

Minneapolis Neighborhood Survey

Prepared for TEAMWORKS

Minnesota Opinion Research, Inc.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Mobility, Homes and Neighborhoods	4
a. Current Mobility	4
b. Reasons for Moving	5
3. Neighborhoods and Deciding Where to Live	6
a. Location of Desirable Homes	6
b. Homes vs. Neighborhoods	6
c. Importance of Particular Factors	7
d. Basic Requirements vs. Desirable Options	8
e. Rating Neighborhoods	8
f. Neighborhood Characteristics and Moving	9
g. Perceived Trends	10
4. Three Neighborhood Groups	11
a. Demographic Characteristics	11
b. Importance of Neighborhood Characteristics	11
c. Rating Neighborhood Conditions	12
d. Trends	13
5. Neighborhood Identification and Involvement	14
a. Activities	14
b. Interest in Neighborhood Affairs	15
c. Sources of Neighborhood Information	15
d. Identification with the Neighborhood	16
e. Effectiveness in Dealing with Neighborhood Issues	18
6. NRP Awareness and Reputation	19
a. General Awareness	19
b. Degrees of Awareness	19
c. Contributors to Awareness	19
d. Activism in Redirection Neighborhoods	20
e. Awareness of Specific NRP Programs	20
f. Relating NRP to Neighborhood Changes	21
g. NRP Reputation	22
Appendix: Survey Questionnaire	24

1. Introduction

Minnesota Opinion Research, Inc. was contracted by TEAMWORKS to conduct a survey of Minneapolis residents on neighborhood issues and aspects of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). Results of the survey are presented in this report, which includes illustrative charts and a set of tables.

A total of 1102 telephone interviews lasting an average of 20 minutes were conducted during the period from August 17 to 31, 1999. The sampling frame consisted of adults (age 18 and older) living in the Minneapolis city limits. Households were selected using a random digit dialing (RDD) sample provided by Survey Sampling, Inc. Respondents within households were selected using the "last birthday" technique. At least four callbacks were made for each telephone number.

The data set was adjusted slightly by statistical weighting to match current estimates for gender, age, race, and Hispanic ethnicity, with targets provided by Market Statistics. Another adjustment matched total population proportions for the three neighborhood groups (Protection, Revitalization, Redirection) identified by NRP using estimates provided by the Minneapolis Community Development Agency.

Respondent neighborhoods were determined after the interview from their addresses, which were obtained either from the respondent or by matching listed telephone numbers with addresses. (A few cases with incomplete information could not be classified.) The City of Minneapolis' GIS coding office assisted in this task.

Many questions in the survey ask for opinions or information about the respondent's "neighborhood." On those questions, as a practical matter, it was necessary to rely on the respondent's own understanding of his or her neighborhood. For most respondents, "the neighborhood" probably consists of a concentric circle some distance around their homes, and so their mental maps will only approximate the 81 defined Minneapolis neighborhoods. This limitation is not a serious problem, as we are concerned in the analysis with differences between the three classes of neighborhoods identified by NRP. Some respondents live on a border between two types of neighborhoods, and so their views probably have a "smoothing" effect on the data. Nevertheless, as the report shows, the three neighborhood groups are quite distinct on various measures.

As with any survey, this research is subject to various sources of error. One source is sampling error, which depends on the sample size and the results of particular questions. Stated most conservatively, normal sampling error for the entire base of 1102 respondents is 3 points (at the 95 percent confidence level). The error margin is larger for subsamples. For example, for 500 respondents, sampling error will be about 4.4 points; for 200 respondents, the margin is 6.9 points.

2. Mobility, Homes and Neighborhoods

a. Current Mobility

The Minneapolis population is quite mobile, and the motivations for moving vary among a mix of housing, neighborhood and personal issues. A 1987 MORI study for the City of Minneapolis focussed on housing concerns, while the current study addresses neighborhood issues in some detail. Before proceeding with the neighborhood analysis, it is worth noting some of the basic facts of household mobility in 1999.

The scope of mobility can be illustrated in questions that asked how long respondents have lived in Minneapolis and in their present homes, and also about their future plans.

