

CUA  
P1012

RESOURCE COLLECTION

***A city examines itself:***  
**The 1974**  
**Duluth Attitude Survey**

**Report #1**

CUA

RESOURCE COLLECTION

Project under the auspices of  
University of Minnesota:  
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs  
University of Minnesota, Duluth  
City Government of Duluth

A CITY EXAMINES ITSELF:  
THE 1974 DULUTH ATTITUDE SURVEY

REPORT #1

William J. Krossner, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Psychology  
and Behavioral Science  
University of Minnesota, Duluth  
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

February, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
	PREFACE . . . . .	v
1.	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
2.	METHOD AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	3
3.	RESULTS . . . . .	6
	REFERENCES AND NOTES . . . . .	14
	APPENDIX . . . . .	15

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample Characteristics . . . . .	8
2. Items Rated Most and Least Favorably . . . . .	9
3. Shifts in Favorability Between 1962 and 1974 . . . . .	10
4. Items Differing Significantly by Neighborhood. . . . .	11

Appendix Table	Page
I. Survey Format . . . . .	16
II. 1962-1974 Comparisons . . . . .	20
III. Geographic Comparisons. . . . .	23

## Preface

Report #1 is the first of two that will be issued describing the results of a large-scale attitude survey conducted in Duluth, Minnesota, in late 1974 and early 1975. The primary goal of the survey was to ascertain to a high degree of accuracy the views of the citizens of Duluth on an extremely wide spectrum of issues that affect their lives as residents of the city: from direct and concrete matters such as property and sales taxes, and street maintenance, to more imponderable concerns such as future economic growth prospects for the city and the effectiveness of its courts. The survey questionnaire contained 53 items within this broad range, and was administered to over 800 adult residents of the community via individual personal interviews.

This first publication is a general report, giving the results in broad but accurate form, accessible and clear, I hope, to non-specialists; Report #2 will properly be a more detailed document for the research community, and will be marked by the extensive footnotes, reference lists, methodological discussions, balancing of competing hypotheses, and cautious generalizations such reports seem to require, thus making it a delight into which scholars, surveyors, and statisticians may delve.

A project so labor-intensive as a large-scale survey could never be completed without the cooperation of numerous groups, whose assistance it is a pleasure to acknowledge.

Students in Psychology courses 3811 and 5811 served as the core of interviewers, aided by members of the Arnold Air Society and Angel Flight campus service organizations. Paul Bugbee of student government was helpful in augmenting the number of student interviewers beyond this base, and the aid of Betty Monson with her League of Women Voters contingent is gratefully mentioned.

Students Betty Brasgala, Ted Decker, Maureen Hooley, and Michael Wasmund were helpful not only in interviewing but also in keypunching the survey data for analysis.

Dr. Armas Tamminen initially interested me in the project, and Professor Frederick Witzig served as an indefatigable coordinator and facilitator once it had begun, aided by the benign interest of UMD administrators Drs. Darland, Heller and Vose. Shirley Bennett of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs was patient in coordinating from the CURA office.

On the community side, Art Barschdorf and Eli Miletich were ably complemented on the planning team by Gene Gruba and Richard Loraas of the city administration. Special thanks are due to former Mayor Ben Boo for his foresight and vision throughout all phases of the project, and to present Mayor Robert Beaudin for his continued support.

Finally, the project benefited continually from the tireless efforts of research assistants Lisbeth Dickrell and Deborah Ferguson. They responded cheerfully and with enthusiasm to a bewildering array of work demands, to the occasional necessity for long and irregular hours, and to the meeting of pressing deadlines. Their talents, as well as oft-proffered advice, were vital.

A final note as to the importance of determining community opinion is provided by the fact that, even prior to the writing of this first report, inquiries have been received asking for copies of the survey and of the final reports, from cities in 14 states from coast to coast, including such giants as Minneapolis, Detroit, Seattle, Atlanta, Washington, D.C., and New York City. It is my hope, then, that this survey project will have benefited not only Duluth, but that it can also serve as a model for other surveys through which information may be gathered that will help to throw light on one of the most

pressing social problems of our time: what is to be the future of our  
urban areas?

