

Technical Report #1

August 1981

# HOUSING SATISFACTION OF ELDERLY RESIDENTS OF GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED HOUSING IN DULUTH - A SUMMARY OF DATA

by Barbara A. Flannery

Funded by the  
Center for Urban & Regional Affairs  
and the  
University of Minnesota Graduate School



CURA has supported the work of the author(s) of this report but has not reviewed it for final publication. Its content is solely the responsibility of the author(s) and is not necessarily endorsed by CURA.

Department of Home Economics  
Lake Superior Basin Studies Center

University of Minnesota, Duluth

HOUSING SATISFACTION OF ELDERLY RESIDENTS OF  
GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED HOUSING IN DULUTH --A

SUMMARY OF DATA

by Barbara A. Flannery  
Instructor, Housing and Home Furnishings  
Department of Home Economics  
University of Minnesota, Duluth

with support from  
University of Minnesota Graduate School  
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs  
Lake Superior Basin Studies Center

August 1981

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities and employment without regard to race, creed, color, sex, national origin or handicap.

The content of this report is the responsibility of the author and is not necessarily endorsed by the University of Minnesota Graduate School, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, or Lake Superior Basin Studies Center.

## PREFACE

This report is a descriptive summary of data collected as part of a research project entitled "Housing, Neighborhood and Community Satisfaction of Elderly Residents of Government Subsidized Housing."

This project was funded primarily by two grants from the University of Minnesota Graduate School and a grant from the University of Minnesota Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. Support was also given by the Lake Superior Basin Studies Center and the College of Education, Dean's Office, University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Special thanks are extended to Mary Larsen and Maureen Jude, graduate students in the School of Social Development, University of Minnesota, Duluth, who had major responsibilities for data collection, coding and keypunching for this project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	i
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose . . . . .	1
Characteristics of the study area . . . . .	1
PROCEDURES . . . . .	2
The sample . . . . .	2
Data collection . . . . .	3
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	5
Demographic information . . . . .	5
Age of the respondent	
Education of the respondent	
Household income per month	
Length of time the respondent has lived in apartment	
Marital status--has the respondent ever been married	
Number of bedrooms in the apartment	
Number of people in apartment	
Sex of respondent	
Type of previous home	
Primary reason for moving . . . . .	.10
Satisfaction with apartment design . . . . .	.11
Overall satisfaction with apartment design	
Satisfaction with apartment design--specific design features	

Satisfaction with common areas in the building . . . . .	12
Overall satisfaction with common areas in the building	
Satisfaction with common areas in the building--specific indicators	
Perception of friendliness of neighbors on floor	
Perception of friendliness of neighbors in building	
Satisfaction with neighborhood . . . . .	16
Does respondent like neighborhood	
Overall satisfaction with neighborhood	
Satisfaction with neighborhood--specific indicators	
Perception of friendliness of neighbors in neighborhood	
General quality of life indicators . . . . .	19
Satisfaction with overall quality of life	
Perception of overall health	
Amount of worry and loneliness	
Does respondent have friends or family in the community to turn to	
Personality indicators (from Buss & Plomin Temperament Scale). . . . .	22
Personality characteristics--emotionality	
Emotion--total	
Personality characteristics--sociability	
Sociability--total	
Personality characteristics--activity	
Activity--total	
Knowledge and use of neighborhood and community activities and services .	26
Amount of participation in activities in building	

Attitudes about number of scheduled activities in building	
Use of area community centers	
Total number of community centers used	
Volunteer agencies--heard of	
Total number of volunteer agencies--heard of	
Volunteer agencies--used	
Total number of volunteer agencies--used	
Community resources--heard of	
Total number of community resources--heard of	
Community resources--used	
Total number of community resources--used	
Other comments . . . . .	64
REFERENCES . . . . .	38
APPENDICES	
A. Housing Satisfaction Questionnaire . . . . .	40
B. Reasons for dissatisfaction with size of apartment . . . . .	52
C. Reasons why apartment does not feel like home . . . . .	54
D. Reasons for dissatisfaction with the neighborhood . . . . .	56
E. Activities available in housing units . . . . .	58
F. Volunteer agencies used by respondents . . . . .	60
G. Other comments . . . . .	63

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Characteristics of the four housing units in the study . . . . .	3
2	Age of respondent . . . . .	5
3	Education of respondent . . . . .	6
4	Household income per month . . . . .	6
5	Length of time respondent lived in apartment . . . . .	7
6	Marital status--has respondent ever been married . . . . .	7
7	Number of bedrooms in apartment . . . . .	7
8	Number of people in apartment . . . . .	8
9	Sex of respondent . . . . .	9
10	Type of previous home . . . . .	10
11	Primary reason for moving . . . . .	10
12	Overall satisfaction with apartment design . . . . .	11
13	Satisfaction with apartment design--specific design features . . . . .	13
14	Overall satisfaction with common areas in the building . . . . .	14
15	Satisfaction with common areas in the building--specific indicators . . . . .	15
16	Perception of friendliness of neighbors on floor . . . . .	14
17	Perception of friendliness of neighbors in building . . . . .	16
18	Does respondent like the neighborhood . . . . .	17
19	Overall satisfaction with neighborhood . . . . .	17
20	Satisfaction with neighborhood--specific indicators . . . . .	18
21	Perception of friendliness of neighbors in neighborhood . . . . .	19
22	Satisfaction with overall quality of life . . . . .	20

23	Perception of overall health . . . . .	20
24	Amount of worry and loneliness . . . . .	21
25	Does respondent have friends or family in the community to turn to . . . . .	22
26	Personality characteristics--emotionality . . . . .	23
27	Emotionality--total . . . . .	24
28	Personality characteristics--sociability . . . . .	25
29	Sociability--total . . . . .	24
30	Personality characteristics--activity . . . . .	27
31	Activity--total . . . . .	26
32	Amount of participation in activities in the building . . . . .	28
33	Attitudes about number of scheduled activities in the building . . . . .	28
34	Use of area community centers . . . . .	29
35	Total number of community centers used . . . . .	29
36	Volunteer agencies--heard of . . . . .	30
37	Total number of volunteer agencies--heard of . . . . .	30
38	Volunteer agencies--used . . . . .	31
39	Total number of volunteer agencies--used . . . . .	31
40	Community resources--heard of . . . . .	32-33
41	Total number of community resources--heard of . . . . .	34
42	Community resources--used . . . . .	35-36
43	Total number of community resources--used . . . . .	37

## INTRODUCTION

### Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the results of a study of resident housing satisfaction in four government subsidized housing units for the elderly in the Duluth, Minnesota area. It is hoped that the information presented in this report will be useful to local agencies and organizations in planning for the needs of the area's elderly population. It is important to note that the statistics discussed in this report are descriptive in nature, and should be viewed primarily as a way to summarize the data from this sample. For a discussion of the theoretical background for the study and results of a multiple regression analysis and other statistical techniques, refer to Flannery (May, 1981), cited in the reference section of this report.

The results discussed in this report summarize the data collected from residents of the four government subsidized housing units in the sample. For a breakdown of data by each of the four units (Gateway Tower, Grandview Manor, Tri-Towers, and Woodland Garden), refer to Flannery (August, 1981), cited in the reference section of this report.

### Characteristics of the study area

Housing the elderly population is a significant problem both at the national level and in the sampling area of this study. As the proportion of the population over 65 years of age increases, demand for appropriate housing will also increase. Therefore, collecting of information related to housing for the elderly can have significant implications for the environmental and social well-being of the elderly population.