- One-fourth of respondents have lived in Minneapolis for less than four years, and more than half said they have lived in Minneapolis only since 1990.
- Almost half of respondents have lived in their current homes three years or less, and two-thirds have been in the same residence for less than 10 years.
- Only about half of residents (54 percent) expect to live in the same residence two or three years from now. One-third of respondents expect to live somewhere outside their current neighborhood, and one-fifth expect to leave Minneapolis.
- Even among current homeowners, only 76 percent expect to live in the same home in two or three years. Only 24 percent of renters expect to stay that long.
- Among those who expect to move, 20 percent plan to stay in the same neighborhood; 30 percent expect to be in a different Minneapolis neighborhood; 20 percent will go elsewhere in the Twin Cities; and 30 percent expect to leave the Twin Cities.
- Minneapolis residents divide into three groups of similar size: those who moved to their present home from somewhere else in their neighborhood (28 percent); those who moved from another Minneapolis neighborhood (35 percent); and those who moved from outside Minneapolis (36 percent).
- Not quite 6 in 10 of survey respondents own their present home. Among all respondents, 34 percent are first-time homeowners (or at least did not own their previous home); 23 percent own their present home as well as their previous home; 39 percent have rented their last two homes; and 4 percent rent now after owning before.
- The desire to own your home is shown in the plans of owners and renters who expect to move within three years. Among current homeowners who expect to move, about 9 in 10 (88 percent) expect to own their next home. Among the large group of renters who expect to move, fully 61 percent expect, or hope, to be homeowners next time.

b. Reasons for Moving

Why do people move? A variety of reasons were deemed applicable to their situations among those who expect to move in the next two or three years. These include:

Better Home:

- 68% To get a larger or nicer home
- 68% To buy rather than rent

Neighborhood:

- 72% To live where people take better care of their property
- 63% To live in a more attractive neighborhood
- 45% To live in a neighborhood where you fit in better
- 41% To live in an area with better public schools
- 41% To live in a neighborhood with more diversity

Personal:

- 43% To move because of a job change
- 39% To be closer to your current job or school
- 39% To be closer to family or friends

Nearly all respondents had more than one reason, so they were asked which one is most important. The American dream of upward mobility to a better home was cited most often, but the motivations remain diverse:

Most Important Reason for Moving (If plan to move in 2-3 years)

- 23% To buy a home rather than rent
- 14% To get a larger or nicer home
- 9% To be closer to family and friends
- 7% To live where people take better care of their property
- 7% To live in an area with better public schools
- 6% To be closer to your current job or school
- 5% To live in a more attractive neighborhood
- 5% To move because of a job change
- 4% To get a smaller or less expensive home
- 4% To live in a safer neighborhood
- 4% To live in a neighborhood where you fit in better
- 3% To live in a neighborhood with more diversity

3. Neighborhoods and Deciding Where to Live

a. Location of Desirable Homes

When asked where they can most likely find homes that are both affordable and satisfactory, those who expect to move within three years differed sharply from those expecting to stay. Respondents likely to move were twice as likely to cite the suburbs, and they were less than half as likely to mention their own neighborhood.

Where Homes Are Affordable and Satisfactory		
	Plan to Move in 2-3 Years	Don't Plan to Move
Own neighborhood	21%	48%
Other Mpls neighborhoods	32	19
Suburbs	36	16
No difference/Don't know	11	17

b. Homes vs. Neighborhoods

Respondents were asked to rate both their homes and neighborhoods.

On a satisfaction scale, 58 percent of respondents said they were “very satisfied” with their home, and 32 percent said they were “somewhat satisfied,” leaving only 10 percent who were very or somewhat dissatisfied.

For neighborhoods, the result is not quite as positive, nor would we expect it to be, as it is easier to influence one’s home than an entire neighborhood. About one-third (36 percent) rated their neighborhoods as “excellent,” and another 41 percent gave a “good” rating; 16 percent said “fair,” and 6 percent said “poor.” So about three-fourths of respondents gave their neighborhoods positive marks (compared to 90 percent for homes).

It is a cliché, but also a reality that location is a significant driver for home quality, value and satisfaction. The following table from the survey shows how satisfaction with one’s home relates to neighborhood ratings. The relationship is strong, though far from perfect.

Rate Neighborhood as Place to Live	Satisfaction with Current Home			
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Excellent	50	19	8	10
Good	38	50	28	32
Only fair	8	26	40	15
Poor	4	5	25	43

(Read Down)

Those who are very satisfied with their homes are most likely to give top marks to their neighborhood. Respondents “somewhat” satisfied with their homes are most likely to give a qualified rating to their neighborhoods. Those dissatisfied with their homes tend not to show much enthusiasm for their neighborhoods.

c. Importance of Particular Factors

A more direct question asked whether one’s neighborhood is a motivation to stay or to move. Among all respondents, more than half (56 percent) said their neighborhood encouraged them to stay, and 1 in 6 (17 percent) said it was a reason to move, leaving 25 percent who said the neighborhood made little difference. However, among those planning to move, about as many said their neighborhood encouraged them to leave (30 percent) as to stay (36 percent).

