TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary		2
Literature Review ¹		10
Data Collection and Me	thodology	23
Findings		41
Recommendations		56
Conclusion		61
Bibliography		64
Appendix A:		67
Appendix B:		113

¹ Special Thanks to Miriam Edelman and the 2010 Consulting Group for their contributions to this report. To read more about the contributions of the 2010 Consulting Group, please see "Initial Survey Report." 2010. Cornell Social Capital Consulting Group.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Social Capital is a measurement of the connectedness and trust between members of a community. The central premise of social capital is that social networks have value. Social capital refers to the collective value of all "social networks" [who people know] and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other [norms of reciprocity] (Putnam 2000). In the fall of 2010, the Tompkins Chamber of Commerce and The Tompkins Community Foundation, with support from the 1492 Consulting Group, and the Cornell Institute of Public Affairs (mainly the Cornell Social Capital Consulting Group), undertook the Harvard Kennedy School's Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey.

The survey was created in 1999 during the Saguaro Seminar at Harvard University, and was updated in 2006 with the creation of a short form of the survey. It is a confidential questionnaire that asks respondents about 11 dimensions of social capital, including levels of trust, political participation, and community involvement. Analysis of the survey is used to help communities discover what measure of social capital they are particularly high in, as well as measures that may need attention; the survey also helps communities understand correlations between various factors relating to social capital (for example, the effects of age, economic status, and education levels on trust). The survey also allows communities to compare themselves with other communities across the nation that have carried out the survey to determine the absolute and relative values of responses. These comparisons also allow communities to connect around sharing and creating solutions for strengthening social capital, both locally and nationally. The 2010 Cornell Social Capital Consulting Group administered the survey to 641 residents of Tompkins County, with an over sample of approximately 100 African-Americans. The results of the survey were presented to the following community leaders: City Councilperson J.R. Clairborne; County Board Chair Martha Robertson; Rabbi Scott Glass; James Brown, United Way; Former Mayor Carolyn Peterson; Ithaca Journal Publisher Sherman Bodner; Ithaca Journal Editor Bruce Estes; Chamber Board Member Michelle Berry; and Human Services Coalition Member Kathy Schlather. The group had mixed reactions to the results and many were put on the defense by the presentation, making clear the need for a thoughtful communication strategy for the future that includes a consideration of framing and individualizing presentations of the findings.

In light of the response of the leaders, and the recommendation of the 2010 Consulting Group that the survey be carried out again in 3-4 years, a new Cornell Social Capital Consulting Group was formed in the spring of 2012. This team of 4 students, and one independent consultant, set out to determine the best ways to increase the impact of the findings of the 2010 survey, as well as the impact of the next survey period. This report is the culmination of that work, and includes findings and recommendations based on the five dimensions of the group's research, including a communication strategy; cross-community comparisons; in-depth statistical data analysis of the 2010 survey findings (with comparisons to national data); location testing and outreach; and a detailed marketing strategy and kit.

Communication Strategy

Since the 2010 survey findings were greeted with mixed results — some community leaders felt personally insulted, others were more open to the data — the 2012 team began to analyze how future survey findings might be communicated in a way that would help inspire community leaders to accept the reality of the findings, as well as engage in strategies for responding to those findings. In order to better understand some of the central driving and restraining forces in the community, the team carried out a "force field analysis." A force field analysis provides a framework for looking at the factors (forces) that influence a situation. It looks at forces that are either driving movement toward a goal or restraining and blocking movement toward a goal. The team also created a set of questions for leaders in attendance at the 2010 meeting, as well as those who were not at the meeting. These questions were designed to gauge level of understanding and perceptions of social capital; as well as individual willingness to devote resources to improve social capital. Some of the recommendations that came out of this analysis include:

- Survey results should be presented to different stakeholder groups independently so that both the results and the framing can be more individualized.
- Particular people in each stakeholder group should be identified as leaders, and effort should be made to help get them on board. For instance, it is not enough to include "police officers," but specific police officers should be identified and approached as potential advocates.

In the future, instead of having one meeting with different groups, several small meetings in which results are presented would have greater impact and acceptance. More personalized meetings of survey findings would also allow for the identification of leaders who can share

the results with their constituents in the way that would be most efficient and useful. In order to help strengthen long-term communication efforts, the team established a set of specific recommendations for consideration.

Cross-Community Comparisons

The following question was posed by the 2010 team: "Now that we have this survey data, what will we do with it?" The 2012 team decided to do both a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the findings. For the qualitative analysis, the team selected a handful of communities around the country with similar demographic features that have also undertaken the social capital survey. The team selected Rochester, NY; Boulder, CO; Winston-Salem, NC; and Ann Arbor, MI. These communities were selected because they are locations with a large research university, surrounded by a rural area. This demographic makeup is similar to Tompkins County. The team collected information through first person interviews and through secondary sources. Our findings include (among a list of other things):

- Rochester, NY broadcast their public meetings on television and on the radio to make them more accessible.
- Boulder, CO applied for and won a \$3 million grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to improve social capital in the community.
- Winston-Salem, NC commenced a grant making process for community groups through their ECHO fund. They also give individual ECHO awards.

Thus, the future team should explore writing and applying for federal and state grants, having the capacity to give small grants or awards, and making public meetings more accessible. During this research we also made connections with social capital leaders, including those working at Harvard's Kennedy School and with the Winston-Salem Foundation; these contacts want to keep up with and support the work in Tompkins County. Based on our qualitative findings, we have developed a set of recommendations.

Data and Regression Analysis

The 2010 team did initial data analysis of the survey findings (See "Initial Survey Report"). In order to better understand the findings and their relationship to other communities, the 2012 team delved deeper into the data using in-depth statistical analysis and regression models. After recoding the variables from the original data set in different permutations, including trust, political participation, age, and relationship status, we used applied statistical analysis and our discoveries include:

- Higher trust was found to be correlated with greater age, being a US citizen, having a job, and greater educational attainment.
- People with disabilities in Tompkins County did not report any statistically significant differing levels of trust than people without disabilities, indicating that Tompkins County has done an adequate job including people with disabilities.
- Some community activities increased levels of trust more than others. For instance, attending public meetings is found to be correlated with increased trust, but blood donation is correlated with lower trust (as is attending political meetings).
- Residents new to Tompkins County have lower trust than people who have lived in the County 5 years or more.

In the future, those working on building social capital will need to make decisions about whether they should direct the interventions at those with lower levels of social capital (the less educated, temporarily laid off, people in poor health, and with low trust levels) or those with higher levels of social capital (leaders, retirees, and others who experienced high levels of trust). We believe a combination of both approaches will have the greatest effect on the community. By reaching leaders actions and policies can be developed that have the potential to reach a large portion of the community; and reaching individuals with low social capital, trust and connections can be strengthened on a person-by-person basis.

Survey Methods: Location Testing

Although the 2010 survey reached a relatively diverse population, many respondents were reached by relying on pre-existing networks, raising questions about who was left out of the results. The problem with reliance on existing social networks is that since the survey is measuring connectedness, those who were not very connected would not be asked to take the survey, and thus would be omitted. So the 2012 team analyzed different methods to try to ensure a more representative sample could be found in the future. The team ultimately decided that going door to door was not feasible for large segments of the community, but might work well for small, hard-to-reach portions. The team tested several different locations, including grocery stores, health clinics, and libraries. We identified a handful of specific locations for distributing survey invitations, including Tops, Wegmans, the Public Library, Dewitt Middle School, Boyton Middle School, Southside Community Center, Ithaca Free Clinic, thaca Internal Medicine (Warren

Road), and the Sciencenter. The team also began to form partnerships with the leaders of these community locations, so that the future teams will already have points of contact. Recommendations from this dimension of our research include the following:

- Although community locations tested had a diverse population in regards to age, sex, and income level, there was a significant divide between Ithacans and people from Greater Tompkins County. Thus, in the future, the team may need to advertise in the community in locations in the other towns and hamlets to make sure all of Tompkins County is represented.
- The team also found that having an incentive of some kind might lead to greater survey response. There are very many concurrent surveys around Ithaca, often instigated by Cornell University, that offer participants \$20, \$75, up to \$1,200. Our survey is marketed on intrinsic motivation, but perhaps if there was some incentive (a discount at a local business, raffle to win an iPod) the survey would be more competitive. Coupons from local businesses would also help expand the customer base of those locations, hopefully creating a win-win-win partnership. In this scenario, the business owner wins by gaining new customers, the survey participant wins by getting a discount, and the community wins by having a good survey sample.
- The future team might investigate social marketing putting the survey link on Facebook, Craigslist or the library website, to reach the population of people who are unable to travel into town where they might come across a survey flyer.

Marketing Strategy

Miriam Edelman, who was part of the 2010 Social Capital Consulting Group, created a comprehensive marketing and outreach strategy tool kit, which is detailed in a separate document available with this report.

Conclusion

The following comprehensive report includes a literature review; a detailed review of the team's data collection and methodology; a review of our findings; and finally, and most importantly, our recommendations for strengthening the impact of the 2010 survey results and the next survey period. It has been our pleasure and honor to assist in this meaningful endeavor.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The new currency won't be intellectual capital. It will be social capital - the collective value of whom we know and what we'll do for each other. When social connections are strong and numerous, there is more trust, reciprocity, information flow, collective action, happiness, and, by the way, greater wealth. - James Kouzes

Introduction

Social Capital is a measure of community connectedness and social networks, including the various dimensions of value that these networks hold. "Norms of reciprocity" are central to the collective benefits of networks, including benefits such as trust, information flow, and cooperation ("Better Together" 2012). New research about social capital shows that communities with higher levels of social capital have more positive outcomes in regards to health, education, economic growth, and crime. Tompkins County stakeholders heightened efforts to improve social capital in the community after incidents of racial harassment and violence. Leaders from the Tompkins County Chamber of Commerce, The Community Foundation, and other local organizations decided to begin these focused efforts with an extensive social capital survey that would provide feedback about the current state of connectedness in the community. They joined approximately 40 other states in the United States in these important efforts.

The survey selected by Tompkins County is called the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey. This survey was created at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government to measure eleven dimensions of social capital. The first social capital survey

was undertaken in Tompkins County in 2010 and received over 600 responses. An initial analysis of this data was carried out, and is included in the 2010 Report created by the previous Cornell Social Capital Consulting Group ("Initial Survey Report"). Community stakeholders currently central to efforts of improving social capital through the use of the Community Benchmark Survey who make up the core client group include John Neuman, President and CEO of 1492 Consulting Group; Jean McPheeters, President of Tompkins County Chamber of Commerce; George Ferrari, Executive Director at Community Foundation of Tompkins County; Alan Pedersen, Vice President of Human Resources at Cayuga Medical Center; and Laurie Linn, President of Communique Design & Marketing. This group will be working closely with the Cornell Social Capital Consulting Group, which is led by Professor Laurie Miller and includes MPA graduate students at CIPA, Miriam Edelman, Jamie Frank, Gabriela Leite-Soares, Hao Luo, and Carrie Young.

This report intends to offer stakeholders feedback that will help strengthen future social capital survey efforts; as well as additional analysis of data from the 2010 survey period. The literature review portion of this report offers background information on various aspects relating to social capital and the Benchmark Survey, including its use in other communities. Following the literature review, we include a detailed strategy for marketing, communication, and outreach efforts; findings from extensive location testing; and statistical analysis of select research findings. The Appendix also includes a "Media Kit" that can be used for the social capital survey, and can serve as a basis/model

for other Tompkins County survey efforts. This information serves to help the country maximize the return on efforts to measure and strengthen social capital.

Overview of Race/Ethnic Relations in Tompkins County

Tompkins County is less racially diverse than much of New York State and the United States as a whole. In 2010, of the 101,564 residents in Tompkins County, 82.6 percent were Caucasian, four percent were African-American, 0.4 percent were Native American, and 8.6 percent were Asian. While 3.2 percent considered themselves to be members of two or more races, 4.2 percent identified as being of Hispanic or Latino origin (Tompkins County 2012). The biggest city in Tompkins County is the City of Ithaca. The population of Ithaca changes throughout the year mainly because of the Cornell University and Ithaca College student populations. Ithaca is more diverse than Tompkins County. In 2010, of 30,014 residents in Ithaca, 70.5 percent were Caucasian, 6.6 percent were African-American, 0.4 percent were Native American, and 16.2 percent were Asian. At the same time, 4.3 percent reported being of two or more races, and 6.9 percent considered themselves to be of Hispanic or Latino origin (U.S. Census 2012). In 2012, Tompkins County and Ithaca have similar demographics to the data mentioned in the fall 2010 report.

In the county, various entities have been trying to improve diversity. The Tompkins County and Ithaca governments have diversity-related committees that work together to discuss important issues and ways to strengthen diversity. Furthermore, various organizations and events try to connect different racial and ethnic groups. Cornell University, Ithaca College, and Tompkins Cortland Community College have been promoting diversity substantially through groups and events.

In relation to the United States communities that carried out the 2000 and 2006 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, race and ethnic relations in Tompkins County are above average. However, some problems have occurred in schools. A few notable recent race-related incidents include the bullying of African-American Epiphany Kearney beginning in 2005, the stabbing of Caucasian Nathan Poffenbarger on Cornell's West Campus in 2006, and the shooting and killing of Shawn Greenwood in 2010.

Race and ethnic relations continue to pose challenging social problems. These struggles date back to the creation of the United States when the Constitution created a racial hierarchy with its counting slaves as three-fifths of a person and with its continuation of the slave trade. In addition, many Native Americans were removed from their land. After slavery was abolished, southern states enacted Jim Crow laws, and racial segregation persisted de facto in much of the rest of the United States. The major civil rights legislation of the 1960s helped improve the situation by providing equal access to education and many services. Over time, much progress has been made. For example, racial and ethnic minorities have been elected and appointed to more government positions, including the U.S. presidency. However, problems between racial and ethnic groups still remain.

These problems still exist in a wide variety of ways. Globalization and the economic collapse have widened already-existing racial disparities in income and wealth, affecting issues of trust and inequality. For example, within the past decade, while the median household net worth is approximately \$90,000 for Caucasians; it is \$8,000 for Latinos; and \$6,000 for African-Americans (Hamilton 2009). Some racial and ethnic minorities

(including African-Americans) are underrepresented in top universities. From a young age, many Caucasian, but not large numbers of African-American children are tracked to more advanced classes. As time passes, more Caucasians than African-Americans take honors/advancement Placement (AP) classes and go to college. To this day, although record percentages of U.S. marriages are interracial or interethnic, many racial and ethnic groups live amongst themselves in ethnic-based enclaves or suburbs and thus are not able to forge close relationships with other types of people ("The Rise of Intermarriage" 2012). In addition, some racial and ethnic minorities suffer from discrimination.

Race Relations in the Northeast

While events are a strong reminder of racism that still exists, there is a great deal of research that suggests that negative interracial attitudes have effects that are even more damaging than dramatic newspaper events. These effects can include levels of achievement in schools, in healthcare, and in relationships with other members of the community (such as what is measured by the social capital survey.)

The United States has a dramatic past regarding race relations—from slavery, to the Jim Crow laws, to the violence experienced during the civil rights movement, to the Newark, Detroit, Rochester, and Los Angeles race riots. Yet today, there are some people who make the claim that America is no longer racist. In fact, after the election of President Barack Obama, many newspapers used the term "post racial" to describe American society, as if Americans were beyond caring about race. Yet, for every article celebrating American post racial society, there is an article decrying some significant episode of racism—even in the Northeastern United States, where the collective (but false) belief is that the North was always less racist.

For instance, in 2009, the Philadelphia Daily News covered a story where African American children were not allowed to use the pool of a country club (which they had already paid for) because the director was afraid they would change the "complexion" of the club (Jaffe 2009). In addition, in the news was the high profile shooting of Sean Bell in New York City--a young black man who was unarmed and was shot several times by the New York Police Department (NYPD). These racial incidents occurring dispute the belief by some that the North is a post-racial society.

An opinion poll conducted by the Opinion Research Corp in 2006 found that most Americans acknowledge that they have experienced some racism in their lives. However, only one out of eight Americans would say that he or she is racist. Oftentimes when talking about American racism, due to the long history of tension, it is easy to assume that most racial issues in America are black-and-white issues. However, as America is becoming more diverse, many racial issues that exist are actually also between different ethnicities. For instance, in 2012, the NYPD was found to have been keeping surveillance of many Muslims all over Upstate New York (Poll: Most Americans 2006).

