Wayne State University
DigitalCommons@WayneState

Sociology Faculty Research Publications | Sociology

1-1-1991

1991 Needs Assessment of the Arab and Chaldean 60 and Over Population in the State of Michigan

Mary C. Sengstock
Wayne State University, marycay910@wowway.com

Mary Lindeman
Michigan Office of Services to the Aging

Recommended Citation
Lindemann, M. A., & Sengstock, M. C. (1992). *1991 Needs Assessment of the Arab and Chaldean 60 and Over Population in the State of Michigan*. Michigan Office of Services to the Aging.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/socfrp/4

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology at DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology Faculty Research Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

1991 NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF THE ARAB AND CHALDEAN 60 AND OVER POPULATION IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Conducted by The Michigan Office of Services to the Aging
Nancy Crandall, Director

Project Coordinator
Mary M. Lindemann, M.A., Director of Planning and Research

Project Director
Mary C. Sengstock, Ph.D., C.C.S.
Wayne State University

January, 1992

© COPYRIGHT BY
MICHIGAN OFFICE OF SERVICES TO THE AGING
1992
All Rights Reserved

Printed 250 copies at a cost of $1,000 or $4.00 per single copy with funds from The Older Americans Act.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is the result of a recognition of the sizeable representation of persons from Arabic-speaking nations who reside in the State of Michigan, most of them in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. The study replicates the Needs Assessment Survey of the Over 60 Population which was conducted in 1985, and represents the third in a series of studies, each designed to focus on a specific ethnic subgroup of the Michigan population. Hispanic elders were studied in 1987, followed by Native American elders in 1989, and the present study of Arab and Chaldean elders in 1991. Mary Lindeman, Director of Planning and Research for the Office of Services to the Aging, served as Coordinator for the project.

Many people contributed to the project's success. Without their help, it would not have reached completion. Of major importance were the two Research Assistants, Dr. Salim Alqaisi, who served the project from June through December, 1990, and Dr. Rifaat Dika, who served from January through September, 1991. Dr. Alqaisi translated the questionnaire into Arabic and conducted extensive interviews in the Dearborn area. Dr. Dika also conducted numerous interviews and performed a major part of the coding of data. Both assisted in many other ways as well. Their willingness to provide assistance and their knowledge of the Arabic language and community are deeply appreciated.

Mrs. Margaret Sarafa served as Consultant to the project for the Chaldean community. She was primarily responsible for locating interviewers and respondents, and for monitoring the interviewing process in the Chaldean community. Her knowledge of the community, its language, and its people were of inestimable value.

Without the assistance of our interviewers, most whom are fluent in either Arabic or Chaldean or both, the project could not have been completed. The project owes a particular debt to two individuals who conducted a large portion of the interviews. These are Ferial Seblani, a graduate student at Wayne State University, who interviewed in the Dearborn Arab community, and Najib Karmo, of the Arab-American and Chaldean Council, who conducted interviews primarily in the Chaldean community. Others who assisted with interviewing included: Ahmed Abadi, Rosemary Antone, Badie Bodiya, Amira Dika, Virgene Hamama, Salim Sarafa, Rev. Fr. Abdel Ahad Shara, Steven Shaya, and Joanie Thomas.

The project is also indebted to Sandra Smith, of the Department of Sociology at Wayne State University, who spent many hours to input interview data into computer readable form; Nadia Mouzahem, who typed the Arabic version of the questionnaire; and Mohammed Okdie, who served as a consultant with the project.

Several leaders of social agencies in the Chaldean and Arabic communities assisted with locating respondents and interviewers,

as well as in other ways too numerous to mention. These include: Ismael Ahmed, Director of the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS), as well as Nancy Adadow Gray and other members of his staff; Dr. Haifa Fakhouri, Executive Director, and Dr. Radwan Khoury, Assistant Director, of the Arab-American and Chaldean Council.

Religious leaders in the Arab and Chaldean communities were particularly helpful in identifying respondents and validating the legitimacy of the research. Special appreciation goes to: Most Rev. Mar Ibrahim N. Ibrahim, Bishop of the Chaldean Apostolic Exarchate of America and pastor of Our Lady of Chaldeans Cathedral; Imam Muhammad A. H. Karoub of the American Islamic Institute; Imam Mohamed Mussa of the American Moslem Society; Imam Mohamad R. Mardini of the American Moslem Bekaa Center; Imam Mohammad Jawad Chirri of the Islamic Center of America; Imam Abdal-Latif Berry of the Islamic Institute of Knowledge; Very Rev. Archpriest Joseph Antypas, of St. George Greek Orthodox Church; and Chor-Bishop Joseph Feghali, pastor of St. Maron's and St. Sharbel's Maronite Churches.

We are also deeply indebted to the members of the Arab and Chaldean community who gave so generously of their time and effort to serve as respondents in our survey. Though they must remain anonymous, their cooperation and assistance are deeply appreciated.

List of Sections of Tables

Note: A detailed list of the Tables in each Section will be found at the beginning of the Section.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Description of Communities and Sample:

Approximately 200,000 persons of Arab and Chaldean descent live in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. The Muslim community, primarily from Lebanon, is concentrated in Dearborn. The Chaldean community from Iraq lives in north central Detroit and southern Oakland County. Other Arabic groups include immigrants from Lebanon, Palestine, Syria, Yemen, and Jordan, including Muslims, and Maronite and Orthodox Christians. A sample of 200 persons aged 60 and over in these communities was interviewed between November, 1990, and June, 1991. Most respondents (98, or 49%) were from the Dearborn community; 91 (45.5%) were from the Chaldean community; 11 (5.5%) were from the other groups. Note: Census data on persons from Arabic nations are quite inaccurate; consequently comparisons would be inappropriate.

Demographics:

Muslim Arabs mainly live in Area Agency on Aging 1-C; Chaldeans are primarily in AAA 1-B, with the poorest in AAA 1-A. The sample is a "young-old" group, mean age being 68.1 years. One-fourth (26.4%) are 70 or over. A few (3.5%) gave no age; it is often difficult to obtain an age for persons from Arab villages, since accurate data were not kept. This makes it difficult for some to obtain Social Security or other benefits. The sample consists of 54.5% males, 45.5% females. Median income for all groups is $7,500. Mean income varies. For the Muslim Arab group it is $10,564; for Chaldeans, $19,886. Nearly half (49%) of the sample are Muslim, 41.5% Chaldean Catholics, 6% other Catholics or Orthodox.

Education:

Nearly half (41.7%) have no education; 34.7% some elementary school; 7.5% finished 8th grade; 16% have high school education or more. Nearly all (91%) of those who attended school did so outside the U.S. Few (5.5%) spoke English at home, and only 9% could be interviewed in English; 66.5% were interviewed in Arabic, 11.5% in Chaldean, 13% in some combination of languages.

Housing:

Mean household size in these communities is 2.8 persons, with mean number of children equal to 1.9. Hence these elders tend to live with other family members, including children. Over three-fourths (77.5%) live in 1 family houses, only 12% in apartments, condominiums, or senior citizen housing. Most are satisfied with their housing; however, interviewers rated 14.7% of the respondents' housing as poor or very poor. Ten percent lived in a son's home, only 1.5% in a daughter's home, reflecting the patriarchal structure of Arabic families. Many report having difficulty with keeping up their homes: 59.9% can afford their housing costs, while 40.1% cannot. The greatest problem reported is utility bills; other problems are rent or mortgage payments, maintenance or repair costs, or taxes. Nearly one-fifth (18.5%) are getting some help, most with utility bills or rent supplements. Most are satisfied with their neighborhood. Where there are problems, the most common is crime; 11% of households have been victims of a crime. Few (16%) are thinking of moving. To assist seniors, most favor rent subsidies, oppose congregate or shared housing, or home equity conversions.

Social Relations:

These elders have very large families with whom they are very close. Two-thirds of the sample are married; 27% are widowed; only 5% of the respondents, and none of the Chaldeans, are separated or divorced, reflecting the strong family structure in these communities. Nearly all respondents (94%) have children, an average of 6.2 each. Most (84%) also have siblings, a mean of 3.869; 9.5% have parents living. Respondents have an average of 8.497 relatives living within 30 miles; 65% have 5 or more. Many mentioned relatives living outside the U.S. Most report visiting relatives weekly. Only 5.5% visit less than once a month or never, which would create serious problems for them, since visiting is so important in the culture. Telephone use is also high -- averaging almost daily. Average attendance at religious services is almost weekly. Most (84.5%) have someone to talk to or get advice from,

many indicating several persons. Most expressed satisfaction with their relationships with children, spouse, friends, siblings. Interviewers rated 19.4% of the respondents as very needy of social support and 24.7% as somewhat needy, which contrasts with their own assessment of being very satisfied with most social relations.

Transportation:

For their transportation needs, most depend on someone else to drive them or drive themselves. Nearly half report having problems getting places, mainly because they do not drive or have no car available. Nearly one-third (30.7%) have no car in the household. Few know about senior transportation. Interviewers rated one fourth as very needy, another fourth as somewhat needy, with regard to transportation.

Mental Health:

Respondents exhibited few signs of poor mental health. Most frequently mentioned was trouble falling asleep (26.5% said "often"). Fewer (15.5%) said they often felt depressed and unhappy. Less than 10% said that they often feel like crying, have a poor appetite, or feel fearful. In contrast, most exhibit the positive signs of mental health frequently. Only 13% said they rarely feel relaxed, and 18.5% rarely feel the future looks bright. But 35% rarely feel excited and interested in something. Over half (56%) say they are satisfied with life, and most respondents had low scores on the stressful events scale. Sixty percent rated their mental health as excellent or good; 31% as fair, only 8% as poor or very poor. Two-thirds said this had not changed in the past year. For those who experienced a change, however, it was twice as likely to be for the worse. Interviewers thought 66% were not needy, 23% somewhat needy, and 10% very needy, in the mental health area.

Employment:

Nearly half (45.5%) of the sample is retired, with 3% partially retired. Fifteen percent never worked. Over half said their health prevents working; over 30% said it limits the kind or amount of work they do. Sixteen percent of those not working would like to

work. Most believe their age affects their job opportunities at least somewhat.

Illnesses:

The mean number of illnesses was 3.19, with 25.5% having 5 or more. Major illnesses (for 30% of sample or more) were arthritis or rheumatism, eyesight problems, and cholesterol problems. Twenty percent or more had problems with heart, hypertension, or diabetes. Over half (53.5%) of the sample have no illnesses which interfere "a great deal" with daily activities. Less than one in ten (7.7%) was sick in bed for 1 month or more in the past six months.

Health Care:

Most respondents (84.4%) have their own doctor, usually a private physician. They are highly satisfied with their health care, but interviewers did not agree. They rated 20.8% as very needy, and 35.4% somewhat needy in terms of health care. Hence these elders seem to be very uncritical of medical care, which is usually much better than what was available in their homeland. Nearly half (45.5%) have problems with their teeth; 43.5% have been to a dentist in the past year. If they do not go it is usually because of lack of money or insurance. Some have never been to a dentist. Over two-thirds (68.2%) have prescribed medications; most (90.6%) take them as prescribed. If they do not, usually it is because they forgot or the medicines have unpleasant side effects.

Diet and Nutrition:

Half (52.8%) are on special diets, primarily low fat and low salt. Nearly half of those on diets are diabetic. About two thirds follow the diet. If they do not, it is usually because it is too difficult, they forget, or do not think it works. Nearly one in four says it is too expensive. Half (51.5%) of the sample eat 3 meals per day. Slightly under half (41.5%) eat 1 or 2. Nearly all (96.9%) of those responding get a hot meal daily and have enough to eat. Slightly over one in ten (11.6%) get help with meals. Bread, fruit, and vegetables are eaten on an average every day; meat, on average, 3-4 times per week to daily; dairy products nearly 3-4 times per week; eggs less than once a week. Mean weekly

expenditure for groceries is $92.99; it should be noted that these are household expenditures for large households.

Food Assistance:

For 29.5% of the sample, someone in the household receives food stamps, with a mean value of $129.21. Slightly over one fourth (26.5%) of the sample receives free groceries. Interviewers assessed 16.3% of the respondents they could rate as "very needy" economically, 42.9% as "somewhat needy," and 40.8% as not needy.

Problems and Managing Them:

Two problems were "very serious" for over 20% of the respondents: money to live on and poor health. Of those for whom these were at least somewhat of a problem, about 30% were not getting help. Other problems mentioned (EX: upkeep of home, loneliness, getting around the house or to places s/he needs to go, living in a poor area, etc.) were "very serious" for less than 10% of respondents. However, in most instances, 30% or more those who had a problem were not getting help with it. The major source of help is a relative; an agency or neighbor were also mentioned.

ADL Needs and Assistance:

About half (50% to 55%) of respondents need at least some help with getting places not within walking distance and shopping for groceries and clothes. Over one fourth (25% to 49%) need some help doing housework, managing money, and preparing meals. More than one in ten (10% to 24%) need help to use the telephone and cut their toenails. Less than 10% need help to walk up and down stairs, take medications, take a bath or shower, dress and undress, care for their appearance, get in and out of bed, walk, or eat. Interviewers rated 16.7% of the respondents as "very needy" in terms of their ADL needs; another 34.9% were somewhat needy; and 48.4% were rated not needy. Persons most likely to help were females, and the children of the respondent. Males and spouses also helped to a considerable degree. Siblings, employees, and grandchildren helped to a lesser extent. Volunteers, friends, and neighbors were seldom used.

Services:

Respondents were aware of few services. More than 40% had heard of education programs and health screening. Thirty percent or more had heard of dental health programs, services for hearing or vision impaired, employment services, emergency energy assistance, home health aides, and crime prevention. Less than 30% had heard of other services. Ten to nineteen percent of respondents had used education programs, dental health programs, or health screening. Others were used by fewer than 10%. More than half of respondents would like transportation assistance. Slightly under half (40% to 49%) would like services for the hearing or vision impaired, home health aides, health screening, emergency energy assistance, dental health programs, home repair service, emergency home monitoring, homemaker services, chore services. Low on the list were education programs, financial management, employment services, home delivered meals, congregate meals, and volunteer opportunities (less than 20% approved).

Where respondents had not received services, it was usually because they could not learn about them (39.5%). Twenty percent or more said there were no services, they had no transportation to get to them, or they were too expensive. Ten percent or more were embarrassed to depend on others, uncomfortable going to an agency, thought it was too far away, or considered agency people difficult to talk to, a special problem since few speak English. The most highly rated agencies were those which spoke Arabic: the Arab-American and Chaldean Council, and ACCESS, as well as church or mosque groups. The Departments of Social Services and Public Health were rated fair to good. Most (76.5%) relied on relatives for information about services; friends and clergy were other frequent sources.

Citizenship:

About 40% of respondents are citizens of the U.S., and most citizens have voted recently. Nearly all non-citizens are on permanent immigrant visas, indicating that they have made a decision to make the U.S. their permanent home.

Special Highlights:

- These are large families with close relations to their elderly, who tend not to lack social support.
- The extensive support provided to elders may mean that family financial resources are often stretched to the breaking point.
- Critical mental health problems will exist for elders lacking these family supports.
- They are uncritical health care consumers, and may receive poor or inadequate care without recognizing it.
- Knowledge of services outside the community is poor.
- Respondents indicated a number of serious problems with which they were getting no help.
- The major source of help for all problems is the family, which may place extreme stress on family resources.
- Lack of English language skills makes outside services inaccessible, and underscores the need for Arabic-speaking service providers.

BACKGROUND OF THE ARAB AND CHALDEAN COMMUNITIES

Approximately 250,000 persons of Arab and Chaldean descent live in the State of Michigan, 200,000 of these in the Detroit Metropolitan Area (Zogby, 1990; Abraham, 1981; Aswad, 1974). The Muslim community, primarily from Lebanon, is concentrated in Dearborn (Aswad, in press; Abraham, 1981; Abraham & Abraham, 1983). The Chaldean community, whose origin is Iraq, is concentrated in north central Detroit and southern Oakland County (Sengstock, 1982). Other Arabic groups include immigrants from Lebanon, Palestine, Syria, Yemen, and Jordan, including Muslims, and Maronite and Orthodox Christians (Abraham, 1981; Abraham & Abraham, 1983; Aswad, 1974, in press). The major growth in these communities has been in the past 25 years, largely due to the deteriorating political situation in the Middle East and the easing of U.S. quota restrictions in the late 1960s (Sengstock, 1982: 43, 50). This sustained period of massive growth has placed considerable strain on the communities' resources, however, as they have attempted to absorb increasing numbers of new immigrants in a brief period. It should be noted that research has shown that these groups tend to operate as separate communities, rather than as a single Arabic community (Abraham & Abraham, 1981; 1983; Aswad, 1974). Arabic-speaking immigrants are divided in terms of their national origins, coming from a variety of different countries in the Middle East. They are also divided in terms of religion, including a number of different sects within both the Christian and Muslim faiths. Even in terms of language there are divisions. While the groups all speak the Arabic language at the present time, there are numerous differences in dialect, and the historic mother tongue of some, notably the Chaldeans, is not Arabic but a village language (Sengstock, 1982). Consequently, it is inaccurate to characterize these groups as a single community; rather they should be thought of a number of separate communities, which may be drawn together for some purposes (to provide Arabic-speaking services, or confront discrimination against Arabs, for example) but operate as separate social units under most circumstances.

METHODOLOGY

For the present study, a sample of 200 persons aged 60 and over in the Arab and Chaldean communities was interviewed between November, 1990, and June, 1991. A deliberate decision was made by the Michigan Office of Services to the Aging to focus the study primarily on the two major concentrations of persons from Arabic countries in the Detroit area. Consequently, most respondents were from the Muslim community in the Dearborn area (98, or 49%), or from the Chaldean community (91, or 45.5%). The remaining 11 respondents (5.5%) were from the other groups.

Due to the difficulty of identifying members of these communities, there was no attempt to develop a random sample. Respondents were identified through organizations in the communities, including social agencies, churches and mosques, as well as persons known to members of the project staff. Care was taken to insure that respondents represented a variety of socio-economic levels and social groups in the communities.

