

VERA INSTITUTE
LIBRARY

1075

Final Report
of the
Opinion Research Project
submitted to
The Fund for the City of New York

The Vera Institute of Justice
30 East 39th Street
New York, New York 10017

June 29, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| I. Summary | 1 |
| Findings | 2 |
| Conclusions | 3 |
| Recommendations | 4 |
| II. Project Design | 8 |
| Project Personnel | 8 |
| Development of Project Design | 8 |
| Housing | 13 |
| Police and Narcotics | 17 |
| Health and Education | 19 |
| III. Findings in Detail | 21 |
| General | 21 |
| Housing | 23 |
| Police Services and Neighborhood Safety | 25 |
| Narcotics | 27 |
| Education | 30 |
| Health | 34 |
| Priorities Among City Services | 36 |
| IV. Project Impact | 38 |
| V. Budget Report | 40 |

I. Summary

On May 1, 1969, the Vera Institute of Justice received a grant of \$75,000 from the Fund for the City of New York to conduct a pilot project to test the feasibility of establishing a survey research center. The idea of a survey research center originated in the Bureau of the Budget, where the center was conceived as a means of providing Budget Bureau analysts and other City administrators with a tool to measure the impact of City programs as well as citizen receptivity to proposed programs.

Three pilot surveys were designed in cooperation with City administrators, primarily program analysts in the Budget Bureau. A housing questionnaire, administered by Louis Harris and Associates attempted to determine attitudes towards rent control and new patterns of ownership, among 400 tenants in transition neighborhoods in New York City. Two other surveys, one on crime and one on health and education, were administered by Opinion Research Corporation. The crime survey explored attitudes towards police service and narcotics usage and treatment among 300 residents of Bay Ridge and 300 residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant. The health and education survey explored usage of health facilities and attitudes towards public education among 300 residents of Tremont.

A. Findings

In several ways, the pilot project demonstrated that survey research can be used as a tool for gathering relevant data on a range of issues with which the city is concerned. First, the studies gathered facts in areas where only subjective and impressionistic information had been available before. In some cases data substantiated hypotheses, but in other cases unexpected results produced substantial revisions of assumptions made by city planners. Second, the pilot project established the value of using survey data as one component in the process of decision-making by program planners. Finally, the people surveyed expressed approval that the city was seeking their input about programs and policies which affect their lives.

The pilot project indicated that a variety of types of data can be generated by survey research. City personnel who participated in the project identified three types of data produced by the pilot surveys: information useful in making decisions about city policies and establishing priorities among programs; data relevant to the planning, implementation and evaluation of particular programs; and background information helpful in filling in gaps in knowledge, but without immediate decision-making relevance. Participation in the pilot project expanded city staffs' ability to think in new categories about program planning

and decision-making, and increased their sophistication about survey research as an aid to program planning. Both policy and program-related data were considered more useful than background information. Subsequent to the completion of the pilot surveys, planners have suggested that survey research may be used to achieve other objectives such as: (1) issue canvassing as a means of expressing governmental interest in the problems which concern private citizens; (2) market research to gauge the receptivity and/or resistance of the principal "consumers" of certain city services; and (3) public interviews as a mechanism to educate citizens to the city resources and programs.

The pilot project generated heavy demand for more surveys. Specific requests for seven studies at a roughly estimated total cost of \$400,000 have been received from a range of City agencies. Of these, there were requests concerning policy decisions in the area of rent control and open enrollment in city colleges; others sought specific program data regarding housing for hospital workers, objective measures of city cleanliness, and two neighborhood evaluations of City services; and one request was for background data on the motivations of sanitation workers.

B. Conclusions

From the findings, several conclusions about the pilot project can be drawn:

1. It is possible to use survey research as a tool for gathering accurate, objective data, such as perceptions of and experiences with city conditions and policies that directly affect the public.
2. City administrators are using the data gathered by this project in a variety of ways. The degree of usefulness appears to be related to (a) the amount of cooperation between City staff and survey experts in planning a survey; (b) clarity about the purposes and uses of survey research; and (c) the types of survey techniques used.
3. There is both the need and demand for New York City to expand its capacity to plan and execute further survey research.

C. Recommendations

Suggestions for the continuation of program related survey research can be divided into two areas, procedural and structural.

Crucial to the long range success of policy and program research is the development of a process which will assure consistent production of useful data. Perhaps the greatest success of this project has been the formulation of the components in such a process. First, those in City government who plan and implement programs must be educated by survey research experts to articulate data needs, to identify data sources, and to understand research techniques. Second, City program planners and implementers must select the general topics, target geographic areas and types of population samples on which they wish to focus.

After a general topic has been selected, survey research experts must take the initiative in soliciting from City personnel those issues or problems within the topic which are of particular concern to City staff. Researchers must also take a reading in the community of issues which are of special concern to the target population. This can be done cursorily through reports from City personnel or extensively through open-ended preliminary surveying of the community. The more thoroughly it is done, the greater the possibility that the final survey will provide a valid product. Finally, the survey experts must assume responsibility for conducting background research regarding other surveys conducted in the topic area to prevent duplications of effort.

