Binghamton University
The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB)

MPA Capstone Projects 2006 - 2015 | Dissertations, Theses and Capstones

Spring 2011

Social Capital in Tompkins County

Shannon David
SUNY Oswego

Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/mpa_capstone_archive

Recommended Citation

David, Shannon, "Social Capital in Tompkins County" (2011). *MPA Capstone Projects 2006 - 2015*. 47.
https://orb.binghamton.edu/mpa_capstone_archive/47

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations, Theses and Capstones at The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in MPA Capstone Projects 2006 - 2015 by an authorized administrator of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.

SOCIAL CAPITAL IN TOMPKINS COUNTY

BY

SHANNON DAVID

BA, SUNY Oswego, 2007

CAPSTONE PROJECT

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters in Public Administration in the Graduate School of
Binghamton University
State University of New York
2011

© Copyright Shannon David 2011
All rights reserved

Accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters in Public Administration
in the Graduate School of
Binghamton University
State University of New York
2011

Kristina Lambright _____
Assistant Professor
Department of Public Administration
May 6, 2011

David Campbell_____
Assistant Professor
Department of Public Administration
May 6, 2011

George Ferrari_____
Executive Director
Community Foundation of Tompkins County
May 6, 2011

Executive Summary

The essence of social capital is that trust, diverse social networks, and associated norms of reciprocity are important to a strong, well-functioning community. On an individual level, social capital has been linked to better physical and emotional health. At the societal level, it has been linked to lower levels of crime and better functioning schools. The Community Foundation of Tompkins County (CFTC) has developed an interest in measuring social capital in response to a series of focusing events in the community that were centered around race and socioeconomic status. These events led the CFTC to investigate ways to measure social capital and pursue efforts to improve it. By measuring social capital systematically, the CFTC hopes to learn more about how much Tompkins County residents trust each other, engage their community, and give back. In doing this, the CFTC hopes to create benchmarks for improving the community's social capital where there are deficits and sustain it where it has strengths.

The following Capstone paper is based on secondary data, obtained from the short form Harvard Social Capital Benchmarking Survey. Using descriptive statistics, I found that social capital in Tompkins County is high. However, measuring group differences, I found that social capital varies based on race/ethnicity, income, education, and whether one lives in Ithaca or elsewhere in the county. Residents report variations in different kinds of trust, in how they engage the community through organizations, associations, and meetings and in their informal social interactions. Based on these findings, the CFTC should: 1) Prioritize building political engagement and government trust, 2) Focus on building bridging social capital, especially from those of lower socioeconomic status, and 3) Continue to develop the Harvard Social Capital Benchmarking Survey as a benchmarking tool for social capital in Tompkins County.

Table of Contents

Problem Definition 1

Conceptual Framework 4

Literature Review 4

Social Capital 4

Community Foundation Leadership 5

Community Foundation Leadership in Developing Social Capital 6

Methodology 8

Data Collection 8

Analysis 9

Strengths 10

Limitations 11

Findings 11

Recommendations 18

Conclusion 22

References 23

Appendix A 28

Appendix B 38

Appendix C 40

Appendix D 41

Appendix E 43

List of Tables

Table 1 9

Table 2 12

Problem Definition

As a member of the Council on Foundations, the Community Foundation of Tompkins County (CFTC) maintains compliance with the National Standards for U.S. Community Foundations, which include indentifying "community issues and opportunities" and acting "as a leader and convenor" (Community Foundations Leadership Team, 2000, p. 7). As such, the issues of trust surrounding race and socioeconomic class have been identified as an opportunity by which the CFTC can convene community partners and lead on developing solutions to address these important community matters. In June 2000, the CFTC was created to "enhance the quality of life for all who work and live" in Tompkins County (Community Foundation of Tompkins County, 2005). Now in its tenth year, the CFTC has continued its commitment to local philanthropy as a means to address quality of life issues as a strategic grantmaker, catalyst, and convenor (Ferrari, 2010). This commitment includes a dedication to "the arts, education, the environment, human services, and community building" (p. 20) in the communities of Tompkins County.

