

Final Report of Satisfactions in an Urban Neighbourhood

**by Grace N. Parasuik
1971**

The Institute of Urban Studies





THE UNIVERSITY OF
WINNIPEG

FOR INFORMATION:

The Institute of Urban Studies

The University of Winnipeg
599 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg
phone: 204.982.1140
fax: 204.943.4695
general email: ius@uwinnipeg.ca

Mailing Address:

The Institute of Urban Studies

The University of Winnipeg
515 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3B 2E9

FINAL REPORT OF SATISFACTIONS IN AN URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD

Published 1971 by the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg
© THE INSTITUTE OF URBAN STUDIES

Note: The cover page and this information page are new replacements, 2016.

The Institute of Urban Studies is an independent research arm of the University of Winnipeg. Since 1969, the IUS has been both an academic and an applied research centre, committed to examining urban development issues in a broad, non-partisan manner. The Institute examines inner city, environmental, Aboriginal and community development issues. In addition to its ongoing involvement in research, IUS brings in visiting scholars, hosts workshops, seminars and conferences, and acts in partnership with other organizations in the community to effect positive change.

HT
169
322585
no. 254
0.2

Final Report
of
Satisfactions in an Urban Neighborhood

submitted to
The Institute of Urban Studies
University of Winnipeg
Winnipeg, Manitoba

prepared by
Grace N. Parasuik
Survey Supervisor

April, 1971

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg which, through a grant from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was able to support the study of an urban neighborhood on which this report is based.

Special recognition is given to the twenty-eight volunteer interviewers who gave so unstintingly of their time and effort during the long, hot summer of 1970.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Margaret Liston, Iowa State University, whose counsel in the preparation of this report was invaluable.

Abstract

Satisfactions in an Urban Neighborhood; Grace N. Parasuik. April, 1970.
Iowa State University.

An exploratory survey of 116 households in a deteriorating neighborhood in central Winnipeg, Canada, was undertaken by the University of Winnipeg, Institute of Urban Studies, for the purpose of determining the climate for potential community action. Objectives of the study were: (1) to describe the characteristics of the population, as well as neighborhood satisfactions and inclinations of respondents toward community action involvement, and (2) to determine the associations of certain population characteristics with respondents' satisfactions regarding neighborhood qualities classified as biophysical, psychosocial and technological. Data were obtained during the summer of 1970 by interviewer administration of a questionnaire to 95 female and 21 male heads of households. Findings revealed that the neighborhood was working class in character. Older households with heads over 45 years of age made up three-fifths of the sample. The majority of respondents were home owners, had resided in the area for five years or more and had a mean income between \$4000 and \$6000. Participation of household members in 11 out of 12 formal organizations was less than 25 percent.

The chi-square test was used to identify significant associations between selected population characteristics and neighborhood satisfactions at the .05 level of probability or better. Each type of satisfaction was measured by several indicants and in turn was tested with nine population characteristics. Results of these tests disclosed 15 significant associations for psychosocial satisfactions, nine for biophysical satisfactions and only one for technological. It was apparent that psychosocial and biophysical satisfactions of respondents were frequently conditioned by population characteristics. However, satisfactions with the technological aspects of the neighborhood were comparable, regardless of population traits. In terms of frequency of association household differences in relative socioeconomic level (SEL), money income, type of occupational employment of household head, age of household head, commitment to the area, household type and dwelling tenure, in that order, appeared to be influential in distinguishing degrees of expressed satisfaction with the psychosocial and biophysical aspects of the neighborhood. Two factors, educational level of household head and length of residence in the area were found to be independent of expressed neighborhood satisfactions. Four measures of biophysical satisfactions significantly were associated with the following household characteristics: (1) adequacy of dwelling space and type of occupation of head, commitment to the area, dwelling tenure; (2) condition of housing and age of head, household type, SEL; (3) plans for future improvement of housing and dwelling tenure; and (4) use of potential windfall income and SEL, money income. Significant associations between five psychosocial satisfactions and population traits were as follows; (1) extent of anomie and SEL, money income; (2) evaluation of present financial condition and age of head, SEL, money income, type of occupation of head; (3) present living conditions and age of head, household type, money income, type of occupation of head; (4) current opportunities for income earner and SEL, money income; and (5) church attendance and commitment to the area, type of occupation of head. Only one quality of the 21 technological-network aspects of the neighborhood examined, that of general satisfaction with community services in relation to property taxes was significantly associated with commitment to the area. The majority of respondents expressed satisfactions with general conditions of the neighborhood. On the basis of stated interest by more than one-half the sample in community action involvement, a recommendation for initiation of community action in the area was made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Reasons for the Study	2
Objectives of the Study	3
The Design of the Study	3
Assumptions and Limitations	5
FRAME OF REFERENCE	7
Scope of the Report	7
Basic Concepts	7
Demographic characteristics of the households	8
Age of the household head	8
Household type	8
Socioeconomic level	9
Commitment to the area	10
Environmental dimensions	10
Biophysical	11
Psychosocial	11
Technological - network	13
Community action	13
Expected Outcomes	13
PROCEDURE	14
Selection of the Residential Area	14
Sampling Procedure	15
Selection and Training of Interviewers	16
Collection of Data	16
Preparation and Analysis of Data	17
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION	18
Descriptive Characteristics	18
Age of household head	18
Size of households	18

	Page
Physical health of household head	18
Ethnic origin of household heads	19
Household type	20
Socioeconomic level	20
Age of household head	20
Household type	22
Type of occupation of household head	22
Educational level of household head	22
Money income	23
Ethnic origin	23
Commitment to the area	23
Age of household head	23
Household type	23
Socioeconomic level	25
Tenure of dwelling	25
Length of residence in the area	25
Ethnic origin of household head	25
Significant Associations Between Selected Population Characteristics	26
Age of household head	26
Household type	26
Socioeconomic level	27
Commitment to the area	28
ENVIRONMENTAL SATISFACTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH SELECTED POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	30
Housing Characteristics	30
Biophysical Satisfactions	31
Adequacy of dwelling space	31
Occupational type	32
Commitment to the area	32
Nature of tenure	33
Satisfactions with housing condition	34
Age of household head	34
Household type	35
Socioeconomic level	36

	Page
Plans for future improvement of housing	36
Expected use of potential windfall income	37
Psychosocial Satisfactions	38
General neighborhood satisfactions	38
Attitudes toward the community	39
Extent of anomie	39
Evaluation of present conditions as compared to five years ago	40
Financial condition	41
Living conditions	43
Opportunities for income earner	43
Opportunities for children	45
Interaction patterns	45
Satisfactions with the Technological-Network Environment	48
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AGED POPULATION	49
Demographic Characteristics	49
Housing Characteristics	50
Psychosocial Satisfactions	50
Attitudes	50
Interaction patterns	50
Sources of Transportation	51
Sources of Communication	51
POTENTIAL FOR COMMUNITY ACTION	52
Interest in Community Action	52
Implications for Community Action	52
Recommendations for Community Action	55
SUMMARY	56
REFERENCES	63
APPENDIX A-Reasons for Non-Participation in Survey	65
APPENDIX B-Population Characteristics by Age of Household Head	67
APPENDIX C-Characteristics of Non-Participants in Formal Organizations	95

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1. Comparison of sample size and total number of households in each section	15
Table 2. Completed and Uncompleted interviews	17
Table 3. Ethnic origin of household heads classified by age	19
Table 4. Household characteristics classified by socioeconomic level	21
Table 5. Household characteristics classified by commitment to the area	24
Table 6. Significant chi-square associations of selected population characteristics	27
Table 7. Monthly accommodation costs by nature of tenure	30
Table 8. Occupied dwelling space by household size	31
Table 9. Adequacy of dwelling space related to population characteristics	33
Table 10. Expressed satisfactions with housing condition associated with population characteristics	35
Table 11. Plans for future housing improvements by tenure characteristics	36
Table 12. Expected use of potential windfall income by socioeconomic level and commitment to the area	38
Table 13. Extent of anomie related to socioeconomic level and money income	40
Table 14. Respondent evaluations of present financial conditions compared with five years ago, by selected population characteristics	42
Table 15. Respondent evaluations of present living conditions as compared to five years ago, by selected population characteristics	44
Table 16. Respondent evaluations of present opportunities for income earner by selected population characteristics	45

List of Tables Continued

	Page
Table 17. Attendance at church within and outside the neighborhood by selected population characteristics	47
Table 18. Respondents' evaluation of community services in relation to property taxes by commitment to the area	48
Table 19. Types of aged households classified by age of head	49
Table 20. Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head	68

INTRODUCTION

Modern cities are made up of people in competition with each other for jobs, homes, education and other resources. The losers in that competition have been accumulating for some time in areas around the central business district of most North American cities. Neighborhoods on the fringes of the central city area represent transition areas as people move away and are replaced by those who are less economically mobile. Residences change from owner-occupied dwellings to rental accommodations. Environmental conditions have a tendency to deteriorate as the majority of residents become transient, rather than long-term residents.

Studies of urban residential areas have traditionally been concerned with those environmental conditions, particularly housing, which contribute to erosion of the quality of life of the residents. Remedies for poor living conditions often entail the renewal of the area. In situations where living conditions may be deteriorating gradually, little attention is given until the situation is so severe that it cannot be ignored. It has been amply demonstrated that we can build cities but we have yet to learn how to maintain them. In many urban centers, various institutions and agencies are looking to the motivation of community groups as a means of exploring and eventually solving some of the problems plaguing the cities.

Since its establishment in 1969, the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Winnipeg, in Manitoba, Canada, has been concerned with investigating various aspects of urban life and developing new approaches to the urban problems that prevail in Winnipeg. A major interest area

at the Institute is the fostering of community action to resolve some of the problems. An outgrowth of this interest is the present study of an urban residential neighborhood in Winnipeg, identified by the code name "McNap area".

Reasons for the Study

The Institute of Urban Studies was particularly interested in downtown residential areas that are exhibiting signs of physical and social deterioration. The main purpose for investigating such areas was to determine the general attitudes of the residents towards their residential areas and the degree to which they might be interested in involving themselves in community activity to improve neighborhood conditions. In addition, the Age and Opportunity Bureau, a metropolitan Winnipeg community agency involved in program development for the elderly, expressed a concern with the lack of response in certain areas of the city to various social programs available at senior citizen centers.

The present study was designed to investigate a particular urban residential area for the purpose of providing both the Institute of Urban Studies and the Age and Opportunity Bureau with the kind of information they were seeking.

The guidelines for the study were as follows:

1. The scope of the study was to be within the financial and personnel resources available.
2. The needs of particular age groups were to be examined.
3. The implications for community action were to be developed.

Within this framework, the objectives of the study were further developed.

Objectives of the Study

The study was designed to accomplish four major objectives, as follows:

1. to describe selected population characteristics of the area;
2. to determine the favorable and unfavorable attitudes of the residents towards selected environmental conditions;
3. to ascertain the extent to which population characteristics were associated with favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward selected environmental conditions; and
4. to develop implications for community action in the area.

The design and pre-testing of the questionnaire was followed by selection of the neighborhood area, drawing of the random sample, selection and training of interviewers, collection of data and the preparation of data for the computer.

Design of the Study

The study was structured to examine selected population characteristics which may influence expressed satisfactions toward various aspects of the residential environment. These demographic or independent variables were categorized as follows:

1. age of the household head;
2. household type as determined by the age of the oldest child;
3. socioeconomic level as determined by the occupational type and educational level of the household head and the relative level of total household income;
4. commitment to the area as determined by the length of residence in the area, nature of tenure of occupied dwelling, ownership of an automobile and location of close friends and/or

relatives; and

5. state of physical health of the household head and/or respondent. Only those variables exhibiting significant associations would be subsequently reported.

Dependent variables were designated as those environmental dimensions about which respondents could express satisfactions. These satisfactions were categorized as follows:

1. Biophysical environment
 - a. adequacy of dwelling space
 - b. housing condition
2. Psychosocial environment
 - a. Interpersonal interaction
 - (1) degree of daily contact
 - (2) orientation toward life
 - (3) anomie
 - b. Community interaction
 - (1) degree of attendance in formal organizations
 - (2) community solidarity
3. Technological/network environment
 - a. Community facilities and services
4. Community action orientations
 - a. views of the future of the area
 - b. desire for involvement in community action

To supplement and give greater reliability to the responses, questions of the following nature were incorporated into the questionnaire.

1. Reasons for choosing the location.
2. Neighborhood "likes".
3. Neighborhood "lacks".

4. Rent and/or mortgage payment levels.
5. Future plans for improvement of property.
6. Potential uses of windfall income.
7. Community services in line with tax levels.
8. Focus for community action.

The questionnaire was developed and then pre-tested in 10 households and revised accordingly. The finished instrument was exploratory in nature in that it was the first attempt by the Institute of Urban Studies to incorporate a lengthy comprehensive survey into their summer research program.

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions made for this study:

- a. Population characteristics are important factors in the determination of satisfactions toward the biophysical, psychosocial and network dimensions of the urban environment.
- b. The random sample selected for the study was adequately representative of the population of the area.
- c. The instrument used in the study, as well as the procedures of the interviewers and evaluators, yielded valid information.
- d. Information obtained from the respondents represented relevant personal, interactional and attitudinal characteristics of the households.
- e. Female respondents, that is the wives or female heads of households, represented the segment of the population most in contact with the neighborhood and therefore most likely to be aware of the neighborhood situation.

A limitation of the study was that the area selected for investigation did not coincide with census tracts. As a result, no comparison of population changes over the years could be made. Another limitation was the use of volunteer interviewers who may not have been as qualified as trained interviewers. A further limitation was the time of year chosen for the study. The height of the summer season with its attendant factors of vacationing households, hot weather and children out of school may have skewed the results.

FRAME OF REFERENCE

As previously stated, the main objectives of the study were to determine associations between selected population characteristics and expressed satisfactions of respondents toward particular environmental dimensions in an urban residential area. This portion delineates the scope of the report and the concepts and variables selected, as well as the rationale for their selection.

The Scope of the Report

The study yielded a variety of information which, after initial statistical evaluation, was reduced to those factors which appeared to have merit for further investigation. In some instances the data were recoded for specific statistical treatments. The report, therefore, deals with certain demographic characteristics and environmental dimensions which are further explained in the following sections. Only a limited attempt has been made to evaluate the nature of community solidarity within the population sample. That facet of the study will be developed more fully in a Master of Science thesis to be completed by the author as the last stage of reporting the study.

Basic Concepts

Certain concepts related to the social sciences were explored in the study of the McNap area. These were the concepts of demographic description and the dimensions of environment. The interaction of households with the environment and the satisfactions expressed with this interaction were the focus of the study.

Demographic characteristics of households

Demography is a science that utilizes vital statistics, such as births, marriages and deaths to distinguish quantitative differences within a population. Two demographic characteristics, namely the age of the household head and the type of household (with or without children) were selected as the main ones for determining both quantitative and qualitative differences within the sample population with respect to environmental satisfactions.