When all this information has been collected, the survey content can be outlined in detail, through a joint effort of City personnel and survey experts. The content should cover issues of concern to City agencies, and issues of concern to the target population, but over which the City staff involved can have some practical influence. Where possible, planners and implementers should attempt to establish other objective data and measurements which are available through standard descriptive records kept by City agencies and which can be compared with the survey data.

This entire process will provide data which are directly relevant to program planning and evaluation decisions,

however, some components in the process will yield usable data alone. Use of City government and community issue canvassing will help City administrators define priorities. Preliminary open-ended community surveys alone will merely provide background information to City agencies with little effect on decision-making.

These procedural suggestions to a large extent dictate the structure for conducting survey research which would be most efficient.

In view of these considerations, it is recommended that a staff unit of survey experts be created in the Bureau of the Budget to coordinate research which would be contracted to survey firms for the field work and tabulating. This arrangement would permit testing of the procedural recommendations outlined above without requiring extensive commitments for separate institutional arrangements at this time.

Ultimately, the users of opinion research for program planning must be the ones to decide how to carry on further survey research. This project has pointed up, however, factors which should influence the decision and several alternative structures were considered--a continuation of the present project arrangement, an independent ORC, and the BoB unit. At this time, the volume of requests for further surveys is sufficient to warrant continued use of this tool. It is not great enough to support the development of a separate center coordinating and conducting survey research to service

the entire City government. As more City planners become educated to the uses and advantages of survey research, the volume of requests, the volume of requests may increase sufficiently to justify the creation of a formal opinion research center. But we cannot recommend this at this time.

The pilot project demonstrated that close coordination between contracting survey firms and City planners is important in focusing surveys on the most relevant information. In order to achieve this kind of coordination, the staff directly responsible for managing survey research projects must have a thorough knowledge of the issues concerning City planners in BoB and other agencies. Thus coordination would best be achieved if project managers knowledgeable about both City programs of survey research were employed by the City. Placement of survey experts within the BoB with its budgetary overview of City agencies would have a positive effect on the speed and efficiency with which surveys could be conducted.

II. Project Design

The purpose of this study was to explore the feasibility of establishing a survey research center to serve City government. The project examined these questions:

1. Can surveys gather data about the public's perceptions of and experiences with New York City's programs and policies?
2. If such data can be collected, which types do City administrators make use of and how do they use it?

A. Project Personnel

Vera hired a project director to design the project, coordinate the concerned parties, and to supervise the drafting, administration, and analysis of surveys. In addition, a summer intern spent two months working on background research and administrative details.

B. Development of Project Design

Opinion Research Corporation, a research firm in Princeton, New Jersey conducted a survey among New York City patrolmen for the Vera Institute of Justice and the New York City Police Department in August 1968. Vera was therefore familiar with the firm and contacted it concerning the survey research project.

Opinion Research Corporation submitted a research proposal to Vera in April 1969. The proposal suggested doing one large-scale survey of New York City residents and

one or two very small-scale surveys among subgroups of the population.

The large-scale survey, which would have sampled 1,000 residents in five boroughs, was intended to provide a benchmark study against which to plot future changes in citizens' attitudes, city conditions, and public programs. ~~It would also have~~ permitted comparisons between the general climate of opinion in New York City regarding various issues, and that in other cities or the nation as a whole. However, a number of opinion surveys had already been conducted in New York City and other urban areas, and it was not clear that much more was to be learned from another city-wide survey.

In May the idea of one large-scale survey was rejected in favor of three or four medium size studies among 300 to 400 respondents in specific areas of the city. This provided an opportunity for diversity and experimentation not available from a single city-wide survey. The neighborhood surveys offered an opportunity to assess not merely raw opinions but: (a) perceptions of and experiences with conditions in definable neighborhoods; and (b) evaluations of the quality of specific schools, hospitals, and other city services.

At the beginning of June, program planners in the Bureau of the Budget prepared draft questions on the topics of health, crime, education, housing, and anti-poverty

programs. Since the areas of health and crime were of interest to both Vera and the Budget Bureau, these topics were chosen for two of the surveys. The Budget Bureau chose education and housing as topics for the other surveys.

As planning progressed, Vera investigated various survey research firms, with the intention of dividing the contract between two firms. Final contracts were awarded to Opinion Research Corporation and Louis Harris and Associates, on the basis of their innovative research proposals and experience in conducting surveys on social issues among low-income populations. Each firm was responsible for the design of questionnaires, administration of field work, tabulation of data, analysis of results, and presentation of a final report.

Opinion Research Corporation received a contract on July 10, 1969 to conduct three surveys in three geographic areas of New York City. Each survey was to explore a different subject among 300 different respondents. ORD estimated that 12 weeks would be required between the time Vera approved the questionnaire and they delivered the completed report. The cost for the surveys was \$48,000.