Neighborhood:	Influence of Neighborhood on Moving Plans		
	Total	If plan to move in 3 years	Don’t plan to move
Motivates staying	56%	36%	73%
Motivates leaving	17	30	7
Both/mixed	25	33	20

(Read Down)

What neighborhood-related factors are most important to Minneapolis residents? Survey respondents rated nine characteristics in terms of their importance in the decision where to live. (The scale ranged from 1-to-5, where “1” means “not important,” and “5” means “extremely important.”) The table below shows the percentages for extremely important.

	Rate as Extremely Important in Decision Where to Live			
	Total	Age 18-34	Age 35-54	Age 55+
Safe neighborhood	69%	64%	74%	70%
Clean neighborhood	58	48	60	71
Housing is well-maintained	56	50	55	68
Good parks/Recreational facilities	48	42	51	54
Good schools in area	46	41	55	46
Quiet neighborhood	39	29	37	58
Convenience to work	34	31	36	37
Shopping areas nearby	32	25	30	46
Friends or family nearby	25	19	19	43

Among the general population, we can distinguish five levels of importance:

- The highest-rated factor is that the neighborhood is safe, with 7 in 10 respondents saying it is very important.

- At a slightly lower level for most respondents (almost 6 in 10) are esthetic considerations: that the neighborhood is clean and housing well-maintained.
- A few points lower (almost 5 in 10) are two types of neighborhood amenities: parks and recreational facilities, and good schools in the area. (Parents of school-age children put good schools on a par with neighborhood safety.)
- Next are issues of quietness and convenience to shopping and work (about one-third).
- Proximity to friends or family scores lowest, with 1 in 4 saying it is very important.

We can also see rather striking differences in priorities among age groups. While all age groups are concerned about safety, older adults (55+) are much above average in their desire for convenience, quiet, neighborhood upkeep and access to friends and family. Young people are particularly more tolerant of noisy neighborhoods.

d. Basic Requirements vs. Desirable Options

An analysis of statistical relationships among the nine criteria suggests that we can reduce them to two concepts of a more general nature. (Factor analysis was used.)

- One set includes safety, cleanliness, housing maintenance and quietness.
- The other set includes parks and recreational facilities, good schools in the area, proximity to work, shopping areas and friends or family. Most of these items have in common some idea of convenience

The first set can be termed “basic requirements,” as they seem more fundamental than the second set, which for many people will be desirable but not as necessary. Further analysis, reported below, shows the four “basic” factors are in fact the strongest motivators for a decision to move.

Safety, cleanliness and housing maintenance were most likely to be rated as “extremely important” among all the items. Quietness was further down the list, perhaps because it is becoming scarcer, as noted in the discussion below of perceptions of change.

e. Rating Neighborhoods

Respondents rated their own neighborhoods on the same criteria, using a scale of excellent, good, only fair and poor. (It should be noted that we used each respondent’s understanding of “neighborhood,” which no doubt varied in some cases from the official definitions of the 81 Minneapolis neighborhoods.)

- The top score was given for good parks and recreation facilities, which three-fourths of respondents rated as excellent or good.
- At the next level, ranging from 70 percent to 65 percent, were clean, well-maintained housing, nearby shopping, convenience to work, and safe.
- At a somewhat lower level were proximity to friends and family, quiet neighborhood and good schools, which ranged from 58 percent to 50 percent.

	Extremely Important	Rate Excel/Good
Good parks/Recreational facilities	48%	78%
Clean neighborhood	58	70
Housing is well-maintained	56	68
Shopping areas nearby	32	68
Convenience to work	34	66
Safe neighborhood	69	65
Good schools in area	46	61*
Friends or family nearby	25	58
Quiet neighborhood	39	54

*School quality rating omits those with no opinion

f. Neighborhood Characteristics and Moving

A more direct measure of the importance of these items compares quality ratings for two groups: those who say their neighborhood encourages them to stay, and those who say local conditions make them more likely to move.

The table below shows that 85 percent of the first group rate their neighborhoods as excellent or good on safety. Only 19 percent of the second group rate their neighborhoods that high, which is a difference of 66 points.

Easily the biggest gaps are for safety, home maintenance and cleanliness. At a lower level, we see similar gap scores for quietness, parks, schools and shopping. However, satisfaction with quietness is among those who generally like their neighborhoods.

