COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION SURVEY METHODOLOGY REPORT

by

Justine H. Lovig
Robert VanStedum

16 February 1995

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION SURVEY METHODOLOGY REPORT

Across the country, groups are agitating for a role in determining how the crime problems facing their neighborhood are defined and prioritized, and for a clearly defined role in influencing how police will work with them to solve those problems. The rhetoric of community policing is that community groups must have such a role, for without the active participation of groups as partners in the enterprise, community policing will fail. The co-production perspective that dominates both community crime prevention theory and the thinking of many about community policing assumes that voluntary action by neighborhood residents can play an important role in maintaining order in a cost-effective and constitutional manner. However, despite the frequent use of strong language to this effect, there has been remarkably little research on the role that groups have actually played in any policing effort.

This study gathered survey data from hundreds of organizational informants on the roles that their groups were playing in Chicago's community policing program. It documents how they mobilized to influence the shape of community policing in the city's five prototype areas. The goal of the survey was to determine to what degree community organizations in the five prototype districts are involved in, and promoting CAPS during its first year of implementation. In particular, the survey was designed to capture information on differences in CAPS involvement between various community organizations, and between the five prototype districts in which it was being tested.

THE SAMPLE

In the absence of anything resembling a systematic frame for selecting a random sample of organizations, our sampling strategy was to search for organizations in diverse and inclusive ways in order to ensure heterogeneity and wide coverage in the resulting list. In order to maximize the accuracy with which

the data described each organization, two informants were quizzed about the workings of each group.

Definitions

What is a community organization? Our operational definition of a community organization was: it is a turf-based group with a name. We built our sample database around identifiably named groups. Their size, number of active participants, structure, characteristic activities, and longevity were variables, and not part of the definition of an organization. Sample groups also had to be turf-based; that is, they must in part define their scope geographically. This was our operational definition of a "community" orientation, and it excluded, for example, VFW Posts.

We knew we would encounter several kinds of community organizations. In Chicago parlance, the basic organizational unit of a residential neighborhood is a *block club*. These encompass a small expanse of turf, typically three to four square blocks, and usually are named after streets or intersections, or have adopted local neighborhood names. *Umbrella groups* are federations of organizations, mostly block groups. While they often are sparked by individual activists, their membership base is other groups. These always have names, and frequently have offices; a surprising number have professional staff members. An umbrella association of condominium associations is active in one of the prototype districts. In addition to these membership groups, we also found a surprising number of *client serving organizations* that were active in CAPS. Supported by grants and contracts or fees for service, they were service-providing rather than membership-based groups. *Churches* fell within our net if they engaged in identifiable political, social, or economic development activities. Local *merchants' associations* typically represent small businesses clustered at the intersection of major arterials or spread along four to five block arterial strips. In many areas of the city they have formed special taxing districts that provide extra street cleaning, garbage pickups, and other (non-police) city services in their catchment area. As the examples of churches and merchants suggest, geography is not necessarily the only way community organizations define their mission, and other criteria could be involved as well.

<u>Procedures</u>

A list of turf-based named groups, along with the names and telephone numbers of persons associated with them, was developed from several sources. A start-up list was contributed by a research team at DePaul University, who shared an inventory they had developed for their own community organization study. Northwestern and Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) staff members supplemented this list with organizations and contacts they came across while attending various CAPS-related meetings, or doing interviews. Each time we conducted an interview with an organizational informant we asked about other organizations that they had run across, to contribute a "snowball" component to the sample. We also culled local news articles and newsletters to locate additional organizations and named contacts to add to the list. Several key community contacts in prototype districts were asked to go through the list for their area and make additions and corrections to it. As part of our evaluation of CAPS, team members conducted interviews with district commanders, neighborhood relations officers, beat team members, and other officers. Among other topics, lists of group names and contacts were gleaned from these key informants.

Finally, the sample list was supplemented during the survey itself. Respondents were asked to share the names of local community organizations, knowledgeable contacts and phone numbers. In some cases, respondents sent us lists with community organization information. The information they gave was then checked against the master list, and additions or corrections were made as appropriate.

Of course, it is not really appropriate to characterize the collection of organizations that we assembled as a "sample" of a bounded universe of units, nor to assume any of the distributional characteristics that come with random sampling. Our approach doubtless biased the results of the study in the direction of groups with larger memberships, telephone listings, offices, staff employees, more visibility in the community, and greater longevity. However, there was no feasible alternative to our approach to sampling through diversity, and there inevitably will

be an empirical as well as conceptual fuzziness around the edge that bounds the universe of "community organizations" in a complex urban setting.