Louis Harris and Associates was awarded a contract on August 11, 1969 to conduct one survey, exploring one subject in depth among 400 respondents. The Harris firm estimated that the report would be delivered by October 15, 1969. The cost for this survey was \$12,000.

Primarily the survey questionnaires were developed through the combined efforts of Bureau of the Budget, the subcontractors, and the Vera coordinator. The Harris firm also consulted frequently with planners in the Housing and Development Administration as the housing survey developed. Line agency personnel were not involved in the other surveys; however, members of the school board were consulted during the formulation of the education survey. This was a failing of the project. Although the Bureau of the Budget does represent planning and coordinating structure, it is a supplement to other agencies' planners rather than a substitute. To a large extent, the original enthusiasm and cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget and the difficulty of involving other agencies caused the project coordinator to make less effort in this area than should have been made, given the need for inter-agency cooperation in City government.

In addition to the focus on one main topic in each survey, it was decided to include an identical series of questions exploring satisfaction with various City services in the three surveys conducted by Opinion Research Corporation. While these questions were not intended to gather detailed data, it was hoped that they would be helpful in developing priorities among services, and in comparing the climate of opinion in different neighborhoods of the City.

From the beginning, Vera wanted to make sure that within each topic the questionnaires covered issues which were of concern to the survey populations, as well as issues of concern to Vera and City administrators. Initially, it was thought that this goal could be achieved through topical discussions with representatives of community organizations. Later, however, it was decided that open-ended interviews, individual and group, with randomly selected members of the sample populations would produce less bias in getting a sense of issues important to the populace. Ultimately, given restraints of time and money, input from the target population in formulating the survey was achieved only in the Harris survey. Over twenty open-ended indepth interviews of one hour or more were held in conjunction with administration of the pre-test of the survey questionnaire in order to determine whether there were any major issues related to housing which were not adequately covered by the questionnaire. In addition, two unstructured group discussion sessions were held after the field work was completed, to explore in a group setting people's experiences with housing. It was hoped that these procedures would provide involvement of the sample population in determining the content of the questionnaire, and would allow an informal comparison of results from structured, individual interviewing with results from less structured in depth interviewing of a few randomly selected discussion groups. The cost of these additional procedures was \$2,000.

C. Housing

After preliminary meetings with HDA, agreement was reached among HDA, BoB and Vera to focus the survey on issues of maintenance and upkeep of existing housing, and exploration of alternative types of housing ownership. The Harris representative took the initiative in educating himself as to the implications of these issues by reviewing the research literature on the chosen topics and thoroughly familiarizing himself with city housing programs and policies.

Defining the sample population was crucial in insuring that a small survey of 300-400 respondents would provide useful and possibly generalizable information. Rather than surveying a limited geographic area, as was originally planned, the Harris firm and HDA decided it would be more useful to define a specific subgroup whose housing habits and attitudes were particularly relevant to the questions at issue, and to draw samples of this subgroup from the entire city. The subgroup consisted of residents of lower-middle income neighborhoods in the process of transition from white to non-white populations.

In early October, the questionnaire was pretested. Each interview included an open-ended discussion with the respondent to determine whether there were any major issues related to housing which were not adequately covered by the questionnaire. Only minor revisions in the questionnaire were made as a result of the pretest and the open-ended discussions.

The original Harris contract guaranteed 400 interviews at the initial price, unless substantial delays in the schedule forced operating costs up. By mid-October, the date estimated by the Harris firm for submitting the final report, the final draft of the questionnaire was just about ready for fielding. One reason for the delay was that Vera, HDA, the Budget Bureau, and Louis Harris were all involved in drafting the questionnaire, and, it was often difficult to arrange joint meetings with busy City administrators. Finally, City administrators had to be educated about the use of survey research as an analytic tool, and the Harris representative had to be educated on HDA's information needs. Vera, the Budget Bureau, and HDA felt that cutting the sample of 400 residents back would significantly reduce its usefulness, so an agreement was negotiated to bring the quota up to 400 by paying an additional \$2,000.

Between October 19-27, 30 interviewers conducted 431 interviews for the housing survey. In November, the coding, tabulation and analysis of data took place. In mid-December, Louis Harris and Associates submitted their report--Transition Neighborhoods in New York City: The People's View of Their Housing Environment.

After the report was submitted, the Harris firm arranged for group discussions to be held in accordance with the earlier agreement. The discussions were held during the

third week of December, one in the survey area of upper Manhattan and one in the survey area of Brooklyn. Over 60 contacts were made in order to get 20 commitments to attend a group session, and it was necessary for the Harris firm to pay each respondent \$5 for his time. None of these respondents had taken the questionnaire.

The difficulty in getting participants made it less likely that the groups would constitute a random sample of the survey population. This was borne out by the discussion leaders' impression that the group participants tended to be in the higher income, better educated, more articulate range of the survey sample. The Harris people still believed the attitudes and experiences discussed were consistent with survey results. A more detailed discussion of the group sessions is included in the following summary by the Harris representative:

As is generally the case in group discussion, some members were reticent and difficult to draw into the discussion, while others were more verbally aggressive, tending to dominate the discussion and giving an impression of consensus which did not actually exist.