In the sampling area of Duluth, Minnesota, the significance of the problems related to housing the elderly population is very apparent. Estimates of population increase which will occur between 1970 and 2000 indicate that St. Louis County ( in which Duluth is located) will experience an 11 to 30 percent increase in the elderly

population (Minnesota State Planning Agency, February 1981). This makes planning for the future housing needs of an increased number of elderly critical.

In addition, the following four characteristics of current Duluth elderly population and housing stock (City of Duluth, 1980) illustrate the significance of the problem in the study area.

First, senior citizens over 60 years of age account for over 20 percent of the population of Duluth. This is double the 1970 Census national figures of ten percent.

Second, senior citizens in Duluth are likely to be low-income (over one-half are below the HUD defined ceiling for housing assistance). Consequently, many people are eligible for subsidized elderly housing. The Duluth Housing and Redevelopment Authority waiting list for such housing is generally over 1,000 persons.

Third, senior citizens are likely to have a high rent burden for housing. A high rent burden is defined as paying over 25 percent of income for housing.

Fourth, much of Duluth's housing stock is old. 72 percent of the housing units are between 30 and 70 years of age, with most units being 50 years old or older. In addition, 37 percent of the housing stock is considered to be substandard. Consequently, maintenance responsibilities and costs, and energy costs are often difficult burdens to overcome, particularly for senior citizens on fixed incomes. (City of Duluth, 1980)

## PROCEDURES

### The sample

The data for this report were obtained from 183 residents of four government subsidized senior citizen housing units in Duluth, Minnesota. The four units which were selected vary by number of apartments and location. In addition, two of the units are classified as public low-income (administered by the Housing and Redevelopment Authority), and two as limited profit low and moderate income housing. A summary of the characteristics of the four buildings is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Characteristics of the Four Housing Units in the Study

	Public or Limited Profit	Location	Number of Apartments
Gateway Tower	Limited profit	Central Hillside	150
Grandview Manor	Public	Central Hillside	60
Tri-Towers	Public	Central Hillside	290
Woodland Garden	Limited profit	Woodland/ Hunters Park	60

Respondents for the study were selected using a systematic sampling technique. Approximately 60 respondents were selected for inclusion in the sample from each of the four sampling units. The entire population of the two smaller apartment buildings (Grandview Manor and Woodland Garden) were included in the sample. Respondents from Tri-Towers and Gateway Tower were selected using a simple random sampling technique. The final sample included 227 potential respondents.

Out of the original sample of 227 respondents, 183 (81 percent) interviews were completed. An additional 22 (9.5 percent) of the potential respondents were unable to complete the questionnaire, due to death, illness, or not currently residing in Duluth. Twenty-two (9.5 percent) of the original sample were unwilling to complete the questionnaire.

#### Data collection

The data for this report were collected during January and February, 1981. The questionnaire format was chosen as the instrument for data collection in this study. Potential respondents were notified by individual letter and asked to participate in the study by attending one of four small group sessions that were arranged in the community

rooms of each of the buildings. Interviewers were available at the sessions to administer the questionnaire, explain the purpose of the investigation, and answer questions about any of the questionnaire items. Respondents who were unable to attend the sessions were given the questionnaire individually. Although most of the interviews were self-administered, several of the interviews were interviewer-administered, due to vision problems of the respondents.

Pretesting of the instrument was done on several individuals outside of the sampling area.

Most of the items in the questionnaire had closed-end responses for ease of coding and analysis. Respondents were given the opportunity to answer in an open-ended fashion wherever appropriate to obtain maximum breadth of information.

A copy of the questionnaire is included in this report as Appendix A.

Information included in the questionnaire which will be discussed in this report includes data from the following eight categories:

- (1) demographic information
- (2) respondents primary reason for moving
- (3) satisfaction with apartment design
- (4) satisfaction with common areas in the building
- (5) satisfaction with neighborhood
- (6) general quality of life indicators
- (7) personality indicators
- (8) knowledge and use of neighborhood and community activities and services

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Demographic information

Age of the respondent. The age range in this sample of residents is from 57 to 93 years of age. The age range of 36 years from youngest to oldest member of the sample illustrates an interesting phenomenon; residents of elderly housing often represent people from two or more generations.

The mean age of the sample is 76 years old. Over one-third of the sample is over 80 years old, and approximately 20 percent are 70 years old or younger.

TABLE 2. Age of Respondent

Age	Frequency	Percent
Under 65	8	5.1
65-69	18	11.4
70-74	40	25.3
75-79	35	22.2
80-84	33	20.0
85-89	19	12.0
90 or older	5	3.2
n = 158		
mean	76.4	
median	76.0	
mode	72.0	

Education of the respondent. Completion of a high school education is the most common educational level of the sample (26.5 percent). 57.4 percent of those responding have less than a high school education; 16.1 percent of the sample have some formal education beyond high school.

TABLE 3. Education of Respondent

Years of education	Frequency	Percent
0 - 8 years	52	33.5
9 - 11 years	37	23.9
12 years	41	26.5
13 - 20 years	25	16.1
n = 155		
mean	9.9	
median	10.3	
mode	12.0	

Household income per month. Over 40 percent of the sample of respondents have a monthly income of under \$300 per month. 31.7 percent of the respondents have monthly incomes of between \$200 and \$300 per month.

TABLE 4. Household Income Per Month

Income per month	Frequency	Percent
Less than \$100	1	.6
\$100 to \$199	13	8.1
\$200 to \$299	51	31.7
\$300 to \$399	44	27.3
\$400 to \$499	32	19.9
\$500 and over	20	12.4
n = 161		

Length of time the respondent has lived in the apartment. Length of time in the apartment ranged from less than six months to 18 years. Although only 7.4 percent of the sample have lived in their apartments over ten years, over three-fourths (76.3 percent) have lived in their apartments between two and ten years, indicating a very low mobility rate among residents.

TABLE 5. Length of Time Respondent Lived in Apartment

Number of years	Frequency	Percent
Less than 5 years	93	52.5
5 - 9 years	71	40.1
10 - 18 years	13	7.4
n = 177		
mean	4.75 years	
median	4.0 years	
mode	7.0 years	

Marital status. Only 13.7 percent of the respondents in the sample have never been married. However, many of the respondents are widowed and currently living alone. Statewide, "by age 65 more than half of all females in Minnesota are widows while only 16% of all elderly men have lost their spouses." (Minnesota State Planning Agency, July 1981)

TABLE 6. Marital Status - Has Respondent Ever Been Married

Ever been married	Frequency	Percent
No	25	13.7
Yes	158	86.3
n = 183		

Number of bedrooms in the apartment. Most of the apartments in the housing units included in the sample are one-bedroom or efficiency apartments. (98.9 percent)

TABLE 7. Number of Bedrooms in Apartment

Number of bedrooms	Frequency	Percent
Efficiency	31	17.1
One bedroom	148	81.8
Two bedroom	2	1.1
n = 181		

Number of people in the apartment. 91.2 percent of the persons included in the sample are single-person households. The remainder of the sample are two-person households.