Neighborhood Survey Report for TEAMWORKS

Excellent/Good Ratings	Neighborhood Motivates Staying	Neighborhood Motivates Moving	Moving Motivation Gap Score**
Safe neighborhood	85%	19%	66
Housing is well-maintained	84	27	57
Clean neighborhood	85	29	56
Quiet neighborhood	65	23	42
Good parks/Recreational facilities	88	49	39
Good schools in area	71	35	36
Shopping areas nearby	77	43	34
Friends or family nearby	65	36	29
Convenience to work	70	56	14

****Moving Motivation Gap Score = (% motivates staying - % motivates moving)**

g. Perceived Trends.

Respondents also were asked whether they thought various neighborhood conditions or issues had shown improvement or decline in recent years. The table below shows percentages for each alternative, as well as a moving motivation gap score (calculated in a similar manner as the previous table).

Substantially more respondents saw more progress than decline on most items.

The largest relative gains were for cleaning up rundown housing, property maintenance and providing parks and recreation. About 4 in 10 saw improvements, and less than 1 in 10 said their neighborhoods had trended down.

Most problematic were traffic management, reducing noise and parking availability, which had deficits.

	Better	Worse	(Difference)	Moving Motivation Gap Score*
Prevent crime	38%	11%	27	58
Attracting people who will help rather than hurt the neighborhood	38	14	24	56
Taking care of property	42	8	34	51
Better stores & restaurants	37	12	25	45
Clean up rundown housing	43	8	35	33
Reducing noise	18	21	-3	30
Clean up rundown store fronts	38	9	29	29
Cleaning up pollution	27	8	19	27
Planting/maintaining trees	35	6	29	25
Providing parks and recreation	37	3	34	22
Managing traffic	18	19	-1	22
Street cleaning	25	5	20	17
Parking availability	13	16	-3	12

*Difference score for those motivated to stay – difference score for those motivated to leave

4. Three Neighborhood Groups

NRP divided Minneapolis neighborhoods into three groups based on various quality of life indicators. From the current survey we can see that respondents living in the three types of neighborhoods are quite different both in terms of certain “objective” characteristics and also resident perceptions.

a. Demographic Characteristics

Protection Neighborhoods (representing 31 percent of respondents) have the largest proportion of college graduates, homeowners, married households, and high-income households. They also are most satisfied with their homes and neighborhoods. Redirection Neighborhood respondents (25 percent of the sample) score lowest on socioeconomic indicators, while Revitalization Neighborhood respondents (40 percent) are in between. (Four percent of survey respondents could not be classified by neighborhood type due to incomplete information.)

	Protection (31%)	Revitalization (40%)	Redirection (25%)
Single family home	65%	60%	29%
Own	68	61	37
Rent	30	37	61
Expects to move in 3 years	27	30	42
College graduate	63	47	47
Prof/Tech/Mgr occupation	40	29	26
Married	47	35	27
Divorced/Separated	7	8	13
Never married	28	38	41
Household income <\$25,000	22	30	46
Household income >\$50,000	46	25	16
Very satisfied with home	70	57	47
Neighborhood encourages staying	77	57	32

b. Importance of Neighborhood Characteristics

Respondents from the different neighborhood types were fairly similar on what they rated as important in a neighborhood as a place to live. However, Protection Neighborhood residents scored somewhat higher than other respondents did on four items: safety, cleanliness, home maintenance and parks/recreational facilities. It is doubtful that residents from other neighborhoods want these things any less, but they may have to make a realistic assessment of what they can afford.

	Extremely Important	More Important for Protection Neighborhoods
Safe neighborhood	69%	80%
Clean neighborhood	58	66
Housing is well-maintained	56	63
Good parks/Recreational facilities	48	56
Good schools in area	46	--
Quiet neighborhood	39	--
Convenience to work	34	--
Shopping areas nearby	32	--
Friends or family nearby	25	--

c. Rating Neighborhood Conditions

The following table shows how residents of the different neighborhood groups rated conditions in their own neighborhoods. The three groups give their neighborhoods strikingly different ratings on most items, especially on cleanliness, safety, and housing maintenance. At a slightly lower degree of differentiation are quietness, proximity of shopping areas and good schools, and having parks and recreational facilities nearby.

In general Protection Neighborhood respondents are more than half again as likely as to rate their areas as excellent or very good.

Rate Excellent/Very Good:	Protection	Revitalize	Redirect
Good parks/Recreational facilities	90%	81%	60%
Clean neighborhood	90	70	43
Safe neighborhood	88	64	39
Housing is well-maintained	87	68	42
Shopping areas nearby	81	66	54
Convenience to work	71	66	62
Friends or family nearby	65	59	46
Quiet neighborhood	64	56	38
Good schools in area	60	49	39
(Average)	77	64	47

d. Trends

The three neighborhood groups show an interesting mix of trends on the question series asking whether various conditions had improved, stayed the same or gotten worse in recent years.

