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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

In the spring of 2003 the then leaders of the Glendale Community Council approached University Neighborhood Partners to begin a collaborative project to investigate why so few ethnic minority residents were participating in the Community Council process.

Faculty from the University of Utah and a group of Glendale residents carried out six focus groups during the spring of 2004 with people of different ethnic backgrounds in Glendale. The purpose of the focus groups was to better understand the obstacles to participation, whether personal or organizational, that these residents face in public decision-making, particularly in their Community Council. An additional goal of the focus groups was to develop some recommendations for how to increase the inclusion of diverse voices in Council decision-making.

University Neighborhood Partners (UNP) committed to this project with the belief that the issues facing the Glendale Community Council were equally pressing in other west side neighborhoods and community councils, as all were facing similar demographic and economic changes. The goal was to identify a model to increase inclusion that could be useful throughout the area. Thus, while the Glendale Community Council leaders who first requested this partnership are no longer in those positions, the group has continued with the research because the current Glendale Community Council leadership showed interest in the project, and (perhaps more importantly) almost everyone we spoke to in west side neighborhoods and within city government agreed that the issues this research addresses affect almost every other Community Council.

Twenty-eight people attended the focus groups. Most resided in Glendale. Participants were identified as either frequent or infrequent participants in Community Council affairs, and as belonging to one of four ethnic groups: Anglo, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Other.

Our analysis of the focus group discussions suggests that the rapid demographic and cultural changes the Glendale neighborhood has undergone over the past decade create challenges and opportunities to which governing bodies have yet to adapt. For the focus group respondents, diversity was both an asset and a challenge. On the one hand, people were enthusiastic about the energy of many different cultures coming together, and were motivated to develop a sense of community that extends to all of Glendale’s geographic borders. New organizations have sprung up to service the needs of Glendale’s multicultural residents, suggesting a great deal of organizing energy at grassroots levels.
On the other hand, Glendale, like other neighborhoods on the west side of Salt Lake City, is struggling to integrate a rapidly diversifying population and to redefine itself as a community of neighbors. It seems that Glendale has been transformed from what might be thought of as a relatively centralized and homogeneous neighborhood—one in which most residents were part of the same overlapping ethnic, language, and religious networks that also shaped decision-making of the Community Council—to a multi-centric and much more diverse neighborhood in which there are multiple languages, backgrounds, religious and family networks, and arenas of local decision-making. Despite this tremendous change, the Community Council still draws most of its leadership and attendance from long-time residents who belong to the original set of overlapping networks, with little or no connection to or communication with new organizations or residents.

**Obstacles to participation and inclusion**

Many focus group respondents indicated involvement in a number of social, religious, and political organizations. Yet levels of awareness of and involvement with the Community Council varied across focus groups, with long-time residents much more aware of the Community Council than recent arrivals to the neighborhood. Some respondents find the Community Council functions relevant, particularly in terms of solving infrastructural problems such as street lighting issues. However, many respondents are unaware of the Community Council’s existence or its functions. This is particularly true of new residents who tend to belong to ethnic minority groups.

Those who were not involved in the Community Council offered a number of reasons for their lack of participation in this organization. These included:
- Lack of information about the Community Council, ranging from time and location of meetings to its function.
- Language differences between participants and potential participants.
- The respondents do not know of people who attend the Community Council meetings and are therefore not mobilized or motivated to attend.
- Time constraints preventing respondents from attending the meetings, including significant time commitments to other local organizations.
- Some respondents feel the Community Council is limited in its functions; they don’t see its relevance to their personal concerns.
- Some respondents go directly to the city with their problems, instead of to the Community Council.
- Some respondents do not feel welcome at the meetings, or feel that their voice and viewpoints are not given weight and attention.

**Strategies to increase inclusion**

Glendale’s diverse and mobile population creates significant challenges to any community council seeking to reach out to residents and include them in public decision-making processes. The following section summarizes some of our core findings and
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proposed strategies intended to address the most important barriers to broad-based participation in the Community Council.

1. **Research Finding:** “Community” means different things to people of different ethnic backgrounds in Glendale. This is a crucial issue for any “community” council. It is difficult for the Community Council, which defines community in terms of geography, to connect with groups which define community in other ways (e.g., culture, language, kin networks).

   **Strategy:** **Emphasize Community-Building Activities**

   ✓ **Focus on community-building** in the neighborhood, especially through cross-cultural activities, instead of focusing on problem-solving. Examples of community-building activities might include:
   
   - A street fair (akin to the Avenues Street Fair) that involves other groups and organizations.
   - A local cultural performance group on the Council agenda each month.
   - Cinco de Mayo festivities.
   - A neighborhood cleanup in cooperation or in partnership with a local church or community organizations.

2. **Research Finding:** Residents do not view the Community Council as being linked to other local organizations that take the bulk of residents’ time and attention such as schools, churches, and cultural organizations.

   **Strategy:** **Build Bridges to other Organizations and Broaden Leadership of the Community Council**

   ✓ **Carry out neighborhood projects and activities as partnerships between the Community Council and other local organizations to build bridges to other groups.**
   
   - Examples might include a neighborhood cleanup project or a block party.
   
   ✓ **Encourage broader leadership in the Community Council** in order to create bridges with other community groups. Possible strategies include:
   
   - Create effective sub-committees.
   - Recruit sub-committee members from other community organizations to create ties between them and the Community Council.
   - Create an outreach committee.
   - Include members and leaders of local community organizations on some sort of an advisory board to the Community Council.

3. **Research Finding:** Respondents, particularly non-Anglo residents, had little information about Community Council meetings, its functions, or its effectiveness.

   **Strategy:** **Increase Information, Especially to Newly Arrived Residents**

   ✓ The Community Council could create a **community newsletter**, which would include the monthly agenda; local updates; and business, school, and church information. This newsletter should be translated into **multiple languages**.
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✓ Include Council information in existing information sources, especially in local school newsletters and in the West View newspaper.
✓ Activities, newsletters, and outreach should target new arrivals to the neighborhood.

4. **Research Finding:** The Community Council can be an effective vehicle for representing community interests, but, as an all-volunteer organization needs more support to be effective.

**Strategy:** Increase Support from the City Government
✓ The Community Council could identify sources for more resources (funding, training, logistical support) from the city government or other organizations, and pursue those resources.

UNP has begun work on two initiatives in order to respond to the above recommendations:

1. In order to support the work of community councils, UNP is working with one of the faculty in the research group who has developed a new course at the University of Utah. Students in the course work directly with a west side community council to study issues of grassroots democracy and to help organize a community-building event in the neighborhood.

2. UNP has created, together with Neighborhood Housing Services and Salt Lake Weed and Seed, a new initiative called the Westside Leadership Institute. The WLI hopes to expand the base of local Westside resident leaders as catalysts for positive change in their neighborhoods by offering skills and tools for effective community involvement. The first WLI cohort included several Westside community council leaders, and the courses offer an opportunity for potential future leaders from many different backgrounds to develop useful skills. The WLI is offering courses in both English and Spanish in 2005.