The interview schedule was basically identical with the interview schedule developed for the Michigan Needs Assessment of the 60 and Over Population by Milan J. Dluhy (1987). Some additional questions, such as questions involving citizenship, immigration or language problems, were developed specifically for use with these communities. The revised interview schedule was reviewed by members of the staff of the Office of Services to the Aging, as well as by staff members at the major social agencies serving the Arab and Chaldean communities, the Arab-American and Chaldean Council, and the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS). The interview schedule was translated into Arabic by the Arabic-speaking Research Assistant on the project, and the Arabic version of the survey was also reviewed for accuracy by two additional persons fluent in Arabic.

Interviews were conducted in person. Since some Chaldean elders are fluent in neither English nor Arabic, but speak Chaldean, a village language for which there is no written form, special provisions had to be made to interview these elders. For these interviews, Chaldean-speaking interviewers from the Chaldean community were hired to conduct the interview, using either the English or the Arabic interview schedule as a guide.

Because of the language problems, all interviews had to be conducted by members of the Arab and Chaldean communities. To insure consistency in interviewing, training was conducted for all interviewers. The interviewing process was continually monitored in the Dearborn community by the two Arabic speaking research assistants, and in the Chaldean community, by the Project Director and a special staff consultant from the Chaldean community.

The majority (82.5%) of the interviews were conducted by four interviewers. The two research assistants who worked on the project, both fluent in Arabic, conducted 41.5% of the interviews between them, primarily in the Dearborn community. A Wayne State University graduate student, also fluent in Arabic, conducted another 23% of the interviews, most in the Dearborn area. The staff consultant for the Chaldean community was responsible for coordinating and supervising interviewing in the Chaldean community, primarily for locating and recruiting interviewers fluent in Chaldean. A staff member from the Arab-American and Chaldean Council conducted 18% of the interviews, both in the Chaldean community and in the other Arabic communities.

Interviews were very long, the mean length being an hour and 29 minutes, with the median an hour and 18 minutes. This contrasts with an average of 47 minutes for the general survey of the 60 and over population (Michigan Office of Services to the Aging: 1987: 7). Language problems are one reason for the length of the interviews. While the interview was translated into Arabic,

members of the communities speak several different dialects, which required modifications and explanations during the interview process. Interviews in the Chaldean community were particularly long, averaging 1 hour and 52 minutes, as opposed to 1 hour and 10 minutes in the Dearborn Arab community, probably due to the fact that Chaldean interviewers were required to translate questions into the Chaldean language during the course of the interview. In addition, many respondents were unfamiliar with the topics mentioned in some questions, such as "Meals on Wheels," home equity loans, or various types of mortgages. Required explanations considerably prolonged the interviews.

It should be noted that the nature of the communities in question presented special problems in interviewing. First, cultural tradition in Arabic families hampers the conduct of social research; protocol dictates that personal information about one's life or family should not be discussed with outsiders. Furthermore, many elders were concerned that data provided through the survey might be used by the government to injure them in some way, such as by raising questions regarding their entitlement to welfare benefits or their qualification for citizenship. These problems also account for the fact that many respondents failed to answer some questions or refused to complete the interview. Even the process of interviewing must be adapted for these communities. The Arab and Chaldean communities, as will be noted later, are characterized by a constant flow of visitors from one home to another. Visitors are even most likely to appear in the event something unusual, such as the arrival of a stranger, occurs. Consequently, it is often impossible to interview Chaldeans or Arabs alone. Even if plans are made ahead of time, the arrival of the interviewer is sufficient to stimulate impromptu visits by neighbors.

Finally, it should be noted that the timing of the survey presented a most difficult problem for the survey staff. As the interviewing

began, hostilities broke out in the Gulf War between the U.S. and Iraq. This resulted in considerable negative feelings being directed against the Arabic communities, particularly Iraqi Chaldeans, and increased the tendency of prospective respondents to refuse requests for interviews. It also increased the tendency of respondents to discuss items other than those on the interview schedule; many interviewers encountered respondents anxious to discuss their fears relative to the Gulf War. Only the persistence of the interviewers and their identity as members of the Arab communities facilitated the completion of the interviewing.

Interviews were coded and entered into computer readable form by the Project Director, Research Assistant, and a staff member of the Department of Sociology at Wayne State University. Statistical analysis of the data was carried out by the Project Director, using SPSS-PC.

In this report, tables have been presented analyzing the data in each of 10 major areas. In Section A, some of the demographic data has been presented separately for the Dearborn Muslim ("Arab") community and the Chaldean community. Where the numbers were inadequate to support such a breakdown, this division has not been made. For tables in the other sections, the sample has been analyzed together. Again, this is largely due to the absence of sufficient numbers to justify a breakdown of the data. Early analysis of the data indicated that the two subgroups were sufficiently alike in most respects to justify considering them together.

Finally, a note is in order regarding comparisons between the present data and U.S. Census data. Scholars familiar with the Arabic-speaking communities in the United States do not consider the U.S. Census to be an accurate depiction of these communities (Abraham, 1981; 1983; Aswad, 1974; Sengstock, 1982). There are several reasons for this inaccuracy. Perhaps most important is the

Census Bureau's relative lack of attention to the Arabic populations prior to the 1990 census. In 1990, for the first time, Arabic-speaking interviewers were sought, and there was a concerted effort to elicit community cooperation with the census. Also important is the fact that many immigrants from the Middle East left their homelands prior to the establishment of some of the nations there; consequently, questions concerning the nation of origin do not elicit a positive response from all of the immigrants from these areas. In addition, religious and ethnic divisions within the Middle Eastern nations prompt many Arabic-speaking immigrants to identify with their religious or cultural origins rather than their national origin. Also, discrimination against Arabic-speaking persons induces many respondents to deny their origin in contacts with non-Arabs. All of these difficulties have served to underestimate the numbers of persons claiming Arabic-speaking origin in the U.S. Census. Consequently, comparisons of the present data with census data, or use of the U.S. Census to obtain estimates of the numbers of Arabic-speaking elders, are inappropriate.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE ANALYSIS

Demographic Data:

Most Muslim Arabs live in Wayne County, in the City of Dearborn (Area Agency on Aging 1-C). Most Chaldeans reside in Oakland County (AAA 1-B), but there is a small group, primarily the poorest, who live in Wayne County, in the northern part of the City of Detroit (AAA 1-A). Other Arabic-speaking groups are dispersed throughout the Metropolitan Detroit Area, with sizeable segments in western Wayne County (AAA 1-C), the Grosse Pointes (AAA 1-A), and Macomb County (AAA 1-B). Since the sample was designed to include the two major communities (i.e., the Dearborn community and the Chaldeans), the dispersed group is poorly represented in the sample. (See Tables A-1, A-2).

The birthplace for the majority of the respondents was either Lebanon, for the Dearborn group, or Iraq, for the Chaldeans. Only 8% of the sample was born in the U.S. (Table A-3). The mean age for the sample is 68.1, with the median being 66. Nearly half (42.5%) are in their early 60s, 31.1% in their late 60s; 26.4% are 70 or over. A small number (3.5%) gave no age, largely due to the fact that it is difficult for immigrants who were born in small villages to obtain accurate information on their age, since most towns kept no accurate statistics. This inability to prove their age makes it difficult for some Arabic-speaking elders to obtain Social Security or other benefits (Table A-4).

The sex of the sample is almost evenly divided: 54.5% male, 45.5% female. Whether this is an artifact of the sample is unknown. Since the Chaldean and Dearborn Arab groups tend to migrate as families, there is no major tendency for single male migration in these groups (Table A-5).

The median income for all groups is $7,500. The mean income varies. For the sample as a whole the mean is $14,733; for the Dearborn Arab group it is $10,564; for the Chaldean sample it is $19,886, reflecting the longer time this group has been in the U.S., as well as their considerable success in the grocery and

related businesses (Table A-6). Care should be taken in the interpretation of these household income data, however, particularly for large households. Where the elderly respondent is neither the household head nor an individual income recipient, he or she may not be aware of the total household income.

Households tend to be large. Mean household size for the sample as a whole is 2.8, with a median of 3. Over half of those who answered this question (52.7%) live in households with more than 2 persons. Mean number of children in the household is 1.9, with a median of 2. Over 60% live in households with children (Table A-6 and A-7).

Nearly all of the respondents (96.5%) live near other Arabs or Chaldeans. It should be noted, however, that this is an artifact of the sampling procedure, since we deliberately focused on the two major concentrations of Arabic-speaking persons. Most isolated Arabs or Chaldeans were less likely to be included (Table A-8).

In terms of religion, 49% of the sample are Muslim; 41.5% are Chaldean rite Roman Catholic; 6% are other Roman Catholic or Orthodox (Table A-9). This is a largely uneducated group, reflecting their origin in an area in which education was not widely available until recent years. Nearly half (41.7%) have no education; 34.7% have some elementary school; 7.5% finished the equivalent of the 8th grade; 16% have achieved more than that. Of those who were educated, 91% attended school outside the U.S. (Tables A-10 and A-11).

Very few of the respondents are fluent in English. Only 14% attended an English-speaking school, and 5.5% spoke English at home (Tables A-12 and A-13). Merely 9% could be interviewed in English; two-thirds were interviewed in Arabic, 11.5% in Chaldean, 13% in some combination of English, Arabic, and Chaldean (Table A-14).

Housing:

The respondents' housing pattern illustrates the fact that these elders tend to live with their families, not alone. Over

three-fourths (77.5%) live in a 1 family house; 12% in an apartment, condominium, or senior citizen complex (Table B-1). Respondents were generally satisfied with their housing: the mean level of satisfaction is 1.3, with a median of 1, on a scale in which "1" represents "very satisfied". Three-fourths (74%) reported being very satisfied, 18.5% somewhat satisfied. Only 6% were dissatisfied in any way (Table B-2).

Interviewers assessed the housing somewhat differently, however. They considered 14.7% of the respondents' housing to be "poor" or "very poor," with 22% considered to be average, and 37.5% to be good or very good (Table B-3).

Mean age of the respondents' housing was 27.9 years, with a median of 21 to 30 years (Table B-4). Nearly half (48%) own their own homes, with 39% reporting that the home is paid for. About one-third (32.5%) rent. Ten percent live in a son's home; 1.5% in a daughter's home. This pattern reflects the traditional patriarchal pattern of the Arabic-speaking communities, in which the male assumes responsibility for the family (Tables B-5, B-6).

Respondents report a high level of difficulty caring for their homes, primarily with mowing the lawn, shoveling snow, doing housework, and making repairs (Table B-7). Sixty percent report they can afford the costs of keeping up their homes; 40.1% cannot (Table B-8). The greatest problems are utility bills, reported by 72% of those with a problem. Over half (57%) have a problem with the rent payment; 40% with the mortgage payment. One-fourth to one-third report having problems with maintenance or repair costs, or taxes (Table B-9).

Most respondents (70.9%) report that their homes are insulated; another 13.7% say it is partially insulated; 15.4% live in uninsulated homes (Table B-10). It should be noted, however, that interviewers reported considerable trouble, with respondents not understanding the meaning of home insulation. Home heating is done primarily with gas (89%), largely reflecting the urban nature of this population. About one tenth (9.5%) get their heat from other sources (Table B-11). Nearly one in five (18.5%) is getting

help with housing costs, most with utility bills or rent supplements (Tables B-12, B-13). A small number (13%) need aids for the handicapped, and most have at least some of these (Table B-14).

Few respondents list problems with their neighborhoods; most expressed considerable satisfaction with the area (Tables B-15, B-16). The most common reason for dissatisfaction with the neighborhood is crime (48% of those dissatisfied), although most still reported that they felt safe in their neighborhoods (Tables B-17, B-18). Eleven percent report that someone in the household has been the victim of a crime (Table B-19).

This is a largely stable population; only 16% are thinking of moving, most within the county (56.3%), or elsewhere in Michigan (21.9%) (Tables B-20, B-21). The main reason for wanting to move is to be nearer to friends and relatives (54.8%; 9 respondents). A few (4 respondents each) would like to move because they cannot afford or maintain the house. Two respondents want a larger house (Table B-22). Most prospective movers (24.4%) have done nothing more than talk about it (Table B-23).

Regarding new housing ideas for older people, ideas receiving the most support (favored by approximately 60% or more) were rent subsidies either to the renter or to the landlord, the "granny flat" to provide space for an older person in existing family housing, or housing projects designed especially for persons 60 and over. Least favored (by 20% or less) were congregate housing, housing shared by non-related persons, and home equity conversion programs (Table B-24).

While this is a largely stable population, 16.7% have moved since 1988 (Table B-25). Most (59.6%) are very satisfied with their new housing situations; 30.8% are somewhat satisfied; 9.6% are not satisfied (Table B-26). Most moved to get a better house (29%; 9 respondents); others moved to live with a child, to be closer to Arabs or Chaldeans, or to live in a safer area. Only two respondents said they moved because they wanted to live alone (Table B-27).

Very few respondents are seriously planning to move; only 10 respondents (30.3% of prospective movers) are very sure about making a move (Table B-28). In considering the kind of house to which they would consider moving, 20-25% said they would consider a smaller house or a condominium; 10-19% would consider senior citizen housing, public housing, or an apartment; less than 10% indicated they would consider living with relatives, with non-relatives, in a retirement community, nursing home, or rooming or boarding house. No one said they would consider living in a mobile home (Table B-29).

Transportation:

Most respondents reported they have someone else drive them (35% to 55%) or drive themselves (about 30%) for trips shopping, to the bank, doctor, dentist, religious services, visiting, or entertainment (Tables C-1 to C-8). Few report going to senior centers or senior meal sites at all (Tables C-9, C-10). Most go to Arab or Chaldean activities by driving or being driven (Table C-11).

Nearly half (46.5%) report having problems getting places; 53% do not report such problems (Table C-12). For those who have problems, most say the reason is that they do not drive (54%), or have no car available (29%). A few report other reasons, including a physical condition that limits their ability to move about (9%), the absence of pubic transportation (2%), or language difficulties which make it impossible for them to explain where they want to go (5%) (Table C-13).

Over two-thirds of respondents report that there is an automobile available in the household: 35.4% have one auto; 33.9% have 2 or more; 30.7% have none (Table C-14). More than three-fourths of the respondents report at least one person in the household has a driver's license: 22.5% of those responding to the question have a driver's license themselves; in 37% of households someone else has a driver's license; 17.5% report that both the respondent and someone else has a license; 23% report no driver's

license in the household (Table C-15).

Respondents know very little about special transportation for seniors: only 6.5% of the entire sample knew that such a service exists, and only 4 persons (2%) use it (Tables C-16 through C-18). Interviewers assessed over half of the respondents as being in need of transportation: 25.9% were rated very needy, 27% as somewhat needy in this area. The remainder (47.1%) were rated as not needy (Table C-19). It is noteworthy that this is one of the few areas in which the respondents' assessment of the problem is approximately similar to that of the interviewers.

Illnesses:

Over half of the sample reported having 3 or more illnesses, with a mean number of 3.19, and a median of 3 illnesses. Reported illnesses ranged from a low of 0 to more than 11. Nearly half (48%) reported 2 or less, while 25.5% had 5 or more (Table D-1). The illnesses most frequently reported (by 30% of respondents or more) were: arthritis or rheumatism, eyesight problems, and cholesterol problems. Twenty to thirty percent of respondents reported problems with heart, hypertension, diabetes or pre-diabetes; and 10% to 19% reported back or spinal problems, overweight, stomach, hearing, respiratory, shortness of breath or heart failure, and kidney or bladder problems (Table D-2).

For the majority (53.5%) these problems did not interfere "a great deal" with their daily activities. Nearly one third (31.5%) have 1 or 2 illnesses which interfere a great deal; 15% have 3 or 4 or more illnesses which interfere a great deal (Table D-3). One-third (33.5%) have no illnesses which interfere "a little" with daily activities; 45% have 1 or 2, while 21.5% have 3 or 4 or more (Table D-4).

Health Care:

Over half of those responding to the question (56.3%) reported that they had not been sick in bed in the past 6 months; 18.8% had been confined to bed for 1 week or less; 17.3% for more than one

week but less than 1 month; 7.7% had been confined to bed for 1 month or more (Table E-1). The comparative health of this sample reflects its relative youth; as noted earlier, these elders are primarily the "young old."

However, nearly three-fourths (72.7%) had seen a doctor for illness in past 6 months (Table E-2). The mean number of doctor visits was 4.2, with a median of 2, and a mode of 1. The range was from 0 to 48 (Table E-3). Nearly all those responding (84.4%) report that they have their own doctor, with 79.4% going to a private physician, 12.4% to an emergency room, and 7.7% to a clinic or HMO (Tables E-4, E-5).

Most report extreme satisfaction with their health care, an assessment which is not the same as that of the interviewers, as we shall indicate shortly. Three-fourths of the sample think it is very likely they will get good medical care when they need it (Table E-6). They were quite uncritical of most aspects of medical care. On a scale in which "1" equals extreme satisfaction, respondents' mean satisfaction scores ranged from 1.1 to 1.6 for all items. They were least satisfied with the cost of health care (i.e., doctor's prices and how soon they were expected to pay the bill) (Table E-7).

In contrast with the respondents' satisfaction, interviewers assessed over half of the respondents as having physical health or medical needs, with 20.8% considered to be very needy, 35.4% somewhat needy, and 43.8% not needy (Table E-8). It is not surprising that many of these people are very uncritical of health care, since whatever health care they receive is almost certain to be immensely better than what was available in their homeland.

Over two-thirds (68.2%) of those responding have prescribed medications (Table E-9). Most (90.6%) report taking their medications as prescribed; 6.5% usually do so; 2.9% do not (Table E-10). Of those not taking their medications, the usual reason is that they forget or because the medications have unpleasant side effects (Table E-11). Over half of all respondents (52.5%) take over-the-counter medications (Table E-12).

Dental problems appear to be a considerable difficulty in these communities, with 45.5% of the sample reporting some problem with their teeth (Table E-13). Less than half (43.5%) have been to a dentist in the past year; 18% went to a dentist from 1 to 3 years ago. For about one-fourth (24%), their last visit to a dentist was more than 3 years ago; and 3.5% of respondents indicated "other." Both of these responses may mean that the respondent has never been to a dentist (Table E-14). Over one-fourth (27.5%) of the sample say they avoid going to a dentist, usually because of lack of money (70.2% of those not going), no dental insurance (43.1%), or because they are afraid to go (20.4%) (Tables E-15, E-16). (Multiple responses are possible, so the total adds up to more than 100%).