William J. Krossner, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Psychology  
and Behavior Science  
University of Minnesota, Duluth  
February 10, 1975



## Introduction

The year 1974 was a troubled, gloomy, anxious and difficult one for the United States. The tragedy of Watergate, a declining economy in recession, a very depressed stock market, rising unemployment, a double-digit inflation rate, with individual shortages and soaring prices for some staples such as sugar, and the stranglehold on petroleum supplies held and exerted by the Arab oil cartel were among the factors that were reflected in public opinion on the future and on the economy: Americans rated their confidence in national affairs as the lowest in 15 years, their confidence in the economy fell to the lowest point ever in the 28-year history of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, a Gallup poll revealed that 87% of the respondents predicted still further gains in unemployment in 1975, and 76% of Minnesotans surveyed early in 1975 by the Minneapolis Tribune felt that the next 12 months would bring bad financial times in the U.S. (1).\*

Against this backdrop of national concern, a proposal was made to conduct an attitude survey in Duluth to see how the community's residents viewed various aspects contributing to the quality of life in Duluth. The purpose of the survey would be to provide a current reading as to these attitudes, on a wide variety of issues. Areas of citizen concern could be identified and referred to relevant city agencies as aids in determining future plans, and contemporary attitudes could be compared, for identical or comparable issues, with those expressed in a similar poll conducted in 1962 and published in 1964 by the Project Duluth Committee.

Funding was obtained jointly from the city via federal revenue-sharing funds and from the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs of the University

---

\*Numbers in parentheses refer to entries in the Reference and Notes section beginning on page 14.

of Minnesota; the survey questionnaire was developed, and in November-December, 1974, a representative sample of over 800 adult Duluthians was contacted individually by field interviewers.

This is a first report on the results of that survey.

### Method and Procedure

The 1970 census figures were used as the basis for selecting the sample of respondents. Admittedly, the population characteristics of Duluth have undoubtedly shifted somewhat since the census was taken, but in view of the stability of the population size (the city has remained close to 100,000 in population since the 1950 census), it was felt that drift would not pose as serious a problem as in fast-changing or expanding communities.

The census divides the city into thirty-odd tracts. It was decided to sample within each tract in proportion to the tract's representation in the overall city population. Blocks within each tract were chosen at random with the probability of block selection dependent on the block's number of inhabitants. Then, several residences per block were randomly selected using the 1974 City Directory as the target sites to be visited. For apartment buildings, apartments within the building were randomly selected. Tables of random numbers and random permutations automatically made the selections of blocks and residences independent of any personal bias or selection factor.

The net effect of the above procedure was to provide for equal likelihoods that any resident of a tract would be picked as a potential survey respondent, and that the number of residents per tract would be in proportion to the tract's percentage of the total Duluth population. In addition, the selection method avoided the bias of selection on the basis of telephone number, as some of the residences had no telephones.

The interviewers were mainly students in psychology classes at UMD, aided by campus service organizations and other student volunteers, and supplemented by a small group from the Duluth League of Women Voters. On November 9, 1974, in a training session lasting most of the afternoon, they were briefed on the essential elements of survey interviewing, on the many factors that would make

the difference between an accurate and a biased sample outcome, on the necessity of being pleasant but neutral interviewers, on the necessity of accurate recording of answers, and on the importance of the study.

The interviewers were divided into teams of two, were given the pre-selected names and addresses of the respondents to contact, survey forms, maps, and a credentials letter. It was stressed that they should contact their respondents in the early evening hours so that men would be home from their places of employment. They began their task on Sunday, November 10, 1974 and completed it by December 13, except for a small follow-up made on January 30, 1975, to get proper representation from a single tract in West Duluth.

Despite very cooperative and adequate media coverage, the interviewers initially found that many persons had not heard of the survey. The credentials letter plus further newspaper coverage early in the week of November 10 made the task of the interviewers easier; while no detailed figures were kept, it is clear from debriefing sessions with the interviewers that the rejection rate, the refusal of residents to cooperate in filling out the survey, ran no higher than 15% overall. Indeed, as the interviewers became more experienced in their tasks, many were able to obtain 100% cooperation from persons they contacted.

