

P1013

CURA

RESOURCE COLLECTION

A city examines itself:
The 1974
Duluth Attitude Survey

Report #2

Detailed Statistical Analysis

CURA

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 #2
DETAILED STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

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

May, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	LIST OF TABLES.	iv
	FOREWORD.	v
1.	COMPARISON WITH OTHER MUNICIPAL SURVEYS.	1
2.	DETERMINATION OF KEY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES.	2
3.	CITIZEN CONCERNS MEASURED BY OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS.	21
	REFERENCES.	23
	APPENDIX	24

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparable Items in Three Municipal Surveys	7
2. Demographic Variables: Primary City Services	8
3. " " : People's Attitudes	9
4. " " : Social Problems	10
5. " " : Recent City Developments	11
6. " " : Secondary City Services	12
7. " " : Entertainment	13
8. " " : Media	14
9. " " : Economic Issues	15
10. " " : Amenities	16
11. " " : Cultural	17
12. " " : Other Topics	18
13. Responses Per Category For Open-Ended Questions	19

Appendix Table	Page
I. Survey Format	25

Foreword

In Report #1, issued in February, 1975, we gave the basic results of a large-scale municipal survey conducted in Duluth, Minnesota, in late 1974, in which 810 citizens were queried about 53 items associated with a large set of issues affecting their lives as residents of the city. The rationale for the study, the details of the respondent selection methods, the manner of execution of the survey, and straightforward tabulations and analyses of the results were given in that Report.

In the present document, we compare our survey to others done in the distant and recent past, introduce a breakdown of responses to the two open-ended questions placed at the conclusion of our survey, and, most importantly, provide the results of analyzing our data by means of recently developed, comprehensive, and sophisticated procedures through which the key demographic variables determining public opinion can be discovered. These statistical methods are perfectly suited to the analysis of data such as result from public opinion surveys, data which naturally fall into what are technically called multidimensional contingency tables. While the methods have been used in a variety of other contexts, it is an apparent first that they have here been applied to an attitude survey; their powerful nature seemingly destines them to become the method of choice for the analysis of surveys of the future.

The dissemination of news about the Duluth survey in various urban research journals has continued to result in many requests for copies of these Reports from municipalities and universities, both within and without the

U.S., reinforcing the claim made in the preface to Report #1 that the accurate surveying of public opinion is now a prime concern of modern city government.

William J. Krossner
Associate Professor of Psychology
and Behavioral Science
University of Minnesota/Duluth
May 28, 1975

Comparison With Other Municipal Surveys

The best list of earlier municipal surveys is contained in Metropolitan Surveys: A Digest (Government Affairs Foundation, 1958), which summarizes "A total of 112 general metropolitan surveys made in the United States since 1923...In addition, 5 surveys made of Canadian metropolitan areas are included." All of these were far more limited in scope than the Duluth Survey, with many having as respondents municipal personnel in relevant agencies rather than citizens at large resident in the city.

There seems to be no comprehensive list of surveys done since 1958, but comparability in some areas with the Duluth Survey was attained by three: St. Louis, Missouri, in 1956-57 (Bollens, 1961), DeKalb County, Georgia, in 1971 (Nix and Seerley, 1972), and Mt. Pleasant, Michigan, in 1974 (Palm, 1974). Sample sizes were 515 for St. Louis, 322 for DeKalb, and 251 for Mt. Pleasant, compared with 810 for Duluth.

The DeKalb study asked both community leaders and community voters about 45 aspects of community life, with a fair degree of overlap with the Duluth questions, and in terms of comprehensiveness must be regarded as the closest. However, the scores are reported only as average ratings along a 1 to 5 continuum, making direct comparison with percentage figures impossible.

Differences in coverage and question wording permit only a limited comparison with the St. Louis and Mt. Pleasant studies. Table 1 presents the similar items and their scores.

The Duluth-St. Louis pattern is remarkably similar, except for street maintenance and parks. Of course, the 18-year time difference between when the two studies were conducted, as well as the size difference between the two cities, make a strict comparison impossible. A factor acting similarly to reduce the comparison between Duluth and Mt. Pleasant is that in the latter city, 46% of the respondents were full-time university students, versus 4% for Duluth.

Determination of Key Demographic Variables

The breakdown of the Duluth Survey results according to important demographic variables was begun in Report #1 with the presentation of response percentages according to the residence neighborhood of the respondents; in Duluth, there are four well-defined neighborhood areas, which have distinctive socio-economic characteristics. An appropriate single statistical method was used to ascertain topics for which the neighborhood of residence was a key variable in the sense that residents of the different neighborhoods differed significantly in their attitudes.