On most items measured, about one-fourth to one-half of Protection Neighborhood respondents see improvements and only a trivial number see declines. The exceptions are traffic management, noise, and parking availability, for which more people see declines than improvement. The most noticeable improvements are in property management, getting better stores and restaurants, and in parks and recreation.

Revitalization Neighborhood respondents are about as likely to see improvements as are those from Protection Neighborhoods. On some items, however, they have somewhat more who see declines. These include crime prevention, attracting people who help rather than hurt the neighborhood, getting better stores and restaurants, and cleaning up rundown housing.

Redirection Neighborhood respondents are most likely to see improvement on cleaning up rundown housing and store fronts, crime prevention, attracting people who help the neighborhood, planting trees, cleaning up pollution, street cleaning, managing traffic and reducing noise. On most of those items, however, they also have relatively more residents who see worsening conditions. In general, though, far more see significant improvement than decline in Redirection Neighborhoods.

	Protection		Revitalization		Redirection	
	Better	Worse	Better	Worse	Better	Worse
Clean up rundown housing	37	2	42	9	49	14
Taking care of property	46	4	39	9	44	11
Clean up rundown store fronts	34	4	39	9	41	14
Prevent crime	36	4	36	13	41	14
Attracting people who will help	37	7	36	15	44	23
Providing parks and recreation	41	1	35	3	35	4
Better stores & restaurants	44	5	34	15	31	16
Planting/maintaining trees	34	4	32	5	40	10
Cleaning up pollution	29	5	25	9	31	12
Street cleaning	24	2	25	5	27	8
Managing traffic	16	22	15	19	23	17
Reducing noise	14	22	15	21	26	18
Parking availability	12	16	10	14	17	20

5. Neighborhood Identification and Involvement

This survey found much evidence of identity with and involvement in their neighborhoods by Minneapolis residents. One of the long-term goals of NRP is to increase a sense of community feeling among Minneapolis residents. We cannot directly measure in one survey whether community feeling has increased. However, we can demonstrate both that Minneapolis residents believe there have been many positive changes; and that perceiving positive change is associated with a higher level of neighborhood identification.

a. Activities

The following table shows a range of neighborhood-based activities over the previous three months that were cited by study respondents.

- Eight in 10 socialized with friends in the neighborhood; shopped for items other than groceries; and/or used parks or recreational facilities in the neighborhood.
- More than half attended neighborhood festivals.
- Four in 10 attended a place of worship in their neighborhood.
- One-fourth did volunteer work and/or attended neighborhood meetings.

Activities within neighborhood in past 3 months	Total	Protect	Revitalize	Redirect
Shop for groceries	84%	89%	86%	78%
Socialize with neighborhood friends	81	85	82	76
Shop for other things	80	86	81	70
Use parks/recreational facilities	76	84	76	67
Attend neighborhood festivals	55	56	54	55
Go to church/place of worship	39	40	41	34
Work at a job	31	27	28	37
Do volunteer work	28	29	25	30
Attend neighborhood meetings	27	22	29	31
Have kids in a neighborhood school	14	11	13	15

- Neighborhood socialization with friends, shopping, and use of parks and recreational facilities is highest among Protection Neighborhood respondents, although Revitalization Neighborhood residents are not far behind.
- Compared to Protection Neighborhood residents, Redirection and Revitalization Neighborhood residents are more likely to attend neighborhood meetings.
- Redirection residents are more likely to have jobs within their neighborhoods.

b. Interest in Neighborhood Affairs

When asked to rate their interest in following community affairs and issues in the neighborhood, almost half of residents placed themselves on the “interested” half of the scale. One-fourth said they were not very interested, and about 3 in 10 were neutral.

What factors encourage interest in neighborhood issues? We may have a chicken and egg problem in establishing primacy, but interest is clearly related to setting down roots. Among homeowners, 52 percent are interested, compared to 37 percent among renters.

Those interested in neighborhood affairs are more likely to be satisfied with their homes and neighborhoods. They are more active in neighborhood-based activities, including socializing, recreational activities, festivals, neighborhood meetings, and volunteer work. They are more likely to see improvements in their neighborhoods, and they have greater faith that residents, businesses, and government can make a positive difference in the neighborhood.

Another striking difference is that women are notably more interested in neighborhood affairs than is the case for men. This finding is not surprising, as we at Minnesota Opinion Research have consistently found similar results in many studies of media usage nationwide.