TABLE 8. Number of People in Apartment

Number in apartment	Frequency	Percent
1	166	91.2
2	16	8.8
n = 182		

Sex of respondent. Over three-fourths (78.8 percent) of the respondents in the sample are female. In a profile of Minnesota's elderly statewide and across all housing types, the Minnesota State Planning Agency indicates that elderly women are much more likely to live alone (42%) than elderly men (18%) (Minnesota State Planning Agency, July 1981). The high occurrence of females in elderly housing may be due in part to a higher proportion of widowed female and subsequent changes in housing that may occur with widowhood.

TABLE 9. Sex of Respondent

Sex of respondent	Frequency	Percent
Female	130	78.8
Male	35	21.2
n = 165		

Type of previous home. Most of the respondents moved to their apartment from either a single family home - alone or with their spouse, (40.4 percent) or from a privately owned apartment (34.8 percent). Statewide figures (Minnesota Planning Agency, July 1981) show that most of Minnesota's elderly live in single family homes, alone or with a spouse (75%). Private apartments house only 10% of the elderly population statewide. The higher percentage from the sample of Duluth residents moving from a private apartment to senior housing (34.8 percent) may be due to lower household incomes and, consequently, less home ownership prior to moving to senior housing. Another possibility is that respondents moved from single family homes to private apartments before moving to senior housing.

TABLE 10. Type of Previous Home

Type of Home	Frequency	Percent
Single family-alone or with spouse	72	40.4
Single family -with other relatives	18	10.1
Apartment - private	62	34.8
Apartment - senior citizen housing	8	4.5
Hotel	10	5.6
Duplex	6	3.4
Other	2	1.1
n = 178		

Primary reason for moving

Persons in the sample were asked to respond to the question "What was the main reason that you decided to move here?" in an open-ended fashion. Responses were then grouped into 14 categories, as shown in Table 11. The most frequent reason for moving in the sample was to lower the cost of housing (17 percent). Less maintenance responsibility was the second most common reason for moving (12.5 percent).

TABLE 11. Primary Reason for Moving

Primary reason	Frequency	Percent
Displaced (sold home, freeway)	17	9.7
Maintenance	22	12.5
Place unliveable or not as nice	12	6.8
Security	1	.6
Design features (size, elevators, stairs)	17	9.7
Financial considerations	30	17.0
Wanted to live in senior housing	8	4.5
Convenience, neighborhood considerations (nicer neighbors, more services)	15	8.5
Health (self or spouse)	12	6.8
Companionship or loneliness	7	4.0
To be nearer family	8	4.5
Retired or old age	9	5.1
Death of spouse	10	5.7
Other	8	4.5
n = 176		

### Satisfaction with apartment design

Satisfaction with apartment design was operationalized by asking the respondents in the sample to answer a series of questions using a five-point satisfaction scale. First, respondents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the design of their apartment. Second, respondents rated their satisfaction with specific design features of the apartment, including kitchen-dining area, living area, sleeping area, bathroom, emergency features, security of apartment, lighting, temperature control, colors, and amount of privacy.

Respondents were also asked if they were satisfied with the size of their apartment. If a respondent was not satisfied with the size of the apartment, they listed why they were dissatisfied in an open-ended response. Results of those responses are listed in Appendix B.

In addition, respondents were asked if their apartment feels like home. Ten respondents said no. Their reasons are listed in Appendix C.

Overall satisfaction with apartment design. The respondents in the sample experience a very high level of overall satisfaction with apartment design. 89 percent of the sample indicated that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the apartment design, using a five-point satisfaction scale.

TABLE 12. Overall Satisfaction with Apartment Design

Range of satisfaction	Frequency	Percent
Very dissatisfied	5	2.7
Dissatisfied	6	3.3
Neutral	9	4.9
Satisfied	102	56.0
Very satisfied	60	33.0
n = 182		

Satisfaction with apartment design--specific design features. Level of satisfaction with ten specific design features of the apartment is shown in Table 13. Respondents in the sample experience the highest level of satisfaction with the living area (93.7 percent either satisfied or very satisfied). The lowest level of satisfaction is with temperature control in the apartment (17.0 percent either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied).

Satisfaction with common areas in the building

Satisfaction with the common areas in the building was operationalized using a five-point satisfaction scale and a five-point friendliness scale. First, respondents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with common areas in the building. Second, respondents rated their satisfaction with specific common areas in the building, including laundry room, common eating room, community room, hallways, activity areas, lobby, parking lot, and elevators. In addition, respondents in the sample rated their perception of the friendliness of their neighbors on their floor and in the building, using a five-point scale ranging from "very unfriendly" to "very friendly."

Overall satisfaction with common areas in the building. The respondents in the sample experience a high level of satisfaction with common areas in the building. 85 percent of the sample indicated that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the common areas, using a five-point satisfaction scale. The overall level of satisfaction with common areas in the building is only slightly lower than respondents experience with overall apartment design (89 percent satisfied or very satisfied).

TABLE 13. Satisfaction with Apartment Design - Specific Design Features

	Very Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Very Satisfied		n =
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Kitchen - Dining	4	2.3	12	6.8	12	6.8	113	63.8	36	20.3	177
Living Area	1	.6	3	1.7	7	4.0	123	69.9	42	23.9	176
Sleeping	2	1.1	11	6.2	7	4.0	117	66.1	40	22.6	177
Bathroom	4	2.2	14	7.8	14	7.8	109	60.9	38	21.2	179
Emergency Features	2	1.2	8	4.7	11	6.4	119	69.6	31	18.1	171
Security of Apartment	2	1.1	8	4.6	14	8.0	113	64.9	37	21.3	174
Lighting	2	1.1	11	6.2	11	6.2	124	70.1	29	16.4	177
Temperature Control	9	5.1	21	11.9	12	6.8	100	56.8	34	19.3	176
Colors	1	.6	11	6.4	10	5.8	116	67.4	34	19.8	172
Amount of Privacy	2	1.1	2	1.1	9	5.1	104	59.4	58	33.1	175

TABLE 14. Overall Satisfaction with Common Areas in the Building

Range of satisfaction	Frequency	Percent
Very dissatisfied	6	3.3
Dissatisfied	1	.6
Neutral	20	11.1
Satisfied	111	61.7
Very satisfied	42	23.3
n = 180		

Satisfaction with common areas in the building--specific indicators. Level of satisfaction with eight specific common areas in the building is shown in Table 15. Respondents in the sample experience the highest level of satisfaction with hallways (91.6 percent either satisfied or very satisfied). A relatively high percentage of "neutral" responses were given by respondents in indicating satisfaction with the common eating room (19.0 percent) and parking lot (19.5 percent). It is possible that the neutral response was given by persons who do not use these facilities. The lowest level of satisfaction with a common area in the building is with the lobby.

Perception of friendliness of neighbors on floor. Respondents in the sample rate neighbors on their floor as friendly. 88.4 percent rate their neighbors as either friendly or very friendly, using a five-point scale.