Diet and Nutrition:

Over half (52.8%) of those responding report being on a special diet. In most cases the diet is low fat (87.7%) or low salt (80%). Obviously many respondents are on both. Nearly half (42.7%) of those on diets are diabetic; 7.5% are other. Over two-thirds (68.6%) say they follow their diets; 25.7% usually do; 5.7% do not. Usually the diet is avoided because it is too difficult (84.4%), or because the respondent forgets (37.9%), or does not think it works (30%). Nearly one-fourth (22.6%) say the diet is too expensive (Tables E-17 through E-20).

Half (51.5%) of the sample eat 3 meals per day. Slightly fewer (41.5%) eat 1 or 2; 4% eat more than 3 meals per day. The mean number of meals eaten is 2.6, with the median and mode both equal to 3 (Table E-21). Nearly all (96.9%) of those responding get a hot meal daily and report having enough to eat. Slightly over one-tenth (11.6%) get help with meals (Table E-22).

Respondents were asked to describe their diet on a scale in which "1" equals "never"; "5" equals "once a day"; and "6" equals "more than once a day." Bread, fruit, vegetables are eaten, on an average, every day (mean = 5.066 to 5.556). Meat, on the average, was eaten 3 to 4 times per week to daily (mean = 4.367). Dairy

products were consumed nearly 3 to 4 times per week (mean = 3.98). Eggs were eaten less than once a week (mean = 2.427) (Table E-24).

Weekly household expenditures for groceries tended to be high, with the mean expenditure being $92.99; the median, $80; and the mode, $100. A large range ($0 to $350) and large standard deviation ($56.50) reflect the large range in family size and economic level in these communities. Respondents spent less eating out, with a mean of $17.29, and a median and mode of 0 (Tables E-25, E-26). It is important to note that these are household expenditures, not individual ones, and these are large households, including younger adults and often children. Consequently, these do not represent expenditures for food for the typical one or two person household of older adults.

Food stamps were received by someone in the households of 29.5% of sample respondents. In about half of the cases, the food stamp recipient was the respondent, with the remainder being the respondent's spouse or someone else. The food stamps have a mean value of $129.21, with a median and mode of $105. Slightly over one-fourth (26.5%) of the sample receives free groceries (Tables E-27, E-28). Interviewers rated 16.3% of respondents they could rate as being "very needy" in terms of economic resources. Another 42.9% of those that could be rated were called "somewhat needy," while 40.8% were not needy (Table E-30).

ADL Needs and Assistance:

Respondents were asked to report those tasks with which they need at least some assistance. It is useful to analyze together those tasks they can do "With Some Help" and those which they are "Completely Unable" to do. Over half of respondents need at least some help getting places not within walking distance and shopping for groceries and clothes. One-fourth to one-half need help doing their own housework, managing their own money, and preparing their own meals. Ten to 25% of the respondents need help using the telephone and cutting their toenails. Less than 10% of respondents reported needing help with most aspects of personal care, such as

walking up and down stairs, taking their own medications, taking a bath or shower, walking unaided, dressing and undressing, caring for their own appearance, getting in and out of bed, and eating (Tables F-1 through F-16). Interviewers assessed respondents' ADL needs as follows: 16.7% of those assessed were rated "very needy," 34.9% as "somewhat needy," and 48.4% as "not needy" (Table F-17).

Females are more likely to provide the help with ADL needs, providing over 60% of assistance with most tasks involving either personal care or care of the household. These tasks include: taking a bath or shower, housework, cooking, cutting toenails, climbing stairs, using the phone, and taking medication. Males were more likely to assist with tasks outside the home, such as shopping, or in typically "masculine" areas, such as providing transportation and managing money (Table F-18).

The major category of helpers providing assistance with ADL needs was the respondent's children. Spouses provided more assistance in two categories: cooking and housework. Other relatives, such as siblings and grandchildren, were used occasionally. Unrelated helpers, such as employees, volunteers, friends, or neighbors, were used too infrequently for analysis (Table F-19).

Mental Health:

Respondents were asked to report on several measures of mental health, including 5 negative signs, and 3 positive signs. The questions employed a scale in which "1" equals "often," and "3" indicates "rarely." Respondents, on the average, reported having the negative mental health signs rather seldom, scoring an average of 2 ("sometimes") or higher ("rarely") on all but one item ("trouble falling asleep"); on this item the mean score was nearly 2. Slightly over one-fourth of the entire sample (26.5%) reported they have trouble falling asleep often, with 15.5% reporting they often feel depressed or unhappy. Less than 10% reported they often feel like crying, have a poor appetite, or feel fearful (Tables G-1 through G-5).

Respondents were more likely to report positive mental health signs, scoring an average of 2 ("sometimes") or less ("often") on two of the three items, and slightly over 2 (2.1) on the third. Forty percent of the sample often feel relaxed; 45% often feel the future looks bright; and 25.5% often feel excited or interested in something. This appears to be an exceptionally bright outlook, particularly when one considers that the interviewing was conducted during the Gulf War, when many of the respondents may have been more concerned than usual about the situation in their homeland (Tables G-6 through G-8). Life Satisfaction scores of the respondents were also relatively high. On a scale in which "1" equals "satisfied" and "3" equals "dissatisfied," the mean score was 1.497, with more than half (56%) of those who answered indicating they were "satisfied" (Table G-9). This satisfaction should be understood in context, however. Discussing family problems or expressing dissatisfaction with one's family is strongly censured in these communities. Furthermore, the almost constant visiting in the Arab and Chaldean communities means that interviews often must be conducted in the presence of other family members and friends. Hence respondents may be embarrassed to indicate dissatisfaction with their relationships, unless some obvious problem, such as a recent death, makes such displeasure suitable.

On the Scale of Stressful Events, scores tended to be low, with a mean score of 102.958; a median of 63; and a mode of 0. Looking at percentiles, 60% of respondents scored under 100; 80% under 188 (Table G-10). Respondents' mental health self ratings also tend to indicate a positive outlook. Nearly one-fourth (23.2%) rate their mental health as excellent, 37.1% as good, 31.4% as fair, 7.2% as poor, and 1% as very poor, with a mean score of 2.258 ("good" to "fair"), and median and mode of 2 ("good") (Table G-11).

Respondents see little change in their mental health in the past year, but where change has occurred, it is twice as likely to be for the worse. Most of those responding (66.8%) feel that their

mental health is about the same as it was a year ago; 10.2% think it is better, while 23% believe it is worse (Table G-12).

Interviewers' assessment of respondents' mental condition is not appreciably different from that of the respondents. Most (79%) were rated as mentally "normal," 13% as somewhat disoriented, 1.5% as very disoriented (Table G-13). In terms of their mental health needs, interviewers rated 64% as not needy, 22.5% as somewhat needy, and 10% as very needy (Table G-14). Interviewers rated the energy level of respondents by indicating that 10.5% appeared very fatigued, 31% somewhat fatigued, and 53% not fatigued (Table G-15). In rating the respondent's cooperation with the interview process, interviewers rated 59.5% as very cooperative, 28.5% as somewhat cooperative, and 3.5% as not cooperative (Table G-16). Considering that the interviews averaged nearly one and one-half hours, this represents an exceptionally high degree of cooperation.

Social Relations:

Two-thirds (66.5%) of the persons in the sample are married, reflecting the high percentage of males and young old in the sample. Slightly over one-fourth (27%) are widowed. Only five of the sample, and none of the Chaldeans, are separated or divorced. This very small number of separated and divorced epitomizes the extremely solid family structure in these communities (Table H-1).

Nearly all (94%) of the respondents have children, with the mean number of children being 6.2, the median equal to 6, and the mode equal to 7. The mean number of sons is 3.5, and of daughters, 2.9. These data illustrate the exceptionally large size of families in the Arabic-speaking communities. When the average number of children in the American society as a whole is less than 2 per family, a mean number of children of 6.2 indicates a dramatic difference! (Tables H-2 through H-5).

The size of Arab and Chaldean families is also illustrated by the number of siblings reported by respondents: 84% have siblings, with the mean number of siblings being 3.869, and a median and mode of 4. The mean number of brothers is 2.1, of sisters, 1.994

(Tables H-6 through H-9). Nearly one in ten (9.5%) of the respondents still has parents living (Table H-10).

These Arab and Chaldean families are not only large, but they also tend to live near each other. Respondents have an average of 8.497 relatives living within a radius of 30 miles, with some listing more than 50 relatives within that range, and 65% listing 5 or more relatives (Table H-11). Arabs and Chaldeans are less likely to have relatives living elsewhere in the state of Michigan (mean equals 1.786), or outside the state (mean equals 1.516). Forty percent have no relatives elsewhere in Michigan, and 60% have no relatives in other states (Tables H-12, H-13). Arabs and Chaldeans are more likely to have relatives outside the U.S. Respondents reported a mean number of 15.373 relatives outside the U.S., with a median of 2 and a mode of 0. Nearly two thirds (62%) of those who answered have 2 or more relatives outside the U.S. (Table H-14).

Visiting friends and relatives is a very common pattern in the Arab and Chaldean communities. On a scale in which "1" equals "weekly" and "4" equals "never," these respondents score extremely high. For visiting neighbors, the mean score is 1.843, with the median and mode equal to 1, indicating that most respondents visit with neighbors at least weekly. About one-fourth visit neighbors less than once a month or never (Table H-15).

For visiting relatives, the mean score is 1.234, with the median and mode equal to 1, indicating that respondents visit relatives even more frequently than neighbors (Table H-16). Very few (5.5%) visit relatives less than once a month or never. It should be noted that respondents are more likely to visit relatives than neighbors or friends, who are likely to be visited only if they are also relatives; this is not uncommon in these communities, however, where whole extended families are likely to live near each other.

Those respondents who indicated that they visit very seldom are likely to have serious mental health problems, since members of these communities are accustomed to a pattern of extremely

frequent visiting. Persons who are unable to visit often are likely to feel unwanted and experience depression to a higher degree than persons in communities in which visiting is a less important part of community life.

Arabs and Chaldeans are likely to be regular attenders at services of their church or mosque, an activity which has important social as well as religious aspects. On a scale in which "1" equals "weekly," the mean score was 1.563, with a median and mode of 1, indicating that the average respondent attends on a weekly basis. Slightly under one-fifth (18.7%) attend less than once a month or never (Table H-17).

Respondents are less likely to belong to clubs and organizations. Slightly over one-fourth (27.5%) of the sample belong, with about half (52.2%) of those who are members attending meetings weekly, 20.9% monthly, and 26.8% once a month or never (Tables H-18, H-19).

Respondents also make use of the telephone on a regular basis. On a scale in which "1" equals "daily," the mean score for telephoning is 1.286, indicating that the average respondent telephones relatives or friends almost daily. A small number (5.7%) make telephone contact less than once a week or never. Again, these respondents are likely to have serious mental health problems, since their cultural pattern assumes frequent contact with others (Table H-20).

Respondents go out, on a average, slightly more than 2 or 3 times a week (mean equals 1.816, on a scale in which "1" equals "daily" and "2" equals "2 or 3 times a week"). One-tenth report that they get out never or almost never; given the community visiting patterns, this may not be a problem if others visit them on a regular basis (Table H-21).

Over three-fourths (84.5%) of respondents report that they have someone to talk to or from whom they get advice. In most instances (81.2% of those listing someone) this person is either their spouse or a child; for 6% it is a sibling or other relative; for 5.4% it is a friend or neighbor. In 43.2% of the cases, the

confidant is male; for the remaining 56.8% she is female. The extreme social character of these communities is further illustrated by the fact that 12.5% of respondents could not list just one confidant, but listed 2 or 3 or more persons with whom they felt they could discuss almost anything. A few (4%) listed "God" as a confidant (Tables H-22 through H-25).

Most respondents expressed satisfaction with their relationships with friends and family. On a scale in which "1" equals "satisfied," and "3" equals "dissatisfied," satisfaction scores with spouse, children, friends, siblings, and parents all had a mean score nearly equal to "1." The number responding "dissatisfied" was less than 5% for all relationships (Tables H-26 through H-30).

Again, the respondents' general level of satisfaction with their social relations contrasts with the assessment of our interviewers, who rated slightly under half of the respondents as being in need of social support. They believe that 19.4% were very needy, with 24.7% somewhat needy, and 55.9% not needy (Table H-31).

Knowledge and Use of Services:

Respondents in the Arab and Chaldean communities have a low level of knowledge and use of services available in the larger community. In large part this may be due to the language barrier, since most respondents are not fluent in English. The only type of service which more than half of respondents had heard about was educational programs. Over 40% had heard of health screening, with 30% or more knowing about dental health programs, employment services, programs for the hearing or vision impaired, emergency energy assistance, home health aides, or crime prevention programs. Fewer than 30% had heard of any of the other types of services (Table I-1). Even fewer respondents had used any community services. Ten to nineteen percent had used educational programs, health screening, or dental health programs. All other programs had been used by less than 10% of respondents (Table I-2).

Respondents were willing to consider using a number of

services, if they were available. The service which the greatest number (50%) would consider was transportation. Other highly supported services (by 40% or more of respondents) were various health services, such as health screening, home health aides, emergency home monitoring, and programs for hearing or vision impaired; as well as services to assist with care of the home, such as homemaker, chore, and home repair services, and emergency energy assistance (Table I-3).

The fewest number of respondents (less than 20%) would consider using such services as educational programs, employment services, financial management, home delivered or congregate meals, or volunteer opportunities (Table I-3). Some of these responses may reflect the strong social character of these ethnic communities. Financial management, for example, is often a family rather than an individual responsibility. Furthermore, Arab and Chaldean elders are not likely to favor congregate or home-delivered meals, since they assume such meals would not include Arabic style foods.

The same preferences appear when respondents were asked to indicate which services they considered most desirable for older people. Transportation was by far their highest preference, with chore services, home repair, and various health services also highly rated. Some also listed legal aid and assistance with translation (Tables I-4, I-5).

Slightly over one in ten (12.5%) reported they had not received transportation services when needed; all others were reported by less than ten percent of respondents. Since most respondents were largely unaware of the availability of any services, their failure to report services not received may reflect this lack of awareness of services (Table I-6).

This lack of knowledge is also indicated when respondents were asked to indicate why services were not received. The largest group (39.5%) said they had no way to learn about services available. Other common reasons (mentioned by 20% or more) were the lack of transportation to services, the belief (whether correct

or incorrect) that the needed services do not exist, and the feeling that services are too expensive (Table I-7). Some reasons mentioned may be related to the Arab or Chaldean respondents' discomfort with outsiders, since some respondents said they were embarrassed to depend on others (17.5%), found agency people difficult to talk to (14.5%) or not helpful (7.5%), or did not think services would help (11%) (Table I-7).

Those service agencies which have been used are most likely to be public agencies, such as the county Department of Social Services (36.5% of those using services), or the Department of Public Health (31% of users). Also frequently used were services provided by the respondent's mosque or church (27.5% of users), or the Arabic-speaking social agencies, ACCESS (24% of users) and the Arab-American and Chaldean Council (23.5% of users) (Table I-8).

Agency users appear generally satisfied with the services they received, although this should be interpreted with caution, since we have already seen that these respondents are generally uncritical of services. Agencies were rated on a scale in which "1" equals "poor" and "4" equals "excellent." Considering only agencies used by at least 40 persons, the highest ratings were given to the Arabic-speaking agencies (the Arab-American and Chaldean Council and ACCESS), both of which received mean, median, and modal scores of 3.0 ("good") or over. Church/mosque services were also rated high, with a mean score of 2.878, with a median and mode of 3. Public agencies are rated slightly lower, with the Department of Public Health achieving a mean score of 2.542, and the country Department of Social Services a mean of 2.507, with median and mode again equal to 3 (Table I-9).

Problems in their Lives:

The seriousness of the lack of services the respondents receive becomes more dramatic when they are asked to list the serious problems in their lives. Problems were rated on a scale in which "1" equals "very serious," "2" indicates this is a serious but manageable problem, and "3" indicates this is "not a problem."

The most serious problems mentioned were not having enough money to live on (mean equals 2.16) and poor health (mean equals 2.194). Over one-third (37.5%) of those with financial problems and nearly one-third (32.4%) of those with health problems were getting no help (Table I-10) .

This pattern of serious problems for which no help was received is repeated for most other problems mentioned. More than half of those with problems of fear of crime, difficulty getting around their home or apartment, legal problems, personal or family stress, or living in a poor neighborhood are getting no help. Over 30% of those with problems of loneliness, upkeep on their homes, transportation to places they need to go, or handling their own personal care are getting no help. Other problems were mentioned by too few respondents for analysis (Tables I-12 through I-22).

As indicated elsewhere, when these respondents do get help, it is most likely from a member of the family. A relative is listed as the major source of help for all problems listed by 20% of more of respondents. These include such diverse problems as getting money to live on, health problems, problems of loneliness, fear of crime, keeping up the home or apartment, personal care, and transportation (Tables I-23 through I-33). As indicated at other points, this may mean that family resources are stretched to the breaking point.

The family is also the major source of information about services, with 76.5% of respondents depending on a relative for information. Other commonly used sources are also informal, including friends (38%) or the clergy (20.5%). Less frequently respondents would go to a professional source, most often a physician or one of the Arabic-speaking social agencies. This suggests that knowledge of services is not likely to improve in these communities as long as the informal communication network is unaware of their availability (Table I-36).

Employment:

Nearly half (45.5%) of the sample is retired, while 3% are

partially retired. Fifteen percent never worked (Table J-1). Over half (54.5%) said their health prevents them from working. Another third said their health limits the kind (34.5%) or amount (32%) of work they can do (Table J-2). For those still working, 7.5% work for a private company; 5% are self employed. One third (9 persons) would like to change their working conditions in some way. For those not working, 15.9% would like to work (Tables J-3 through J-5).

Most believe their age affects their job opportunities: the mean score is 1.447, with a median and mode of 1, on a scale in which "1" represents "very much," and "3" represents "no" (Table J-6). On the other hand, respondents have mixed feelings about the ability of older workers to perform. Attitudes were measured on a scale in which "1" equals strong disagreement, "3" represents uncertainty, and "5" equals strong agreement. Results indicate that respondents are uncertain as to whether older people perform as well as when they were younger (mean = 2.358). On the other hand, they believe employers discriminate against older people (mean = 4.006). And they exhibit weak agreement that most people retire of their own choice (mean = 3.771) (Table J-7).