The American Community Survey from 2005 to 2009 estimates Tompkins County's total population at 100,583 and was comprised of mostly Whites (83.3%). The rest of the population consisted of Asians (9.3%), African Americans (3.5%), and Hispanic/Latino individuals (3.8%). Residents of Tompkins County had a median household income of $46,506, which was lower than the median for the United States of $51,425. Furthermore, a larger share of individuals lived below the poverty line (20.2%) than the 13.5% in the rest of the country (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.) Despite the relative homogeneity of Tompkins County, it has not been without its challenges and focusing events regarding social class, race, and ethnicity. These include a high profile shooting of an African American male in February, 2010 (*Grand Jury Clears*, 2010) and

the racial tensions it caused, which have been exacerbated by the suspicious burning of the home of the police officer who shot him after being cleared of any wrongdoing in the shooting (Robbins, 2010). A racially charged stabbing of an African American student at Cornell University and racial tensions in Ithaca City Schools also garnered attention and led to an investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice (Harris, 2006). One Ithaca resident went so far as to say that "We have racial and class segregation in Ithaca…" (Robbins, 2010). These events have garnered the attention of the CFTC and raised questions about the level of trust and social interconnectedness that exists in the community and between groups from different socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds. In response, the CFTC has also expressed interest in how it may learn more about the degree of community connectedness in Tompkins County so that it may develop informed strategies to improve it and build trust across race, class, and ethnicity (G. P. Ferrari, personal communication, October 25, 2010).

The staff of the CFTC need systematic data collection and analysis in order to effectively lead on these issues, to develop a grantmaking strategy, and to assess the effectiveness of such efforts. Without data to inform strategies and data to develop a baseline that can be used to measure the results of efforts to build community and overcome barriers, it has proven difficult for the CFTC to take a leadership role (G. P. Ferrari, personal communication, October 25, 2010). Obtaining such data could be used to develop more strategic approaches and make the kinds of administrative decisions that must be made in developing solutions that require staff, time, and financial resources. Presently, beyond anecdotal evidence, the CFTC has insufficient information to objectively determine how much community or trust exists in Tompkins County. Additionally, making decisions based on anecdotal evidence may not only result in waste of important organizational resources, but also limits the CFTC's ability to measure potential

impact of its efforts. Elsewhere, interest has also been developing in how community foundations may take a leadership position on building positive relationships between diverse groups, or bridging social capital (Putnam, 2000).

In recent years, the challenges associated with community building have increasingly become a topic of great interest to community foundation administrators such as those at the CFTC. As Easterling (2008) notes, opportunities for community foundations to assert themselves in improving community are growing, which is also being encouraged by the Community Foundation Leadership Team at the Council of Foundations. Other community foundations have heeded this call by the Council of Foundations by playing key roles in collecting data on social capital through the Harvard Social Capital Benchmarking Survey. This survey has been used as a means to inform their own efforts regarding community building challenges and to build a body of knowledge on community building efforts (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, n.d.). The Rochester Area Community Foundation has become one such leader through grantmaking efforts, which "focus on bridging differences and dismantling barriers to involvement" (University of Rochester, 2002). The Central New York Community Foundation has also incorporated elements of community building into its efforts by supporting projects that "build connections among diverse groups and build mutual trust and reciprocity"(Central New York Community Foundation, 2009).

Noting the efforts of other community foundations in using the results of the Harvard Social Capital Benchmarking Survey to address issues regarding trust and community across race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status, the CFTC has determined that the data obtained from this instrument could be used in Tompkins County to launch similar efforts. Pursuant to these ends, this study endeavors to answer the following question:

1. What can the CFTC learn about social capital across socioeconomic, racial/ethnic, and geographic lines in Tompkins County?