UNP will continue to try to identify other opportunities for University-community collaboration to address the issues presented in this report.

In sum, the focus group results point to ways in which the Community Council might shift its role in the community from one that links residents to the city, to one that links residents to each other, in order to capitalize on the organizing energy and desire for community among Glendale residents.
II. METHODOLOGY

This research project began at the request of the 2002-2003 Glendale Community Council leadership, who were concerned about the under-representation of non-whites in Community Council meetings. The project represents a partnership between University of Utah faculty and students and west side community residents and leaders, who came together in order to gain a better understanding of the obstacles Glendale residents face to participation in public decision-making, particularly to participation in monthly Community Council meetings.¹

The research team held six focus groups between March 25, 2004 and April 28, 2004. Each focus group was held in the evening at the University Neighborhood Partners house located on the west side of Salt Lake City. The groups consisted of 2-8 respondents (28 respondents in total) and lasted approximately two hours each. Either a University of Utah professor or the Assistant Director of University Neighborhood Partners moderated each focus group. Five group discussions were conducted in English, and one focus group was conducted in Spanish.

Selected members of the community were asked to submit the names of several individuals whom they knew to be residents of Glendale. From this list we selected a subset of individuals to contact for participation in the study. Potential respondents were screened to ensure they were residents of Glendale and were at least 18 years old.

The focus groups were designed to include members of the three largest ethnic groups in Glendale, residents who are regular participants (2 or more meetings per year) in Glendale Community Council meetings, and residents who rarely or never participate. The focus group respondents were distributed into groups in the manner depicted in the chart below. At the beginning of each session, potential respondents were given a consent form to read and sign. Those who consented to participate were asked to complete a brief, anonymous questionnaire that asked basic demographic questions prior to the start of the discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Group Description</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anglo, Non-participants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple ethnicities, Regular participants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Latino, Non-participants (Spanish-speaking group)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacific Islander, Non-participants</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anglo, Occasional participants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anglo, Regular participants</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The research protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Utah (IRB 00012268).
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Though we made attempts to recruit people who represent some of the diverse backgrounds and experiences of Glendale residents, it is important to bear in mind that any attempt to generalize these findings to the entire population of Glendale should be done with caution. First, though focus groups are a good research tool for exploring a wide range of themes in depth, the views of the focus group respondents do not necessarily represent all Glendale residents. Discussions with other Glendale residents may well have emphasized different points. Second, though a variety of Glendale residents were invited to participate in the focus groups, not all agreed to take part. It is possible that actual participants in the study may be more active in their community than other Glendale residents. Nevertheless, this research points to important issues pertaining to community participation that are relevant not only to Glendale, but to other communities undergoing similar cultural, economic, and demographic changes.
III. RESEARCH FINDINGS – GENERAL THEMES

Group participants were asked to comment on their attitudes toward the Glendale community, their participation in organizations and social networks, and their opinions of and participation in the Glendale Community Council. This section identifies the major themes that emerged from the focus group discussions and describes the diverse views that residents expressed about key community issues.

---

### The Glendale Community

At the beginning of each focus group, respondents were asked to think about living in Glendale. Specifically, they were asked what they liked about living in Glendale, followed by what they felt the biggest issues were facing the community. Across the six focus groups, there were consistent responses in both areas, but differences between the groups emerged as well.

**What People Like about Glendale**

Respondents feel there are many things to like about Glendale, including the community’s diversity; friendliness of the neighborhood; pride in the community; the authenticity of residents (“People aren’t fake here, they don’t put up a front,” noted one respondent); affordability; and convenience (e.g., proximity to local schools and parks, the airport, and downtown Salt Lake City). Also singled out as benefits of living in Glendale are access to Jordan River Park, the Sorenson Center, block parties and other community activities, “pretty gardens,” and Glendale’s “interesting looking architecture.” One individual noted that he likes hearing the train whistle at night; it was not only soothing, but also brought back childhood memories.

For Latinos (Focus Group 3), the main positive about living in Glendale is that the community is calmer and safer, particularly for children, than other U.S. cities in which they had resided, principally Los Angeles. Anglo respondents who regularly attend Community Council meetings (Focus Group 6) have long histories in Glendale (all over 40 years residence). These individuals tended to frame their positive comments about Glendale in terms of the past. They view themselves as among the first to settle in Glendale and described a sense of community that exists among long-time residents. Benefits of living in Glendale for this group include long-occupied family homes and raising children in well-kept neighborhoods. Also mentioned was Glendale’s central location in relation to freeways and downtown and the presence of local business in the past, especially at Glendale Plaza.

**Issues Facing Glendale**

While all focus group respondents could readily identify positive aspects to living in Glendale, they are also keenly aware of the issues and problems facing the community. Most frequently mentioned were poverty, unemployment, crime, the gang presence, and
drug activity. Other negative aspects of living in Glendale that were mentioned include limited access to economic resources, lack of commerce on the west side, poor health, limited opportunities to send children to college (a comment in the Pacific Islander focus group, Focus Group 4), declining property values, low quality schools, unkempt yards and neighborhoods, the exodus of residents, and bad publicity about the west side. It is worth noting that the Anglo residents who never attend Community Council meetings (Focus Group 1) recognize that these issues often lead to a negative portrayal of Glendale in the media; however, this does not stop them from feeling proud to be Glendale residents.

The group consisting of Anglo residents who occasionally attended Community Council meetings (Focus Group 5) regret Glendale’s physical layout, noting that there is no one center of cultural and economic activity. These same respondents feel that Glendale is not a “walkable community.” One respondent in the group mentioned the need to “integrate” Glendale’s various communities and cultures. Along these same lines, an issue raised in both the Latino (Focus Group 3) and Pacific Islander (Focus Group 4) groups is the lack of information in their respective languages. Latinos said there is no visible organization to assist Spanish-speaking residents with housing, legal, financial, and other matters. In addition, both focus groups mentioned the greater difficulty Latinos and Pacific Islanders have in securing credit. A Latino respondent noted that interest rates on loans for Latinos are much higher, while their salaries are generally lower.

Neighborhoods, Neighbors, and Community

Focus groups respondents were asked if they felt like they lived in a neighborhood and how big their neighborhood was. There was variation in responses, both within and among groups. Among Anglo respondents who do not participate in the Community Council (Focus Group 1), all feel they live in a neighborhood, noting that it is people who make up the neighborhood. One individual in this group said there is “a sense of everyone pulling together,” while another pointed to the helpfulness of neighbors, stating, “The best kept secret about [my] neighborhood is that people are nice.” In the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2), some respondents feel they live in a neighborhood while others do not. In this same group, neighborhood size ranges from “my block” to “all of Glendale.”