Interviewers were to secure responses from all of the adults in the households in which they were admitted. In this way, adequate representation of elderly, housebound, or bedridden individuals could be guaranteed. When interviewers were refused by a household, they were to substitute the house either to the right or left of the one they were at, if these were not already on their list, and try to secure cooperation there. In this way, the correct block representation within tracts was maintained.

In general, the interviewers reported active cooperation from residents who admitted them into their homes and apartments. Many offered the interviewers

refreshments, some asked them to stay for dinner, and a large number were pleased that they had been selected and their opinions solicited. Survey respondents were offered a copy of the eventual report on results, and many availed themselves of this possibility. All understood that their responses would be kept confidential.

As a check on the reliability of the interviewers, a random group of people from those reported to have been surveyed by the interviewers was contacted by telephone to verify that they had in fact been surveyed; in no case was there final doubt of the fact that the person claimed to have been interviewed actually had been.

The survey questionnaire was modeled basically on the 1962 format, with the addition of quite a few more topics. The total length was 53 items, making it definitely one of the longer surveys administered to ascertain attitudes. Interviewers reported that typically respondents required from 15 to 20 minutes to complete a survey form, with additional time being necessary if the respondents filled out the two open-format questions at the end, which were in addition to the 53 determinate items.

The returned completed survey forms were logged in, and their data key-punched on standard computer cards. Checks were made for accuracy of key-punching, and the final data analyzed by computer.

## RESULTS

By popular consensus, Duluth is regarded as being divided into four neighborhoods: East, Heights, Central and West. Therefore, the census tracts were consolidated into these four areas according to the standard map used for city planning, which corresponds to the ordinary ideas of where neighborhoods are located. Table 1 shows that the survey percentages match the 1970 census percentages exactly, contributing to the conclusion that a representative sample of citizens was obtained. Further support for this notion is given by the sex distribution for the city and for the survey: again, the percentages match, even though the respondents were not selected in advance by sex.

The entire survey form exactly as used, save for the addition of numbers next to each question to facilitate referring to them, is given in Appendix Table I. The first page of the survey was filled in by the interviewer, using information given by the respondent. The respondent then completed the questionnaire, beginning with the questions in Part I of the survey. In this part, respondents answered on a five-point scale, ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied, or circled 0 for no opinion. In Part II, simple yes/no choices were circled, with again an option for no opinion, although this choice was discouraged by the interviewers for questions on this part. At the conclusion, there were two open-ended questions which the respondents could fill in if they desired.

Table 2 shows the 10 most favorably and 10 least favorably rated items (2,3). Quite evidently, Duluthians enjoy living in a small-sized city whose population is only 100,000; they regard it as being very safe, as having good medical facilities and higher education opportunities, and a good fire department. They regard the city as having a favorable year-round climate, despite the severe winter,

good radio and television, and they are in agreement that the Arena Auditorium and the Seaway are beneficial to the community.

In the least-favored items, clearly Duluthians share the gloomy view concerning economic prospects that the rest of the nation holds. The presence of three tax items on the least-favored list should be no surprise either, as who likes taxes? Only 22% give a favorable rating to street maintenance, and as shall be shown later, this is a very significantly lower rating than in the 1962 survey. On the other hand, teenage entertainment opportunities, while given only a 22% rating, has moved up significantly in approval since 1962. Only 33% think that drug use is not a major problem in Duluth, although it is difficult to know just from the question wording whether alcohol was considered by the respondents as being a drug, and hence whether alcoholism is included within the drug-problem framework.

The remaining three items are rather abstract: do a few individuals have too much control over running the city?, have labor unions helped economic growth enough?, and have city planning efforts been adequate? In all cases, the citizens take the pessimistic view.

Whatever the view as to the least-favored items, it is clear that Duluth residents now regard the quality of life here as higher than in 1962. Of the 33 items that were included in both surveys, there has been a statistically reliable improvement in the ratings given 13 items, while there has been a statistically reliable decline for only 3. These items are shown in Table 3 (4). Most in the list are self-explanatory, but it is relevant to comment on a few.