These issues of racism and racist incidents do not just affect the people they happen to; they also affect the surrounding community. In 2010, researchers at Johns Hopkins University found that African-American and Latino students who experience high levels of institutionalized racism experience higher levels of motivation and lower academic performance (Reynolds 2010). A University of North Carolina Press publication reported that higher levels of contact between people of different races and ethnicities increase their positive feelings about people of different races and ethnicities (Sigelman 1993). Yet complexities in these relationships remain, as illustrated by recent findings relating to the impact of race on interviewers and respondents. Mary Krysan, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Michigan, has reported that people's responses to questions may be highly influenced by the race of the interviewer. While some strides have been made in race relations in the Northeast, there is still a lot of work to be done, and the social capital survey sets out to contribute to this work.

Overview of the Social Capital Survey

In 1999, the Saguaro Seminar at Harvard University developed the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey to measure connectedness among people of varying ethnic and racial backgrounds in communities around the United States. The survey has both a short and long form, and it has been administered in at least forty communities with over 5,000 respondents. The survey has eleven different dimensions of social capital, including two dimensions of "Social trust" (whether you trust others); two measures of political participation (electoral political participation and participation in protest politics); two measures of civic leadership and associational involvement; a measure of giving and volunteering; a measure of faith-based engagement; a measure of informal social ties; a measure of the diversity of our friendship; and a measure of the equality of civic engagement at a community level. Community foundations use the survey to help measure the overall health of the community in regards to social capital ("The Rise of Intermarriage" 2012). Communities that have chosen to use the short version include Lewiston, Maine, Central Minnesota, and Tompkins County. The two central concerns that arise when comparing long form to short form results are a) the context of the questions, and b) the questions themselves. Many questions in the long form are preceded by questions that are not present in the short form, which could potentially change the nature of responses (even in cases where the individual question at hand remains the same). The second concern about the individual questions on the survey must also be taken into consideration because many communities changed questions, sometimes just slightly, to tailor the questions to their specific community. Through careful coding, data analysis can still be carried out between long form and short form survey findings, but attention must be given to these issues.

The 2010 Social Capital Survey in Tompkins County

During the fall of 2010, the social capital survey was conducted in Tompkins County for the first time. At the guidance of a core client group (see list above), student consultants from the Cornell Institute for Public Affairs implemented and completed preliminary analysis of this survey's short version of forty-eight questions in English. Members of this student team included Lincoln Bent, Miriam Edelman, Xuelai Li, Tamara Struk, and Atsuki Takahashi.

This survey work involved multiple steps. The student team conducted outreach to local residents who could complete the survey and also to Tompkins County community organizations. A link to the online survey was sent by email to the listservs of many Tompkins County groups. In addition, the students discussed the survey at several local events. Furthermore, the core client group and the students publicized the survey using the Ithaca Journal and the radio. Approximately 641 people completed the survey, mainly online through SurveyMonkey.

During the spring of 2011, Shannon David, a SUNY Binghamton graduate student, completed further analysis of the survey's results. Using descriptive statistics, he found that there is a large amount of social capital in Tompkins County. However, when he measured differences among groups, he found that social capital varies based on race/ethnicity, income, education, and home location.

After the survey findings were collected and analyzed, a meeting was held at the Chamber of Commerce. Various stakeholders were invited to attend, including the mayor and members of the Ithaca Police Department. As findings were presented, including perceived weaknesses and areas for growth in community connectedness, some of those present at the meeting took a defensive standpoint – feeling as though they were being blamed or were falling short in their duties somehow.

Marketing and outreach strategist Laurie Linn suggested a more targeted approach to the presentation of findings. She suggested that by tailoring findings relating more specifically to each group of stakeholders, and by going to their offices to meet and present findings in a more proactive tone, the communication and ensuing follow-up could be greatly strengthened. The ongoing importance of the findings should be shared with the community stakeholders by utilizing a highly responsive communication strategy.

Leaders believe the community is willing to work towards the improvement of race relations and connectedness; this has been seen recently through noteworthy race-related news items in Tompkins County. The historic election of Ithaca Mayor Svante Myrick is a sign of progress in race/ethnic relations in the county. On November 8, 2011, Democrat Svante Myrick won 54 percent of the vote to replace Mayor Carolyn Peterson. At 24, he became Ithaca's youngest and first African-American Mayor. A 2009 Cornell graduate, he had represented Ithaca's Fourth Ward on Ithaca's Common Council since his junior year of college (Weaver 2011).

In February 2012, Cornell's President David Skorton issued a new statement about diversity goals. "Central to the university's founding vision," a commitment to diversity is important to Cornell. Part of Cornell's strategic plan is an increase in Cornell's diversity (President Skorton 2012). Between 2012 and 2015, Skorton and Provosts Kent Fuchs and Laurie Gilmcher will try to increase the diversity of Cornell employees; to recruit, educate, and graduate a diverse student body; promote conversations across diversity; and to complete other goals. The statement also mentioned the formation of a new University Diversity Council and the creation of an annual report on diversity. Members of the Cornell community can express their views to diversityinput@cornell.edu.

Considering and Comparing Social Capital in Other Communities

Rochester, New York, is a fading industrial city in Upstate New York that is remaking its image as a college town, arts community, and technological center. Home to Xerox, Bausch and Lomb, and former home to Eastman Kodak, Rochester is striving to remain a cultural and economic center in upstate New York (Moore 2012). The city of Rochester has a population of 210,565 people.

Rochester is of interest to the Tompkins County social capital survey group because Rochester is also a city in Upstate New York with colleges and universities at its core. For Rochester, the University of Rochester (including the medical school) is the largest employer in Monroe County (Appleboom 2012), similar to the relationship Cornell has to Ithaca. However, Rochester is far larger, and far more diverse--the city of Rochester has a greater percentage of minorities of all ethnic groups, with the exception of those of Asian descent. Rochester also has a far larger percentage of the population under the age of eighteen.

However, similarly to Ithaca, although Rochester has a diverse population within the city, the greater Monroe County is akin to Tompkins County, being mostly rural farmers and small towns. Racial minorities characterize only 20 percent of Monroe County's population, despite the fact that they are a plurality in the city of Rochester—similar to Tompkins County.

Monroe County undertook the Social Capital survey in the year 2000 and in 2006. The findings from the initial survey found that levels of trust were lowest in the City of Rochester, and not in the surrounding communities, and the trust level was the highest with the population aged 55 or older. Residents of Monroe County appear to be either more tolerant (or have more opportunities to interact with diverse populations) as they were higher than the national average in respondents agreeing with the statement that they have a personal friend who is of a different religion, gay or lesbian, or of a different race. Rochester was similar to the national percentage on low rates of civic involvement (many Rochester residents did not

volunteer, attend public meetings, or belong to any clubs in the last twelve months.) The greatest barrier to involvement in the Rochester area was inflexible work schedules or inadequate childcare (Rochester Area Community Foundation 2000). In our analysis of Tompkins County's findings on social capital, we will continue to look at Rochester and other communities that share similar characteristics in order to compare and learn from one another.

Health and Community Connectedness

The value of social capital extends to many areas of a community's economic and social well-being. As race and ethnic relations improve, so do networks and channels for communication and social education (i.e. "word of mouth" information sharing). This information can range from tips on local churches to places to look for employment, among a myriad of other topics. Central among these topic areas in relation to a community's overall well-being is health.

While the association of social capital and health is still debated, there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that social capital can have a significant impact in unequal societies with inadequate safety nets (Blakely 2006). In a recent survey carried out by Islam et al., numerous single-level studies published in the decade after 1995 revealed consistently fixed effects among levels of social capital and a range of health outcomes (Islam 2006). Since health is one of the foundations of a productive community, community members could consider the effect that connectedness plays on health outcomes. In additional to the transfer of information about health care, social capital might improve health outcomes for other reasons. Research from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescents in 2002 found that adolescents who feel more connected are less likely to abuse substances, initiate violence, and have their sexual debut earlier than their peers who feel less connected (McNeely 2002). In regards to minorities, a study out of the University of Minnesota found that Native American adolescents who feel greater connectedness have better mental health outcomes (Leal Hill 2009). This short description of the relationship between social connectedness and health gives an example of a dimension of social capital around which discourse can be created in a meaningful and pragmatic way in the community; relating connectedness to direct outcomes.

Conclusion

This review is intended to set the stage for the information presented in the remaining sections of the report. This review offers background information on the following topics: 1) social capital and its definition; 2) race relations in Tompkins County and in the region as a whole, including Rochester as an example of a city for comparison; 3) the development and use of the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey; and 4) areas worth exploring further that help illuminate the benefits – both social and economic – of improved community connectedness.

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

Social capital refers to the social relationships and the trust that allow people, organizations, neighborhoods, and entire communities to work together in ways that advance everyone's interests. - Robert Putman

Introduction

When in the fall of 2010, a group of students from Cornell University for Public Affairs (CIPA) carried out the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey (short form) in Tompkins County., they received survey responses from over 600 people. Yet, the information gathered has had little application in changing the constitutive or pragmatic behavior of people in the community. This is due in large part to the fact that carrying out the survey and having a wealth of information from citizens is not enough; the community must follow up on these findings in a number of ways in order to inspire change and strengthen the social capital of Tompkins County.

The 2012 CIPA consulting group has determined five dimensions that require additional attention if the survey results are to have the highest chance of being maximized in the community. Three of these dimensions relate to strengthening the findings of the 2010 survey (and potentially future surveys); and two of these dimensions are directly meant to strengthen the next survey period.

These five dimensions include: 1)The development of a detailed *communications strategy* outlining best practices for reaching stakeholders within the community with the survey findings in a way that inspires them to act on those findings. After the 2010

survey, a number of central community stakeholders- including the major, members of the police department, and a rabbi- were brought together and select components of the survey findings were shared with them. But what happened after this meeting? Essentially, nothing. The reason for this is that the findings were not presented strategically, and many in the room were put on the defensive and overwhelmed by what they perceived as negative feedback. By carrying out research to better understand the attitudes and perceptions of these and other stakeholders, we can help to ensure the findings are presented more strategically during the next attempt to do so.

Two other ways in which this year's consulting group determined that the results of the survey could be strengthened was through 2) *cross-community comparison*, as well as 3) *in-depth statistical analysis of the data*. By comparing the actions of other communities sharing demographic features with Tompkins County (both successful and unsuccessful responses and activities), Tompkins County can better determine which efforts are likely to impact the community in positive ways and which are not. By further analyzing the data through statistical analysis, we will be able to compare findings with other communities on a range of survey dimensions, helping us to situate the county among other similar counties.

This detailed analysis gives us important 'rhetoric' for presenting survey findings, as it will provided us with a more nuanced understanding of the data, allowing for tailored presentation to stakeholders of findings that are of specific interest to them. Jean McPheeters (President of the Tompkins County Chamber of Commerce) believes that situating Tompkins County within the framework of other counties will add leverage to conversations about the data.

The fourth way in which the consulting group hopes to strengthen the survey relates to the next survey period and is related to 4) *location testing*. Because the survey hopes to reach a sample that represents the entire community, including those people most marginalized, we are testing various locations for response rate. These locations include schools, libraries, community centers, health care centers and grocery stores. We hope that by measuring response rates from each location that we can get a sense of how best to distribute invitations during the next survey period to avoid tapping into existing networks only.

We decided that the most useful information about the different locations, and the diversity of the population at that location would be held by the leaders of those locations. So we added an additional step to the method to ask every leader of the location the same research questions when we sought permission. Those questions are:

- Do you think there is a diverse population at this location? What are the levels of diversity in regards to gender, race, age, income level, and disability?
- Do you think this location serves mostly Ithacans, or all of Tompkins County? What do you think the ratio is?
- Where are some community locations that you frequent?

These questions are based on helping improve information about the location, as well as provide justification for choosing certain locations over others in the future. The questions are standardized across locations to ensure reliability. Ideally, as we ask the questions of community leaders, we will also be making connections that the survey team in the future can use, instead of relying from scratch. Finally, the team will include 5) *marketing strategy and kit* to help strengthen the results of the next survey period by making the community fully aware of the survey, and by by getting citizens inspired to participate. These efforts, we hope, will also help legitimize the survey among community stakeholders who can play an important role in creating change based on the results. The marketing kit will help brand the survey by making it recognizable through a logo and stable color scheme; a website will help community members learn more about the survey and its results; and various outreach efforts will ensure that many in the community have heard about the survey.

We hope that these five strategies will help improve social capital in Tompkins County by maximizing the impact of the survey, and thereby improving the resiliency and responsivity of the community. Below we explain more about the methods behind each of the strategies:

Communication Strategy

We now have information ready to present to the community — leaders and citizens — about social capital in Tompkins County and about its measurable value. So, how do we get this information to people in a way that inspires a sustained commitment to a strong comm**UNITY**?

A communications strategy is an important tool that helps an organization identify resources and challenges that may serve as either driving or restraining forces in reaching desired goals for a project. Participation and ownership are two of the major elements considered during preparation of a communications strategy. Participation relates to the active involvement; while ownership relates to specific sets of activities and goals. Ownership ultimately helps everyone involved use the communication strategy as a guide to help achieve the overarching goals. For this project, this goal is ultimately to maintain and strengthen high levels of social capital in Tompkins County.

There are five basic questions that should be used to generate discussion about a communication strategy. These five questions relate to the "what, who, where, when, and how" of the project. Specifically, they are: What are we doing; what are our specific goals? Who will be involved? Where do/should the central activities take place? When will activities be implemented? And, the last part is: How will we carry out the necessary activities, and with what methods?

The 2012 Social Capital Consulting Group decided to begin the process of developing a communication strategy and recommendations by carrying out a "force field analysis." A force field analysis (Lewin 1951) is used by organizations to help them hone in on the most effective and efficient methods, and *people*, for promoting values and goals. The analysis consists of two forces: driving forces and restraining forces.

The first step of our analysis included ongoing brainstorming as a group (the student group, along with the selected leaders working on the project). Out of this group came the identification of a number of driving and restraining forces in the community. Next, the group identified leaders who might be able to contribute to the analysis. This included those present at the 2010 meeting of the survey findings, as well as others. Finally, the team designed a set of questions to use in carrying out the analysis. These questions were also intended to open dialogue with leaders about the definition and value of social capital. As City Councilperson Ellen McCollister stated, "There is a fundamental lack of understanding of the theory of

social capital, which helps explain why communities function, or don't function, well." So, our goal was both to understand the forces at work and create an environment for increasing understanding of social capital.

A survey monkey form of these questions was created and is ready for use (see Appendix C). This survey consists of two parts: the first part has a set of question that seeks to understand how community define and understand social capital, and what type of activity motivates community members to participate. The second part of the survey contains questions about how the survey findings were presented in 2010. The latter seeks to learn how well community leaders understand the 2010 survey findings and whether there should be any changes made to the methodology of the presentation. One of the major challenges of online question is that there is little room for discussion between the survey questioner and respondents. Some misunderstanding of questions can lead to frustration, which then reflects on the survey response. With this in mind, it is also recommended that a discussion is organized to generate deeper level of conversation among stakeholders. Understanding the goal and action needed to be taken through the survey questions and discussion will produce a solid communication plan. Below are two samples of communications plans that might be used to help organize activities:

project specific):				
h Strategy:				
Who Needs to be Involved (Partners, Stakeholders, etc.):				
get Expectation:				
to Overall Project Budget:				
Initial Messages	Expected Outreach Products	Outreach Channels/Distribution Opportunities		
	: project specific): :h Strategy: lved (Partners, Stakeholders, etc.): lget Expectation: to Overall Project Budget: Initial Messages	: project specific): :h Strategy: lved (Partners, Stakeholders, etc.): lget Expectation: to Overall Project Budget: Initial Messages Expected Outreach Products		

Audience Type	Desired Response Resulting from	Messages
	Communication Plan/Outreach Strategy	

The two samples above have the key components of a communication plan: target audience, outputs and outputs indicators, as well as key messages that need to be conveyed through each activity. The first sample has room for more detailed information than the second, such as a budget for the activities. Ideally, a task team would be invited to oversee communication matters. This task team would be responsible for monitoring communication activities and providing support to help mitigate any risks pertaining to the dissemination of survey findings. Person-to-person communication and relationship building will be central to these efforts, even if the survey monkey forms are used as a springboard for collecting information and generating conversations.