Nonetheless, neighborhood was not the only demographic variable measured; for all of the respondents, information was also obtained on sex of respondent, age, marital status, education level, occupation, state of employment, home ownership, residence time in Duluth, and, if not a life-long resident of Duluth, size of place of previous residence--information on a total of 10 possibly significant variables. Any of these singly, or combinations collectively, of these variables could be determinative of differential attitudes towards different topics.

Further, the 10 variables have differing numbers of levels, of classification slots. Respondent age was categorized into four levels, as was neighborhood; sex had two levels, marital status three, occupational type ten, and so forth. Considering only age and neighborhood alone, then, we see that there are sixteen classification cells jointly for these two variables, for each neighborhood can, and does have residents in each of the four age levels. ($4 \times 4 = 16$). When we consider all of the 10 variables simultaneously, there are, because the classification categories are multiplicative, a total of 1,152,000 cross-classification cells into which survey respondents could, at least conceptually, be placed.

The problem of deciding which subsets of these cross-classification cells were determinative of attitude differences towards the topics surveyed is clearly not trivial.

Methods exist for the solution of similar problems where there are many influencing variables, and where the basic response data collected are not simple yes/no/no opinion enumerations, (i.e., nominal scale), but are instead measurements of scores on an interval or ratio scale (such as weights, times, distances, or voltages); one method is the factorial analysis of variance, (see, e.g., Winer, 1971). Until recently, no equivalent methods existed for the simpler case of enumeration or frequency data collected in multidimensional contingency tables. Fortunately, the general problem has now been solved, remarkably enough, in a satisfactorily convergent fashion by two separate groups of research workers, one centered at the National Bureau of Standards (Ku, Varner & Kullback, 1972; Ku & Kullback, 1974), and the other at the University of Chicago (Goodman, 1970; Goodman, 1971; Goodman, 1972a, 1972b; Haberman, 1974a, 1974b). Shaffer (1973) provides a tutorial introduction which makes clear the parallels between the log-linear model for multidimensional contingency tables and the additive effects model that is the basis for analysis of variance.

Goodman has refined the applications of the basic model until it is now an exceptionally powerful and flexible tool for data exploration and discovery; linear interaction effects may be differentiated from quadratic and higher-order polynomial effects, ordered response classifications may be analyzed, models with more than one response variable can be tested, and the size of any significant effect measured in terms of a proportion-of-explained-variance index (Goodman, 1971; Goodman, 1972a).

Application of Goodman's techniques to the survey data was begun by selecting various subsets of the 10 demographic variables and constructing and testing

the relevant statistical models via computer to see which of the variables produced the biggest explanatory effects across all 53 survey questions. Because of the large number of cross-classification cells with the 10 variables (1,152,000) versus the size of the sample (810) it was of course impossible to test all of the variables in one pass (this would have necessitated a sample size of several million respondents) but a fairly rapid convergence to three key variables--neighborhood, educational level, and age--was obtained with the heuristic testing of various combinations of the 10 variables. Neighborhood of residence and educational level are related to socio-economic class status, and age may be regarded as connected to a dimension of liberalism-conservatism.

The survey questions were grouped into 11 areas and the results of the analysis shown in Tables 2 through 12 .

In the questions concerned with primary city services, there was an education effect with regard to opinion on parks; with the high school graduates who had taken no college work the most pessimistic about parks, and college graduates the most favorable. Age was the key variable for bus service, with a steady decline in favorability with age level, until the over-65 group is reached, when favorability rises again. A possible explanation for this is that this advanced age group is not as ambulatory as the lower ones, and does not feel the need for public transportation as much as, say, the 51-65 group.

For the remaining five topics in the primary city services group, the absence of any of the three key variables means that opinion was homogeneous on the issues with respect to these variables--there were no differences in attitudes as a function of age, education, or neighborhood.

In the second bloc, concerned with people's attitudes towards others, age was the variable identified as significant for the questions on discrimination against minorities or against women. In both cases, the youngest age category,

from 21 to 35 years of age, was notably more pessimistic about the existence of such discrimination than were the older groups, possibly because of higher expectations or idealistic standards.

Question 53, which asked whether the courts were too lenient in sentencing offenders, produced independent and sharp trend effects due to education and age. Respondents agreed that the courts were too lenient the lower their education level or the more advanced their age. Interestingly, although the older age levels had the largest number of people who were not able to pursue their educations beyond the 8th grade level, there was no significant education-by-age interaction effect for this question; such an interaction would easily have been detected by the log-linear model technique if it existed. (Such interactions did exist and will be commented on for subsequent topic areas.)