Citizenship and Legal Problems:

About 40% of the sample are U.S. Citizens. Some became citizens as early as the 1920s, others as recently as the year of the study, over half since 1970. Three-fourths of citizens are registered to vote; most of these voted in the 1988 presidential election or later. Most vote in person, rather than by absentee ballot. Non-U.S. citizens are most often citizens of either Lebanon or Iraq (the 2 communities which were sampled intensively). Nearly all are here on permanent immigrant visas. Few respondents (less than 10% each) mention legal problems, most often problems regarding Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid. Only 10% of these have consulted a lawyer about these problems.

Special Highlights:

- These elders live in large families which maintain close relations to their elderly, who tend not to lack for social support.

- The extensive support provided to elders may mean that family financial resources are often stretched to the breaking point.

- Critical mental health problems will exist for elders lacking these family supports.

- This population consists of largely uncritical health care consumers. Many may be receiving poor or inadequate health care without realizing it.

- Respondents indicate a number of serious problems with which they are getting no help.

- The major source of help for all problems is the family, again placing extreme stress on family resources.

- Knowledge of services outside the community is poor.

- Lack of English language skills often makes outside services inaccessible. Consequently, Arabic-speaking service providers, both in social agencies open to the general public and in special Arabic-serving agencies, is a critical need.

References

Abraham, S.Y., 1981. "A Survey of the Arab-American Community in Metropolitan Detroit." In S.Y. Abraham and N. Abraham, eds. The Arab World and Arab-Americans: Understanding a Neglected Minority. Detroit: Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies.

Abraham, S.Y., and N. Abraham, eds., 1981. The Arab World and Arab-Americans: Understanding a Neglected Minority. Detroit: Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies.

Abraham, S.Y., 1983. "Detroit's Arab Community: A Survey of Diversity and Commonality." In S. Y. Abraham and N. Abraham, eds. Arabs in the New World. Detroit: Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies.

Abraham, S.Y., and N. Abraham, eds., 1983. Arabs in the New World. Detroit: Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies.

Aswad, B.C., 1974. "Introduction and Overview." In B.C. Aswad, ed. Arabic-Speaking Communities in American Cities. New York: Center for Migration Studies and Association of Arab-American University Graduates.

Aswad, B.C., in press. "Arab Communities in Michigan." In Arthur Helwig, ed. Building on Diversity: Ethnic Communities in Michigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Dluhy, Milan J., 1987. "Final State of Michigan Needs Assessment Survey." Appendix C in Michigan Office of Services to the Aging, State of Michigan, 1987. Michigan Needs Assessment of the 60 and Over Population: Executive Summary and Independent Variable Analysis. Lansing, MI: Michigan Office of Services to the Aging.

Elkholy, Abdo, 1966. The Arab Muslims in the United States. New Haven: College and University Press.

Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck, ed., 1991. The Muslims of America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Michigan Office of Services to the Aging, State of Michigan, 1987. Michigan Needs Assessment of the 60 and Over Population: Executive Summary and Independent Variable Analysis. Lansing, MI: Michigan Office of Services to the Aging.

Naff, A., 1983. "Arabs in America: A Historical Overview." In S. Y. Abraham and N. Abraham, eds. Arabs in the New World. Detroit: Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies.

Sawaie, Mohammad, 1985. Arabic Speaking Immigrants in the United States and Canada: A Bibliographical Guide with Annotations. Lexington, KY: Mazda Publishers.

Sengstock, M.C., 1982. Chaldean-Americans: Changing Conceptions of Ethnic Identity. Staten Island, NY: Center for Migration Studies.

Sengstock, M.C., in press. "Detroit's Chaldean Community: Experiencing the Effect of International Strife." In Arthur Helwig, Ed. Building on Diversity: Ethnic Communities in Michigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sengstock, M.C., 1974. "Iraqi-Christians in Detroit: an Analysis of an Ethnic Occupation." In B.C. Aswad, ed. Arabic-Speaking Communities in American Cities. New York: Center for Migration Studies and Association of Arab-American University Graduates.

Sengstock, M.C., 1970. "Telkaif, Baghdad, Detroit -- Chaldeans Blend Three Cultures." Michigan History. Vol. 54, pp. 293-310.

Suleiman, M., 1987. "Early Arab-Americans: The Search for Identity." In E. Hooglund, Ed. Crossing the Waters. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Zogby, John, 1990. Arab-America Today: A Demographic Profile of Arab Americans. Washington, D.C.: Arab-American Institute.

SECTIONS OF TABLES

SECTION A

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

TABLE A-1
COUNTY BY COMMUNITY

COMMUNITY

	Arab	Chaldean	Other	Row Total
Macomb		3 3.3	6 54.5	9 4.5
Oakland	2 2.0	75 82.4	2 18.2	79 39.5
Wayne	96 98.0	13 14.3	3 27.3	112 56.0
Column Total	98 49.0	91 45.5	11 5.5	200 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 0

TABLE A-2
AREA AGENCY ON AGING
BY COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY

	Arab	Chaldean	Other	Row Total
Area 1A		13 14.3	2 18.2	15 7.5
Area 1B	2 2.0	78 85.7	8 72.7	88 44.0
Area 1C	96 98.0		1 9.1	97 48.5
Column Total	98 49.0	91 45.5	11 5.5	200 100.0

TABLE A-3
PLACE OF BIRTH
BY COMMUNITY

	COMMUNITY			Row
	Arab	Chaldean	Other	Total
Lebanon	76 77.6	1 1.1	3 27.3	80 40.0
Syria	1 1.0		4 36.4	5 2.5
Iraq	2 2.0	87 95.6		89 44.5
Palestine	8 8.2		2 18.2	10 5.0
Yemen	6 6.1			6 3.0
Jordan	1 1.0			1 0.5
Ethiopia	1 1.0			1 0.5
U.S.	3 3.1	3 3.3	2 18.2	8 4.0
Column Total	98 49.0	91 45.5	11 5.5	200 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 0

TABLE A-4
AGE OF RESPONDENT

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
60-64	82	41.0	42.5	42.5
65-69	60	30.0	31.1	73.6
70-74	23	11.5	11.9	85.5
75-79	13	6.5	6.7	92.2
80-84	10	5.0	5.2	97.4
85+	5	2.5	2.6	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	68.109	Std Dev	6.680
Median	66.000	Mode	61.000
Valid Cases	193	Missing Cases	7

TABLE A-5
SEX OF RESPONDENT
BY COMMUNITY

	COMMUNITY			Row
	Arab	Chaldean	Other	Total
Male	47 48.0	55 60.4	7 63.6	109 54.5
Female	51 52.0	36 39.6	4 36.4	91 45.5
Column Total	98 49.0	91 45.5	11 5.5	200 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 0

TABLE A-6
INCOME LEVEL
BY COMMUNITY

	COMMUNITY		
	Arab	Chaldean	Total Sample
Median Income	$7,500	$7,500	$7,500
Mean Income *	$10,564	$19,886	$14,733
Standard Deviation	$8,958	$26,321	$19,017
Valid Cases	77	66	152
Missing Cases	21	25	48

* To calculate the Mean, the highest income category was closed at $150,000, with $100,000 being used as the midpoint of the category.

TABLE A-7
HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

NUMBER OF CHILDREN:

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One	57	28.5	46.3	46.3
Two	37	18.5	30.1	76.4
Three	16	8.0	13.0	89.4
Four	7	3.5	5.7	95.1
Five	6	3.0	4.9	100.0
	77	38.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.927	Std Dev	1.125
Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	123	Missing Cases	77

TOTAL NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD:

Number in Household	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One	30	15.0	20.0	20.0
Two	40	20.0	26.7	46.7
Three	31	15.5	20.7	67.3
Four	30	15.0	20.0	87.3
Five	19	9.5	12.7	100.0
	50	25.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.787	Std Dev	1.319
Median	3.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	150	Missing Cases	50

TABLE A-8
RESPONDENT LIVES NEAR
OTHER ARABS/CHALDEANS

COMMUNITY

	Arab	Chaldean	Other	Row Total
Yes	97 99.0	83 93.3	11 100.0	191 96.5
No	1 1.0	6 6.7		7 3.5
Column Total	98 49.5	89 44.9	11 5.6	198 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 2

TABLE A-9
RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE
BY COMMUNITY

COMMUNITY

	Arab	Chaldean	Other	Row Total
Muslim (Unspecified)	50 51.0			50 25.0
Shiite	37 37.8			37 18.5
Sunni	11 11.2			11 5.5
Chaldean		83 93.3		83 41.5
Other Catholic		5 5.6	7 63.7	7 3.5
Orthodox		1 1.1	4 36.4	5 2.5
Column Total	98 49.5	89 44.9	11 5.6	198 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 2

TABLE A-10
EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT
BY COMMUNITY

		COMMUNITY			
	Count	Arab	Chaldean	Other	Row Total
None		52 53.6	25 27.5	6 54.5	83 41.7
Some Elementary		36 37.1	30 33.0	3 27.3	69 34.7
Completed Grade 8		5 5.2	10 11.0		15 7.5
Some High School		1 1.0	9 9.9	2 18.2	12 6.0
High School Graduate		2 2.1	6 6.6		8 4.0
Some College			3 3.3		3 1.5
B.A.			6 6.6		6 3.0
Advanced Degree		1 1.0	2 2.2		3 1.5
	Column Total	97 48.7	91 45.7	11 5.5	199 100.0

TABLE A-11
WHERE RESPONDENT ATTENDED SCHOOL

Country	Frequency	Percentage
Lebanon	34	17.0
Yemen	3	1.5
Jordan	2	1.0
Palestine	4	2.0
Syria	2	1.0
Iraq	62	31.0
U.S.	18	9.0
Other	1	0.5

TABLE A-12
LANGUAGE USED IN RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL

Language	Frequency	Percentage
Arabic	109	54.5
Chaldean	20	10.0
English	28	14.0
French	4	2.0
Ethiopian	1	0.5

TABLE A-13
LANGUAGE USED IN RESPONDENT'S HOME

Language	Frequency	Percentage
Arabic	158	79.0
Chaldean	87	43.5
English	11	5.5
French	1	0.5
Ethiopian	2	1.0

TABLE A-14
LANGUAGE OF INTERVIEW

Language	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
English	18	9.0	9.0	9.0
Arabic	133	66.5	66.5	75.5
Chaldean	23	11.5	11.5	87.0
Eng/Arab	6	3.0	3.0	90.0
Eng/Chal	2	1.0	1.0	91.0
Arab/Chal	18	9.0	9.0	100.0
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 200 Missing Cases 0

SECTION B

HOUSING DATA

TABLE B-1
TYPE OF HOUSE RESPONDENT LIVES IN

Type of House	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One Family		155	77.5	78.7	78.7
Two Family		18	9.0	9.1	87.8
Apartment		14	7.0	7.1	94.9
Condominium		8	4.0	4.1	99.0
Senior Citizens' Housing		2	1.0	1.0	100.0
		3	1.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 197 Missing Cases 3

TABLE B-2
RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH HOUSING

Satisfaction Level	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Satisfied (1)	148	74.0	75.1	75.1
Somewhat Satisfied (2)	37	18.5	18.8	93.9
Somewhat Dissatisfied (3)	8	4.0	4.1	98.0
Very Dissatisfied (4)	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
	3	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.330	Std Dev	.653
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	197	Missing Cases	3

TABLE B-3
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S HOUSING CONDITION

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Poor (1)	7	3.5	4.3	4.3
Poor (2)	17	8.5	10.4	14.7
Average (3)	44	22.0	27.0	41.7
Good (4)	47	23.5	28.8	70.6
Very Good (5)	48	24.0	29.4	100.0
	37	18.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	3.687	Std Dev	1.131
Median	4.000	Mode	5.000
Valid Cases	163	Missing Cases	37

TABLE B-4
APPROXIMATE AGE OF RESPONDENT'S HOME

Age of Home	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0 to 5 years (1)	8	4.0	5.6	5.6
6 to 10 years (2)	10	5.0	7.0	12.7
11 to 20 years (3)	22	11.0	15.5	28.2
21 to 30 years (4)	37	18.5	26.1	54.2
31 to 40 years (5)	14	7.0	9.9	64.1
41 to 50 years (6)	20	10.0	14.1	78.2
51 to 60 years (7)	16	8.0	11.3	89.4
61 to 70 years (8)	13	6.5	9.2	98.6
71 to 80 years (9)	1	.5	.7	99.3
81 to 90 years (10)	1	.5	.7	100.0
	58	29.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	4.690 (27.9 yrs.)	Std Dev	2.029
Median	4.000 (21-30 yrs.)	Mode	4.000 (21-30 yrs.)
Valid Cases	142	Missing Cases	58

TABLE B-5
RESPONDENT'S RELATIONSHIP TO HOME

Relationship to Home	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
R. Owns Home	96	48.0	49.5
Rents Home	65	32.5	33.5
Son's House	20	10.0	10.3
Other	10	5.0	5.2
Daughter's House	3	1.5	1.5
	6	3.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 194 Missing Cases 6

TABLE B-6
IS RESPONDENT'S HOME PAID FOR?
(For Home Owners Only)

Is Home Paid For?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	43	21.5	39.1	39.1
No	67	33.5	60.9	100.0
	90	45.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 110 Missing Cases 90

TABLE B-7
PROBLEMS RESPONDENT HAS MAINTAINING HOME

Scale:
Can Do Without Difficulty (1)
Can Do With Difficulty (2)
Can Do Only With Help (3)
Cannot Do At All (4)

Problem	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	N=
Mowing Lawn	2.672	1.058	3.000	3.000	186
Shoveling Snow	2.730	1.012	3.000	3.000	185
Heavy Housework	2.754	.994	3.000	3.000	183
Minor Repairs	2.826	.982	3.000	3.000	172
Major Repairs	2.929	.879	3.000	3.000	168

TABLE B-8
AFFORDABILITY OF RESPONDENT'S HOME:

Can R. Afford Home Costs?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes (1)	109	54.5	59.9	59.9
No (2)	73	36.5	40.1	100.0
	18	9.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 182 Missing Cases 18

TABLE B-9
DIFFICULTIES IN PAYING FOR HOME/APT COSTS
(For Persons Having Difficulty)

Difficulty	Frequency	Percent of those with Prob.	N=
Utility Bills	62	72.1	86
Rent Payment	47	57.3	82
Mortgage Payment	30	40.0	75
Maintenance Costs	25	32.5	77
Repair Costs	24	31.6	76
Taxes	22	28.9	76

TABLE B-10
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENT'S HOME:
IS HOME INSULATED?

Is Home Insulated?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes, Completely (1)	129	64.5	70.9	70.9
Yes, Partially (2)	25	12.5	13.7	84.6
No (3)	28	14.0	15.4	100.0
	18	9.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.445	Std Dev	.747
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	182	Missing Cases	18

TABLE B-11
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS' HOME:
TYPE OF HEAT

Type of Heat	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Natural Gas	178	89.0	90.4
Bottled Gas	9	4.5	4.6
Electric Heat	9	4.5	4.6
Oil	1	.5	.5
	3	1.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases	197	Missing Cases	3

TABLE B-12
GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE FOR HOUSING COSTS:
IS RESPONDENT RECEIVING ASSISTANCE?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	37	18.5	19.2
No	156	78.0	80.8
	7	3.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 193 Missing Cases 7

TABLE B-13
TYPE OF HELP RESPONDENT IS RECEIVING

Type of Assistance	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N=
Utility Bills	26	13.0	51.0	51
Prop. Tax Credit/Reduct'n	4	2.0	8.3	48
Rent Supplement	14	7.0	28.0	50
Public Housing Aid	4	2.0	8.2	49
Section 8/MSHDA	2	1.0	4.7	43
Other Aid	3	1.5	10.3	29

TABLE B-14
NEED FOR AIDS FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

	Frequency	Percent
Persons Needing Aids	13	6.5
Persons Having Aids:		
All	8	4.0
Some	3	1.5

TABLE B-15
ATTITUDES REGARDING NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS
(In Ascending Rate of Mean Seriousness)

Scale:
Very Big Problem (1)
Small Problem (2)
Not a Problem (3)

Problem	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	N=
No Public Transp.	2.569	.730	3.000	3.000	197
Crime	2.667	.645	3.000	3.000	198
Traffic	2.685	.556	3.000	3.000	197
No Church Close	2.756	.582	3.000	3.000	197
No Stores, Banks	2.795	.517	3.000	3.000	195
Unrepaired Streets	2.818	.436	3.000	3.000	198
Abandoned Buildings	2.848	.448	3.000	3.000	198
Rundown Buildings	2.857	.430	3.000	3.000	196

TABLE B-16
SATISFACTION WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Scale:
Satisfied (1)
Mixed (2)
Dissatisfied (3)

Satisfaction:	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	N=
	1.218	.494	1.000	1.000	193

TABLE B-17
REASON FOR DISSATISFACTION
(For Those Dissatisfied N=25)
(In Decreasing Order of Frequency)

Reason Dissatisfied	Frequency	Percent	Percent of Dissatisfied
Fear of Crime	12	6.0	48.0
Area Declining	5	2.5	20.0
Miss Old Country	3	1.5	12.0
Few Arabs/Chaldeans	2	1.0	8.0
Don't Like House	2	1.0	8.0
Arab/Chal Prejudice	1	.5	4.0

TABLE B-18
ATTITUDES REGARDING NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS:
FEELINGS OF SAFETY

Scale:
Very Safe (1)
Safe (2)
Unsafe (3)
Very Unsafe (4)

Time of Day	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	N=
Daytime	1.352	.821	1.000	1.000	199
Night	1.383	.717	1.000	1.000	196

TABLE B-19
CRIME VICTIMIZATION AMONG RESPONDENTS' HOUSEHOLDS

	Frequency	Percent of Whole	Percent of Victims
Household Has Been Victim	22	11.0	--
Type of Crime:			
Burglary	13	6.5	48.1
Robbery	13	6.5	48.1
Vandalism	4	2.0	14.8
Assault	4	2.0	14.8

TABLE B-20
RESPONDENT'S MOVING PLANS
THINKING OF MOVING

Is R. Thinking of Moving?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	32	16.0	16.5	16.5
No	162	81.0	83.5	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 194 Missing Cases 6

TABLE B-21
WHERE RESPONDENT WANTS TO MOVE

Wants to Move to:	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Elsewhere in County	18	9.0	56.3	56.3
Elsewhere in Michigan	7	3.5	21.9	78.1
Outside Michigan	3	1.5	9.4	87.5
Outside U.S.	4	2.0	12.5	100.0
	168	84.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 32 Missing Cases 168

TABLE B-22
REASON FOR WANTING TO MOVE

Value Label	Frequency	Percent of Movers	(N=31)
Closer to Friends, Relatives	9	29.0	54.8
Can't Afford Present House	4	12.9	12.9
Can't Maintain Present House	4	12.9	25.8
Other	4	12.9	67.7
Closer to Arabs/Chaldeans	3	9.7	77.4
Safer Area	3	9.7	100.0
Health Reasons	2	6.5	83.9
Need Bigger House	2	6.5	90.3
Too Much Room	0		

TABLE B-23
RESPONDENT'S ACTIONS REGARDING CHANGE IN HOUSING

Action Taken	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N=
Talked about Moving	30	15.0	24.4	123
Talked to Realtor re Sale	8	4.0	6.6	122
Waiting List-Group Housing	6	3.0	4.9	123
Talk Manager-Group Housing	5	2.5	4.1	123
Advertised Home for Sale	2	1.0	1.6	123
Talk Housing Counselor	1	.5	.8	123

TABLE B-24
RESPONDENT'S OPINION OF NEW
HOUSING IDEAS FOR OLDER PEOPLE

Idea	Good Idea Freq (%)	Bad Idea Freq (%)	N=
<u>Favored Ideas:</u>			
Rent Subsidy to Renter	120 (60.0%)	31 (15.5%)	188
Rent Subsidy to Landlord	119 (59.5%)	28 (14.0%)	193
Granny Flat	124 (62.0%)	27 (13.5%)	196
60+ Housing Projects	121 (60.5%)	39 (19.5%)	196
<u>Less Favored Ideas:</u>			
Congregate Housing	40 (20.0%)	130 (65.0%)	197
Shared Housing (non-rel)	45 (22.5%)	125 (62.5%)	197
Home Equity Conversion	41 (20.5%)	96 (48.0%)	196

TABLE B-25
RESPONDENT'S MOVING HISTORY

HAS RESPONDENT MOVED SINCE 1988?