Characteristics of Those with Different Levels of Interest in Neighborhood Affairs (read down)			
	Low (23%)	Medium (31%)	High (46%)
Men	59%	48%	43%
Women	41	52	57
Married	25	34	43
Own home	46	54	65
Expect to move in 3 years	42	48	64
Attend neighborhood festivals	39	54	64
Worship in neighborhood	29	42	42
Volunteer in neighborhood	14	23	37
Attend meetings	11	17	42
Believe neighborhood residents effective in dealing with issues	35	40	64
Aware of neighborhood organizations	38	61	71

c. Sources of Neighborhood Information

Community and neighborhood newspapers are the most important source for information about issues, people, and events that happen in Minneapolis neighborhoods. Seven in 10 respondents cite local papers as a source for this type of news. We know from other research that these papers also are an important source for advertising information for people who regularly shop in their neighborhoods.

The second-most cited source for local information was word-of-mouth, which was mentioned by half of respondents (49 percent).

The Star Tribune or other daily newspapers were slightly behind at 47 percent, and television followed at 42 percent and radio at 28 percent. Flyers, newsletters or bulletin boards were noted by only two percent of respondents.

d. Identification with the Neighborhood

The survey included several questions that measured different aspects of neighborhood identification. Another set of questions asked about feelings and emotions in relation to neighborhoods.

- Six in 10 respondents strongly agreed with two similar statements about feeling “at home” in their neighborhood and it being a “good place for me to live.”
- Not quite half of respondents strongly agreed with three statements relating to interpersonal relations in the neighborhood (getting along with others, recognizing many people in the neighborhood, and caring what others think).
- One-third expressed strong confidence in the ability of residents in their neighborhoods to solve collective problems.
- Only one-fifth strongly agreed they have influence over neighborhood conditions, but 40 percent agreed somewhat.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Disagree
I feel at home in this neighborhood	65%	25%	10%
I think my neighborhood is a good place for me to live.	61	26	13
People in this neighborhood get along with each other	48	38	9
I can recognize many of the people who live in my neighborhood	44	36	20
I care about what my neighbors think of my actions	44	32	21
If there is a problem in this neighborhood, people who live here can get it solved	34	41	17
I have influence over what this neighborhood is like	19	40	39

Base: Total Adults

Neighborhood Survey Report for TEAMWORKS

The following table compares the three neighborhood groups on these statements. On three statements the three neighborhood groups are in rank order. Residents of “better” neighborhoods are more likely to feel that they belong; that they have a greater sense that people in their neighborhood get along; and that they have greater confidence people in their neighborhood can solve collective problems.

Residents of the three neighborhood groups do not differ, however, on questions relating to their own individual capacities. They are about the same in saying they recognize people in their neighborhoods; that they care what their neighbors think; and that they have influence over conditions near where they live.

% Strongly Agreeing by Neighborhood Type	Protection	Revitali- zation	Redirection
I feel at home in this neighborhood	78	64	52
I think my neighborhood is a good place for me to live.	79	61	40
People in this neighborhood get along with each other	63	48	31
I can recognize many of the people who live in my neighborhood	41	46	45
I care about what my neighbors think of my actions	42	47	43
If there is a problem in this neighborhood, people who live here can get it solved	42	32	25
I have influence over what this neighborhood is like	20	18	19

Base: Total Adults

e. Effectiveness in Dealing with Neighborhood Issues

Several parties are involved in neighborhood issues, and Minneapolis residents tend to believe local is better.

- When asked to rate the effectiveness of various groups in dealing with neighborhood-related issues in the past two or three years, half of survey respondents rated neighborhood residents as very or somewhat effective (rated 4 or 5 on a 1-5 scale).
- Neighborhood advocacy groups and local businesses were next at 43 percent with the same rating.
- City agencies and elected officials, such as the mayor and city council, trailed with almost 3 in 10 rating them on the high end of the effectiveness scale.

Rate as Very or Somewhat Effective in Dealing with Neighborhood Issues		
	Total	Interested in Neighborhood Affairs
Neighborhood residents	50%	64%
Neighborhood advocacy groups	43	55
Local businesses	42	52
City agencies	29	37
Elected officials, mayor, council	27	32

The ratings were mostly uniform across the three neighborhood groups, with the exception that local businesses were more highly rated in Protection Neighborhoods (49 percent) and below average in Revitalization Neighborhoods (37 percent).

Those with a strong interest in neighborhood affairs give higher effectiveness ratings for each group, although the gain is less for elected officials.