In terms of recent developments in the city, the construction of the arena auditorium was approved as having been beneficial in proportion to education level, while the Seaway is regarded as having been beneficial in inverse proportion to age, perhaps because members of the younger age groups are more likely to be employed in waterway-related jobs.

Question 24, which asked about the quality of drinking water, implicitly relative to the problem of possible dangers from ingesting taconite tailing fibers from the Lake Superior drinking water, produced not only an age effect but also an age-by-education interaction. Persons in the two middle age groups were the most optimistic about the water quality, while the young and old together were more dubious. For the interaction, in the top two education categories, as age increased so did doubts about the quality of the water: the percentage of respondents saying yes on water quality declines sharply and dramatically. In the lower two education categories this trend effect is not present; rather, there is a curvilinear relationship with age.

For entertainment opportunities, the youngest age group has the lowest opinion of adult and evening entertainment facilities, while the other age brackets are more sanguine. With regard to children's recreational facilities, education is the key variable, with the two middle groups being less favorable than the end groups.

Opinions on the newspaper were a function both of education, neighborhood, and an education-by-neighborhood interaction. Increasing educational level produced a less favorable view towards the newspaper, as did residency in East Duluth; the interaction pattern is quite complicated indeed.

Favorable attitudes towards local radio was a decreasing function of education, and there were sharp neighborhood differences as well, with East Duluth being the most critical and the Heights section the most approving.

Question 25, on whether or not too few individuals exerted too much power in the city had an age effect, with the youngest group answering yes more often than any other.

Opinion was homogeneous across neighborhood, education, and age with regard to questions on the economy and on city amenities and cultural opportunities.

Table 1

Favorability Percentages for Comparable Items in Three Municipal Surveys

<u>Items</u>	St. Louis, 1956			Mt. Pleasant, 1974			Duluth, 1974		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No Op.</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No Op.</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No Op.</u>
Police	76	20	4	65	14	21	71	25	4
Parks	63	29	8	63	24	13	51	45	4
Street Maintenance	61	38	1	52	40	8	22	76	2
Public Transportation	57	34	9				48	40	12
Libraries	69	9	21				75	17	8
Schools	78	9	13				74	18	8
Fire Department	92	3	4				91	4	5

Table 2

PRIMARY CITY SERVICES

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category				Chi-Square
17	Parks	Education	Years of Education				13.48*
			8(below)	9-12	13-15	16(above)	
			56.6%	46.7%	53.2%	67.3%	
18	Bus service	Age	Age Category				10.36*
			21-35	36-50	51-65	65(above)	
			63.3%	52.7%	43.4%	54.4%	
8	Street maintenance	None					
12	Police	None					
13	Fire department	None					
14	Schools	None					
16	Libraries	None					

* $p < .05$ if Chi-Square ≥ 7.815 (3 degrees of freedom)
 ** $p < .01$ if Chi Square ≥ 11.345 (3 degrees of freedom)
 *** $p < .01$ if Chi Square ≥ 21.666 (9 degrees of freedom)
 **** $.10 > p > .05$ if Chi Square ≥ 14.684 (9 degrees of freedom)

Table 3

PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category				Chi-Square
29	Discrimination against minorities	Age	Age Category				26.44**
			21-35	36-50	51-65	65 (above)	
			49.1%	33.3%	27.8%	30.5%	
36	Female discrimination	Age	Age Category				23.56**
			21-35	36-50	51-65	65 (above)	
			51.6%	38.2%	34.3%	28.4%	
19	Duluthians are friendly	None					
22	Pride in city	None					
35	Sacrifice for Duluth	None					

Table 4

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category				Chi-Square
53	Courts too lenient	Education	Years of Education				34.17*
			8(below)	9-12	13-15	16(above)	
			80.0%	63.2%	47.9%	45.8%	
		Age	Age Category				58.12**
			21-35	36-50	51-65	65(above)	
			39.3%	60.8%	68.2%	74.1%	
45	Drug use	None					

Table 5

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category				Chi-Square
20	Arena auditorium	Education	Years of Education				23.82**
			8 (below)	9-12	13-15	16 (above)	
			81.3%	90.8%	96.4%	97.6%	
47	Seaway has been good	Age	Age Category				22.98**
			21-35	35-50	51-65	65 (above)	
			89.9%	84.6%	77.4%	72.6%	
49	Spirit Mountain	None					

Table 6

SECONDARY CITY SERVICES

Question # | Topic | Key Variable(s) | % Yes By Variable Category | Chi-Square

24	Water Supply	Age	Age Category				14.51**
			21-35	36-50	51-65	65 (above)	
			34.3%	45.3%	47.8%	32.5%	

Age by Education Interaction		Age Category				26.41 ***
		21-35	36-50	51-65	65 (above)	
	8 (below)	*	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%	
	9-12	21.4%	30.0%	31.4%	17.1%	
Years of Education	13-15	46.6%	33.0%	18.2%	2.3%	
	16 (above)	36.6%	26.8%	28.2%	8.5%	

* No respondents in this category.