In general, the views expressed by the groups tended to repeat and confirm the findings of the survey. However, probably as a result of the unrepresentative composition of the groups, there appeared to be a bit more sympathy and understanding for the problems faced by landlords and more understanding of the concept of cooperatives and interest in belonging to a cooperative. These differences would be expected of groups with greater than

average income and education for these neighborhoods. However, it should be noted that these differences were not great--as in the survey, most of the participants were basically angry with, and suspicious of, landlords and were not strongly interested in co-ops.

Some views did come out of the group sessions which did not have a chance to be expressed in the formal survey: There was some feeling that the City does not enforce regulations because of graft received from landlords, and that some police don't bear down on crime in the area because they either are being "paid off," or simply don't care. There was even more emphasis on crime as their major problem (senseless muggings, destruction of property, robbery, burglary) by the groups than in the survey sample.

The group participants were able to go into more detail when they wished and, thus, gave more of the underlying reasons for their opinions. They said that one reason tenants don't organize is "fear"--fear that the landlord will retaliate by evicting them at a time when they are convinced they can find no other suitable place to live.

Community issue canvassing could have been done more efficiently by: (1) defining a broad area of interest, such as "housing"; (2) soliciting from planners and implementers the issues in that area with which they were currently concerned; (3) soliciting from potential survey populations a very general list of their concerns within the topic; and (4) then developing a questionnaire reflecting both the issues raised in the preliminary issue spotting interviews and issues about which City personnel are in the process of making decisions. Ideally, final questionnaires would include those issues of concern to the community over

which City administrators feel they have some influence.

D. Police and Narcotics

In July, planning meetings were held with representatives from Vera, the Budget Bureau, and Opinion Research Corporation to discuss the surveys on health, education and crime.

Police services, neighborhood safety, non-police patrols, police precinct consolidating, and narcotics usage and treatment emerged as the main themes of the crime survey. It was decided that information on these subjects would be more useful if perceptions and experiences of a black community and a neighboring white community were compared. Sections of Bedford-Stuyvesant and Bay Ridge in Brooklyn were selected, and each area was assigned 300 interviews, or a total of 600. Because the pilot project budget for this contract was only large enough to purchase a total of 900 interviews, the health and education questionnaires were combined into one survey of 300 respondents.

In addition to the City's desire for data on narcotics usage and perceptions about drug problems and treatment, Vera was also interested in taking the pulse of the Bedford-Stuyvesant community, where they were planning to open a methadone treatment center for heroin addicts in the fall. Vera hoped to gauge community receptivity to this program through the survey.

In early August, Opinion Research Corporation prepared a preliminary draft of the questionnaire on police and

narcotics. After several draftings the questionnaire was pretested in early September. Interviewers found that the sensitive nature of the issues being discussed sometimes made it difficult to establish rapport with the respondent, and revisions were made accordingly. A second pretest was conducted.

Final interviewing for the police and narcotics survey took place between October 16th and November 5th.

Coding and tabulation of data were completed by mid-November. The report was held up, however, because it had been agreed that results of all the surveys conducted by Opinion Research Corporation would be submitted in one report. Work on the health and education survey encountered several delays and data from that survey were not coded and tabulated until mid-January. A final report on both surveys was submitted in February.

E. Health and Education

At the end of June, Budget Bureau planners in health and education submitted drafts of survey questions. By mid-July, Opinion Research Corporation had adapted the material into preliminary drafts of two questionnaires, one on health and one on education. At the end of July when the decision was made to combine the health and education questionnaires, the original drafts had to be shortened considerably.

The sample location decided upon was Tremont, in the Bronx. Tremont had access to several municipal health facilities, and was an ethnically mixed neighborhood, which would allow the survey to compare attitudes of a total of 300 Negro, Puerto Rican, and white respondents.

Parents with school age children were selected as the population to be surveyed and health questions were keyed to this populace. They included usage and perception of public and private medical facilities by young and middle-aged persons, level of satisfaction with specific aspects of health services and means of payment. The education questions were directed at parents' experiences with and opinions about primary and intermediate school education, and, where relevant, preschool education.

Two pretests were conducted in late October and November to define the sample population. The final sample included 100 interviews with parents of children in P.S. 6; 100 parents of children in P.S. 38; and 100 with parents of children in I.S. 45. Because of the significant Puerto Rican population in Tremont, the questionnaire was administered in Spanish as well as in English. Changes in the questionnaire as a result of pretesting were minor.

Final interviews were conducted from December 6-27. Translation of answers from Spanish and coding and tabulation of data were completed by mid-January. A final report on the surveys conducted by Opinion Research Corporation was submitted in February.