TABLE 16. Perception of Friendliness of Neighbors on Floor

	Frequency	Percent
Very unfriendly	6	3.3
Unfriendly	1	.6
Neutral	14	7.7
Friendly	106	58.6
Very friendly	54	29.8
n = 181		

TABLE 15. Satisfaction With Common Areas In the Building - Specific Indicators

	Very Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Very Satisfied		n =
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Laundry Room	4	2.2	4	2.2	11	6.1	117	65.0	44	24.4	180
Common Eating Room	4	2.5	4	2.5	30	19.0	92	58.2	28	17.7	158
Community Room	6	3.4	11	6.1	20	11.2	105	58.7	37	20.7	179
Hallways	3	1.7	3	1.7	9	5.1	119	66.9	44	24.7	178
Activity Areas	7	4.0	10	5.6	19	10.7	109	61.6	32	18.1	177
Lobby	6	3.4	12	6.7	17	9.5	112	62.6	32	17.9	179
Parking Lot	4	2.4	5	3.0	33	19.5	96	56.8	31	18.3	169
Elevator	3	1.7	6	3.4	14	7.8	120	67.0	36	20.1	179

Perception of friendliness of neighbors in building. Neighbors in the building are also perceived by respondents as being friendly. 86.1 percent of the respondents rate the neighbors in the building as either friendly or very friendly. This is only slightly lower than the perception of friendliness of neighbors on their floor (88.4 percent friendly or very friendly).

TABLE 17. Perception of Friendliness of Neighbors in Building

	Frequency	Percent
Very unfriendly	3	1.7
Unfriendly	1	.6
Neutral	21	11.7
Friendly	120	66.7
Very friendly	35	19.4
n = 180		

Satisfaction with neighborhood

Satisfaction with neighborhood was operationalized using a five-point satisfaction scale and a five-point friendliness scale. First, respondents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their neighborhood. Second, respondents rated their satisfaction with specific neighborhood features, including medical facilities, retail stores, grocery stores, restaurants, public transportation, banking, and churches. In addition, respondents in the sample rated their perception of the friendliness of their neighbors in the neighborhood. Respondents were also asked if they like the neighborhood where they are living.

Does respondent like neighborhood. Nearly all respondents in the sample indicate that they like the neighborhood where they are living. Only 2.7 percent said they do not like the neighborhood. Their reasons are listed in Appendix D.

TABLE 18. Does Respondent Like the Neighborhood

	Frequency	Percent
No	5	2.7
Yes	177	97.3
n = 182		

Overall satisfaction with neighborhood. The respondents in the sample experience a high level of satisfaction with the neighborhood. 84.4 percent of the sample said they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the neighborhood. The overall level of satisfaction with neighborhood is only slightly lower than respondents experience with common areas in the building (85 percent satisfied or very satisfied) or overall apartment design (89 percent satisfied or very satisfied).

TABLE 19. Overall Satisfaction with Neighborhood

	Frequency	Percent
Very dissatisfied	1	.6
Dissatisfied	3	1.7
Neutral	24	13.4
Satisfied	121	67.6
Very satisfied	30	16.8
n = 179		

Satisfaction with neighborhood--specific indicators. Level of satisfaction with seven specific indicators of neighborhood satisfaction is shown in Table 20. Respondents in the sample experience the highest level of satisfaction with public transportation (87.2 percent either satisfied or very satisfied). The lowest level of satisfaction is with grocery stores (15.2 percent either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied).

TABLE 20. Satisfaction With Neighborhood--Specific Indicators

	Very Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Very Satisfied		n =
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Medical Facilities	0	0.0	5	2.8	27	15.3	109	61.9	35	19.9	176
Retail Stores	1	.6	11	6.3	38	21.8	99	56.9	25	14.4	174
Grocery Stores	9	5.1	18	10.1	23	12.9	96	53.9	32	18.0	178
Restaurants	3	1.7	13	7.5	37	21.3	94	54.0	27	15.5	174
Public Transportation	2	1.1	4	2.2	17	9.5	102	57.0	54	30.2	179
Banks	0	0.0	9	5.1	18	10.3	105	60.0	43	24.6	175
Churches	3	1.7	11	6.3	33	18.8	93	52.8	36	20.5	176

Perception of friendliness of neighbors in neighborhood. 58.3 percent of the respondents rate their neighbors in the neighborhood as being either friendly or very friendly. A substantial number of respondents (40 percent) gave a neutral response to this question. The perception of friendliness of 58.3 percent friendly or very friendly on this question is much lower than the perception of friendliness of neighbors on the floor (88.4 percent friendly or very friendly) or perception of friendliness of neighbors in the building (86.1 percent friendly or very friendly).

TABLE 21. Perception of Friendliness of Neighbors in Neighborhood

	Frequency	Percent
Very unfriendly	3	1.7
Unfriendly	0	0.0
Neutral	70	40.0
Friendly	89	50.9
Very friendly	13	7.4
n = 175		

General quality of life indicators

Respondents in the sample were asked a series of questions related to their perception of the quality of their lives. Included in the set were satisfaction with overall quality of life, perception of health, how often the respondent worries about money, being taken care of if ill, and getting help in an emergency, how often the respondent feels lonely, and if the respondent has friends or family in the community to turn to.

Satisfaction with overall quality of life. 82.8 percent of the respondents indicated that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with their overall quality of life, using a five-point satisfaction scale.

TABLE 22. Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Life

	Frequency	Percent
Very dissatisfied	6	3.3
Dissatisfied	6	3.3
Neutral	19	10.6
Satisfied	124	68.9
Very satisfied	25	13.9
n = 180		

Perception of overall health. Only 28.1 percent of the respondents in the sample rate their health as above average or excellent. 15.4 percent of the persons interviewed rate their health as being either poor or below average.

TABLE 23. Perception of Overall Health

	Frequency	Percent
Poor	8	4.4
Below average	20	11.0
Average	102	56.4
Above average	31	17.1
Excellent	20	11.0
n = 181		

Amount of worry and loneliness. Table 24 shows the responses of respondents to four quality of life items. Responses to these items on a five-point scale ranged from "always" to "never."

Responses to each of the four items were fairly consistent with each other. Over one-half of the respondents checked "almost never" or "never" in each of the four questions, indicating a lower level of worry and loneliness.

TABLE 24. Amount of Worry and Loneliness

	Always		Almost Always		Sometimes		Almost Never		Never		n =
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
How often do you worry about money?	7	3.9	8	4.4	61	33.9	34	18.9	70	38.9	180
How often do you worry about being taken care of if you become ill?	8	4.4	9	5.0	63	34.8	36	19.9	65	35.9	181
How often do you worry about getting help in an emergency?	7	3.9	3	1.7	59	32.8	34	18.9	77	42.8	180
How often do you feel lonely?	7	3.9	6	3.3	64	35.4	37	20.4	67	37.0	181

Does the respondent have friends or family in the community to turn to.

Most respondents (85.1 percent) indicated that they do have friends or family in the community that they feel they can turn to.

TABLE 25. Does Respondent Have Friends or Family in the Community to Turn to

	Frequency	Percent
No	27	14.9
Yes	154	85.1
n = 181		

Personality characteristics (from Buss and Plomin Temperament Survey)

In a temperament theory of personality, Buss and Plomin (1975) suggest that attitudes are affected by the temperament of an individual. Four temperaments are presented in the theory: level of activity, emotionality, sociability, and impulsivity.

Nine items from Buss and Plomin's Temperament Survey were included in the questionnaire for this report (three each for the level of activity, emotionality and sociability temperaments).

Personality characteristics --emotionality. Table 26 shows respondent responses on the three questionnaire items that measure the emotionality temperament in the Buss and Plomin theory.