Conceptual Framework

This literature review will examine the conceptual underpinnings of social capital and place it within the context of community foundation leadership literature. I begin by defining social capital and why it has drawn interest from community foundations. In order to inform how the CFTC may respond to the results of its survey, I examine how other community foundations have provided leadership in measuring social capital with the goal of developing it.

Literature Review

Social Capital

Social capital is most commonly understood as the totality of social networks, norms of reciprocity, and trust, which enhance coordination and cooperation in societies (Putnam, 2007; Putnam, 1995). Contemporary discussions of social capital center on its instrumental value as a facilitator (Putnam, 1995) and lubricator (Sagawa & Jospin, 2009) for individual and collective processes (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000). Social capital is further distinguished by relationships between heterogeneous groups of individuals, termed "bridging" social capital and those between homogenous groups of individuals, or "bonding" social capital. Whereas bonding social capital tends to reinforce group identities and ties between like individuals, bridging social capital may expand those identities and create ties between individuals distinguished by race, class, ethnicity or any number of identities (Putnam, 2000).

Though scholarly debate continues, the essence of social capital is that quality social relationships matter to achieving individual and collective goals (King 2004; Stone & Hughes, 2002). This is evident at the bonding level where our personal and professional networks are

used to pursue employment opportunities. At a collective level this is evident where positive externalities may accrue for a community where trust is high and networks are strong in the forms of reduced crime, increased personal health and happiness, and better functioning schools and governments (Graddy & Morgan, 2009; Putnam, 2007). Social capital has garnered attention from community foundations as a concept deeply concerned with public life and the functioning of communities. This concern for such concepts is congruent with the traditional roles of community foundations as leaders in the communities that they are mandated to serve.

Community Foundation Leadership

Community foundations were created as vehicles for developing and managing a location-based, permanent charitable endowment. Through grantmaking and leadership, they are intended to serve the evolving needs of the broader community (Carman, 2001; Bernholz, Fulton, & Kasper, 2005). A critical component of a community foundation's work continues to be grantmaking. In recent years however, community leadership has emerged as an important means for increasing the impact of grants while also carving out a niche in an increasingly competitive philanthropic environment (Ballard, 2007; Bernholz, Fulton, & Kasper, 2005; Ostrower, 2007; Reynolds, 2008). Furthermore, the National Standards for U.S. Community Foundations encourage leadership to address community challenges and capitalize on opportunities (Community Foundations Leadership Team, 2000). Many opportunities exist for community foundations to meet this standard. Examples include researching needs, identifying issues for which they can rally additional support, developing and sharing knowledge, and convening community stakeholders by capitalizing on the relationships with private, public, and nonprofit actors (Hamilton, Parzen, & Brown, 2004; Bernholtz, Fulton, & Kasper, 2005; The James Irvine Foundation, 2003; Reynolds, 2008; Ballard, 2007; Ostrower, 2007). Recently,

community foundations have capitalized on opportunities to exercise leadership through research and development of social capital.

Community Foundation Leadership in Developing Social Capital

Through its knowledge of and focus on a single community, and the attendant credibility developed through relationship building, a community foundation is positioned well for mobilizing social capital efforts (Easterling, 2008). Researchers have identified four key ways that a community foundation may develop its work in social capital through educating and catalyzing conversations and actions, building social capital into grantmaking, capturing lessons and developing knowledge on social capital, and measuring social capital (Walkenhorst, 2002). Robert Putnam sparked interest when speaking at a national conference for community foundations where he highlighted the roles that community foundations could play in developing social capital at the local level (Easterling, 2008). Community foundations nationwide then developed a partnership with the Saguaro Seminar at Harvard University in administering the Social Capital Benchmarking Survey (SCBS) in their communities. Consistent with the knowledge and convening leadership roles of community foundations, the data was intended to give communities a reliable estimate of social capital from which it could mobilize stakeholders (Easterling, 2008; Saguaro Seminar, n.d.) and benchmark their efforts to increase it (The Social Capital Benchmarking Survey, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c).