If another meeting is coordinated, the use of a brainstorming method popularly introduced by IDEO might be considered to help those in the room express their thoughts and opinions. This method of brainstorming uses colorful post-it-note to create a more lively and interactive discussion. For instance, a question might be posted about how each individual would define social capital. Participants would then use short sentences and drawing to describe their understanding. Similarly, in regard to how they would like the research findings to be presented, a short sentence or even fun drawing could be used. Participants will stick the post-it-note that has their ideas on the wall. After all questions are answered, each of the ideas would be reviewed and discussed. Further explanation of the "rules of brainstorming" as introduced by IDEO is provided in the Bibliography.

By continuing to open up dialogue that seeks to better understand perceptions, passions and ideas around social capital with variety of stakeholders in the county, it becomes possible to greatly strengthen the findings of the 2010 survey (as well as future surveys). With 641 respondents and 11 dimensions of social capital insights, the survey offers a wealth of information, not only about weaknesses in community connectedness, but about opportunities for strengthening and growing connections. Yet, without the involvement of community stakeholders to follow-up on these findings, the intended impact will not be reached. This communication strategy that began with a force field analysis is the first step in giving community stakeholders a sense of ownership; as well as figuring out how best to reach these stakeholders in a way that will encourage open reception and responsiveness. Detailed steps

based on our current force field analysis findings are outlined in the "Recommendations" section of this report.

Cross-Community Comparison and Data Analysis

For comparison, Tompkins County will select counties throughout the nation sharing a similar demographic makeup (including the presence of a large number of University students), so stakeholders can begin to situate the racial and ethnic relations of Tompkins County within a larger framework; they can learn from the successes and failures of other counties in their responses to the survey; and the survey can be further legitimized by the role it has played in other similar communities, both in helping the community understand their social dynamics and in helping those communities act on that understanding.

To begin the cross-community comparison, it was necessary to identify communities of interest; the communities chosen were Boulder, Colorado: Boulder County; Rochester, NY: Monroe County; Ann Arbor, MI: Washtenaw County; and Winston Salem, NC: Forsyth County. The first step to the comparison is the identification of key players in each of these counties. George Ferrari of the Community Foundation in Ithaca isassisting in the identification of these players.

The next step involved identifying the framework of questions we would like to use in gathering information for the comparison. John Neuman, President and CEO of 1492 Consulting Group, helped identify the following questions:

• What cross-community comparisons have been conducted and would communities share these results? How did other communities deal with the interview short-form

versus the long-form?

- Have other communities conducted the survey more than once? What did they learn and/or do or initiate as a result?
- Are they considering another survey soon, and if so, will they be making any changes?
- Would they share their follow up actions that they pursued as a result of their results and what subsequently happened (successful or not)?
- Would they share their lessons learned?
- What kind of steps did they take to share their result in their communities? Did they do anything particularly unusual or creative to get their communities involved in taking constructive new actions/initiatives?

We also hope to understand how the survey results changed in Rochester between the first and second time it was carried out; including the social and political factors that may have impacted the difference in the results from the two survey periods. Along with the importance of understanding how other communities have responded to the survey, is the understanding of Tompkins County's results on a more nuanced level.

The 2010 CIPA consulting team focused more attention on the distribution of survey and data collection than on in-depth analysis. This year, based on their survey results, we focus more on the in-depth analysis. In order to do so, we conducted additional statistical (regression) analysis, and used STATA, a data analysis and statistical software. Regression analysis, as a specific statistical method, is widely used by economists to examine economic theories, as well as by social scientists in their quantitative research.

The Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey is carried out in both a long and a short form, so decisions have to be made about comparing results from the two formats. Although some literature suggests that context may play a role in the way that respondents answers questions in an interview, we have decided that, for our purposes, the two surveys are similar enough in nature for comparison. There are two different dimensions or ways for us to carry out the in-depth analysis: to treat community or county as one unit or to treat individual respondent as one unit. For the first dimension, we treat the Tompkins County as one unit.. After coding the data, we can build up the regression model and do the analysis.

In the data coding process, we code the survey data of Tompkins County and the data of other counties into two different data matrices or data sets: one called the raw data matrix (the raw data set), and the other called the coded data matrix (the coded data set). In the raw data matrix, we treat the individual respondent as row vector, while county affiliation and a list of questions as column vectors. The size of the raw data matrix is designated by its number of respondents and number of questions plus one in form of "row by column". And the 641 respondents from Tompkins County are only part of the raw data matrix.

By coding the raw data into abstract measures, such as trust, political participation, religious variety, income disparity, as well as adding some some concrete measures, such as median income, population, we would have the coded data matrix, in which we treat the individual county as row vector, and different measures as column vectors.

For example,

	Social Trust	Inter-racial Trust	Conventional Politics	Protest Politics	Civic Leadership	Associational Involvement	Informal Socializing
Atlanta Metro (GA)	83	91	88	85	89	104	77
Baton Rouge (LA)	99	91	106	76	116	102	116
Birmingham Metro (AL)	103	89	90	89	112	118	93
Bismarck (ND)	131	124	136	91	122	106	122
Boston (city of) (MA)	81	99	118	116	83	78	77
Boulder County (CO)	108	115	98	121	112	113	104
central OR	90	98	95	108	104	107	89
Charlotte region/14 counties (NC)	93	78	91	87	97	114	78
Chicago Metro (IL)	81	86	89	100	92	93	95
Cincinnati Metro (OH)	102	95	81	91	107	112	104
Cleveland/Cuyahoga Cty. (OH)	96	91	94	105	108	107	94
Delaware	99	105	105	87	104	108	98
Denver (city/county) (CO)	99	109	101	120	105	101	98
Detroit Metro/7 cty (MI)	90	94	104	114	96	118	121
East Tennessee	81	81	91	94	86	89	94
Fremont/Newaygo Co. (MI)	97	92	92	106	96	107	113
Grand Rapids (city of)	111	108	96	102	99	116	99
Greensboro/Guilford County (NC)	96	95	101	86	109	111	87
Houston/Harris Cty. (TX)	85	85	81	67	78	68	78
Indiana	98	102	90	94	95	100	119
Kalamazoo County (MI)	103	99	89	108	98	109	132

In addition, we built up data matrices of location testing and the pre-survey survey in the same way, to carry out in-depth analysis. After talking about the data sets, we will go deeply into the data analysis, and also provide some examples to show our methods.

For example, we treat trust as the dependent variable, and ethnicity, population, median income, income disparity, political participation, religious variety, community events and others as the independent variables. Then we could have results about whether these factors significantly influence the trust building and racial relations.

For instance, let's suppose we know that the political participation has significant influence on trust building from the complex model above.

We could build up a simple model, with only the political participation as the explanatory variable.

In the scalar notation:	Trust= $\beta 0+$	β1*political	participation+e
-------------------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------

And we could also use two-dimensional graph to find out where Tompkins County locates and compare it with other communities. If it locates near the regression line and other communities, it means the Tompkins County is similar to other communities on this dimension. If it locates far away, it means maybe the Tompkins County has some differences in this area and they need to be further explored.



Graph 1: Two-dimentional Graph of Treating Individual County as One Unite

In the second dimension, we treat the individual respondent as one unit. So we could

have 600 respondents from the last team's survey. This dimension helps us look inside our communities. After coding the data, we can construct a complex model, with all factors included.

For example, we treat trust as the dependent variable, and ethnicity or racial variety, family income, income disparity, political participation, religious belief, participation in different kinds of community events and others as independent variables.

In the scalar notation:

Trust= $\beta 0+\beta 1$ *ethnicity(racialvariety)+ $\beta 2$ *familyincome+ $\beta 3$ *medianincome+

 β 4*incomedisparity+ β 5*political participation+ β 6*religious variety+

β7*participationcommunityevents+.....e

Although this model is quite similar with the former one, it is from a totally different perspective or dimension. Take the same dependent variable "trust" as a typical example. The trust in the first complex model represents the inter-racial trust or racial relation of the communities in one county. But here, the trust stands for the individual feeling of trust of others or other ethnic groups. Here we want to find out whether specific factors, like income disparity or median income would affect personal feeling of trust, as well as whether those factors have significant influences or not.

Then, we could also look at some simple models and draw the two-dimensional graphs, in order to examine where those 600 respondents located around the regression line are. For example, we set trust as the dependent variable and family income as the independent variable.

In the scalar notation: Trust= $\beta 0 + \beta 1 * family income + e$
If there are 100 respondents locate far away from the other 500 respondents, then we could look deeply into the 100 respondents, and see why they are quite different with other.



Graph 2: Two-dimensional Graph of Treating Individual Respondent as One Unit

Finally, there are two things we want to note. First, before we go into the in-depth analysis, we still have to compare the data with other communities, using simple descriptive statistical methods same as the 2010 team. Second, the examples shown above have nothing to do with the actual findings, they merely illustrate the methods that we would use in our in-depth analysis.

Location Testing

In order for the survey to act as a true mirror for Tompkins County, it is important for us to make sure that the voices represented in the survey are a true representation of Tompkins County. While in the past, the survey respondents did represent Tompkins true diversity; there was one issue in which they were all similar—connection to a network. Since the information about the survey was distributed primarily through pre-existing networks, there would be very little chance that a resident of Tompkins County who felt isolated would know about the survey. Since the survey is a measure of social connectedness, this is a glaring omission.

Thus, while the survey will use existing networks and the traditional media to inform community members in the future, there is a need to reach out to community members within their everyday lives. In order to identify the best method of achieving this, we are attempting to test several different locations across the county to see where we achieve the best response rate. In regards to response rate, we are looking at two specific indicators. The first indicator is the technical response rate of each location—i.e. of all the surveys given out, how many were responded to. We hope to analyze the response rate to see the comparison between the different localities within the same categories, as well as across category. The second indicator is the apparent diversity in the responses. We would want the survey responses to be as diverse as possible, and in the past it has been hard to get the requisite number of people of color to respond. Thus, we would also be measuring which localities reach the most diverse set of voices.

To obtain this information, we will add a question on the survey that says, "Where did you find out about the survey?" In regards to the demographic information to measure diversity of the respondents that information is collected within the survey itself. The locations that will be

tested are schools, health care centers, grocery stores, libraries, and community centers. All of the locations are in Tompkins County, and we plan to leave thirty surveys at each location, in order to guarantee uniformity and generalizability for the results. We will create a survey flier that is similar to the one the Social Capital Survey will use in the future, inviting community members to take the survey.

The schools that will be tested are both in Ithaca City School District, Boynton Middle School and DeWitt Middle School. DeWitt middle school has a population of 30% free and reduced lunch, 41% minority population. Boynton Middle School is 30% free and reduced lunch and 28% minority student population. We chose middle schools because we believe that due to the predicted age of the students, we are likely to see the greatest age range of parents with middle school students. For instance, a student who is the youngest in a family is likely to have parents who are more than ten years older than a middle school student who is the oldest.

In regards to community centers, we are testing two different community centers, the Rackers center, and Southside Community Center. Through community centers we are likely to reach populations that we may not ordinarily have access to. The Rackers Center provides support for families of people with disabilities, and the Southside Community Center historically was the African American community center. These are populations that we want to make sure are represented in the survey, and we plan to see what the effect having the link to the survey will have on the response rate of these target groups.

Libraries become more important as the Social Capital Survey transitions to an all online structure. In the more rural areas of Tompkins County, many people do not have

internet, and high speed internet may be even more limited. Thus, many people go the libraries to use the internet. We will have the 30 survey fliers at the libraries for people to take as they are using the internet in the library. We will test the Tompkins Regional Library in Ithaca, and the Southworth Library in Dryden.

We will also be testing two healthcare centers and two grocery stores on opposite ends of Ithaca. It is our hope that people checking out of these services would take the survey with them and take the survey.

After the results come in, we will analyze the response rate of each location,, and the diversity of the results as we look to see if there is information from these results to inspire our recommendations for the invitation of the full survey for the fall. By developing recommendations for the five dimensions described: communications, cross-community comparison, data analysis, marketing, and location testing, we believe we can maximize the impact of the 2010 survey findings, as well as the impact for future survey periods. With a dynamic plan in place, Tompkins County can begin to shift perceptions, attitudes and actions in a way that can help strengthen the health and vibrancy of the community.

FINDINGS

There is a fundamental lack of understanding of the theory of social capital, which helps explain why communities function, or don't function, well.

- Ithaca City Councilperson Ellen McCollister

Findings Force field Analysis

From our conversations with different community stakeholders, we have isolated different driving and restraining forces. Driving forces are forces in the community that can lead to a better understanding of the need for social capital, and better strategies for helping accomplish these goals. Restraining factors are those factors that keep social capital from expanding that can lead to misunderstanding about social capital, and other limiting factors that can mitigate the effectiveness of the work.

Driving forces that have been identified include the follwing: 1) The identification of "key" areas for improvement, allowing leaders and citizens to strategize around these issues. 2) Discovery that Ithaca rates relatively high in social capital nationally; which is encouraging and useful in framing during communication efforts. 3) There is research available offering new insight into the issues and their possible solutions. 4) Local leaders are working to strengthen the diverse community. 5) The City of Ithaca is currently developing a Comprehensive Plan that includes 700 stakeholders; if social capital is incorporated into this plan, it will become a part of the City's goals and can "piggyback" on the new initiatives in the plan. 6) The City of Ithaca is currently developing a communication campaign that can potentially include social capital as a feature; for example, the new website might have a page or two dedicated to social capital. 7) Many realistic, low-cost opportunities for involving students in the community; connecting students with local arts programming for example. 8) There is attention being given in the community to hiring diverse staff. 9) There are resources available from local Universities. 10) The community comes together in open forums to discuss race-related events peacefully; this carries tremendous social capital value.

Some of the central restraining forces we have identified include: 1) Communicating social capital survey findings is complex; many are put on the defense; listening and framing are key. 2) There is a lack of fundamental understanding of the theory/definition of social capital. 3) The county has limited resources. 4) There is some difficulty sustaining good improvement initiatives over the long term as leaders change, and community priorities fluxuate. 5) There are high levels of mistrust of municipalities and non-taxable entities. 6) There are fractured and weakened local media outlets. 7) There are housing issues, including balkanization, with social groups isolated in homogenous neighborhoods/segments of the city. And, 8) There is a lack of diversity in socially homogenous groups/activities.

This initial understanding of driving and restraining forces, gathered from core group meetings, as well as conversations with other local community members, helped us develop our set of communication strategy recommendations. This is only a beginning, however, and these forces should be continually identified, as there are many not listed here, and those that are listed many change over time.

Cross Community Comparisons Findings

As previously mentioned, the 2012 social capital group picked specific counties to analyze.

We were particularly looking for counties that were similar to Tompkins County, thus we were looking for communities that had taken the social capital survey, and who had a large research university as a primary employer in the area,, which was then surrounded by a large rural area. The communities analyzed were Rochester, NY, Winston-Salem, NC, Ann Arbor, MI and Boulder, CO. After connecting with leaders in these communities, and doing some outside research about this area, we have determined these conclusions.

Rochester, NY was of significant interest to our group, due to the fact that it is also in upstate NY, so has similar context about state politics. Rochester appears to have strong initial success with some initiatives that the Rochester Area Community Foundation has instigated. Some of their more successful ideas have been to spread interest and knowledge of both the concept of social capital and the Rochester results through a Broadcast Town Meeting, to be offered to the community through RACF and local public TV WXXI. This allows community members to learn about what is happening in the community, without leaving their homes, or if they were unable to attend the meeting (can listen to the radio while commuting for instance). Since our data analysis have shown that attendance in public meeting is correlated with stronger measures of trust, this finding is interesting. Rochester also engaged a diverse "Priority Panel" of community leaders to assist RACF with creating an expanded Civic Engagement Grant making strategy. The RACF also developed and issued a "Civic Engagement Request For Proposals" in Spring 2001, with first grant awarded August 2001. Thus, they started sharing control with different nonprofits in the area, through grant making, to also allow to the nonprofits to be responsible for social capital.