City staff and coordinators agree that this study was the least successful as a prototype for form and techniques. It attempted to cover too much diverse material with a small and limited sample. Based on what was learned from this survey, procedures (see pp.4-6) were developed for future studies to include suggestions which would prevent repetition of the same errors.

III. Findings in Detail

A. General

The surveys conducted for the pilot project were successful in testing various survey topics and techniques. Two subcontractors with relatively different approaches were used; seven topic areas (priorities among City services, housing in transition neighborhoods, public safety, police service, narcotics, health practices, and public school education) were included; the scope and depth of questions was varied; and the composition and size of the sample populations was different in each of the four surveys.

These variables were examined in terms of the usefulness of the data to the City planners. Although none of these variables in survey techniques seem to have been as important to the success of the surveys as other factors discussed on p.22, some guidelines in terms of the techniques emerged:

1. The subcontractor who was more inclined to involve himself in the conceptual and substantive issues of the survey seems to have produced slightly more useful data.*
2. Data seems to have been most useful in those topic areas which were most limited and well-defined--housing, police service, narcotics.

*Whether this is important as a technique in the future will depend on the relative involvement of planners and administrators; if it is high such qualities in the subcontractor may not be necessary.

3. Size of sample population is related to depth of information desired. The more cross tabulations and subgroups the sample is divided into, the larger the size must be. Even 300 is too small for extensive cross tabulating. Although this size was somewhat compensated for by limiting the sample population to a city neighborhood with some already apparent characteristics, useful techniques may be to preselect a sample population with certain characteristics and then draw the sample from neighborhoods with those characteristics that recur throughout New York. This was done in the housing survey.

Other factors which affected the usefulness of the data were:

1. The amount of involvement of planners and administrators in developing the surveys.
2. The lack of clarity of these people about the purposes and uses of opinion research as a tool for program planning.
3. The relative inexperience of the project director in coordinating these efforts, and educating the planners to the best use of survey techniques.

To summarize, this project provided an opportunity to test information gathering techniques and to collect data on a number of topics of concern to the City; but most importantly it yielded the opportunity to devise a process which would assure systematic input from planners and administrators so that survey research would be consistently relevant and useful. The biggest key to a successful survey is the intelligent involvement of the potential "consumer" in designing the survey.

Further, it is important to cover issues and phrase

them in such a way that the sample population will be interested in responding to the questionnaire. In short, both the input from planners and from potential respondents during the formulation of a questionnaire are vital to the ultimate usefulness of the survey.

After the survey reports were completed, City staff reviewed the findings and evaluated the usefulness of the data. Their comments are outlined below by subject area:

B. Housing

Staff of both the BoB and HDA looked over the final project report and listed the following findings as particularly useful:

1. They discovered that the equity in or ownership of one's residence, per se, was not important to low-middle-income residents of transition neighborhoods. It became important only as a means of providing more safety or better services, implying to HDA staff that encouragement of co-oping in low-income areas must stress immediate gains in services rather than long-term equities.
2. Additionally, respondents placed more emphasis on safety, security, and services than on rent levels. By and large, they were willing to pay somewhat more for improvements in these areas.
3. Tenant hostility toward landlords appeared to be more closely related to the range and quality of services provided, than to factors such as absenteeism of landlords and ethnic origin of landlords, as previously hypothesized.

4. In an attempt to place housing within the neighborhood context, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with their own apartment, their building, and the neighborhood. The most satisfaction was indicated for apartment, less for building, and least for the neighborhood. Policy-makers felt this indicated that morale about housing was reduced by larger discontents about the neighborhood as a whole.
5. The types of complaints about their housing listed by respondents were the same as the problems observed by the survey interviewers. Respondents did not ignore major issues, nor did they overrate their problems.
6. Awareness of City services, and housing codes was at a minimum. Respondents were not aware of remedies available to them for some of their problems.

To summarize, a number of implications for program planning and implementation arose from analyses of the pilot project data. Policies and programs relating to modes of home ownership (such as cooperatives) and to the flexibility of rent controls must be related to issues of security and service. In the area of code enforcement, respondents listed several needs (such as locks on mail boxes) which could be met in housing codes. Respondents listed other needs which are covered by codes, implying that more effort must go into: (a) public education about codes; and (b) rigorous enforcement of these codes. One of the tenants' greatest concerns was for improved services. A possible basis for cooperation between landlords and tenants seems possible since the survey revealed little tenant animosity toward landlords on other grounds such as race or proximity, and both parties

could be provided with common service interests by the city. Finally, any effort to improve the housing conditions may be best appreciated if it is linked with general neighborhood improvements.

C. Police Services and Neighborhood Safety

Planning staff at the Bureau of the Budget reviewed the survey report, although the individuals at BoB who had participated in the planning process had all taken other employment by the time the results were in.

1. Several years ago the Police Department initiated efforts to consolidate two precinct houses in each of several areas to increase efficiency. This attempt was met with a relatively strong public outcry for retention of small local precincts. In the survey, respondents asked about their receptivity to precinct consolidation, indicated that they did not feel that protection would diminish due to consolidation, nor did they indicate frequent use of local precinct houses. Nonetheless, the majority in both Bay Ridge and Bedford-Stuyvesant were opposed to consolidation. For program planners these data indicated the subject warrants further study to discover what the basis of opposition to consolidation is, and to consider whether reopening this issue is possible.