Across the English-speaking and the Spanish-speaking focus groups, respondents expressed concern for a lack of communication and interaction between neighbors. For Latinos (Focus Group 3), language barriers are the primary obstacles to interaction with neighbors. Spanish-speaking respondents also expressed concern over their perception of a confrontational approach taken by Anglo neighbors, who will call the police when there is a noise or parking issue, instead of approaching their neighbors directly. One Latino respondent described a “lack of patience” on the part of Anglo neighbors.

Language barriers are also viewed by Anglo respondents who regularly attend Community Council meetings (Focus Group 6) as the main obstacle to a sense of
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community, as these barriers result in an inability to interact not only with one’s neighbors, but also with proprietors of local businesses. One member of this group saw an issue in the number of minorities coming into the community, to which another member responded, “They don’t care about this community the way we do.” Pacific Islanders (Focus Group 4) feel that others often perceive them in a negative light, which leads to discrimination in opportunities.

There were striking differences in the way in which the various focus groups envisioned “community.” Furthermore, these differences fall out along ethnic and cultural lines. Anglo focus group respondents, particularly long-standing Glendale residents, define community geographically, i.e., the physical neighborhood—nearby streets, shops, and neighbors. For these residents, the LDS ward structure also defines community, whereby one’s neighbors tend to be part of the same church community. Pacific Islanders (Focus Group 4) saw community as being linked more to kin and church, rather than geography. Finally, Latinos (Focus Group 3) saw community lying somewhere between these two conceptualizations: while community can be identified by one’s physical location on a particular street, it is also comprised of other Spanish speakers, especially those attending the same church. (As mentioned, Anglo LDS wards on the City’s west side are structured geographically, i.e., neighbors are members of the same ward. However, Pacific Islander and Latino wards are ethnicity- and language-based, i.e., ward members come from all over the west side.)

Glendale and Salt Lake City

Focus group respondents were asked to comment on how they saw Glendale in relation to Salt Lake City: Does Glendale face the same or different issues as the rest of Salt Lake City? Is Glendale well-represented in city government? Some respondents feel Glendale faces the same issues as Salt Lake City, for example, crime, but the media still negatively portrays Glendale. Differences include the feeling that Glendale is more “urban” than Salt Lake City, that people are more neighborly, and that “color doesn’t matter” on the west side. Noting that Glendale has more diversity than on the East Bench, one respondent said, “We have all the colors of the rainbow.”

There is consensus across focus groups that Glendale is not well-represented in city government. “We aren’t loud enough,” said one respondent. “Our representatives are trying, but they are not loud enough.” Another respondent echoed this theme: “Our wheel really isn’t squeaky.” One individual said Glendale is well-represented “a couple of months before each election.” Another said Glendale was not as well represented as Rose Park or Poplar Grove, “and certainly not as well as the east side.” Another respondent noted both a “lack of ideas” and a “lack of spokespersons” for the west side.

Participating in Organizations and Social Networks within the Glendale Community

Each of the groups was asked about their interaction with neighbors and their participation in community groups. Respondents answered questions pertaining to what
kinds of social networks they took part in, and whether these networks provided channels for addressing neighborhood issues.

**Participation in Their Community**

There is an impressive amount of community participation among all the focus group respondents. Most of the participation cited by respondents is in “formal” organizations. In order of frequency, people mentioned church activities, school groups, civic organizations (non-state affiliated), cultural groups, political parties, leisure-based associations, youth sports, civic organizations (state-affiliated), and scouting. People are clearly not isolated individuals. With only a few exceptions, people of all ethnicities and Community Council participation levels are vibrant participants in social life.

Yet there are important differences in the informal ties enjoyed by members of different groups. Members of 4 groups [Anglo respondents who never attend meetings (Focus Group 1), the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2), Anglo respondents who regularly attend meetings (Focus Group 6), and Pacific Islanders (Focus Group 4)] mentioned engaging in social activities with neighbors and friends. Ties within the Spanish-speaking group (Focus Group 3) seem to be limited to the formal organizations of church and school.

**Solving Community Problems**

Very rarely, however, did any one of these groups directly try to address a community issue. “Church is not for community problems,” answered one Latino (Focus Group 3). School groups focus on education, cultural acclimation, and parenting issues; charity organizations focus on direct assistance; and coaches focus on their teams. It was mentioned that only occasionally do LDS church wards directly address political issues. One Anglo resident who never attends Community Council meetings (Focus Group 1) stated that neighborhood issues are sometimes discussed, but not solved, in church. For example, a Polynesian LDS church leader mentioned a meeting of bishops with a state agency on the issue of gangs.

The focus group respondents were asked a series of questions pertaining to what leaders in the community they might turn to in order to solve community problems. Respondents mentioned a wide variety of leaders. The group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2) and the group consisting of Anglo respondents who regularly attend meetings (Focus Group 6) identified current Community Council leadership, while members of the Pacific Islander group (Focus Group 4) cited church leaders, explaining that leaders who had been “called and sustained” garner more respect than tribal chiefs back in the Islands. Several groups were at a loss to identify leaders, namely the Anglo respondents who never attend meetings (Focus Group 1) and the Spanish speakers (Focus Group 3).

Yet these leaders were rarely, if ever, contacted to help solve community problems. Rather, when someone is seeking a political solution to an issue, they are more
likely to contact their area’s city council member directly. Members in three groups mentioned this: the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2), Anglo residents who occasionally attend meetings (Focus Group 5) and the Anglo respondents who regularly attend Community Council meetings (Focus Group 6). Members of only two groups [the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2) and the group consisting of Anglo residents who regularly attend meetings (Focus Group 6)] mentioned contacting the Glendale Community Council about solving a neighborhood issue.

Social Ties among Neighbors

When asked whether they knew their neighbors, respondents indicated that, in general, relations between neighbors are not strong. While several respondents mentioned socializing with various neighbors, most keep to themselves. According to a respondent in the Pacific Islander group (Focus Group 4), “families stick to families.”

However, people in all groups mentioned episodes of “neighborliness” — shoveling a walk, sharing holiday treats or garden produce, even babysitting. Yet people tend to know most of their neighbors by sight, not by name. Language problems were frequently cited as a barrier to getting acquainted, which is especially acute for members of the Spanish-speaking group (Focus Group 3). They mentioned friction with Tongans several times, and Anglo respondents who regularly attend meetings (Focus Group 6) lamented the language barrier they encounter with immigrants from Latin America and the Balkans. Only Anglo respondents who regularly attend meetings (Focus Group 6) stated that they talked to neighbors about community issues.

Glendale Community Council

Respondents were asked several questions about the Glendale Community Council in order to gauge respondent awareness of the Council, perceptions of the effectiveness of the Community Council and whether or not the Council represents everyone in the community.

Awareness of the Glendale Community Council

Awareness of the Community Council varied among focus group respondents. Some respondents admitted knowing “nothing,” while other respondents said they “went for five minutes to a meeting once,” or “I’ve heard they exist, but I don’t know what they do; I think they meet once a month.” Other focus group respondents were acutely aware of the Glendale Community Council, knowing exactly when and where the Council meets.