Winston-Salem, NC is home to Wake Forest University, but is also famous for its tobacco fields and cigarette factory. However, Winston-Salem has started some effective initiatives in regards to social capital. For instance, The Winston-Salem Foundation created the ECHO Fund , "Everyone Can Help Out." In 1999, The Foundation committed a minimum of \$2.5 million over 5 years to be used for grants to organizations that increase our community's stock of social capital. Each year of the ECHO Fund, The Winston-Salem Foundation presented ECHO Awards to individuals and informal groups that were "caught in the act" of building social capital. Each ECHO Award winner receives a gift of \$1,000 to donate to a charitable organization of their choice. Similar to Rochester, this helps all community members interested in pursuing social capital initiative, as well as seeing the value of higher social capital.

The group also made significant contacts in Winston-Salem such as Scott Wierman and Doug Easterling (both associated with the Winston-Salem Foundation). Doug is one of the key people nationally involved in progressing social capital. His two articles, "Promoting Community Leadership Among Community Foundations: The Role of the Social Capital Benchmark Survey," and "The Leadership Role of Community Foundations in Building Social Capital" share information on promoting social capital in the community, and is the inherent value of social capital. He is interested in working with Tompkins County in the future, thus the future group should keep up this contact.

Boulder, Colorado is home to the University of Colorado, and also has similar political leanings to Tompkins County. In January 2004, the city council of Boulder set a priority to focus on the quality of life in Boulder, particularly the social aspect. As a result, the

Community Sustainability Goal Committee was formed. The goal of this committee was identify key factors that contribute to the livability of the community including integrating those who may not identify themselves as part of the community. This committee was also responsible to develop a strategy that addressed social issues confronting the community in Boulder.

During 2004 and 2005, the community organized a series of discussions with community members and civil society organizations to encapsulate key issues concerning the community and set shared goals among the community. This also led to the creation of the Colorado Nonprofit Development Collaboration Center. Formed in the summer of 2001, this organization serves as the umbrella for the partnership between FOCUS and Restoring the Soul.

Restoring the Soul is a faith-group organization aims to enhance community collaboration through organizing activities such as volunteerism and outreach in the community. This organization collaborates with congregations, universities, service agencies and community members to organize volunteer activities. The organization also develops monthly newsletter and panels that discuss emerging issues in the community. The panel discussion is also broadcasted widely. FOCUS (Facilitating Offenders Seeking Uplifting Situations) is a re-entry monitoring program that works with Boulder Jail inmates. The first mentor program started in 2005. Although the closest prison to Tompkins County is in Auburn, it is still worthwhile to think about ways to create mentorships and partnerships between some marginalized groups in the community.

Ann Arbor, Michigan is home to the University of Michigan, and its rural

community is similar to Tompkins County. Most interestingly, in late 2011, Washtenaw County applied for \$3,000,000 in Housing and Urban Development Community Challenge Planning Grant (CCPG). The county created a project called Washtenaw County Sustainable Community that seek to address social equity issues through affordable housing choices, transportation, economic opportunities and healthy food access. This project received support and collaborated with several municipalities, the State of Michigan, non-profit organizations, private businesses, and academic institutions. The project description summarized the initiative from the Washtenaw County to create a more integrated community and remove the disparity between isolated segments that existed in the community. As of January 2012, the Washtenaw County was awarded \$3,000,000 to implement the proposed project.

This is of particular relevance to Tompkins County, due to the limited financial resources in the area. It is interesting to know that federal funds are available to commit to work like improving social capital, and that is something that the Social Capital Group can look into in the future.

Thus, although the communities we examined are very different, they all also valuable lessons to what Tompkins County can do with the survey data once they acquire and analyze. These other communities all had significant challenges (whether it is more violence in the community, or more marginalized populations) but they all came up with interesting ideas of how to fund these initiatives, and how to make the concept of social capital relevant to their residents and community members. This is the next logical step for the Social Capital group to undertake, so it is worthwhile to examine these communities.

Data Findings

Our major findings for data analysis focused on the following four aspects: social trust and its relationship with different social activities, individuals with low level of trust, and politics.

(1): Social Trust: From the perspective of social trust, the Tompkins County rates higher than national averages, as well as Winston-Salem and Rochester. And Hispanic community and people with disabilities rate relatively high in trust level, especially compared to national average and other communities. However, the white and black racial relations need more attention.

(2): Different Social Activities and Events: Different social activities and events were found to have very different effects on social trust. For example, the public meeting (ex. town hall meeting) and volunteer projects raise trust, while attending blood drives and political party meeting or rally were actually shown to lower levels of trust.

(3): Individuals or Groups with Relatively Low Level of Trust: According to the analysis results, male, young people, non-U.S. citizens, short-period residents, specific races or ethnic groups, those separated and never married, lower income familiers, lower educated people, and temporary laid off workers are the individuals or specific social groups that were found to have relatively lower levels of trust, which should be the focus of efforts to improve social capital. Moreover, social trust is not an isolated variable, but is correlated with the economy, education and perceptions about the medical environment. And the Tompkins County could raise its social capital by improving its local economy, average level of education, and diversity of medical environment.

(4): Role of Politics: Comparing to Winston-Salon and Rochester, politics play a much more important role in levels of trust in Tompkins County. High level of political interests and political participation (ex. vote registration) of residents could significantly raise social trust and social capital. And transparency in local governance, including good communication with citizens, is central to strengthening social trust and in turn, social capital in the Tompkins County.

Locality Testing

Location findings are still coming in, but we will continue to analyze the data. When the data is analyzed, it should offer a glimpse into what locations around town will result in the highest response rate, and what locations around town will offer the highest level of diversity of responses. In regards to our conversations, we found that many of the people we talked to who are decision makers at the locations do not live within the borders of the city of Ithaca, and thus, the future group must make an effort to reach non Ithacans. Most of the people we talked to all felt that there was great diversity in the population who visited their area, especially in regards to race and income levels. However, the greatest facet of diversity that was lacking in the city locations is the community members who do not live within Ithaca.

The 2010 Survey did a great job with obtaining a diverse population of survey respondents (641 respondents, with an over sample of African-Americans). However, the limitation was the reliance of pre-existing networks. While this data is very valuable, we examined the limitation to think about how to reach an even more representative sample when the survey is conducted again. Some of the questions we were thinking about were; how would you account for the people who are socially isolated, or people who don't leave the house or people new to the

community or people who do not speak English?

We brainstormed the answer to some of these questions. For instance the survey can be made available in different languages. In the future perhaps create a Spanish flier and internet link to survey, where the survey questions are posted on surveymonkey.com in Spanish.

In regards to reaching people who are socially isolated, or who cannot leave the house, we thought about giving the survey door to door, however, this would negatively impact the confidentiality of the survey. The survey respondents might not feel as anonymous, because we would have seen them, and it would affect the comparability of our survey. Most communities nationwide offered the survey either online or on the phone, thus our results might be different and not able to be compared with other communities.

Thus, we decided that when the survey is given again, they should use social marketing, and use some of the techniques the 2010 group employed. However to reach these groups that we were concerned about, we decided the next group should share information about the survey in locations where the people who may not be reached out based on networks are likely to be anyway. We brainstormed community locations where we should give the survey. The locations that were originally listed as places to share information about the survey (to find our sample population in their "natural habitat") were Tops Market (Lansing), Tompkins County Public Library, Wegmans (Ithaca), Dewitt Middle School, Ithaca Free Clinic Boynton Middle School, Cayuga Medical Center, and the Southside Community Center.

We interviewed local leaders for information on that location, obtaining information

on questions about the diversity of the location, the community outreach of that location, and the population that location served. From our conversations, and the relative ease of difficulty of having these conversations, we have prepared these recommendations for the future survey group.

Although schools are a great way to reach a diverse set of the population (although only the population with school-aged children), we offer up these recommendations. As early as possible, the group must request an IRB exemption for research involving children. In regards to connecting with community leaders, the group should make contacts with principals for permission early. They should also connect with one specific teacher (attempt to get that teacher on board- for example, connection to a percents math lesson.) The IRB was concerned that even though we are not asking children to take the survey, since we send the flier home with them, the children may take the flier. Thus, they must edit online survey that you cannot take the survey if you click under 18 for age. There is a way to do this on Survey Monkey, that if you choose that answer the survey says "Thanks!" and that survey is completed. The groups should also make sure to try Ithaca City School District Schools outside of Ithaca (i.e. Caroline Elementary). This would be particularly interesting findings, because any in school differences are population related, because almost all the schools in Tompkins County are in the Ithaca City School District, so the differences in school administration are controlled for.

Grocery stores may be the best bet to reach the most diverse group of people, especially in regards to income level. Since grocery stores have access to the relative income level of various shoppers (those who use food stamps, or WIC) they can give an actual determination on

income level, instead of basing this judgment on the biases of income level of the community leader. As with the schools, the group must make contacts early, and attempt to on board specific managers—thus those managers feel like a partner is this work. Other ideas include creating a partnership with Wegman's that allows the group to hand out survey flier with the receipt. They could also create a partnership with Top's that allows us to hang the survey flier tear off sheet on the community service board. The group could also try to go to Grocery stores outside Ithaca, such as trying Ithaca Farmer's Market and the Trumansburg Farmer's market, see if allowed to set up table where hand out fliers for survey. Everyone needs to buy food, so it more a question of where people may nontraditionally buy food (such as the farmer's market).

Libraries and Community Centers may be the place to go to find target populations. People without a computer are likely to use the library, and there are some community centers (such as Southside Community Center) that cater to a particular population (for instance, Southside was historically the African-American community center), so may be a good place to visit to reach populations that have traditionally been underrepresented in survey respondents.

As always the group should make connections with specific staff at each location, and make sure to leave just Ithaca—they should visit other Libraries such as Dryden and Ulysses. They should acquire permission to leave link to survey website at the computer stations and acquire permission to put flier on community events board. They also could attempt to see if these locations will put survey on the events page on the website. There is a lot of trust with both the library and the community centers, so the respondents who hear about the survey there are likely to not be as suspicious of it.

Medical Centers are a valuable site for diverse populations, but present special confidentiality challenges. For instance, one would not want to table at a medical facility, because that would most likely be a HIPPA violation, as well as negatively impacting the anonymity of the survey. However, some things that the group could do are to make specific contact at each location, they could hang survey flier at community events boards. They also could seek permission to have fliers with link in the magazine racks in waiting rooms. People are often waiting there anyway (and if the survey is available to take using a Smartphone or a mobile app) they might not have anything else to do.

There are many other community locations where they could try to leave information about the survey.. They should make sure to have the link to the survey, or the survey flier around the community at places such as community events, coffee shops and gyms and workout facilities. This doesn't totally fix the problem of finding the people who never leave the house, but the more diverse and different places information the survey is provided, the more likely it is that that survey will sample a large and diverse population.

Due to the work accomplished on the excellent marketing kit created by Miriam Edelman, there is now a way to coordinate and synchronize actions by various media, community leaders, legislatures, etc. around consistent new messages about the nature of the issues being faced and the initiatives to improve. There also will be excellent use of various community forums/events engaging effective participation by the general citizenship, perhaps taking advantage in various ways of some of the already existing festivals and public events to communicate and engage. Some of our interviewees have also explored the possible development of citizen-based code of conduct and/or values from the "ground up", and not handed down by "leaders."

However, the restraining forces do exist, and were brought to our attention in our discussions with stakeholders. There are some concerns from stakeholders that effective community leadership not fully engaged/passionate enough. This could be partly to the insufficient priority assigned by leadership or in the community generally to support constructive change initiatives. These concerns were reflected in some of the reactions of the stakeholders when the 2010 results were presented.

Interviewees also raise the concern over the lack of understanding of the importance of change initiatives, as well as the lack of community/leadership belief that the initiatives being brought forward are the correct ones or will work. In order for true change to take place, residents and community members must have a stronger understanding on the importance of social capital, and come to a consensus over what issues are most important. Ideally, this agreement could be made before there is some sort of tragedy that forces everyone to agree, but some stakeholders express concern that tragedy is the only driver of action.

The biggest restraining force for Tompkins County compared to other communities is the insufficient resources available (or re-assignable) to support the change initiatives. This in turn, leads to difficulties in sustaining good improvement initiatives over the longer term as leaders change, and community priorities flux. Compared to other communities, Tompkins has no large grant-making private charity or foundation to help fund these initiatives, so resources must be particularly well-managed.

Since there is less resources, the initiatives that are chosen must pass muster with popular opinion, since not all ideas will be funded. This can be a limitation because initiatives under

consideration viewed as too broad and not specific enough for particular segments of the overall community to take to heart. There also exists some sort of frustration with the lack of real progress in the past, or at least the perceptions of no real progress in the past.

There are also geographic isolation issues. Unlike some communities, Tompkins County is rather spread out, and although the TCAT system is very strong, there is no other form of public transportation to connect people in the City of Ithaca with some of the outlying hamlets. The relative isolation of some neighborhoods leads to misunderstandings among or between different citizen groups by class, race, or income level. There also is fairly broad-based mistrust by some groups relative to other groups, agencies, or government organizations, which is very difficult to reverse. For instance, due to a few dramatic events, there exists a currency of mistrust towards the police that may be difficult to change.

Other limiting factors are the geographic and sociopolitical realities of Tompkins County. One example of this are "Town Gown" issues, which are high levels of mistrust of the Town of Ithaca and Cornell. For one thing, 67% of the land in Ithaca is owned by the town or by Cornell University, so it is tax exempt. Thus, property owners, who are less wealthy than Cornell often feel like they are paying for a wealthy university. To help ease this tension, the town leaders must begin conversations with Cornell about the importance of communicating with the community and giving back; as well as the importance of student involvement outside of the University bubble.

The spatial realities are the neighborhood housing issues/balkanization: social groups are isolated in homogenous neighborhoods/segments of the city. For instance, the students all live in one area, and different immigrant groups have different ethnic enclaves. As city

councilperson Ellen McCollister said, "If you don't have diverse groups of people living together to the extent possible, you lose the checks and balances necessary for a vibrant healthy society." Thus leaders must begin conversations with the Housing Authority to help keep social capital central to planning and neighborhood zoning.

Other interviewees have brought up the insufficient efforts, which were either lacking in being consistent, persistent, inspired, by the schools and the faith-based organizations to support constructive change over the short and longer term. Thus, in our discussions with community stakeholders, many of whom were present at the original presentation meeting, we learned that many people are looking for sustainable change in raising the level of social capital; there are concerns about the viability of creating these changes. Thus, we looked for other similar communities for ideas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Just as a screwdriver (physical capital) or a college education (human capital) can increase productivity (both individual and collective), so too social contacts affect the productivity of individuals and groups. - Robert Putnam, Bowling Alone

Based in thoughtful research in the dimensions of 1) communication 2) cross-community qualitative comparisons 3) in-depth quantitative data analysis, and 4) locality testing, we have developed a set of recommendations for each dimension. We believe that these clear and straightforward recommendations will help strengthen the impact of the survey; but they are just a beginning point for the ongoing efforts of building social capital in the community.

Communication Recommendations

As resources become available, it will be useful to hire a full-time social capital specialist housed at Community Foundation who can oversee ongoing efforts. These efforts will include creating and maintaining dialogue and relationships with leaders (including those contributing to the force field analysis questionnaire. This person can also initiate and help to oversee the development of the core group of community leaders who might plan to meet once a month with the initial task of determining concrete goals and actions

Another recommendation for strengthening social capital communication is piggybacking messages on local radio shows (i.e. "All Things Equal"), and in other media outlets. Community events are another way to get the message about social capital out the a wide variety of community members. Communicating with the community is key, including topics such as where we need to focus our attention and what we can we do as individuals. Involving the arts; including "Have a HeART®" events for children and adults that involve poster, t-shirt, bumper sticker design contest; as well as window art days; among other things.

For strengthening ongoing communication efforts it would be helpful to initiate a series of community conversations around topics relating to trust and racial/ethnic relationships and interactions. Understanding perceptions, as well as realities, is key, and these conversations might help bring perceptions to light so they can be addressed. Inviting well-known speakers to town, such as Robert Putman, is another way to energize the community around social capital. Other communities have had success increasing trust levels through publicly broadcasting Town Hall Meetings – we recommend that towns throughout Tompkins County are encouraged to do this as well. It would also be helpful to involve religious leaders (many who already hold interfaith meetings) to encourage building diverse relationships among their congregations; these leaders might also initiative events.

