neighbors, watching kids or neighbors, just sitting, rocking or swinging, and eating or drinking. Significant differences in frequency of these reported activities between neighborhoods were found for visiting with friends or neighbors and eating or drinking, with the older neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Newer Neighborhood Reporting Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Older Neighborhood Reporting Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit and talk with family</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relax</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit with friends or neighbors*</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch kids/neighbors</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just sit/rock/swing</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat or drink*</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi-square statistic shows a significant difference between neighborhoods at $p < .05$. 
respondents reporting a significantly higher frequency of these activities than the newer neighborhood respondents. Reading, sitting and talking with family, and relaxing were frequently selected in both neighborhood samples (see Table 2). These listed activities show that, as a behavior setting, the front porch does provide an environment to engage in a variety of activities, both solitary and social, and that the older neighborhood residents engage in more of the social activities on the front porch than the newer neighborhood residents.

PUSH AND PULL FORCES

Table 3 lists the factors that respondents reported kept them from using their porch more often. In the newer neighborhood, three of the five most influential factors included the following pull forces: prefer using back deck or patio (1), prefer using backyard (2), or prefer to be in air conditioning (5).
The other two of the five most influential factors included the following push forces: too many bugs on the porch (3) and the porch is too small (4). In the older neighborhood, three of the five most influential factors were the following pull forces: don’t have enough time (1), prefer to be in air conditioning (3), and prefer using backyard (4). The other two of the five factors were the following push forces: too many bugs on the porch (2) and the porch is too small (5). The older and newer neighborhoods differed significantly on the importance of preference for using back deck or patio or backyard, not having any furniture on the porch, and having nothing to do on the porch. In all of these instances the newer neighborhood sample rated these factors as significantly more important in keeping them from using their porch than the older neighborhood sample.

Correlations were run to determine whether these pull and push forces as well as the observed push forces of porch size and amount of furniture on porch were significantly related to porch use. As seen in Table 4, two pull forces, preference for using back deck/patio and preference for using backyard, showed significant negative relationships to porch use. Several push forces—too noisy on porch, nothing to do on porch, no furniture on porch, observed porch size, and observed amount of furniture—were also significantly related to porch use. Noise, nothing to do on porch, and no furniture on porch were negatively related to porch use, and porch size and amount of furniture on porch were positively related to porch use. Hence, porch use was significantly lower when these pull and push forces were stronger. Other pull and push forces were not significantly related to porch use in these neighborhood samples.

### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficients Describing Significant Relationships Between Reported Porch Use With Factors That Keep Respondents From Using Their Porches (n = 62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported Porch Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pull forces</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer using back deck/patio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer using backyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Push forces</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too noisy on porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing to do on porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No furniture on porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch size (observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pieces of furniture on porch (observed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01.
DISCUSSION

The results of this study support the notion that there are push and pull forces that negatively affect front porch use in modern-day America. Changes in housing styles have produced houses in the past 30 years that have much smaller porches than pre-WWI houses, and the size of the porch is significantly related to front porch use. These results suggest that the most important factors in reducing front porch use are the reduction in the size of porches, the attractiveness of the backyard in home design, and lifestyles that no longer support front porch use.

As Rowe (1991) suggests, the design of homes to focus on the informal rooms in the house and the backyard or patio/deck has pulled Americans away from the front porch and street. The findings from this study suggest that residents are indeed more taken with the private world of the backyard than the front porch. However, this trend was significantly different between the older and newer neighborhoods, suggesting that when the house offers a smaller front porch and a nicer backyard with a patio or deck, then residents will migrate to the back of the house. Residents are naturally attracted to the place that meets their needs. If the porch is too small to accommodate activity and too small to house furniture, then residents are forced to go to the backyard to enjoy the outdoors where the patio is large enough to house furniture and the yard is large enough to house play equipment.

Our busy lifestyles also contribute to the reduction of front porch use. Not having enough time was an important pull force away from front porch use, suggesting that other activities take away the time that might be spent using the front porch. With it being more likely that both parents are working and commuting, there are only rare hours spent at home, and when the hours are spent at home they may not be relaxing. With the lawn to be cut, house to be cleaned, and laundry to be done, there is precious little time to sit on the porch and chat with the neighbors (Langdon, 1994).