Age of the household head. This variable was selected not only to determine the nature of the aged population for use by the Age and Opportunity Bureau but also to determine the proportion of aged people inhabiting the area. As indicated by Beyer (1969, p. 338) large proportions of the aged, who live on limited means, are found frequently in deteriorating neighborhoods in central city areas. Presence of such a concentration of older persons in the McNap area might indicate one of the contributing factors to deterioration of environmental conditions.

Other demographic characteristics and supplemental information, classified by the age of the household head, is found in Appendix B for use as a general reference concerning population characteristics.

Household type. The first consideration of this variable was in terms of stages of the life cycle through which individuals and families passed in the course of their lives. However the classification of households into family types became cumbersome because of the diversity of possible stages in a cross section of families in the community. Further, for the purpose of this analysis it was important to determine the degree to which the presence of children in the household influenced

the attitudes towards the environment. Since the McNap area contained a large proportion of single-family dwellings, it was assumed that such dwellings would have more appeal for families with children than those without. (Michelson, 1970, p. 96)

In the legal sense, the age of 18 years and over is regarded as the age of adult responsibility and as a result children of that age were not considered crucial to the evaluation of the neighborhood environment in the McNap area. Thus, the following classification of households was developed to obtain pertinent information concerning household composition.

1. oldest child under 6 years of age
2. oldest child under 12 years of age
3. oldest child under 18 years of age
4. oldest child 18 years and over
5. no children under 18 years of age (this category also includes single person and childless households)

It is understood that the second, third, and fourth categories of households include two or more age ranges of children. This classification was used to determine how adequately the needs of households with children of different age groups were met.

Socioeconomic level. The concept of socioeconomic level is one currently employed to describe the assigned and/or achieved position or status of an individual or kinship group which serves to differentiate it from others. The concept of social class as a variable in the evaluation of environment has been defined by Warner (1970, p. vi). As pointed out by Michelson (1970, p. 6), current research indicates that

the quality of dwellings is directly proportional to social class as determined by occupational prestige.

Various indicants can be used to assess the socioeconomic levels of the population inhabiting an area. The most consistently used indicants are those of occupational type and educational level of the household head as well as household income (Kaul and Davis, 1955, p. 325). On the basis of these three indicants, McNap households were classified into a range of relatively low, middle and high socioeconomic levels for the purpose of evaluating environmental satisfactions.

Commitment to the area. Other population characteristics were felt to be relevant to the McNap study. Commitment to the residential area was considered to be especially important in determining the implications for community action based on the study. Urban residential mobility, the process whereby families and individuals change their place of residence appeared to have significance in determining the stability of a residential area (Leslie and Richardson, 1961, p. 894). Length of residence in the area and ownership or rental of the dwelling occupied were selected as the major indicants in the McNap area for determining the degree of commitment to the area. The location of close friends and relatives was also considered in this context and was used to supplement this aspect of population characteristics.

Environmental dimensions

Environment can be defined as the field of effective stimulation and interaction of an organism with objects, persons and situations (Fairchild, 1961, p. 107). In this context, environment not only influences the organism but the organism can at the same time influence the environment.

There are many dimensions of environment. One concept of environment stresses the near-far continuum which relates to the geographical orientation of man to home, neighborhood, city and world (Jacobs, 1961, p. 117). This concept is also embodied in the Ekistics Grid which seeks to differentiate the levels of the physical environment with which man interacts. (Doxiadis, 1965, p. 3). These concepts imply that man is a passive observer and receiver of stimuli. Other theoretical considerations of environment indicate a further dimension which includes the affective orientation involved in psychosocial preferences, values, attitudes and satisfactions (McHale, 1965, p. 23). A combination of these dimensions of environment was delineated and is further explained in the following sections.

Biophysical dimension of environment. In the consideration of what is external to an organism, the physical organism becomes an object to the self and therefore part of the environment. In this context, the characteristics of age, sex, ethnic origin and other demographic statistics are to be regarded as part of the environment. Essentially in the McNap study, the stimulations and interactions of people were examined as they related to the psychosocial and technological dimensions of environment.

Psychosocial dimension of environment. The community scale selected for the McNap study was the neighborhood unit which corresponds to the concept of the near environment as described by Jacobs. Influences of the near environment are readily apparent in a statement from the President's Committee on Urban Housing (1969):

The place a man lives is more than just another commodity, service or possession; it is a symbol of

his status, an extension of his personality, a part of his identity, a determinant of the many benefits--and disadvantages--of society that will come to him and his family; schooling, police protection, municipal services, neighborhood environment, access (or lack of access) to a hundred possibilities of life and culture (p. 45)

The climate of an urban residential area is dependent upon the degree of interaction of an interpersonal and institutional nature. Greer and Kube (1959, p. 189) cite evidence that people in more urbanized areas exhibit a greater dependence on friends rather than formal organizations as a means of fulfilling social needs. In addition, the residential mobility of a population appears to be related to low socio-economic level and degree of involvement in an area (Rossi, 1955, p. 257).

To determine the influence of the near environment, an attempt was made to ascertain the attitudes of persons towards the residential area. An attitude has been defined as a predisposition to feel, think or act (favorably, neutrally or unfavorably) with respect to something or somebody; a mental set or readiness to respond in a certain way when the appropriate situation occurs (Harriman, p. 17).

It is recognized that an assessment of attitudes is largely influenced by emotions and may not be relevant except for the particular moment in time. Attitudes towards life in general, as measured by Srole's Anomie Scale, and the specific aspects of environment, as measured by the Community Solidarity Index developed by Fessler, were adapted and used to examine the psychosocial dimensions of environment (Miller, 1970, p. 321 and p. 278-282).

An aspect of the psychosocial dimension of environment which warranted examination was the satisfactions of respondents with the residential area. Satisfaction is defined as the absence of complaint when the opportunity for complaint is provided (Schoor, 1952, p. 15). The effects of environment upon satisfactions appear to be related to past experience. As a result, the respondent's previous financial, living and employment conditions were examined to provide insight into present satisfactions.

Technological dimension of environment. The condition of housing as well as community facilities and services was recognized as having a bearing on the degree of satisfaction expressed about the McNap area. No attempt was made to evaluate the quality of the dwellings or community facilities or services. Responses were sought as to the adequacy of these aspects of the environment as they related to the respondent's biophysical needs.

Community action

Community action is a form of social involvement which depends upon mobilization of consensus, equality and activation inherent in the community (Etzioni, 1969, p. 28). The rationale for community action lies in the fundamental premise that man can guide his destiny through the expression of citizen participation.

Expected Outcomes

The overall objectives of the McNap study indicated need to test the following general hypotheses; stated in null form:

1. Selected population characteristics are independent of each other.
2. Selected population characteristics and satisfactions towards selected environmental dimensions are independent of each other.
3. Expressed desire for involvement in community action and selected population characteristics are independent of each other.
4. Expressed desire for involvement in community action and expressed satisfactions towards selected environmental dimensions are independent of each other.

The following section of the report recounts the procedure utilized in the execution of the study.

PROCEDURE

Selection of the Residential Area

The residential area selected for the study was within the administrative boundary of the City of Winnipeg. It met the criteria of dense population and deteriorating housing. It was bounded on the south by Portage Avenue, on the east by McGee Street, on the north by Notre Dame Avenue and on the west by Arlington Street and was given the code name McNap area. The known population characteristics, obtained from the 1961 Canadian Census Bulletin indicated that there was diversity in ethnic origin, stages in family life-cycle, length of residence in the area and socio-economic level.

There were approximately 3,300 households in the 35 block area. The community facilities in the area included one playground, two schools

and various social and commercial facilities located along the traffic arteries of Portage, St. Mathews, Ellice, Sargent, Wellington and Notre Dame Avenues.

Sampling Procedure

The financial and personnel resources available limited the study to 250 households out of the 3,380 households as indicated in the Henderson City Directory. Household addresses obtained from the Directory were divided up into five sections. Each section was bounded by an east-west avenue and included seven one-block segments of McGee, Agnes, Victor, Toronto, Beverley, Simcoe, Home and Arlington Streets.

Rental accommodation was separated from owner-occupied residences to enable a comparable sample to be drawn from both groups. The starting point in each of the five sections was selected randomly and every thirteenth owner occupied household was selected in turn proceeding north down both sides of the street and south on the adjoining street to the west. The rental household sample was independently selected in the same manner.

An examination of Table I indicates the sample size in relation to the total number of households in each section.

Table 1 Comparison of sample size and total number of households in each section

Section	Total number of households		Sample size	
	owner occupied	rental accommodation	owner occupied	rental accommodation
1	559	125	41	10
2	534	161	41	12
3	508	233	39	17
4	434	226	33	18
5	<u>411</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>13</u>
	2485	897	186	64

To be eligible for the survey, the head of the household had to have been in residence at that address during the previous three months. No substitutions were allowed for households with which contact was not made.

Selection and Training of Interviewers

Fifteen volunteers were available through the auspices of the Age and Opportunity Bureau, a participating agency in the McNap study. The interviewers were instructed in the administration of the questionnaire by Grace Parasuik, the survey supervisor. Interviewers were assigned an average of 17 households to contact within a two-week period. Interviewers contacting households where English was not spoken were asked to request an interpreter to complete the interview. A field office was set up at the University of Winnipeg to facilitate contact with the interviewers.

Collection of Data

The field survey was begun on the twentieth of July, 1970, with the target date for the completion of interviews set for the first of August. At the end of the two-week period, the number of completed interviews was not sufficient. Fourteen additional volunteer interviewers were obtained to complete as many interviews as possible by the middle of August. At that time, volunteer interpreters were assigned to non-English speaking households who had been contacted during the previous two weeks. Particular difficulties were encountered in making contact with apartment dwellers during the evening hours. Table II indicates the breakdown of completed and uncompleted interviews in the survey.

Table 2 Completed and Uncompleted Interviews

	Number	Percentage
Completed interviews	116	46.4
Refusals	59	23.6
No Contact	50	20.0
Vacancies	9	3.6
Ineligible	<u>16</u>	<u>6.4</u>
	250	100.0

An attempt was made to determine the reasons for refusal to participate in the survey. A summary of these reasons is to be found in Appendix A.

Preparation and Analysis of Data

Much of the questionnaire was pre-coded to facilitate standard administration. Twelve questions were asked that solicited free responses which were subsequently coded into specific categories. All the questionnaires were checked for completeness by the survey supervisor before the data were punched on computer cards. One-way frequency distributions were compiled on all data; two-way frequency distributions were computed on selected portions of the data after some subsequent re-coding. Promising portions of this data were submitted to chi-square evaluation and treatments to determine possible associations.

The remaining sections of this report are devoted to the findings of the study based on statistical tests of the general hypotheses.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION

Descriptive characteristics of the McNap sample population were classified by age of household head and appear in a detailed table in Appendix B as a basic source of information obtained in the survey. In the present section, an overview of the general characteristics of the sample will be reported, as well as the association of specific population characteristics which have been designated as the independent variables in the study.

Descriptive Characteristics

Age of the household head

The age of the household head represents a vital descriptive characteristic and, as such, was selected as the major variable for the study. In the McNap sample population of 116 households, the heads were found to be distributed almost equally in five age groups ranging from under 35 years to over 65 years (Appendix B, p. 68). One out of every four households had a female as head.

Size of households

Households ranged by size from one to 10 members. The average size of those with heads under 65 years was 3.6 persons. One-and-two-member households predominated and represented two-fifths of the total. Over one-third of this group had household heads over 45 years (Appendix B, p. 69).

Physical health of household heads

The physical health of the household head was reported as good for 84.5 percent of the total sample; the remainder reported fair or poor health (Appendix B, p. 72). Heads of households who reported fair or poor health were over 55 years of age.

Ethnic origin of household heads

When the ethnic origin of household heads was examined in reference to age distribution, slightly less than one-half the total (44.8%) were Canadian born (Appendix B, p. 68). One-tenth (11.2%) reported ethnic origin as the British Isles and the remaining 44.0 percent mentioned a variety of countries of origin.

Canadian-born household heads were almost equally distributed by age in each of the five age categories, ranging from under 35 years to 65 years and over. In each category, Canadian-born heads made up approximately one-half the total. Table 3 provides a summary of the distribution of ethnic origin in the under 45 and over 45 age groups. In the younger age group, Italian and Portuguese households were more frequent than any other group, with the exception of the Canadian-born. In the older age category, aside from the Canadian-born, the British-born were next in frequency; the remainder were predominately Middle European and Slavic-born.

Table 3 Ethnic origin of household heads classified by age

Ethnic origin	Age of household head				Total	
	Under 45		Over 45		N	%
	N	%	N	%		
Canada	22	46.8	30	43.6	52	44.8
British Isles	1	2.1	12	17.4	13	11.2
Italy	9	19.1	2	2.9	11	9.5
Russia	1	2.1	6	8.7	7	6.0
Germany	2	4.3	4	5.8	6	5.2
Portugal	5	10.6	0	0	5	4.3
Ukraine	1	2.1	3	4.3	4	3.4
Other European	3	6.4	8	11.6	11	9.5
Other	3	6.4	4	5.8	7	6.0
	47	100.0	69	100.0	116	100.0

Household type

One-half the sample population (49.1%) consisted of households in which no children under the age of 18 years were reported. This category included households of single persons, childless couples, and older persons not involved with child rearing (Appendix B, p. 69). Of the 59 households with children under 18, one-fourth had children in each of the following categories: oldest child under 6 years, oldest child under 12 years, oldest child under 18 years, and oldest child over 18 years. The last category consisted of households where the oldest child was over 18 years but there were other children of younger years in the household.

Children under 12 years of age were found most frequently when the household head was under 45 years; 89.3 percent of these younger households reported children in this age group. In the older age categories, almost all of the children were over 12 years of age (61.3%).

Socioeconomic level

Composite scores for socioeconomic level were obtained by aggregating the individual scores for occupational type and educational level of household heads and total money income. A distribution of the composite scores was ranged into a low, moderate and high classification for the purpose of distinguishing differences in the responses on the basis of relative socioeconomic level. Table 4 provides a summary of some general population characteristics in relation to socioeconomic level.

Age of household head Age distribution of household heads under and over 45 years of age was almost equal in the moderate and high socioeconomic levels. In the low socioeconomic group, twice as many households with heads over 45 were included in that category than were households with heads under 45 years of age.