Community foundations have used this data in a variety of ways. A popular means is incorporating social capital building into grantmaking (Maine Community Foundation, n.d.; Central New York Community Foundation, Inc., 2009; Kalamazoo Community Foundation, 2011; Princeton Area Community Foundation, 2011; Winston-Salem Community Foundation, 2010; Charlotte Mecklenburg Community Foundation, n.d.). Organizations such as the Rochester

Area Community Foundation have done so extensively by using their own survey results in addition to secondary social capital research to directly inform the request for proposal (RFP) for their annual civic engagement grants. The organization's spring 2011 RFP includes a summary of findings regarding trust, diversity of relationships, and level of community involvement and asks grantees to enumerate how their projects will address deficits in their community's social capital (Rochester Area Community Foundation, 2011). Others include familiar elements associated with social capital such as trust, reciprocity, and community in their grant guidelines without mentioning the term specifically. The Central New York Community Foundation lists these elements as indicators of successful projects for its Community Grant guidelines (Central New York Community Foundation, 2009).

The results have also been used to create initiatives that address important dimensions of social capital such as building relationships across diverse groups and community engagement. The Kalamazoo Community Foundation created an initiative which includes support for "Good Neighbor Grants," "Changemaker Workshops," and "Front Porch Grants." Good Neighbor Grants seek to engage informal, grassroots organizations in creating bridges between people by engaging residents in community projects. Changemaker workshops focus on building individual capacity and developing strategies to build bridging social capital and community engagement. Lastly, to promote interactions at the most basic level, Front Porch Grants are small sums of up to one hundred dollars for "block parties, get-togethers, potluck meals and town meetings that build deeper neighbor-to-neighbor connections" (Kalamazoo Community Foundation, 2011). Others seek to elevate the importance of social capital in the broader community (Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2009) and promote the significance of social capital to policymakers (The Social Capital Benchmark Survey, 2001a). The survey also served as a

"conversation starter" for educating others on the concept and issues surrounding social capital (Rochester Area Community Foundation, 2011), which some have elected to do prior to the public release of their results (Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation, 2009). Some have also convened local chambers of commerce and community leaders for the purposes of developing grantmaking and community strategies for taking action on their findings (Maine Community Foundation, n.d.).

In the hopes of providing leadership on the issue of social capital, the CFTC endeavors to learn more about the level of trust, norms of reciprocity, and the diversity of social networks in Tompkins County from the results. It has chosen to do so by administering the short form Harvard Social Capital Benchmarking Survey.

Methodology

Data Collection

To investigate how Tompkins County might measure and develop social capital, a group of community leaders formed the Core Client Group (CCG) to determine data collection methodology and guide the collection and analysis process. The Executive Director of the Community Foundation of Tompkins County, George Ferrari, is a member of this consortium. The CCG identified the Harvard Social Capital Benchmarking Survey (SCBS) as an appropriate survey instrument for measuring social capital in their community. In the interest of time and resources, the group determined that a short form version of this survey would be the most economical and efficient means for collecting data. The short form SCBS was developed based on four criteria including: how central a question is to a given dimension of social capital, researcher interest in the answer to a given question, the stability of answers to questions based on a comparison of data from multiple waves of the long form SCBS, and the length of time

required to ask and answer a given question (Harvard Social Capital Benchmark Survey Short Form, 2002). Please see Appendix A for the survey instrument.

In total, 641 respondents completed the short form SCBS distributed by the CCG. As Table 1 indicates the sample is overrepresented in regards to both higher income households and those with a Bachelor's Degree or higher. Although Race/Ethnicity is also overrepresented, the CCG intentionally oversampled this group so as to ensure adequate representation of the views of People of Color in this research. Please see Appendix B for an explanation of grouping categories that were used for analysis.