Emotionality--total. To get the total score for an individual on the emotionality items, scores for the item "When displeased, I let people know it right away" were recoded so that a low score would be consistent with the direction on the other two items. Scores for each of the three five-point scale items were then added together, yielding a total score of from five to 15. Scores were then recoded into low (five through eight), medium (nine through 11) and high (12 through 15) categories. A low score on emotionality represents a higher level of emotionality in the individual; a high score represents a lower

TABLE 26. Personality Characteristics - Emotionality

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		n =
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
I am almost always calm and nothing ever bothers me.	3	1.8	34	20.7	41	25.0	78	47.6	8	4.9	164
I have fewer fears than most people my age.	3	1.8	11	6.6	51	30.5	84	50.3	18	10.8	167
When displeased, I let people know it right away.	15	9.2	65	39.9	34	20.9	38	23.3	11	6.7	163

level of emotionality in the individual. Table 27 shows the results of totaling the emotionality scale scores.

TABLE 27. Emotionality - Total

	Frequency	Percent
Low	24	14.6
Medium	106	64.2
High	35	21.2
n = 157		

Personality characteristics--sociability. Table 28 shows respondent responses on the three questionnaire items that measure the sociability temperament in the Buss and Plomin theory.

Sociability--total. To get the total score for an individual on the sociability items, scores for each of the three five-point scale items were added together, yielding a total score of from five to 15. Scores were then recoded into low (five through eight), medium (nine through 11) and high (12 through 15) categories. A low score represents a lower level of sociability in the individual; a high score represents a higher level of sociability in the individual. Table 29 shows the results of totaling the sociability scores. The scores on sociability are much higher than in either the emotionality or level of activity temperaments.

TABLE 29. Sociability - Total

	Frequency	Percent
Low	7	4.3
Medium	52	31.9
High	104	63.8
n = 163		

TABLE 28. Personality Characteristics - Sociability

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		n =
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
I make friends very quickly.	3	1.8	7	4.1	40	23.7	89	52.7	30	17.8	169
I am very sociable.	1	.6	7	4.2	42	25.1	89	53.3	28	16.8	167
I have many friends.	2	1.2	3	1.8	21	12.6	104	62.3	37	22.2	167

Personality characteristics--level of activity. Table 30 shows respondent responses on the three questionnaire items that measure the level of activity temperament in the Buss and Plomin theory.

Level of activity--total. To get the total score for an individual on the level of activity items, scores for each of the three five-point scale items were added together, yielding a total score of from five to 15. Scores were then recoded into low (five through eight), medium (nine through 11) and high (12 through 15) categories. A low score represents a lower level of activity in the individual; a high score represents a higher level of activity in the individual. Table 31 shows the results of totaling the activity scores.

TABLE 31. Activity - Total

	Frequency	Percent
Low	45	28.3
Medium	79	49.7
High	35	22.0
n = 159		

Knowledge and use of neighborhood and community activities and services

An important aspect of this study was to determine the level of knowledge and use of local resources and services designed for the elderly in the Duluth area. Four categories of resources and services were examined: (1) activities in the buildings in which the respondents live; (2) area community centers; (3) volunteer agencies; and (4) community resources.

Amount of participation in activities in the building. Over one-half of the respondents in the sample participate in one or more activities in the building where

TABLE 30. Personality Characteristics - Activity

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		n =
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
I like to keep busy all the time.	4	2.4	13	7.7	31	18.3	88	52.1	33	19.5	169
My life is fast paced.	7	4.3	52	32.3	61	37.9	32	19.9	9	5.6	161
When I do things, I do them vigorously.	4	2.5	41	25.2	49	30.1	55	33.7	14	8.6	163

they live. The complete listing of activities listed by respondents is recorded in Appendix E.

TABLE 32. Amount of Participation in Activities in the Building

	Frequency	Percent
No participation	80	43.7
One activity	39	21.3
Two or more activities	64	35.0
n = 183		

Attitudes about number of scheduled activities in the building. 82.3 percent of the persons interviewed feel that the right number of activities are scheduled in the building where they live.

TABLE 33. Attitudes About Number of Scheduled Activities in the Building

	Frequency	Percent
Not enough	28	16.0
Right number	144	82.3
Too many	3	1.7
n = 175		

Use of area community centers. The Senior Citizens Community Center is the community center that is most frequently used by the respondents in the sample. The Senior Citizens Community Center is located within close proximity to three out of the four buildings in the sample. Table 34 shows the amount of use of nine area community centers.

TABLE 34. Use of Area Community Centers

Community Center	NO		YES	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Central Neighborhood Community Center	176	96.7	6	3.3
Harrison " " "	180	98.9	2	1.1
Central Hillside " " "	180	98.9	2	1.1
Goodfellowship Community Club	178	97.8	4	2.2
Portman Square Recreation Center	179	98.4	3	1.6
West End Senior Center	177	97.3	5	2.7
Welch Center	180	98.9	2	1.1
West Duluth YWCA Senior Center	178	97.8	4	2.2
Senior Citizens Community Center	134	73.6	48	26.4
n = 182				

Total number of community centers used. Over one-third (38.3 percent) of the respondents in the sample have used one or more community centers in the area.

TABLE 35. Total Number of Community Centers Used

	Frequency	Percent
0	110	61.8
1	57	32.0
2	8	4.5
4	1	.6
9	2	1.2
n = 178		

Volunteer agencies--heard of. More than one-half of the respondents in the sample have not heard of each of the four volunteer agencies listed in the questionnaire. The most familiar of the four is the Retired Senior Volunteer Program; 48.4 percent of the persons interviewed have heard of this program.

TABLE 36. Volunteer Agencies - Heard of

Volunteer Agency	NO		YES	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Retired Senior Volunteer Program	94	51.6	88	48.4
Social Services Volunteers	106	58.2	76	41.8
Voluntary Action Program	142	78.0	40	22.0
Central Hillside United Ministry	143	78.6	39	21.4
n = 182				

Total number of volunteer agencies--heard of. Although knowledge of each of the individual volunteer agencies is less than half (Table 36), 62 percent of the respondents in the sample are familiar with one or more volunteer agencies. Code 5 in Table 37 indicates persons who have heard of all four volunteer agencies which were listed in the questionnaire, plus another which they listed in an open-ended response. A complete listing of volunteer agencies cited by respondents is recorded in Appendix F.

TABLE 37. Total Number of Volunteer Agencies - Heard of

	Frequency	Percent
0	69	37.9
1	42	23.1
2	30	16.5
3	15	8.2
4	17	9.3
5	9	4.9
n = 182		

Volunteer agencies--used. The Retired Senior Volunteer Program is the most frequently used volunteer agency by respondents in the sample. (10.4 percent)

TABLE 38. Volunteer Agencies - Used

Volunteer Agency	NO		YES	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Retired Senior Volunteer Program	163	89.6	19	10.4
Social Service Volunteers	179	98.4	3	1.6
Voluntary Action Program	181	99.5	1	.5
Central Hillside United Ministry	179	98.4	3	1.6
n = 182				

Total number of volunteer agencies--used. 17.5 percent of the persons interviewed have used one or more volunteer agencies in the community. Three agencies is the greatest number used by any individual in the sample.

TABLE 39. Total Number of Volunteer Agencies - Used

	Frequency	Percent
0	150	82.4
1	27	14.8
2	3	1.6
3	2	1.1
n = 182		

Community resources--heard of. Out of 27 community resources listed in the questionnaire, 15 have been heard of by more than 50 percent of the persons interviewed. The most familiar resources listed Mini the Bus; 92.9 percent of the persons interviewed have heard of it.