Table 4 Household characteristics classified by socioeconomic level

	Socioeconomic level							
	Low		Moderate		High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age of household								
Under 45 years	13	27.7	17	36.2	17	36.2	47	100.0
Over 45 years	26	37.7	21	30.4	22	31.9	69	100.0
Total	39	33.6	38	32.8	39	33.6	116	100.0
Household type								
Children under 18 years	18	30.5	21	35.6	20	33.9	59	100.0
No children under 18 years	21	36.8	17	29.8	19	33.3	57	100.0
Total	39	33.6	38	32.8	39	33.6	116	100.0
Occupational type								
Unskilled and semi-skilled	22	47.8	17	37.0	7	15.2	46	100.0
All others	4	9.5	14	33.3	24	57.1	42	100.0
Total	26	29.5	31	35.2	31	35.2	88	100.0
Retired/female heads of households	13	46.4	7	25.0	8	28.6	28	100.0
Educational level of head								
Grade 8 or less	34	63.0	18	33.3	2	3.7	54	100.0
Grade 8 or more	5	8.1	20	32.3	37	59.7	62	100.0
Total	39	33.6	38	32.8	39	33.6	116	100.0
Money income								
Under \$4000	27	69.2	8	20.5	4	10.3	39	100.0
\$4000 and over	9	12.9	27	38.6	34	48.6	70	100.0
Total	36	33.0	35	32.1	38	34.9	109	100.0
No response	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3	7	100.0
Ethnic origin								
Canadian-born	13	25.0	19	36.5	20	38.5	52	100.0
Foreign-born	26	40.6	19	29.7	19	29.7	64	100.0
Total	39	33.6	38	32.8	39	33.6	116	100.0

Household type With regard to household type, the distribution of households with and without children under 18 years was approximately one-third in each of the socioeconomic classifications.

To facilitate a greater understanding of the concept of socioeconomic level, a summary is provided in Table 4 of the distribution of occupational type and educational level of household heads, as well as total household income.

Type of occupation of household head More than five times as many households with heads classified in the unskilled and semi-skilled categories of occupational type were evaluated as low in socioeconomic level, as compared to households with heads of other occupational types. One-half of the 28 retired and unemployed female heads of households were considered low in socioeconomic level. This group of retired and of female heads of households made up one-third of the low socioeconomic classification.

The other occupational types, namely; skilled, clerical, service, self-employed and professional were combined to make one category. When distributed according to socioeconomic level, this group was found to predominate in the higher level. Three times as many households classified in the latter category were included in the high socioeconomic level as those in which the head of the household was in the unskilled and semi-skilled classification. The distribution in the two occupational categories was nearly equal (54.8% and 45.2% respectively) in the socioeconomic level designated as moderate.

Educational level of household heads Educational level of household heads was found to be distributed in a similar manner as occupational type with respect to socioeconomic level.

Money income Two-thirds of the 39 households classified as low in socioeconomic level reported incomes of less than \$4000. In contrast, the moderate and high socioeconomic groups combined, accounted for 87.2 percent of all 70 households with a reported annual income of over \$4000.

Ethnic origin The low socioeconomic level included twice as many foreign born heads of households as Canadian born. Of the 52 households headed by Canadian born heads, 75.0 percent were included in the moderate and high socioeconomic classification. Four-tenths (40.6%) of the 64 households with foreign-born heads were included in the low socioeconomic level and 29.7 percent in each of the moderate and high categories.

Commitment to the area

Scores used for deriving commitment to the area were based on tenure of dwelling and length of residence in the area. The anticipated indicators of automobile ownership and location of close friends and/or relatives were eliminated because their distribution indicated that they were not adequately discriminating as measures. The distribution of some general population characteristics determined by commitment to the area is summarized in Table 5.

Age of the household head The older age group was found to exhibit higher commitment to the area than the younger age group. Over one-half of the 69 households with heads over 45 years were highly committed to the area. The low and moderately committed category included 95.7 percent of the younger age group.

Household type Households without children under 18 years of age were found to be more frequent in the highly committed category than those households with children under 18 years. Three times as many of the

Table 5 Household characteristics classified by
commitment to the area

	Commitment to the area							
	Low		Moderate		High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age of household head								
Under 45 years	19	40.4	26	55.3	2	4.3	47	100.0
Over 45 years	14	20.3	16	23.2	39	56.5	69	100.0
Total	33	28.4	42	36.2	41	35.3	116	100.0
Household type								
Children under 18 years	18	30.5	32	34.2	9	15.3	59	100.0
No children under 18 years	15	26.3	10	17.5	32	56.1	57	100.0
Total	33	28.4	42	36.2	41	35.3	116	100.0
Socioeconomic level								
Low	13	33.3	14	35.9	12	30.8	39	100.0
Moderate	10	26.3	16	42.1	12	31.6	38	100.0
High	10	25.6	12	30.8	17	43.6	39	100.0
Total	33	28.4	42	36.2	41	35.3	116	100.0
Tenure of dwelling								
Rented	30	76.9	9	23.1	0	00	39	100.0
Owned or being purchased	3	3.9	33	42.9	41	53.2	77	100.0
Total	33	28.4	42	36.2	41	35.3	116	100.0
Length of residence in area								
Less than 1 year	13	81.3	3	18.8	0	00	16	100.0
1-4.99 years	20	58.8	14	41.2	0	00	34	100.0
5-9.99 years	0	00	19	100.0	0	00	19	100.0
10 years or more	0	00	6	12.8	41	87.2	47	100.0
Total	33	28.4	42	36.2	41	35.2	116	100.0
Ethnic origin								
Canadian-born	17	32.7	19	36.5	16	30.8	52	100.0
Foreign-born	16	25.0	23	35.9	25	39.1	64	100.0
Total	33	28.4	42	36.2	41	35.2	116	100.0

childless households exhibited high commitment to the area as did those households with children under 18 years. Less than one-half (43.8%) of these older households, in contrast with 84.7 percent of those with children under 18, had relatively low or moderate commitment to the area.

Socioeconomic level Distribution of socioeconomic levels in relation to commitment to the area resulted in approximately one-third of each socioeconomic level accounted for in each of the three categories of commitment to the area.

Tenure of dwelling To illustrate the rationale for use of a composite score for commitment to the area, Table 5 provides a summary of the distribution of households on the basis of tenure of dwelling and length of residence in the area in relation to the relative commitment of respondents to the area. Households in which the dwelling was rented, were found more frequently in the low committed category; households in which the dwelling was being purchased were more prevalent in the moderate category and households in which the dwelling was fully owned were exclusively in the high category.

Length of residence in the area A similar distribution to that of tenure and commitment to the area was exhibited in length of residence of respondents and commitment to the area. Those households which had the shortest length of residence, less than five years, were lowest in commitment, with the reverse exhibited by households in residence for 10 years or more.

Ethnic origin of household head Both Canadian-born and foreign-born heads of households were equally distributed, approximately 50 percent, in each of the low and moderate committed categories. In the highly committed group, 61.0 percent consisted of household heads of foreign extraction as compared to 39.0 percent that were Canadian-born.

Significant Associations Between Selected Population

Characteristics

Chi-square evaluations were carried out to determine any possible associations between the four selected population characteristics which were designated as the independent variables. The significant levels of association between the independent variables are summarized and appear in Table 6.

Age of household head

Socioeconomic level, educational level and occupational type were found to be independent of age of household head. As expected, age of household head and household type were closely associated. In the McNap sample, as the age of the household head increased, the number of children under 18 years decreased. In addition, a significant association between money income and age of household head was established. In the sample population, more of the younger age group, 84.5 percent, reported an annual income of over \$4000 as compared to the older age group of which 51.6 percent had incomes over \$4000.

Age of household head was also found to be associated with commitment to the area and the two indicants of that variable. High commitment in the McNap sample was exhibited to a greater extent by the older age group than the younger. In addition, the older age category was found to have a higher proportion of home owners than the younger, as well as greater length of residence in the area.

Household type

Household type, found to be associated with age of head, was also associated with commitment to the area and length of residence in the area. Households without children under 18 years exhibited greater

commitment to the area and were in residence in the area for a greater length of time than the households with children under the age of 18 years.

Table 6 Significant Chi-square associations of selected population characteristics

	1	2	3				4		
			a	b	c	d	a	b	c
1. Age of household head	X	.001	X	X	X	.01	.001	.001	.001
2. Household type		X	X	X	X	X	.001	X	.001
3.a. Socioeconomic level, overall			X	.001	.001	.001	X	X	X
b. Occupational type				X	.005	X	X	X	.025
c. Educational level					X	X	X	X	X
d. Money income						X	X	X	X
4.a. Commitment to the area, overall							X	.001	.001
b. Tenure of dwelling								X	.001
c. Length of residence									X

Socioeconomic level

To validate the rationale for using the indicants of occupational type, educational level and money income to determine relative socioeconomic level, tests of association were performed. Occupational type and educational level were significantly associated with each other but money income was found to be independent of either of the other two indicants. In the McNap sample, it would appear that money income bore little relationship to occupational or educational status of the household head. The association of occupational type and length of residence in the area indicated that the area was the residential location for a period of time exceeding 5 years, of unskilled and semi-skilled

occupational types.

Commitment to the area

Relative commitment to the area, found to be associated with age of household head, household type, tenure of dwelling and length of residence in the area indicated that the older households with no children under 18 years exhibited higher commitment because of ownership of dwelling and residence in the area for over 5 years.

In summary, the McNap sample population exhibited the following characteristics.

Age of household head

40.5 %	under 45 years of age
40.5 %	45-64 years of age
19.0 %	65 years and over

Household type

10.3 %	oldest child under 6 years of age
13.8 %	oldest child under 12 years of age
12.1 %	oldest child under 18 years of age
*13.8 %	oldest child over 18 years of age
**49.1 %	no children under 18 years of age

* younger children are present in the household
 ** includes single persons and childless couples

Relative socioeconomic level

33.6 %	low
32.8 %	moderate
33.6 %	high

Occupational type of household head

39.7 %	unskilled and semi-skilled
36.2 %	skilled, clerical, service, self-employed, professional
24.1 %	retired and/or non-employed female heads

Educational level of household head

46.6 %	Grade 8 or less
40.5 %	Grade 9-11
12.1 %	Grade 12
9.5 %	University

Money Income

10.3 %	under \$2000
28.4 %	\$2000-\$3999
19.0 %	\$4000-\$5999
19.0 %	\$6000-\$7999
23.3 %	\$8000 or more

Commitment to the area

31.0 %	low
34.5 %	moderate
34.5 %	high

Dwelling tenure

33.6 %	rented
18.1 %	being purchased
48.3 %	fully owned

Length of residence in the area

13.8 %	less than 1 year
30.2 %	1-4.99 years
16.4 %	5-9.99 years
25.0 %	10-19.99 years
15.5 %	20 years or more

Ethnic origin

44.8 %	Canadian born
55.2 %	foreign born

The next section of the report provides descriptions of environmental characteristics and reviews the significant associations between population characteristics and responses toward the biophysical, psychosocial and technological-network dimension of the neighborhood.

ENVIRONMENTAL SATISFACTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH SELECTED POPULATION

CHARACTERISTICS

In addition to the nature of population characteristics which are themselves biophysical in concept, attempts were made in the McNap area survey to determine satisfactions of respondents with physical aspects of the environment; namely housing. Adequacy of dwelling space occupied by the household, degree of satisfaction with the condition or state of repair of the dwelling, plans for the future improvement of occupied housing and expected use of potential windfall income were the queries selected to provide insight into neighborhood satisfactions with the physical environment.

Housing Characteristics

The nature of housing characteristics as related to the various age groups in the sample are to be found on page 74 and 75 in Appendix B. Of the 112 households that reported mortgage and/or rental payments, 80 percent paid less than \$100 a month for accommodation. Of this group, more than one-half were in the over-55 age range. In the under-35 age group, 60.9 percent paid \$100 or more per month for their accommodation. 86.8% of the 53 households that reported a monthly accommodation payment of less than \$60 were occupying fully owned accommodation in which case the payment was for taxes only (Table 7).

Table 7 Monthly accommodation costs by nature of tenure

	Dwelling tenure							
	Rented		Being purchased		Fully owned		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than \$60	2	5.6	5	21.7	46	86.8	53	47.3
\$60-\$90	21	58.3	4	17.4	2	3.8	27	24.1
\$100-\$139	12	33.3	9	39.1	4	7.5	25	22.3
\$140 or more	1	2.8	5	21.7	1	1.9	7	6.3
Total	36	100.0	23	100.0	53	100.0	112	100.0
No response	1		1		2		4	

Crowding did not appear to be a factor in the McNap area (Table 8). One and two member households made up 42.6 percent of the sample with over one-half of this group living in dwelling space of five rooms or more. The average dwelling space occupied per household was five rooms.

Table 8 Occupied dwelling space by household size

	Size of household									
	1 and 2 members		3 and 4 members		5 and 6 members		6 or more		Total N=115	
Number of rooms occupied	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Two	4	8.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3.5
Three	6	12.2	3	7.3	2	10.5	0	0	11	9.6
Four	12	24.5	15	36.6	3	15.8	0	0	30	26.1
Five or six	24	49.0	19	46.3	5	26.3	1	16.7	49	42.6
Seven or more	3	6.1	4	9.8	9	47.4	5	83.3	21	18.3
Total	49	100.0	41	100.0	19	100.0	6	100.0	115	100.0

With regard to meeting monthly accommodation costs, over four-fifths of the sample reported no difficulty, 13.0 percent reported occasional difficulty and 4.3 percent frequent difficulty (Appendix B, p. 74).

As reported in the Preliminary Report of this study, (p. 17), 62.9 percent of the households in the sample occupied single unit dwellings, 22.2 percent occupied 2, 3 and 4 unit dwellings and the remainder 14.4 percent occupied multiple unit dwellings. Of the 116 dwellings, 25 (18.8%) were reported as being used as rooming, boarding and guest houses (Preliminary Report, p. 17).

Biophysical Satisfactions

Adequacy of dwelling space

The distribution of responses related to adequacy of dwelling space and age of household head appear on page 74 in Appendix B. No

significant association was established between adequacy of dwelling space and age of household head, household type, relative socioeconomic level, educational level, money income and length of residence in the area. Significant associations between adequacy of dwelling space and the remaining independent variables are summarized in Table 9.

Occupational type The unskilled and semi-skilled occupational category recorded proportionally higher responses of insufficient dwelling space than the other categories, while the retired and female headed group recorded more than enough dwelling with greater frequency than the other two groups.

Of the 15 households that reported not enough housing space, slightly less than one-half belonged to the unskilled and semi-skilled occupational groups, one-third were distributed in all the other occupational groups and one-fifth were retired or unemployed. One-half of those 18 households that registered having too much living space were retired or unemployed, one-third were in the unskilled and semi-skilled classification and one-sixth in all other occupational categories.

Commitment to the area Low and moderately committed groups in the McNap area tended to regard their dwelling space as inadequate, while the moderate to highly committed groups tended to have more dwelling space than required by their households. Over nine-tenths of the 15 households that recorded insufficient dwelling space were categorized as having low and moderate commitment to the area. Of the 18 households that reported too much living space, over three-quarters were in the moderate and high commitment classification. The majority of respondents, (71.6%) appeared to be satisfied with the dwelling space their households occupied.