As City Councilperson Ellen McCollister pointed out, conversations with the Housing Authority to help keep social capital central to planning is key to reducing the homogenization of groups (the "balkanization" we see in Ithaca). Conversations with Cornell about the importance of communicating with the community and giving back; as well as the importance of student involvement outside of the University bubble are also key. The City should also be encouraged to make efforts of communicating with citizens to ease 'Town Gown' mistrust, which is an issue in Ithaca.

Contact should be made with leaders developing the City's Comprehensive Plan to see how social capital might be included; this should be done as soon as possible because the

draft is currently being developed (mid-May 2012). The City's Chief Communication Officer, Julie Holcomb, should be contacted to see if the new website can include a page on social capital – including a section for laurels. This would reduce the resources needed to develop a complete website (at least until these resources are available). Those working on social capital efforts might consider joining in the Veteran's Parade and other local parades and events. Simple media messages (see ex. of Altanta Energy Commercial) should be created keeping social capital at the forefront of people's minds.

A clear and realistic strategy and goals that are fine-tuned and responsive must be created and constantly updated. It is important to remember to actively involve people from all corners of the county- from the mother to the farmer to the student to the preacher to the town leader, and make it fun! Social capital ultimately increases the overall wellbeing of individuals, as well as the community as a whole– that message should be at the core of communication efforts <u>Recommendations Based on Qualitative Findings:</u>

All of the communities we compared with Tompkins County had significant funding available through grants for social capital efforts. Because of this, we believe it should be a primary goal moving forward to seek funding for initiatives from both single national and diverse local sources. Many communities also offered grants to local organizations, giving them the inspiration and resources for action; we recommend that once Tompkins County has secured funding, a similar set of grant offering be made available. The Winston-Salem Foundation offers individual community leaders and citizens who are "caught in the act" of doing good work for social capital small grants to encourage the continuation of that work; we recommend Tompkins County develop a similar program for catching those in the act of creating community trust and strengthening networks.

It is important moving forward that Tompkins County synchronize with the national survey so that findings can be better compared. This will also strengthen the relationship between Tompkins County and other counties involved as they share results and strategies in ongoing efforts. Those working on social capital in Tompkins County should make efforts to nurture relationships with leaders at Harvard and in Winston-Salem who are heading up national efforts. There is a wealth of information and strength that can be garnered from these relationships.

Recommendations Based on Quantitative Findings:.

Based on our data analysis, we have a short and clear first set of recommendation for Tompkins County: 1) Efforts should focus on public meetings and volunteering- make opportunities available and visible. 2) Efforts should also focus on black-white racial trust relationships. 3) There should be attention given to issues of political trust – transparency and communication. 4) Focus on hiring and maintaining diverse staff should continue to be at the forefront of efforts.

Recommendations for the next survey period

Plenty of time should be given prior to the next survey period for Internal Review Board approval and for making initial contact at each location. Many locations will require a display that entices people to pick up an invitation with the survey link- display design and wording should be given adequate time and creative consideration. At locations such as grocery stories, putting invitations in grocery bags would help reach the maximum amount of customers. Alternative channels for inviting participants should be considered for those who don't frequent local establishments – such as the City website, organization websites, and Facebook. Be sure to reach outside Ithaca. Consider coupons as incentives (win-win-win) Consider offering translated versions of the survey. Implement the marketing strategy (please see Miriam Edelman's report). Look into hiring a volunteer Cornell CIPA intern for the summer of 2013 (program to sponsor) And, work with the next Cornell consulting group on the following: 1) Researching and applying for grant funding. 2) Assisting with the creation of a working group of local stakeholders (with rotating leadership); continue careful communication with individual leaders- making LISTENING the priority. 3) Collecting quantifiable data on the impact of social capital (in the areas of education, crime, economy, and health). 4) Preparing for the next survey period

CONCLUSION

Actively involve people from all corners of the county- from the mother to the farmer to the student to the preacher to the town leader, and make it fun! Social capital ultimately increases the health and happiness of individuals, as well as the community as a whole- that message is the core of this effort.

The value of social capital in our community cannot be overstated. Social capital is not necessarily something you have or lack, but is instead a measurement tool to determine the level of trust and connectedness in a community. Thus, you cannot lack social capital, but there is value to having higher amount.

The social capital survey allows us to isolate the key issues for our community and determine strategies to strengthen the areas that are lower. The presentation of the results allows various different stakeholders to come together to create solutions around the "right" strategic issues. Different communities have also used the social capital survey to lead to the empowerment of residents, to help come up with solutions that are community driven and community based, and give residents the tools and opportunity to get involved.

The team's work stimulated interest among central national social capital leaders to build a relationship with Tompkins County leaders. Leaders include Robert Putnam and Thomas Sanders from Harvard's Kennedy School; and Scott Wierman and Doug Easterling from the Winston Salem Foundation. It is important to build up these relationships further, through sharing results and new information. Perhaps Robert Putnam or other national figures could be invited to the town to speak to the community and town leaders.

None of this work would have been possible without the support and input from core

client group, comprised of key community leaders, and their generous engagement of time and resources. Also, the survey was carried out successfully in 2010 with the help of the core client group and Cornell and SUNY Binghamton students, which saved Tompkins County \$10,000, which can be put to other meaningful uses.

Since the original survey, positive change is already occurring in Tompkins County. Key community leaders, including political leaders, are contributing their time and input. Local organizations and businesses are carrying out community building activities, for example, CMA is purposefully hiring ethnically diverse doctors and Wegman's features community giving stories on their website, among other activities.

Every community is different, but higher levels of trust and connectedness are correlated with many other positive outcomes. Some studies have shown that when teenagers feel connected to a community, there are better grades in school, and lower rates of depression. Other studies have found that higher levels of trust are correlated with a faster recovery time after surgery or illness. These are all things we want for our community.

While we know that these positive outcomes are desirable, the social capital survey allows us to isolate the key issues for our community and determine strategies to strengthen the areas that are lower. The presentation of the results allows various different stakeholders who may never have access to each other to come together and develop the best solution for our community. It leads to the empowerment of residents, to help come up with solutions that are community driven and community based, and gives residents the tools and opportunity to get involved.

There are many areas in which the community is already very strong in social capital, but

we want to be strong in every area to help advocate for the changes that residents care about, lead to a much happier retirement for our adults, and better health and education for our community's children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Applebome, Peter. "Despite Long Slide by Kodak, Company Town Avoids Decay." The New York Times. Web. 16 Jan. 2012. <u>www.nytimes.com/2012/01/17/nyregion</u>.
- Bent, Lincoln, Miriam Edelman, Xuelai Li, Tamara Struk, and Atsuki Takahashi. Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey in Tompkins County: 1492 Consulting Final Report. Web. 2010.

"Better Together: Connect with Others. Build Trust. Get Involved." Web. www.bettertogether.org/socialcapital.htm.

- Blakely, T., J. Atkinson, V. Ivory, S. Collings, J. Wilton, and P. Howden-Chapman. "No Association of Neighbourhood Volunteerism with Mortality in New Zealand: A National Multilevel Cohort Study." International Journal of Epidemiology 35 (2006): 981-89. Print.
- Doolitte, Nancy. "Cornell Chronicle: Town-gown Event Recognizes Local Leaders." Cornell Chronicle Online. 6 Dec. 2011. Web. 2012. www.news.cornell.edu/stories/Dec11/TownGown.html.
- Doris, Leal Hill. "Sense of Belonging as Connectedness, American Indian Worldview, and Mental Health." Sense of Belonging as Connectedness, American Indian Worldview, and Mental Health 20.5: 210-16. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 1 Oct. 2006. Web. www.psychiatricnursing.org/article/S0883-9417(06)00089-6/abstract.
- Hamilton, Darrick. "Race, Wealth, and Intergenerational Poverty." The American Prospect. 14 Aug. 2009. Web. <u>http://prospect.org/article/race-wealth-and-intergenerational-poverty</u>.

"Initial Survey Report." 2010. Cornell Social Capital Consulting Group.

- Islam, MK, J. Merlo, I. Kawachi, M. Lindstrom, and U-G Gerdtham. "Social Capital and
- Health: Does Egalitarianism Matter? A Literature Review." 5.3 (2006). International Journal Equity Health, 2006. Web. <u>http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/4/989.full</u>.
- Jaffe, Sarah. "Racism at Philadelphia Pool Is Just the Tip of the Iceberg." 9 July 2009. Web. <u>http://globalcomment.com/2009</u>.
- Krysan, Maria. "Racial Attitudes in America: A Brief Summary of the Updated Data | Institute of Government and Public Affairs." Institute of Government and Public Affairs. 2012. Web. 2012. <u>http://igpa.uillinois.edu/programs/racial-attitudes/brief</u>.

- Leal Hill, Doris. "Relationship between sense of belonging as connectedness and suicide in American Indians." Psychiatric Nursing. 2009. 23:1, 65-74. Print.
- McNeely, Clea, James Nonnemaker, and Robert Blum. "Promoting School Connectedness: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescents." Promoting School Connectedness: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescents 4th ser. 72. Apr. 2002.
- "Meeting between Spring 2012 Student Group and Core Client Group at the Tompkins County Chamber of Commerce." 10 Feb. 2012.
- Moore, Duncan T. "No Rust in Rochester." The New York Times. Web. 2 Feb. 2012. <u>www.nytimes.com/2012/02/03/opinion/rochesters-survival-lessons.html</u>.
- "Nassau County QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau." U.S. Census 2012. Ithaca, NY. 2012. Web. 2012. <u>http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/36/3638077.html</u>.
- "New survey asks: Do We Trust Each Other?" Rochester Area Community Foundation. Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey. Web. 1 March 2001. www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/ny3c.html.
- Platt, Spencer. "NYPD Spied on Muslims All over Northeast." NYPD Spied on Muslims All over Northeast US â RT. 21 Feb. 2012. Web. 05 Mar. 2012. http://rt.com/usa/news/nypd-buffalo-muslim-college-793/.
- "Poll: Most Americans See Lingering Racism -- in Others." CNN. 12 Dec. 2006. Web. 2012. http://articles.cnn.com/2006-12-12/us/racism.poll_1_whites-blacks-racism? s=PM:US.
- "President Skorton Issues Statement on Diversity Goals." University Statements." 05 Feb. 2012. Web. www.cornell.edu/statements/2012/20120215-diversity-statement.cfm.
- "Questions in Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Short Form." Web. www.ceplearning.org/documents/resources/Interv_Protcol_Soc_Capital_Maine.pdf.

Putnam, Robert. Bowling Alone. 2000. New York: Simon & Schuster. Print.

Race and Public Policy Class. Cornell University, Spring 2012. Web.

Reynolds, Amy L., Jacob N. Sneva, and Gregory P. Beehler. "The Influence of

Racism-Related Stress on the Academic Motivation of Black and Latino/a Students." V51.N2: 135-49. ERIC %u2013 World%u2019s Largest Digital Library of Education

Literature. Mar.-Apr. 2010. Web. 2012. www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true.

- "The Rise of Intermarriage: Rates, Characteristics Vary by Race and Gender." Pew Research Center. 16 Feb. 2012. Web. 2012. <u>http://pewresearch.org/pubs/2197/intermarriage-race-ethnicity-asians-whites-hispanics-bl</u> <u>acks</u>.
- Rosen, Aaron. "Svante Myrick Elected Mayor." The Ithacan. 8 Nov. 2011. Web. 2012. http://theithacan.org/17746.
- Shannon, David. "Social Capital in Tompkins County." Social Capital in Tompkins County. 2011. Web. www2.binghamton.edu/ccpa/public-administration/current-students/capstone/David%20 Final.pdf.
- Sigelman, Lee, and Susan Welch. "The Contact Hypothesis Revisited: Black-White Interaction and Positive Racial Attitudes Social Forces." Social Forces 71.3 (1993): 781-95. Web. 2012. <u>http://sf.oxfordjournals.org/citmgr?gca=sf;71/3/781</u>.
- "The Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey." Web. www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/index.html.
- "Tompkins County, New York." U.S. Census. 20012." 2012. Web. http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/36/36109.html.

Trochim, William. "Plus & Minus of Survey Methods." Social Research Methods. 2006. Web. 2012. <u>www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/survaddi.php</u>.

UpFront, Consulting. "Social Capital Survey Central Minnesota: Final Report." (2010): 4. Web. <u>www.communitygiving.org/files/425.pdf</u>.

Weaver, Teri. "Svante Myrick: How a Child of Modest Means Became Ithaca's Youngest Mayor-elect." The Post-Standard. 20 Nov. 2011. Web. 2012. <u>www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2011/11/svante_myrick_how_a_child_of_m.html</u>.

APPENDIX A

More on Data Analysis Methodology

This section is mainly about the in-depth data analysis and some major findings of the analysis. Before the data analysis and major findings, we would like to focus on the data coding process, introduce some new measures, and explain a little bit about the data matrices and those dependent and independent (explanatory) variables. After that, we will go through the in-depth analysis using the Tompkins County's data matrix that were coded from the 2010 social capital team's survey results; and then conclude with five major findings about Tompkins County. In the last part of this section, using the national data matrix that combines Tompkins' 2010 datasets with the 2006 national datasets, we will compare findings not only with the whole nation, but also with other communities that share similar demographic features with Tompkins County, for example, Rochester and Winston-Salem, helping us compare Tompkins County to other communities and the nation.

Because we treat ethnic relations as a dependent variable and use trust to measure it, those seven trust measures (trust, trnei, trcop, trshop, trwht, trblk, and trhis) are more important than other measures. After checking data, we construct two new measures: trustscore and activescore. The first one, trustscore, is computed from trustadd which is coded from those seven different measurements of trust with weights. The trustscore which will be our dependent variable in the model, is from 3 to 23, measuring the personal feeling of trust. Then, activescore (active), also the social activeness, is coded from the ten different measurements of participation in social events or activities (compro, donblo, pubmeet, polmeet, clubmeet, friover, frdrac, difnei, comhom, and voltimes). The activescore is ranging from 9 to 90, in which the larger number means that this respondent is more actively involved in those social events or activities.

Besides trust measures and the dependent variable of trustscore, we have plenty of independent variables or explanatory variables, measuring different aspects of respondents. And there are two different kinds or types of explanatory variables. The first kind of explanatory variables are the unchangeable factors that local government and community cannot or are hard to change them, for example, gender, race, citizenship, age, and so on. The analysis of those factors will give us some sense which individuals and/or groups should be the focus of efforts to improve social capital and ethnic relations, although the local government and community may not alter those aspects.

As for the second kind of explanatory variables, socio-economic factors, like family income, employment status, political interests, and so on, the local government and community can initiate policies or do something to influence and change them. For example, the local government and community could increase their transparency and publicize their decision making process, to increase people's trust in them. Or the local government could develop new local projects and hire more people, to decrease the unemployment rate.

The coding process resulted in two coded data matrices for further analysis: 2010 Tompkins' coded data matrix, and the combined national data matrix. In the first data matrix, we treat the individual respondent as row vector, while all measures as column vectors. The size of the raw data matrix is designated by its number of respondents and number of measure in form of "row by column". To be parallel and consistent, we deleted some measures in both 2010 and 2006 datasets, and combine them into one, the second data matrix. In the second

one, we added a new column of county affiliation, with numbers representing specific counties. And the 593 respondents from the Tompkins County are only part of the national data matrix. In the following two parts, we will focus more on in-depth analysis using statistical methods and present some major findings that we get from the analysis. We focused on the ethnic relations in Tompkins County and present our major findings from five aspects after analyzing the first data matrix (from the 2010 survey).

Graph: the Correlation Matrix of Seven Different Measurements of Trust

	Trwht	Trblk	Trh	nisOther
Mean	1.809122	2 1.8445	95	1.832487
Std.Dev.	0.620341	15 0.6341	957	0.6618109

Table: the Mean and Standard Deviation of Trust Measures in Different Races

In the correlation matrix, trwht, trblk, and trhis, these three measures are highly correlated, which means that if a individual respondent has low trust in one race, he or she will probably have low trust in other race. Then from the table above, we may find the means and standard deviations of those three measures are quite close. In other words, the trust in one race is not distinguished with that in other races. To be more cautious, we may use t-test to check whether there are significant differences between the means of those trust measures. After further analysis, we find out the racial equity issue is quite complex. From the t-tests, we cannot reject the null hypotheses that there is significant difference between these three trust measures, in 99% and 95% confidence level, which means substantively there is no

racial discrimination. But when we focus on the hypothesis testing between trwht and trblk, it is quite close to 1.96 and 0.05, which are the critical points of claiming significant difference. And we cannot hold the former statement that there is no significant difference between trwht and trblk if the confidence level is 90%.

