Neighborhood Satisfaction Survey

Philly Rising

August 5, 2015

By Christopher Nyepan, Daniel Pietrovito, Daniel She, Gina Dukes, Martin Moskat, Matthew Rappaport, Ruben Burenstein, Shante Robinson

1. INTRO

Philadelphia is a vibrant city known for its rich history, lending itself to be not only the place of “brotherly love” but also the birthplace of American Democracy. In 2015 the city has seen more growth and is receiving an unprecedented amount of attention as a result of a recent increase in the city’s population, along with the city being named as ‘The Coolest City in America’ by media publishing titan Huffington Post, and it plans to host Pope Francis as he visits for the World Meeting of Families this fall. Clearly, the city is buzzing with an energetic flair that is attracting people from all over the world. Yet in spite of this, the city struggles with deep inequality, poverty, a crumbling public education system, and dilapidated neighborhoods. According to the 2013 U.S. Census American Community Survey, Philadelphia ranks as having the highest rate of deep poverty containing of any of the nation’s 10 most populous cities.” The city may be booming, but many of its neighborhoods still face deep systemic troubles. This is where Philly Rising enters the picture.

Philly Rising is a new initiative that was created by the Mayor's Office to address the needs of communities that suffer from quality of life concerns and are plagued with persistent crime. Throughout the past 10 weeks of the Mayor’s Internship program, as a team of eight, we have been entering different neighborhoods as part of Philly Rising’s project of surveying residents to identify their most pressing issues so that they can be served better. Within this paper, we will delve deeper into the project we completed by introducing important background knowledge, presenting our methodology and data, as well as examining our findings. Overall we intend to provide useful recommendations for

the continuation of the project while also proving that to better engage and serve communities, Philly Rising must establish a strong presence in the city.

2. BACKGROUND

A key component of Philly Rising's mission is to establish partnerships with organizations and city residents so that their needs can be met. After establishing partnerships with community organizations and members in the community, Philly Rising then goes to the City agencies to help the community members have their concerns addressed through a sustainable, responsive, and cost-effective solution. Philly Rising's use for the surveying project we were assigned was to figure out the needs of the Philadelphia neighborhoods by finding out the neighborhood's degree of community involvement and rate of crime. With that data, Philly Rising intends to serve those neighborhoods more efficiently and effectively. Based on a neighborhood's rate of crime and community involvement Philly Rising will put them in a category on whether or not it is a strong neighborhood, responsive neighborhood, vulnerable neighborhood, or an alienated neighborhood. The following chart explains those above-mentioned terms:

The surveys we distributed are used to measure the community involvement and crime in that particular neighborhood and define its measure as high or low.
In strong neighborhoods that have high community involvement and low crime, Philly Rising would like to maintain the low crime and high quality of life in these neighborhoods. Responsive neighborhoods have high community involvement and high crime, and in these types of neighborhoods Philly Rising would use the high community involvement to gradually reduce crime over time. Vulnerable neighborhoods have low community involvement and low crime, and in these neighborhoods Philly Rising would work to increase community involvement to keep the level of crime low. Alienated neighborhoods have high crime and low community involvement, which Philly Rising would work to raise community involvement as well use other strategies to reduce the crime.

Philly Rising has a responsive approach to the neighborhood's problems by notifying the community members about resources that are available to them and how to access them in their neighborhood. Philly Rising is also cost-efficient because they do not add more funding to neighborhoods, but uses already existing resources and re-prioritizes them to make them more efficient for that particular neighborhood.

There are nineteen Philadelphia neighborhoods under Philly Rising. We have surveyed many neighborhoods, for example some of those neighborhoods were Kensington, Kingsessing, and Point Breeze. To provide a snapshot of those neighborhoods, data and statistics from Philadelphia police district websites have been used as sources of information. One neighborhood in the northern part of the city that we worked in called Kensington has a population of 5,867 with 42% of households earning

less than $15,000 per year. In contrast, the neighborhood of Kingsessing in the Southwest section of the city, has a population of 7,744 with a demographic of 2% White, 98% African American, and 0.41% Latino, also having 30% of household income earning less than $15,000 per year. Lastly, the neighborhood of Point Breeze in South Philadelphia has a population of 5,295 with 31% of households earning less than $15,000 per year. Although Kensington, Kingsessing, and Point Breeze are just a few of the neighborhoods we visited, their demographic data illustrates the characteristics of the neighborhoods that Philly Rising serves.