Table 9 Adequacy of dwelling space related to population characteristics

Population characteristics	Adequacy of dwelling space						Total	
	Not enough		Too much		Just right		N=116	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Occupational type								
Unskilled/semi-skilled	7	15.2	6	13.0	33	71.7	46	100.0
Other (a)	5	11.9	3	7.1	34	81.0	42	100.0
Retired/female heads	3	10.7	9	32.1	16	57.1	28	100.0
Total	15	12.9	18	15.5	83	71.6	116	100.0
	$\chi^2_{14} = 9.72$		9.5 @ .05P					
(a) other occupational groups; skilled, clerical, service, self employed and professional								
Commitment to the area								
Low	8	22.2	2	5.6	26	72.2	36	100.0
Moderate	6	15.0	7	17.5	27	67.5	40	100.0
High	1	2.5	9	22.5	30	75.0	40	100.0
Total	15	12.9	18	15.5	83	71.6	116	100.0
	$\chi^2_{14} = 9.72$		9.5 @ .05P					
Dwelling tenure								
Rented	12	32.4	2	5.4	23	62.2	37	100.0
Owned or being purchased	3	3.8	16	20.3	60	75.9	79	100.0
Total	15	12.9	18	15.5	83	71.6	116	100.0
	$\chi^2_{14} = 18.92$		13.8 @ .001P					

Nature of tenure Households which rented their accommodation gave more frequent responses of occupying inadequate dwelling space than did the respondents who occupied dwellings that were fully owned or being purchased. Four times as many renting households as owner-occupied households reported occupying insufficient dwelling space, while 8 times as many owner occupied households recorded having too much dwelling space for their needs than did the renting households.

Approximately two-thirds of the renting households and three-fourths of the owner-occupied households found their accommodation to be just right for their needs.

In the McNap sample population, insufficient dwelling space was reported to a greater extent by the unskilled and semi-skilled occupational classification, low and moderately committed respondents and renters of dwelling space. Responses of too much dwelling space were recorded with more frequency by retired and female-headed households, moderately to highly committed households and owner-occupied households.

Satisfactions with housing condition

Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of satisfaction they felt with the condition or state of repair of the occupied dwelling. A five-point range from very dissatisfied to very satisfied was used. In accordance with the definition of a satisfaction as given in the frame of reference section of this report, "the absence of complaint, when opportunity for complaint is provided", responses of "uncertain" were grouped with the responses registering dissatisfaction.

Age of household head The strong association found to exist between age of household head and condition of housing would indicate that the older age group tended to be more satisfied with the condition of their housing than the younger age group. Table 10 provides a summary of the significant findings between housing satisfactions and population characteristics. Slightly more than three-fourths of the total sample expressed satisfaction with the condition of occupied housing, of which 88.4 percent were households in the over-45 age group. The under-45 age group was equally divided between those who were satisfied and those who were not satisfied with the condition of their housing.

Table 10 Expressed satisfactions with housing condition associated with population characteristics

Population characteristics	Satisfactions with housing condition				Total	
	Dissatisfied/ uncertain		Satisfied		N=116	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age of household head						
Under 45 years	24	51.1	23	48.9	47	100.0
Over 45 years	8	11.6	61	88.4	69	100.0
Total	32	27.6	84	75.9	116	100.0
	$\chi^2_1 = 21.8$		10.8 @ .001P			
Household type						
Children under 18 years	23	39.0	36	61.0	59	100.0
No children under 18 years	9	15.8	48	84.2	57	100.0
Total	32	27.6	84	75.9	116	100.0
	$\chi^2_1 = 7.8$		7.4 @ .01P			
Socioeconomic level						
Low	14	35.9	25	64.1	39	100.0
Moderate	14	36.8	24	63.2	38	100.0
High	4	10.3	35	89.7	39	100.0
Total	32	27.6	84	75.9	116	100.0
	$\chi^2_2 = 8.8$		7.48 @ .025P			

Household type In the McNap sample population, households with no children under 18 years of age appeared to be more satisfied with the condition or state of repair of their dwelling than those with children under 18. Of the 84 households which expressed a satisfaction with housing condition, over one-half were households with no children under the age of 18 years, while over two-thirds of those households which expressed dissatisfaction with housing condition reported children under the age of 18 years.

Socioeconomic level Respondents in the higher socioeconomic category appeared to be more satisfied with the condition of their housing than either of the other 2 groups. Approximately 40 percent of the 32 households which were reported to be dissatisfied with housing conditions were found to be in each of the low and moderate socioeconomic levels, with the remainder, 12.5 percent, in the higher socioeconomic level.

Dissatisfaction with the condition or state of repair of housing in the McNap area was exhibited to a greater extent by those households with heads under 45 years, children under 18 years of age and classified as low or moderate in socioeconomic level.

Plans for future improvement of housing

As might be expected, respondents who owned or were buying their homes were more likely to have plans for the future improvement of their property than renters in the hypothetical situation that both groups were responsible for repairs (Table 11). Of the 86 responses, 36.0 percent recorded plans for future improvement of housing with four times as many owners as renters registering affirmative responses.

Table 11 Plans for future housing improvement by tenure characteristics

Tenure characteristics	Plans for housing improvement				Total	
	No plans		Some plans		N= 86	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Dwelling tenure						
Rented	22	78.6	6	21.4	28	100.0
Owned or being purchased	33	56.9	25	43.1	58	100.0
Total	55	64.0	31	36.0	86	100.0
	$\chi^2_1 = 3.84$		3.8 @ .05P			

Expected use of potential windfall income

When asked to respond to the question of what use they would put a potential windfall income of \$1000, two-thirds of the 102 respondents indicated that they would use it on housing, while the remainder would use it for purposes other than housing. An examination of Table 12 shows that a higher proportion of those households classified as moderate and high in socioeconomic level and all levels of commitment to the area would use windfall income on housing. Households of low socioeconomic level tended to register expected uses of windfall income for purposes other than housing.

Of the 71 households that recorded an expected use of potential windfall income on housing, 80.3 percent were classified as moderate or high in socioeconomic level, while 58.1 percent of those households which would not use potential windfall income on housing were in the low socioeconomic classification. This would indicate that the low socioeconomic group had either less interest or, less need or more vital uses for income than improvement of housing.

With regard to commitment to the area and expected use of potential windfall income, nine-tenths of the moderately committed group which had the general characteristics of moderate length of residence in the area and in the process of purchasing their homes expressed desires to use windfall income on housing, as contrasted with approximately two-thirds of the low and highly committed groups.

In the McNap area, expected use of potential windfall income on housing was more pronounced in the moderate and high socioeconomic levels and committed groups than in the lower classifications.

Table 12 Expected use of potential windfall income
by socioeconomic level and commitment to the area

Population characteristics	Expected use of windfall income				Total	
	On housing		Other		N=102	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Socioeconomic level						
Low	14	43.8	18	56.3	32	100.0
Moderate	26	78.8	7	21.2	33	100.0
High	31	83.8	6	16.2	37	100.0
Total	71	69.6	31	30.4	102	100.0
$\chi^2_2 = 14.9 \quad 13.8 @ .001P$						
Commitment to the area						
Low	18	60.0	12	40.0	30	100.0
Moderate	33	89.2	4	10.8	37	100.0
High	20	57.1	15	42.9	35	100.0
Total	71	69.6	31	30.4	102	100.0
$\chi^2_2 = 12.7 \quad 10.6 @ .005P$						

Psychosocial Satisfactions

Satisfaction of a psychosocial nature were designated as attitudinal and interactional. Attitudinal responses pertaining to reasons for choosing the location, along with neighborhood "likes" and "lacks", formed the basis of general descriptive information. Descriptions of attitudes toward the community, life in general and present conditions as compared to five years ago, each related to population characteristics, were the focus of the analytical portion of this section. In addition, interaction patterns of respondents and households were examined in the context of interpersonal and institutional contact.

General neighborhood satisfaction

The reasons for selecting the neighborhood as the location of residence, classified by age of the household head, are summarized on page 84 of Appendix B. In order of greatest frequency of responses,

the following reasons were given for choice of residential location in the neighborhood.

1. Housing was suitable
2. Near employment
3. Community services and facilities
4. Near friends and/or relatives
5. Character of the neighborhood

The qualities of the neighborhood currently regarded as pleasing by the respondents were the character of the neighborhood, central location and community services and facilities, in that order of frequency of response. (Appendix B, p. 85)

Qualities of the neighborhood found to be deficient by the 59 respondents were diverse, with facilities for children and lack of peace and quiet given as the preponderant "lacks" of the neighborhood by 44.1 percent of them. (Appendix B, p. 85)

Attitudes toward the community

A Community Solidarity Index, developed by Fessler (Miller, 1970, p. 278-282) was administered to the respondents.¹ The relative levels of low, moderate and high community solidarity were found to be independent of age of household head, household type, socioeconomic level and commitment to the area. The distribution of levels of community solidarity scores in relation to age of household head is found on page 78 of Appendix B.

Extent of anomie

Responses to the five items developed by Srole (Miller, 1970, p. 321) to measure anomie, that is, tendencies toward normlessness, were aggregated and the sums distributed into relatively low, moderate and high categories. This measure of attitude toward life was found to be significantly associated with socioeconomic level and money income

¹An evaluation of the Community Solidarity Index, as a measure of urban attitudes is the topic of a Master's thesis being prepared by this author and will be made available to the Institute of Urban Studies when completed.

(Table 13). Over one-half of the group designated as low in socioeconomic status was evaluated as high in anomie tendency, which indicated that respondents in the low socioeconomic level lacked social ties to greater extent than those categorized as of moderate or high socioeconomic level. This quality was also exhibited by the respondents whose money income was under \$4000. Almost one-half of this group (45.9%) presented anomie tendencies in contrast with 22.9 percent of the respondents with household incomes of over \$4000.

Table 13 Extent of anomie related to socioeconomic level and money income

	Extent of anomie						Total	
	Low		Moderate		High		N=114	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Socioeconomic level								
Low	6	15.8	11	28.9	21	55.3	38	100.0
Moderate	15	40.5	13	35.1	9	24.3	37	100.0
High	9	23.1	13	33.3	7	17.9	39	100.0
Total	40	35.1	37	32.5	37	32.5	114	100.0
	$\chi^2_4 = 15.2$		14.9 @ .005P					
Income (N=107)								
Under \$4000	9	24.3	11	29.7	17	45.9	37	100.0
Over \$4000	30	42.9	24	34.3	16	22.9	70	100.0
Total	39	36.4	35	32.7	33	30.8	107	100.0
	$\chi^2_2 = 6.6$		6.0 @ .05P					

Evaluation of present conditions compared to five years ago

The extents to which respondents, classified by age of household head, considered present financial and living conditions, opportunities for income earner and opportunities for children, as worse, the same, or better than five years ago are presented in Appendix B on pages 76 and 77. Significant associations between four of the nine

independent variables and evaluations by respondents of their current situations are herewith reported.

Financial conditions Younger households and those in the higher socioeconomic level evaluated their present financial conditions as better than five years ago. This evaluation was also given by those household in which the money income was over \$4000 and the head was classified in the higher occupational types (Table 14). One-half (51.8%) of the 112 respondents considered their financial situation to be improved.

Of the 45 households with heads under 45 years of age, three-fourths (73.3%) evaluated their present condition as better than five years ago as compared with 37.3 percent of the older age group.

Only 32.4 percent of the households classified as low in socioeconomic level evaluated their present financial condition as better than five years ago. This is contrasted with 54.1 percent of the households in the moderate socioeconomic level and 68.4 percent of the households of relatively high socioeconomic level who indicated an improvement in their financial condition.

Money income, an indicant of socioeconomic level was also found to be associated with improvement in financial condition. Of the 68 households that reported incomes of \$4000 or more, 58.8 percent evaluated their financial condition as better than five years ago in contrast with 36.8 percent of the 38 households that reported money income of less than \$4000.

Table 14 Respondent evaluations of present financial conditions compared with five years ago, by selected population characteristics

Population characteristics	Evaluation of present financial condition						Total	
	Worse		The same		Better		N=112	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age of household head								
Under 45 years	3	6.7	9	20.0	33	73.3	45	100.0
Over 45 years	16	23.9	26	38.8	25	37.3	67	100.0
Total	19	17.0	35	31.3	58	51.8	112	100.0
	$\chi^2_2 = 14.59$		13.8 @ .001P					
Socioeconomic level								
Low	10	27.0	15	40.5	12	32.4	37	100.0
Moderate	6	16.2	11	29.7	20	54.1	37	100.0
High	3	7.9	9	23.7	26	68.4	38	100.0
Total	19	17.0	35	31.3	58	51.8	112	100.0
	$\chi^2_4 = 10.6$		9.5 @ .05P					
Income (N=106)								
Under \$4000	11	28.9	13	34.2	14	36.8	38	100.0
Over \$4000	7	10.3	21	30.9	40	58.8	68	100.0
Total	18	17.0	34	32.1	54	50.9	106	100.0
	$\chi^2_2 = 7.4$		6.0 @ .05P					
Occupational type								
Unskilled/ semi-skilled	9	19.6	15	32.6	22	47.8	46	100.0
Other	2	5.1	10	25.6	27	69.2	39	100.0
Retired/female heads	8	29.6	10	37.0	9	33.3	27	100.0
Total	19	17.0	35	31.3	58	51.8	112	100.0
	$\chi^2_4 = 10.9$		9.5 @ .05P					

The association of occupational type of the household head and evaluation of present financial condition indicated that households with retired and/or female heads tended to consider their present financial conditions as the same or worse than five years ago more frequently than did households in which heads were classified by occupation. Of

the 27 reporting households with retired and/or female heads, 66.7 percent evaluated their financial condition as the same or worse, in contrast with 48.0 percent of the households with heads who were employed.

Living conditions The evaluation by respondents of current living conditions, compared to five years ago, was significantly associated with four of nine variables tested. (Table 15). Judgements of "better than five years ago" were expressed by proportionally more of the households with heads under 45 years of age, one or more children under the age of 18 years, money income over \$4000 and the head was occupationally employed. Tendencies to appraise current living conditions as worse than they were five years ago were strongest when the main earner was unskilled or semi-skilled and when the income level was under \$4000. Households with heads under 45 years of age and those with retired or female heads were more prone than others to assess current living conditions as the same as they were five years ago.

Opportunities for income earner Evaluation of current opportunities for income earner were found to be associated with relative socioeconomic level and one of the indicants of that variable, money income. Households classified as high in socioeconomic level and those which had a reported income of over \$4000 tended to appraise current employment opportunities as better than five years ago (Table 16).