The focus group respondents who are aware of the Community Council agreed that the Council, if not already, could be an effective mechanism to achieve community objectives. The group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2), for example, indicated that their perception is that the Glendale Community Council “acts on behalf of the city,” “acts on behalf of the neighborhood,” “votes on new businesses in the area,”
and organizes projects such as Night Out Against Crime. New housing, street lights, traffic control, and other infrastructure-related accomplishments such as curb and gutter were cited by Anglo respondents who regularly attend meetings (Focus Group 6), and an Anglo respondent who occasionally attends meetings (Focus Group 5) indicated “if there’s a drainage issue, or lights…they’re pretty effective.”

In the majority of the focus groups, at least one group respondent expressed awareness and understanding of who the Community Council is and what the Community Council does. Latinos (Focus Group 3) appear to be the least aware of the Glendale Community Council. Additionally, Pacific Islanders (Focus Group 4) are less aware of the Community Council than Anglo group respondents in other focus groups.

Effectiveness of Community Council

Respondents who regularly participate in the Glendale Community Council said they did so for a number of reasons. One reason, as articulated by an Anglo respondent who regularly attends meetings (Focus Group 6), is an ethic of community participation, indicating “my mother took me to meetings all the time.” Other reasons for participation in the Glendale Community Council are that it is viewed as a good source of information (“I just go to see what’s going on: to see if there’s a project coming down the pike, and I report back to the community.”); that they attend for specific issue discussions; and that they “wanted to fight” for their children.

Barriers to Effectiveness

Those who are aware of the existence of the Glendale Community Council indicate a variety of reasons for not participating in the Council meetings. Several focus group respondents indicated that there needed to be more representation from different ethnicities on the Glendale Community Council. The lack of diversity on the Community Council itself was shared across Community Council participant and non-participant groups alike. In the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2), a respondent specifically mentioned the need for more representation by ethnic groups, such as “Hispanics, Africans, Pacific Islanders, and various refugee communities.” A Latino (Focus Group 3) carried this need further by linking a lack of representation to a lack of being heard: “people at the meetings give preference to the opinions of Anglo English speakers over Spanish speakers.”

Another important reason cited as a barrier to the effectiveness of the Glendale Community Council is that other avenues of decision-making are viewed as being more effective than bringing issues or problems to the Glendale Community Council. The group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2), Anglo respondents who occasionally attend Community Council meetings (Focus Group 5), and Anglo respondents who regularly attend meetings (Focus Group 6) said that they prefer to go directly to the source of the decision-making. Furthermore, issues of interest, such as “walkable communities” and open space, need to be addressed by a “larger authority,” said an Anglo respondent who occasionally attends meetings (Focus Group 5).
The perception of conflict at the Glendale Community Council meetings themselves was also mentioned as a potential barrier. An Anglo respondent who never attends meetings (Focus Group 1) noted that he/she was interested in attending a Community Council meeting but “their neighbor told them that there was yelling at the meetings and that nothing gets done.” One individual from the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2) mentioned that clique-struggles within the Glendale Community Council have also been an obstruction to community attendance. Additionally, perceived conflict between the Salt Lake City Mayor and the Glendale Community Council is a factor in the Council’s ability to make things happen in the neighborhood.

While focus group respondents thought that there was much the Glendale Community Council leadership might do to alleviate the barriers to participation, respondents also put much of the responsibility of enlivening the Glendale Community Council on themselves as community residents. Anglo respondents who never attend meetings (Focus Group 1) noted that the Glendale Community Council has “no clue what I want” if I don’t tell them and that lack of involvement on the part of Glendale residents means that the Glendale community is not taking advantage of the “privilege of having a community council.”

**Respondent Suggestions for Improving Participation in the Glendale Community Council**

Several suggestions from across the focus groups emerged to remedy the lack of diversity at Glendale Community Council meetings, an issue identified as a barrier to participation. An Anglo respondent who frequently attends meetings (Focus Group 6) mentioned the need for increasing diversity as a strategy for moving into the future. Other focus group respondents suggested that the Glendale Community Council extend personal invitations to the meetings to different ethnic and social groups as well as develop a “buddy system” to have people invite one friend from within their social circle.

Suggestions for improving participation more generally include disseminating information about Glendale Community Council meeting details and discussion items through schools, churches, and other organizations, e.g., through existing newsletters. One Anglo respondent who never attends meetings (Focus Group 1) suggested publishing meeting details and agenda items in the west side newspaper. A Latino respondent (Focus Group 3) additionally listed Telemundo, Univision, 1600 AM, and 102.3 FM as viable alternative information channels.

Further suggestions pertained to altering the agenda to make the meetings more attractive. A respondent from the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2) indicated that the agenda needs to be “strong[er].” Capitalizing on a Glendale Community Council meeting where Pacific Islander dancers boosted attendance, an Anglo respondent who never attends meetings (Focus Group 1) suggested that each meeting should highlight talented groups or people from the many different cultures represented in the area.
Several focus group participants expressed enthusiasm for shared community activities. Mobile Watch, for example, was listed by Anglo respondents who frequently attend meetings (Focus Group 6) and the group consisting of multiple ethnicities (Focus Group 2) as a successful avenue of community organizing, and these efforts could viably continue. Similarly, an Anglo respondent who occasionally attends meetings (Focus Group 5) suggested that future Glendale Community Council projects could include neighborhood events, days in the park, and craft booths. Community projects such as crafts and a potential “handbook guide to living in Salt Lake City in six languages” were also suggested.
IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS – SPECIFIC FOCUS GROUPS

This section provides summaries of each of the six focus group discussions.

**Focus Group 1: Anglo Respondents, Never Attend Community Council Meetings**

This group was comprised of five respondents, all of whom are not participants in the Glendale Community Council.

Respondents felt that there were many things to like about Glendale, expressing pride in the diversity and friendliness of their neighborhood. These residents, however, are also acutely aware of the problems within Glendale, indicating concerns over the gang and drug presence, the high incidence of crimes, the lack of commerce, and the presence of traffic congestion. Group respondents recognize that Glendale gets portrayed poorly in the media because of these factors, but this does not stop them from being proud to be Glendale residents.

Despite being able to articulate the problems associated with living in Glendale and on the west side of Salt Lake City, these Glendale residents do not discuss political solutions to these problems with public officials, their neighbors, or fellow church members. Instead, these community residents turn to alternative non-political venues for problem-solving such as organizations that build homes, involve children, or work to improve the school system. They get involved with their community because it makes them feel good to contribute to their neighborhood. They have a life-long pattern of behavior of service to the community. They feel it is important to have pride in the area. They feel that their community involvement will contribute to Glendale’s improvement. These residents are aware of their lack of contact with public officials and the Community Council, but they feel that oftentimes public officials, particularly the Zoning Commission, are not listening to Glendale residents and that public officials have not made ample efforts to entice their participation.