3. METHODOLOGY

The Neighborhood Satisfaction Survey was a face-to-face survey given over eight consecutive Fridays (From June 1st-July 24, 2015) in eight high-risk neighborhoods across the City of Philadelphia. Philly Rising identified these neighborhoods based on their high crime levels, high need of city services, and high level of poverty in the community. To conduct the surveys, we set up tables outside active community service facilities operating in the neighborhoods that Philly Rising had a partnership with (for example, local recreational centers or police stations). Most days we placed our survey tables at two different locations within the same police district to try to get as many participants from the neighborhood as possible. We then asked locals to fill out our community survey. In Kensington, however, as a group we went door to door and administered surveys with members of the community who could translate if needed, due to that particular neighborhood's high population of Spanish speakers. The first thing we did on all of our survey days was explained to people what Philly Rising is and what the

purpose of the survey. We used incentives to motivate individuals to complete our surveys. The incentives included candy, water ice and Philadelphia Soul tickets.

To reach as many people as we possibly could in each community, and to conduct the survey as quickly and efficiently as possible, our team used resources from organizations that were already operating in each of the neighborhoods that we visited; we also chose these organizations as the primary sites at which to set up our tables and conduct our surveys. These organizations/sites included: The Cecil B. Moore Library (Central police district), MLK Recreation Center (Central police district), Public Assistance Office (East police district), Goodlands of Kensington Festival with the 24th police district, Widener Library (Central police district), Lawn crest Library (Northeast division), Arrot Transportation Center (Northeast police division), Dixon House (South police division), 17th police district (South police district), United Community/Houston Center (South police district), Hawthorne Cultural Center (South police district), Common Place (Southeast police district), and the 12th police district. The resources used included, tables, chairs, and tents. Furthermore, John's Water Ice also donated water ice for us to use as incentives for individuals who filled out our surveys. To assist those who were physically unable to complete our surveys due to medical purposes (Arthritis of the hand, or poor vision without glasses) we would read the survey questions to them, and write down their responses. This method was used to obtain the input of those who were unable to complete the survey on their own, but still wanted their opinions to be heard.

To get an exact picture of the state of the community we decided to ask questions that required our participants to respond to our quality of life section of the survey by rating their experiences and situations related to their community from excellent to

poor. To assess our respondents' ability to take on leadership roles in responding to negative situations in their community, we asked them to respond to “Yes or No” questions that asked about their reactions in certain situations. To assess our participant’s views on the equitable allocation of resources that their community receives compared to other communities in Philadelphia, and to what degree of attention that they feel their neighborhood receives from the city, we asked the participants to rate our related questions from strongly agree to strongly disagree. To assess our participants' involvement in their community, we asked them to respond “Yes or No” to questions that asked if they did specific activities in their communities. To assess the level of safety in the participants' community, we asked them to rate how safe they felt in different locations in their communities at certain times of the day, including their homes. To finish the survey we assessed their knowledge of “Philly Rising Collaborative”. To assess their views of what they believe needs to be changed in their communities we asked them open-ended questions about what they liked and disliked about their communities. The last part of the survey asked the participant demographic questions along with their employment status, their transportation methods and if they rent or own their homes.