Twice as many households in the high socioeconomic category considered employment opportunities better than did those in the low and moderate level. Approximately one-fourth of those in the low and moderate socioeconomic levels assessed current employment opportunities

Table 15 Respondent evaluations of present living conditions compared with five years ago, by selected population characteristics

Population characteristics	Evaluation of present living conditions						Total	
	Worse		The same		Better		N=113	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age of household head								
Under 45 years	5	11.1	9	20.0	31	68.9	45	100.0
Over 45 years	6	8.8	42	61.8	20	29.4	68	100.0
Total	11	9.7	51	45.1	51	45.1	113	100.0
$\chi^2_2 = 19.9 \quad 13.8 @ .001P$								
Household type								
Children under 18	6	10.5	18	31.6	33	57.9	57	100.0
No children under 18	5	8.9	33	58.9	18	32.1	56	100.0
Total	11	9.7	51	45.1	51	45.1	113	100.0
$\chi^2_2 = 8.9 \quad 7.8 @ .02P$								
Income (N=106)								
Under \$4000	7	18.9	21	56.8	9	24.3	37	100.0
Over \$4000	3	4.3	28	40.6	38	55.1	69	100.0
Total	10	9.4	49	46.2	47	44.3	106	100.0
$\chi^2_2 = 11.9 \quad 10.6 @ .005P$								
Occupational type								
Unskilled/skilled	8	17.8	15	33.3	22	48.9	45	100.0
Other	2	5.0	14	35.0	24	60.0	40	100.0
Retired/female heads	1	3.6	22	78.6	5	17.9	28	100.0
Total	11	9.7	51	45.1	51	45.1	112	100.0
$\chi^2_4 = 20.9 \quad 18.5 @ .001P$								

as better in contrast with two-thirds of those in the higher socioeconomic level.

Of the 61 households with a reported income of over \$4000, one-half (47.5%) considered current opportunities better for the income

earner than five years ago, as compared to 10.0 percent of the 20 households with reported incomes of less than \$4000.

Table 16 Respondent evaluations of present opportunities for income earner by selected population characteristics

Population characteristics	Present opportunities for income earner						Total	
	Worse		The same		Better		N= 86	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Socioeconomic level								
Low	9	36.0	11	44.0	5	20.0	25	100.0
Moderate	5	18.5	15	55.6	7	25.9	27	100.0
High	3	8.8	8	23.5	23	67.6	34	100.0
Total	17	19.8	34	39.5	35	40.7	86	100.0
		$\chi^2_4 = 19.6$		14.8 @ .001P				
Income (N= 81)								
Under \$4000	6	30.0	12	60.0	2	10.0	20	100.0
Over \$4000	11	18.0	21	34.4	29	47.5	61	100.0
Total	17	21.0	33	40.7	31	38.3	81	100.0
		$\chi^2_2 = 8.9$		7.4 @ .025P				

Opportunities for children No significant association was found between respondents evaluation of current opportunities for children and selected population characteristics.

Interaction patterns

Extent of daily contact with neighbors and/or friends, an aspect of interpersonal interaction, was found to be independent of the nine variables designated as selected population characteristics. A summary of the extent of daily contact by age groups appears on page 77 in Appendix B. Interaction of an institutional nature was measured by degree of household participation in formal organizations. These were categorized as those in which any member of the household attended, either within or outside the neighborhood. A breakdown of household

participation in formal organizations appears on pages 78 to 81 in Appendix B.

The only organization in which more than 25 percent of the McNap sample population participated was the church. Because the households which participated in all but one of the organizations were so few in number, only church attendance was evaluated. Twenty-three households (19.0% of the total sample) recorded no participation in any of the 12 formal organizations considered in the survey. Characteristics of these households have been compiled and are presented in Appendix C.

Church attendance by one or more members of the household was found to be significantly associated with two of the nine independent variables. Those households which were classified as moderate or highly committed to the area on the basis of tenure of dwelling and length of residence exhibited more church attendance both within and outside the neighborhood than did the lower committed group. (Table 17). Of the 52 households that reported church attendance in the area, 69.2 percent were moderately and highly committed. In addition, nine-tenths (90.9%) of those who attended church outside the neighborhood also consisted of the moderately and highly committed group.

All of the 11 reporting households with retired or female heads had one or more members who attended church in the area. In contrast, 39.1 percent of the unskilled and semi-skilled group and one-half (54.8%) of the other occupationally classified group had members who attended church in the area.

Approximately one-fourth of each of the two occupationally designated groups recorded participation in church attendance outside

the neighborhood. Non-participant households in church attendance comprised one-half of those for whom commitment to the area was low and the head was unskilled or semi-skilled. In contrast, one-fourth of the moderate and high committed households, one-fifth of the other occupational group, and three-fifths of retired and female headed households reported non-participation of any member in church attendance.

With the exception of church attendance, participation in formal organizations was not a major characteristic of the McNap area sample population.

Table 17 Attendance at church within and outside the neighborhood by selected population characteristics

Population characteristics	Church attendance							
	In neighborhood		Outside neighborhood		No attendance		Total N=116	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Commitment to area								
Low	14	38.9	2	5.6	20	55.6	36	100.0
Moderate	19	47.5	10	25.0	11	27.5	40	100.0
High	19	47.5	10	25.0	11	27.5	40	100.0
Total	52	44.8	22	19.0	42	36.2	116	100.0
		$\chi^2 = 8.6$		$7.8 @ .05P$				
Occupational type								
Skilled/semi-skilled	18	39.1	12	26.1	26	56.5	46	100.0
Other	23	54.8	10	23.8	9	21.4	42	100.0
Retired/female heads	11	39.3	0	0	17	60.7	28	100.0
Total	52	44.8	22	19.0	42	36.2	116	100.0
		$\chi^2 = 11.9$		$10.6 @ .005P$				

Satisfactions with the technological-network environment

Evaluation of the quality of 21 community services and facilities available in the neighborhood was solicited from the respondents. A summary of the degree of satisfaction with these indicants of the technological-network environment, as registered by households according to the age of the household head, appears on page 82 of Appendix B. All community services and facilities were judged adequate or satisfactory by the majority of respondents. With the exception of one indicant, these evaluations were found to be independent of household characteristics. Respondents' satisfactions with general community services in relation to property taxes was found to be associated with commitment to the area. (Table 18)

As might be expected, households classified as moderately and highly committed expressed more frequent responses of poor community services in relation to taxes than did households of low commitment. This appraisal may have been due to the proportionally greater numbers of home-owner households in the moderate and high levels of commitment. Regardless of extent of commitment, approximately one-half of the households evaluated community services as good in relation to property taxes.

Table 18 Respondents evaluation of community services in relation to property taxes by commitment to the area

	Community services in relation to property taxes							
	Poor		Uncertain		Good		Total N=114	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Commitment to the area								
Low	6	15.8	12	31.6	20	52.6	38	100.0
Moderate	12	32.4	6	16.2	19	51.4	37	100.0
High	17	43.6	4	10.3	18	46.2	39	100.0
Total	35	30.7	22	19.3	57	50.0	114	100.0
	$\chi^2 = 9.9$		9.5 @ .05P					

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AGED POPULATION

The aged population in the McNap area sample, that is, those households with heads 65 years of age and over, made up one-fifth (19.0%) of the total. A detailed description of household characteristics classified, by age of household head, is presented in Appendix B. A brief summary based on this information is reported here for the benefit of the Age and Opportunity Bureau of Winnipeg. In Table 18 a summary of the age levels of these households is presented.

Table 19 Types of aged households classified by age of head

Age groups	Types of households				Total
	one-person households		two-person households		
	male	female	husband	wife	
65-69 years	N 0	N 2	N 3	N 3	8
70-74 years	1	1	4	0	6
75-79 years	1	3	0	3	7
80 years and over	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	2	8	12	7*	29

* Includes only wives over 65 years

Demographic Characteristics

The 22 households which had heads over 65 years of age were distinctive in the following qualities:

One-third (36.4%) were single person households, one-half (50.0%) were composed of two-persons;

One-half (45.5%) were widowed;

One-half (54.5%) reported fair or poor health;

One-third (35.0%) recorded annual incomes of less than \$2000, two-fifths (45.0%) had incomes between \$2000 and \$4000, one-fifth (20.0%) had incomes of \$4000 or higher;

Three-fourths (77.3%) were full owners of their homes;

Four-fifths (81.9%) had resided in the McNap area for 10 years or more.

Housing Characteristics

Three-quarters (77.5%) reported monthly rent/or mortgage and tax payment of less than \$60.

Four-fifths (81.8%) registered never having had difficulty in meeting housing costs.

Three-quarters (72.7%) felt their dwelling space was adequate; one-quarter (27.3%) reported having too much dwelling space.

Four-fifths (81.9%) were very satisfied with the conditions of their housing.

Two-thirds (68.4%) reported no plans for future improvement of housing; one-third (36.8%) would use potential windfall income on housing.

Psycho-social Satisfactions

Attitudes

Nine-tenths (90.5%) considered their present financial condition the same or better than five years ago.

Over nine-tenths (95.5%) regarded their present living conditions as better than five years ago.

One-half (50.0%) of those who responded to items of the Srole anomie scale were classified as highly anomic, which indicated a lack of social ties.

One-half (45.0%) recorded relatively high community solidarity scores which exhibited attachment to the neighborhood.

Interaction Patterns

Two-fifths (40.9%) had no daily contact with neighbors, friends or relatives.

Over two-thirds (71.4%) of the 14 responding households desired no daily contact such as a Friendly Visitor; one-quarter (28.6%) desired such contact.

Participation in formal organizations ranged from 10 households out of 22 (45.5%) who attended church;

six (27.3%) households involved in lodge or legion activities; and only three (13.6%) households in Senior Citizen Clubs. One-third of the households (31.8%) with heads over 65 did not participate in any formal organizations (Appendix C).

One-half (52.4%) reported that close friends and/or relatives were located in the neighborhood or areas close to the neighborhood.

Relatives were given as the source of help with personal problems by two-thirds (63.6%) of the 11 responding households; one-half (50.0%) of the total elderly group said they did not have problems which required assistance.

One-half (55.0%) of the 20 responding households recorded leisure activities categorized as indoor relaxation; one-fifth (20.0%) in outdoor recreation and one-fifth (20.0%) in crafts and hobbies.

Sources of Transportation

One-half (54.5%) of the elderly households did not own an automobile.

Two-thirds (66.7%) transported groceries on foot.

Bus transportation was used by approximately four-fifths of the elderly group for downtown activities, (visits to doctor, social activities, etcetera).

Sources of Communication

The use of daily newspapers as a major communication source was selected by four-fifths of the aged households with radio and television selected by three-fifths of the older age group.

In the McNap sample, the elderly exhibited a high attachment to the area by virtue of length of residence, uninvolved in formal organizations, independence in living arrangements and satisfaction with general community conditions.

POTENTIAL FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

No particular population attributes was found to be associated with expressed interest in involvement in community action, future of the area or knowledge of development in the area. The extent to which these factors were appraised by the various age groups in the sample is reported on pages 87 and 88 in Appendix B.

Interest in Community Action

One-half of the sample population (64 households) expressed a definite interest in citizen participation, in contrast with one-quarter who expressed a definite disinterest in community participation. The remainder were undecided. The nature of the responses, although encouraging, may have been inaccurate as to the real potential for involvement because the sample was 83.5 percent female.

When asked what should be the focus of community action in the area, the main concern registered by respondents was recreational facilities for children. (Appendix B p. 88) Of the 68 households responding, one-third considered this the major concern, while living and housing conditions were selected by one-fifth of the respondents. Conditions of streets, lack of parking facilities and the problem of noise control were also selected as problems in the neighborhood. The range of responses to this question was detailed on page 15 of the Preliminary Report of this study.

Implications for Community Action

Certain personal observations of the qualities of the urban residential area are presented here to provide additional information on which recommendations for community action are partially based. The

topics considered are the appraisal of housing condition in the area, availability of recreational areas for children, and interaction patterns of the population.

The McNap area is a dense residential area with some encroachment by commercial establishments occurring in areas adjacent to the major traffic arteries of Portage, St. Mathews, Ellice, Sargent, Wellington and Notre Dame Avenues. Most of the housing is comprised of single family units of two and three stories, situated predominately on 33-foot lots. Examination of the housing from a frontal perspective revealed that considerable attention was given to most of the units in the way of painting and yard maintenance. However, an examination of the housing condition from the back lanes exposed a preponderance of dilapidated garages and lean-to attachments to the dwellings. There appeared to be very little back yard space due to the accumulation of materials and the use of the space for parking. In most instances, painting of the rear of the dwelling was not maintained. It appeared that consistent maintenance of housing was difficult due to lack of economic resources, physical ability, and/or motivation.

Although no standardized evaluation of housing condition was made in the area at the time of the survey, much of the housing appeared to be sound but in need of visible repairs. Without attention, the future housing condition will probably be towards further deterioration. Some means of rehabilitation of housing appears to be the solution.

Tentative findings of the survey denote the area to be primarily working class in character, relatively low in income procurement and with a substantial proportion of the residents over 45 years of age. Consideration of these factors should be paramount in any housing solution. In addition, an increasing number of rental accommodations

appears likely as fully owned larger dwellings, currently occupied by elderly households, become available on the market. The extent to which deterioration of housing and changes in dwelling tenure are realized by residents as problems for community action in the neighborhood could well determine the future of the area.

Another observation by this author of physical conditions in the area pertained to the lack of recreational space for children. Many visits to the area during the months of July and August, 1970, revealed that a large number of pre-school and younger school-age children used the boulevards and back lanes for non-sport play activities. The one playground in the area appeared to be used sporadically and the two school yards were fenced and locked during the observation periods. The location of the playground in the north-east corner of the neighborhood appeared to be a factor in its use by residents of the McNap area. Long blocks and the need to cross major traffic arteries limited accessibility of the playground to unsupervised small children. A possible consideration for providing recreational facilities for small children would be the utilization of the few vacant lots in the area. Because of the scattered nature of these lots, recreational facilities within the boundaries of two major traffic arteries would alleviate the problem of crossing potentially dangerous streets.

The nature of informal personal interaction between residents in the area was observed during daytime hours and at night. During the daytime, clusters of conversing women and children were frequently observed on the streets or in the yards. At night, family groups seemed to be interacting from their front yards. With the exception of apartment dwellers, interviewers often obtained information from

neighbors about the availability of potential respondents to the survey. These observations would tend to substantiate the tentative findings that a cohesive community spirit existed in the area but had no formalized expression. Initiation of a neighborhood organization to deal with community problems would appear to have a solid base of interested participants.

A final consideration based on personal observation is related to the nature of the ethnic mix of the area. Diverse ethnic groups chose the area as a residential location. The most recent arrivals are those of Italian and Portuguese extraction. No neighborhood facility appears to exist for the purpose of assisting new immigrants in adjusting to life in Winnipeg. This is yet another focus for potential community action in the area.

Housing conditions, recreational facilities for small children, utilization of inherent community cohesiveness and assistance to new immigrants are concerns which, from observations of the present writer, appeared to be important factors in determining the future of the McNap area.

Recommendations for Community Action

The findings of this survey revealed that more than one-half of the respondents in the McNap area sample were interested in citizen participation when neighborhood problems are being considered. Thus, it is recommended that the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg, exploit this favorable climate to help create a neighborhood action organization.

If community action in the area is undertaken, it is further recommended that appropriate research of the initiation, development, direction and results of citizen involvement be undertaken to provide a useful record for evaluation purposes.