41	City Government Education	Years of Education				11.26 **
		8 (below)	9-12	13-15	16 (above)	
		44.1%	57.3%	54.9%	67.3%	

42	County Government	Neighborhood	East	Heights	West	Central	16.07 **
			38.9%	49.1%	43.1%	58.0%	

- 7 Adult Vocational opps. None
- 11 City Planning None
- 40 Senior Citizen opps. None
- 43 School Board None
- 44 Chamber of Commerce None

Table 7

ENTERTAINMENT

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category				Chi-Square
6	Adult entertainment	Age	Age Category				31.54**
			21-35	36-50	51-65	65 (above)	
			53.2%	76.2%	72.2%	82.7%	
21	Children's recreation	Education	Years of Education				18.00**
			8 (below)	9-12	13-15	16 (above)	
			41.5%	34.3%	38.2%	54.0%	
28	Evening entertainment	Age	Age Category				26.00**
			21-35	36-50	51-65	65 (above)	
			49.5%	68.5%	63.6%	71.0%	
23	Teenage entertainment	None					
32	Parks maintained	None					
33	Good resturants	None					

Table 8

MEDIA

Question # | Topic | Key Variable(s) | % Yes By Variable Category | Chi-Square

3	Newspaper	Education	Years of Education				22.15**
			8(below)	9-12	13-15	16(above)	
			76.5%	69.2%	50.0%	41.2%	

	Neighborhood	Neighborhood				43.83**
		East	Heights	West	Central	
		37.1%	72.0%	64.0%	63.7%	

Education by Neighborhood Interaction		Years of Education				16.20***	
			8(below)	9-12	13-15		16(above)
		East	57.1%	28.6%	40.3%		38.2%
		Heights	76.9%	63.3%	75.0%		29.2%
		West	58.3%	50.0%	76.2%		50.0%
Central	94.7%	56.8%	76.9%	57.1%			

4	Radio	Education	Years of Education				16.87*
			8(below)	9-12	13-15	16(above)	
			94.7%	92.4%	81.5%	79.1%	

	Neighborhood	Neighborhood				25.76*
		East	Heights	West	Central	
		37.1%	92.4%	81.5%	79.1%	

5 TV None

Table 9

ECONOMIC ISSUES

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category	Chi-Square
2	Duluth's economy	None		
9	Local property tax	None		
10	City sales tax	None		
26	Good growth potential	None		
38	Local tax situation	None		
39	Labor unions economically helpful	None		
51	Enough tourist attractions	None		

Table 10

AMENITIES: NON CITY-SUPPLIED BASICS

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category	Chi-Square
27	Medical facilities	None		
30	Another newspaper	None		
34	Adequate rental housing	None		
46	Downtown good shopping	None		
52	Duluth a safe town	None		

Table 11

CULTURAL

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category	Chi-Square
15	Higher education	None		
50	Adequate cultural advantages	None		

Table 12

OTHER

Question #	Topic	Key Variable(s)	% Yes By Variable Category				Chi-Square
			Age category				
25	Too few individuals control city	Age	21-35	36-50	51-65	65(above)	14.30**
			75.5%	64.5%	69.8%	57.1%	
1	Climate	None					
31	Bicentennial	None					
37	Too large population	None					
48	City industrial agency	None					

Table 13
Responses Per Category For Open-Ended Questions

<u>Categories</u>	<u># of Responses</u> (Total = 1206)
Economy	195
Taxes	95
Parks, Recreation	74
Street Maintenance	72
Water Quality	60
Freeway Extension	44
Education	42
Crime, Justice, Police	41
General Quality of Life	39
Government, In General	36
Government, City	34
Youth	34
Citizen Involvement	34
City Cleanliness	30
Public Transportation	29
Tourism	28
Welfare	28
Housing	27
Downtown Area/Shopping	26
Environment	23
Entertainment	23
Media	19
Power Distribution	18
City Planning	17
General City Services	15
All Other Topics Combined	123



Citizen Concerns Measured by Open-Ended Comments

At the end of the survey there were two questions with sufficient writing space so that respondents could comment on any issues they felt were either not covered by the preceding 53 questions or were not given sufficient importance. The first such question was, "If you were in a position to make the decisions, what one or two things would you suggest to improve the city of Duluth?", and the second was, "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?."