4. RESULTS

Police District Demographics

*All demographic information is reported in accordance with the self-identification and opinions of our survey respondents

- Average age Citywide is 35-44; Northeast is the oldest district, with an average of 45-64; Central is the youngest district, with an average of 18-34
- Average years in respondents' respective neighborhoods Citywide is 5-20; Southwest has the most deeply rooted residents, with average length of 10-20 years in the neighborhood; East has the least rooted residents, with average length of 0-10 years in the neighborhood
- 30% of all respondents have lived in the city for 0-5 years; 22% of respondents for 20+ years; 21% of respondents for 10-20 years; 17% of respondents for 5-10 years; East district is most represented, accounting for 37% of all respondents; Northwest is least represented, accounting for only 5% of all respondents
- Male respondents are the majority, accounting for 53% of all respondents; East District is the most represented, claiming 37% of all respondents; and Northwest is the least represented, with only 5% of all respondents
- Black/African American is the most prominent racial/ethnic classification, accounting for 51% of all respondents; followed by Hispanic/Latino, at 23%; White/Caucasian, at 15%; Asian/Indian, at 1%; and Other, at 1%
- African Americans are most prominent among each district; the most racially mixed district is Southwest (Black/AA [40%], Hispanic/Latino [28%], White [24%], Other [4%]); while the least racially diverse district is Northwest (Black/AA [73%], Hispanic/Latino [6%], White [6%])
- The majority of respondents are renters (62%), while owners (35%) comprise the minority; South district comprises the largest percentage of renters (73%) while Northeast comprises the largest percentage of owners (55%), per any single district

· Individuals holding full-time jobs (38%) comprised the greatest percentage of respondents, while the next largest percentage of respondents designated themselves as other (20%) ("Stopped Looking/Disabled"), followed by unemployed (19%), working part-time (12%), and lastly, students (5%)

On Perceptions of Government Responsiveness

The majority of respondents are divided on the City's level of perceived responsiveness to citizen issues, with 31% reporting that they "Somewhat Agree" that City government is responsive and 31% reporting that they "Somewhat Disagree" that City government is responsive. However, 22% of respondents report that they "Strongly Disagree" that the City is responsive, whereas only 12% report that they "Strongly Agree" that the City is responsive.

South district expressed the largest level of satisfaction with responsiveness of City government, with 52% of respondents reporting that they either "Strongly Agree" (16%) or "Somewhat Agree" (36%) that City government is responsive to citizen issues. East district expressed the most significant level of dissatisfaction with the responsiveness of City government, with 57% of respondents reporting that they either "Somewhat Disagree" (34%) or "Strongly Disagree" (23%) that City government is responsive to citizen issues.

On Perceptions of the Quality of Police Interaction/Services

The majority of respondents (57%) reported that they either "Strongly Agree" (19%) or "Somewhat Agree" (38%) that police are respectful to people in their respective neighborhoods. However, a large minority (40%) reported that they either "Somewhat

Disagree” (22%) or “Strongly Disagree” (17%) that police are respectful to people in their respective neighborhoods.

South district reported the highest level of satisfaction with police respect and 66% of district respondents reported they either “Strongly Agree” (27%) or “Somewhat Agree” (39%) that police are respectful. Meanwhile, Central district reported the highest level of dissatisfaction with police respect; 48% of district respondents reported they either “Somewhat Disagree” (29%) or “Strongly Disagree” (19%) that police are respectful to people in their respective neighborhoods.

The majority of respondents (55%) believe that police do prevent crime in their respective neighborhoods, reporting that they either “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree” with this assertion, while a sizeable minority (42%), reported that they either “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” with this assertion.
Respondents from Southwest district reported the highest level of satisfaction with crime prevention, with 74% of respondents expressing positive opinions; of whom some replied that they “Strongly Agree” (24%) while most “Somewhat Agree” (47%) with this assertion. Meanwhile, East district respondents reported being most dissatisfied, and 52% of survey takers reported that they either “Somewhat Disagree” (30%) or “Strongly Disagree” (22%) with this assertion.

The majority of respondents (57%) recorded their views of police services within their respective communities as either “Fair” (31%) or “Poor” (26%); while a sizeable minority (42%) reported feeling as thought police services within their respective communities was either “Good” (26%) or “Excellent” (16%).

Northwest district respondents reported being most satisfied with police services; 60% of survey takers reported feeling as though police services were either “Excellent” (7%) or “Good” (53%). Meanwhile, East district respondents were the least satisfied with police services; 61% of survey takers reporting feeling as though police services were either “Fair” (32%) or “Poor” (29%). Northwest District as a Case Study.