SUMMARY

In many urban centers, institutions and agencies are inquiring into the potential of citizen participation as a means of exploring and developing new approaches to urban problems. The present exploratory study is an outgrowth of interest by the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg in such an approach. The McNap area survey was undertaken during the summer of 1970 to determine the attitudes of residents in a specific, deteriorating neighborhood in central Winnipeg from the standpoint of estimating the climate for potential community action. Major objectives of the study were to ascertain the characteristics of the population, the extent to which these characteristics were associated with expressed satisfactions toward environmental conditions and the degree to which respondents in the area were inclined to community action involvement.

Population characteristics selected for study were age of household head, household type, relative socioeconomic level and commitment to the area. The environmental dimensions examined were designated as biophysical, psychosocial and technological-network in concept. Those pertaining to the biophysical dimension included adequacy of dwelling space, satisfaction with housing condition, plans for future improvement of housing and expected use of windfall income. Attitudinal qualities of the psychosocial environment under investigation were community

solidarity, extent of anomie and evaluation of present financial and living conditions, opportunities for income earner and children in relation to five years ago. Psychosocial traits also included the assessment of interaction patterns of the respondents. Respondents' expressed satisfactions with community facilities and services formed the basis of the technological-network dimension of environment.

A random sample of 116 households in the McNap area provided the following information about the characteristics of the sample population.

Three-fifths of the household heads were over 45 years of age

One-half had no children under 18 years of age residing in the household

One-third of the household heads were employed at unskilled or semi-skilled occupations; one-fourth were retired or non-employed female heads.

One-half of the household heads had Grade 8 or less education

One-third of the reported household incomes were \$4000 or less

Two-thirds of the dwellings were being purchased or fully owned

One-half of the respondents had resided in the area for five years or more.

Slightly more than one-half the household heads were foreign born

Relative socioeconomic level and commitment to the area were analytical measures of population characteristics and were encompassed in the qualities reported above.

To test the general hypothesis that population characteristics and respondents' evaluation of environmental dimensions of the neighborhood were independent of each other, chi-square tests of dispersion were made. Six of the nine population characteristics were found to

be independent of judgements concerning adequacy of dwelling space, namely; age of household head, household type, socioeconomic level, educational level of the household head, money income and length of residence in the area.

Responses to the query about adequacy of dwelling space were associated significantly with occupational type of the main earner, extent of commitment to the area and dwelling tenure. Approximately three-fourths of the respondents said that the amount of space was "just right" for their household needs. Respondents who diverged from this tendency were most often from households characterized as follows:

Not enough space:	Too much space:
Unskilled/semi-skilled occupations	Retired/female heads
Low commitment to the area	High commitment to the area
Renters of dwellings	Homes owned in full or in part

The majority of respondents (72.4%) expressed satisfaction with the condition or state of repair of their dwellings. Those households with the following attributes tended to record dissatisfaction with housing condition to a greater degree than others; household heads under 45 years of age, children under 18 years of age, and households in the relatively low and moderate socioeconomic levels. Satisfactions with condition of housing were found to be independent of the indicants of socioeconomic level, specifically occupational type and educational level of households head and money income, as well as commitment to the area and the two indicants of that factor, dwelling tenure and length of residence in the area.

Definite plans for future improvement of housing were indicated by one-thirds (36.0%) of the 86 responding households. As might be expected,

households who were renters expressed fewer tendencies of interest in future improvement of housing than owners. Dwelling tenure was the only population trait found to be associated with plans for improvement of housing.

Expected use of windfall income on housing was reported by 69.6 percent of the 102 responding households. Significant chi-square associations identified households designated as low in relative socioeconomic level and both high and low in commitment to the area as most unlikely to spend potential windfall income on housing.

The scope of respondents' attitudes toward the psychosocial dimension of the neighborhood were encompassed in three measures, namely; the Community Solidarity Index, Anomie Scale and evaluation of certain present conditions of the household compared to five years ago. Responses to the 40 items of the Community Solidarity Index were found to be independent of all nine population characteristics.

Extent of anomie was found to be significantly associated with relative socioeconomic level and money income. Two-thirds of the sample reflected low and moderate anomic tendencies. High anomie or normlessness was exhibited most frequently by households classified as low in relative socioeconomic level and those with money incomes of \$4000 or less.

Respondents' evaluation of present financial condition as compared to five years ago was found to be independent of household type, educational level of the household head, commitment to the area, dwelling tenure and length of residence in the area. One-half of the sample judged their present financial condition as better than five years ago. The attributes of households which recorded most frequent assessments of the same or worse financial condition than five years ago were those with

heads of household over 45 years of age, employed at unskilled or semi-skilled occupations, money income of \$4000 or less and classified as low in socioeconomic level.

Current living conditions as compared to five years ago were considered to be improved by 45.5 percent of the respondents. Households who diverged from this evaluation were most frequently those with the following traits: household heads over 45 years of age, no children under the age of 18 years, money income of \$4000 or less and either retired from employment or employed at unskilled or semi-skilled occupations. No association was established between evaluation of present living conditions and relative socioeconomic level, educational level of the household head, commitment to the area, dwelling tenure and length of residence in the area.

Appraisal of current opportunities for income earner were judged to be better than five years ago by four-tenths of the respondents. Two household characteristics found to be significantly associated with this psychosocial indicant, were relative socioeconomic level and money income. Those respondents classified as low and moderate in relative socioeconomic level and those with incomes of \$4000 or less were more prone to consider current opportunities for income earner to be the same or worse than five years ago.

Respondents' evaluations of current opportunities for children were found to be independent of population characteristics.

Interaction patterns of respondents, of an interpersonal and institutional nature were investigated as a dimension of the psychosocial environment. No significant association between extent of daily contact

and population characteristics was established. With the exception of church attendance, participation in 12 formal organizations was also found to be independent of household attributes. Two-thirds of the sample recorded attendance at church of some member of the household, and seven-tenths of this group, 52 out of 74 households, indicated church attendance within the neighborhood. No participation in any of the 12 formal organizations specifically considered in the study was reported by 19.8 percent of the sample. Of the nine population characteristics tested, commitment to the area and occupational type of household head were found to be associated with church attendance. More frequent responses of church attendance were recorded by those of moderate or high commitment to the area and those with heads of households employed at occupations other than unskilled or semi-skilled.

The technological-network dimension of environment was investigated by soliciting responses as to the adequacy of 21 community facilities and services. The majority of respondents evaluated the quality of community facilities and services as adequate or satisfactory. The only significant association established was between adequacy of general community services in relation to property taxes and commitment to the area. Households categorized as moderate in commitment tended to consider general community services as poor, with regard to taxes, more often than the other two groups classified by commitment to the area.

Two population characteristics, educational level of the household head and length of residence in the area were confirmed to be independent of all neighborhood satisfactions tested. Of the 24 neighborhood satisfactions found to be associated with household attributes, nine were related to biophysical satisfactions, 14 to psychosocial satisfactions

and only one to technological-network satisfactions. In the McNap area survey, household differences in relative socioeconomic level, money income, type of occupational employment of the household head, age of household head, relative commitment to the area and dwelling tenure, in that order, appeared to be influential in distinguishing degrees of expressed satisfactions with primarily, the psychosocial and biophysical aspects of the neighborhood.

Potential for community action in the area was measured by respondents' interest in community activity, knowledge of future development in the area and assessment of the future of the area. All three of these factors were found to be independent of population characteristics. Slightly over one-half of the sample recorded a definite interest in community involvement with 15.9 percent somewhat interested.

Implications for community action based on personal observation and survey findings were developed. Recommendations for initiation of community action in the area and research into the progress of community activity, if initiated, were made.

REFERENCES

- Beyer, Glen H. *Housing and society*. New York, N. Y., 2nd ed., MacMillan Company, 1969.
- Doxiadis, C. A. *The ekistics grid*. *Ekistics*, Doxiadis Associates, Athens Greece. Vol. 19, No. 110, January, 1965: 3-28.
- Etzioni, Amatai. *A theory of societal guidance*. In Heidt, Sara Jane and Etzioni, Amatai, eds. *Societal guidance; a new approach to social problems*. New York, N. Y., Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.
- Fairchild, Henry Pratt. *Dictionary of sociology and related sciences*. Paterson, N. J., Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1961.
- Fiser, W. S. *Mastery of the metropolis*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- Greer, S. and Kube, E. *Urbanism and social structure*. In Sussman, M. B. ed. *Community structure and analysis*. New York, N. Y., Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1959: 93-112.
- Harriman, Phillip Lawrence. *Encyclopedia of psychology*. New York, N. Y., Citadel Press, 1951.
- Jacobs, Jane. *The death and life of great american cities*. New York, N. Y., Vintage Books, 1961.
- Kaul, Joseph A. and Davis, James A. *A comparison of indexes of socio-economic status*. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 20, No. 3, June, 1955: 317-325.
- Leslie, Gerald R. and Richardson, Arthur H. *Life-cycle, career patterns and decision to move*. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 26, No. December, 1961: 894-902.
- McHale, John. *Document 6, the ecological context: energy and materials*. Illinois: World Resources Inventory, 1965.
- Michelson, William H. *Man and his urban environment; a sociological approach*. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

Miller, Delber C. Handbook of research design and social measurement.
2nd ed. New York, N. Y., David McKay Company Inc., 1970.

Parasuik, Grace N. Neighborhood satisfaction survey, unpublished
preliminary report. Winnipeg, Manitoba. Institute of Urban
Studies, University of Winnipeg, October, 1970.

Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing. Washington, D. C.
United States Government Printing Office, 1969.

Rossi, P. H. Why families move. New York, N. Y., Free Press of
Glencoe, 1955.

Schoor, Alvin L. Slums and social insecurity. Washington, D. C.
United States Government Printing Office. ca. 1952.

Warner, W. Lloyd. Social class in america. New York, N. Y., Harper
and Row, 1960.

APPENDIX A

Reasons for Non-Participation in Survey

No reason	28
Too busy	8
Too old	6
Not interested	4
Questions too personal	4
Moving/going on vacation	3
Personal problems	2
Religious reasons	1
Language difficulty	1
Too ill	1
No results from previous surveys	1
	—
	59

APPENDIX B

Table 20 Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head

Demographic characteristics within households	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Sex of head	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	22	91.7	23	100	20	90.9	14	56.0	14	63.6	93	80.2
Female	2	8.3	0	0	2	9.1	11	44.0	8	36.4	23	19.8
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Ethnic origin of head												
Canada	11	45.8	11	47.8	11	50.0	11	44.0	8	36.4	52	44.8
British Isles	0	0	1	4.3	1	4.5	5	20.8	6	27.3	13	11.2
Italy	7	29.2	2	8.7	1	4.5	0	0	1	4.5	11	9.5
Russia	0	0	1	4.3	2	9.1	1	4.0	3	13.6	7	6.0
Germany	2	8.3	0	0	0	0	4	16.7	0	0	6	5.2
Portugal	1	4.2	4	17.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4.3
Ukraine	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	1	4.0	2	9.1	4	3.4
Poland	0	0	0	0	2	9.1	0	0	0	0	2	1.7
Scandnavia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.5	1	.9
Other European	0	0	3	13.0	3	13.6	2	8.0	0	0	8	6.9
Other	3	12.5	0	0	2	9.1	1	4.0	1	4.5	7	6.0
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Demographic characteristics within households	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
No. of persons	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	0	0	1	4.5	0	0	7	28.0	8	36.4	16	13.9
Two	5	20.8	1	4.5	6	27.3	10	40.0	11	50.0	33	28.7
Three	6	25.0	3	13.6	9	40.9	3	12.0	2	9.1	23	20.0
Four	6	25.0	9	40.9	2	9.1	2	8.0	0	0	19	16.5
Five	3	12.5	4	18.2	1	4.5	1	4.0	0	0	9	7.8
Six	3	12.5	2	9.1	2	9.1	2	8.0	0	0	9	7.8
Seven	0	0	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	1	4.5	2	1.7
Eight	1	4.2	1	4.5	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	3	3.5
Nine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ten	0	0	0	0	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	1	1.0
Total	24	100	22	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	115	100
No response			1								1	
Household type												
Oldest child under 6	8	33.3	2	8.7	1	4.5	0	0	1	4.5	12	10.3
Oldest child under 12	9	37.5	6	26.1	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	16	13.8
Oldest child under 18	2	8.3	5	21.7	4	18.2	3	12.0	1	4.5	15	12.9
Oldest child over 18	0	0	6	26.1	6	27.3	3	12.0	0	0	15	12.9
*No children under 18	5	20.8	4	17.4	10	45.5	19	76.0	20	90.9	57	49.1
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Socioeconomic level												
Low	5	20.8	8	34.8	4	18.2	11	44.0	11	50.0	39	33.6
Middle	9	37.5	8	34.8	9	40.9	7	28.0	5	22.7	38	32.8
High	10	41.7	7	30.4	9	40.9	7	28.0	6	27.3	39	33.6
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
No response												

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Demographic characteristics within households	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Occupational type of head												
Unskilled	3	13.0	8	34.8	5	25.0	5	26.3	0	0	21	23.9
Semiskilled	8	34.8	5	21.7	6	30.0	6	31.6	0	0	25	28.4
Skilled	5	21.7	5	21.7	1	5.0	2	10.5	1	33.3	14	15.9
Clerical	2	8.7	0	0	3	15.0	4	21.1	0	0	9	10.2
Service	3	13.0	2	8.7	4	20.0	1	5.3	1	33.3	11	12.5
Self-employed	1	4.3	3	13.0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0	5	5.7
Professional	1	4.3	0	0	1	5.0	0	0	1	33.3	3	3.4
Total	23	100	23	100	20	100	19	100	3	100	88	100
Unemployed female heads	1		0		2		6		0		9	
Retired	0		0		0		0		19		19	
Educational level of head												
8th grade or less	7	29.2	15	65.2	9	40.9	11	44.0	12	54.5	54	46.6
Grade 9-10	12	50.2	2	8.7	6	27.3	12	48.0	5	22.7	47	40.5
Grade 12	3	12.5	4	17.4	5	22.7	1	4.0	1	4.5	14	12.1
University	2	8.3	2	8.7	2	9.1	1	4.0	4	18.2	11	9.5
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Money income												
Under \$2000	2	8.7	0	0	1	4.8	2	8.7	7	35.0	12	11.0
\$2000-\$3999	4	17.4	2	9.1	4	19.0	8	34.8	9	45.0	27	23.9
\$4000-\$5999	3	13.0	7	31.8	3	14.3	7	30.4	1	5.0	21	19.3
\$6000-\$7999	3	13.0	8	36.4	7	33.3	2	8.7	2	10.0	22	20.2
\$8000 and over	11	47.8	5	22.7	6	28.6	4	17.4	1	5.0	27	24.8
Total	23	100	22	100	21	100	23	100	21	100	109	
No response	1		1		1		2		2			