Although group respondents do not feel that the Glendale Community Council adequately represents them, they offer other reasons for their non-attendance, such as busy lives and unawareness of the time and location of Community Council meetings. The Glendale Community Council is simply not an avenue they choose for their participation. They understand from newspapers and neighbors that there is a lack of diversity within the Glendale Community Council leadership and suggest that the way to increase the diversity at meetings is for the leadership to extend personal invitations to different ethnic groups, allowing word-of-mouth to work through ethnic organizations and groups.
Focus Group 2: Multiple Ethnicities, Regularly Attend Community Council Meetings

This group was comprised of six persons, who were of Caucasian, Hispanic (Latino), and Pacific Islander (Tongan) ethnicities.

Respondents had a very favorable attitude toward Glendale, while recognizing its “second class status” with respect to some other areas of Salt Lake City. Respondents were very specific in pointing to aspects of the Glendale neighborhood that they like. Notable are Jordan Park, ethnic diversity (“rainbow of colors”), close proximity to downtown, block parties and other community activities, and the authenticity (or down-to-earth) attitude of residents (“people aren’t fake here”). All but one member has lived in Glendale for many years. The resident who lived in Glendale for the shortest amount of time expressed some pride in identifying with Glendale, although he mentioned that there is not a lot of neighborly interaction on his particular street.

Among the problems these participants associated with living in Glendale are drugs, crime (principally by youth), street gangs, and poor health. Additional discussions revealed that respondents saw poverty as the root problem. In particular, respondents feel that parents holding multiple jobs has ramifications for the neighborhood, e.g., parents being unable to watch their children after school, children not being well prepared for the educational system, a general lack of upward mobility in terms of employment.

All but one of the six respondents are active in neighborhoods and embedded in social networks. Major activities include church/ward, scouts, PTA, youth sports, and the Pacific Islander Association (which one respondent helped to found). And, even the exception to this level of involvement said that he was beginning to volunteer at school to help keep children out of gangs. Several of the respondents see themselves as having friendly relations across ethnic and religious lines.

The focus group respondents do not feel that Glendale is adequately represented in city government, even in comparison with Rose Park and Poplar Grove, and certainly not in comparison with the east side (these are almost the exact words of two respondents, which received nods of agreement around the table). All but one respondent admitted to knowing something about the Glendale Community Council, including time, location, and the nature of meetings. Four respondents have attended meetings at various points over the years, especially to have a voice on certain issues. One person had been the environmental committee chair in the past.

The four respondents most familiar with the Glendale Community Council agree that certain interpersonal conflicts had hindered the Council’s performance in the past and have also dampened enthusiasm and negatively affected attendance. The respondents pointed to Mobile Watch and Night Out Against Crime as the Glendale Community Council’s most significant successes. All agree that greater ethnic representation as well as more engagement with pressing issues would enhance the vitality of the Glendale Community Council. Finally, the respondents recommended that religious and other
community leaders be enlisted to help support attendance at Glendale Community Council meetings and to solicit input from community groups regarding issues of concern for the Council.

**Focus Group 3: Latino, Never Attend Community Council Meetings**

This Spanish-speaking group had five respondents. All of the respondents in the group live on the west side, but only one lives in Glendale (two in Poplar Grove and two in Rose Park).

Respondents in this group did not articulate clear benefits to living in their neighborhoods, but did present a rather mixed listing of positive and negatives. The principal positive is that the west side of Salt Lake City is calmer and safer than other U.S. cities in which they had resided (principally Los Angeles). Respondents also mentioned that the area is relatively diverse, is safe for children, and has schools and parks nearby. Vandalism, loud music, hurried neighbors who do not interact with each other, and acute perceptions of discrimination are among their top concerns. A repeated concern is their perception of a confrontational approach taken by Anglo neighbors when there is an issue with noise or parking, instead of approaching them directly.

Respondents in this group feel little sense of community or neighborhood where they live but recognize there are some welcoming neighbors and nice streets around them. Language barriers are primary obstacles to interactions with neighbors. Spanish language churches are the principal locus of community for this group, not physical neighborhood. Respondents are involved in their church and spend a fair amount of time there, but all stated that church is not a place to solve community problems; however, they feel it is an appropriate place to solve food, charity, and individual problems. A further obstacle to a feeling of community is the perceived lack of organizations that represent Hispanics (re: legal help, predatory lending, low salaries) and a feeling of being ignored by city government. Respondents in this group do not seek to solve problems through organizations or groups, but stated that “the solution is in the individual – there is no one to go to.” When recruited by local schools to get involved and paid a small stipend, several women are happy to be involved, but cannot do the work as volunteers due to economic pressures on their families. Most of the wage earners in these families are in the construction industry and are under constant financial pressure, especially during the slow winter season.

Respondents in this group said they knew very little about the existence of the Glendale Community Council. When told that the Council addresses issues that they had raised as problems (traffic, loud music, and safety) they indicated interest in participating in the meetings. Immigration and health care are two concerns that supercede local community problems for this group.

Respondents indicated a thirst for more information in the community to be presented in Spanish – whether translators in school or Spanish-speaking media. They
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read the school newsletter, which is translated into Spanish, and suggested that could be a medium for information about community issues.

**Focus Group 4: Pacific Islander, Never Attend Community Council Meetings**

This group of Pacific Islanders named diversity, affordability, and convenience as the benefits of living in Glendale (all but one are current residents of the neighborhood). They also expressed concern with poverty, limited access to economic resources, and fewer opportunities to send children to college. They also noted that others frequently perceive Pacific Islanders in a negative light, and that this leads to discrimination in opportunities.

Family was clearly expressed as the center of life. All respondents mentioned church as centrally important as well. Consequently, community is defined through people, not geography. Respondents noted the challenges to maintaining cultural integrity, articulating the difficulties associated with parents bringing children up in the “old ways” in the midst of American cultural influences. The leaders mentioned are ministers and bishops, clergy of various Polynesian congregations whom the community looks up to and trusts.

Relations with government are tenuous and often filled with mistrust. Incidents between some parents and the state child welfare agency have not helped. Candidates for office and government officials are seen as being full of talk and not action. In general, outsiders are perceived with suspicion. Respondents described the community’s fatigue with those trying to take advantage of Pacific Islanders, and the keen skills the community has developed to resist the overtures of people they don’t trust.

Members of this focus group did not know much about the Community Council. With the exception of an aspirant for local office, no one in the group had attended a meeting. But all had suggestions for the Council: that Council members should attend some of the Polynesian community’s activities, reach out with advertisements in their language, and recognize the leaders that the community already has. Language barriers, the demands of everyday life, and lack of information are all reasons for non-participation.

**Focus Group 5: Anglo, Occasionally Attend Community Council Meetings**

While this focus group was originally recruited as mixed-ethnicity and participation level, the two respondents who participated are Anglo, active in their community, and only occasionally attend Glendale Community Council meetings.