As mentioned earlier, although the availability of teenage entertainment centers rated low, it nonetheless has increased its rating since 1962. Also very impressive is the gain by the basic services of police and fire departments. A fireman is seen in a limited context by the public: assisting in emergency situations. A policeman, on the other hand, is seen in a much broader

Table 1

## Comparison of the 1970 Duluth Population with the Survey Sample

<u>Geographic Area</u>	<u>1970 % of Duluth Population</u>	<u>Survey %</u>	<u>Survey Number</u>
East	27%	27%	218
Heights	17%	17%	137
Central	26%	26%	213
West	<u>30%</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>242</u>
Total	100%	100%	810

<u>Sex</u>	<u>1970 % of Duluth Population</u>	<u>Survey %</u>	<u>Survey Number</u>
Male (21 or older)	46%	46%	375
Female (21 or older)	<u>54%</u>	<u>54%</u>	<u>434</u>
Total	100%	100%	809

Note: 1 person not identified as to sex.

Table 2

Ten Items Most Favorably and Least Favorably Rated

A. Most Favorable

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>% Favorable</u>
37	City population not too large	92%
27	Unusually good medical facilities	91%
20	Arena Auditorium	91%
13	Fire department	91%
52	A safe city in which to live and work	89%
15	Higher education facilities	89%
4	Radio	86%
1	Year-round area climate	83%
5	Television	83%
47	Seaway helping economy	81%

B. Least Favorable

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>% Favorable</u>
2	Economy	17%
9	Local property taxes	18%
8	Street maintenance	22%
23	Teenage entertainment opportunities	22%
38	Local tax situation	25%
10	City sales tax	26%
39	Labor unions helping growth	29%
25	Control by few individuals	30%
11	City planning efforts	31%
45	Drug use	33%

Table 3

Items Gaining or Losing Significantly from 1962 to 1974

A. 13 Categories Rising Significantly in Favorable Direction, Ranked in Descending Order of Percentage Point Gains

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>% Point Gain</u>
33	Good restaurants	56%	79%	23
6	Adult entertainment oportunities	42%	65%	23
50	Cultural advantages	49%	70%	21
22	Citizens take pride in city	50%	68%	18
12	Police	54%	71%	17
51	Tourist attractions	36%	53%	17
7	Adult vocational training	62%	78%	16
35	Citizens willing to sacrifice	28%	43%	15
48	Need for industry-attracting agency	85%	75%	10*
44	Chamber of Commerce	26%	36%	10
23	Teenage entertainment centers	13%	22%	9
13	Fire department	82%	91%	9
5	Television	74%	83%	9

B. 3 Categories Declining Significantly, Ranked in Descending Order of Percentage Point Losses

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>% Point Loss</u>
9	Local property taxes	40%	18%	22
8	Street maintenance	41%	22%	19
3	Newspaper	74%	58%	16

Note: These are the only categories showing significant gains or losses.

\*Decreasing percentage saying agency needed is a favorable change.

Table 4

## Items Exhibiting Significant Geographic Differences

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>% Approval</u>			
		<u>East</u>	<u>Heights</u>	<u>Central</u>	<u>West</u>
3	Newspaper	37%	64%	63%	70%
17	Public parks	50%	38%	59%	52%
25	Few individuals in control	29%	31%	44%	33%
30	Need another newspaper	64%	49%	52%	44%
32	Parks well-maintained	51%	47%	61%	47%
40	Senior citizen opportunities	65%	60%	62%	51%
42	County government does a good job	36%	39%	54%	46%
53	Courts too lenient	51%	58%	42%	60%

Note: These are the only items exhibiting significant geographic differences.

set of contexts and is more visible to the public. Thus it is not surprising that the overall rating given to the fire department is higher than that given to the police, both in 1962 and in 1974, but it also makes the 17 percentage point gain of police extremely impressive. Such a positive change in the image of the police could be matched by very few other communities in the nation.

Three items moved significantly from less-than-50%-favorable to more-than-50%-favorable positions in the 12-year period between the surveys: adult entertainment opportunities, adequacy of cultural opportunities, and sufficiency of tourist attractions.

In the three items declining significantly, two have already been mentioned: local property taxes, which, as all across the nation, have risen steeply, and street maintenance. The third declining item is the newspaper, which showed a loss of 16 percentage points.

Several further measures, all easily obtained, show the gains in favorable attitudes towards the survey issues from 1962 to 1974. With the 33 items common to both surveys, the arithmetic mean favorable percentage rose from 52.4 to 56.9 in 1974 (mean for all 53 items is 56.8). The median percentage rose from 50% to 58% (1974 all-item median, 55%).