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Demographic characteristics within households	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Commitment to the area	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low	15	62.5	4	17.4	5	22.7	6	24.0	3	13.6	33	28.4
Middle	8	33.3	18	78.3	8	36.4	6	24.0	2	9.1	42	36.2
High	1	4.2	1	4.3	9	40.9	13	52.0	17	77.3	41	35.3
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Nature of tenure												
Dwelling rented	12	50.0	6	26.1	7	31.8	9	36.0	3	13.6	37	31.9
Dwelling being purchased	8	33.3	7	30.4	4	18.2	2	8.3	2	9.1	23	19.8
Dwelling fully owned	4	16.7	10	43.4	11	50.0	14	58.3	17	77.3	56	48.3
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Length of residence in the area												
Less than 1 year	9	37.5	2	8.7	4	18.2	1	4.0	0	0	16	13.8
1 - 4.99 years	12	50.0	9	39.1	5	22.7	5	20.0	3	13.6	34	29.3
5 - 9.99 years	2	8.3	10	43.5	3	13.6	3	12.0	1	4.5	19	16.4
10 - 19.99 years	1	4.2	2	8.7	7	31.8	11	44.0	8	36.4	29	25.0
20 years or more	0	0	0	0	3	13.6	5	20.0	10	45.5	18	15.5
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Demographic characteristics within households	Age of household head										Total	
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over			
Location of close friends and/or relatives	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Within the neighborhood	7	29.2	7	30.4	6	27.3	7	28.0	9	42.9	36	31.3
In areas close to neighborhood	8	33.3	3	13.0	6	27.3	3	12.0	2	9.5	22	19.1
In the suburbs	9	37.5	11	47.8	9	40.9	15	60.0	8	38.1	52	45.2
Outside the city	0	0	2	8.7	1	4.5	0	0	2	9.5	5	4.3
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	21	100	115	100
No response									1			
Physical health of head												
Good	24	100	23	100	22	100	19	76.0	10	45.5	98	84.5
Fair	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16.0	9	40.9	13	11.2
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8.0	3	13.6	5	4.3
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Sources of help with personal problems												
Relatives	9	64.3	9	56.3	7	58.3	6	46.2	7	63.6	38	57.6
Doctor/lawyer	1	7.1	4	25.0	2	16.7	3	23.1	0	0	10	15.2
Minister/priest	3	21.4	2	12.5	0	0	2	15.4	2	18.2	9	13.6
Friends	1	7.1	1	6.3	2	16.7	2	15.4	2	18.2	8	12.1
Total	14	100	16	100	12	100	13	100	11	100	66	100
*No response (Includes help not needed)	10		7		10		12		11		50	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Demographic characteristics within households	Age of household head										Total	
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over			
Leisure activities of respondents	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Indoor relaxation	12	50.0	14	70.0	10	45.5	10	50.0	11	50.0	57	52.8
Outdoor relaxation and recreation, sports	8	33.3	3	15.0	8	36.4	6	30.0	4	18.2	29	26.9
Crafts and hobbies	4	16.7	3	15.0	3	13.6	3	15.0	4	18.6	17	15.7
Community work	0	0	0	0	1	4.5	2	10.0	1	4.5	4	3.7
Cultural	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.0	0	0	1	.9
Total	24	100	20	100	22	100	22	100	20	100	108	100
No response			3				3		2		8	
Marital status/household head												
Married	21	87.5	21	91.3	19	86.4	13	52.0	12	54.5	86	74.1
Widowed	0	0	0	0	2	9.1	6	24.0	10	45.5	18	15.5
Divorced/ Separated	2	8.3	1	4.3	0	0	1	4.0	0	0	4	3.4
Common law	0	0	0	0	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	1	.9
Never married	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	1	4.0	0	0	2	1.7
Never married	1	4.2	0	0	0	0	4	16.0	0	0	5	4.3
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100

Table 20 Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head

Housing characteristics	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Monthly mortgage/rental payments	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than \$60	2	8.7	10	45.5	10	50.0	14	56.0	17	77.5	53	45.7
\$60 - \$90	7	30.4	4	18.2	2	10.0	11	44.0	3	13.6	27	23.3
\$100 - \$139	11	47.8	6	27.3	6	30.0	0	0	2	9.1	25	21.6
\$140 or more	3	13.0	2	9.1	2	10.0	0	0	0	0	7	6.0
Total	23	100	22	100	20	100	25	100	22	100	112	100
No response	1		1		2							
Difficulty in meeting housing costs												
All the time	1	4.2	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	1	4.5	3	2.6
Often	1	4.2	1	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.7
Sometimes	2	8.3	2	8.7	2	9.1	2	8.0	3	13.6	11	9.5
Seldom	2	8.3	0	0	1	4.5	1	4.0	0	0	4	3.4
Never	18	75.0	20	87.0	19	86.4	21	84.0	18	81.8	96	82.8
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Adequacy of dwelling space												
Not enough	6	25.0	3	13.0	5	22.7	1	4.0	0	0	15	12.9
Too much	1	4.2	3	13.0	4	18.2	4	16.0	6	27.3	18	15.5
Just right	17	70.8	17	73.9	13	59.1	20	80.0	16	72.7	83	71.6
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100

72

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Housing characteristics	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Satisfaction with housing condition	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very dissatisfied	2	8.3	2	8.7	1	4.5	1	4.0	2	9.1	8	6.9
Dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	0	0	1	.9
Uncertain	9	37.5	7	30.4	2	9.1	3	12.0	2	9.1	23	19.8
Satisfied	8	33.3	10	43.5	15	68.2	16	64.0	8	36.4	57	49.1
Very satisfied	5	20.8	4	17.4	4	18.2	4	16.0	10	45.5	27	23.3
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100
Plans for improving housing in near future												
No plans	10	58.8	12	63.2	8	61.5	12	66.7	13	68.4	55	64.0
	7	41.2	7	36.8	5	38.5	6	33.3	6	31.6	31	36.0
Total	17	100	19	100	13	100	18	100	19	100	86	100
Don't know	2		3		4				2		15	
No response	5		1		5				1		15	
Use of windfall income												
Extensive interior and exterior repairs	5	21.7	4	19.0	2	11.1	2	8.7	3	15.8	16	15.4
Interior repairs only	5	21.7	8	38.1	6	33.3	9	39.1	4	21.1	32	30.8
Exterior repairs only	8	34.8	2	9.5	2	11.1	8	34.8	5	26.3	25	24.0
Not on housing	5	21.7	7	33.3	8	44.4	4	17.4	7	36.8	31	29.8
Total	23	100	21	100	18	100	23	100	19	100	104	100
No response	1		2		4		2		3		12	

Table 20 Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head

Psycho-social environmental characteristics	Age of household head										Total	
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over			
Present financial condition as compared to 5 years ago	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Worse	3	13.6	0	0	5	23.8	9	36.0	2	9.5	19	17.0
The same	2	9.1	7	30.4	8	38.1	5	20.0	13	61.9	35	31.3
Better	17	77.3	16	69.6	8	38.1	10	44.0	6	28.6	58	51.8
Total	22	100	23	100	21	100	25	100	21	100	112	100
Don't know	2				1				1		4	
Present living conditions as compared to 5 years ago												
Worse	3	13.6	2	8.7	3	14.3	2	8.0	1	4.5	11	9.7
The same	4	18.2	5	21.7	9	42.9	16	64.0	17	77.3	51	45.1
Better	15	68.2	16	69.6	9	42.9	7	28.0	4	18.2	51	45.1
Total	22	100	23	100	21	100	25	100	22	100	113	100
Don't know	2										2	
No response					1						1	
Present opportunities of income earner as compared to 5 years ago												
Worse	6	27.3	0	0	4	23.5	5	27.8	2	28.6	17	19.8
The same	4	18.2	12	54.5	6	35.3	10	55.6	2	28.6	34	39.5
Better	12	54.5	10	45.5	7	41.2	3	16.7	3	42.9	35	40.7
Total	22	100	22	100	17	100	18	100	7	100	86	100
Don't know	2						3		7		15	
No response							4		8		15	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Psycho-social environmental characteristics	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Present opportunities for children as compared to 5 years ago	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Worse	5	33.3	1	5.9	4	26.7	2	33.3	1	16.7	13	22.0
The same	2	13.3	5	29.4	3	20.0	3	50.0	1	16.7	14	23.7
Better	8	53.3	11	64.7	8	53.3	1	16.7	4	66.7	32	54.2
Total	15	100	17	100	15	100	6	100	6	100	59	100
Don't know	8		4		4		12		9		37	
No response	1		2		3		7		7		20	
Extent of anomie												
Low	11	45.8	8	34.8	11	50.0	6	24.0	4	20.0	40	35.1
Middle	7	29.2	10	43.5	5	22.7	9	36.0	6	30.0	37	32.5
High	6	25.0	5	21.7	6	27.3	10	40.0	10	50.0	37	32.5
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	20	100	114	100
No response									2			
Extent of daily contact with neighbors/friends												
No contact	10	41.7	7	30.4	11	50.0	7	28.0	9	40.9	44	37.9
Daily contact	14	58.3	16	69.6	11	50.0	18	72.0	13	59.1	72	62.1
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	100

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Psycho-social environmental characteristics	Age of household head										Total	
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over			
Desire for daily contact of those reporting no contact	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	8	80.0	7	87.5	8	80.0	7	100.0	10	71.4	40	81.6
Yes	2	20.0	1	12.5	2	20.0	0	0	4	28.6	9	18.4
Total	10	100	8	100	10	100	7	100	14	100	49	100
Don't know												
Community solidarity												
High	5	20.8	9	39.1	6	28.6	9	37.5	9	45.0	38	33.9
Middle	6	25.0	8	34.8	9	42.9	9	37.5	5	25.0	37	33.0
Low	13	54.2	6	26.1	6	28.6	6	25.0	6	30.0	37	33.0
Total	24	100	23	100	21	100	24	100	20	100	112	100
No response					1		1		2			
Participation in formal organizations												
Church												
In neighborhood	7	43.8	14	73.7	9	60.0	13	92.9	9	90.0	52	70.3
Outside neighborhood	9	56.3	5	26.3	6	40.0	1	7.1	1	10.0	22	29.7
Total	16	100	19	100	15	100	14	100	10	100	74	100
No attendance	8		4		7		11		12		42	
Church groups												
In neighborhood	1	25.0	5	71.4	3	60.0	5	100	3	100	17	70.8
Outside neighborhood	3	75.0	2	28.6	2	40.0	0	0	0	0	7	29.2
Total	4	100	7	100	5	100	5	100	3	100	24	100
No attendance	20		16		17		20		19		92	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Psycho-social environmental characteristics	Age of household head										Total	
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over			
Participation in formal organizations (cont.)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parent teachers												
In neighborhood	1	33.3	7	100	5	83.3	1	100	0	0	14	82.4
Outside neighborhood	2	66.7	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	3	17.6
Total	3	100	7	100	6	100	1	100	0	0	17	100
No attendance	21		16		16		24		22		99	
Community organizations												
In neighborhood	1	33.3	3	100	7	100	0	0	1	100	12	80.0
Outside neighborhood	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	3	20.0
Total	3	100	3	100	7	100	1	100	1	100	15	100
No attendance	21		20		15		24		21		101	
Lodge, legion												
In neighborhood	0	0	0	0	4	100	3	60.0	4	66.7	11	61.1
Outside neighborhood	1	100	2	100	0	0	2	40.0	2	33.3	7	38.9
Total	1	100	2	100	4	100	5	100	6	100	18	100
No attendance	23		21		18		20		16		98	
Recreation groups												
In neighborhood	3	60.0	2	33.3	4	57.1	1	14.3	2	66.7	12	42.9
Outside neighborhood	2	40.0	4	66.7	3	42.9	6	85.7	1	33.3	16	57.1
Total	5	100	6	100	7	100	7	100	3	100	28	100
No attendance	19		17		15		18		19		88	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Psycho-social environmental characteristics	Age of household head										Total	
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over			
Participation in formal organizations (cont.)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ethnic social groups												
In neighborhood	0	0	1	50.0	1	100	1	33.3	0	0	3	27.3
Outside neighborhood	5	100	1	50.0	0	0	2	66.7	0	0	8	72.7
Total	5	100	2	100	1	100	3	100	0	100	11	100
No attendance	19		21		21		22		22		105	
Union groups												
In neighborhood	1	25.0	2	33.3	2	40.0	0	0	0	0	5	26.3
Outside neighborhood	3	75.0	4	66.7	3	60.0	2	100	2	100	14	73.7
Total	4	100	6	100	5	100	2	100	2	100	19	100
No attendance	20		17		17		23		20		97	
Service groups												
In neighborhood	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	2	28.6
Outside neighborhood	1	100	1	100	1	33.3	1	100	1	100	5	71.4
Total	1	100	1	100	3	100	1	100	1	100	7	100
No attendance	23		22		19		24		21		109	
Senior citizens clubs												
In neighborhood	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	3	100	4	100
Outside neighborhood	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	100	4	100
No attendance	24		21		22		25		19		112	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Psycho-social environmental characteristics	Age of household head						Total					
	Under 35 years	35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over				
Participation in formal organizations (cont.)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Youth clubs												
In neighborhood	2	100	3	75.0	5	100	1	50.0	0	0	11	78.6
Outside neighborhood	0	0	1	25.0	0	0	1	50.0	1	100	3	21.4
Total	2	100	4	100	5	100	2	100	1	100	14	100
No attendance	22		19		17		23		21		102	
Nursery school/day care center												
In neighborhood	1	50.0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	2	66.7
Outside neighborhood	1	50.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3
Total	2	100	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	3	100
No attendance	22		23		21		25		22		113	

