



1st QMHOA HOME-OWNER SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT

QUEENSLAND

MANUFACTURED HOME OWNERS
ASSOCIATION INC.

2026

www.qmhoa.org.au





QMHOA

QUEENSLAND MANUFACTURED HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION INC.

What Home Owners Told Us

QMHOA 2026 Home Owner Satisfaction Survey Report

Contents

Contents	1
1. Executive summary	2
2. About the survey	2
3. Sector context	3
4. Who responded	3
5. Home owner satisfaction – whole of industry findings	4
1) <i>Living in the community</i>	4
2) <i>Park owner interaction and management</i>	4
3) <i>Park manager, onsite manager and staff</i>	5
4) <i>Maintenance and services</i>	5
5) <i>Consultation and transparency</i>	5
6. Likelihood to recommend - NPS-style result	6
7. Home owner satisfaction – park owner group/brand findings	6
8. Next steps	8
9. Method, limitations and privacy	8
10. Conclusion	8
Annexure A: Survey Questions	9
Annexure B: Source Notes	11
Contact QMHOA	11

1. Executive summary

QMHOA's 2026 Home Owner Satisfaction Survey received 1,300 responses from manufactured home owners in Queensland. The survey is designed to provide a substantial body of evidence about what respondents' value most in manufactured home residential parks and where they believe improvement is needed. The purpose of this report is to provide details of the findings of the survey without attempting to make any interpretation of/or opinion on their implications.

Respondents to the survey were asked to answer 18 questions aimed at establishing the level of their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with 5 aspects of life in their park and the way they are managed. They were also asked to indicate how willing they would be to recommend their park to others. The clearest findings are that many home owners value the community lifestyle and social environment of park living. Respondents were most positive about the friendliness of residents, communal activities and overall satisfaction with living in their community. At the same time, respondents reported lower satisfaction with budget transparency, consultation, timeliness of repairs, communication from park owners and some maintenance-related matters.

Responses to the survey also show that home owner satisfaction varies significantly between parks owned by different owner group brands, with some park owner groups achieving much higher levels of satisfaction than others.

QMHOA will use the findings as part of an evidence-led advocacy and engagement program. This includes informing home owners, briefing government and other stakeholders, engaging constructively where possible with park owners and industry participants, and advocating for practical improvements that support fairness, transparency and confidence across the sector.

Key finding	Survey result
Strongest positive result	86.2% satisfied or very satisfied with the friendliness of residents
Overall community satisfaction	77.4% satisfied or very satisfied with living in their community
Weakest result	14.2% satisfied or very satisfied with budget transparency / how site fees are used
Overall recommendation result	Net Promoter Score (NPS)-style score of -10.3

2. About the survey

QMHOA conducted a survey to better understand the experiences of home owners living in manufactured home residential parks in Queensland. It was carried out over 3 weeks in April and May of 2026. The survey asked about satisfaction with community life, park owner communication and management, onsite management, maintenance, services, consultation, transparency and likelihood to recommend living in the community.

The survey was voluntary. The results should not be treated as a statistically random sample of all manufactured home owners in Queensland. They are best understood as a large body of respondent feedback that helps identify broad patterns, recurring concerns and advocacy priorities.

Throughout this report, the word "respondents" means the people who completed the survey. The results reflect their reported experiences and perceptions.

3. Sector context

The Queensland Government's public register of residential parks with manufactured homes listed 220 registered residential parks with manufactured homes at 30 April 2026. These parks contained 34,907 manufactured home sites.

QMHOA received 1,300 survey responses. This is equivalent to approximately 3.7% of the number of manufactured home sites listed in the government register.

This should not be described as a formal response rate because survey responses cannot be directly equated with registered sites. Some sites may be vacant, some homes may have more than one home owner, and not every home owner necessarily had the same opportunity to participate.

