

METHODOLOGY

This survey of Chesapeake residents was conducted by Continental Research Associates, Inc., a Hampton Roads marketing research firm. A total of 308 interviews were completed by telephone from October 9th through November 6th (excluding Presidential debate evenings and Election Day). The objective of this study was to learn how Chesapeake residents feel about their community and the services provided by the City. Similar studies have been performed since 1998, with the most recent study being in 2007.

Continental Research and representatives from the City of Chesapeake met to discuss the 2008 survey's goals and objectives. During that meeting, the City decided to continue with the "Gap Analysis" approach to measure the City's ability to meet citizen expectations. Many items from the 2007 survey instrument were retained, some were modified, and new questions were added. To be considerate of each citizen's time, the goal was to construct a questionnaire that would require 12 - 14 minutes to administer by phone.

Screening questions were placed at the beginning of the survey: 1) to verify that each participant was over age 18, and 2) to eliminate business phone numbers. A "length of residence in Chesapeake" item also confirmed that the person actually lived in Chesapeake. Working from general to specific, the survey began with an open-ended question asking residents to name the most important problem or greatest need facing the City of Chesapeake today. This was followed by a measure of their overall satisfaction with City services.

As part of the Gap Analysis, the survey included a series of questions rating the importance of and satisfaction with various City services/attributes: the public school system, parks and recreation areas, police services, fire services, the public library system, City trash collection, recycling services, rain water drainage in the City, traffic flow on City roadways, the maintenance of City roads, the maintenance of City bridges, human service programs, the quality of the drinking water, keeping residents informed about City services and activities, and whether citizens have an opportunity to share their ideas before the City makes important decisions.

Another section of the survey was dedicated to budget-related items. Two open-ended questions were included, asking residents to name one thing the City should spend less on and one thing they should spend more on in the next budget cycle. Then, a series of questions were asked to see if residents want the City to spend more, the same, or less money: to improve traffic flow on City streets, for roads and road maintenance, for bridge maintenance, to deal with rain water drainage, for public safety, for parks and recreation, for programs and activities for teenagers, for the public library system, and for economic development. After the entire series was complete, follow-up questions were asked of those who said more money should be spent to determine whether they would still say "more" if that cost *increased* their property taxes. (For clarity, this was a departure from the 2007 survey wording which referred to the cost *affecting* property taxes.)

METHODOLOGY (cont'd)

Residents were also asked if they had watched any programs on WCTV-48, whether they would be willing to pay \$7.75/mo. per household for an expanded recycling program, and a series of demographic questions (i.e., age, the neighborhood area closest to their home, income, ethnic origin, and gender). The draft questionnaire was presented to and approved by the City of Chesapeake.

As is customary, the survey was pre-tested by senior staff members on a sub-sample of 33 Chesapeake residents. This helps identify any wording difficulties or sequencing problems and may suggest design or format changes that could improve the flow of the interview. Only minor changes were made as a result of this pre-test. The final version of the questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to administer. Although this is a long survey, many residents who were contacted were eager to participate. (A copy of the final survey instrument is included in the Appendix of this report.)

The list of randomly-selected Chesapeake households was generated by Continental Research using an in-house, copyrighted computer program. The software also uses a two-digit, randomizing technique to alter each telephone number so that both new residents and unlisted numbers will be included in the sample frame. The resulting phone numbers are then screened to eliminate businesses and non-working numbers.

Seven staff data collectors conducted the interviews. Each had extensive training and several years of experience prior to this project. Several team members had worked on other City of Chesapeake surveys. A briefing session was held by the Sr. Project Manager. Detailed instructions for using the questionnaire were presented, and current issues relating to Chesapeake (e.g., the possible bridge closing) were discussed. Each person role-played with the questionnaire to practice the proper technique for administering the interviews verbatim and test various types of probes.

The telephone contacts originated from the Continental Research offices in Norfolk. Initial contacts were made between 5:15 and 9:15 p.m. on Monday through Thursday and from 4:00 to 9:00 p.m. on Sunday. These interviewing times are the most productive and ensure the inclusion of both working and non-working adults. If a respondent asked to be called back at a later date or time, an appointment system was used to accommodate his schedule.

To minimize the bias caused by females answering the phone more frequently, a statistical technique was used to select the adult in the household who would be asked to participate. And, the interviewers attempted to reach each person selected for inclusion in the study at least six times (on different days) before a substitute phone number was chosen.

All 308 survey participants were heads of households in Chesapeake who were over the age of 18. Their responses were entered directly into the computer using Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) technology. A supervisor was present at all times to electronically monitor the interviewers' work. He listened to both sides of the conversation and visually observed the

METHODOLOGY (cont'd)

recording of all answers on a computer monitor (via Dameware software). Over 38% of all interviews were fully monitored, and an additional 25% were partially monitored by a supervisor. This is far in excess of the 5-10% industry standard for validation.

At the end of each shift, a de-briefing session was held to discuss the survey's progress and how citizens were responding to the questions. These meetings provide anecdotal information that is useful when interpreting the tabulated findings. They also help to identify whether any current events may be impacting the survey results.

Each morning, the prior night's interviews were removed from the CATI system and added to an SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) system file. They were read for completeness and the open-ended answers were analyzed, grouped into categories, and assigned a numeric code. A detailed computer program was then written to tabulate the findings. Upon completion, the surveys were analyzed using SPSS. The findings from the 2008 survey are displayed on the following pages (in near-questionnaire order). Tracking data are provided under separate cover.

MARGIN OF ERROR

Because random selection was used to create the sample of households for this study, the results represent Chesapeake households well. The term "Margin of Error" refers to the difference between what the survey found and what one would get if a complete census of Chesapeake households had been conducted. With a sample of 308 randomly-selected residents, any percentage in this report that is near 50% would be accurate within ± 5.58 percentage points. If a figure in this report is above or below 50%, the Margin of Error is smaller, which is better (see chart below).

If the reported percentage =	The Margin of Error =
99%	$\pm 1.11\%$
95%	$\pm 2.43\%$
90%	$\pm 3.35\%$
80%	$\pm 4.47\%$
70%	$\pm 5.12\%$
60%	$\pm 5.47\%$
----- 50% - Highest Margin of Error - -----	$\pm 5.58\%$
40%	$\pm 5.47\%$
30%	$\pm 5.12\%$
20%	$\pm 4.47\%$
10%	$\pm 3.35\%$
5%	$\pm 2.43\%$
1%	$\pm 1.11\%$