To conclude on racial equity, we can say that there is no racial discrimination here at the Tompkins County. But to be more cautious, we should pay attention to the ethnic relations between white people and blacks, because it is near the critical point.

By looking at the graphs and table, although there is a 0.5 difference between the means of trustscore between disabled people and non-disabled people, the p-value and f-test show that this difference is not significant, which means that being disabled is not convincing enough to explain the changes of trust.

To conclude on disabled, we can say there is no significant difference between the trustscore of disabled and non-disabled people, and actually the local government did a very good job in helping those disabled people to have a good sense of trust.

We then turn our attention to focus on social events and activities and use regression analysis to illustrate whether and how those events contribute to the personal feeling of trust (trustscore).

From the graph about social activities and trust (see appendix A, figure 8), we could have three conclusions about the effects of those social community events and activities. First, some social events and activities may not have positive effects on trust and ethnic relations as people thought, like community projects, blood donation, and political meetings or rallies. And the regression coefficients of those events and activities are negative, which means people become less trusting as they increase their participation in these events. Second, the positive influences of some other social events and activities, like volunteer projects, public meetings for discussing town and school affairs, friends coming over, and having chance to serve on board or committee, on trust are statistically amazing. For example, the coefficient of friover (having friends over) is around 0.225, and its p-value is 0.008, which representing that the positive effects of having friends coming over or going to their home on personal are not only statistical, but also substantively significant. Moreover, the volunteer projects also contribute to the increase of trust.

We are then left to answer the question of which individuals and/or groups should be the focus of efforts to improve Social Capital. Although it is hard or impossible for the local government and community to influence and change the factors, like gender, age, race, and so on, the analysis of those factors could give them some sense that which individuals and group they should pay more attention to or targeted.

Demographics

Trustscore	Male	Female
Mean	17.32093	18.2234
Std.Dev.	3.725923	3.282777

Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Male and Female Respondents

From the analysis, we find out that female respondents actually have higher trust score than males. And also with the p-value to be 0.002, we could tell that this effect is significant.

From the analysis is seems that the trustscore increases as age increases, which means that the young people actually have lower trust scores than other groups.

U.S. Citizenship

Trustscore	U.S. Citizen	Non-U.S. Citizen
Mean	18.03636	15.51429
Std.Dev.	3.38196	4.231336

Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of U.S.Citizen and Non-U.S.Citizen

Respondents

Citizenship really matters, and non-citizens have lower trust scores than U.S. citizens. And this effect is extremely significant.

A very strong result is that those who own their homes have higher trust scores than those

who rent, and this effect is quite significant.

Residency

Trustscore	Less than 1	1-2 years	3-5 years	5-10 years	More than 10
Mean	17.5942	16.4902	16.25532	17.84615	18.5
Std.Dev.	3.340125	4.509424	3.319691	3.921233	3.144997

Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Living Years

The analysis shows that the longer a respondent lives in Tompkins county, the higher trust score he or she will have. To be cautious, although the STATA results show statistical significance, the substantive effect is not so significant. And by looking to the table, we could
find that the residents who lived in the Tompkins county among 1-5 years have lower trust scores than other groups.

From the table (see appendix A, figure 20), we can tell that those separated, divorced and never married have lower trust scores than others, and those never married should be paid more attention to.

Different than racial equity, the analysis on race represents personal feeling of trust in general, not in specific ethnic group. In fact, ethnic groups of 2, 4, and 5 have lower trust scores than other ethnic groups.

To sum up, the analysis of those factors above gives us some sense that which individuals or groups should be the focus of efforts to improve social capital and trust. For example, young people, male residents, non-U.S. citizens, those lives here less than 5 years, those separated or never married and those who do not own the places they live should be paid more attention to.

However there are socioeconomic aspects that the local government and community could influence. Different from the factors above, the socio-economic factors, like employment status, family income, education, and health status, could be influenced and changed by government policies or projects. In a sense, ethnic relations and racial trust are not isolated ideas, but have more to do with education, local economy, and local medical environment.

Labor (Employment Status): From the table (see Appendix A, figure 22), we could tell that the temporary laid off people have extremely lower trust score than others, even lower

73

than those unemployed people. In contrast, the retired are more satisfied with their situation and have higher personal feeling of trust.

Not surprisingly, the trust score increases with the increase of family income, which means local government and community could improve the social capital via influencing family income.

Education: Graduate or professional degree

Mean 0		16.61765	16.82456	17.1954 17.8	808 17.5263	32 19.00518
Std.Dev.	0	3.143196	3.391812	3.500296	3.593668	3.61687 3.084736

Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Education

From table and (see appendix A, figure 27), we can tell that education has a significant effect on social trust. The trust score increases with the increase of education level. The well-being of a person consists of two aspects: not only physical health, but also mental health. In this survey, we use happiness to measure mental well-being, though it will be biased to some degree. The trust score increases as people become happier with their situation. This also is quite significant. Physical health also has significant effects on personal feeling of trust. Those with good health intend to have higher trust in people than those with bad health.

Besides from local economy and other socioeconomic aspects, politics is also a big issue. And in the social capital survey, there are plenty of questions measuring several aspects of politics. For example, polint is used to measure how people are interested in politics and national affairs; regvote is about whether the individual respondent has registered to vote; tgnat and tgloc are used to measure people's trust in national and local government; ideo is about people's own perception of their ideological outlook, from most conservative to most liberal. In the following analysis, we will show how those factors about politics are related to personal feeling of trust and ethnic relations.

After looking at the tables and graphs (Appendix A, figures 35-40), we find out that the trust score increase as individual becomes more interested in politics and national affairs, and those who have registered to vote have higher trust scores than those who haven't. And those two aspects are not only statistically significant, but also substantively significant. Given the fact that we found out the political meetings and rallies have negative effects on trust scores, it is quite interesting to see actually political interests have positive effects, which seems to confuse people. Anyway, it is definitely right for local government to increase people's interests in politics and national affairs.

From the tables and graphs (see Appendix A, figures 41-45) we could have three conclusions. First, according to the correlation matrix, the trust in national government and local government are highly correlated with each other. Second, they both have significant influences on trust scores, and the trust score increases as individual becomes more trustful in national government or local government. It means the transparency of governmental affairs does matter. Third, the marginal effect of trust in local government on trust score is much larger than that of trust in national government. In other words, the transparency in local affairs actually is more effective than that of national government in improving the social capital and ethnic relations.

As for the political ideology, we could easily find out that the trust score increases as individual becomes more liberal. Given the fact that the Tompkins County (especially Ithaca) is much liberal than any other counties in the upstate New York, this finding makes sense. To conclude, after analyzing the different aspects of politics, we may find that politics plays an important role in influencing social capital and ethnic relations. And the local government and community could not only focus more on those political factors, but also initiate policies and develop projects to improve social capital and ethnic relations, for example, by increasing local transparency, people's political interests, and influencing their ideological outlook.

Cross-Community Comparison: In this section, we are going to compare the Tompkins County with the whole nation and other counties, and present our major finding of the data comparison, using the combined national data matrix. In this data matrix, we include a new variable of "county", helping us to identify the county affiliation. To be simple, we just choose Winston-Salem and Rochester for cross-community data comparison. For example, county 1 stands for the Tompkins County; county 18 stands for Winston-Salem; county 44 and 45 stand for Rochester. If there is no county variable included in the regression, it represents the whole nation, including the Tompkins, Winston-Salem and Rochester. To be cautious, although we assume that the ethnic relations are quite stable during 2000-2010 census periods and we could compare the Tompkins County's 2010 data with the 2006 national data, those two datasets were collected by two different groups of people, using different survey methods, at the different years and also with the problem of short-form vs. long-form survey, which may lead to some biasness. So, we should take that those limitations into consideration. But this comparison analysis will still give us some valuable information, even having those limitations.

Trustscore	Tompkins	Nation Wi	nston-Salem	Rochester
Mean	17.89713	16.62468	16.47077	16.29537
Std.Dev.	3.474989	2.930194	2.724473	2.631189

Table: Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem and Rochester)

By just comparing the means of trust scores, we may find that the Tompkins County has a much higher trust score than the whole nation, Winston-Salem and Rochester, while the trust scores of the latter three are pretty close around 16.5. To be cautious, because we compare the Tompkins County in 2010 with the others in 2006, so it is hard for us to just conclude that the Tompkins is doing better job than the whole nation, Winston-Salem and Rochester. But, at lease, the ethnic relations and trust at the Tompkins County are not bad. And the Tompkins County also has a much higher standard deviation than the others, which means that the Tompkins County has more outliers than the nation and other communities. And in the following analysis, we should focus more on the comparison of marginal effects, not only on the comparison of trust scores.

In the analysis of Tompkins 2010, we concluded that the racial relations and trust between white and black are pretty close to the brink, which meant although there was no racial discrimination existed, the analysis was parallel with some of the background stories that there were some conflicts between different racial groups. In this part of comparison analysis, we will compare the Tompkins with the whole nation and other communities to examine this finding. From the graphs of t-tests above, we may see that the p-values are very large (0.7999, 0.1819, and 0.7821), especially compared to the p-value of the Tompkins (0.0518), which means we can easily reject the hypotheses that there are significant differences between trust in white people and in black people. So, we have to admit that the ethnic relations between white people and black people are a little better in Winston-Salem, Rochester, and the whole nation than in Tompkins, although there is definitely no racial discrimination exited in the Tompkins County.

Hispanics And Latinos

Trhis	Tompkins	Nation Winston-Salem Rochester
Mean	1.832487	3.19758 3.390769 3.213523
Std.Dev	r66181	09 .99889 .8595367 1.016276

Trhis=1:trust a lot, Trhis=2:trust them some, Trhis=3:trust them only a little, Trhis=4: no trust Table: Means and Standard Deviations of Trhis (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem and Rochester)

When looking at the Hispanics and Latinos, the trhis score of Tompkins is much lower than those scores of Winston-Salem, Rochester and the whole nation, especially those scores are extremely high. It means the ethnic relations between Latinos and other racial groups are much better than the whole and other communities. Then we conduct a comparison analysis on those unchangeable factors, like gender, age, citizenship, residency, and marital status, to situate the Tompkins in the whole nation. From the regression results (see Appendix A, figure 52-56), we may find the marginal effect of gender to be a female on the trust scores in the Tompkins County actually are much larger than those in the nation and other communities. Moreover, for Winston-Salem and Rochester, this gender effects are not statistically and substantively significant. And one interesting finding is that the male respondents have higher than female respondents for Rochester, which is quite different with other communities.

From the regression outputs and graph (see appendix A, figures 57-61) we may find that the marginal effect of age on trust scores in the Tompkins is much larger than the nation and other communities, while the effects of the nation and other communities are pretty close around 0.03.

From the regression outputs (see Appendix A, figures 62-65), we may find out that the effects of being a U.S. citizen in the Tompkins, Winston-Salem and the nation are quite close, also statistically and substantively significant, while this effect of Rochester is much lower and not statistically significant.

Similar to the citizenship, the effects of property ownership in the Tompkins, Winston-Salem and the nation are quite close, also statistically and substantively significant, while this effect of Rochester is much lower and not statistically significant. Similar to the citizenship and property ownership, for the Tompkins, Winston-Salem and the nation, the trust scores increase significantly as the residency increases, while this effect of Rochester is much lower and not so significant.

79

Parallel with the former finding, those never married, separated, and divorced are three groups of people have lowest trust scores. In addition, those divorced actually have higher trust scores than those separated, except Winston-Salem.

The national data show parallel findings with the former findings in the Tompkins 2010 that those temporary laid off people have much lower trust scores than other groups of people, even the unemployed people. For Winston-Salem and Rochester, the data of employment status are missing, so we cannot compare the Tompkins data with Winston-Salem and Rochester.

From the regression outputs and graph (see appendix A, figure 81-85), we can find that the effects of education on ethnic relations and social capital are quite close among different communities.

According to the regression outputs and graph (see Appendix A, figures 86-90, we can see that the effect of physical well-being on social capital and ethnic relations is much larger in the Tompkins than the nation and other communities.

We then conducted a comparison analysis of different political factors, to situate the Tompkins County in the nation and other communities. According to the regression results, we can conclude that the voting registration has significant influences on ethnic relations and social capital, and this effect is much higher in the Tompkins than other communities. But for the political interests, the situation is quite different. The effects of political interests on trust and ethnic relations in Winston-Salem and Rochester are not so significant as Tompkins, or even the whole nation. From the regression outputs and graphs (see Appendix A, figure 96-101), we could have two major conclusions. First, parallel with the former finding in the Tompkins 2010, the local government plays a more significant role than the national government. Second, the effects of transparency and trust in government seem to be more significant in the Tompkins and nation than Winston-Salem and Rochester. Or in other words, the political factors are playing significant roles in Tompkins, while they seem less important in Winston-Salem and Rochester to influence ethnic relations and social capital.

To conclude on politics, we may find that political factors play important roles in influencing

ethnic relations and social capital of the Tompkins County, for example, political interests, voting registration, and trust in the government, transparency and political ideology. In contrast, those political factors do not significantly influence the ethnic relations and social capital of Winston-Salem and Rochester. As for the political ideology, it is quite complex. How an individual's ideological outlook influence their trust in people and the ethnic relations in this region (or whether this effect is positive or negative) highly depends on local politics, national politics and the overview of local constituency.

Then, we will go through the in-depth data analysis and conclude on some of our major findings. After the data coding process, we have two different data matrices: the Tompkins data matrix and the combined national data matrix. Using the Tompkins data matrix, we focus only on the Tompkins County itself, we have following five major findings:

(1) The Tompkins County actually does a very good job in racial equity and helping disabled people, although the racial equity issue is a little complex.

(2) As for those social events and activities, we find out some events or activities may have negative effects on ethnic relations and social capital, like community projects, political meetings or rallies and blood donation, while some of other events or activities do have significantly positive effects, such as public meetings and volunteer projects.

(3) For those unchangeable factors, like gender, age, citizenship, residency, property ownership and marital status, although the local government and community cannot or are hard to change them, the analysis of those factors would provide some information of which individuals and/or groups should be the focus of efforts to improve social capital and ethnic relations.

(4) After analyzing those socio-economic factors, we find out that the ethnic relations and trust are not only about themselves, but have more to do with education, local economy, and local medical environment. In other words, the local government and community could improve the ethnic relations and social capital via initiating local policies and projects to influence those socio-economic factors.

(5) Those political factors, like political interests, voting registration, transparency in government and political ideology, play important roles in influencing ethnic relations and social capital of the Tompkins County.

When we compare the Tompkins County not only with the whole nation, but also with other communities that share similar demographic features with the Tompkins County, for example, Rochester and Winston-Salem, using the combined national data matrix. (1) By comparing the trust scores, we find out that the Tompkins County has higher trust score than the whole nation, Winston-Salem, and Rochester. To be cautious, there are lots of

82

limitations with the combined national data matrix. But, at least, we could be optimistic about the ethnic relations and social capital of the Tompkins County.

(2) As for the racial equity issue, by comparing with the nation and other communities, we find out that the ethnic relations between the white people and black people are just at the brink, and this situation is much more serious and dangerous than the whole nation and other communities. But, the Tompkins County does a much greater job in the ethnic relations between Hispanics or Latinos and other racial groups.

(3) The comparison analysis on those unchangeable factors, such as age, gender, citizenship, property ownership, residency, marital status, is parallel and consistent with those findings in the Tompkins County. Besides, we find out that the effects of those unchangeable factors actually are more significant in the Tompkins County than the whole nation or other two communities.

(4) Similarly, the comparison analysis on those socio-economic factors, like employment status, education, and physical well-being, show in favor of our former findings in the Tompkins County part.

(5) After the comparison analysis, we find out that those political factors, like political ideology, play interests, voting registration, government transparency, and individual political ideology, play much more significant roles in influencing ethnic relations and social capital of the Tompkins County than Winston-Salem and Rochester. Moreover, the effect of political ideology on ethnic relations and social capital highly depends on local politics, national politics, and the overview of local constituency.