Respondents from Northwest district were least likely to rate their neighborhood experience positively, with only 20% of Northwest residents describing their quality of life as “Excellent” or “Good.” Central district had the next lowest rate of respondents rating their quality of life as “Excellent” or “Good,” at 26%, and the overall rate was 27%. Northwest residents were least or second-to-least likely to report having talked to neighbors (73%), used neighborhood recreation centers (1%), attended a community event (4%), or volunteered in their neighborhood (2%) within the last year.

Northwest district also had the lowest percentage of respondents rating street repair and maintenance as “Excellent” or “Good” (20%). Northeast and Southwest districts had the next lowest percentage of respondents describing street repair and maintenance as “Excellent” or “Good” (29%), and the overall rate was 30%. Northwest district had the lowest number of respondents describing trash collection and recycling services in their area as “Excellent” or “Good” (26%), while Northeast district had the second lowest number in this category at 43%. The overall percentage of respondents describing trash and recycling services in their neighborhood as “Excellent” or “Good” was 47%.

Northwest district also had the lowest or second lowest rate of residents reporting feeling safe in their neighborhood during the day (53%), in their neighborhood after dark (27%), in city parks during the day (73%), and in city parks after dark (27%).

5. DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(1.1) On Correlation between police services and race/ethnicity the East district, which encompasses 38% of all Black/African American respondents and is majority (53%) Black/African American reported being least satisfied with police services. This correlation aligns with contemporary attitudes – particularly those held among urbanites of color – that law enforcement needs to do a better job of connecting to and establishing relationships within the communities they serve. However, we must note that Northwest, the least racially diverse district in terms of respondents – 73% of whom are Black/African American - was most likely to rank law enforcement as “Excellent” or “Good” and 60% of survey takers gave law enforcement services a positive mark. We should also note that this was the only district in which the majority of residents approved of police services.

It’s difficult to suggest there’s any meaningful correlation between race/ethnicity and respondents’ satisfaction with police services. This outcome out of keeping with what we expected to find within Philadelphia’s inner-city neighborhoods; specifically, we looked for a positive correlation between minority communities and dissatisfaction with police services.

Recommendation: Philly Rising should better facilitate the establishment and maintenance of community-police relationships among all served communities, but particularly with its Black/African American partners and service recipients.

(1.2) On Correlation between police services and employment

Northeast district respondents claimed the highest rate of employment among respondents (58%) and only ranked police services as “Excellent” or “Good” at a 45% rate; both Northwest and Southwest ranked police services more favorably, at 60% and 47% approval, respectively. While Southwest respondents claimed the second highest rate of employment among survey takers (55%), Northwest notched the second-lowest rate of employment among respondents (40%). We must note that employment status isn’t necessarily indicative of wealth or income, factors which also largely determine social inequity.

It’s difficult to suggest there’s any meaningful correlation between employment status and respondents’ satisfaction with police services. This outcome is out of keeping with what we expected to find; specifically, that employment among communities would correlate with higher satisfaction with police services.

Recommendation: Philly Rising should collect data on income during future surveys, making sure an effort is made to link degrees of socioeconomic inequity with satisfaction with law enforcement services.

(1.3) On Correlation between crime prevention and race/ethnicity

Southwest district respondents claimed the highest rate of perceived crime prevention among respondents, with 71% reporting they either “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree” that police prevent crimes in their neighborhood. Southwest district,

according to respondents' self-identification, is also the most racially diverse district. East district claimed the lowest rate of perceived crime prevention among residents, with 58% reporting they either "Somewhat Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" that police prevent crimes in their neighborhoods. More than 1/3 (38%) of all Black/African American survey takers reported residing within the East district, and the district itself is 53% Black/African American. Northwest district, however, reported the second highest rate of satisfaction with crime prevention – 60% reporting that they either "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" that police prevent crimes in their neighborhood – and logged the highest rate of Black/African American respondents by percentage, at 73%.