A straightforward quality-of-life index could be defined on the basis of the median favorable percentage for all items in the survey. Then, for a 1962 base of 100, the 1974 index would be  $100 \times (55/50) = 110$ . Perhaps a better basis for a quality-of-life index would be the percentage of survey items which over 50% of the respondents rated favorably, i.e., those which a majority of the persons questioned think contribute to the quality of life. In the 1962 survey there were 17 out of 33 such items, or 51.5%. In 1974, there were 33 out of 53, or 62.3%. The 1974 index is then computed as  $100 \times (62.3/51.5) = 121$ .

An interesting question is whether citizen's views on issues varied by the neighborhood they reside in; these neighborhoods for Duluth are rather heavily related to income and residential type: East Duluth had a median 1970 tract income

of \$11,324; Heights, \$10,817; Central, \$7,194; and West, \$8,355. Table 4 shows the 8 items for which there were statistically significant opinion differences (5). The complete geographic breakdown for all 53 of the survey questions is contained in Appendix Table III.

### References and Notes

1. Duluth News-Tribune, Oct. 27, 1974, p. 10; Wall Street Journal, Dec. 12, 1974, p. 16; Minneapolis Tribune, Jan. 5, 1975, p. 11C; Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 2, 1975, p. 1A.
2. It is important to note that, because of the way in which some questions were worded, answers of no constitute favorable responses to questions 25, 29, 30, 36, 37, 38, 45, 48 and 53. Thus, those who answered no to Question 45 believe that drug use is not a major problem in Duluth.
3. The answer options for Questions 1 through 18 constitute a 5-point Likert scale of satisfaction. Mean satisfaction scores for these questions will be presented in Report II. For purposes of the present report, answer options 1 and 2 were scored as yes ("satisfied"), 4 and 5 as no ("dissatisfied"), and the responses to option 3 ("medium") were proportionally split, to secure the final reported yes-no percentages. The 1962-64 study had only yes-no answer options for these 18 questions.
4. The well-known sign test, for a split of 13 to 3, shows, for the 16 categories that have changed, a general movement upward in favorability from 1962 to 1974 with statistical reliability (i.e., 1 - alpha, two-tailed) greater than .95. See any standard statistics text, e.g., W. Dixon and F. Massey, Introduction to Statistical Analysis, 3rd ed., (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1969). The criterion for change in percentages was a dual one: a significant chi-square value plus an absolute effect size, h, of at least .20. With sample sizes as large as those in the present study, the use of traditional statistical significance tests alone, such as chi-square, without a simultaneous consideration of practical or pragmatic significance, i.e., effect sizes, leads to implausible conclusions. For an able exposition of this argument, see J. Cohen, Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, (Academic Press, New York, 1969).
5. Again, a dual criterion was used: not only an overall significant chi-square for the four different regional percentages, but also a significant difference between the highest and lowest percentages on a multiple-comparisons basis. See Cohen, op. cit., and T. Ryan, Significance Tests for Multiple Comparison of Proportions, Variances, and Other Statistics, Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 57 (1960), pp. 318-328.

APPENDIX

Table	Page
I Survey Format . . . . .	16
II 1962-1974 Comparisons . . . . .	20
III Geographic Comparisons. . . . .	23

APPENDIX TABLE I  
1974 CURA-UMD ATTITUDE SURVEY

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Census Tract \_\_\_\_\_

Sex

- \_\_\_\_ 1 Male
- \_\_\_\_ 2 Female

Age

- \_\_\_\_ 3 21-35
- \_\_\_\_ 4 36-50
- \_\_\_\_ 5 51-65
- \_\_\_\_ 6 Over 65

Marital Status

- \_\_\_\_ 7 Married
- \_\_\_\_ 8 Single
- \_\_\_\_ 9 Other

Education

- \_\_\_\_ 10 8th grade and below
- \_\_\_\_ 11 9-12
- \_\_\_\_ 12 13-15
- \_\_\_\_ 13 16 or above