Table 20 Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head

Satisfactions with community facilities and services	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Condition of streets												
Unsatisfactory	5	20.8	4	19.0	7	33.3	4	16.0	5	23.8	25	22.3
Adequate	7	29.2	4	19.0	3	14.3	6	24.0	4	19.0	24	21.4
Satisfactory	12	50.2	13	61.9	11	52.4	15	60.0	12	57.1	63	56.3
Total	24	100	21	100	21	100	25	100	21	100	112	100
No response			2		1				1		4	
Parking facilities												
Unsatisfactory	6	26.1	8	34.8	8	40.0	3	13.6	3	18.8	28	26.9
Adequate	8	34.8	3	13.0	1	5.0	3	13.6	4	25.0	19	18.3
Satisfactory	9	39.1	12	52.2	11	55.0	16	72.7	9	56.3	57	54.8
Total	23	100	23	100	20	100	22	100	16	100	104	100
No response	1				2		3		6		12	
Recreation facilities for youth												
Unsatisfactory	4	22.2	6	33.3	3	18.8	6	35.3	3	21.4	22	26.5
Adequate	4	22.2	3	16.7	0	0	2	11.8	5	35.7	14	16.9
Satisfactory	10	55.6	9	50.0	13	81.3	9	52.9	6	42.9	47	56.6
Total	18	100	18	100	16	100	17	100	14	100	83	100
No response	6		5		6		8		8		43	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Satisfactions with community facilities and services	Age of household head										Total	
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over			
Recreation facilities for elderly	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Unsatisfactory	4	40.0	2	15.4	2	22.2	6	50.0	4	23.5	18	29.5
Adequate	2	20.0	5	38.5	3	33.3	3	25.0	6	35.3	19	31.1
Satisfactory	4	40.0	6	46.2	4	44.4	3	25.0	7	41.2	24	39.4
Total	10	100	13	100	9	100	12	100	17	100	61	100
No response	14		10		13		13		5		55	
Recreation facilities for other adults												
Unsatisfactory	5	33.3	3	25.0	3	27.3	5	45.4	1	11.1	17	29.3
Adequate	5	33.3	4	33.3	4	36.4	4	36.4	4	44.4	21	36.2
Satisfactory	5	33.3	5	41.7	4	36.4	2	18.2	4	44.4	20	34.5
Total	15	100	12	100	11	100	11	100	9	100	58	100
No response	9		11		11		14		13		58	
Day care center												
Unsatisfactory	4	40.0	2	28.6	3	60.0	2	66.7	2	50.0	13	44.8
Adequate	4	40.0	1	14.3	1	20.0	0	0	1	25.0	7	24.1
Satisfactory	2	20.0	4	57.1	1	20.0	1	33.3	1	25.0	9	31.0
Total	10	100	7	100	5	100	3	100	4	100	29	100
No response	14		16		18		22		18		87	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Satisfactions with community facilities and services	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Senior citizens club												
Unsatisfactory	2	28.6	1	9.1	1	14.3	1	12.5	1	9.1	6	13.6
Adequate	3	42.9	6	54.5	1	14.3	2	25.0	4	36.4	16	36.4
Satisfactory	2	28.6	4	36.4	5	71.4	5	62.5	6	54.5	22	50.0
Total	7	100	11	100	7	100	8	100	11	100	44	100
No response	17		12		15		17		11		72	
Leadership in the area												
Unsatisfactory	4	50.0	0	0	2	25.0	2	28.6	2	20.0	10	20.8
Adequate	3	37.5	1	20.0	1	12.5	2	28.6	1	10.0	8	16.7
Satisfactory	1	12.5	4	80.0	5	62.5	3	42.9	7	70.0	30	62.5
Total	8	100	5	100	8	100	7	100	10	100	48	100
No response	16		18		14		18		12		78	
Reasons for choosing location												
Housing was suitable	10	43.5	7	33.3	5	26.3	6	25.0	6	31.6	34	32.1
Near employment	3	13.0	4	19.0	5	26.3	7	29.2	3	15.8	22	20.8
Community services	5	21.7	2	9.5	5	26.3	6	25.0	4	21.1	22	20.8
Near friends and/or relatives	2	8.7	5	23.8	2	10.5	3	12.5	4	21.1	16	15.1
Character of neighborhood	3	13.0	3	14.3	2	10.5	2	8.3	2	10.5	12	11.3
Total	23	100	21	100	19	100	24	100	19	100	106	100
No particular reason	1		2		3		1		3		10	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
(Table 20 continued)

Satisfactions with community facilities and services	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Neighborhood "likes"												
Character of neighborhood	6	26.1	9	39.1	13	59.1	10	43.5	11	55.0	49	44.1
Central location	12	52.2	12	52.2	8	36.4	10	43.5	5	25.0	47	42.3
Community services	5	21.7	2	8.7	1	4.5	3	13.0	4	20.0	15	13.5
Total	23	100	23	100	22	100	23	100	20	100	111	100
No response	1						2		2		5	
Neighborhood "lacks"												
Facilities for children	5	41.7	2	14.3	2	20.0	2	18.2	5	41.7	16	27.1
Peace and quiet	1	8.3	2	14.3	4	40.0	2	18.2	1	8.3	10	16.9
Maintenance of housing	0	0	3	21.4	1	10.0	2	18.2	1	8.3	7	11.9
Stability of residents	1	8.3	1	7.1	0	0	3	27.3	1	8.3	6	10.2
Street maintenance, parking	1	8.3	2	14.3	0	0	0	0	1	8.3	4	6.8
Adequate housing and space	2	16.7	1	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.1
Other	2	16.7	3	21.4	3	30.0	2	18.2	3	25.0	13	22.0
Total	12	100	14		10	100	11	100	12	100	59	100
No response	3		5		6		6		2		23	
Nothing lacking	8		4		6		8		8		34	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
 (Table 20 continued)

Satisfactions with community facilities and services	Age of household head					Total
	Under 35 years	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 Years and over	
Taxes in line with community services	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Unsatisfactory	6 25.0	9 39.1	8 36.4	6 26.1	6 30.0	35 30.7
Uncertain	4 16.7	3 13.0	4 18.2	4 17.4	7 35.0	22 19.3
Satisfactory	14 58.3	11 47.8	10 45.5	15 66.5	7 35.0	57 50.0
Total	24 100	23 100	22 100	25 100	20 100	114 100
No response					2	2

Table 20 Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head

Community action	Age of household head						Total
	Under 35 years	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 Years and over		
Knowledge of development in the area	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	
No knowledge	23 95.8	22 95.7	20 90.9	23 92.0	21 95.5	109 94.0	
Some knowledge	1 4.2	1 4.3	2 9.0	2 8.0	1 4.8	7 6.0	
Total	24 100	23 100	22 100	25 100	22 100	116 100	
Future of the area							
Will run down	2 8.7	4 17.4	5 23.8	8 32.0	2 9.1	21 18.4	
Won't run down	5 21.7	2 8.7	2 9.5	3 12.0	3 13.6	15 13.2	
Uncertain	12 52.2	9 39.1	9 42.9	3 12.0	13 59.1	46 40.4	
Will improve	1 4.3	6 26.1	4 19.0	6 24.0	2 9.1	19 16.7	
Will be redeveloped	3 13.0	2 8.7	1 4.8	5 20.0	2 9.1	13 11.4	
Total	23 100	23 100	21 100	25 100	22 100	114 100	
No response	1		1			2	
Interest in community action							
No interest	4 16.7	4 18.2	2 9.1	9 37.5	12 57.1	31 27.4	
Uncertain	4 16.7	5 22.7	4 18.2	3 12.5	2 9.5	18 15.9	
Expressed interest	16 66.7	13 59.1	16 72.7	12 50.0	7 33.3	64 56.6	
Total	24 100	22 100	22 100	24 100	21 100	113 100	
No response		1		1	1	3	

Selected household characteristics classified by the age of the household head
 (Table 20 continued)

Community action	Age of household head											
	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Focus for community action	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Youth and recreation	8	44.4	7	46.7	4	30.8	3	20.0	1	14.3	23	33.8
Living conditions and housing	4	22.2	2	13.3	3	23.1	4	26.7	2	28.6	15	22.1
Streets, maintenance	2	11.1	5	33.3	1	7.7	1	6.7	0	0	9	13.2
Noise control	2	11.1	0	0	1	7.7	4	26.7	1	14.3	8	11.8
Other	2	11.1	1	6.7	4	30.8	3	20.0	3	42.9	13	19.1
Total	18	100	15	100	13	100	15	100	7	100	68	100
No response	6		8		9		10		13		48	

Table 20 Transportation

Transportation information	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ownership of auto												
No	8	33.3	8	34.8	6	27.3	11	45.8	12	54.5	45	39.1
Yes	16	66.7	15	68.2	16	72.7	14	58.3	10	45.5	71	61.7
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	22	100	116	
No response												
Modes of transportation												
Work												
Walking	4	19.0	4	19.0	2	9.5	3	15.8	0	0	13	14.4
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0	1	1.1
Bus	7	33.3	7	33.3	6	28.6	9	47.4	5	62.5	34	37.8
Others car	1	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	2	2.2
Own car	9	42.9	10	47.6	13	61.9	6	31.6	2	25.0	40	44.4
Taxi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	21	100	21	100	21	100	19	100	8	100	90	100
No response												
Groceries												
Walking	8	42.1	10	43.5	6	27.3	14	56.0	14	66.7	52	45.2
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.8	1	.9
Bus	2	10.5	1	4.3	3	13.6	0	0	2	9.5	8	7.0
Others car	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8.0	1	4.8	3	2.6
Own car	14	73.7	12	52.2	13	59.1	9	36.0	3	14.3	41	35.7
Taxi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	21	100	115	100
No response									1			

Transportation

(Table 20 continued)

Transportation information	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total
Modes of transportation											
Doctor	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N %
Walking	3	12.5	2	8.7	2	9.1	2	8.0	3	14.3	12 10.4
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0
Bus	10	41.7	13	56.5	10	45.5	14	56.0	12	57.1	59 51.3
Others car	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.0	3	14.3	4 3.5
Own car	10	41.7	7	30.4	10	45.5	8	32.0	2	9.5	37 32.2
Taxi	1	4.2	1	4.3	0	0	0	0	1	4.8	3 2.6
Total	24	100	23	100	22	100	25	100	21	100	115 100
No response									1		
Social act											
Walking	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.2	0	0	1 .9
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0
Bus	1	4.3	3	13.6	4	18.2	6	25.0	8	44.4	22 20.2
Others car	3	13.0	4	18.2	3	13.6	5	20.8	6	33.3	21 19.3
Own car	16	69.6	15	68.2	15	68.2	12	50.0	3	16.7	61 56.0
Taxi	3	13.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6	4 3.7
Total	23	100	22	100	22	100	24	100	18	100	109 100
No response	1		1				1		4		7

Transportation

(Table 20 continued)

Transportation information	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Modes of transportation												
Visiting	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Walking	1	4.3	3	13.0	5	22.7	0	0	3	15.8	12	10.9
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bus	3	13.0	4	17.4	3	13.6	7	30.4	8	42.1	25	22.7
Others car	3	13.0	1	4.3	1	4.5	3	13.0	4	21.1	12	10.9
Own car	15	65.2	15	65.2	13	59.1	12	52.2	4	21.1	59	53.6
Taxi	1	4.3	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	2	1.8
Total	23	100	23	100	22	100	23	100	19	100	110	100
No response	1						2		3		6	
Recreation												
Walking	0	0	1	4.5	0	0	1	4.3	1	7.1	3	2.9
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bus	0	0	3	13.6	2	9.5	4	17.4	5	35.7	14	13.5
Others car	7	29.2	3	13.6	3	14.3	4	17.4	5	35.7	22	21.2
Own car	17	70.8	15	68.2	16	76.2	14	60.9	3	21.4	65	62.5
Taxi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	24	100	22	100	21	100	23	100	14	100	104	100
No response			1		1		2		8		12	

Transportation

(Table 20 continued)

Transportation information	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
Modes of transportation												
Downtown	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Walking	1	4.5	4	17.4	4	19.0	2	8.0	4	20.0	15	13.5
Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bus	13	59.1	14	60.9	8	38.1	18	72.0	12	60.0	65	58.6
Others car	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10.0	2	1.8
Own car	8	36.4	5	21.7	9	42.9	5	20.0	2	10.0	29	26.1
Taxi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	22	100	23	100	21	100	25	100	20	100	111	100
No response	2				1				2		5	

Table 20 Communication sources

Sources of communication		Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Radio													
	Never	2	8.7	4	17.4	2	9.1	1	4.2	1	4.5	10	8.8
	Some	10	43.5	7	30.4	10	45.5	8	33.3	6	27.3	41	36.0
	Very much	11	47.8	12	52.2	10	45.5	15	62.5	15	68.2	63	55.3
	Total	23	100	23	100	22	100	24	100	22	100	114	
	No response	1						1					
T.V.													
	Never	0	0	5	21.7	1	4.5	4	16.7	2	9.5	12	10.6
	Some	8	34.8	3	13.0	12	54.5	4	16.7	6	28.6	33	29.2
	Very much	15	65.2	15	65.2	9	40.9	16	66.7	13	61.9	68	60.2
	Total	23	100	23	100	22	100	24	100	21	100	113	100
	No response	1						1		1		3	
Newspaper (daily)													
	Never	4	18.2	6	26.1	3	13.6	4	16.7	2	9.1	19	16.8
	Some	10	45.5	7	30.4	6	27.3	0	0	2	9.1	25	22.1
	Very much	8	36.4	10	43.5	13	59.1	20	83.3	18	81.8	69	61.1
	Total	22	100	23	100	22	100	24	100	22	100	113	100
	No response	2						1				3	

Communication sources

(Table 20 continued)

Sources of communication	Under 35 years		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 Years and over		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
News magazines												
Never	9	40.9	15	68.8	9	40.9	8	33.3	14	66.7	55	49.5
Some	12	54.5	5	22.7	10	45.5	10	41.7	6	28.6	43	38.7
Very much	1	4.5	2	9.1	3	13.6	6	25.0	1	4.8	13	11.7
Total	22	100	22	100	22	100	24	100	21	100	111	100
No response	2		1				1		1		5	
Personal visiting or telephone												
Never	10	43.5	11	47.8	9	40.9	9	37.5	8	38.1	47	41.6
Some	10	43.5	9	39.1	8	36.4	10	41.7	12	57.1	49	43.4
Very much	3	13.0	3	13.0	5	22.7	5	20.8	1	4.8	17	15.0
Total	23	100	23	100	22	100	24	100	21	100	113	100
No response	1						1		1		3	

10

APPENDIX C

Characteristics of non participants in formal organizations

	Number	%
Age of household head		
Under 35 years	5	21.7
35-44 "	2	8.7
45-54 "	2	8.7
55-64 "	7	30.4
over 65 "	7	30.4
	<u>23</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Household type		
No children under 18	18	78.3
Children under 18	5	21.7
	<u>23</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Socioeconomic level		
Low	10	43.5
Moderate	8	34.8
High	5	21.7
	<u>23</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Occupational type of household head		
Unskilled & semi skilled	7	30.4
All others	5	21.7
Retired/female heads	11	47.8
	<u>23</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Educational level of household head		
Under 8th grade	11	47.8
Over 8th grade	12	52.2
	<u>23</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Money income		
Less \$2000	6	26.1
\$2000-\$3999	6	26.1
\$4000-\$5999	6	26.1
\$6000-\$7999	3	13.0
Over \$8000	2	8.7
	<u>23</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Commitment to area		
Low	8	34.8
Moderate	7	30.4
High	8	34.8
	<u>23</u>	<u>100.0</u>

	Number	%
Tenure		
Renter	10	43.5
Being purchased	4	17.4
Fully owned	<u>9</u>	<u>39.1</u>
	23	100.0
Length of residence in area		
Less 1 year	5	21.7
1-4.99 years	8	34.8
5-9.99 years	1	4.3
10 years or more	<u>9</u>	<u>39.1</u>
	23	100.0
Extent of anomie		
Low	7	31.8
Moderate	3	13.6
High	<u>12</u>	<u>54.5</u>
	22	100.0
No response	1	
Community solidarity		
Low	5	23.8
Moderate	6	28.6
High	<u>10</u>	<u>47.6</u>
	21	100.0
No response	2	