R. Moved Since 1988	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	31	15.5	16.7	16.7
No	155	77.5	83.3	100.0
	14	7.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 186 Missing Cases 14

TABLE B-26
RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH NEW LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

R's Satisfaction	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Satisfied (1)	31	15.5	59.6	59.6
Somewhat Satisfied (2)	16	8.0	30.8	90.4
Not at All Satisfied (3)	5	2.5	9.6	100.0
	148	74.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.500	Std Dev	.672
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	52	Missing Cases	148

TABLE B-27
REASON FOR RESPONDENT'S MOVE

Reason for Move	Frequency	Percent of Movers (N=31)
Better House	9	29.0
To Live with Child, Rel.	6	19.4
Closer to Rel, Arab/Chal	5	16.1
Other	5	16.1
Better/Safer Area	4	12.9
To Live Alone	2	6.5

TABLE B-28
CHANCE OF RESPONDENT'S MOVING

Chance of Move	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Sure (1)	10	5.0	30.3	30.3
Pretty Sure (2)	8	4.0	24.2	54.5
Just Thinking About It (3)	15	7.5	45.5	100.0
	167	83.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.152	Std Dev	.870
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	33	Missing Cases	167

TABLE B-29
KIND OF HOUSING RESPONDENT WOULD CONSIDER MOVING TO
(For Persons Considering Moving)
(In Order of Acceptability)

Kind of House	Frequency	Percent of Movers	N=
Smaller House	9	24.3	37
Condominium	8	21.6	37
Senior Citizen Housing	6	16.7	36
Public Housing	6	16.7	36
Apartment	4	10.8	37
Living with Relatives	3	8.3	36
Share a House with Someone	2	5.5	36
Retirement Community	2	5.5	36
Nursing Home	2	5.0	40
Rooming/Boarding House	1	2.8	36
Mobile Home	0	0	36

SECTION C

TRANSPORTATION DATA

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-1
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO SHOPPING

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	11	5.5	5.5	5.5
Taxi	1	.5	.5	6.0
Volunteer	12	6.0	6.0	12.0
Local Service Agency	2	1.0	1.0	13.0
Bus	1	.5	.5	13.5
Walk	15	7.5	7.5	21.0
Drive Self	61	30.5	30.5	51.5
Someone Else Drives	94	47.0	47.0	98.5
Other	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 200 Missing Cases 0

TABLE C-2
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO THE BANK

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	45	22.5	23.1	23.1
Taxi				
Volunteer	8	4.0	4.1	27.2
Local Service Agency				
Bus	1	.5	.5	27.7
Walk	9	4.5	4.6	32.3
Drive Self	59	29.5	30.3	62.6
Someone Else Drives	73	36.5	37.4	100.0
	5	2.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 195 Missing Cases 5

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-3
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO THE DOCTOR'S OFFICE

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	1	.5	.5	.5
Taxi	2	1.0	1.0	1.5
Volunteer	12	6.0	6.0	7.5
Local Service Agency	2	1.0	1.0	8.5
Bus	3	1.5	1.5	10.0
Walk	7	3.5	3.5	13.5
Drive Self	61	30.5	30.5	44.0
Someone Else Drives	108	54.0	54.0	98.0
Other	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 200 Missing Cases 0

TABLE C-4
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO THE DENTIST'S OFFICE

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	20	10.0	10.3	10.3
Taxi	2	1.0	1.0	11.3
Volunteer	9	4.5	4.6	16.0
Bus	2	1.0	1.0	17.0
Walk	6	3.0	3.1	20.1
Drive Self	60	30.0	30.9	51.0
Someone Else Drives	93	46.5	47.9	99.0
Other	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 194 Missing Cases 6

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-5
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO CHURCH/MOSQUE

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	13	6.5	6.6	6.6
Volunteer	10	5.0	5.1	11.6
Local Service Agency	2	1.0	1.0	12.6
Walk	25	12.5	12.6	25.3
Drive Self	58	29.0	29.3	54.5
Someone Else Drives	86	43.0	43.4	98.0
Other	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
	2	1.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 198 Missing Cases 2

TABLE C-6
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO VISIT FRIENDS/RELATIVES

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	16	8.0	8.1	8.1
Volunteer	9	4.5	4.5	12.6
Local Service Agency	1	.5	.5	13.1
Walk	25	12.5	12.6	25.8
Drive Self	57	28.5	28.8	54.5
Someone Else Drives	86	43.0	43.4	98.0
Other	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
	2	1.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 198 Missing Cases 2

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-7
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO ENTERTAINMENT

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	48	24.0	26.2	26.2
Volunteer	7	3.5	3.8	30.0
Walk	8	4.0	4.4	34.4
Drive Self	51	25.5	27.9	62.3
Someone Else Drives	69	34.5	37.7	100.0
	17	8.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 183 Missing Cases 17

TABLE C-8
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO A JOB

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	63	31.5	55.8	55.8
Volunteer	3	1.5	2.7	58.4
Local Service Agency	1	.5	.9	59.3
Walk	1	.5	.9	60.2
Drive Self	30	15.0	26.5	86.7
Someone Else Drives	14	7.0	12.4	99.1
Other	1	.5	.9	100.0
	87	43.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 113 Missing Cases 87

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-9
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO A SENIOR CENTER

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	90	45.0	72.0	72.0
Volunteer	5	2.5	4.0	76.0
Walk	2	1.0	1.6	77.6
Drive Self	13	6.5	10.4	88.0
Someone Else Drives	15	7.5	12.0	100.0
	75	37.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 125 Missing Cases 75

TABLE C-10
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO A SENIOR MEAL SITE

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	90	45.0	73.8	73.8
Volunteer	2	1.0	1.6	75.4
Walk	4	2.0	3.3	78.7
Drive Self	16	8.0	13.1	91.8
Someone Else Drives	10	5.0	8.2	100.0
	78	39.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 122 Missing Cases 78

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-11
HOW RESPONDENT GETS TO ARAB/CHALDEAN ACTIVITIES

Transportation Method	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Doesn't Go	49	24.5	29.5	29.5
Taxi	2	1.0	1.2	30.7
Volunteer	4	2.0	2.4	33.1
Walk	10	5.0	6.0	39.2
Drive Self	43	21.5	25.9	65.1
Someone Else Drives	55	27.5	33.1	98.2
Other	3	1.5	1.8	100.0
	34	17.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 166 Missing Cases 34

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-12
RESPONDENT'S PROBLEMS IN GETTING PLACES

R. Has Problems	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	93	46.5	46.7	46.7
No	106	53.0	53.3	100.0
	1	.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 199 Missing Cases 1

TABLE C-13
RESPONDENT'S MAJOR PROBLEM IN GETTING PLACES

Main Reason	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
R. Doesn't Drive	54	27.0	54.0	54.0
No Car Available	29	14.5	29.0	83.0
R.'s Physical Condition	9	4.5	9.0	92.0
No Public Transportation	2	1.0	2.0	94.0
Language Problems	5	2.5	5.0	100.0
Other	1	.5	1.0	95.0
	100	50.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 100 Missing Cases 100

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-14
NUMBER OF AUTOS IN RESPONDENT'S HOUSEHOLD

Number of Autos	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None (1)	59	29.5	30.7	30.7
One (2)	68	34.0	35.4	66.1
Two (3)	38	19.0	19.8	85.9
More than Two (4)	27	13.5	14.1	100.0
	8	4.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.172	Std Dev	1.022
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	192	Missing Cases	8

TABLE C-15
DRIVER'S LICENSES IN RESPONDENT'S HOUSEHOLD

Has Driver's License	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No One	46	23.0	23.0	45.5
Respondent	45	22.5	22.5	22.5
Someone Else	74	37.0	37.0	82.5
Self & Other	35	17.5	17.5	100.0
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases	200	Missing Cases	0

SENIOR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND RESOURCES

TABLE C-16
SPECIAL SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS EXIST IN RESPONDENT'S AREA

Program Exists	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	13	6.5	9.2	9.2
No	129	64.5	90.8	100.0
No Response	58	29.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 142 Missing Cases 58

TABLE C-17
RESPONDENT HAS USED SENIOR TRANSPORTATION

R. Has Used	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	4	2.0	9.8	9.8
No	37	18.5	90.2	100.0
	159	79.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 41 Missing Cases 159

TABLE C-18
FREQUENCY OF USE OF SENIOR TRANSPORTATION

Level of Use	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weekly	4	2.0	66.7	66.7
2-3/Year	2	1.0	33.3	100.0
	194	97.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 6 Missing Cases 194

TABLE C-19
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Assessment	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Needy (1)	49	24.5	25.9	25.9
Somewhat Needy (2)	51	25.5	27.0	52.9
Not Needy (3)	89	44.5	47.1	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.212	Std Dev	.830
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

SECTION D

ILLNESSES

TABLE D-1
NUMBER OF ILLNESSES LISTED

Number Mentioned	Frequency	Percent
None	26	13.0
One	30	15.0
Two	40	20.0
Three	27	13.5
Four	26	13.0
Five	21	10.5
6 to 10	27	13.5
11 +	3	1.5
TOTAL	200	100.0

Range: 0 to 26

Mean	3.190	Std Dev	2.854
Median	3.000	Mode	2.000

TABLE D-2
ILLNESSES MENTIONED

Type of Illness	Frequency	Percent
Arthritis, Rheumatism	77	38.5
Eyesight Problems	71	35.5
Cholesterol Problems	61	30.5
Heart Problems	55	27.5
Hypertension	51	25.5
Diabetes, Pre-Diabetes	43	21.5
Back, Spinal Problems	36	18.0
Overweight	34	17.0
Stomach Problem, Ulcer	31	15.5
Hearing Problems	28	14.0
Respiratory Problems	25	12.5
Shortness of Breath, Heart failure	23	11.5
Kidney, Bladder, Urine	21	10.5
Hay Fever, Other Allergies	15	7.5
Varicose Veins	9	4.5
Effects of Stroke	8	4.0
Other Problems	8	4.0
Anemia	8	4.0
Hernia	6	3.0
Hemorrhoids	6	3.0
Trouble Drinking Liquids	5	2.5
Cirrhosis/Liver Problems	4	2.0
Goiter, Thyroid Problem	4	2.0
Cancer	4	2.0
Skin Irritations (Flaky, Itching)	3	1.5
Tuberculosis	2	1.0

TABLE D-3
RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE ILLNESSES
WHICH INTERFERE "A GREAT DEAL"
WITH THEIR DAILY ACTIVITIES

Number of Illnesses R. Has	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	107	53.5	53.5	53.5
One	33	16.5	16.5	70.0
Two	30	15.0	15.0	85.0
Three	17	8.5	8.5	93.5
Four or More	13	6.5	6.5	100.0
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.035	Std Dev	1.440
Median	.000	Mode	.000

Range = 0 to 7

TABLE D-4
RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE ILLNESSES
WHICH INTERFERE "A LITTLE"
WITH THEIR DAILY ACTIVITIES

Number of Illnesses R. Has	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	67	33.5	33.5	33.5
One	49	24.5	24.5	58.0
Two	41	20.5	20.5	78.5
Three	18	9.0	9.0	87.5
Four or More	25	12.5	12.5	100.0
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.540	Std Dev	1.650
Median	1.000	Mode	.000

Range = 0 to 9.

SECTION E

HEALTH CARE

TABLE E-1
TIME RESPONDENT WAS SICK IN BED
IN THE PAST SIX MONTHS

Time in Bed	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None (1)	111	55.5	56.3	56.3
Week or Less (2)	37	18.5	18.8	75.1
Less than 1 Mo.(3)	34	17.0	17.3	92.4
1 to 3 Months (4)	8	4.0	4.1	96.4
4 to 6 Months (5)	7	3.5	3.6	100.0
	3	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.797	Std Dev	1.088
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	197	Missing Cases	3

TABLE E-2
HAS RESPONDENT SEEN A DOCTOR FOR ILLNESS
IN PAST SIX MONTHS?

R. Has Seen Doctor	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	141	70.5	72.7	72.7
No	53	26.5	27.3	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases	194	Missing Cases	6

TABLE E-3
NUMBER OF TIMES RESPONDENT HAS SEEN DOCTOR
IN PAST SIX MONTHS

Number of Times	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0	15	7.5	8.7	8.7
1	44	22.0	25.4	34.1
2	30	15.0	17.3	51.4
3	18	9.0	10.4	61.8
4	13	6.5	7.5	69.4
5	9	4.5	5.2	74.6
6	16	8.0	9.2	83.8
7 to 9	3	1.5	1.8	85.5
10 to 19	21	10.5	12.1	97.7
20 or more	4	2.0	2.4	100.0
	27	13.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	4.202	Std Dev	5.349
Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	173	Missing Cases	27

Range: 0 - 48

TABLE E-4
DOES RESPONDENT HAVE OWN PERSONAL DOCTOR?

Does R. Have Doctor?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	168	84.0	84.4	84.4
No	31	15.5	15.6	100.0
	1	.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 199 Missing Cases 1

TABLE E-5
WHERE RESPONDENT GOES FOR MEDICAL CARE

Place of Care	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Private Physician	154	77.0	79.4	79.4
HMO	3	1.5	1.5	80.9
Clinic	12	6.0	6.2	87.1
Emergency Room	24	12.0	12.4	99.5
Other	1	.5	.5	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 194 Missing Cases 6

TABLE E-6
RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL CARE:

WITH LIKELIHOOD OF GETTING GOOD MEDICAL CARE WHEN NEEDED

Likelihood	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Likely (1)	152	76.0	78.8	78.8
Somewhat Likely (2)	36	18.0	18.7	97.4
Not Likely at All (3)	5	2.5	2.6	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.238	Std Dev	.484
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	193	Missing Cases	7

TABLE E-7
RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL CARE:

Scale:
Very Satisfied (1)
Somewhat Satisfied (2)
Not Satisfied at All (3)

Issue: (in order of Mean Support Level)	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	N=
Time Dr. Spends with Pt.	1.125	.348	1.000	1.000	184
Doctor's Office Hrs.	1.169	.390	1.000	1.000	178
Ability of Reach Doctor	1.173	.408	1.000	1.000	179
Able to Get Emerg. Care	1.228	.522	1.000	1.000	189
Personal Health Ins Coverage	1.337	.586	1.000	1.000	169
Waiting Time for Appts.	1.339	.549	1.000	1.000	186
Waiting Time in Office	1.366	.537	1.000	1.000	183
How Soon Must Pay Bill	1.553	.661	1.000	1.000	150
Doctor's Prices	1.611	.760	1.000	1.000	149

TABLE E-8
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S PHYSICAL HEALTH/MEDICAL NEEDS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Needy (1)	40	20.0	20.8	20.8
Somewhat Needy (2)	68	34.0	35.4	56.3
Not Needy (3)	84	42.0	43.8	100.0
	8	4.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.229	Std Dev	.772
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	192	Missing Cases	8

TABLE E-9
RESPONDENT'S MEDICATIONS

HAS PHYSICIAN PRESCRIBED REGULAR MEDICATIONS?

Medications Prescribed	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	133	66.5	68.2	68.2
No	62	31.0	31.8	100.0
	5	2.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 195 Missing Cases 5

TABLE E-10
DOES RESPONDENT TAKE MEDICATIONS AS PRESCRIBED?

R. Take Medications	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes (1)	125	62.5	90.6	90.6
Usually (2)	9	4.5	6.5	97.1
No (3)	4	2.0	2.9	100.0
	62	31.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.123	Std Dev	.409
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	138	Missing Cases	62

TABLE E-11
WHY RESPONDENT DOES NOT TAKE MEDICATIONS

Reason	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent*	N=
Sometimes Forget	7	3.5	41.2	17
Unpleasant Side Effects	6	3.0	37.5	16
Don't Think I Need It	4	2.0	28.6	14
Too Expensive	4	2.0	25.0	16
Don't Think it Works	2	1.0	14.3	14

* Includes only those not taking medications as prescribed.

TABLE E-12
RESPONDENT'S MEDICATIONS

DOES RESPONDENT TAKE OVER THE COUNTER MEDICATIONS?

R. Takes O.T.C. Med.	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	105	52.5	56.5	56.5
No	81	40.5	43.5	100.0
	14	7.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.435	Std Dev	.497
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	186	Missing Cases	14

TABLE E-13
RESPONDENT'S DENTAL CARE

DOES RESPONDENT HAVE PROBLEMS WITH TEETH?