Sector measure	Number
Registered residential parks with manufactured homes	220
Manufactured home sites	34,907
Survey responses	1,300
Survey responses as proportion of registered sites	approximately 3.7%
Purpose-built parks listed in register	142
Mixed-use parks listed in register	78
Standardised brand/operator groups represented in survey responses	28
Larger survey response groups using the 25-response internal threshold	10
Smaller survey response groups below the internal threshold	18
Identifiable standardised parks represented in survey responses	103
Unidentified specific-park categories	6
Responses included in brand/operator analysis where exact park remains unidentified	18

What the table shows: This table places the survey in the context of the Queensland Government register and the cleaned survey dataset. It shows the number of responses, the number of standardised brand/operator groups represented, and the number of identifiable standardised parks represented in the survey. These figures describe survey coverage only; they are not a formal response rate or a claim about how many parks each operator has in Queensland.

4. Who responded

The survey strongly reflects the experiences of older manufactured home owners. More than three-quarters of respondents were aged 70 years or older.

Age range	Count	Percentage
Under 50	1	0.1%
50-59 years	31	2.4%
60-69 years	265	20.4%
70-79 years	697	53.6%
80+ years	291	22.4%
No age provided	15	1.2%

Respondents included both newer and longer-term residents.

Years lived in park	Count	Percentage
Under 1 year	140	10.8%
1-3 years	351	27.0%
3-5 years	355	27.3%
6-10 years	254	19.5%
Over 10 years	200	15.4%

5. Home owner satisfaction – whole of industry findings

The survey asked respondents to rate 18 satisfaction areas grouped under five broad themes of life in a manufactured home residential park. The whole-of-industry results are set out below.

1) Living in the community

Area	Satisfied / very satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	Average /5
Overall satisfaction with living in the community	77.4%	11.6%	11.0%	3.92
General appearance of the community	60.5%	15.3%	24.2%	3.50
Communal activities	76.9%	14.9%	8.2%	4.00
Friendliness of residents	86.2%	9.5%	4.2%	4.20
Friendliness of staff	64.3%	20.5%	15.2%	3.68
Safety and security	60.2%	17.5%	22.3%	3.51

Note: In calculating average scores, a response of very satisfied was assigned a score of 5; satisfied a score of 4; neutral a score of 3; dissatisfied a score of 2; and very dissatisfied a score of 1. A midpoint average score is 3 out of 5.

This is the theme area that respondents were most satisfied with. They were especially positive about resident friendliness, communal activities and overall satisfaction with community life. These findings indicate that many home owners value the residential park lifestyle itself. The average score for all the questions in this theme is comfortably above the midpoint score of 3 out of 5.

2) Park owner interaction and management

Area	Satisfied / very satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	Avg / 5
Park owner / how park is run	39.0%	20.9%	40.1%	2.95
Communication from park owners	40.6%	23.0%	36.4%	3.01

Less than half of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with park-owner communication or how the park is being run. With approximately the same percentage of them being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, satisfied or very satisfied in response to both questions on this theme.

3) Park manager, onsite manager and staff

Area	Satisfied / very satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	Avg / 5
Friendliness of staff	64.3%	20.5%	15.2%	3.68
Park manager/staff performance	53.5%	19.2%	27.4%	3.36
Clear/consistent manager/staff communication	52.6%	22.2%	25.2%	3.36
Manager/staff response to concerns	50.6%	21.3%	28.1%	3.30
Support for older/vulnerable residents	34.2%	40.0%	25.8%	3.09

Respondents were more positive about staff friendliness than about performance, communication or responsiveness.

4) Maintenance and services

Area	Satisfied / very satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	Avg / 5
Common areas	57.2%	18.8%	24.0%	3.41
Handling safety issues / health risks	50.1%	24.3%	25.6%	3.29
Streets and street lighting	50.1%	16.2%	33.8%	3.16
Grounds, gardens and lawns	46.4%	17.2%	36.4%	3.11
Timeliness of repairs	33.0%	25.0%	42.0%	2.81

The maintenance and services results are mixed to weak. Timeliness of repairs is the most serious concern within this theme, with 42.0% of respondents dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

5) Consultation and transparency

Area	Satisfied / very satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	Avg / 5
Consultation with home owners	28.9%	27.6%	43.5%	2.75
Budget transparency / site fee use	14.2%	28.2%	57.7%	2.30

Consultation and transparency is the weakest theme with both questions in this theme achieving an average score of well less than the midpoint score of 3 out of 5. Budget transparency is the question in the whole survey that achieved the lowest average score out of 5.

