

Cary Retlin & Martin McMurry
Analytical Techniques for Public Service III
MPA Program; April 10, 2007

**Analysis Plan:
Downtown Olympia Housing Vision**

The analysis of our quantitative survey data will require the use of multiple tools. Survey results were initially collected in Survey Monkey. The data from the survey will be downloaded from Survey Monkey into Microsoft Office Excel (Excel) Spreadsheets. The data will be converted into SPSS® so that statistical analysis not possible in Excel can be achieved. Microsoft Excel will be used to convert statistical data into graphs and other visual images. Microsoft Office Word (Word) was used to compile qualitative data during focus group sessions. Those notes will be coded into excel for analysis. Quantitative and qualitative data from Word and Excel will be used together in the narrative and visual display of research results. A slideshow designed to accompany the final report will be created in Microsoft Office PowerPoint.

We will mine our qualitative data for key themes focus group respondents identified. Those themes will be used to develop commonalties between the ‘super citizen’ and ‘general citizen’ focus groups. The first group consisted of the general public—citizens that are not formally a part of a City advisory committee or directly involved with a neighborhood association. The second group was considered “super citizens” because they either held elected office, worked on appointed boards or had worked as a contractor for the City of Olympia. Commonalties in data collected between those groups will be merged with quantitative survey results to triangulate citizen values applicable to elements of a downtown housing vision.

Plan for Analyzing the Qualitative Data: Two focus groups were conducted in one day, a noon session and a 2:30pm session. The duration for each of the focus groups were about an hour and a half in length, providing the researchers with rich material. The plan is the code the analysis using very specific methods often used in qualitative analyses in social research.

Stage 1 shall include open coding (Neuman, 2006) for both sets of notes. This is essentially a first cut of analyses specifically designed to generate thematic concepts within the data. Since there are two focus groups, which comparisons can be made, it will be useful to analyze similar or dissimilar themes and concepts. After the conclusion of this first stage, the hope is to garner initial categories or codes from the focus group sessions.

Stage 2 shall include a process that begins to seek relationships with the new codes/categories initiated in stage one (Neuman, 2006). The key in this stage is realizing any linkages with the main concepts, categories or codes.

Stage 3 will consist of the final stage of qualitative analysis. Looking at the major categories and the linkages among them, this final stage will seek to selectively (Neuman, 2006) code data to support the major conceptual ideas. The sub-themes shall be categorized under major concept areas. Also important in this stage is be more analytic about methodological issues and atmospheric influences (e.g., the setting and how it might have influenced the participants).

Plan for Analyzing the Quantitative Data: The Citizen Vision on Downtown Housing in Olympia survey consisted of 11 closed questions and one open ended question. We will use a mix of descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, median, standard deviation, etc.); visual

representations of data; and bivariate statistical analysis for our final description of quantitative data. The plan consists of executing the below items:

- 1) What are the limitations and assumptions to each question? Each question will require an analysis of not only the methodology, but of the limitations and assumptions the question may inherently have.
- 2) Creating a respondent profile. Based on the demographic data collected in the survey, a confidential profile will be created.
- 3) A comparison of responses by Income; participants were asked what incomes levels would likely be attracted to downtown Olympia and then subsequently asked of what their personal income was. This will likely entail bivariate correlation analysis.
- 4) A statistical comparison of what participants selected as the most important elements for a vibrant downtown (e.g., housing downtown or transit) compared to what they feel are the most appealing images of a future downtown (e.g., views of the Puget Sound or owned and rented units in the same building). Visual bar charts will be utilized for this analysis.
- 5) What linkages between questions can be made? The questions were designed to collectively facilitate a “vision statement” for the future of housing in downtown Olympia. As a part of the analysis, the key will be to develop a statement as a result of what citizens’ ranked the highest.
- 6) Similarly, what did participants find least appealing? A final analysis of what was least important in the questions will be conducted.

- 7) Categorizing and coding the open-ended question (last question asked in the survey). Forty-two participants responded to this question; the same three-tiered qualitative analysis plan of the focus groups will be applied to this question as well.
- 8) Categorizing each question that required a ranking. For example, question one asked participants to rank what they think are the most important elements for a vibrant downtown from a list of categories; The name of this category could be called “Downtown Vibrancy.” Visual representation through bar charts can help facilitate this.
- 9) Developing a mean score of the categories in the ranked questions (Excel & SPSS can do this by utilizing descriptive statistics).
- 10) Which categories scored above the mean (again, Excel & or SPSS)?