Occupation

- \_\_\_\_ 14 Professional
- \_\_\_\_ 15 Managerial
- \_\_\_\_ 16 Clerical
- \_\_\_\_ 17 Sales
- \_\_\_\_ 18 Skilled
- \_\_\_\_ 19 Unskilled
- \_\_\_\_ 20 Service
- \_\_\_\_ 21 Agricultural, Forestry
- \_\_\_\_ 22 Housewife

Presently Employed

- \_\_\_\_ 23 Employed full-time
- \_\_\_\_ 24 Employed part-time
- \_\_\_\_ 25 Unemployed
- \_\_\_\_ 26 Housewife
- \_\_\_\_ 27 Other, specify

Housing

- \_\_\_\_ 28 Own
- \_\_\_\_ 29 Rent
- \_\_\_\_ 30 Other

Time in Duluth

- \_\_\_\_ 31 Less than one year
- \_\_\_\_ 32 1-5
- \_\_\_\_ 33 6-15
- \_\_\_\_ 34 16 or more

Previous residence

- \_\_\_\_ 35 Duluth only
- \_\_\_\_ 36 Rural to 999
- \_\_\_\_ 37 1,000 to 24,999
- \_\_\_\_ 38 25,000 to 125,000
- \_\_\_\_ 39 Over 125,000

## Questions----Part I

For each of the following indicate how you personally feel about the following aspects of Duluth by giving a rating of 1 to 5, where

- 1 stands for very satisfied                      4 is somewhat dissatisfied  
2 means satisfied                                      5 is very dissatisfied  
3 is medium

While we would like you to try to give a rating on each item, if you really don't know or have no opinion, please give a 0. Circle your answer.

	very satisfied	satisfied	medium	dissatisfied	very dissatisfied	no opinion		Question Number
1	2	3	4	5	0		Area climate and weather on a year-round basis	(1)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Duluth's economy	(2)
1	2	3	4	5	0		The major newspaper	(3)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Local radio	(4)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Local television	(5)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Entertainment opportunities for adults	(6)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Adult vocational training opportunities	(7)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Street maintenance	(8)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Local property taxes	(9)
1	2	3	4	5	0		City sales tax	(10)
1	2	3	4	5	0		City planning efforts	(11)
1	2	3	4	5	0		The police department	(12)
1	2	3	4	5	0		The fire department	(13)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Public schools	(14)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Higher education facilities	(15)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Public libraries	(16)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Public parks	(17)
1	2	3	4	5	0		Bus service	(18)

## Questions----Part II

One frequently hears people making statements about Duluth, both favorable and unfavorable. Please indicate how you personally feel about the following statements by selecting the choice you think is more nearly correct. Circle your answer.

Question  
Number

- 19 The people of Duluth (are / are not) very friendly.
- 20 Duluth's Arena Auditorium (is / is not) an asset to the community.
- 21 Duluth (does / does not) have adequate public recreational facilities for children.
- 22 Duluthians (do / do not) take pride in their city.
- 23 Duluth (does / does not) have adequate entertainment centers for teenagers.
- 24 Duluth's water supply (is / is not) of high quality.
- 25 A few individuals in Duluth (do / do not) have too much control over how the city is run.
- 26 Duluth (does / does not) have good growth potential.
- 27 Duluth's medical facilities (are / are not) unusually good.
- 28 Duluth (does / does not) have good opportunities for evening entertainment.
- 29 There (is / is not) discrimination against minority groups in Duluth.
- 30 Duluth (does / does not) need another major newspaper.
- 31 Duluth (should / should not) place a major emphasis on celebrating the bicentennial.
- 32 Parks and historical sites in Duluth (are / are not) well maintained.
- 33 Duluth (does / does not) have plenty of good restaurants.
- 34 Duluth (does / does not) have adequate rental housing.
- 35 Duluthians (are / are not) willing to sacrifice in order to improve their city.
- 36 There (is / is not) discrimination against women in Duluth.
- 37 Duluth (is / is not) too large in population.
- 38 The local tax situation in Duluth (has / has not) hindered economic growth.
- 39 Labor unions (have / have not) done enough to help the economic growth of Duluth.
- 40 Opportunities and facilities for senior citizens in Duluth (are / are not) adequate.
- 41 The city government (does / does not) do a good job.
- 42 The county government (does / does not) do a good job.
- 43 The school board (does / does not) do a good job.