Whole of industry findings summary –

Aggregated results for each of the 5 themes or aspects of life in a park

Theme	Average /5	Satisfied / very satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied
Living in the community	3.83	72.2%	13.8%	14.0%
Park manager, onsite manager and staff	3.36	51.0%	24.6%	24.3%
Maintenance and services	3.16	47.3%	20.3%	32.4%
Park owner interaction and management	2.98	39.8%	22.0%	38.2%
Consultation and transparency	2.53	21.5%	27.9%	50.6%

6. Likelihood to recommend - NPS-style result

As well as measuring the levels of home owner satisfaction with different aspects of their park, the results of which are shown above, the survey sought to get an NPS- style measure of their satisfaction.

Net Promoter Score (NPS) is a simple but widely used metric for measuring **customer loyalty and satisfaction**

Customers are asked one key question, “How likely are you to recommend our product/service to others?”

They respond on a **0–10 scale**. The scores given are interpreted as falling into 3 groups

- **Potential Promoters (9–10):** Loyal enthusiasts who will recommend you
- **Passives or Neutrals (7–8):** Satisfied but not enthusiastic
- **Potential Detractors (0–6):** Unhappy customers who may discourage others

The NPS (Net Promoter Score) is calculated by subtracting the % of respondents who are detractors from the % who are promoters. A score above zero with more promoters than detractors is generally regarded as good. A score below zero is often interpreted as showing that there could be a danger of reputational risk to the enterprise concerned.

The table below shows the Whole of Industry NPS-Style result based on the 1,300 responses to the survey. *(It should be noted that in this survey the scale used was 1-10 rather than 0-10, the scale usually used in measurement of NPS. For this reason, it is referred to as an NPS-Style result rather than an NPS one.)*

Whole of industry NPS-style result

Recommendation group	Score range	Count	Percentage
Strong recommendation	9–10	356	27.4%
Moderate recommendation	7–8	454	34.9%
Low recommendation	1–6	490	37.7%

The overall NPS-style score was -10.3. The average recommendation score was 6.82 out of 10. The median was 8 out of 10. In simple terms, more respondents gave lower recommendation scores than strong recommendation scores.

7. Home owner satisfaction – park owner group/brand findings

In the tables below the overall results for the ‘5 Theme Areas’ and the ‘Likelihood to Recommend /NPS Style question’ for the main park owner group brands from which responses were received are aggregated.

Responses were received from residents in parks owned by 28 different group brands. The table only shows the aggregated results for the 10 park owner groups (brands), for which 29 or more responses were received. Fewer than 29 responses were deemed problematic for operator-group reporting.

The names of the park owner group brands have been withheld with a view to focusing upon measurement of the extent to which levels of home owner satisfaction are consistent across the whole industry.

Park owner group brand aggregate theme scores (Shown as average scores out of 5)

Operator group code	Responses	Living in community avg /5	Owner interaction & management avg /5	Manager/staff avg /5	Maintenance & services avg /5	Consultation & transparency avg /5
Operator Group 12	261	3.77	2.68	2.98	2.86	2.21
Operator Group 21	215	3.43	2.45	2.99	2.53	2.08
Operator Group 24	202	3.84	2.77	3.45	3.17	2.56
Operator Group 10	153	4.12	3.73	3.97	3.81	3.04
Operator Group 22	115	4.17	3.34	3.83	3.75	2.96
Operator Group 01	114	4.02	3.32	3.53	3.26	2.63
Operator Group 26	63	4.15	3.71	3.67	3.83	3.21
Operator Group 11	36	3.40	2.00	2.42	2.24	1.76
Operator Group 07	31	4.20	4.15	4.17	3.77	3.55
Operator Group 23	29	3.62	3.03	3.31	3.20	2.47

Four of the operator groups achieve average scores above the midpoint (3 out of 5) in all 5 themes. Three of them score above the midpoint score in only the Living in the Community theme.