TABLE 40. Community Resources--Heard of

	YES		NO	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Information & Referral Service	73	39.9	110	60.1
Duluth Transit Authority	168	91.8	15	8.2
Mini the Bus	170	92.9	13	7.1
Volunteer Drivers--St. Louis County Social Services	97	53.0	86	47.0
Duluth Community Health Clinic	74	40.4	109	59.6
Human Development Center	50	27.3	133	72.7
Senior Health Program (Senior Citizen Coalition)	116	63.4	67	36.6
Public Health Nurse (St. Louis County Health Department)	127	69.4	56	30.6
Health Service Unit (Senior Citizens Community Center)	113	61.7	70	38.3
Social Security Administration	160	87.4	23	12.6
Financial Services Division of St. Louis County Social Services Department (SAS - budget help of income maintenance)	48	26.2	135	73.8
Financial Counseling Service (Ordean Building)	57	31.1	126	68.9
Senior Citizens Legal Aid	106	57.9	77	42.1
Food Stamp Dept.(Social Services)	148	80.9	35	19.1
Home Delivered Meals	142	77.6	41	22.4
Duluth Senior Dinners Program	108	59.0	75	41.0
Telecare - CHUM (Central Hillside United Ministry)	56	30.6	127	69.4
Family Service Society (Ordean Bldg)	68	37.2	115	62.8
Northeast Minnesota Consumers League	33	18.0	150	82.0
Senior Adult Services--East (SAS East)	101	55.2	82	44.8

TABLE 40. Community Resources -- Heard of (Continued)

	YES		NO	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Senior Adult Services-West (SAS West)	88	48.1	95	51.9
Homemaker-Home Health Aid (St. Louis County)	124	67.8	59	32.2
Homemakers Service- University of Minnesota Extension	38	20.8	145	79.2
American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)	128	69.9	55	30.1
Duluth CAP (Community Action Program)	47	25.7	136	74.3
Senior Citizens' Coalition of Northeastern Minnesota	128	69.9	55	30.1
St. Louis County Council on Aging, Incorporated	86	47.0	97	53.0
n = 183				

Total number of community resources --heard of. Table 41 shows the total number of community resources that individuals in the sample are familiar with. The average number (mean and median) of community resources heard of is 14 out of 27, or about one half.

TABLE 41. Total Number of Community Resources -- Heard of

	Frequency	Percent
0	2	1.1
1-4	15	8.2
5-9	26	14.2
10-14	51	27.9
15-19	40	21.9
20-25	33	18.0
25 & over	16	8.7
n = 183		
mean	14.5	
median	14.2	
mode	12.0	

Community resources--used. Out of 27 community resources listed in the questionnaire, three are used by more than 50 percent of the persons interviewed (Duluth Transit Authority, Mini the Bus, and Social Security Administration).

The most commonly used resource is the Duluth Transit Authority (74.3 percent of the respondents have used it).

TABLE 42. Community Resources--Used

	YES		NO	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Information & Referral Service	15	8.2	168	91.8
Duluth Transit Authority	136	74.3	47	25.7
Mini the Bus	96	52.5	87	47.5
Volunteer Drivers-St. Louis County Social Services	21	11.5	162	88.5
Duluth Community Health Clinic	10	5.5	173	94.5
Human Development Center	2	1.1	181	98.9
Senior Health Program (Senior Citizen Coalition)	16	8.7	167	91.3
Public Health Nurse (St. Louis County Health Department)	22	12.0	161	88.0
Health Service Unit (Senior Citizens Community Center)	30	16.4	153	83.6
Social Security Administration	133	72.7	50	27.3
Financial Services Division of St. Louis County Social Services Department (SAS - budget help of income maintenance)	6	3.3	177	96.7
Financial Counseling Service (Ordean Building)	4	2.2	179	97.8
Senior Citizens Legal Aid	15	8.2	168	91.8
Food Stamp Dept.(Social Services)	34	18.6	149	81.4
Home Delivered Meals	34	18.6	149	81.4
Duluth Senior Dinners Program	36	19.7	147	80.3
Telecare - CHUM (Central Hillside United Ministry)	5	2.7	175	97.3
Family Service Society (Ordean Bldg)	4	2.2	179	97.8
Northeast Minnesota Consumers League	1	.5	182	99.5
Senior Adult Services-East (SAS East)	23	12.6	160	87.4

TABLE 42. Community Resources--Used (Continued)

	YES		NO	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Senior Adult Services--West (SAS West)	3	1.6	180	98.4
Homemaker--Home Health Aid (St. Louis County)	36	19.7	147	80.3
Homemakers Service-- University of Minnesota Extension	0	0.0	183	100.0
American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)	49	26.8	134	73.2
Duluth CAP (Community Action Program)	2	1.1	181	98.9
Senior Citizens' Coalition of Northeastern Minnesota	28	15.3	155	84.7
St. Louis County Council on Aging, Incorporated	8	4.4	175	95.6
n = 183				

Total number of community resources--used. Table 43 shows the total number of community resources used by each individual in the sample. The average number (mean and median) of community resources used by an individual in the sample is four out of the 27 listed, or about 15 percent.

TABLE 43. Total Number of Community Resources - Used

	Frequency	Percent
0	12	6.6
1	13	7.1
2	32	17.5
3	24	13.1
4	27	14.8
5	22	12.0
6	15	8.2
7	15	8.2
8	10	5.5
9	7	3.8
10	4	2.2
12	2	1.1
n = 183		
mean	4.2	
median	3.9	
mode	2.0	

Other comments

Other comments included in the questionnaire by respondents are reported in Appendix G.

## REFERENCES

Buss, A.H. & Plomin, R. A temperament theory of personality development.  
New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975

City of Duluth. Housing plan for the City of Duluth. City of Duluth:  
Department of Planning and Development, 1980.

Flannery, B. A. Housing satisfaction of Elderly Residents of Government  
Subsidized Housing in Duluth - Breakdown of Data by housing unit,  
Lake Superior Basin Studies Center Technical Report, August 1981.

Flannery, B.A. "Preliminary results of a study of housing, neighborhood,  
and community satisfaction of elderly residents of government  
subsidized housing", presented at the 13th Annual Mid-Continent  
Regional Science Association Meeting, Cincinnati, Ohio,  
May 15, 1981.

Minnesota State Planning Agency. The Changing Minnesota Elderly  
Minnesota State Planning Agency, February 1981.

Minnesota State Planning Agency. Housing for the Elderly. Minnesota  
State Planning Agency, July 1981.

## APPENDICES

- Appendix A. Housing Satisfaction Questionnaire
- Appendix B. Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Size of Apartment
- Appendix C. Reasons why Apartment Does Not Feel Like Home
- Appendix D. Reasons for Dissatisfaction with the Neighborhood
- Appendix E. Activities Available in Housing Units
- Appendix F. Volunteer Agencies Used by Respondents
- Appendix G. Other Comments

APPENDIX A

HOUSING SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

INTERVIEW NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

Statement of Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a study about how you and other residents in your housing unit feel about your housing and your neighborhood. The information that you and other residents give will help us to understand how you feel about the design features of your home, your satisfaction with living there, and the quality of services that are available to you. You have been chosen as a participant because we are looking specifically at housing units like yours in the Duluth area.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary and confidential. If you choose to participate in the study, please answer the questions on the following pages. You may refuse to answer any question or set of questions on the questionnaire. If you have any questions about any part of this study, please feel free to call Barbara Flannery at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, at 726-8182.