<u>Sample Size and Respondent Selection</u>

The survey was budgeted to yield data on 50 organizations in each of the five prototype districts, or a total of 250 organizations. For reasons discussed below, each organization was to be represented by <u>two</u> respondents who were knowledgeable about their group. When they were available, the names of individual respondents associated with each organization were included on a call sheet for that group. These respondents were often the head of the organization, or other high-level personnel. When there was no valid name on the call sheet, interviewers were instructed to "Ask for the person most knowledgeable regarding the organization, perhaps the executive director or president of the organization."

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND PROCEDURES

The paramount research question was, "<u>What</u> are the groups doing regarding CAPS?" Two different questionnaire sequences (Q10 and Q11 in the appended questionnaire) targeted this topic. First, respondents were asked a number of questions about their organization's activities (eg, do they hold general public meetings, do fund raising, etc.). After they described their activities, they were asked as a follow-up if each activity was CAPS-related. This was followed by a sequence of eight questions probing specific CAPS-related activities, such as "encouraging people to attend CAPS-related meetings?" Responses to these sets of items were used to score each organization in terms of its type and intensity of involvement in CAPS.

The next question was, "<u>Who</u> is active in CAPS?" The answers to this were developed from a number of questions about the organizations and their goals. Those measures fall into several clusters:

- *geographical scope*: how expansive is the group's turf

- *organizational base*: is the group membership-based, or does it principally serve clients; does it use volunteers

- *constituency factors:* eg., the race and class background of group members or clients

- *structural factors:* group funding, staffing, office space, phone listings, size, longevity, dues

- *purposes:* why they were formed, and the goals or purposes of the organization

- *networks:* what is their relationship to other organizations, and to umbrella groups

The next issue was, "Are there <u>differences</u> between the districts in organizational involvement in CAPS, and how can these differences be explained?" As noted in the main report, area differences in organizational involvement could be explained in part by the differential distribution of types of groups across the five districts.

Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire was developed during a series of meetings between the principal investigator, an experienced consultant, and the project manager. Detailed research questions and questioning strategies were developed at these sessions. Several meetings were held to discuss and revise draft questionnaires. The questionnaire underwent three major revisions before the extensive piloting process.

Pilot test

A questionnaire pilot test was conducted from April 22 through April 26, 1994, to test questionnaire length and wording. Particular attention was paid to the sample being called, and the completion rate. Interviewing was conducted during mornings, afternoons and evenings to learn if productivity was affected by the time calls were made. Attention was paid to the questionnaire items: were they easily understood by respondents, were they too wordy or awkward, did they capture meaningful information, were existing categories appropriate. It was also important to learn the range of completion times to determine if items would need to be deleted from the questionnaire. The project manager and pilot-test interviewers met with the principal investigator and the project director to debrief and discuss what

transpired during the pilot test. The project manager then made a final revision to the questionnaire based on this feedback.

DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected from the beginning of May, 1994, through September, 1994. Altogether, 10 interviewers worked on the project. Interviewing was conducted by graduate students, professional interviewers, an ICJIA staff member, a temporary employee, and the project manager.

In the end, 476 full and partial interviews were completed with representatives of 253 organizations. Table 1 presents summary information on survey completion rates. The total organizational response rate, based on the final dispositions of activated call sheets of eligible organizations, was 81.6 percent. Call sheets were not used in computing the response rate if: they were not activated; the phone number was non-working with no new number available; or, the call sheet was a duplicate of an organization already in the sample.

Table 1
Interview Completions by District

	District 07	District 10	District 15	District 22	District 24	Total
Number of Informant completions	103	102	79	84	108	476
Number of groups represented	53	53	43	45	59	253
Group response rate	83%	79%	84%	94%	74%	82%
Number of groups with two completions	50	49	36	39	49	223
Number of groups with one completion	3	4	7	6	10	30
Average number of calls to complete an interview	5.1	3.8	6.2	5.2	4.7	4.8

These interviews were conducted mostly with heads of the organizations (31 percent), or project directors and coordinators (37 percent). The remainder of the

interviews were completed with project staff members (17 percent), board members (10 percent) or staff members working directly under the head of the organization, for instance, a vice-president (5 percent). For 30 organizations an interview was completed with only one respondent due to the unavailability or refusal of other respondents, or the absence of any other eligible respondents. On average, it took 4.8 calls to complete an interview.