Also, the push force of having nothing to do on the porch is an interesting contributor of our busy lifestyles to lack of front porch use. Americans have a large number of entertainment opportunities available. With hours spent watching television and playing video games and going to the hundreds of social activities outside of our homes, Americans may not appreciate the inactivity of the front porch. As Jackson (1985) states, “With a car at the curb, youngsters no longer had to sit at home and wait for things to happen; cars could quickly whisk them off to the action” (p. 280). Our busy lifestyles are often filled with stimulation from passive sources, such as the television or computer, or active sources, such as destinations outside the home. These
competing activities leave little reason to use the porch as entertainment (Langdon, 1994). Hence, the porch is seen as boring rather than an exciting social environment.

Partial support for the hypothesis that indoor lifestyles affect porch use was found. In both neighborhoods, a preference for being in air conditioning was an important pull force away from front porch use. In addition, reporting too many bugs on the porch was the most important push force in reducing front porch use in both neighborhoods. These findings show that residents like the amenity of air conditioning and are repulsed by the amount of insects on the porch. It is interesting to note that residents did not report that a preference for staying indoors, watching television, or using the computer were not important pull forces away from front porch use in either neighborhood. In addition, not liking the outdoors and the porch being too hot or cold or too sunny were not important push forces away from porch use, regardless of porch size. It would seem, then, that the indoor lifestyle in general is not crucial in reducing front porch use. Because these were self-report data requiring recollection, it would be useful to confirm these findings in future research that uses time diaries or other methods to reduce possible memory biases in time-use research.

If New Urbanists are correct in their assertion that front porch use will increase the social cohesion of neighborhoods (Calthorpe, 1993) or sense of community of a neighborhood (Plas & Lewis, 1996), this study provides evidence that there are measures that can be taken to increase the actual use of porches. First, this study supports the New Urbanists’ claim that building large front porches may indeed encourage more front porch use. Having a porch that can accommodate interesting activity and furniture for sitting (and eating) would render it more likely to be used. Avoiding “cartoon porches,” which are merely symbolic of the porch environment, would provide enough space in which to make the porch viable (Kunstler, 1996). Other considerations may be constructing permanent seating on porches, such as swings or benches, as well as permanent game opportunities such as hopscotch boards embedded in the cement, or chess tables. Residents claimed that not having enough furniture and having nothing to do on the porch negatively affected their porch use. Therefore, if porches are built with these accommodations in mind, then these items could increase porch use.

Another New Urbanist principle—putting the garage in back of the house along back alleys (Calthorpe, 1993)—may also increase front porch use, according to these findings. Houses built with unattractive porches and very attractive backyards pull residents away from the street. Reversing this trend would provide residents with an attractive option in the front of the house and a less desirable option in the back of the house, therefore increasing the
likelihood that they would choose the front porch. In the present sample, neither traffic nor noise were great deterrents to front porch use overall; the two push factors are often cited by New Urbanists as reasons for decreasing porch use. Even though these were relatively quiet neighborhoods, those residents who do report noisy porches also use them less, confirming the general threat that noise can pose for porch use. New Urbanist designs with back alleys can take a lot of the noise of traffic behind the house, making the street-front less noisy and more attractive for residents to use.

However, there are some factors that may not be so easily changed, having to do with larger societal issues that affect porch use. There is no “quick fix” to reducing the busy lifestyles or indoor lifestyles that we live. However, providing residents with a front porch environment that is attractive may give them the option when their busy lives permit.

In conclusion, this study supports several notions put forth by New Urbanists having to do with the design of homes and especially the front porch. Furthermore, the present study has extended prior research (Brown et al., 1998) by using observational data to demonstrate objective differences in porch size, furniture, and evidence of use between New Urbanist and more suburban designs. The results suggest that giving residents attractive and usable front porch options, instead of just “symbolic” porches, provides an environment that would attract residents to the front of the house.

NOTES

1. Note that there is some controversy about the expansion of amount of work hours for Americans. See Robinson and Godbey (1997) for data using personal time diaries and reporting of actual hours worked, which is in opposition to the views stated here.

2. During the 7-day period, the temperature ranged from 65° to 81° F with an average temperature of 73°. The humidity was high on 2 of the 7 days, with rain also occurring on 2 of the 7 days.
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