It's difficult to suggest there's any meaningful correlation between race/ethnicity and respondents' satisfaction with law enforcement crime prevention. We had no preconceived outcome for this metric.

(1.4) On Correlation between crime prevention and employment

Southwest respondents claimed the highest rate of perceived crime prevention among survey takers, and reported a 55% rate of employment, the second highest among districts. East district respondents reported the lowest rate of perceived crime prevention, with only 42% reporting they either "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" that police prevent crimes in their neighborhood. Respondents from East also reported the lowest level of employment, at 35%. When we examine the district with the next lowest level of employment, Northwest, we notice respondents claimed the second highest rate of satisfaction with crime prevention. Moreover, Northeast district had the highest level of employment, at 58%, and reported in the middle of the pack in terms of satisfaction with crime prevention, with 55% of respondents reporting satisfaction with police efforts. We

must note that employment status isn't necessarily indicative of wealth or income, factors which also largely determine social inequity.

It's difficult to suggest there's any meaningful correlation between employment status and respondents' satisfaction with law enforcement crime prevention. This is out of keeping with our expected outcome; specifically, that employment within communities would correlate positively with crime prevention.

(1.5) On Correlation between police conduct (respect) and race/ethnicity

Respondents from three districts (Southwest, South, Northwest), reported significant approval of police conduct; with over 60% of respondents from all three districts recording that they either "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" that police are respectful. Two districts (East and Northeast) reported majority approval, with 54% and 58% of respondents, respectively, recording that they either "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" that police are respectful. Central respondents were the only survey takers to report majority disapproval of police, with 52% reporting they either "Somewhat Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" that police are respectful.

Central district respondents were mixed in racial/ethnic composition; survey takers self-identified as 48% Black/African American, 29% Hispanic/Latino, and 13% White. Northwest and South districts, both of which reported 67% approval of police conduct, are the two largest majority Black/African American districts, with 73% and 58% of respondents, respectively, identifying as Black/African American.

It's difficult to suggest there's any meaningful correlation between race/ethnicity and respondents' satisfaction with police conduct. This holds particularly true for majority

black communities, in which we expected to see a positive correlation between race/ethnicity and dissatisfaction with police conduct.

(1.6) On Correlation between police conduct (respect) and employment

Respondents from the Northeast district recorded the highest rate of employment (58%), but the third lowest rate of police conduct approval (58%). East district respondents recorded the lowest rate of employment (35%), and came in just under Northeast on police conduct approval (54%). Central district, whose respondents recorded the lowest level of police conduct approval, notched the third highest level of employment, at 52% of survey takers. We must note that employment status isn't necessarily indicative of wealth or income, factors which also largely determine social inequity.

It's difficult to suggest there's any meaningful correlation between employment status and residents' satisfaction with police conduct. This holds particularly true for low-employment communities, in which we expected to see a positive correlation between employment and satisfaction with police conduct.

(1.7) On Correlation between perceptions of police and propensity to volunteer

While Northeast district residents reported the strongest propensity to volunteer, at 68%, only 45% of survey takers reported that police services were either "Excellent" or "Good" but the majority of Northeast respondents, however, reported that they either "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" that police are respectful (58%) and prevent crime (55%) within their neighborhood. Northwest respondents were least likely to have volunteered, with only 40% of survey takers giving this question the nod. Respondents from this district, however, approved of police services at a 60% rate - the highest of

among all districts. They also approved of crime-prevention efforts at the same rate, second only to one district; and landed in the middle of the pack, at 58% approval, on opinions of police conduct.

It's difficult to suggest there's any meaningful correlation between perceptions of police services and residents' propensity to volunteer within their communities. We expected to see a positive correlation between well-perceived policing and individuals' propensity for community service.

Recommendation: Philly Rising needs to further gauge communities to identify both internal and external variables that increase communities' propensity to participate in volunteer and service initiatives.