- The Chamber of Commerce (has / has not) done enough to help the economic growth of Duluth. (44)
- Drug use in Duluth (is / is not) a major problem. (45)
- Duluth's downtown (is / is not) a good shopping area. (46)
- The Seaway (has / has not) helped Duluth's economy. (47)
- Duluth (does / does not) need a city-government-supported agency for attracting new industries. (48)
- The Spirit Mountain project (will / will not) be an asset to the community. (49)
- Duluth (does / does not) have adequate cultural advantages. (50)
- Duluth (does / does not) do enough to attract tourists. (51)
- Duluth (is / is not) a safe town in which to live and work. (52)
- Courts in Duluth (are / are not) too lenient in sentencing. (53)

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you were in a position to make the decisions, what one or two things would you suggest to improve the city of Duluth ?

In a few words, do you have any final comments on any issue you feel affects your life here in Duluth, whether or not it was raised in this survey ?

Appendix Table II

	<u>1974</u>			<u>1962</u>					
	YES	NO	NO OPINION	YES	NO	NO OPINION	NO CHANGE	FAVORABLE CHANGE	UNFAVORABLE CHANGE
1. climate.....	83%	16%	1%	87%	12%	1%	X		
2. economy.....	17%	77%	6%						
3. newspaper.....	58%	40%	2%	74%	25%	1%		X	
4. radio.....	86%	12%	2%	82%	10%	8%	X		
5. television.....	83%	15%	2%	74%	23%	3%		X	
6. adult entertainment.....	65%	30%	5%	42%	40%	19%		X	
7. adult vocational training..	78%	11%	11%	62%	13%	25%		X	
8. street maintenance.....	22%	76%	2%	41%	55%	3%			X
9. local property tax.....	18%	72%	10%	40%	40%	20%			X
10. city sales tax.....	26%	69%	5%						
11. city planning.....	31%	58%	11%	34%	22%	45%	X		
12. police.....	71%	25%	4%	54%	41%	6%		X	
13. fire department.....	91%	4%	5%	82%	10%	8%		X	
14. schools.....	74%	18%	8%	77%	8%	15%	X		
15. higher education.....	89%	5%	6%	86%	5%	9%	X		
16. libraries.....	75%	17%	8%	71%	16%	13%	X		
17. parks.....	51%	45%	4%						
18. bus service.....	48%	40%	12%	45%	40%	15%	X		

Note: Due to rounding, some percentage totals may not total 100%.  
 Size of sample: 1974--810, 1962 -650.

	<u>1974</u>			<u>1962</u>					
	YES	NO	NO OPINION	YES	NO	NO OPINION	NO CHANGE	FAVORABLE CHANGE	UNFAVORABLE CHANGE
19. friendliness.....	83%	16%	2%	80%	19%	1%	X		
20. Arena Auditorium.....	91%	7%	1%						
21. children's recreation.....	38%	58%	4%	38%	59%	3%	X		
22. city pride.....	68%	29%	3%	50%	48%	2%		X	
23. teenage entertainment.....	22%	71%	7%	13%	77%	10%		X	
24. water supply.....	39%	58%	3%						
25. too powerful individuals....	66%	30%	5%	62%	28%	11%	X		
26. growth potential.....	66%	32%	1%	63%	34%	3%	X		
27. medical facilities.....	91%	9%	0%	93%	6%	1%	X		
28. evening entertainment.....	59%	39%	3%						
29. minority discrimination.....	35%	58%	7%						
30. another newspaper.....	52%	47%	1%	49%	50%	1%	X		
31. bicentennial.....	76%	20%	4%						
32. parks maintained.....	52%	45%	4%	45%	50%	5%	X		
33. good restaurants.....	79%	20%	1%	56%	42%	2%		X	
34. adequate rental housing.....	35%	59%	6%						
35. willing to sacrifice.....	43%	51%	6%	28%	67%	5%		X	
36. women discrimination.....	38%	55%	7%						
37. too large population.....	7%	92%	1%						
38. local tax situation.....	70%	25%	5%	66%	21%	13%	X		
39. labor unions economic help..	29%	63%	8%	36%	51%	13%	X		
40. senior citizens.....	59%	35%	6%						
41. city government .....	54%	40%	6%	55%	32%	13%	X		
42. county government .....	45%	49%	7%						