Table 1: Key Demographic Distributions: Tompkins County versus Sample

Demographic	*Tompkins County*	*Sample*
Race/Ethnicity	White **83.3%**, People of Color **13.1%,** Two or more races **2.4%**, Other **3.2%**.	White **76.8%**, People of Color **17.7%**, Two or more races **2.4%**, Other **3.2%**.
Household Income	Median household income is **$46, 506.**	**36.1%** report household income of **Less than $50,000. 65.9%** report household income of **Over $50,000.**
Education	**48.7%** of individuals age 25 and over have a Bachelor's Degree or higher.	**69.3%** of all respondents have a Bachelor's Degree or higher.
Residence	**50%** of the population resides in either the Town of Ithaca or City of Ithaca.	**50.2%** of the sample resides in either the Town of Ithaca or City of Ithaca.

Analysis

I created indices to measure inter-racial and social trust in addition to volunteerism. See Appendix C for a complete listing of the questions that were included in these indices. Altogether, I examined five elements of social capital: Trust, Political Participation, Giving and Volunteering, Civic and Associational Involvement, and Informal Social Ties. These

components were informed by the HSCBS long form survey and serve to help guide the CFTC with the conclusions it may ultimately draw from this analysis. See Appendix D for clarification.

Descriptive statistics such as cross-tabular analysis were used to identify if there are any differences in respondent groups by the following distinctions: education and household income as measures of socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity. Also, since the CFTC is interested in all residents of Tompkins County and not just those living within the county's population center of Ithaca, Ithaca residents were compared to Non-Ithaca residents. To statistically test differences between groups Mann Whitney tests were run on the following categories of respondents: Whites and People of Color; Ithaca residents and Non-Ithaca residents, individuals from households that make over $50,000 annually and those who make under $50,000 annually. Pairwise differences were also examined between individuals with an associate's degree or less and those with a bachelor's degree or more. Tested at the 5% significance level, the results of the Mann-Whitney tests will allow us to be 95% certain that the results are not due to chance.

Strengths

The long form version of the HSCBS administered to thirty-four community foundations in 2001 informed the short form version that is the focus of this project (Easterling, 2008). This gave the short form survey creators confidence that this version measured the most important concepts related to social capital and that the tool would provide consistent results. Generally when using secondary data, there are concerns that the questions asked by the survey instrument may not adequately cover the concept being examined, which in this case is social capital. Given that the short form survey was informed by questions used elsewhere, at two different points in time, and at several locations, allays concerns in this regard. Another strength of this secondary

data is the large sample that was collected, which resulted in a total of 641 respondents. With such a large sample size the likelihood of finding statistically significant results increases.

Limitations

Using secondary data includes a unique set of limitations stemming from loss of control over the development of the survey instrument and implementation of data collection. Since I accepted secondary data as an appropriate method for the research question being examined the data being used must also be accepted for any flaws that exist. For example, the data I used does not include figures regarding how many individuals responded to the survey versus the total number of surveys distributed. As such, we cannot draw any inferences about the degree to which those who did not respond to the survey could have impacted our results, which would be driven by the size and nature of this group. For example, if one thousand surveys were distributed, but only one hundred responded, the conclusions drawn from this data would be less robust than from a situation where seven hundred responded. This is driven by the fact that the other nine hundred respondents may reflect a group that would influence the results significantly had they responded. Unfortunately, I do not have this information so I cannot draw any conclusions about how this may have impacted my data.

Findings

My analysis examined group differences by: race/ethnicity, income, education, and residence. I found several substantive and statistically significant differences in the dimensions of social capital across those groups. I also analyzed the overall sample of respondents to obtain a general impression of social capital in Tompkins County. Summaries of key findings listed below in Table 2 are followed by my analysis of important substantive and statistically

significant findings. A complete listing of group and overall comparisons may be found in Appendix E.