Thank you again for your cooperation. It is greatly appreciated.

1. To the nearest one-half year, how long have you lived here? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Where did you live before moving here? \_\_\_\_\_  
 (home address and city)

3. Was your previous home a(n):

\_\_\_ 1 single family home (where you lived alone or with your spouse)

\_\_\_ 2 single family home (where you lived with your children or other relatives)

\_\_\_ 3 apartment - private

\_\_\_ 4 apartment - senior housing

\_\_\_ 5 hotel

\_\_\_ 6 duplex

\_\_\_ 7 other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

4. What was the main reason that you decided to move here? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Have you ever been married?

\_\_\_ 1 yes

\_\_\_ 0 no

6. What is/was the specific occupation of your last spouse? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. How many people (including yourself) are living in your apartment now? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Please fill in the information requested on the following chart for each person living in your apartment now.

Relationship to you	Sex	Age	Education (in years)	Occupation (former, if retired)
"Yourself"				

9. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with how your apartment is designed?

\_\_\_ 1 very dissatisfied

\_\_\_ 2 dissatisfied

\_\_\_ 3 neutral

\_\_\_ 4 satisfied

\_\_\_ 5 very satisfied

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following design features of your apartment. Circle your response.

DESIGN FEATURES	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
10. kitchen-dining area	1	2	3	4	5
11. living area	1	2	3	4	5
12. sleeping area	1	2	3	4	5
13. bathroom	1	2	3	4	5
14. emergency features	1	2	3	4	5
15. security of apartment	1	2	3	4	5
16. lighting	1	2	3	4	5
17. temperature control	1	2	3	4	5
18. colors	1	2	3	4	5
19. amount of privacy	1	2	3	4	5

20. Does your apartment feel like home?

- 1 yes
- 0 no (if no, why not?) \_\_\_\_\_

21. Is your apartment an efficiency, one bedroom, or two bedroom unit?

- 1 efficiency
- 2 one bedroom
- 3 two bedroom

22. Are you satisfied with the size of your apartment?

- 1 yes
- 0 no (if no, why not?) \_\_\_\_\_

The next few questions are designed to help us to understand how you feel about different areas and features provided in your building.

23. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with common areas within your building?

- 1 very dissatisfied
- 2 dissatisfied
- 3 neutral
- 4 satisfied
- 5 very satisfied

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the design of the following common areas in your building. Circle your response.

COMMON AREAS	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
24. laundry room	1	2	3	4	5
25. common eating room	1	2	3	4	5
26. community room	1	2	3	4	5
27. hallways	1	2	3	4	5
28. activity areas	1	2	3	4	5
29. lobby	1	2	3	4	5
30. parking lot	1	2	3	4	5
31. elevators	1	2	3	4	5

32. Does your building have a resident manager or caretaker?

- 1 yes
- 0 no

33. Do you feel that your resident manager or caretaker does a good job looking after the building and the concerns of the tenants?

- we do not have one
- 1 yes
- 0 no (if no, why not?) \_\_\_\_\_

34. Do you have a resident organization or resident council in your building?

- 1 yes
- 0 no

35. Do you feel that the resident organization or council does a good job looking after the building and concerns of the tenants?

- we do not have one
- 1 yes
- 0 no (if no, why not?) \_\_\_\_\_

36. Do you think that the number of activities and services that are provided in your building are the right number, not enough, or too many?

- 1 not enough
- 2 right number
- 3 too many

37. What religious and/or social activities do you participate in, in your building? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Do you participate in activities in any of the following community centers?  
 Check all those that apply.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
38. Central Neighborhood Community Center	___	___
39. Harrison Community Center	___	___
40. Central Hillside Community Center	___	___
41. Goodfellowship Community Club	___	___
42. Portman Recreation Center	___	___
43. West End Senior Center	___	___
44. Welch Center	___	___
45. West Duluth YWCA Senior Center	___	___
46. Senior Citizens Community Center	___	___
47. Other (specify) _____	___	___

The following questions are about volunteering agencies you have heard of or have been involved in.

	Have you ever heard of this resource?		Have you ever been a volunteer in this agency?	
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
48. Retired Senior Volunteer Program	___	___	___	___
49. St. Louis County Social Service Department Volunteers	___	___	___	___
50. Voluntary Action Center	___	___	___	___
51. CHUM (Central Hillside United Ministry)	___	___	___	___
52. Other (specify) _____	___	___	___	___

53. What community organizations are you presently a volunteer in? Please list them.

---



---



---

54. How friendly or unfriendly do you think that your neighbors on your floor are?

- 1 very unfriendly
- 2 unfriendly
- 3 neutral
- 4 friendly
- 5 very friendly

55. How friendly or unfriendly do you think that your neighbors in your building are?

- 1 very unfriendly
- 2 unfriendly
- 3 neutral
- 4 friendly
- 5 very friendly

56. How friendly or unfriendly do you think that your neighbors in your neighborhood around the building are?

- 1 very unfriendly
- 2 unfriendly
- 3 neutral
- 4 friendly
- 5 very friendly

The purpose of the following questions is to help us to understand how you feel about the area or neighborhood surrounding your building and the services provided in that area.

57. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the neighborhood around your building?

- 1 very dissatisfied
- 2 dissatisfied
- 3 neutral
- 4 satisfied
- 5 very satisfied

Please indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the services available in your neighborhood. Circle your response.

SERVICES	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Do Not Have
58. medical facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. retail stores	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. grocery stores	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. public transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
63. banking	1	2	3	4	5	6
64. churches	1	2	3	4	5	6
65. other (specify)	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____						

66. Do you like the neighborhood where you are living?

- 1 yes  
 0 no (if no, why not?) \_\_\_\_\_

67. Would you rather be living in some other neighborhood?

- 1 yes (if yes, why?) \_\_\_\_\_  
(if yes, where?) \_\_\_\_\_  
 0 no

68. How would you rate your overall health?

- 1 poor  
 2 below average  
 3 average  
 4 above average  
 5 excellent

69. Presently, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall quality of your life?

- 1 very dissatisfied  
 2 dissatisfied  
 3 neutral  
 4 satisfied  
 5 very satisfied

Please indicate how often you worry about the following things.

70. How often do you worry about money?

- 1 always  
 2 almost always  
 3 sometimes  
 4 almost never  
 5 never

71. How often do you worry about being taken care of if you become ill?

- 1 always  
 2 almost always  
 3 sometimes  
 4 almost never  
 5 never

72. How often do you worry about getting help in an emergency?

- 1 always  
 2 almost always  
 3 sometimes  
 4 almost never  
 5 never

73. Do you have friends or relatives in the community that you feel you could turn to in case of ill health or an emergency?

- 1 yes
- 0 no

74. How often do you feel lonely?

- 1 always
- 2 almost always
- 3 sometimes
- 4 almost never
- 5 never

The next few questions will tell us a little bit about you. Please indicate the level that you agree or disagree with the following statements about yourself. Circle your response.