	<u>1974</u>			<u>1962</u>			NO CHANGE	FAVORABLE CHANGE	UNFAVORABLE CHANGE
	YES	NO	NO OPINION	YES	NO	NO OPINION			
43. school board.....	52%	43%	5%						
44. Chamber of Commerce helps...	36%	56%	8%	26%	65%	9%	X		
45. drug use a problem.....	59%	33%	8%						
46. downtown good shopping.....	55%	44%	1%						
47. Seaway has helped.....	81%	16%	3%						
48. industrial agency.....	75%	21%	4%	85%	11%	4%	X		
49. Spirit Mountain.....	80%	16%	4%						
50. cultural advantages.....	70%	26%	4%	49%	44%	7%	X		
51. enough tourist attractions..	53%	45%	3%	36%	61%	3%	X		
52. Duluth a safe town.....	89%	9%	2%						
53. courts are too lenient.....	52%	40%	7%						

## APPENDIX TABLE III

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS

The percentages given indicate the fraction of the interviewees who were generally satisfied with the items numbered 1 through 18.

QUESTION	<u>EAST</u>	<u>HEIGHTS</u>	<u>CENTRAL</u>	<u>WEST</u>	<u>GEO. DIFF.</u>
(1)	83%	85%	77%	86%	
(2)	21%	16%	18%	14%	
(3)	37%	64%	63%	70%	**
(4)	80%	97%	80%	88%	
(5)	80%	91%	81%	83%	
(6)	73%	66%	61%	61%	
(7)	81%	79%	74%	77%	
(8)	22%	16%	24%	23%	
(9)	16%	17%	15%	23%	
(10)	32%	27%	25%	21%	
(11)	29%	35%	36%	26%	
(12)	71%	72%	69%	71%	
(13)	92%	91%	90%	92%	
(14)	78%	80%	70%	72%	
(15)	91%	87%	88%	87%	
(16)	73%	77%	77%	75%	
(17)	50%	38%	59%	52%	**
(18)	46%	53%	45%	50%	

\*\* indicates a statistically reliable geographic difference

Sample Size:  
 East 218  
 Heights 137  
 Central 213  
 West 242  
 Total 810

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS

The percentages given indicate the fraction of the interviewees who answered yes to items 19 through 43.

QUESTION	<u>EAST</u>	<u>HEIGHTS</u>	<u>CENTRAL</u>	<u>WEST</u>	<u>GEO. DIFF.</u>
(19)	78%	90%	84%	82%	
(20)	95%	93%	92%	86%	
(21)	43%	29%	43%	35%	
(22)	73%	69%	66%	65%	
(23)	22%	13%	26%	24%	
(24)	40%	35%	44%	36%	
(25)	71%	69%	56%	67%	**
(26)	68%	71%	60%	67%	
(27)	92%	99%	91%	86%	
(28)	62%	58%	55%	59%	
(29)	33%	24%	39%	39%	
(30)	64%	49%	52%	44%	**
(31)	74%	74%	76%	78%	
(32)	51%	47%	61%	47%	**
(33)	72%	85%	80%	81%	
(34)	41%	32%	35%	30%	
(35)	42%	39%	44%	46%	
(36)	35%	36%	42%	38%	
(37)	6%	5%	8%	8%	
(38)	72%	70%	66%	71%	
(39)	23%	25%	30%	36%	
(40)	65%	60%	62%	51%	**
(41)	55%	56%	53%	53%	
(42)	36%	39%	54%	46%	**
(43)	51%	54%	53%	50%	

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS

The percentages given indicate the fraction of the interviewees who answered yes to items 44 through 53.

QUESTION	<u>EAST</u>	<u>HEIGHTS</u>	<u>CENTRAL</u>	<u>WEST</u>	<u>GEO. DIFF.</u>
(44)	37%	37%	39%	33%	
(45)	57%	58%	59%	60%	
(46)	54%	53%	53%	58%	
(47)	79%	84%	83%	79%	
(48)	76%	78%	73%	74%	
(49)	83%	77%	80%	78%	
(50)	74%	68%	71%	65%	
(51)	51%	47%	55%	55%	
(52)	94%	91%	85%	88%	
(53)	51%	58%	42%	60%	**