2. Planners wanted to learn whether frequent community rumors of corruption and citizen hostility toward

police were well founded. The survey indicated surprisingly little citizen criticism of, or hostility toward, the police, in either neighborhood surveyed. The possibility must be considered, however, that such opinions indeed, if held, would not be expressed by respondents without extensive rapport with the interviewer because of feared retribution for voicing such thoughts.

3. Polititians have often stated their belief that the public wants to have the security of a familiar "cop on the beat" in their neighborhood. However, the survey indicated that when respondents were informed of the efficiency advantages of auto police patrols, they would choose that alternative over the walking policeman.

4. Surprisingly, respondents in both low and middle-income neighborhoods reported similar rates of crime victimization during the past year: Bay Ridge, 11% and Bedford-Stuyvesant, 9%. In both neighborhoods the expectation of being victimized ran far ahead of the actual rates, supporting data on this subject in other cities.

5. Only 20% of the respondents in both neighborhoods supported the idea of non-police patrols, or private guards and even less wanted to participate in them. Despite a few strident voices calling for community patrols, this particular concept does not appear to have wide spread neighborhood acceptance. A strong majority of 62% prefer to leave community protection and law enforcement in the hands of the police.

6. Although overall rates were low, the respondents in Bedford-Stuyvesant were slightly more critical of police practices and services in their area.

7. In both neighborhoods there was minimal perception (16% and 17%) of any improvements in police service, despite the fact that both areas had been assigned more police on the beat at night several months before the survey.

8. The survey conformed with all the evidence indicating that safety and fear about crime are preoccupations of the public today both nationally and locally.

The immediate program implications of the data which were listed by BoB staff included plans to re-examine the issue of precinct-house consolidation in depth, and to make cooperation with and the development of non-police patrols a lower priority concern than it has been.

D. Narcotics

The section on narcotics was included in the police survey. BoB staff, and staff at the methadone treatment project in Bedford-Stuyvesant reviewed the data.

1. Although with somewhat different emphasis, there is wide agreement between the black lower income and white middle income neighborhoods about the importance of drug problems. Bay Ridge respondents tended to emphasize "soft drug" problems more, and Bedford-Stuyvesant, hard core

addiction problems.

2. Parents in both areas expressed great concern about the use of drugs in schools. This appears to be the area of closest agreement between both neighborhoods, and schools may provide the most viable base for new and additional programs.

3. Less than half the respondents in either area thought that they had ever seen an addict in their neighborhood. Considering that Brooklyn has been estimated to have 20,000 addicts this is surprising, and may say more about the inability of the respondents to recognize drug users than about the prevalence of addicts.

4. The general populace in these areas was not aware of any great controversy raging about use of methadone in treating heroin addicts. Less than 3% had heard rumors of bad effects from methadone, and the great majority had never heard of methadone at all.

5. People do perceive a direct link between crime and addiction, but it is not a perception necessarily based on experience either as a crime victim or in sighting many addicts.

6. Parents in both communities have difficulty in recognizing the drugs which may be used by their children.

7. The only subject on which there was a major disparity between the respondents in Bedford-Stuyvesant and those in Bay Ridge was that of treatment modalities.

Predictably respondents in Bay Ridge were much less willing than Bedford-Stuyvesant respondents to tolerate an outpatient treatment center in the community and slightly less willing to permit an outpatient center in their area. Although concern in the middle class areas is great, their tolerance for local treatment solutions is limited and fed by fears that treatment facilities will produce or increase the influx of addicts into the neighborhood.

The data from this survey have a variety of applications, according to the BoB and methadone program staff involved. The BoB reviews budget allocations relating to prevention, treatment and enforcement in the area of narcotics. The BoB felt that the major impact of the project for them was to underline the urgency of helping all City agencies involved to focus more precisely on coordination of addiction programs. The methadone project staff listed some program objectives which were developed on the basis of study findings. Research components of the methadone project will attempt to develop evidence indicating therapeutic treatment, rather than punitive measures, is a more effective deterrent to addict-related crime. Since concern is high, but knowledge is low, greater efforts are being made by the methadone program to educate the public to recognize drugs and drug paraphenalia, as well as the symptoms of addiction. Finally, a fact sheet about methadone has been made available to the public as a direct

result of the survey finding that there is widespread ignorance about this new component in heroin addiction treatment. Both city and methadone staffs thought that the survey data regarding receptivity to treatment programs would be valuable to those in the city who will be closely connected with new addiction program plans. Factors which may increase receptivity for treatment centers in middle class neighborhoods are: (1) the localizing effect of addiction among children in neighborhood schools; and (2) the availability of enough centers to allay fears about an influx of "outside addicts: to any one neighborhood.