(1.8) On Correlation between employment status and propensity to volunteer

The majority of Northeast residents (58%) – who reported at the highest rate (68%) that they've volunteered - are employed full- or part-time. Northeast respondents reported the lowest unemployment rate of all districts surveyed, at 6%, and accounted for only 4% of all unemployed respondents. Northwest, the district least likely to have volunteered, with only 40% giving this question the nod, reported unemployment at a 60% rate, second only to East district respondents. Moreover, only 57% of East district respondents reported that they've volunteered within their neighborhood; one of the lowest rates, second only to Northeast.

It's reasonable to suggest there's some correlation between employment rates and residents' propensity to volunteer within their communities. We must also point out, that a healthy majority of respondents have volunteered or actively volunteer within their

communities. With the exception of Northwest, which is somewhat of an outlier, the median rate of respondents who engage in community service is 58%.

Recommendation: Philly Rising might achieve greater success collaborating with employed community leaders, and targeting pockets of employment within neighborhoods for grassroots organization. Also, future survey initiatives should distinguish between past volunteer experience and active volunteer experience. This distinction might enhance Philly Rising's ability to identify community members with whom to work.

(1.9) On Correlation between duration of residency and propensity to volunteer

The majority of Northeast respondents (51%) have lived in the community for at least ten years; more importantly, 32% of residents (the second highest rate of all districts) have lived there for 20+ years. In contrast, only 13% of Northwest district respondents – who reported the lowest propensity for volunteering – have been in the community for 20+ years. Southwest has the highest rate of 20+ year residents (42%) and claims the second highest propensity to volunteer, with 59% of respondents reporting that they've volunteered. Moreover, East district claimed the lowest rate of resident longevity, with 61% of respondents having lived there for 10 years or fewer, as well as the second lowest rate of community service participation, with only 57% of respondents reporting they've volunteered in their neighborhood.

It's reasonable to suggest there's some correlation between community service-inclined districts and average longevity of residents. This outcome is aligned with our expectation to see a positive correlation between deeply rooted residents and level of local community service.

Recommendation: Philly Rising should make an effort to work specifically with long-time residents – those who've lived in the neighborhood for 20+ years – on community organizing and grassroots initiatives.

(1.10) On Correlation between age and propensity to volunteer

Northeast district respondents recorded the highest mean age (4.8 on a 6-point scale), with the average resident categorizing themselves as being between the ages of 45 and 64. District respondents also reported a record of community service at 68%, a higher rate than any other, suggesting that older residents are more open-minded to community service and related initiatives. However, we must point out that Central district survey takers recorded the youngest mean age (1.86 on a 6-point scale), with the average resident categorizing themselves as being between the ages of 18 and 34, while being the third most likely group of individuals to have volunteered – 58% reported having participated in community service. Northwest claims the lowest rate of community service, and is largely young adult aged (2.8 on a 6-point scale), with 61% of respondents falling between the ages of 25-44. This suggests that perhaps the young adult and early middle age years mark a low point in one's propensity to volunteer.

It's difficult to suggest there's a significant correlation between respondents' age groups and their propensity to volunteer. We had no preconceived outcome for this metric but are slightly surprised by our insignificant outcome.

(1.11) On Correlation between safety and propensity to volunteer

Respondents from Central district reported feeling safest in their neighborhoods, with 77% stating they either "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" that residents feel safe in their neighborhoods during the day. The district also recorded the third highest

propensity for volunteering, second to Southwest, within a single percentage point. Southwest district respondents reported feeling nearly as safe within their neighborhoods, with 75% stating they either “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree” that residents feel safe in their neighborhoods during the day. Residents from Northeast district, who reported the highest propensity to volunteer, felt similarly safe in their neighborhoods, with 71% stating they either “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree” that residents feel safe during the day. In the Northwest, where respondents reported feeling the least safe, only 53% reported feeling safe in their neighborhoods during the day. Northwest residents were least likely to engage in volunteering, with only 40% reporting that they’ve volunteered

We can comfortably determine that neighborhood safety does correlate with the propensity to volunteer among residents. This finding is aligned with our expectation at the onset; specifically, that safety within neighborhoods is paramount to the ability of residents to engage in community service.