In District 7 there were 103 completed interviews covering 53 organizations, with an organizational response rate of 82.8 percent. Three of the organizations were represented by only one informant. On average, it took 5.1 calls to complete an interview in District 7.

In District 10 there were 102 completed interviews covering 53 organizations, with an organizational response rate of 79.4 percent. Four of the organizations were represented by only one informant. On average, it took 3.8 calls to complete an interview in District 10 -- this was the lowest average.

In District 15 there were 79 completed interviews covering 43 organizations, with an organizational response rate of 84.3 percent. Seven of the organizations were represented by only one informant. On average, it took 6.2 calls to complete an interview in District 15 -- this was the highest average.

In District 22 there were 84 completed interviews covering 45 organizations, with an organizational response rate of 93.7 percent. Six of the organizations were represented by only one informant. On average, it took 5.2 calls to complete an interview in District 22.

In District 24 there were 108 completed interviews covering 59 organization, with an organizational response rate of 73.8 percent. Ten of the organizations were represented by only one informant. On average, it took 4.7 calls to complete an interview in District 24.

Altogether, call sheets for 398 organizations were activated. The call sheets for 88 of these organizations were determined to be ineligible :

- 17 were wrong numbers, with no new number available;

- 16 were disconnected phones, with no new number available;

- 1 was a fax or modem machine, or some other unusual noise, with no new number available;

- 20 organizations were not active at this time;

- 1 was a temporarily disconnected phone;

- 11 were call sheets for organizations which were found to be duplicates of organizations that were already in the activated sample;

- 22 were ineligible organizations (not in the district, or not a community organization).

In all but one of the districts, one or more call sheets were never activated because enough had already been activated to meet our completion goals, or because they were deemed of lower priority. In most cases, an organization was deemed lower priority when it did not appear to meet our operational definition of a community organization as a turf-based group; for instance, The Department of Aging, or the Department of Human Services. Altogether, 17 organizations with call sheets were not called.

Table 2
Disposition of Eligible Sample Organizations

	District 07	District 10	District 15	District 22	District 24	Total
Made contact with respondent, but no interview	0	0	1	0	2	3
Respondent refused	2	1	1	1	0	5
Ineligible respondent	1	0	1	0	0	2
Made contact with group, but no interview	5	10	4	0	13	32
Phone never answered	1	0	0	1	1	3
Answering machine only	2	3	1	1	5	12
Total noncompletions	11	14	8	3	21	57
Total group completions	53	53	43	45	59	253
Total attempts	64	67	51	48	80	310
Completion rate	83	79	84	94	74	82

Of the 310 eligible organizations that were called, 57 organizations did not complete one or more interview. The disposition of eligible sample organizations is summarized in Table 2. These unsuccessful attempts included: Three direct contacts made with respondents who did not refuse to be interviewed, but with whom an interview was not completed. This might have been due to the respondent being too busy to complete an interview at any time the respondent was reached, but still stating that he or she was willing to complete an interview at a later time. Five respondents or potential respondents refused to be interviewed and/or refused for anyone in their group to be interviewed. Three phones were never answered. Twelve attempts to reach organizations only yielded repeated contacts to answering machines.

Each completion was checked through by the project manager, and if there was missing or unclear information, call-backs were made.

OPEN-ENDED CODING

A master coding list was developed for coding open-ended items by the principal investigator and another staff member. They worked empirically with questionnaires from two districts, and developed simple descriptive coding schemes upon which they could agree. A list of codes for the open-ended questionnaire items is appended to this report.

DATA ANALYSIS

A key feature of the data was the use of two informants to characterize the activities of each organization. When possible, two informants per organization were interviewed so that the data might transcend some of the errors introduced by the use of a single informant. As we conceptualized them, the two informants provided different observational "windows" through which we could peer to discern how the groups were organized and what they were doing. The observers were generally differentially positioned in the organizations; for example, one might be the president or executive director and the other a staff member or

volunteer activist. From their different vantage points they each brought different — but not necessarily better or more complete — knowledge and experience to the interview.