83

Data Graphs and Tables

1) Trust and Racial Equity

	trust	trnei	trcop	trshop	trwht	trblk	trhis
trust	1.0000						
trnei	0.4285	1.0000					
trcop	0.2435	0.3638	1.0000				
trshop	0.3854	0.4591	0.4221	1.0000			
trwht	0.3991	0.5392	0.4704	0.5927	1.0000		
trblk	0.3847	0.5376	0.3235	0.5149	0.7262	1.0000	
trhis	0.4055	0.5204	0.3741	0.5631	0.7007	0.8429	1.0000

2) Graph: T-test of the Significant Difference between Two Means of Trwht and Trblk

. ttest trwht=trblk

Paired t	test					
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
trwht trblk	591 591	1.808799 1.846024	.025537	.6208172 .6337782	1.758644 1.794822	1.858953 1.897225
diff	591	037225	.0190982	.4642856	0747337	.0002836
mean Ho: mean	(diff) = me (diff) = 0	an(trwht - 1	rblk)	degrees	t of freedom	= -1.9491 = 590
Ha: mean Pr(T < t	(diff) < 0) = 0.0259	Ha Pr(a: mean(diff) T > t) =	!= 0 0.0518	Ha: mean Pr(T > t	(diff) > 0) = 0.9741

3) Graph: T-test of the Significant Difference between Two Means of Trwht and Trhis

Paired t	test					
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
trwht trhis	590 590	1.808475 1.833898	.0255783 .0272328	.6212939 .6614821	1.758239 1.780413	1.85871 1.887383
diff	590	0254237	.0205405	. 4989269	0657653	.0149178
<pre>mean(diff) = mean(trwht - trhis)</pre>						
Ha: mean Pr(T < t)	(diff) < 0) = 0.1082	Ha Pr(a: mean(diff) T > t) =	!= 0 0.2163	Ha: mean Pr(T > t	(diff) > 0) = 0.8918

. ttest trwht=trhis

4) Graph: T-test of the Significant Difference between Two Means of Trblk and Trhis

. ttest trblk=trhis

```
Paired t test
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
trblk	590	1.844068	.026151	.6352068	1.792707	1.895428
trhis	590	1.832203	.027268	.6623364	1.778649	1.885758
diff	590	.0118644	.0150696	.3660391	0177323	.0414611
mean	t	= 0.7873				
Ho: mean	of freedom	= 589				
Ha: mean	(diff) < 0	Ha	: mean(diff)	!= 0	Ha: mean	(diff) > 0
Pr(T < t)) = 0.7843	Pr(T > t) =	0.4314	Pr(T > t) = 0.2157

5) Hypothesis Testing Trwht==Trblk Trwht==Trhis Trblk==Trhis

T-value -1.9491 -1.2377 0.7873 P-value 0.0518 0.2163 0.4314

Table: Hypothesis Testing Results (Trwht, Trblk, Trhis)

6) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore disabled"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
disabled _cons	537918 17.90155	1.059404 .1446545	-0.51 123.75	0.612 0.000	-2.618595 17.61745	1.542759 18.18566
Trustscore	Disabled=1	Non-Disal	oled=0			
Mean	17.36364	17.90155				
Std.Dev.	3.585324	3.4789				

Table: Means and Std.Devs of Disabled and Non-disabled

7) Graph: F-test of Whether to Include Disabled in the Regression Model