E. Education

Bureau of the Budget staff were the major "consumers" of the pilot project section on education. Initially, involvement of the Central Board of Education was considered and then put aside since the transition of some decision-making authority from the Central Board to local elected boards was thought to be forthcoming.

Based on the data, BoB education staff felt the following findings were important:

1. There is opposition among minority parents to day-care and preschool programs for children under the age of three. Particularly Puerto Rican mothers do not seem anxious to find pre-education and outside care for their children, even though it would free them to produce income

outside their homes and offer children a "headstart."

2. In general parents were more favorable toward the schools their children attend than was expected. In two of the three schools more than 70% of the parents rated the general quality of education as good or excellent. One fourth of the respondents felt their children's schools had improved during the past year.

3. The majority of respondents surveyed in Tremont expressed a desire to have kindergarten through sixth grade housed in the same school. The current city-wide policy is a 4-4-4 grade breakdown.

4. Respondents did not express as much desire for vocational education as has been attributed to the general public. This finding relates to the issue of whether or not to develop comprehensive high schools including academic and vocational components.

5. There was extensive positive reaction among the respondents to the use of para-professional teacher aides in the elementary grades.

The data from this survey provided information of a type which will probably be of greatest use to local school boards as they become operational. The report will be sent to the Tremont local board when it has been elected. The BoB has specific program impact only through the capital or building budget for education. In this area several findings are germane. The preference of Tremont parents for having

kindergarten through the sixth grade in the same school may affect building allocations in that area, and raise this issue as an input factor in other areas. Building plans may also be affected by such information as this survey revealed regarding vocational education and its implications for comprehensive high schools. The lack of interest in day-care for very young children, will influence decisions about the priority of such a program in the future.

F. Health

The data was of use to BoB Health staff, and they listed the following information as helpful:

1. The survey provided some indication for the first time of the importance of Medicaid for families with children in moderate to low income neighborhoods. Thirty-one percent of the families in the survey were on welfare, but 57% held medicaid cards, and another 9% were eligible for medicaid cards. Since Medicaid allows freedom of choice between private and public health card, a large shift to private medicine was anticipated. The Tremont survey indicated that the shift is of moderate proportions with about half the population still relying on public facilities.

2. The major factor in choice of facility appears to be convenience of location rather than preference for private card, or cost of services.

3. Emergency rooms have generally figured as a major component of the care offered by public health facilities, on the assumption that they serve as outpatient clinics after hours. The survey indicated, however, that only a small fraction of the respondents (11%) had a preference for evening clinic hours. In fact, the greatest preference was for a system with "middle class medical" characteristics-advance, day-time appointments and family doctors. Since use of emergency rooms in this area is high, it may be assumed that they serve purposes different

from clinics, and that providing evening hours at clinics would not significantly decrease emergency room use.

4. Despite widely publicized criticisms of the City's public hospitals and other aspects of health care, this survey indicated a high degree of satisfaction with virtually all aspects of health care including politeness of doctors and nurses, waiting time and other non-medical aspects. Respondents did not perceive deterioration or improvement in City hospital service over the last two years, nor did they believe the medical care in their neighborhood was distinctly better or worse than in the City as a whole. On the other hand, half the survey respondents felt that health services had improved, while the other half felt they had worsened. It did not come as a surprise to BoB personnel that the quantitative use of Medicaid in this lower income neighborhood was high, indicating a projected average of 16.2 medical service contacts per year per household for the entire population. Excluding phone consultations, the average would be 13 visits per year.

Several program implications were derived from these data. Two-thirds of the families with children reported themselves eligible for medical care at public expense in this area. This suggests that the task of providing public medical facilities and supervising the provision of medical care in areas of the City like this will be enormous. An area of lessening emphasis may be development of emergency rooms as outpatient clinic surrogates,

if needed most people do not have a strong preference for evening clinic hours. The issue of convenience as the most important factor in a patient's choice of facility, as a new insight which may influence a broad range of decisions from site selection to treatment capacities of various services.

5. Strong preference was indicated for a family doctor system ~~and for doctor appointments~~ rather than walk-in visits. This runs counter to belief in some health circles and the experience in some poverty clinics.

G. Priorities among City services

An overview of the four surveys, plus several questions specifically soliciting preferences and priorities among the entire range of City services provided information about key basic issues of City government.

1. Crime prevention is perceived by respondents as the most important issue with which the City must deal. This issue was highlighted not only in the police services study, but also in the housing survey, where many preferences about housing centered on the safety of the building and the neighborhood.

2. Air pollution, although widely touted as of great public concern, appeared very low on the list of things that trouble residents of low income areas. Also of little concern to these residents is the question of park maintenance.

3. Survey respondents almost uniformly took the view that conditions in their neighborhoods were getting worse. Perception of improved City services, in areas where improvements have been made was low. The issue of how to provide dramatic and visible change in services was brought to the fore in the pilot project.