How we capitalized on the heterogeneity of their knowledge depended on the measure we were developing. For example, when we were interested in group activities, if either informant knew of an activity we counted the organization as being involved in that way. On the other hand, for the relatively small set of judgmental assessments included in the survey, we averaged their responses. For example, we averaged responses to a question about the impact of CAPS on the community's relationship with the police, which use a three-point response scale ranging from "None" to "Large." We also averaged their descriptions of certain key organizational factors, such as the age of the group, staff size, and the like. For the 12 percent of organizations represented by only one informant completion, we utilized the data from the single respondent. As detailed in Table 1, the percentage of single-informant organizations ranged from 6 percent to 17 percent across the districts.

Table 3 presents an analysis of levels of agreement between pairs of organizational informants. It examines some of the codes, counts, and averages that we examined in the main report, to describe organizational involvement in CAPS. Interinformant agreement was fairly high with regard to structural features of their organizations, whether they had a crime or drugs focus, and the organization's history. They tended to agree less when asked to make subjective ratings of the quality of police service or the impact of CAPS on the community, and their different vantage points gave them different views of how often their group interacted with the police. They did agree very much on factors that were not very directly observable, such as the income distribution of their members or clients. However, the correlation between reports of the race of their organization's members or clients was very high, principally because most groups tended to score either close to zero or close to 100 percent on this dimension.

The principal investigator developed a set of SPSS/PC+ control statements that generated organization-level data from the individual respondent data. A copy

of that program was submitted to the ICPSR data archive, along with both sets of original data.

Table 3
Selected Interinformant Agreement Scores

Percentage Agreement Scores (%) or Interinformant Correlations			
group age category	85%	has individual members	81%
geographical focus	88%	dues for members to pay	91%
group goal to address crime & drug problems	84%	receives external funding or gifts	83%
have full-time paid staff	95%	group belongs to umbrella organization	71%
uses volunteers	89%	who founded group	.86
count of CAPS-related activities	.67	rating of impact of CAPS on community	.44
pct of members with incomes under $20,000	.38	satisfaction with police service	.41
frequency group interacts with police	.39	pct of members or clients black	.93
pct of members with incomes under $20,000	.38	pct of members or clients white	.92

Open-Ended Coding Categories

Q3-current position in the organization

0 none given; blank
1 board of directors member
      member, president or chair
      "founder," former president
2 organization head

president	executive director
pastor	regional/national head
principal	chair, co-chair

3 vice-president, assistant manager/director
4 program director, coordinator or manager

function organizer	treasurer
co/assistant pastor	supervisor
director of services	function manager
committee chair	community organizer

5 program staff member, worker

librarian	client manager	teacher
therapist	staff/secretary	volunteer worker
admin assts	case manager	office staff

6 free-lancers, consultants
      consultant
8 other; not on list above
9 ambiguous, uncodeable

Q5-geographic area

0 none given
1 district or district community areas
      07 Englewood & West Englewood
      10 North Lawndale, So. Lawndale and Little Village
      15 Austin
      22 Beverly, Morgan Park, Washington Hts, Mt. Greenwood
      24 Rogers Park (East or West); West Ridge
2 district area <u>and</u> other sub-parts of the city: EXAMPLES
      07 Greater Grand Crossing, New City, Woodlawn, Chatham
        Avalon Park, "South Side"
      10 Archer Heights; Brighton Pk; McKinley Pk; Garfield Pk;
        Near West Side; "West Side"
      15 Belmont-Cragin; Hermosa; Humbolt Pk; Garfield Pk; "West Side"
      22 Ashburn; Auburn-Gresham; Chatham; Roseland; Pullman;
        "Far South Side"
      24 Edgewater
3 city-Wide, or serves no particular area of the city
4 county, metro area, state, national, international

5 not geographical
        serve ethnic groups, etc wherever they are
7 other; not on list above
8 ambiguous, uncodeable

Q6-organization's mission

00   None given; blank
10s range: Youth programs
        11 gangs
        12 schooling, education (GED; go to college; stay in school)
        13 drugs, drugs and alcohol; substance abuse
        14 offender, arrestee, parolee
        15 recreation
        16 employment
        17 counseling
        18 general service to youth
        19 general crime/problem prevention for youths/all other youths
21 Families & young children
        parenting skills; family reconciliation; family living
        child development; baby/child/mom health; services for children