As is usually the case, many respondents availed themselves of the opportunity to write comments, often exceeding the space provided and continuing on the backs of the survey pages. Comments were made on a total of 1206 issues, for an average of 1.48 per respondent, although many respondents, of course, commented on more than one issue, balancing the number who did not use the open-ended option at all.

Overwhelmingly, the free responses concerned the state of the local economy (197 responses) and local taxes (100 responses), both of which, of course, being items that rated notably low on the questions concerned with them (2, 9, 10, 38). The tension between economic development and job availability, on the one hand, and freedom from the pollution and population congestion thought to be the inevitable accompaniment of concentrations of industry, on the other, occupied several citizens. One wrote, "I would want Duluth to remain a small town, but one with a booming economy, possibly an impossible paradox."

Nonetheless, 100 of the commentators on the economy stressed the desirability of attracting industries to Duluth and 28 felt that some concessions with regard to tax breaks and/or land availability should be offered to industries willing to move here.

Similarly, 32 people expressed deep concern for the lack of jobs for young people, and that there is, thus, a preferential out-migration of the young to larger cities to find work. Several mentioned that some of their own children had done this.

With regard to Duluth's present dependence on the port and its shipping activities to sustain local economic health, 11 persons felt that the St. Lawrence Seaway needed better management and more promotional activity; obviously the flow of shipping to Duluth, the final westernmost port in the Great Lakes system, is affected by developments all along the length of the Seaway.

The main tax issues commented on were the property tax and the city sales tax. It was widely felt that the taxes were differentially assessed in different neighborhoods; as one person put it, "Homes of equal value are not taxed the same throughout the city." It was also felt that money spent for home improvements would result in higher tax assessments, so there was a negative incentive to maintaining adequately repaired and painted dwellings. 23 persons specifically mentioned changing the property tax.

The third category in terms of frequency of mention was parks/recreation (74 responses). The chief concern, not surprisingly, was for more and better recreation facilities. Indoor and outdoor swimming, tennis courts, and places for children and teenagers led the list.

Street maintenance, which received one of the lowest satisfaction ratings in the entire survey in question 8, which was devoted to it, and one of the chief decliners in ratings between 1962 and 1974, received a further blast of negative comments from 72 persons. Not one single favorable remark was made about street maintenance in Duluth; a typical remark was, "We don't think it's fair to do all the street work in just one area--our street hasn't been improved in the last thirty-five years."

Table 13 provides a summary, by frequency of mention, of all topics which received over 15 comments in the open-ended section of the survey.

References

- Bollens, J.C., ed. Exploring the metropolitan community. Berkeley: Univ. of Cal. Press, 1961.
- Goodman, L.A. The multivariate analysis of qualitative data: Interactions among multiple classifications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1970, 65, 226-256.
- Goodman, L.A. The analysis of multidimensional contingency tables: Stepwise procedures and direct estimation methods for building models for multiple classifications. *Technometrics*, 1971, 13, 33-61.
- Goodman, L.A. A modified multiple regression approach to the analysis of dichotomous variables. *American Sociological Review*, 1972, 37, 28-46. (a)
- Goodman, L.A. A general model for the analysis of surveys. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1972, 77, 1035-1086. (b)
- Government Affairs Foundation. *Metropolitan surveys: A digest*. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1958.
- Haberman, S. The analysis of frequency data. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1974. (a)
- Haberman, S. Log-linear models for frequency tables with ordered classifications. *Biometrics*, 1974, 30, 589-600. (b)
- Ku, H.H., Varner, R.N., & Kullback, S. On the analysis of multidimensional contingency tables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1971, 66, 55-64.
- Ku, H.H., & Kullback, S. Log-linear models in contingency table analysis. *American Statistician*, 1974, 28, 115-122.
- Nix, H.L., & Seerley, N.R. *Community social analysis of DeKalb county, Georgia*. Athens: Univ. of Georgia, 1972.
- Palm, A.F. *Citizen satisfaction with Mt. Pleasant government*. Mt. Pleasant: Central Michigan University, 1974.
- Shaffer, J.P. Defining and testing hypotheses in multidimensional contingency tables. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1973, 79, 127-141.
- Winer, B.J. *Statistical principles in experimental design*. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

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

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.

1974 CURA-UMD Survey
Questions, Part II continued
Question
Number

- 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 ?