This group identified diversity, affordability, and convenience as the aspects they like most about Glendale. All respondents displayed a high awareness of multi-cultural and economic development issues. While repeatedly expressing fondness for the cultural
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and economic diversity of the neighborhood, they also regret its physical layout—that there is no one center of cultural and economic activity. The fact that Glendale is not a “walkable community” was mentioned several times.

The group also expressed concern for the quality of local schools, admitting that they would probably not be sending their children to the neighborhood junior high. They are involved in local political and citizens’ groups 10-15 hours a week. Although all of the respondents in this group have attended Community Council meetings in the last several years, the groups in which they are most active are rarely engaged with the Community Council. The respondents articulated several reasons for their infrequent engagement of the Community Council. First, the issues with which their groups are concerned are better “taken to the source,” i.e. the planning commission or the city council. Second, the Community Council is perceived as unrepresentative—of both their own group and of other communities in Glendale.

They acknowledged that the Community Council is effective with certain issues such as drainage and lighting. But they strongly recommended the Community Council be more proactive in its activities. The respondents suggested that the Community Council engage in more activities such as neighborhood events, days in the park, and craft fairs that would bring the different neighborhoods in the community to a common place. But they also acknowledged obstacles like language issues, economic demands on new immigrants, and the cultural insularity of groups (including current Community Council leadership) as challenges associated with bringing diverse groups together.

Focus Group 6: Anglo, Frequently Attend Community Council Meetings

Respondents in this group have long histories in Glendale (all over 40 years residence) causing respondents to focus much on the past. They articulated that in the past there was a sense of community among long-time residents, as these residents were among the first to settle in Glendale. Respondents said that in the past people knew each other, occupied their family homes for many years, raised children in the neighborhood, and maintained Glendale as a well-kept area. They also mentioned the presence of local business in the past, especially at Glendale Plaza. Several mentioned that the neighborhood had been in decline but that the community had come together to fight gangs and has improved. Bad publicity and declining property values, neighborhood cleanliness, gangs and crime, the exodus of residents, and perceived low quality of schools are principal issues for this group.

For this focus group, language barriers supercede cultural or ethnic differences as the main issue that prevents a sense of community. Different languages cause an inability to talk to neighbors and leave people feeling alienated by local businesses that sell products they don’t recognize and whose proprietors they cannot interact with. Respondents perceive the west side as being quite different from the rest of Salt Lake City due to the influx of residents and of receiving little attention from city government. Housing was a big issue for these respondents due to the declining quality of the housing
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The construction of new homes, they said, makes it unlikely that anyone would buy and renovate the older, more dilapidated homes.

“Communities” for these respondents are physical, strengthened by the LDS ward system, which is geographically based. Yet respondents feel this system, which also provided social networks and a community decision-making structure, is unraveling due to the influx of new residents and other changes. Respondents regret the fragmentation of LDS stakes into ethnically-based wards that separate residents who live in the same area. They perceive this fragmentation in the larger community, describing Glendale as a series of ethnic enclaves now with no community center (which used to be around Glendale Plaza). This group indicated that community issues do get addressed on the ward council level, but that “minorities do not get included unless they are members of the church.”

This group is sensitive to and respectful of cultural differences. At the same time, respondents recognize that these cultural differences cause a great deal of daily friction with neighbors from different backgrounds. This group is unsure how to find a shared basis for community or decision-making with such diversity of religion, language, and culture. They seem unsure how to solve conflicts with neighbors (most of whom were Spanish-speaking) over code or “good neighbor” issues (including loud music, multiple families in single family homes, many cars, and unkempt lawns) without calling the police. Respondents lamented the lack of community activities such as soccer leagues or a central locale such as a community square in Glendale.

Respondents in this group are quite involved in Community Council affairs as well as in other organizations. They address community problems through the Glendale Community Council as well as through the local city council representative and other leaders. All agreed that the Community Council had been very effective in the past when the city had provided more research and training for leaders. They feel that the best way to strengthen the leadership of the Community Council is to recruit leaders from Hispanic and Pacific Islander communities. They also articulated that the best way to involve the community’s diverse residents in the Community Council is to create sub-committees, which would focus on different community issues.
V. DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

The goal of this research project is to gain a better understanding of the barriers residents of west side neighborhoods face in participation in the Glendale Community Council, and to develop a community action plan to foster increased participation in community councils. The focus groups produced a wealth of information, not all of which falls specifically within the scope of this report. This discussion of the findings focuses on the specific lessons learned regarding participation of residents in the Glendale Community Council.

Community

Focus group respondents identified many assets in the neighborhood, including central location, neighborliness, good people, parks and schools, diversity, and others. At the same time, the Glendale neighborhood has undergone rapid change over the past decade and the community is struggling with the twin goals of integrating a rapidly diversifying population and of redefining itself as a community of neighbors.

For focus group respondents, diversity was both an asset and a challenge. People were motivated by the energy of many different cultures coming together to develop a sense of community that extends to all of Glendale’s geographic borders. At the same time, residents are struggling to adjust from what might be thought of as a relatively centralized and largely homogeneous neighborhood, in which many residents were part of the same ethnic, language, and religious networks that also shaped participation and decision-making of the Community Council, to a multi-centric and much more diverse neighborhood in which there are multiple languages, backgrounds, religious and family networks, and arenas of local decision-making.

This diversity has a number of implications for the Community Council:

✔ The word “community” means different things for different groups in Glendale, which raises the question of what is meant by “community” in “Community Council.” For Anglo residents it is principally associated with the physical neighborhood, which overlaps well with the geography-based community council system. For Hispanic and Pacific Islander residents, community is tied more to language, family, and church networks, which span physical neighborhood boundaries. Each of these groups needs to see the Community Council as connecting in some way with its form of “community.”

✔ The shift to a more multi-centric nature of community life has created a number of challenges, including:
  o Lack of communication, interaction, and cooperation across/among local organizations.
  o No “center” of the community.
  o Language barriers leading to misunderstandings.
o Core organizations (church, civic) separating the community into different groups.
o Few effective links to connect existing groups and organizations in the neighborhood.

**Local Decision-Making Arenas and Networks**

Glendale is full of residents with lots of energy, many forms of community participation. Although the community is bubbling with organizational life, there is little coordination among the groups. A bird’s-eye view of the organizational life in Glendale might show a dense array of community organizations with few or no ties between them. This means that although residents are vibrant participants in social and group activities, their social interactions involve repeated exchanges with familiar faces but relatively few interactions with members of other groups. So although residents (perhaps especially new arrivals and “minority” residents) are already very engaged in numerous activities and organizations, these activities rarely overlap with the activities of others in the neighborhood and do not contribute to the formation of a neighborhood-wide identity. In addition, there are now multiple groups to which people can turn to solve community problems, and the Community Council is rarely the first place they turn.