Table 2: Summary of Findings by Group

	Group				
Variable	**Race/Ethnicity** (White/People of Color)	**Household Income** (Over/Under $50,000)	**Education** (Associate's or Less/Bachelor's or More)	**Residence** (Ithaca/Non-Ithaca Residents)	**Overall** (Sample of all Respondents)
Trust	People of Color have lower levels of trust.	Those from higher income households have higher levels of trust.	Individuals with higher education have higher levels of trust.	There are no substantive differences in terms of trust.	Overall trust is high, although trust in government is low.
Political Participation	People of Color attend more political meetings despite lower levels of interest in politics and voter registration.	Voter registration is higher among higher income households.	Those with less education are less engaged politically.	Ithaca residents are more engaged politically.	Residents report high levels of interest in public affairs and politics, but involvement in political meetings or rallies is low.
Giving and Volunteering	People of Color give blood more often.	Giving and volunteering is higher among higher income households.	Those with more education give and volunteer substantially more.	Ithaca residents give and volunteer more.	Many residents do not give blood, but many give back by volunteering and donating.
Civic and Associational Involvement	People of Color attend more public meetings and religious services. Whites attend more organizational meetings.	Those from lower income households attend more religious services, but are involved less in other organizations.	Engagement through associations and organizations is much higher from those with more education.	Ithaca residents attend more civic and organizational meetings.	Residents prefer engaging their community through organizations or religious institutions, but not through public meetings.
Informal Social Ties	Whites and People of Color have different social ties. Whites interact more with friends in general, but less with a different race.	Higher income households interact less with different races.	Informal social ties are more diverse among those with more education.	Non-Ithaca residents interact more with friends, but have less diverse social networks than Ithaca residents.	Social ties are strong in Tompkins County, but residents bridge less across racial/ethnic and neighborhood lines.

Finding 1: Social capital in Tompkins County is high, but there is variation in the level of different types of trust as well as variation in the extent to which residents engage in different community and social activities.

The overall results reflect high levels of general and social trust, but lower levels of interracial and government trust. For example, 59.1% of respondents reported that "People can be trusted" compared to 32.1% who reported that "You can't be too careful." Though the results on the Interracial Trust Index are relatively high, they are lower than those for the Social Trust Index. Respondents reported low levels of trust in both local and national government to do what is right; however, the results indicate relatively more trust in the local government. For example, 74.5% reported trusting the national government only "Some of the time" or "Hardly ever" compared to 58.2% for the local government. Despite this lack of government trust, 81.8% reported being at least "Somewhat interested" in politics and national affairs.

Despite the relatively low trust scores, Tompkins County residents report high levels of interest in giving back to and engaging their community. A substantial majority, or 91% of respondents, reported either volunteering or working on a community project at least once over the past twelve months. Attendance at public meetings where school or town affairs were discussed is lower than at clubs or organizations and religious services. This finding holds across all examined subgroups. For example, 63.2% reported attending a public meeting at least once, compared to 72.4% who reported attending religious services at least once and 84.8% who reported attending a club or organizational meeting. Not only do more Tompkins County residents attend religious services and club or organizational meetings, but they also do so more often.

In terms of informal socialization in the home, most respondents report having friends over, but less so with those from other neighborhoods or races/ethnicities. While 95.4% reported having friends over to their home at least once over the past twelve months, 89.7% reported visiting with someone from a different neighborhood, and 76.3% reported visiting with a friend of a different race. Not only did fewer respondents report visiting with a friend of a different race, they also do so less frequently.

Finding 2: There are significant differences between Whites and People of Color regarding trust, political and civic involvement, and informal social ties.

Despite the overall high levels of social capital in Tompkins County, different groups report varying levels. For example, there were significant differences in the levels of trust that Whites and People of color reported on four of the five measures: General, social, inter-racial, and national government trust. In general, People of Color reported lower levels of trust than Whites. When respondents were asked whether they feel that most people can be trusted, 45% of People of Color and 30% of Whites responded, "You can't be too careful." Whites reported lower levels of Inter-Racial Trust compared to Social Trust, while People of Color reported identical levels of both kinds of trust. National Government Trust was the only measure on which People of Color reported higher levels of trust.