R. Has Problems	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	91	45.5	46.7
No	104	52.0	53.3
	5	2.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 195 Missing Cases 5

TABLE E-14
RESPONDENT'S LAST VISIT TO A DENTIST

Last Visit to Dentist	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Less than 1 Yr Ago	87	43.5	48.9
1 to 3 Yrs Ago	36	18.0	20.2
3 or More Yrs Ago	48	24.0	27.0
Other	7	3.5	3.9
	22	11.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 178 Missing Cases 22

TABLE E-15
HAS RESPONDENT AVOIDED GOING TO A DENTIST
IN THE PAST 5 YEARS?

R. Has Avoided Dentist	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	55	27.5	29.9
No	129	64.5	70.1
	16	8.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 184 Missing Cases 16

TABLE E-16
REASONS RESPONDENT AVOIDS GOING TO DENTIST
(For Those Who Avoid Going)
(In Order of Frequency Mentioned)

Reason R. Avoids Dentist	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N=
Not Enough Money	40	20.0	70.2	57
No Dental Insurance	25	12.5	43.1	58
Afraid to Go to Dentist	11	5.5	20.4	54
No Transportation	9	4.5	16.1	56
Too Sick to Go Out	7	3.5	12.5	56
Other Reason	5	2.5	11.1	45
Dentist Won't Accept Patient	3	1.5	5.4	56
Couldn't Find Dentist R. Liked	2	1.0	3.6	56

TABLE E-17
RESPONDENT'S DIET:
IS RESPONDENT ON A SPECIAL DIET?

R. Is on Special Diet	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	102	51.0	52.8	52.8
No	91	45.5	47.2	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.472	Std Dev	.500
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	193	Missing Cases	7

TABLE E-18
TYPE OF DIET:

Type of Diet	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N=
Low Fat	93	46.5	87.7	106
Low Salt	84	42.0	80.0	105
Diabetic	44	22.0	42.7	103
Other	4	2.0	7.5	53

TABLE E-19
DOES RESPONDENT FOLLOW THE DIET?

R. Follows Diet	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	72	36.0	68.6	68.6
Usually	27	13.5	25.7	94.3
No	6	3.0	5.7	100.0
	95	47.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.371	Std Dev	.593
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	105	Missing Cases	95

TABLE E-20
WHY RESPONDENT DOES NOT FOLLOW DIET

Why R. Avoids Diet	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N=
Too Difficult	27	13.5	84.4	32
R. Forgets	11	5.5	37.9	29
Doesn't Think It Works	9	4.5	30.0	30
Too Expensive	7	3.5	22.6	31
Other	2	1.0	9.5	21

TABLE E-21
RESPONDENT'S NUTRITION:
NUMBER OF MEALS PER DAY

No. Meals per Day	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
One	3	1.5	1.5	1.5
Two	80	40.0	41.2	42.8
Three	103	51.5	53.1	95.9
Four	4	2.0	2.1	97.9
Five or more	4	2.0	2.1	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.619	Std Dev	.659
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	194	Missing Cases	6

TABLE E-22
RESPONDENT'S MEAL PATTERNS

Meal Pattern	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N =
Hot Meal Daily	190	95.0	96.9	196
Help with Meals	22	11.0	11.6	190
Enough to Eat	190	95.0	96.9	196

TABLE E-23
PROBLEMS WITH GETTING ENOUGH TO EAT
(For the 5% Occasionally Not Eating Enough)

Problem Getting Food	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Payment	5	2.5	55.6
Other	2	1.0	22.2
Preparing Food	1	.5	11.1
Shopping	1	.5	11.1
	191	95.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases	9	Missing Cases	191

TABLE E-24
FREQUENCY OF EATING CERTAIN FOODS

Scale:
- Never (1)
- < 1/Week (2)
- 1/Week (3)
- 3 or 4/Week (4)
- 1/Day (5)
- > 1/Day (6)

Type of Food	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	N=
Bread	5.556	.858	6.000	6.000	198
Vegetables	5.066	.896	5.000	5.000	198
Fruit	5.010	.982	5.000	5.000	198
Meat	4.367	.670	4.000	4.000	196
Dairy Products	3.980	1.042	4.000	4.000	198
Eggs	2.427	1.186	2.000	2.000	199

TABLE E-25
HOUSEHOLD GROCERY EXPENDITURES PREVIOUS WEEK

Mean	$92.99	Std Dev	$56.50
Median	$80.00	Mode	$100.00
Valid Cases	179	Missing Cases	21

Range: 0 to $350

TABLE E-26
HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURES EATING OUT PREVIOUS WEEK

Mean	$17.29	Std Dev	$45.22
Median	$0	Mode	$0
Valid Cases	134	Missing Cases	66

Range: 0 to $450

TABLE E-27
FOOD ASSISTANCE INFORMATION:
WHO IN HOUSEHOLD RECEIVES FOOD STAMPS?

Person Receiving Stamps	Frequency	Percent of Sample	Percent of Receivers
Self	28	14.0	47.5
Spouse	19	9.5	32.2
Other	12	6.0	20.3
TOTAL RECEIVING STAMPS	59	29.5	100.0

TABLE E-28
VALUE OF FOOD STAMPS RECEIVED BY HOUSEHOLD

Mean	$129.21	Std Dev	$72.15
Median	$105.00	Mode	$105.00
Valid Cases	52	Missing Cases	148

Range: $28 to $380

TABLE E-29
HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FREE GROCERIES

HH Rec'd Free Groceries	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	53	26.5	27.5	27.5
No	140	70.0	72.5	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 193 Missing Cases 7

TABLE E-30
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S ECONOMIC NEEDS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Needy (1)	30	15.0	16.3	16.3
Somewhat Needy (2)	79	39.5	42.9	59.2
Not Needy (3)	75	37.5	40.8	100.0
	16	8.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.245	Std Dev	.717
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	184	Missing Cases	16

SECTION F

ADL NEEDS AND ASSISTANCE

ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING

TABLE F-1
USE THE TELEPHONE

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	163	81.5	83.6	83.6
With Some Help (2)	18	9.0	9.2	92.8
Completely Unable (3)	14	7.0	7.2	100.0
	5	2.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.236	Std Dev	.571
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	195	Missing Cases	5

TABLE F-2
GET TO PLACES OUT OF WALKING DISTANCE

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	84	42.0	44.7	44.7
With Some Help (2)	55	27.5	29.3	73.9
Completely Unable (3)	49	24.5	26.1	100.0
	12	6.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.814	Std Dev	.822
Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	188	Missing Cases	12

TABLE F-3
ABLE TO SHOP FOR GROCERIES OR CLOTHES

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	90	45.0	48.4	48.4
With Some Help (2)	65	32.5	34.9	83.3
Completely Unable (3)	31	15.5	16.7	100.0
	14	7.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.683	Std Dev	.744
Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	186	Missing Cases	14

ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING

TABLE F-4
ABLE TO PREPARE OWN MEALS

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	133	66.5	70.4	70.4
With Some Help (2)	40	20.0	21.2	91.5
Completely Unable (3)	16	8.0	8.5	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.381	Std Dev	.638
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

TABLE F-5
ABLE TO DO OWN HOUSEWORK

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	109	54.5	58.3	58.3
With Some Help (2)	53	26.5	28.3	86.6
Completely Unable (3)	25	12.5	13.4	100.0
	13	6.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.551	Std Dev	.719
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	187	Missing Cases	13

TABLE F-6
ABLE TO MANAGE OWN MONEY

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	115	57.5	63.2	63.2
With Some Help (2)	33	16.5	18.1	81.3
Completely Unable (3)	34	17.0	18.7	100.0
	18	9.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.555	Std Dev	.790
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	182	Missing Cases	18

ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING

TABLE F-7
ABLE TO TAKE OWN MEDICATIONS

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	173	86.5	91.5	91.5
With Some Help (2)	11	5.5	5.8	97.4
Completely Unable (3)	5	2.5	2.6	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.111	Std Dev	.390
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

TABLE F-8
ABLE TO EAT WITHOUT ASSISTANCE

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	187	93.5	98.9	98.9
With Some Help (2)	2	1.0	1.1	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.011	Std Dev	.103
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

TABLE F-9
ABLE TO WALK UNAIDED

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	171	85.5	95.5	95.5
With Some Help (2)	7	3.5	3.9	99.4
Completely Unable (3)	1	.5	.6	100.0
	21	10.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.050	Std Dev	.243
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	179	Missing Cases	21

ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING

TABLE F-10
ABLE TO DRESS AND UNDRESS

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	176	88.0	95.7	95.7
With Some Help (2)	8	4.0	4.3	100.0
	16	8.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.043	Std Dev	.204
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	184	Missing Cases	16

TABLE F-11
ABLE TO CARE FOR OWN APPEARANCE

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	177	88.5	96.7	96.7
With Some Help (2)	6	3.0	3.3	100.0
	17	8.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.033	Std Dev	.179
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	183	Missing Cases	17

TABLE F-12
ABLE TO TAKE A BATH OR SHOWER

Level of ABility	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	165	82.5	92.2	92.2
With Some Help (2)	9	4.5	5.0	97.2
Completely Unable (3)	5	2.5	2.8	100.0
	21	10.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.106	Std Dev	.389
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	179	Missing Cases	21

ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING

TABLE F-13
ABLE TO WALK UP AND DOWN STAIRS

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	164	82.0	91.1	91.1
With Some Help (2)	12	6.0	6.7	97.8
Completely Unable (3)	4	2.0	2.2	100.0
	20	10.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.111	Std Dev	.379
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	180	Missing Cases	20

TABLE F-14
ABLE TO GET IN AND OUT OF BED

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	184	92.0	97.4	97.4
With Some Help (2)	4	2.0	2.1	99.5
Completely Unable (3)	1	.5	.5	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.032	Std Dev	.204
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

TABLE F-15
ABLE TO CUT OWN TOENAILS

Level of Ability	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Without Help (1)	162	81.0	88.5	88.5
With Some Help (2)	14	7.0	7.7	96.2
Completely Unable (3)	7	3.5	3.8	100.0
	17	8.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.153	Std Dev	.455
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	183	Missing Cases	17

TABLE F-16
SUMMARY OF ADL NEEDS:
RESPONDENTS WHO NEED AT LEAST SOME HELP
WITH ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIFE
(Includes Both "With Some Help"
and "Completely Unable" Categories)

Task	Frequency	Percent of Those Responding
Get Place Not Walk Dist.	104	55.4
Shop for Groc, Clothes	96	51.6
Do Own Housework	78	41.7
Manage Own Money	67	36.8
Prepare Own Meals	56	29.7
Use Telephone	32	16.4
Cut Toenails	21	11.5
Walk Up/Down Stairs	16	8.9
Take Own Medications	16	8.3
Take Bath/Shower	14	7.8
Walk Unaided	8	4.5
Dress/Undress	8	4.3
Care for Appearance	6	3.3
Get In/Out of Bed	5	2.6
Eat	2	1.1

TABLE F-17
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S ADL NEEDS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Needy (1)	31	15.5	16.7	16.7
Somewhat Needy (2)	65	32.5	34.9	51.6
Not Needy (3)	90	45.0	48.4	100.0
	14	7.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.317	Std Dev	.744
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	186	Missing Cases	14

TABLE F-18
GENDER OF ADL HELPERS
BY TYPE OF HELP
(In Decreasing Frequency of Female Help)

Type of Help	Gender of Helper (%) Male	Female	N=
Bath/Shower	7.7%	92.3%	13
Housework	13.3%	86.7%	60
Cooking	13.6%	86.4%	44
Cut Toenails	23.1%	76.9%	13
Climb Stairs	30.8%	69.2%	13
Phone	33.3%	66.7%	30
Take Medication	40.0%	60.0%	10
Shopping	50.0%	47.4%	76
Transport'n	57.1%	41.7%	84
Manage Money	65.4%	34.6%	52

Too Few Cases to Analyze:
(Less than 10 Cases Reporting)

Eating	N=1
Dressing	N=7
Grooming	N=6
Walking	N=8
In/Out Bed	N=5

TABLE F-19
RELATIONSHIP OF MOST FREQUENT HELPERS
BY TYPE OF HELP
(In Decreasing Frequency of Child Help)

Type of Help	Type of Helper* (Percent) Child	Spouse	GdChld	Sibling	N=
Transport'n	71.1%	4.5%	*	*	90
Manage Money	67.3%	10.0%	*	5.5%	55
Phone	66.7%	13.3%	10%	*	30
Shopping	64.4%	15.9%	*	8.5%	82
Bath/Shower	57.1%	*	*	*	14
Climb Stairs	53.8%	*	*	*	13
Cut Toenails	53.5%	*	*	*	15
Take Medication	41.7%	*	*	*	12
Cooking	31.3%	52.1%	*	8.3%	48
Housework	30.8%	46.2%	*	10.8%	65

* Note: Where the cell contains only 1 or 2 cases, or the percentage is less than 5%, the percentage has not been listed. Certain categories of helpers never were listed more than a small number of times, and have not been included here. These are: Neighbor, Employee, Friend, Volunteer, or Parent.

Too Few Cases to Analyze:
(Less than 10 Cases Reporting)

Eating	N=4
Dressing	N=7
Grooming	N=6
Walking	N=8
In/Out of Bed	N=8

SECTION G

MENTAL HEALTH

TABLE G-1
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
TROUBLE FALLING ASLEEP

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	53	26.5	27.0	27.0
Sometimes (2)	98	49.0	50.0	77.0
Rarely (3)	45	22.5	23.0	100.0
	4	2.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.959	Std Dev	.708
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000

TABLE G-2
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
POOR APPETITE

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	15	7.5	8.0	8.0
Sometimes (2)	81	40.5	43.1	51.1
Rarely (3)	92	46.0	48.9	100.0
	12	6.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.410	Std Dev	.635
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	188	Missing Cases	12

TABLE G-3
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
FEELING FEARFUL

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	11	5.5	5.8	5.8
Sometimes (2)	66	33.0	34.9	40.7
Rarely (3)	112	56.0	59.3	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.534	Std Dev	.606
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

TABLE G-4
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
FEEL LIKE CRYING

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	14	7.0	7.4	7.4
Sometimes (2)	80	40.0	42.3	49.7
Rarely (3)	95	47.5	50.3	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.429	Std Dev	.629
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

TABLE G-5
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
FEEL DEPRESSED AND UNHAPPY

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	31	15.5	16.5	16.5
Sometimes (2)	95	47.5	50.5	67.0
Rarely (3)	62	31.0	33.0	100.0
	12	6.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.165	Std Dev	.686
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	188	Missing Cases	12

TABLE G-6
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
FEEL RELAXED

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	96	48.0	52.5	52.5
Sometimes (2)	61	30.5	33.3	85.8
Rarely (3)	26	13.0	14.2	100.0
	17	8.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.617	Std Dev	.723
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	183	Missing Cases	17

TABLE G-7
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
THINK THE FUTURE LOOKS BRIGHT

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	90	45.0	48.9	48.9
Sometimes (2)	57	28.5	31.0	79.9
Rarely (3)	37	18.5	20.1	100.0
	16	8.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.712	Std Dev	.781
Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	184	Missing Cases	16

TABLE G-8
MEASURES OF SUBJECTIVE WELL BEING:
FEELING EXCITED OR INTERESTED IN SOMETHING

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Often (1)	51	25.5	26.8	26.8
Sometimes (2)	69	34.5	36.3	63.2
Rarely (3)	70	35.0	36.8	100.0
	10	5.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.100	Std Dev	.794
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	190	Missing Cases	10

TABLE G-9
LIFE SATISFACTION

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Satisfied (1)	108	54.0	56.0	56.0
Mixed (2)	74	37.0	38.3	94.3
Dissatisfied (3)	11	5.5	5.7	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.497 Std Dev .605
Median 1.000 Mode 1.000

Valid Cases 193 Missing Cases 7

TABLE G-10
STRESSFUL EVENTS SCORES

Range: 0 to 558

Percentiles:

Percentile	Value	Percentile	Value
10.00	.000	20.00	.000
30.00	37.600	40.00	53.000
60.00	90.000	70.00	128.200
80.00	188.000	90.00	282.800

Mean 102.958 Median 63.000
Std Dev 115.371 Mode .000
Valid Cases 165 Missing Cases 35

TABLE G-11
MENTAL HEALTH SELF RATING

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Excellent (1)	45	22.5	23.2	23.2
Good (2)	72	36.0	37.1	60.3
Fair (3)	61	30.5	31.4	91.8
Poor (4)	14	7.0	7.2	99.0
Very Poor (5)	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.258	Std Dev	.931
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	194	Missing Cases	6

TABLE G-12
CHANGE IN RESPONDENT'S MENTAL HEALTH
IN PAST YEAR

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Better (1)	20	10.0	10.2	10.2
About Same (2)	131	65.5	66.8	77.0
Worse (3)	45	22.5	23.0	100.0
	4	2.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.128	Std Dev	.563
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	196	Missing Cases	4

TABLE G-13
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S MENTAL CONDITION

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Disoriented (1)	3	1.5	1.6	1.6
Somewhat Disoriented (2)	26	13.0	13.5	15.0
Normal (3)	158	79.0	81.9	96.9
Can't Determine (4)	6	3.0	3.1	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.865	Std Dev	.459
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	193	Missing Cases	7

TABLE G-14
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Needy (1)	20	10.0	10.4	10.4
Somewhat Needy (2)	45	22.5	23.3	33.7
Not Needy (3)	128	64.0	66.3	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.560	Std Dev	.675
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	193	Missing Cases	7

TABLE G-15
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S ENERGY LEVEL

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Fatigued (1)	21	10.5	10.8	10.8
Somewhat Fatigued (2)	62	31.0	32.0	42.8
Not Fatigued (3)	106	53.0	54.6	97.4
Unknown (4)	5	2.5	2.6	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.490	Std Dev	.722
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	194	Missing Cases	6

TABLE G-16
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S COOPERATION

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Cooperative (1)	119	59.5	61.7	61.7
Somewhat Cooperative (2)	57	28.5	29.5	91.2
Uncooperative (3)	7	3.5	3.6	94.8
Unknown (4)	10	5.0	5.2	100.0
	7	3.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.523	Std Dev	.798
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	193	Missing Cases	7

SECTION H

SOCIAL RELATIONS

TABLE H-1
RESPONDENT'S MARITAL STATUS

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Married	133	66.5	67.2
Widowed	54	27.0	27.3
Separated	5	2.5	2.5
Divorced	5	2.5	2.5
Never Married	1	.5	.5
	2	1.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 198 Missing Cases 2

TABLE H-2
DOES RESPONDENT HAVE CHILDREN?