Two other questions probed perceptions about City Hall attention to neighborhood concerns. When asked how much attention the mayor or city council pay to what people think in “your neighborhood,” 14 percent said a lot of attention, 47 percent said some attention, and 34 percent not much attention.

When asked whether improving conditions in their own neighborhoods was thought to be a high priority in city government, one third (34 percent) said it was, while 55 percent said it was not, and the rest did not know.

6. NRP Awareness and Reputation

a. General Awareness

One of the goals of this research was to gauge awareness of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) and to determine whether residents associate NRP with positive changes in their neighborhoods.

Two-thirds of Minneapolis adults (66 percent) said they had heard of NRP when the program was described to them. (“Before I mentioned it, had you heard of something called the Neighborhood Revitalization Program, or NRP, in which each neighborhood in Minneapolis develops projects for improving housing, parks, the environment, and other aspects of the community?”)

b. Degrees of Awareness

The 66 percent total no doubt include some residents who know the program quite well, some who have read about NRP and can talk about it, some who have only heard the term, and some who think they might have heard of it. We can estimate degree of familiarity from a direct question about the effect of NRP on the respondent’s neighborhood. Among those who had heard of NRP, 43 percent said it was good for their neighborhood, while only 3 percent said it had a bad effect, and 22 percent said the program had “no effect.” Another one-third of this group had no opinion.

If we repercentage these results using the total sample, we find 44 percent of Minneapolis adults are familiar with and have an opinion about NRP in their own neighborhood; 22 percent are familiar with the name but have no opinion; and 34 percent of Minneapolis adults have not heard of the program.

c. Contributors to Awareness

The factors most predictive of NRP awareness are age, education, income, home ownership, length of residence in Minneapolis, and interest in community issues.

- About three-fourths of the following target groups have heard of NRP: those 35 and older, homeowners, college graduates, those with household incomes of \$50,000 or more, those living in Minneapolis for at least four years, and those with a strong interest in community affairs.
- This compares to about half who are aware of NRP among those age 18-34, renters, adults with a high school education or less, those who have lived in Minneapolis for less than four years, and those with less interest in community affairs.

Age, education, income, home ownership and interest in community affairs are obviously interrelated to some degree. Middle-aged or older people are more likely to own their homes, and homeowners are more likely to be interested in community affairs. People with high incomes are more likely to have college degrees, and college-educated people typically are more knowledgeable about public affairs. However, while younger people (18-34) are more likely to have college degrees, they are less likely to have the local ties—such as home ownership—that encourage interest in neighborhood affairs.

d. Activism in Redirection Neighborhoods

Given these relationships, we might expect knowledge about NRP to be highest in Protection Neighborhoods and lowest in Redirection Neighborhoods, as Protection areas have more homeowners, upper-income households, and college graduates. However, NRP awareness is very similar in the three neighborhood areas, ranging from 64 percent in Redirection to 69 percent in Protection Neighborhoods.

A compensating factor for Redirection Neighborhoods is the higher level of neighborhood activism, which is related to NRP awareness. We can see this in the 29 percent of Redirection residents who say they are “very interested” in neighborhood issues (compared to about 20 percent with that interest among Revitalization and Protection residents). Similarly, 29 percent of Redirection residents have participated in neighborhood meetings or done volunteer work at least three times in the past year (compared to 18 percent in the other two neighborhood types).

e. Awareness of Specific NRP Programs

Further evidence of knowledge about NRP can be seen in a question about specific programs. Respondents aware of NRP were asked which programs from a list they associate with NRP. About six in ten cited fixing up housing (60 percent), neighborhood planning (59 percent) and park improvement (56 percent). Smaller numbers mentioned new housing construction (38 percent), youth programs and improved street lighting (37 percent each). As a test, “building animal shelters” was included in the program mix, but only one percent of respondents named that fictional program.

Residents from the three neighborhood groups did not differ in citing neighborhood planning, youth programs and street lighting as NRP initiatives. Redirection residents, however, were far more likely to mention new housing construction, compared to people from other neighborhoods. Redirection and Revitalization residents named repairing existing housing more often than did Protection residents. On the other hand, Protection and Revitalization residents mentioned park improvement more frequently than Redirection Neighborhood residents did.

f. Relating NRP to Neighborhood Changes

As discussed elsewhere in this report, Minneapolis residents found improvements in most, if not all, neighborhood conditions measured. Do people associate specific positive changes with NRP? There is evidence for such a conclusion, as NRP-aware people are more likely to see improvement on most items measured. Variations among neighborhood types on certain measures also support the NRP association.