This poses distinct challenges for the Community Council. People’s free time outside of work and family is already taken up with commitments to other organizations, which makes it hard to recruit new participants or encourage attendance by more residents. It seems that new arrivals to the community in particular have no knowledge of the Community Council, and so do not include it in their repertoire of participatory activities. To the extent that new arrivals belong to non-white ethnic groups, this tends to create a marked under-representation of Pacific Islander and Latino voices in the Community Council.

This suggests that the Community Council must adapt its role to the new situation or become increasingly less representative of the needs and views of neighborhood residents. One possibility is that it shift its emphasis from an organization that links residents to the city government, to one that links residents and community organizations to each other. This would allow it to tap into the organizational energy that exists in the neighborhood and help build bridges across local organizations and groups.

**Increasing the Relevance of the Community Council**

Most people interviewed for this project see a valuable role for the Community Council even though they may not have the time or currently see a role for themselves in it. The relevance of the Community Council to residents, and the information residents have about the Community Council, seem to vary not just with ethnicity, but also with length of residence. Since longer-standing residents tend to be Anglo while new arrivals tend to belong to ethnic minorities, low participation by ethnic minorities may be due partially or mostly to their length of residence in Glendale. This suggests that the
Community Council needs to do more to reach out to new arrivals in the community. This is critical in a neighborhood where the population is changing so quickly.

As suggested earlier, the Community Council could refocus its role in the community in order to capitalize on the community involvement that already exists among Glendale residents, to connect multiple centers of interaction, and to engage in outreach activities. Shifting the role of the Community Council – and community councils on the west side in general – does not mean abandoning its role as an intermediary with the city or as a place for residents to solve urban problems. Rather, the research findings indicate that the Community Council could fruitfully place more emphasis on the creation of contacts with other organizations in the community so as to establish a greater presence in the neighborhood and increase the Council’s relevance for residents.

In sum, the challenge for the Community Council is to find a way to tap into the energy that people are already investing in their community and to connect these multiple centers to build a shared sense of belonging among Glendale’s many groups.

**Recommendations**

Recommendations for the Community Council, stemming from the research findings, concern four broad themes: disseminating information; encouraging linkages with schools and churches; engaging in community-building activities; and broadening leadership capabilities.

**Information:** Respondents, particularly non-Anglo residents, had little information about Community Council meetings, its functions, or its effectiveness.

- The Community Council could create a *community newsletter*, which would include the monthly agenda; local updates; and business, school, and church information. This newsletter should be translated into *multiple languages*.
- Include Council information in existing information sources, especially *in local school newsletters* and in the *West View* newspaper.
- Emphasize activities and outreach that *target new arrivals* to the neighborhood.

**Community-Building Activities**

- The Community Council could broaden its focus to include *community-building activities* in addition to its problem-solving activities. Examples of community-building activities might include:
  - A street fair (akin to the Avenues Street Fair) that involves other groups and organizations.
  - A local cultural performance group on the Council agenda each month.
  - Sponsor Cinco de Mayo festivities.
  - Neighborhood cleanup in cooperation or in partnership with a local church.
Building Bridges to other Organizations and Broadening Leadership of the Community Council

- Encourage broader leadership in the Community Council. Possible strategies include recruiting sub-committee members from other community organizations to create bridging ties across networks; creating an outreach committee; including members and leaders of local community organizations on some sort of an advisory board to the Community Council.

- The Community Council could carry out neighborhood projects and activities in partnerships with other local organizations to build bridges to other groups. For example, community-building activities could be done in cooperation with local organizations, not by the Council alone, which would help expand the Council’s presence in the community.

It is important to note that the successful implementation of these recommendations will require more resources (money, training, logistical support) from the city government.
VI. APPENDIX I: SUMMARY OF OBSTACLES TO INCREASING DIVERSITY IN COMMUNITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS

Obstacles to increasing diversity in Community Council affairs identified by focus group participants:

I. **Time**
   a. Too busy—many people work multiple jobs

II. **Relevance**
   a. People seem to try to get things done through networks and organizations (community involvement) not through Community Council meetings (community action)
   b. People won’t go to a meeting unless it’s about something they care about
   c. Time-worn skepticism about new programs in the Pacific Islander community
   d. Top priority goes to other pressing issues: job, school, health care
   e. Much of what people want to address in a community is beyond the scope of the Community Council’s authority (e.g., walkable communities, open space, school issues)
   f. Not clear whether Community Council has the authority to really get things done
   g. Community Council tends to focus on crime and safety, but many residents have other priorities even before that. Community Council should focus more on community-building and social relationships.
   h. Heard the Community Council’s meetings were confrontational

III. **Language**
   a. Minorities, especially non-native English speakers, are often afraid, don’t know where to go, feel that people at meetings give preference to the opinions of Anglo English speakers over Spanish speakers
   b. Language barriers

IV. **Community**
   a. Not clear what common ground is that unites community. Used to be ward structure, but now many more mixed religions, languages, cultures—need to find common ground
VII. APPENDIX II: RESPONDENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASING PARTICIPATION IN THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL AND IN PUBLIC DECISION-MAKING

Recommendations that emerged from focus group participants:

I. Information/communication
   a. A banner announcing Council meeting time
   b. Welcome new homeowners in neighborhood
   c. Publicize issues and meetings in school papers, in different languages
   d. Keep reminding people, inviting people
   e. Print flyer in multiple languages
   f. Encourage a “dialogue” approach to nuisance issues (talk to neighbors instead of calling police)
   g. Publish a Community Council newsletter (not just an agenda) like the Avenues Community Council, and in Spanish also
   h. Need to mobilize schools and churches—send letters, follow up with call
   i. Need to see faces, language, values of different cultural groups in representative bodies
   j. Advertise on Spanish-language media (Telemundo, Univision, 1600 AM, 102.3 FM)
   k. Create a “neighborhood handbook” in several languages to hand out to all residents and new homeowners

II. Relevance
   a. Publicize the specific issues that the Council will deal with each month—identify a theme for discussion and planning (e.g., industrial pollution, trains, housing)
   b. Broadcast past Community Council accomplishments so people will have confidence in having an impact
   c. Need to explain what the Community Council does
   d. Need to make Community Council relevant to people—focus on something people believe is worth doing
   e. Mobilize people through their children—neighborhood activity for kids (to draw parents); discuss school-related issues; get children involved in a neighborhood cleanup; teach kids “good neighbor” lessons at school and they’ll teach their parents
III. **Community-building**
   a. Organize neighborhood soccer league
   b. Organize neighborhood history project
   c. Have cultural talents displayed at meetings to mobilize ethnic communities; build on networks of trust and friendship to involve people in Community Council issues
   d. Organize neighborhood project, mobilize churches and neighborhood groups to participate
   e. Organize neighborhood cleanup, give beautification awards, public competition for awards
   f. Welcoming members from different backgrounds needs to be a top priority of Community Council
   g. Community Council leaders should attend some of ethnic communities’ events
   h. Do something positive to bring people together—e.g., a crafts fair