Has Children	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	188	94.0	95.4
No	9	4.5	4.6
	3	1.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 197 Missing Cases 3

TABLE H-3
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENT'S CHILDREN

Number of Children	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0	3	1.5	1.6	1.6
1	5	2.5	2.6	4.2
2	7	3.5	3.7	7.9
3	23	11.5	12.2	20.1
4	14	7.0	7.4	27.5
5	27	13.5	14.3	41.8
6	26	13.0	13.8	55.6
7	28	14.0	14.8	70.4
8	19	9.5	10.1	80.4
9	15	7.5	7.9	88.4
10	7	3.5	3.7	92.1
11	6	3.0	3.2	95.2
12	6	3.0	3.2	98.4
14	2	1.0	1.1	99.5
18	1	.5	.5	100.0
	11	5.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	6.201	Std Dev	2.932
Median	6.000	Mode	7.000
Valid Cases	189	Missing Cases	11

TABLE H-4
TOTAL NUMBER OF SONS

Number of Sons	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0	5	2.5	2.8	2.8
1	17	8.5	9.4	12.2
2	35	17.5	19.3	31.5
3	46	23.0	25.4	56.9
4	26	13.0	14.4	71.3
5	26	13.0	14.4	85.6
6	14	7.0	7.7	93.4
7	7	3.5	3.9	97.2
8	2	1.0	1.1	98.3
9	1	.5	.6	98.9
10	1	.5	.6	99.4
11	1	.5	.6	100.0
	19	9.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	3.525	Std Dev	1.922
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	181	Missing Cases	19

TABLE H-5
TOTAL NUMBER OF DAUGHTERS

Number of Daughters	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0	5	2.5	2.7	2.7
1	34	17.0	18.7	21.4
2	51	25.5	28.0	49.5
3	32	16.0	17.6	67.0
4	22	11.0	12.1	79.1
5	19	9.5	10.4	89.6
6	14	7.0	7.7	97.3
7	4	2.0	2.2	99.5
9	1	.5	.5	100.0
	18	9.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.945	Std Dev	1.752
Median	3.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	182	Missing Cases	18

TABLE H-6
DOES RESPONDENT HAVE SIBLINGS?

Has Siblings	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	168	84.0	86.2	86.2
No	27	13.5	13.8	100.0
	5	2.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 195 Missing Cases 5

TABLE H-7
TOTAL NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

Number of Siblings	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1	20	10.0	11.9	11.9
2	26	13.0	15.5	27.4
3	27	13.5	16.1	43.5
4	39	19.5	23.2	66.7
5	21	10.5	12.5	79.2
6	18	9.0	10.7	89.9
7	10	5.0	6.0	95.8
8	6	3.0	3.6	99.4
10	1	.5	.6	100.0
	32	16.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	3.869	Std Dev	1.932
Median	4.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	168	Missing Cases	32

TABLE H-8
NUMBER OF BROTHERS

Number of Brothers	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0	11	5.5	7.1	7.1
1	50	25.0	32.3	39.4
2	42	21.0	27.1	66.5
3	27	13.5	17.4	83.9
4	13	6.5	8.4	92.3
5	11	5.5	7.1	99.4
6	1	.5	.6	100.0
	45	22.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.116	Std Dev	1.363
Median	2.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	155	Missing Cases	45

TABLE H-9
NUMBER OF SISTERS

Number of Sisters	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0	7	3.5	4.4	4.4
1	54	27.0	34.0	38.4
2	56	28.0	35.2	73.6
3	27	13.5	17.0	90.6
4	6	3.0	3.8	94.3
5	8	4.0	5.0	99.4
6	1	.5	.6	100.0
	41	20.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.994	Std Dev	1.183
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	159	Missing Cases	41

TABLE H-10
DOES RESPONDENT HAVE PARENTS LIVING?

Parents Living?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	19	9.5	10.2	10.2
No	167	83.5	89.8	100.0
	14	7.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 186 Missing Cases 14

TABLE H-11
WHERE RESPONDENT'S RELATIVES LIVE:
NUMBER LIVING WITHIN 30 MILES

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	4	2.0	2.3	2.3
One	6	3.0	3.5	5.8
Two	12	6.0	6.9	12.7
Three	18	9.0	10.4	23.1
Four	20	10.0	11.6	34.7
Five	15	7.5	8.7	43.4
Six	19	9.5	11.0	54.3
Seven	11	5.5	6.4	60.7
Eight	13	6.5	7.5	68.2
Nine	10	5.0	5.8	74.0
Ten	13	6.5	7.5	81.5
11 to 49	29	14.5	16.8	98.3
50 +	3	1.5	1.8	100.0
	27	13.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	8.497	Std Dev	11.993
Median	6.000	Mode	4.000
Valid Cases	173	Missing Cases	27

TABLE H-12
WHERE RESPONDENT'S RELATIVES LIVE:
NUMBER LIVING IN THE SAME STATE

Number of Relatives	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	79	39.5	67.5	67.5
One	10	5.0	8.5	76.1
Two	7	3.5	6.0	82.1
Three	3	1.5	2.6	84.6
4 to 10	13	6.5	11.1	95.7
11 to 49	4	2.0	3.4	99.1
50 +	1	.5	.9	100.0
	83	41.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.786	Std Dev	5.410
Median	.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	117	Missing Cases	83

TABLE H-13
WHERE RESPONDENT'S RELATIVES LIVE:
NUMBER LIVING OUT OF STATE

Number of Relatives	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	62	31.0	48.4	48.4
One	32	16.0	25.0	73.4
Two	16	8.0	12.5	85.9
Three	4	2.0	3.1	89.1
4 to 10	13	6.5	10.1	99.2
11 to 49	1	.5	.8	100.0
	72	36.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.516	Std Dev	3.926
Median	1.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	128	Missing Cases	72

TABLE H-14
WHERE RESPONDENT'S RELATIVES LIVE
NUMBER LIVING OUTSIDE THE U.S.

Number of Relatives	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
None	32	16.0	21.3	21.3
One	25	12.5	16.7	38.0
Two	19	9.5	12.7	50.7
Three	14	7.0	9.3	60.0
4 to 10	25	12.5	16.7	76.7
11 to 49	16	8.0	10.7	87.4
50 +	19	9.5	12.7	100.0
	50	25.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	15.373	Std Dev	35.055
Median	2.000	Mode	.000
Valid Cases	150	Missing Cases	50

TABLE H-15
FREQUENCY OF VISITING NEIGHBORS

Frequency of Visits	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weekly (1)	126	63.0	64.0	64.0
Monthly (2)	17	8.5	8.6	72.6
< 1/Month (3)	13	6.5	6.6	79.2
Never (4)	41	20.5	20.8	100.0
	3	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.843	Std Dev	1.233
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	197	Missing Cases	3

TABLE H-16
FREQUENCY OF VISITING RELATIVES

Frequency of Visits	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weekly (1)	167	83.5	84.8	84.8
Monthly (2)	19	9.5	9.6	94.4
< 1/Month (3)	6	3.0	3.0	97.5
Never (4)	5	2.5	2.5	100.0
	3	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.234	Std Dev	.628
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	197	Missing Cases	3

TABLE H-17
FREQUENCY OF ATTENDING CHURCH/MOSQUE

Frequency of Attendance	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weekly (1)	141	70.5	71.6	71.6
Monthly (2)	19	9.5	9.6	81.2
< 1/Month (3)	19	9.5	9.6	90.9
Never (4)	18	9.0	9.1	100.0
	3	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.563	Std Dev	.996
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	197	Missing Cases	3

TABLE H-18
MEMBERSHIP IN CLUBS

R is Member	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	55	27.5	28.4	28.4
No	139	69.5	71.6	100.0
	6	3.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 194 Missing Cases 6

TABLE H-19
ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS
(FOR RESPONDENTS IN CLUBS)

Frequency of Attendance	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Weekly (1)	35	17.5	52.2	52.2
Month (2)	14	7.0	20.9	73.1
< 1/Month (3)	7	3.5	10.4	83.6
Never (4)	11	5.5	16.4	100.0
	133	66.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.910	Std Dev	1.138
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	67	Missing Cases	133

TABLE H-20
FREQUENCY OF PHONING FRIENDS, FAMILY

Frequency of Phoning	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Daily (1)	154	77.0	80.2	80.2
Weekly (2)	27	13.5	14.1	94.3
< 1/Week (3)	5	2.5	2.6	96.9
Never (4)	6	3.0	3.1	100.0
	8	4.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.286	Std Dev	.668
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	192	Missing Cases	8

TABLE H-21
FREQUENCY OF GOING OUT

Frequency of Going Out	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Every Day (1)	98	49.0	50.0	50.0
2-3 Times/Week (2)	61	30.5	31.1	81.1
Once/Week (3)	17	8.5	8.7	89.8
Almost Never (4)	15	7.5	7.7	97.4
Never (5)	5	2.5	2.6	100.0
	4	2.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.816	Std Dev	1.046
Median	1.500	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	196	Missing Cases	4

TABLE H-22
HAVING SOMEONE TO TALK TO OR GET ADVICE FROM

Does R Have Someone?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	169	84.5	85.8	85.8
No	28	14.0	14.2	100.0
	3	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 197 Missing Cases 3

TABLE H-23
IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT'S CONFIDANTE

R's Confidante	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	67	33.5	40.6	40.6
Child	67	33.5	40.6	81.2
Sibling	6	3.0	3.6	84.8
Other Relative	4	2.0	2.4	87.3
Friend	8	4.0	4.8	92.1
Neighbor	1	.5	.6	92.7
Clergy	1	.5	.6	93.3
Other	11	5.5	6.7	100.0
	35	17.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 165 Missing Cases 35

TABLE H-24
SEX OF RESPONDENT'S CONFIDANTE

Sex of Confidante	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Male	64	32.0	43.2	43.2
Female	84	42.0	56.8	100.0
	52	26.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 148 Missing Cases 52

TABLE H-25
SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS' CONFIDANTES

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Lists More Than One	25	12.5
Names "God"	8	4.0

TABLE H-26
SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS: CHILDREN

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Satisfied (1)	178	89.0	95.2	95.2
Mixed (2)	8	4.0	4.3	99.5
Dissatisfied (3)	1	.5	.5	100.0
	13	6.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.053	Std Dev	.248
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	187	Missing Cases	13

TABLE H-27
SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS: SPOUSE

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Satisfied (1)	135	67.5	93.8	93.8
Mixed (2)	3	1.5	2.1	95.8
Dissatisfied (3)	6	3.0	4.2	100.0
	56	28.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.104	Std Dev	.422
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	144	Missing Cases	56

TABLE H-28
SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS: FRIENDS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Satisfied (1)	172	86.0	93.0	93.0
Mixed (2)	13	6.5	7.0	100.0
	15	7.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.070	Std Dev	.256
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	185	Missing Cases	15

TABLE H-29
SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS: SIBLINGS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Satisfied (1)	153	76.5	92.2	92.2
Mixed (2)	10	5.0	6.0	98.2
Dissatisfied (3)	3	1.5	1.8	100.0
	34	17.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.096	Std Dev	.352
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	166	Missing Cases	34

TABLE H-30
SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS: PARENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Satisfied (1)	18	9.0	100.0	100.0
99.0	182	91.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases	18	Missing Cases	182

TABLE H-31
INTERVIEWER'S ASSESSMENT OF RESPONDENT:
RESPONDENT'S SOCIAL SUPPORT NEEDS

Assessment	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Needy (1)	36	18.0	19.4	19.4
Somewhat Needy (2)	46	23.0	24.7	44.1
Not Needy (3)	104	52.0	55.9	100.0
	14	7.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.366	Std Dev	.789
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	186	Missing Cases	14

SECTION I

SERVICES

TABLE I-1
SERVICES RESPONDENT HAS HEARD OF

Service	Frequency	Percent
Education Programs	113	56.5
Health Screening	87	43.5
Dental Health Prog.	73	36.5
Hearing Impaired	69	34.5
Employment Services	66	33.0
Emerg. Energy Assist.	64	32.0
Vision Assistance	62	31.0
Home Health Aide	60	30.0
Crime Prevention	60	30.0
Homemaker Services	58	29.0
Home Repair Services	56	28.0
Congregate Meals	55	27.5
Chore Services	53	26.5
Emerg. Home Monitor	50	25.0
Adult Day Care	49	24.5
Home Delivered Meals	49	24.5
Food Bank	48	24.0
Counsel/Long Term Care	48	24.0
Legal Assistance	48	24.0
Transportation	44	22.0
Library	43	21.5
Financial Management	41	20.5
Assessment/Referral	38	19.0
Housing Assistance	32	16.0
In-Home Visits	31	15.5
Complaint/Long Term C.	28	14.0
Telephone Reassurance	22	11.0
Volunteer Opportunity	14	7.0

TABLE I-2
SERVICES RESPONDENT HAS USED

Service	Frequency	Percent
Education Programs	31	15.5
Health Screening	24	12.0
Dental Health Prog.	22	11.0
Vision Assistance	19	9.5
Legal Assistance	14	7.0
Assessment/Referral	14	7.0
Emerg. Energy Assist.	13	6.5
Home Health Aide	11	5.5
Hearing Impaired	10	5.0
Housing Assistance	8	4.0
Homemaker Services	8	4.0
Home Repair Services	8	4.0
Chore Services	8	4.0
Employment Services	7	3.5
Food Bank	6	3.0
Emerg. Home Monitor	5	2.5
Transportation	5	2.5
Financial Management	4	2.0
Crime Prevention	3	1.5
Adult Day Care	3	1.5
Home Delivered Meals	2	1.0
In-Home Visits	2	1.0
Library	2	1.0
Counsel/Long Term Care	2	1.0
Volunteer Opportunity	2	1.0
Telephone Reassurance	1	.5
Complaint/Long Term C.	0	
Congregate Meals	0	

TABLE I-3
SERVICES RESPONDENT WOULD CONSIDER

Service	Frequency	Percent
Transportation	100	50.0
Vision Assistance	97	48.5
Home Health Aide	95	47.5
Health Screening	93	46.5
Emerg. Energy Assist.	92	46.0
Hearing Impaired	92	46.0
Dental Health Prog.	91	45.5
Home Repair Services	88	44.0
Emerg. Home Monitor	89	44.5
Homemaker Services	82	41.0
Chore Services	81	40.5
Assessment/Referral	71	35.5
Legal Assistance	68	34.0
Food Bank	66	33.0
Crime Prevention	66	33.0
Housing Assistance	64	32.0
Adult Day Care	63	31.5
Complaint/Long Term C.	60	30.0
Counsel/Long Term Care	56	28.0
Telephone Reassurance	53	26.5
In-Home Visits	52	26.0
Library	52	26.0
Education Programs	38	19.0
Financial Management	33	16.5
Employment Services	31	15.5
Home Delivered Meals	30	15.0
Congregate Meals	20	10.0
Volunteer Opportunity	20	10.0

TABLE I-4
FIRST CHOICE OF SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE
THAT COMMUNITY SHOULD OFFER

Service Mentioned	Frequency	Percent
Transportation	34	17.0
Chore Services	18	9.0
Dental Care	12	6.0
Crime Prevention	11	5.5
Education	10	5.0
Adult Day Care	9	4.5
Health Screening	9	4.5
Translation	8	4.0
Home Repair	6	3.0
Housing Assistance	5	2.5
Home Visitors	5	2.5
Legal Assistance	4	2.0
Assessment/Referral	4	2.0
Emerg.Energy Asst.	4	2.0
Vision Services	3	1.5
Food Bank	3	1.5
Financial Asst.	2	1.0
Home Health Aid	2	1.0
Counsel.Long Term Care	2	1.0
Volunteer Opportunity	1	.5
Fitness/Exercise	1	.5
Emerg. Home Monitor	1	.5
Library	1	.5
Phone Reassurance	1	.5
Homemaker Services	1	.5
Other	1	.5

N = 158

TABLE I-5
RESPONDENT'S RECOMMENDED
SERVICES FOR SENIORS

Preferred Service	Frequency	Percent
Transportation	68	34.0
Chore Services	38	19.0
Health Screening	32	16.0
Home Repair	26	13.0
Dental Care	25	12.5
Legal Assistance	24	12.0
Translation Help	23	11.5
Home Health Aid	21	10.5
Emerg. Energy Assistance	19	9.5
Homemaker Services	18	9.0
Education	17	8.5
Crime Prevention	16	8.0
Assessment & Referral	14	7.0
Housing Assistance	13	6.5
Adult Day Care	12	6.0
Vision	11	5.5
Employment	9	4.5
Telephone Reassurance	9	4.5
Food Bank	9	4.5
Home Visits	8	4.0
Counseling: Long Term Care	8	4.0
Help with Immigration	6	3.0
Hearing Impaired Services	6	3.0
Emerg. Home Monitoring	6	3.0
Complaint Resolution: LTC	5	2.5
Other Help	4	2.0
Financial Management	3	1.5
Congregate Meals	3	1.5
Volunteer Opportunity	3	1.5
Exercise/Fitness	2	1.0
Substance/Alcohol Ab. Assist.	2	1.0
Help Quitting Smoking	1	.5
Home Delivered Meals	1	.5
Library	1	.5

* Note: Respondents were asked to list their first, second, and third choice of services for seniors which should offered. In this table, these 3 choices have been combined.

TABLE I-6
SERVICES RESPONDENT NEEDED
BUT DID NOT RECEIVE

Service Not Received	Frequency	Percent
Transportation	25	12.5
Chore Services	14	7.0
Other Help	13	6.5
Home Repair	12	6.0
Homemaker Services	12	6.0
Dental Health	11	5.5
Emerg. Energy Assist.	9	4.5
Crime Prevention	8	4.0
Housing Assistance	7	3.5
Home Health Aid	7	3.5
Assessment & Referral	6	3.0
Employment	6	3.0
Translation Help	5	2.5
Counseling: Long Term Care	5	2.5
Library	5	2.5
Legal Assistance	5	2.5
Health Screening	5	2.5
Food Bank	5	2.5
Telephone Reassurance	4	2.0
Complaint Resolution: LTC	3	1.5
Vision	3	1.5
Financial Management	3	1.5
Adult Day Care	3	1.5
Education	2	1.0
Home Visits	2	1.0
Volunteer Opportunity	1	.5
Immigration Services	0	
Home Delivered Meals	0	
Congregate Meals	0	
Hearing Impaired Services	0	
Emerg. Home Monitoring	0	

* Note: Respondents were asked to list 3 services which they had needed but not received. In this table, these 3 responses have been combined.