For example, a 43 percent plurality of Minneapolis residents noted improvement in “cleaning up rundown housing,” while only 8 percent noted a decline on this factor. By a nine-point margin, NRP-aware respondents were more likely to see improvement. This difference, however, was far more pronounced in the Revitalization and, especially, Redirection Neighborhoods, where rundown housing has been a high priority for NRP projects. NRP-aware people in Revitalization Neighborhoods score 17 points higher on noting improvement on this measure compared to those not aware of NRP. (The difference is only five points in Protection Neighborhoods.)

Similar “NRP effects” can be seen on park improvements (Protection Neighborhoods); for crime prevention and pollution control (Revitalization Neighborhoods); for attracting better stores and restaurants (Protection and Revitalization); planting and maintaining trees (Protection and Revitalization); and for taking care of property (Redirection).

NRP awareness is associated with lower improvement scores on traffic control, parking, street cleaning, and noise. These were the most problematic conditions for all respondents, and it is not surprising that NRP-aware people were more critical, as they tend to have more interest and involvement in community issues.

% Citing Neighborhood Improvements by Those Aware/Not Aware of NRP in Different Neighborhoods						
	Protection		Revitalization		Redirection	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Aware of NRP:						
Clean up rundown housing	39	34	45	35	55	38
Taking care of property	46	44	41	34	48	35
Clean up rundown store fronts	34	34	49	36	44	34
Prevent crime	36	38	39	30	41	41
Attracting people who will help	40	32	41	26	47	38
Providing parks and recreation	46	32	37	31	32	41
Better stores & restaurants	48	37	37	27	30	32
Planting/maintaining trees	37	29	36	23	40	41
Cleaning up pollution	31	25	28	18	28	34

g. NRP Reputation

As noted above, a 43 percent plurality of those aware of NRP say it has been good for their neighborhoods, compared to 22 percent saying it has had no effect, 3 percent finding bad effects, and 33 percent with no opinion. These totals are quite similar across the three neighborhood groups.

Converted to the total sample, we have:

- 28 percent of all adults who are aware of NRP and say it has had a good effect on their immediate neighborhood;
- 2 percent who say it has had a bad effect;
- 14 percent who say it has had no effect;
- 2 percent who are aware of NRP but have not opinion about it; and
- 34 percent who are not aware of the NRP.

What distinguishes those with more or less enthusiasm for NRP? Those rating NRP positively do not differ appreciably in demographic terms from other Minneapolis residents. However, they tend to be much more satisfied with their own neighborhoods; they see more evidence of progress; and they have more faith in the ability of government and residents to improve neighborhood conditions. Additionally, those who say NRP has helped their neighborhoods tend to be somewhat more interested and active in community and neighborhood affairs. Of course, involvement and success reinforce each other, so it is not surprising to see greater interest among those who see positive results.

Those who say they have heard of NRP but do not have an opinion about it fall in between the two groups described above in their beliefs about their neighborhood. For example, respondents were asked whether their neighborhood motivates them either to stay where they are now or to move. We can make an index by subtracting the “move” percentage from the “stay” percentage. Among respondents who say NRP has had good results, this index is 60 (70% stay – 10% move). Those who say NRP has not improved the neighborhood index at only 21 (50% - 30%); and those who no opinion about NRP are in between at 43 (58% - 15%).

However, those with no opinion about NRP are somewhat less active in neighborhood affairs than is the case for residents who do have an opinion.

Neighborhood Survey Report for TEAMWORKS

The following table illustrates these points. It compares responses on various questions among respondents who said NRP has had a good effect on their neighborhoods (28 percent) with those who said it had no effect or a bad effect (16 percent) and those who had heard of the program but had no opinion about it (22 percent).

Rate Effect of NRP on Neighborhood (if aware):			
	Good Effect 28%	No Opinion 22%	No Effect/ Bad Effect 16%
Expect to live in same neighborhood in 3 yrs.	77%	61%	58%
Rate neighborhood as excellent/good	87	80	70
I have influence over what this neighborhood is like	76	61	47
People can make a big difference in improving neighborhood	48	33	27
Improving neighborhood is high priority with city government	49	35	18
Neighborhood advocacy groups rated as effective	60	45	36
Rate neighborhood schools as excel./good	60	45	45
Rate rundown housing cleanup as improved	57	44	28
Rate preventing crime as improved	45	41	22
Rate parks & recreation as improved	45	39	27
Rate attracting better stores and restaurants as improved	50	36	24
Rate planting & maintaining trees as improved	50	30	22
Attended neighborhood meetings in past 3 months	41	23	31
Interested in neighborhood affairs	63	45	50

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