IV. **Broadening leadership and networks**
   a. Create subcommittees to involve more people in Community Council leadership, delegate authority to these, recruit Spanish and Tongan community leaders for these positions
   b. Need to involve whole community in a project; in past Community Council was very active and effective: model cities program created senior center, community school, Jordan River parkway
   c. Use Sugarhouse model for electing Community Council leaders: candidate needs to provide 20 signatures from residents/neighbors to be able to run for Board
   d. City needs to provide more training and resources for Community Council leaders
VIII. APPENDIX III: RESPONSIVE PROFILE

At the beginning of each focus group, respondents were asked to fill out a ten-question survey. The aim of the survey was to discern and quantify the characteristics of the group members. These surveys reveal the following about the focus group respondents:

- Most respondents indicated that they had lived in Glendale for at least one year. Half of the respondents have lived in Glendale for more than ten years.
- The majority of respondents have attended at least one Glendale Community Council meeting with two respondents indicating that they have attended as many as ten meetings. A substantial number of respondents, however, have never attended a Glendale Community Council meeting.
- The majority of respondents indicated that they voted in the fall 2003 city elections for mayor.
- Almost all respondents fall between the ages of 25-44 or are older than 55. There were no respondents younger than 24 and only one between the ages of 45-54.
- A majority of the respondents have one or more children under the age of 18 living in the same household with them.
- The focus group respondents largely work outside of the home.
- Most respondents were Caucasian but the Latino and Pacific Islander populations were represented as well.
- A majority of respondents speak English at home.
- The respondents vary widely in their educational background, with most respondents having less than a college degree. A substantial portion of the respondent population, however, attended graduate or professional school.
- Slightly more than half of the respondents were female.
### Results of In-Group Questionnaire

1. How long have you been a Glendale resident?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Does not live in Glendale)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Within the last year, how many Glendale Community Council meetings have you attended?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did you vote in the city elections for mayor this fall?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How old are you?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many children under the age of 18 currently live in your household?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. In thinking about all of your jobs combined, how many hours a week do you work outside of the home?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not work outside home</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39 hours</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hours</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-59 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 hours or more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What is your ethnicity?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What language do you speak at home?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Tongan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Portuguese</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What is the highest level of education you have completed?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from college</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended graduate or professional school</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What is your gender?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. APPENDIX IV: MODERATOR GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>(8 minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi, my name is ___________ , and I am a professor at the University of Utah. For the next few hours, I am going to be asking you questions on what it is like to live in Glendale for our study of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will be audio-taping this discussion for research purposes only. The recording is so that we may review this discussion later on, but no one else besides the research team will hear this recording. You’ll also notice that we have a note-taker in the room with us. She is going to observe what we are talking about tonight and write down some of the topics we discuss and the comments you make. She is part of the research team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your comments here will remain completely confidential. No one outside our research group will ever see the notes or listen to the tape. The information we learn from this group will only be used for our project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ll be asking you a variety of questions tonight and would like for all of you to feel comfortable offering your opinion. If for some reason you didn’t get a chance to express your feelings on a particular topic, please feel free to stop me and let me know. If you do not want to comment on a particular topic, then please do not feel pressured to do so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s begin by going around the room and having each one of you introduce yourself with your first name only, telling us a little about you and your family, what you do for a living, and how long you have lived in Glendale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glendale Community</th>
<th>(25 minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’d like for you now to think about living in Glendale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you like about living in Glendale?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. What else do you like about living in Glendale? (ask no more than 3 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Of the things that we just listed, which ones do you think you like the most about living in Glendale?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you feel like you live in a neighborhood? Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. How big is your neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In your opinion, what are the biggest issues facing the Glendale community today? [moderator: write down issues on the board; follow-up questions later on]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Are there any other issues facing Glendale you’d like to mention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How do these issues affect you personally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Do you feel like Glendale faces the same issues as the rest of Salt Lake City or
different issues? Why or why not?
   a. Do you feel like Glendale is a part of Salt Lake City?
   b. Do you feel like Glendale is well represented in city government?

Organizations/Social Networks                      (30 minutes)

5. Do you know your neighbors?
   a. What kinds of activities have you done with your neighbors in the past
      year?
   b. Do you talk with your neighbors regularly about neighborhood issues?

6. If a neighborhood issue comes up, what organization or individual would you go
to?
   a. Are there other people who are influential in Glendale?
   b. What qualities do these influential people have?

7. What kinds of groups or organizations do you participate in, either inside
   Glendale or elsewhere in the Salt Lake Valley?
   a. Why did you get involved with these groups?
   b. Which group or organization is most important to you? Which one do you
      spend the most time with?
   c. Why do you spend as much time with these groups as you do?
   d. Have you ever tried to work with one of these groups to sort out a
      community issue you mentioned earlier? [name specific issues from Q3
      here]

8. Would you say you have a lot of contact with people of other ethnic groups?
   a. Do you feel like it is difficult to communicate with neighbors who speak a
      different language than you do?
   b. How much contact would you say you have with people of other
      religions?
   c. Do you wish you had you more contact with people of other ethnicities
      and religions?

Community Council                             (45 minutes)

Now I’d like to ask you about the Glendale Community Council.

9. What do you know about the Glendale Community Council?
   a. What can you tell me about what the Community Council does?
   b. Do any of you know when and where the meetings are?

10. Have you ever attended a Community Council meeting?
    a. **IF YES:** Why did you attend the Community Council meeting? Did you
        actually participate in the meeting?
b. What prevents you from going more often?
c. What changes would make you want to become more involved?

11. What other experience, if any, have you had with the Community Council?
   a. Do you think the Glendale Community Council is effective? How so or how not?
   b. Has the Glendale Community Council been effective on the community issues you mentioned earlier? [name specific issues from Q3 here]
   c. What has the Community Council done to address these issues? [name specific issues from Q3 here]
   d. Is the Glendale Community Council more or less effective than other organizations you belong to?
   e. Do you feel like the Glendale Community Council could do more to reach out to the community, or do you feel like the Community Council does enough to reach out to Glendale residents already?

12. Some say that attendance at Glendale Community Council meetings is low. Do you feel like this is true?
   a. Why or why not?
   b. If you agree with that statement, what is the reason for low attendance?
   c. What do you think can be done to increase attendance?

13. What things could the Glendale Community Council do to increase participation?
   a. Are their particular issues that you think the Community Council should be more vocal about?
   b. Do you think that there are logistical issues, such as the place or time of the meetings, which might prevent participation?

14. Do you think the Glendale Community Council represents everyone in the community?
   a. Do you think the Glendale Community Council acts in the interest of everyone in the community?
   b. What groups do you think are not represented on the Glendale Community Council?
   c. What can be done to increase diversity on the Community Council?

15. Do you think the Glendale Community Council has been effective in bringing people of different ethnicities and religions together?
   a. In what ways do you think that all of these groups can be brought together?

Closing (5 minutes)

16. Do you have any other comments?

THANK YOU!
X. CONTACT INFORMATION AND RESEARCH TEAM
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