22 Assist with domestic violence; recovery
25 Drugs & alcohol: adults, ex-offenders, or general/unspecified
        TASC (Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime)
        drugs & violence generally
26 Educational resources
        Adult education programs; GED classes, literacy, ESL
    classes, etc.
29 Social activities
     Recreation, activities, block parties;
     neighbors "get to know each other"
31 Health: general health condition or services, access
        mental health; after care
35 Housing: redlining; vacant buildings; housing referral
36 Housing: clean up community in general; physical neighborhood
41 Economic/business development
        promote businesses; advertising, marketing; infrastructure
        Chamber of Commerce/merchants association activities
45 Legal services: advice, assistance, representation
46 Political empowerment
51 Jobs: job skills, job-getting skills, making applications,
    keeping; job referral
55 Crime prevention: patrols, household security
     neighborhood, community watch, rid community of violence
60s range: Other client-based services
        60 senior/elderly programs
        61 low-income people
        62 specific ethnic/religious groups
        63 battered/abused women

14

64 homeless
65 offer range of services to people in general
66 feed/clothe people
67 general women; foster independence
68 General church-oriented; none of the mission codes above apply
        promote church, spiritual development
71 Vague/general quality of life: provide direction for lives;
        enhance QOL alternatives; improve lifestyles; unify
        neighborhood; tackle "problems", preserve community, support or develop
        community
75 Vague/general: serve as referral agent; refer to resources (unstated)
81 Other; not on list above
85 Ambiguous, uncodeable

Q14-any other ongoing non-CAPS programs with police

00 none given; blank
01 refer problems, clients <u>to</u> the police
        clients for evaluation   service request forms/I&I/MOII
02 receive clients, referrals <u>from</u> police
        community adjustment referrals
        victims   battered women   youth referrals
03 routine informal contact with police
        beat officers drop in; stop by asking for information
04 police attend/participate in activities
        lecture students   show videos   work with teens
        Big Brother/Big Sister   advisory council
        part of coalition with district(s) guidance for calling 911
        police help clean up
05 communication, coordination, work together better (general)
        meet with/discuss issues, problems
        work with police (general)
        community meetings send a representative to police meetings
06 used to work with Beat Rep; be on District Steering Committee
07 police presence, protection; regular police service
   (ex: police are there when they change shifts)
08 neighborhood watch program
09 court watch
18 other; not on list above
19 ambiguous, uncodeable

Q15-anything else regarding goals/activities

00 none given; blank
01 build community networks, citizen participation*
        newsletters, sharing information/network with organizations
02 get community working with police; involved in CAPS
        work more with police; more beat reps

03 youth-related programs, activities
     jobs, recreation
     schooling, self-esteem, leadership, safety
04 families & young children: parenting, reconciliation, family living
     child development, baby/child/mom health, family services-   children;
teach families to become good decision makers
05 drugs & alcohol: adults, ex-offenders, or general/unspecified
     drugs & violence generally
06 economic/business development
07 community education, training, problem solving
     neighborhood self help (general)
08 get more community facilities
     community center, clinic; expand programming, offer more services
09 job skills, job-getting skills, making applications, keeping,   referral, sponsor
GED classes, etc
10 housing: fix-up, rehab, affordable, supply, mortgages
   redlining; vacant buildings; housing referral
11 crime prevention: patrols, household security, neighborhood watch
12 lobby, advocacy before legislature, city council, etc.
13 fund raising (garage sales etc.), obtain outside funding
14 programming for seniors; activities etc.
15 general services, connections and activities for homeless
16 court watch
17 emphasis on the individual; independence, self-help,
   strengthening of morals etc.
18 other; not on list above
19 ambiguous, uncodeable
20 empower community
21 prevent/deal with violence
23 political organization, getting out the vote
24 clean up neighborhood
25 social activities; neighbors get to know each other
26 landlords: educate, make sure their buildings are "clean";
   support etc. Landlord networking to keep crime out of buildings

Q18-goals added since CAPS started

0 none stated, blank
1 involved in CAPS
     getting CAPS to work; getting people involved in CAPS
     work with beat meetings; get community to call police;
     get community more comfortable with police, going to police
     staffing organization to handle CAPS
2 interact with other agencies about area problems
     referrals of problems to agencies
3 work with gangs to stop the killing and violence
4 add/develop community facilities; more block clubs
5 youth programs; keep kids off of streets
6 crime
7 other; not on list above

8 ambiguous, uncodeable
9 sexual assault task force
10 organize leaders in community; training etc.
11 more communication within area; people phone each other to inform
   on what's going on
12 drugs