Park owner group brand recommendation scores

Operator group code	Responses	Avg recommendation /10	NPS-style score	Strong recommendation Potential promoters	Moderate recommendation % Neutral	Low recommendation Potential detractors
Operator Group 12	261	6.38	-27.2	17.2%	38.3%	44.4%
Operator Group 21	215	6.02	-38.6	12.6%	36.3%	51.2%
Operator Group 24	202	6.75	-12.4	28.2%	31.2%	40.6%
Operator Group 10	153	7.73	18.3	42.5%	33.3%	24.2%
Operator Group 22	115	7.77	24.3	42.6%	39.1%	18.3%
Operator Group 01	114	7.64	16.7	37.7%	41.2%	21.1%
Operator Group 26	63	7.40	20.6	44.4%	31.7%	23.8%
Operator Group 11	36	4.19	-77.8	2.8%	16.7%	80.6%
Operator Group 07	31	8.23	35.5	51.6%	32.3%	16.1%
Operator Group 23	29	6.72	-24.1	17.2%	41.4%	41.4%

Half of the park owner group brands shown in the table achieved a positive NPS-style score (more potential promoters than potential detractors), with half receiving a negative one (more potential detractors than potential promoters).

When looking at the average recommendation in this table it must be remembered that the range offered in the survey was from 1 to 10, so the mathematical midpoint is 5.5, and 6 is the first whole-number score above the midpoint. The average rating received by all but one of the park owner group brands was above the midpoint.

8. Next steps

QMHOA proposes to use the survey findings through a staged approach, with evidence supporting sustained advocacy via stakeholder specific engagement after the initial public release.

Stage	Proposed action
1. Member and home owner communication	Share survey findings and explain what the survey can and cannot show.
2. Stakeholder briefing	Prepare concise briefing materials for government, regulators, advisers and aligned organisations.
3. Constructive engagement	Use survey findings to support discussions with park owners and industry stakeholders about practical improvements.
4. Reform platform	Translate the main themes into specific policy, regulatory and operational reform priorities.
5. Evidence development	Collect additional examples, case studies and follow-up feedback where appropriate, while protecting privacy.
6. Ongoing review	Track responses, monitor progress and update advocacy priorities over time.

The aim is to move from evidence collection to practical influence: improving understanding, strengthening the home owner voice, and supporting fairer and more transparent practice across the manufactured home residential park sector.

9. Method, limitations and privacy

The survey was voluntary and should not be treated as a statistically random sample of all manufactured home owners in Queensland. It reflects the experiences and perceptions of people who chose to respond.

The results are useful for identifying broad themes, recurring concerns and advocacy priorities. They should not be read as a definitive measure of every park or every operator.

Original survey response fields have been preserved as an audit trail. Brand/operator comparison tables (Section 6) are approved and included for use with subsequent stakeholder specific engagement.

For the likelihood-to-recommend question, scores of 9-10 are described as strong recommendation, 7-8 as moderate recommendation, and 1-6 as low recommendation. The report refers to the overall figure as an NPS-style score because the survey used a 1-10 scale rather than the formal 0-10 Net Promoter Score scale.

10. Conclusion

The release of this report is intended to be the first step in a planned advocacy and engagement program that is evidence-led, constructive and focused on practical improvement.

QMHOA believes there is much to learn from the findings of this survey. The aim is to use the evidence constructively, to support fairer and more transparent practice, and to protect the positive community life that many manufactured home owners value.