STATEMENTS ABOUT YOURSELF					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
73. I am almost always calm and nothing ever bothers me.	1	2	3	4	5
74. I have fewer fears than most people my age.	1	2	3	4	5
75. When displeased, I let people know it right away.	1	2	3	4	5
76. I like to keep busy all the time.	1	2	3	4	5
77. My life is fast paced.	1	2	3	4	5
78. When I do things, I do them vigorously.	1	2	3	4	5
79. I make friends very quickly.	1	2	3	4	5
80. I am very sociable.	1	2	3	4	5
81. I have many friends.	1	2	3	4	5

82. Please indicate what your approximate income per month is.

- 1 less than \$100
- 2 \$100-\$200
- 3 \$200-\$300
- 4 \$300-\$400
- 5 \$400-\$500
- 6 over \$500

The following is a list of some of the services that are available in the community for you to use. We would like to know which resources you are familiar with, and which programs and services you have used.

	Have you ever heard of this resource?		Have you ever used this resource?	
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
83. Information and Referral Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
84. Duluth Transit Authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Have you ever heard of this resource?		Have you ever used this resource?	
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
85. Mini the Bus	—	—	—	—
86. Volunteer Drivers - St. Louis County Social Services	—	—	—	—
87. Duluth Community Health Clinic (East 5th Street)	—	—	—	—
88. Human Development Center	—	—	—	—
89. Senior Health Program (Senior Citizen Coalition)	—	—	—	—
90. Public Health Nurse (St. Louis County Health Department)	—	—	—	—
91. Health Service Unit (Senior Citizens Community Center)	—	—	—	—
92. Social Security Administration	—	—	—	—
93. Financial Services Division of St. Louis County Social Services Department (SAS - budget help or income maintenance)	—	—	—	—
94. Financial Counseling Service (Ordean Building)	—	—	—	—
95. Senior Citizens Legal Aid	—	—	—	—
96. Food Stamp Department (Social Services)	—	—	—	—
97. Home Delivered Meals	—	—	—	—
98. Duluth Senior Dinners Program	—	—	—	—
99. Telecare - CHUM (Central Hillside United Ministry)	—	—	—	—
100. Family Service Society (Ordean Bldg.)	—	—	—	—
101. Northeast Minnesota Consumers League	—	—	—	—
102. Senior Adult Services - East (SAS East)	—	—	—	—
103. Senior Adult Services - West (SAS West)	—	—	—	—
104. Homemaker-Home Health Aid (St. Louis County)	—	—	—	—
105. Homemakers Service - University of Minnesota Extension	—	—	—	—

	Have you ever heard of this resource?		Have you ever used this resource?	
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
106. American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)	—	—	—	—
107. Duluth CAP (Community Action Program)	—	—	—	—
108. Senior Citizens' Coalition of Northeastern Minnesota	—	—	—	—
109. St. Louis County Council on Aging, Incorporated	—	—	—	—
110. Other (specify) _____	—	—	—	—

OTHER COMMENTS \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

END

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY

APPENDIX B

Appendix B Reasons for dissatisfaction with size of apartment

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number of People</u>
Kitchen is too small	3
All rooms are too small	2
Need more storage and closet space	1
It could be larger	2
Would like more storage	1
Living room is too small	1
No storage space in apartment	1
Bedroom is too small	1
I would like a bedroom	1
Too small	6
Could use more storage and place to hang things	1
Kitchen area and cupboard and closet space too small	1
Need larger bedroom	2
Would like larger living and dining area	1

APPENDIX C

Appendix C Reasons why apartment does not feel like home

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number of people</u>
It's better living in a home	1
An apartment can never feel like one's own home	1
Not enough windows	1
I am very happy here and like being useful to some of the older people. I really enjoy the garden in back of the building and the view	1
I'm too used to my own home	1
Strange at first, but becoming used to it	1
Too hot	1
Used to living in a house all her life	1
Just not like my own home	1
Not like home	1

APPENDIX D

Appendix D Reasons for dissatisfaction with the neighborhood

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number of People</u>
Too far from church and grocery store	1
Streets are too noisy	1
Don't like climbing the hill	1
The home close to my apartment has a very unsightly yard	1

APPENDIX E

Appendix E Activities available in housing units

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Number of People</u>
1. Social club (meetings, fellowship club, president of S.C., club meetings, resident's club, dances, funtime, parties)	51
2. Bingo	45
3. Religious activities (Christian fellowship, church, Roman Catholic church, religious activities)	27
4. Cards (bridge, poker)	21
5. Crafts (arts, ceramics, quilting, afghans)	10
6. Coffee get togethers, Dinners/Luncheons	29
7. Other	4

APPENDIX F

Appendix F Other volunteer agencies used by respondents

Tri Towers' Nutrition Program

Heritage Center

Tri-Towers cafeteria

St. Lukes Hospital

Social Club at Gateway Towers

Saleslady at Glensheen

Depot and Historical Society; taking patients to doctor and shopping; help in building during minor illnesses

RSVP - Veterans - officer in Duluth - Women's Last Alumni Members of St. Lukes Hospital

Volunteer at Public Library

Miller Dwan Hospital

Senior Citizens Coalition of N.E. Minnesota

Utilities

Depot

Church

City Library

Educational organizations

Tri Towers

Grandview Bingo Party

Cafeteria

King Manor - wrap silver

Helping with meals

Calvary Temple Church

Rice Lake and Gnesen  
Heritage Center at Depot  
I sew for some of the people in the building  
Homesteaders  
Vice President at Woodland Garden Club  
Secretary at Woodland Hunters Park  
Sunshine chairman and treasurer at Woodland Senior Citizens Center  
Resident Club  
Lakeshore Home  
St. Pauls Home  
Meals-In-The-Home  
Do things for people on her own  
Outlook Club - Miller Dwan  
Senior Volunteer  
Duluth  
Lester Park Library  
St. Michaels Church Library  
Plant flower bed at Woodland Gardens  
Work at reception area in Tri-Towers  
Take people in building places  
Needy Neighbors  
St. Anne's  
Glensheen  
Volunteer for Cancer Society  
St. Mary's luncheon volunteer  
Lakeshore Home

APPENDIX G

Appendix G Other comments

Residents don't socialize

Have to wash walls ourselves and I can't do it

I am on Social Security

A neighbor thinks we need a flag

Need a larger grocery store

Winter air ventilation is very inadequate

Thermostat doesn't work

Bathroom has poor arrangement

Apartment is not very well designed and storage space is too limited

Recreational area on 14th floor is poorly designed

Michigan Street entrance is inconvenient

Freight elevator should be in building

The city library is a big mistake

Shocked at bank turning over to Glass Block

Why all the lack of firm decisions for completion of the highway

Need a service elevator (2)

Unsatisfied with amount of storage space

Bathroom is too small

Don't like the carpet

Need more storage space (2)

Bedroom is too small

Should have a larger lounge

Lakeside residents want building like Woodland Garden Apartments

Wish kitchen/ dining area was more separate

Need a closer restaurant

Would like a bathtub

Bathroom needs grab bars

The Transit Authority could be more cooperative

Bathroom needs more light. Heat control hard for older people to regulate.

Apartment design too warm

Temperature control has no control over it

Kitchen/dining area too small

In lobby people steal

Need better instructors for activities

Parking lot too small

Don't get windows washed, need apartment painted, will not help and replace  
burned out lights

Sprinkler system should be installed - Dead bolt locks were promised

Too little closet and cupboard space

I miss my family

I think it's wonderful to have all these opportunities and all this love and care so  
we can grow old

Feels depressed a lot

Need more closet space

Colors are too cool

Elevator doors close too quickly

Hallways should have railings

Shouldn't have so many apartments in building

Don't like refrigerator

Don't like apartment colors