4. The support for open-enrollment in City colleges was tested in the Bay Ridge, Bedford-Stuyvesant and Tremont areas. The amount of opposition seemed related to the income level of the neighborhood. In the low income area, Bedford-Stuyvesant, only 44% were opposed. In the highest income area, Bay Ridge, 73% were opposed. When the same question was asked of the special interest group-- parents of school age children in a relatively middle income area--less opposition was revealed (34%). In all areas, however, the proportion of respondents approving of open-enrollment was highest among those who were parents of school age children. On the other hand, the lack of overwhelming support for open enrollment may indicate an ambivalence among lower class families between the needs for vocational education and the aspirations for college training. Information about these perceptions may be crucial to future policies regarding higher education.

IV. Project Impact

As word of the pilot project has spread throughout City agencies many inquiries have been made about the possibility of conducting other surveys. To date one additional study has been completed, six requests for studies have been received, and one generalized new use of survey research has been proposed. Certainly this project has spurred new thoughts about techniques for gathering input not heretofore available.

Soon after HDA had reviewed the results of the pilot project housing survey, a follow-up was requested to assist HDA in formulating recommendations for new rent control policies. With the aid of a survey expert employed directly by the BoB, goals were formulated, a questionnaire designed, field work conducted, and results tabulated all in the space of six days. In addition to the substantive results produced, this survey demonstrated that given a higher level of sophistication among planners and implementers, and given available in-house expertise, the time required to execute a survey can be cut drastically.

The six other studies requested include:

1. A request from Health Services Administration to survey hospital personnel's housing needs and preferences.

2. A study which would survey public perceptions of whether the City seems more or less clean than a year ago as a means of evaluating the impact of various

City agencies' programs. A part of this study might use aerial photography to identify objective conditions of cleanliness to compare with perceptions.

3. A second study requested by the Environmental Protection Agency concerns exploration of the motivations and morale of sanitation workers.

4. The higher education division of the New York school system has initiated a project to ascertain the college plans and aspirations of current high school students. These data will be important as decisions regarding open-enrollment in City colleges are made.

5. & 6. The new Office of Neighborhood Government has inquired about conducting separate surveys in two Neighborhood Districts to determine the residents' response to current City services and priorities for emphasis in the future.

A further implication derived from the pilot project is the potential of the survey technique as a mechanism for citizen participation in and control over some of the institutions which affect people's lives.

Much has been written about the problems of alienation, powerlessness, and erosion of faith in public decision-makers. Basically, the present extent of this citizen control over public policies and programs is limited to the vote. However, elections are both infrequent and rarely related closely to specific issues--new ones are raised during tenure, others are never made public, etc.

There is also an administrative problem. Running a big government demands centralization. On the other hand, both citizens and the government are aware that unresponsive policies and programs have created a trend toward decentralized control and closer consultation with the general public.

A number of ways to consult have been tried-- publicity or "experiential" walks about the City by public officials, group or community meetings, and advisory committees, for example.

Survey research may offer another vehicle of consultation. It can be used as a means of a) determining the issues of greatest concern to the public; b) soliciting their suggestions in meeting these issues and c) testing response to current and new policies and programs. The greatest disadvantage of survey research is that it is not highly visible, and the public would have to be educated to its potential, just as City personnel were. On the other hand, it has the advantage of being relatively non-controversial since random surveys will not produce power struggles among local leaders as to whose voice should be heard, or to determine who represents whom. It is representative of any population. The peril attached to the use of this mechanism is its potential to raise expectations of influence, and participation among respondents without a meaningful response and from City government resulting from the input.

V. Budget Report

The agreement with the Fund for the City of New York on the allocation of funds for this project was that \$60,000 would be used to conduct surveys and the remaining \$15,000 would be spent on Vera's administrative and overhead expenses. The cost for conducting the four surveys came to approximately \$65,000. Of the remaining \$10,000, salaries and employee benefits absorbed \$8,850. Vera therefore absorbed most of the overhead expenses.

A detailed accounting of expenditures is included on the following page.

Vera Institute of Justice, Inc. -

Fund for the City of New York

Expenditures: June 16, 1969 - February 28, 1970

Received from Fund for the City of New York

\$75,000.00

Expenditures:

Salaries

\$ 8,120.39

Josephine Marshall (7/1/69-8/31/69)

\$ 736.68

Wendy Miller (10/8/69-2/28/70)

3,383.71

Mary Myers (6/16/69-10/15/69)

4,000.00

Payroll Taxes and Employee Benefits

729.95

F.I.C.A. Employer's Tax

389.78

Disability Insurance

31.40

Blue Cross-Blue Shield

67.47

Major Medical Insurance

14.84

Group Life Insurance

26.46

Moving Expenses (Mary Myers)

200.00

Subcontracts

65,050.00

Opinion Research Corporation

48,000.00

Louis Harris and Associates

17,050.00

Travel and Subsistence

91.66

Overhead

1,008.00

Rent

Consumable Supplies

Telephone

Utilities

Duplicating

Office Equipment

Insurance

Total Expended

\$75,000.00