Annexure A: Survey Questions

This annexure lists the survey questions/fields used for the QMHOA 2026 Home Owner Satisfaction Survey. It is provided so readers can see the questions behind the findings reported in the survey documents.

Note on presentation: In the source dataset, QMHOA membership was recorded as two separate yes/no fields. For public readability, it is shown below as a single membership status question. The satisfaction questions were analysed using a five-point satisfaction scale. (Very satisfied; Satisfied; Neutral; Dissatisfied; Very dissatisfied.)

Question type		Response format used in analysis
Membership		Yes / No
Park and brand/operator details		Free-text response, later standardised for analysis
Respondent profile		Categorical response
Satisfaction questions		Very satisfied / Satisfied / Neutral / Dissatisfied / Very dissatisfied
Likelihood to recommend		1 to 10 rating, where 1 is extremely unlikely and 10 is extremely likely
No.	Survey question / field	Notes
Demographic & background information		
1	QMHOA membership status	Recorded in the source data as "QMHOA Member Yes" and "QMHOA Member No".
2	What is your Park Name?	
3	What is your Park Owner 'Brand' or 'Group' Name? If you know it.	
4	How many years have you lived in your park?	
5	Your Age Range? (optional)	
Living in the community		
6	Overall, how satisfied are you with living in your community?	Satisfaction question
7	How satisfied are you with the general appearance of your community?	Satisfaction question
8	How satisfied are you with the communal activities in your community?	Satisfaction question
9	How satisfied are you with the friendliness of the residents in your community?	Satisfaction question
10	How satisfied are you with the friendliness of the park manager, onsite manager and staff?	Satisfaction question
Park owner interaction and management		
15	How satisfied are you with the communication from your park owner?	Satisfaction question

16	How satisfied are you with the way your park owner manages or runs your community?	Satisfaction question
Park manager, onsite manager and staff		
19	How satisfied are you with how complaints or issues are handled?	Satisfaction question
20	How satisfied are you with the sense of safety and security in your community?	Satisfaction question
21	How satisfied are you with access to services and facilities?	Satisfaction question
Maintenance and Services		
11	How satisfied are you with the general maintenance of your community?	Satisfaction question
12	How satisfied are you with the cleanliness of shared facilities in your community?	Satisfaction question
13	How satisfied are you with the quality of roads, paths and common areas in your community?	Satisfaction question
14	How satisfied are you with the timeliness of repairs and maintenance in your community?	Satisfaction question
23	How satisfied are you with the overall standard of management and services?	Satisfaction question
22	How satisfied are you with value for money in your community?	Satisfaction question
Consultation and transparency		
17	How satisfied are you with consultation with home owners in your community?	Satisfaction question
18	How satisfied are you with the transparency of budget information or how site fees are used?	Satisfaction question
Likelihood to recommend		
24	How likely are you to recommend living in your community to a friend or family member?	1 to 10 recommendation rating
Miscellaneous		
25	Additional comments or feedback	Free-text response, not published in full
26	Contact details if provided	Not used in public reporting

Annexure B: Source Notes

- The QMHOA 2026 Home Owner Satisfaction Survey was carried out over 3 weeks in April and May of 2026.
- QMHOA 2026 Survey, original deidentified survey response file, May 2026.
- Queensland Government Open Data Portal, Residential Parks with Manufactured Homes Registered with the Department of Housing and Public Works, public register data on 30 April 2026.
- Working analysis files prepared for QMHOA using standardised scoring and de-identified whole-of-industry reporting.
- QMHOA internal strategic engagement planning with informed approval and release of survey finding against a measured rollout approach.

Contact QMHOA

Roger Marshall M.Ed. Ph.D. | QMHOA President

Phone 0402 435 993 | president@qmhoa.org.au

Sue Gregor | QMHOA Secretary

Phone 0468 458 625 | secretary@qmhoa.org.au

Queensland Manufactured Home Owners Association Inc.

ABN 23 538 396 279 | PO Box 932 BOOVAL FAIR, QLD 4304