Recommendation: Philly Rising should conduct outreach to determine variables that contribute to feelings of insecurity and vulnerability within these communities, as well as tactics that can be used to combat these feelings. This outreach would have the potential to increase the likelihood that residents would feel safe and volunteer within their communities.

(1.12) On Correlation between sense of community and propensity to volunteer

Respondents from East district reported feeling the greatest sense of community, with 56% of survey takers reporting they either “Strongly Agree” or “Somewhat Agree” that residents’ neighborhoods have a strong sense of community. These individuals,

however, were the second least likely to have performed community service, with 57% reporting that they've volunteered. Respondents from the Northwest district reported the weakest feelings of community, with only 40% revealing they either "Strongly Agree" or "Somewhat Agree" on their sense of strong community. These individuals also reported the weakest propensity for volunteering, with only 40% reporting they've volunteered. Moreover, Northeast, the community that reported the highest level of community service engagement, at 68%, had a relatively strong sense of community; 52% of respondents agreed that there's a sense of community, second only to East district.

We can say with some measure of confidence that a loose correlation exists between respondents' sense of community and his or her propensity to volunteer. This outcome is aligned with our expectation; specifically, we did expect to see some measure of positive correlation between the strength of local relationships and local participation in community service.

Recommendation: Philly Rising should do a better job of determining what the elements of "community" are; as well as how these elements can be used as levers to catalyze future community engagement and grassroots initiatives.

(1.13) On Correlation between home ownership and propensity to volunteer

Respondents from Northeast reported the highest rate of home ownership, at 55%, and were the most likely to volunteer within their neighborhoods. Upon further examination, we see that home ownership rates correlate nicely with propensity to volunteer within the neighborhood. Respondents from Southwest district reported the second highest home ownership rate, at 43%, and were the second most likely to have volunteered within their communities. Respondents from South district reported the

lowest home ownership rate, at only 28%, and were tied for second least likely to have volunteer within their community.

We can confidently report that a significant level of correlation exists between home ownership and propensity to volunteer within the neighborhood. This outcome is aligned with our expectation; that significant financial investment in the community (i.e. home and property ownership) will incentivize service.

Recommendation: Philly Rising should seek to engage homeowners in order to establish a more dependable cohort of grassroots volunteers. The agency should conduct outreach that specifically targets these individuals, gauges their interest in community outreach, and encourages them to get involved in service initiatives.

The responses collected in Northwest district are of special interest because residents in that area were considerably less likely to rate their quality of life as "Excellent" or "Good" than residents of other districts. Looking at other questions that Northwest residents were more likely to answer negatively, we hoped to determine some potential causal factors behind a district's self-reported level of quality of life.

Answers collected in the Northwest more or less matched answers collected in other police districts except for in three categories: questions about community engagement (i.e. talking to neighbors, participating in community events, using neighborhood recreation centers, etc.), questions about feelings of safety (i.e. in the neighborhood at day or after dark, in city parks at day or after dark), and questions about public services (i.e. street repair/maintenance and trash collection). Northwest residents were considerably less likely to report being engaged in their community; feel safe in

their neighborhood; or be satisfied with public services, especially those (streets and trash) affecting the physical appearance of the neighborhood.

While these findings are not statistically significant, they do provide anecdotal evidence that community engagement, feelings of safety, and physical appearance of a neighborhood are major factors in determining the likelihood that a resident would rate their quality of life as “Excellent” or “Good.”

Responses from all respondents also suggest that these are major concerns. 49% of answers to the question “What do you like least about your neighborhood?” included mentions of safety or crime, 20% mentioned the cleanliness of the neighborhood, and 8% mentioned a lack of community.

Recommendation: Philly Rising should seek to organize and promote events that gather residents together to work on improving the physical appearance of their neighborhood. These could include litter pick up days or similar events that would simultaneously improve the physical appearance of a given neighborhood and build community by connecting neighbors with one another. By addressing a possible lack of community and the cleanliness of the neighborhood, this type of event could also help make residents feel safer in their neighborhood.

6. SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our experience as a group administering the surveys, we have come up with a number of recommendations. Our recommendation to Philly Rising is that data on income should be collected during future surveys and that an effort must be made to link degrees of socioeconomic inequity with satisfaction with law enforcement services.

We recommend that Philly Rising facilitate the establishment and maintenance of community-police relationships among all served communities, but particularly with its Black/AA community partners and service recipients.

We recommend that Philly Rising make an effort to work specifically with long-time residents – those who've lived there for 20 or more years – on community organizing and grassroots initiatives.

We recommend that Philly Rising might achieve greater success/investment in collaborating with employed community leaders, targeting pockets of employment within neighborhoods for grassroots organization.

Recommendations for Methodology

We have come up with a number of recommendations for the methodology of the neighborhood satisfaction survey as well. The first recommendation, which was addressed after the second week of administering the surveys, is to shorten the length of the survey. The original survey was three pages long and took about 10-15 minutes for respondents to fill out. The updated survey was shortened to the front and back of one paper. Respondents answered this form of the survey much faster, and were more willing to give time out of their day.

The second recommendation would be to find more effective ways to get specific testimonials from respondents related directly to issues they face on a daily basis in their neighborhood. For example the only two open-ended questions on the survey asked "what one thing do you like most about living in your neighborhood," and "what one

thing do you like least about living in your neighborhood." The two above questions provided general information about respondent's feelings toward their neighborhood, but did not serve to elaborate on the specific issues that were being asked in other sections of the survey. One example to be more effective would be to add an open-ended response after the section that asks respondents to rate the cleanliness of their neighborhood, affordable housing opportunities, and employment opportunities. Doing this would provide specific testimonials on the issues that are being asked for each question, and help add validity to the quantitative data.

The third recommendation is to consider the best method to administer the survey to respondents. As a group we found the most effective way was to incentivize respondents, but not all incentives were effective. We initially started without any incentives, but quickly realized that we were not going to be successful if we didn't provide anything to motivate respondents to take the survey. After using candy and Philadelphia Soul tickets to varying levels of success we found an incentive that appealed to everyone, water ice.

As a group we also spent one day canvassing door to door in Kensington. There were pros and cons to this that should be mentioned when considering methodology related to administering the survey. The pros were that we partnered with a church and went to door to do with people who lived in the neighborhood and were capable of translating if necessary. The cons were time of day (2pm on a Friday) and not many people were home.

Our final recommendation is to continue getting the name of Philly Rising out in the communities. It was evident from our surveys that Philly Rising is not a very well

known department. We think that it's very important for Philly Rising to promote self-knowledge in communities until it has a stronger presence. The goal is that as more people are familiar with Philly Rising, they will also be more likely to improve their neighborhood without extra outside help.

7. CONCLUSION

It's tough to say if there's a link between either race or employment and overall satisfaction with performance of and interaction with law enforcement. We can say confidently however, that people feel respected by law enforcement personnel in their neighborhoods and that the majority of people feel as though police are preventing crimes. However, there's overall disapproval in terms of satisfaction with law enforcement services among the individuals surveyed, and we can only speculate as to what this means. Perhaps these individuals feel as though law enforcement should be more pervasive, services should be more robust, etc. A follow-up survey, honing in on the issue, will need to be administered before we're able to generate a definitive conclusion.

We can, however, suggest with some confidence (given our sample size and other limiting factors), that links do exist between independent variables: residents' sense of community, ownership of home/property, perception of neighborhood safety, length of residency, status of employment; and our dependent variable: residents' propensity to volunteer within their respective neighborhoods. However, we're unable to exceed the certainty that purely empirical correlations grant us; that is, we cannot assert statistical significance. In the future, Philly Rising will need to implement recommendations herein to achieve greater objective certainty. Moreover, follow up surveys, honing in on the

issues, will need to be administered, and Philly Rising will need to access a larger sample size. Overall we believe that for Philly Rising to be as effective as possible, they must establish a strong presence in the communities it visits by publicizing its name more and having more popular incentives such as water ice in the summer or giveaways like free book bags with the Philly Rising logo.