TABLE I-7
REASONS RESPONDENT DID NOT
RECEIVE NEEDED SERVICES

Reason	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N=
Can't Learn About Services	79	39.5	91.9	86
No Transportation	56	28.0	65.9	85
Services Don't Exist	49	24.5	61.3	80
Too Expensive	42	21.0	52.5	80
Embarrassed to Depend on Others	35	17.5	41.2	85
Difficult to Talk To	29	14.5	34.1	85
Uncomfortable Going to Agency	26	13.0	31.0	84
Too Far Away	25	12.5	30.5	82
Didn't Think Service Would Help	22	11.0	26.2	84
Service Providers Not Helpful	15	7.5	18.3	82

TABLE I-8
SERVICES RESPONDENT HAS USED

Service	Frequency	Percent
County DSS	73	36.5
Dept. Pub. Health	62	31.0
Church (Mosque) Groups	55	27.5
ACCESS	48	24.0
Arab-Amer/Chal.Coun.	47	23.5
CHR/Outreach Worker	5	2.5
Com. Action Agencies	3	1.5
Com. Mental Health	2	1.0
City Prog. for Seniors	2	1.0
County Prog. for Seniors	2	1.0
United Way Services	1	.5

TABLE I-9
RESPONDENT'S RATING OF AGENCIES USED*

Agencies with 40 or more Users:

	Mean	Std Dev.	Median	Mode	N=
Ar/Chal Coun.	3.047	.785	3.000	3.000	43
ACCESS	3.016	.975	3.000	3.000	61
Relig.Grps.	2.878	.781	3.000	3.000	49
Dept.Pub.Heal.	2.542	.837	3.000	3.000	59
County DSS:	2.507	.784	3.000	3.000	73

Agencies with Less than 40 Users:

	Mean	Std Dev.	Median	Mode	N=
CHR/Outreach	2.800	.447	3.000	3.000	5
Com.Act.Agen.	2.750	.500	3.000	3.000	4
City Sr.Prog.	2.000	.707	2.000	2.000	5
County Sr.Prg.	2.000	.816	2.000	2.000	4
Com.Ment.Heal.	1.750	.957	1.500	1.000	4
United Way	1.500	.707	1.500	1.000	2

* Note: These ratings follow a scale as follows:
1 = Poor; 2 = Fair; 3 = Good; 4 = Excellent.
The Mean, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation, and Total N for each agency are provided.

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-10
Money to Live On

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	45	22.5	24.9	24.9
Serious, Can Manage (2)	62	31.0	34.3	59.1
Not a Problem (3)	74	37.0	40.9	100.0
	19	9.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.160	Std Dev	.797
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	181	Missing Cases	19

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	39	19.5	37.5	37.5
Getting Help	65	32.5	62.5	100.0
	96	48.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.625	Std Dev	.486
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	104	Missing Cases	96

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-11
Poor Health

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	42	21.0	23.3	23.3
Serious, Can Manage (2)	61	30.5	33.9	57.2
Not a Problem (3)	77	38.5	42.8	100.0
	20	10.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.194	Std Dev	.792
Median	2.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	180	Missing Cases	20

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	33	16.5	32.4	32.4
Getting Help	69	34.5	67.6	100.0
	98	49.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.676	Std Dev	.470
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	102	Missing Cases	98

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-12
Loneliness

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	12	6.0	6.8	6.8
Serious, Can Manage (2)	43	21.5	24.4	31.3
Not a Problem (3)	121	60.5	68.8	100.0
	24	12.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.619	Std Dev	.612
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	176	Missing Cases	24

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	22	11.0	35.5	35.5
Getting Help	40	20.0	64.5	100.0
	138	69.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.645	Std Dev	.482
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	62	Missing Cases	138

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-13
Fear of Crime

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	14	7.0	8.1	8.1
Serious, Can Manage (2)	15	7.5	8.7	16.9
Not a Problem (3)	143	71.5	83.1	100.0
	28	14.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.750	Std Dev	.594
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	172	Missing Cases	28

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	25	12.5	71.4	71.4
Getting Help	10	5.0	28.6	100.0
	165	82.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.286	Std Dev	.458
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	35	Missing Cases	165

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-14
Upkeep of Home/Apartment

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	8	4.0	4.5	4.5
Serious, Can Manage (2)	36	18.0	20.1	24.6
Not a Problem (3)	135	67.5	75.4	100.0
	21	10.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.744	Std Dev	.718
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	179	Missing Cases	21

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	17	8.5	32.7	32.7
Getting Help	35	17.5	67.3	100.0
	148	74.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.673	Std Dev	.474
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	52	Missing Cases	148

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-15
Getting around Home/Apartment

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	5	2.5	2.8	2.8
Serious, Can Manage (2)	15	7.5	8.3	11.0
Not a Problem (3)	161	80.5	89.0	100.0
	19	9.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.862	Std Dev	.419
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	181	Missing Cases	19

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	21	10.5	52.5	52.5
Getting Help	19	9.5	47.5	100.0
	160	80.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.475	Std Dev	.506
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	40	Missing Cases	160

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-16
Getting to Places R. Needs to Go

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	14	7.0	7.8	7.8
Serious, Can Manage (2)	53	26.5	29.6	37.4
Not a Problem (3)	112	56.0	62.6	100.0
	21	10.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.547	Std Dev	.638
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	179	Missing Cases	21

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	23	11.5	30.7	30.7
Getting Help	52	26.0	69.3	100.0
	125	62.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.693	Std Dev	.464
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	75	Missing Cases	125

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-17
Handling Own Personal Care

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	5	2.5	2.8	2.8
Serious, Can Manage (2)	25	12.5	14.0	16.9
Not a Problem (3)	148	74.0	83.1	100.0
	22	11.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.803	Std Dev	.464
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	178	Missing Cases	22

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	17	8.5	37.8	37.8
Getting Help	28	14.0	62.2	100.0
	155	77.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.622	Std Dev	.490
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	155

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-18
Living in a Poor Neighborhood

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	10	5.0	5.7	5.7
Serious, Can Manage (2)	8	4.0	4.6	10.3
Not a Problem (3)	156	78.0	89.7	100.0
	26	13.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	3.011	Std Dev	2.334
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	174	Missing Cases	26

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	17	8.5	56.7	56.7
Getting Help	13	6.5	43.3	100.0
	170	85.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.433	Std Dev	.504
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	30	Missing Cases	170

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-19
Legal Problems

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	10	5.0	5.8	5.8
Serious, Can Manage (2)	26	13.0	15.0	20.8
Not a Problem (3)	137	68.5	79.2	100.0
	27	13.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.734	Std Dev	.559
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	173	Missing Cases	27

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	17	8.5	56.7	56.7
Getting Help	22	11.0	53.7	100.0
	159	79.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.537	Std Dev	.505
Median	2.000	Mode	2.000
Valid Cases	41	Missing Cases	159

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-20
Personal or Family Stress

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	8	4.0	4.5	4.5
Serious, Can Manage (2)	26	13.0	14.7	19.2
Not a Problem (3)	143	71.5	80.8	100.0
	23	11.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.763	Std Dev	.522
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	177	Missing Cases	23

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	27	13.5	64.3	64.3
Getting Help	15	7.5	35.7	100.0
	158	79.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.357	Std Dev	.485
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	42	Missing Cases	158

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-21
Drug or Alcohol Abuse Problem

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	0			
Serious, Can Manage (2)	1	.5	.6	.6
Not a Problem (3)	168	84.0	99.4	100.0
	31	15.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.994	Std Dev	.077
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	169	Missing Cases	31

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	11	5.5	68.8	68.8
Getting Help	5	2.5	31.3	100.0
	184	92.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.313	Std Dev	.479
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	16	Missing Cases	184

PROBLEMS IN RESPONDENT'S LIFE

TABLE I-22
Keeping a Job

Level of Seriousness	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Serious (1)	2	1.0	1.4	1.4
Serious, Can Manage (2)	4	2.0	2.7	4.1
Not a Problem (3)	141	70.5	95.9	100.0
	53	26.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	2.946	Std Dev	.281
Median	3.000	Mode	3.000
Valid Cases	147	Missing Cases	53

Is Respondent Getting Help with Problem?

Is R. Getting Help?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Help	8	4.0	61.5	61.5
Getting Help	5	2.5	38.5	100.0
	187	93.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Mean	1.385	Std Dev	.506
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	13	Missing Cases	187

SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE I-23
For Money to Live On

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	3	1.5	3.8	3.8
Relative	63	31.5	79.7	83.5
Clergy	3	1.5	3.8	87.3
Agency	4	2.0	5.1	92.4
Other	6	3.0	7.6	100.0
	121	60.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 79 Missing Cases 121

TABLE I-24
For Health Problems

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	10	5.0	12.8	12.8
Relative	37	18.5	47.4	60.3
Clergy	2	1.0	2.6	62.8
Volunteer	1	.5	1.3	64.1
Agency	20	10.0	25.6	89.7
Other	8	4.0	10.3	100.0
	122	61.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 78 Missing Cases 122

SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE I-25
For Loneliness

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	10	5.0	19.2	19.2
Relative	37	18.5	71.2	90.4
Neighbor	2	1.0	3.8	94.2
Clergy	2	1.0	3.8	98.1
Volunteer	1	.5	1.9	100.0
	148	74.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 52 Missing Cases 148

TABLE I-26
From Fear of Crime

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Relative	17	8.5	63.0	63.0
Neighbor	9	4.5	33.3	96.3
Volunteer	1	.5	3.7	100.0
	173	86.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 27 Missing Cases 173

SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE I-27
For Keeping Up Home/Apartment

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	9	4.5	23.1	23.1
Relative	25	12.5	64.1	87.2
Neighbor	1	.5	2.6	89.7
Volunteer	2	1.0	5.1	94.9
Other	2	1.0	5.1	100.0
	161	80.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 39 Missing Cases 161

TABLE I-28
For Getting Around the House/Apartment

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	3	1.5	11.5	11.5
Relative	18	9.0	69.2	80.8
Volunteer	1	.5	3.8	84.6
Agency	1	.5	3.8	88.5
Other	3	1.5	11.5	100.0
	174	87.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 26 Missing Cases 174

SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE I-29
For Transportation

Sources of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	4	2.0	6.3	6.3
Relative	56	28.0	88.9	95.2
Volunteer	1	.5	1.6	96.8
Agency	1	.5	1.6	98.4
Other	1	.5	1.6	100.0
	137	68.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 63 Missing Cases 137

TABLE I-30
For Taking Care of Self

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	7	3.5	22.6	22.6
Relative	22	11.0	71.0	93.5
Other	2	1.0	6.5	100.0
	169	84.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 31 Missing Cases 169

SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE I-31
For Problems with Living in a Bad Neighborhood

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Relative	8	4.0	53.3	53.3
Neighbor	4	2.0	26.7	80.0
Agency	2	1.0	13.3	93.3
Other	1	.5	6.7	100.0
	185	92.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 15 Missing Cases 185

TABLE I-32
For Legal Problems

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	1	.5	4.3	4.3
Relative	14	7.0	60.9	65.2
Volunteer	1	.5	4.3	69.6
Agency	4	2.0	17.4	87.0
Other	3	1.5	13.0	100.0
	177	88.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 23 Missing Cases 177

SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE I-33
For Personal or Family Stress

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	6	3.0	28.6	28.6
Relative	14	7.0	66.7	95.2
Neighbor	1	.5	4.8	100.0
	179	89.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 179

TABLE I-34
For Problems of Drug or Alcohol Abuse

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Relative	3	1.5	50.0	50.0
Other	3	1.5	50.0	100.0
	194	97.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 6 Missing Cases 194

TABLE I-35
For Keeping a Job

Source of Help	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Spouse	2	1.0	25.0	25.0
Relative	3	1.5	37.5	62.5
Other	3	1.5	37.5	100.0
	192	96.0	MISSING	
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 8 Missing Cases 192

TABLE I-36
RESPONDENT'S SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT SERVICES

Source of Information	Frequency	Percent
Relative	153	76.5
Friend	76	38.0
Clergy	41	20.5
Physician	34	17.0
Arab-Amer/Chal. Council	25	12.5
ACCESS	20	10.0
Dept. of Social Services	16	8.0
Social Worker	15	7.5
Volunteer	9	4.5
County Government	9	4.5
Information & Referral	8	4.0
CHR/Outreach Worker	7	3.5
Dept. Pub. Health	6	3.0
Sr. High Rise Mgmt.	4	2.0
Area Agency on Aging	3	1.5
City Hall	3	1.5
Other	2	1.0
Community Mental Health	1	.5
Council on Aging	0	

SECTION J

EMPLOYMENT AND LEGAL PROBLEMS

TABLE J-1
RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS

IS RESPONDENT RETIRED?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes		91	45.5	46.0
No		31	15.5	15.7
Partially Retired		6	3.0	3.0
Other		35	17.5	17.7
Never Worked		30	15.0	15.2
Unemployed		5	2.5	2.5
		2	1.0	MISSING
	TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 198 Missing Cases 2

TABLE J-2
DOES RESPONDENT'S HEALTH LIMIT WORKING?

Limit on Working	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	N=
Prevents Working	109	54.5	71.2	153
Limits Kind of Work	69	34.5	70.4	98
Limits Amount of Work	64	32.0	69.6	92

TABLE J-3
RESPONDENT'S CURRENT EMPLOYMENT
(For Those Still Working)

Type of Employment	Frequency	Percent of Sample	Percent of Responders
Private Co. for Pay	15	7.5	50.0
Government	3	1.5	10.0
Self-Employed	10	5.0	33.3
Other	2	1.0	6.7
Family Business without Pay	0		
	170	85.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 30 Missing Cases 170

TABLE J-4
RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS

RESPONDENT'S SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT WORK SITUATION

R's Satisfaction	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Satisfied	18	9.0	66.7
Wants to Work Less	4	2.0	14.8
Wants to Work More	5	2.5	18.5
	173	86.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 27 Missing Cases 173

TABLE J-5
IS RESPONDENT LOOKING FOR WORK?

R's Work Choice	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Not Looking	69	34.5	84.1
Wants Full Time Work	6	3.0	7.3
Wants Part Time Work	4	2.0	4.9
Wants Either Part or Full	3	1.5	3.7
	118	59.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 82 Missing Cases 118

RESPONDENT'S OPINIONS ON AGE AND EMPLOYMENT

TABLE J-6
DOES RESPONDENT BELIEVE AGE AFFECTS HIS/HER JOB OPPORTUNITIES?

Scale:
1 = Yes, Very Much
2 = Yes, Somewhat
3 = No

Mean	1.447	Std Dev	.662
Median	1.000	Mode	1.000
Valid Cases	159	Missing Cases	41

TABLE J-7
GENERAL BELIEFS ABOUT OLDER PEOPLE'S EMPLOYMENT CAPACITIES

Scale:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree Somewhat
3 = Not Sure
4 = Agree Somewhat
5 = Agree Strongly

Belief	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	N=
Older People Perform as Well as When Younger	2.358	1.392	2.000	1.000	179
Employers Discriminate Against Older People	4.006	1.090	4.000	4.000	177
Most People Retire of Own Choice	3.771	1.170	4.000	4.000	179

RESPONDENT'S CITIZENSHIP

TABLE J-8
IS RESPONDENT A U.S. CITIZEN?

U.S. Citizen	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	79	39.5	40.1
No	118	59.0	59.9
	3	1.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 197 Missing Cases 3

TABLE J-9
YEAR RESPONDENT BECAME A U.S. CITIZEN

Yr. of Citizenship	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
1920-29	6	3.0	8.6
1930-39	3	1.5	4.3
1940-49	6	3.0	8.6
1950-59	9	4.5	12.9
1960-69	6	3.0	8.6
1970-79	16	8.0	22.9
1980-89	22	11.0	31.4
1990-	2	1.0	2.9
	130	65.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 70 Missing Cases 130

VOTING BEHAVIOR FOR U.S. CITIZENS

TABLE J-10
IS RESPONDENT REGISTERED TO VOTE?

R. is Registered Voter	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	56	28.0	74.7
No	19	9.5	25.3
	125	62.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 75 Missing Cases 125

TABLE J-11
ELECTION IN WHICH R. MOST RECENTLY VOTED

Most Recent Voting	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
1988 or later	51	25.5	89.5
Before 1988	2	1.0	3.5
Never	1	.5	1.8
	146	73.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 57 Missing Cases 143

TABLE J-12
MEANS BY WHICH R. VOTES

Means of Voting	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	(N=)
In Person	44	22.0	74.6	59
Absentee Ballot	12	6.0	30.0	40

CITIZENSHIP STATUS FOR NON-U.S. CITIZENS

TABLE J-13
TYPE OF VISA FOR NON-U.S. CITIZENS

Visa Type	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Immigrant Visa	99	49.5	95.2
Other Visa	5	2.5	4.8
	96	48.0	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 104 Missing Cases 96

TABLE J-14
NATION OF CITIZENSHIP FOR NON-U.S. CITIZENS

Nation of Citizenship	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Lebanon	56	28.0	61.5
Iraq	27	13.5	29.7
Palestine	4	2.0	4.4
Yemen	3	1.5	3.3
Jordan	1	.5	1.1
	109	54.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 91 Missing Cases 109

RESPONDENT'S LEGAL PROBLEMS

TABLE J-15
LEGAL PROBLEMS IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY

Legal Problem	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	(N=)
Medicare Benefits	14	7.0	9.4	149
Social Security Benefits	13	6.5	8.5	153
Medicaid Benefits	11	5.5	7.4	149
Buying Private Insurance	9	4.5	6.0	150
Immigration/Citizenship	7	3.5	4.5	155
Domestic Problems	7	3.5	4.7	148
Control of Own Property	7	3.5	4.5	154
Tax Problems	6	3.0	3.9	155
Problems with R's Will	3	1.5	2.0	152

TABLE J-16
RESPONDENT'S USE OF LAWYERS

Has Respondent Seen a Lawyer about Any of These Problems in Past Year?

R. Has Seen Lawyer	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	12	6.0	10.4
No	103	51.5	89.6
	85	42.5	MISSING
TOTAL	200	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 115 Missing Cases 85