```
. test disabled
( 1) disabled = 0
F( 1, 588) = 0.26
Prob > F = 0.6118
```

8) Graph: the Regression Results of All Social Events or Activities Measured by the Survey

trustscoreCoef.Std. Err.tP> t [95% Conf. Intervalcompro0714323.0832835-0.860.3912350372.09217donblo3581246.1157794-3.090.002585565513068pubmeet.1331669.08805561.510.1310398125.30614polmeet2852439.1116949-2.550.011504661106582clubmeet.019573.07397960.260.7911257549.1649friover.2247153.08451552.660.008.0586903.39074frdrac2157417.0763367-2.830.005365706578difnei.13182.0897521.470.1430444918.30813comhom.0716379.08850870.810.4191022316.24550voltimes.1577791.07959821.980.048.0014137.31414serve.2915463.34593350.840.4003880169.97110relser.2180096.08806062.480.014.0450204.39099								
compro 0714323 .0832835 -0.86 0.391 2350372 .09217 donblo 3581246 .1157794 -3.09 0.002 5855655 13068 pubmeet .1331669 .0880556 1.51 0.131 0398125 .30614 polmeet 2852439 .1116949 -2.55 0.011 5046611 06582 clubmeet .019573 .0739796 0.26 0.791 1257549 .1649 friover .2247153 .0845155 2.66 0.008 .0586903 .39074 frdrac 2157417 .0763367 -2.83 0.005 3657 06578 difnei .13182 .089752 1.47 0.143 0444918 .30813 comhom .0716379 .0885087 0.81 0.419 1022316 .24550 voltimes .1577791 .0795982 1.98 0.048 .0014137 .31414 serve .2915463 .3459335 0.84 0.400 <th></th> <th>trustscore</th> <th>Coef.</th> <th>Std. Err.</th> <th>t</th> <th>P> t </th> <th>[95% Conf.</th> <th>Interval]</th>		trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
contri .3148645 .1035952 3.04 0.002 .1113585 .51837 _cons 14.90017 .7363697 20.23 0.000 13.45362 16.346	_	compro donblo pubmeet clubmeet friover frdrac difnei comhom voltimes serve relser contri _cons	0714323 3581246 .1331669 2852439 .019573 .2247153 2157417 .13182 .0716379 .1577791 .2915463 .2180096 .3148645 14.90017	.0832835 .1157794 .0880556 .1116949 .0739796 .0845155 .0763367 .089752 .0885087 .0795982 .3459335 .0880606 .1035952 .7363697	-0.86 -3.09 1.51 -2.55 0.26 2.66 -2.83 1.47 0.81 1.98 0.84 2.48 3.04 20.23	0.391 0.002 0.131 0.011 0.791 0.008 0.005 0.143 0.419 0.048 0.400 0.014 0.002 0.000	2350372 5855655 0398125 5046611 1257549 .0586903 3657 0444918 1022316 .0014137 3880169 .0450204 .1113585 13.45362	.0921725 -1306837 .3061464 -0658267 .164901 .3907403 -0657834 .3081317 .2455074 .3141444 .9711094 .3909988 .5183704 16.34672

9) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By the Frequency of



Blood Donation with the Regression Line

10) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By the Frequency of Participation in Political Meetings or Rallies with the Regression Line



11) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By the Frequency of Volunteering With the Regression Line



12) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore gender".

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
gender	.902474	.2950168	3.06	0.002	.3230612	1.481887
_cons	17.32093	.2353135	73.61		16.85877	17.78309

13) Age Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore age".

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
age	.0602606	.0097053	6.21	0.000	.0411978	.0793235
_cons	15.12747	.4819408	31.39		14.18085	16.07408

14) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted by Age with the

Regression Line



15) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore uscit".

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
uscit	2.522078	.5992049	4.21	0.000	1.345215	3.698941
_cons	15.51429	.5810035	26.70		14.37317	16.6554

16) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore own".

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
own _cons	1.589783 16.81522	.3021011	5.26 67.26	0.000	.9964414 16.32416	2.183124 17.30627

17) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Who Own the Place That

They Live or Rent

Trustscore Own Rent	
Mean 18.405 16.81522	
Std.Dev.3.229093 3.720947	

18) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore livcom".

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
livcom	.3970842	.1029804	3.86	0.000	.194798	.5993705
_cons	16.3573	.4265543	38.35		15.51941	17.19519

19) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted by How Long They have lived in Tompkins with the Regression Line



20) Marital Status Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By

Marital Status

Trustscor	Marital=1	Marital=2	Marital=3	Marital=4	Marital=5	Marital=6
e	Currently	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Partnered	Never
	Married					Married
Mean	18.36812	17.33333	17.50943	20	18.19512	16.63492
Std.Dev.	3.382689	4.064949	3.196288	2.828427	3.249765	3.515914

21) Graph: Means and Std.Dev. of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Race

race	N(trusts~e)	mean(trusts~e)	sd(trusts~e)
0	3	18.3333	4.725816
1	438	18.2854	3.251237
2	13	15.3077	3.945137
3	19	19.3684	2.832559
4	42	15.2619	3.100429
5	30	16.6333	3.746109
6	10	19.1	4.532598
7	10	17	4.109609
8	10	17.1	2.960856
9	18	17.2222	4.634342

¹ Race=1: White; Race=2: Middle Eastern; Race=3: European; Race=4: Black or

African-American; Race=5: Asian; Race=6: Native American; Race=7: Hispanics; Race=8:

Latino; Race=9: Others

22) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Employment

Status

Trustscore	Labor=1	Labor=2	Labor=3	Labor=4	Labor=5
	Working	Temporary	Unemploye	Retired	Housemake
		Off	d		r
Mean	17.97872	13.8	16.44231	19.09524	18.04762
Std.Dev.	3.43188	2.774887	3.577783	2.852551	4.043219

23) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Family Income in

2009

Family	FI=1	FI=2	FI=3	FI=4	FI=5	FI=6
Income	\$20,000	\$20,000-	\$30,000-	\$50,000-	\$75,000-	\$100,000
	Or Less	\$30,000	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	Or More
Mean	16.61818	16.55769	17.13131	17.64545	18.31111	18.88439
Std.Dev.	3.045889	3.733334	3.538841	3.363556	3.18227	3.323356

24) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore familyincome2009"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
familyi~2009	.5134201	.0844669	6.08	0.000	.34752	.6793202
_cons	15.72195	.3746687	41.96		14.98606	16.45783

25)Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Family Income in



2009 with the Regression Line

26) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Education

Trustsco	Educ=1	Educ=2	Educ=3	Educ=4	Educ=5	Educ=6	Educ=7
re	Less	High	Some	Associat	Bachelo	Some	Graduat
	than	school	college	es	r's	graduate	e or
	high	diploma		degree	degree	training	professi
	school	(includi		(2 years)			onal
	(Grade	ng		or			degree

	11 or	GED)		specializ			
	less)			ed			
				technica			
				1			
				training			
Mean	0	16.6176	16.8245	17.1954	17.808	17.5263	19.0051
		5	6			2	8
Std.Dev.	0	3.14319	3.39181	3.50029	3.59366	3.61687	3.08473
		6	2	6	8		6

27) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore educ"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
educ	.4920351	.0893832	5.50	0.000	.3164866	.6675837
_cons	15.2918	.4938743	30.96		14.32183	16.26177

28)Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Eduction with the

Regression Line





Trustscore (Happynew)	Happynew=1 Not happy at	Happynew=2 Not very	Happynew=3 Happy	Happynew=4 Very Happy
	all	happy		
Mean	12.4	16.67742	17.4558	19.07254
Std.Dev.	2.792848	4.43762	3.41002	3.05589

30) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore happynew"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
happynew	1.557655	.2347324	6.64	0.000	1.09664	2.018669
_cons	12.82659	.776961	16.51		11.30064	14.35254

31) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Happiness with the



Regression Line

32) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Health

Trustscore	Healthnew=	Healthnew=	Healthnew=	Healthnew=	Healthnew=
(Healthnew)	1	2	3	4	5
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent
Mean	13.25	16.3913	17.21168	18.08481	18.53103
Std.Dev.	4.193249	3.115053	3.624733	3.421855	3.246911

33)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore healthnew"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
healthnew	.7656398	.1698467	4.51	0.000	.4320622	1.099217
_cons	14.89569	.6797451	21.91		13.56067	16.2307

34) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Health with the

Regression Line



35) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Their Interests in Politics

Trustscore	Polint=1	Polint=2	Polint=3	Polint=4
	Not at all	Only slightly	Somewhat	Very interested
	interested	interested	interested	
Mean	14.75	16.97647	17.85202	18.54264
Std.Dev.	4.464838	3.661175	3.25363	3.296048

36) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore polint"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
polint	.9582349	.1670094	5.74	0.000	.6302273	1.286243
_cons	14.82397	.5542916	26.74		13.73534	15.91261

37) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Their Interests in

Politics with the Regression Line



38) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Whether Register

To Vote Or Not

Trustscore	Regvote=0	Regvote=1
	Not Registered	Registered
Mean	15.53247	18.25737
Std.Dev.	4.12497	3.210246

39) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore regvote"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
regvote	2.7249	. 4088305	6.67	0.000	1.921943	3.527857
_cons	15.53247	. 3810249	40.76	0.000	14.78412	16.28081

40) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore polint regvote"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
polint	.6598349	.1721368	3.83	0.000	.3217475	.9979223
regvote	2.301745	.4237159	5.43	0.000	1.46954	3.133949
_cons	13.77675	.5911717	23.30	0.000	12.61565	14.93785

41) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Their Trust in

National or Local Government

Trust in	Tgnat=1	Tgnat=2	Tgnat=3	Tgnat=4
National	Hardly ever	Some of the	Most of the	Just about
Government		time	time	always
Mean	15.58696	17.98286	18.94737	19.5
Std.Dev.	3.467755	3.239219	3.340105	3.39786
Trust in Local	Tgloc=1	Tgloc=2	Tgloc=3	Tgloc=4
Government	Hardly ever	Some of the	Most of the	Just about
		time	time	always
Mean	14.93478	17.19601	19.22172	20.81818
Std. Dev.	4.644721	3.005237	3.097019	3.002164

42) Graph: the Correlation Matrix of Trustsocre, Tgnat and Tgloc

	trusts~e	tgnat	tgloc
trustscore tgnat tgloc	1.0000 0.2974 0.4012	1.0000 0.5446	1.0000

43) Graph: the Regression Resutls of "reg trustscore tgnat tgloc"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
tgnat	.5796662	.2329696	2.49	0.013	.122101	1.037231
tgloc	1.728067	.228973	7.55	0.000	1.278351	2.177782
_cons	12.55122	.5125636	24.49	0.000	11.54451	13.55792

44)Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Their Trust in National Or Local Government with the Regression Line. National (Left) & Local (Right)



45)Graph: The Regression Lines of "reg trustscore tgnat" and "reg trustscore tgloc".

National (Blue) & Local (Red)



46) Table: Means and Std.Devs of the Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Their Political

Ideology

Ideology	Ideo=1	Ideo=2	Ideo=3	Ideo=4	Ideo=5
	Very	Moderately	Middle-of-t	Moderately	Very liberal
	conservativ	conservativ	he-road	liberal	
	e	e			
Mean	16.75	17.53409	17.18065	18.31053	18.53623
Std,Dev.	4.837355	3.407054	3.364195	3.303581	3.596753

47) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore ideo"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
ideo	.4643388	.1315988	3.53	0.000	.2058751	.7228025
_cons	16.23959	.4934451	32.91	0.000	15.27045	17.20873

48) Graph: Two-Way Scatter Plot of Trustscore of Respondents Sorted By Their Political

Ideology with the Regression Line



Trustscore	Tompkins	Nation	Winston-Salem	Rochester
Mean	17.89713	16.62468	16.47077	16.29537
Std.Dev.	3.474989	2.930194	2.724473	2.631189

Table: Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem and Rochester)

49) Graph: T-test of the Significant Difference between Two Means of Trwht and Trblk

(Tompkins) Nation

. ttest trwht=trblk if county=1

Paired t	test					
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
trwht trblk	591 591	1.808799 1.846024	.025537	.6208172 .6337782	1.758644 1.794822	1.858953 1.897225
diff	591	037225	.0190982	.4642856	0747337	.0002836
mean Ho: mean	(diff) = me (diff) = 0	an(trwht - t	rblk)	degrees	t of freedom	= -1.9491 = 590
Ha: mean Pr(T < t)	(diff) < 0) = 0.0259	Ha Pr(a: mean(diff) T > t) =	!= 0 0.0518	Ha: mear Pr(T > t	(diff) > 0 :) = 0.9741

50) Graph: T-test of the Significant Difference between Two Means of Trwht and Trblk

(Nation) Winston-Salem

. ttest trwht=trblk

Paired t test

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
trwht trblk	5785 5785	1.820398 1.82178	.0088832 .0089683	.6756475 .682124	1.802983 1.804199	1.837812 1.839362
diff	5785	0013829	.0054558	. 4149666	0120784	.0093126
mean(Ho: mean((diff) = me (diff) = O	an(trwht - t	rb1k)	degrees	t of freedom	= -0.2535 = 5784
Ha: mean(Pr(T < t)	(diff) < 0) = 0.4000	Ha Pr(: mean(diff) T > t) =	!= 0 0.7999	Ha: mean Pr(T > t	(diff) > 0) = 0.6000

51) Graph: T-test of the Significant Difference between Two Means of Trwht and Trblk

(Winston-Salem) Rochester

. ttest trwht=trblk if county=18

Paired	t test	:
--------	--------	---

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
trwht trblk	325 325	1.809231 1.84	.036224 .0366809	.6530373 .6612745	1.737967 1.767837	1.880495 1.912163
diff	325	0307692	.0229976	. 414596	0760128	.0144743
mean Ho: mean	(diff) = me (diff) = 0	ean(trwht - 1	trb1k)	degrees	t of freedom	= -1.3379 = 324
Ha: mean Pr(T < t)	(diff) < 0) = 0.0909	Ha Pr(a: mean(diff) T > t) =	!= 0 0.1819	Ha: mean Pr(T > t	(diff) > 0) = 0.9091

52) Graph: T-test of the Significant Difference between Two Means of Trwht and Trblk

(Rochester)

. ttest trwht=trblk if county=44 | county=45

Paired t test

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
trwht trblk	281 281	1.854093 1.86121	.0372234 .0379955	.6239786 .6369211	1.780819 1.786417	1.927366 1.936003
diff	281	0071174	.0257046	. 4308868	0577161	.0434813
mean Ho: mean	(diff) = me (diff) = 0	an(trwht - t	rb1k)	degrees	t of freedom	= -0.2769 = 280
Ha: mean Pr(T < t)	(diff) < 0) = 0.3910	Ha Pr(: mean(diff) T > t) =	!= 0 0.7821	Ha: mean Pr(T > t	(diff) > 0 :) = 0.6090

Trhis	Tompkins	Nation	Winston-Salem	Rochester
Mean	1.832487	3.19758	3.390769	3.213523
Std.Dev.	.6618109	.99889	.8595367	1.016276

Trhis=1: trust them a lot

Trhis=2: trust them some

Trhis=3: trust them only a little

Trhis=4: trust them not at all

53) Gender & Tompkins Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore gender" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
gender	.902474	.2950168	3.06	0.002	.3230612	1.481887
_cons	17.32093	.2353135	73.61	0.000	16.85877	17.78309

54) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore gender" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>[t]	[95% Conf.	Interval]
gender	.3329189	.0790089	4.21	0.000	.1780318	.487806
_cons	16.41961	.06191	265.22	0.000	16.29825	16.54098

55) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore gender" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
gender	.1306228	.3170938	0.41	0.681	4932072	.7544527
_cons	16.38596	.2554979	64.13	0.000	15.88331	16.88861

56) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore gender" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
gender	1722077	.3255076	-0.53	0.597	8129705	.468555
_cons	16.40385	.2583418	63.50	0.000	15.8953	16.91239

57) Age Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore age" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
age	.0602606	.0097053	6.21	0.000	.0411978	.0793235
_cons	15.12747	.4819408	31.39		14.18085	16.07408

58)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore age" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
age _cons	.0343199 14.92097	.002307	14.88 121.76	0.000	.0297973 14.68073	.0388426 15.1612

59)Winston-SalemGraph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore age" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
age	.0313702	.0092797	3.38	0.001	.0131128	.0496277
_cons	14.8878	.490541	30.35	0.000	13.92268	15.85292

60)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore age" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
age	.0290977	.0094894	3.07	0.002	.0104157	.0477797
_cons	14.81374	.514006	28.82		13.80181	15.82568

61) Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore age" (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem and Rochester)



62) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore uscit" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
uscit	2.522078	.5992049	4.21	0.000	1.345215	3.698941
_cons	15.51429	.5810035	26.70		14.37317	16.6554

63) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore uscit" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
uscit	2.32814	.2000614	11.64	0.000	1.935944	2.720336
_cons	14.39352	.1962597	73.34		14.00878	14.77826

64)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore uscit" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
uscit	3.168831	.7251753	4.37	0.000	1.742118	4.595545
_cons	13.42857	.7092354	18.93		12.03322	14.82392

65)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore uscit" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
uscit	2.059091	1.322971	1.56	0.121	5452643	4.663446
_cons	14.25	1.313453	10.85	0.000	11.66438	16.83562

66)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore own" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
own _cons	1.589783 16.81522	.3021011	5.26 67.26	0.000	.9964414 16.32416	2.183124 17.30627

67)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore own" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
own	.9023241	.0909837	9.92	0.000	.7239617	1.080687
_cons	15.93802	.079823	199.67		15.78154	16.0945

68)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore own" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
own	1.083974	.3941346	2.75	0.006	.3085699	1.859378
_cons	15.57895	.3577896	43.54		14.87505	16.28285

69) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore own" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
own	.535455	.3542708	1.51	0.132	1619501	1.23286
_cons	15.90789	.3021908	52.64	0.000	15.31301	16.50278

70) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore livcom" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
livcom	.3970842	. 1029804	3.86	0.000	.194798	.5993705
_cons	16.3573	. 4265543	38.35		15.51941	17.19519

71) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore livcom" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
livcom	.2565071	.0291439	8.80	0.000	.199374	.3136403
_cons	15.65966	.1153528	135.75	0.000	15.43353	15.8858

72) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore livcom" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
livcom	.291573	.1115516	2.61	0.009	.0721136	.5110325
_cons	15.43187	.4247533	36.33		14.59624	16.2675

73) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore livcom" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
livcom	.0912968	.1219218	0.75	0.455	1487066	.3313002
_cons	15.94513	.4934026	32.32	0.000	14.97387	16.9164

74) Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore livcom" (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem

and Rochester)



75) Table: Marital Status National Table: the Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore

sorted by Marital Status (Tompkins)

Trustscor	Marital=1	Marital=2	Marital=3	Marital=4	Marital=5	Marital=6
e	Currently	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Partnered	Never
	Married					Married
Mean	18.36812	17.33333	17.50943	20	18.19512	16.63492
Std.Dev.	3.382689	4.064949	3.196288	2.828427	3.249765	3.515914

76)	Table: the Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore sorted	by	Marital	Status	(Nation)
-----	---	----	---------	--------	----------

Trustscor	Marital=1	Marital=2	Marital=3	Marital=4	Marital=5	Marital=6
e	Currently	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Partnered	Never
	Married					Married
Mean	16.89237	15.88667	16.1635	17.08349	18.19512	15.93888
Std.Dev.	2.829424	3.051101	2.983012	2.726551	3.249765	3.081193

77) Table: the Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore sorted by Marital Status

(Winston-Salem)

Trustscor	Marital=1	Marital=2	Marital=3	Marital=4	Marital=5	Marital=6
e	Currently	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Partnered	Never
	Married					Married
Mean	16.83529	16.875	15.65385	17.73529	0	15.39344
Std.Dev.	2.41958	2.695896	3.192421	2.573864	0	2.715871

78) Table: the Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore sorted by Marital Status

(Rochester)

Trustscor	Marital=1	Marital=2	Marital=3	Marital=4	Marital=5	Marital=6
e	Currently	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Partnered	Never
	Married					Married
Mean	16.79592	15.57143	15.64286	16.35714	0	15.59677
Std.Dev.	2.622189	2.13809	2.452728	2.921368	0	2.52502

79) Table: the Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore sorted by Employment Status

(Tompkins)

Trustscore	Labor=1	Labor=2	Labor=3	Labor=4	Labor=5
	Working	Temporary	Unemploye	Retired	Housemake
		Off	d		r

Mean	17.97872	13.8	16.44231	19.09524	18.04762
Std.Dev.	3.43188	2.774887	3.577783	2.852551	4.043219

80) Table: the Means and Standard Deviations of Trustscore sorted by Employment Status

(Nation)

Trustsco	Labor=1	Labor=2	Labor=3	Labor=4	Labor=5	Labor=6
re	Working	Temporar	Unemploy	Retired	Housemak	Student
		y Laid Off	ed		er	
Mean	16.89746	13.66667	15.92222	16.9302	15.76923	16.2907
				3		
Std.Dev.	3.219408	3.279272	3.461596	2.76635	3.678379	3.024863
				2		

81) Education Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore educ" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
educ	.4920351	.0893832	5.50	0.000	.3164866	.6675837
_cons	15.2918	.4938743	30.96		14.32183	16.26177

82) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore educ" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
educ	.3380323	.0200482	16.86	0.000	.2987302	.3773344
_cons	15.29362	.0879678	173.85	0.000	15.12117	15.46607

83) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore educ" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
educ	.4118135	.080314	5.13	0.000	.2538053	.5698217
_cons	14.76614	.3619442	40.80		14.05406	15.47823

84) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore educ" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
educ	.342863	.0825549	4.15	0.000	.1803509	.5053751
_cons	14.99743	.3466533	43.26		14.31503	15.67983

85) Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore educ" (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem

and Rochester)



86) Physical Well-Being Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore hea(health)"

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
hea	.7656398	.1698467	4.51	0.000	.4320622	1.099217
_cons	14.89569	.6797451	21.91		13.56067	16.2307

87) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore hea(health)" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
hea	.4842497	.0359306	13.48	0.000	.4138122	.5546872
_cons	14.86849	.1358843	109.42		14.60211	15.13488

88) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore hea(health)" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
hea	.3965755	.145546	2.72	0.007	.1102377	.6829133
_cons	15.04066	.5457789	27.56		13.96693	16.11439

89)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore hea(health)" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
hea	. 473315	.1470204	3.22	0.001	.1839049	.762725
_cons	14.62277	.5419999	26.98		13.55584	15.6897

90)Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore hea(health)" (Tompkins, Nation,

Winston-Salem and Rochester)



91) Political Interests And Registration Status Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore

polint regvote" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
polint	.6598349	.1721368	3.83	0.000	.3217475	.9979223
regvote	2.301745	.4237159	5.43	0.000	1.46954	3.133949
_cons	13.77675	.5911717	23.30	0.000	12.61565	14.93785

92) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore polint regvote" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
polint	.4138022	.0431736	9.58	0.000	.3291657	.4984387
regvote	1.381433	.1183579	11.67	0.000	1.149407	1.613459
_cons	14.14461	.1496108	94.54	0.000	13.85132	14.43791
trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
------------	----------	-----------	-------	-------	------------	-----------
polint	.2913282	.1805325	1.61	0.108	0638481	.6465046
regvote	1.251794	.5247705	2.39	0.018	.2193704	2.284218
_cons	14.44646	.6147341	23.50	0.000	13.23704	15.65587

93) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore polint regvote" (Winston-Salem)

94)Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore polint regvote" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
polint	.2304866	. 1777817	1.30	0.196	1194938	.5804671
regvote	1.10692	. 4975707	2.22	0.027	.1274039	2.086436
_cons	14.6183	. 6039089	24.21	0.000	13.42944	15.80715

95) Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore polint" (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem

and Rochester)



96) Trust In National And Local Government Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore tgnat tgloc" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
tgnat	.5796662	.2329696	2.49	0.013	.122101	1.037231
tgloc	1.728067	.228973	7.55	0.000	1.278351	2.177782
_cons	12.55122	.5125636	24.49	0.000	11.54451	13.55792

97) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore tgnat tgloc" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
tgnat	.4512681	.0537032	8.40	0.000	.3459896	.5565466
tgloc	1.118686	.0551498	20.28	0.000	1.010572	1.226801
_cons	12.87152	.1329647	96.80	0.000	12.61086	13.13218

98) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore tgnat tgloc" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
tgnat	.2951631	.2030297	1.45	0.147	1042786	.6946048
tgloc	1.213343	.2137028	5.68	0.000	.7929035	1.633783
_cons	12.85395	.5100918	25.20	0.000	11.8504	13.85751

99) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore tgnat tgloc" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
tgnat	.1032987	.2209836	0.47	0.641	3317288	.5383261
tgloc	1.280402	.2349064	5.45	0.000	.8179665	1.742838
_cons	12.81954	.5980083	21.44	0.000	11.6423	13.99678

100) Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore tgnat" (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem

and Rochester)



101) Local Government Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore tgloc" (Tompkins,



Nation, Winston-Salem and Rochester)

102) Tompkins Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore ideo" (Tompkins)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
ideo	.4643388	.1315988	3.53	0.000	.2058751	.7228025
_cons	16.23959	.4934451	32.91		15.27045	17.20873

103) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore ideo" (Nation)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
ideo	.0981129	.0333687	2.94	0.003	.0326976	.1635283
_cons	16.37278	.1014679	161.36		16.17386	16.57169

104) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore ideo" (Winston-Salem)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
ideo	0682711	.1304362	-0.52	0.601	3248981	.1883558
_cons	16.6675	.3874169	43.02	0.000	15.90528	17.42973

105) Graph: the Regression Results of "reg trustscore ideo" (Rochester)

trustscore	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
ideo	1174244	.1375382	-0.85	0.394	3881772	.1533284
_cons	16.64346	.4271476	38.96	0.000	15.8026	17.48433

106)Graph: the Regression Line of "reg trustscore ideo" (Tompkins, Nation, Winston-Salem

and Rochester)



Appendix **B**

Statistical Methods

Statistical analysis methods represent a way by which the characteristics of a population are inferred through observations made in a representative sample from that population. A population could be very large — for example the population of residents in Tompkins County. Thus, it is not practical for us to collect data from the whole population in this case. For this reason, a randomly chosen subset of the population, called a sample, is studied. Once a sample is determined, and survey data are collected. We can use the statistical methods to analyze the data.

Regression analysis is a specific statistical tool used to model relationships within the data. The regression analysis involves many techniques for modeling and analyzing variables, focusing on the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. More specifically, regression analysis helps us understand how the value of a dependent variable changes when any one of the independent variables changes, while holding the other independent variables constant. To be simple, we mainly use the classical linear regression model (CLRM).²

The typical process of the data analysis using regression includes data collection, data

For details, please refer to William H Greene, *Econometric analysis*, Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Prentice Hall, 2003, Or Damodar N Gujarati, *Basic econometrics*, New York : McGraw-Hill, 1978

² The classical linear regression model has six basic assumptions, which includes:

A1: Linearity (Y=X β + ϵ)

A2: Full Rank of X (linearly independent)

A3: Exogeneity of X's

A4: Homoskedasicity (non-autocorrelations, except if time series)

A5: Data generation (Randomization)

A6: Normality $\varepsilon \sim N(0,\sigma 2)$

coding, model construction, final analysis using software, and concluding. We have the survey data from the 2010 team and in the following paragraphs, we will show how the data are coded, and how we conduct a regression analysis.

Appendix C

Survey Monkey Questionnaire

About the survey itself and the presentation of the findings:

1. Have you (ever) heard of social capital?

- Yes
- ° _{No}
- 2. How did you hear about "social capital"?

3. Please rate the importance of social capital according to your personal perception

- Extremely important
- Important
- Somewhat important
- Not important
- I don't know

4. Were you present at the 2010 when the findings of the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey were presented?

• Yes

ο _{No}

5. Did you find the meeting useful?

- Yes
- _{No}

6. How clearly did the presenter/researcher explain the result of the findings?

- Extremely clear
- Somewhat clear

• Clear

• Not very clear

• Not clear at all

7. How clearly did the researcher explain the goal of the social capital during the meeting in 2010?

• Extremely clear

• Somewhat clear

• Clear

• Not very clear

• Not clear at all

8. What were the most surprising findings for you from the 2010 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey?

9. What suggestion/s in regard to the overall meeting present the findings in 2010 (timing, agenda, content, presenters, venue)?

10. Do you have any suggestion/s in regards to how findings for the next Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey to be more effective?

About community connectedness in respondent's community

1. Please rate activities organized by the Tompkins County that can help strengthening community connectedness in your community?

- Extremely good
- C Very good
- © Good

• Somewhat good

I don't know

2. Please rate the local leaders' commitment to strengthen community connectedness in your community.

- ^O The community leaders have been extremely committed
- ^O The community leaders have somewhat committed
- ^C The community leaders have not very committed
- The community leaders are not committed at all
- I don't know

*

3. What types of events would you attend if they were held in your community?

4. How often do you participate in activities in your community?

- Extremely often
- Very often
- Moderately often
- Slightly often
- Not at all often

5. If you do not participate in activities in your community, why not?

6. What types of activities would you participate in if they were available in this neighborhood?

7. What suggestions do you have for improving community connectedness in Tompkins County?