Results regarding political and civic involvement reveal that People of Color are engaged actively in the political process in some ways, but not others. People of Color reported attending more political meetings or rallies, yet 40% of People of Color are not registered to vote versus 8.1% of Whites. When respondents do attend these events, 23.3% of Whites responded that they had done so more than once compared to 39.1% of People of Color. Though not statistically significant, People of Color reported attending more public meetings as well.

How much we socialize in the homes of others or have them in our own homes is a simple measure of a community's informal social ties. Though it does not indicate the other ways we interact with each other informally at restaurants, festivals, or sporting events, it provides at least some indication as to how much bridging and bonding social capital a community has. Analysis of informal social ties in Tompkins County yielded a number of statistically significant results. While 89.9 % of People of Color and 96.5% of Whites have had friends over to their home at least once over the past twelve months, Whites do so more often. This comparison reflects more bonding social capital from White respondents, but People of Color report more bridging social capital. Whereas 15% of People of Color noted that they had not been in the home of a friend from a different race over the past twelve months, 26.7% of Whites indicated the same.

Finding 3: Low income residents show statistically significant differences in levels of trust and how they engage their community, compared to high income residents.

Though not as stark as the differences between Whites and People of Color, those from households with incomes over $50,000 reflect consistently higher and statistically significant levels of trust on all measures. Results pertaining to political participation and interest also vary with income. However, the only statistically significant result pertains to voter registration, where more individuals from households making over $50,000 report being registered to vote.

Rates of giving and volunteering were also higher for those from higher income households. Despite statistically significant results indicating that those making over $50,000 give more, 70.2% of those from households under $50,000 gave at least something to a cause. Though those from households under $50,000 volunteer less than those from higher income

households, over 80% of each income group volunteered at least once over the past twelve months.

With respect to civic and association involvement, significant differences also exist in terms of how these two groups engage through associations and organizations. Those from higher income households reported attending more public meetings and club/organizational meetings yet fewer religious services than those from lower income households. Also, when residents take leadership positions by serving on an organizational or club committee, those from higher income households do so more often. This result, however, was not statistically significant.

Finding 4: Compared to those with lower levels of education, respondents with higher levels of education indicate statistically significant differences on nearly all measures of social capital.

Similar to results regarding differences based on household income, respondents reported different levels on many measures of social capital based on their level of education. The only social capital measure on which those with lower levels of education scored higher than those with higher levels of education was the number of times over the past twelve months a respondent had given blood. Although this measure is important as a reflection of giving back to others in the community, the results regarding blood donation were not statistically significant. With regard to trust, respondents with an Associate's Degree or less reported statistically significant, lower levels of trust on all measures compared to those with a Bachelor's Degree or higher.

Findings regarding rates of giving and volunteering are mixed. On the one hand 88.1% of those with an Associate's Degree or less and 92.2% of those with a Bachelor's Degree or higher

reported working on a community project or volunteering at least once over the past twelve months. On the other hand those with higher levels of education do so far more often. Though statistically significant differences exist between these two groups as it pertains to donating to a cause, a majority of those with a Bachelor's Degree or more (82.6%) and those with an Associate's Degree or less (66.5%) gave at least something over the past twelve months.

Responses regarding attendance at political meetings or rallies and other types of participation in civic and associational affairs indicate a number of substantive and statistically significant differences. In particular, while 45% of those with a Bachelor's Degree or higher reported attending a political meeting or rally at least once over the past twelve months, only 29% of those with an Associate's Degree or less reported doing so. Noticeably stark are the differences in attendance at public meetings. While 51.3% of those with less than an Associate's Degree reported never attending a public meeting where town or school affairs were discussed, only 30.2% of those with a Bachelor's Degree or more reported the same. Additionally, when individuals with a Bachelor's Degree or more attend these meetings, they do so more often.

Finding 5: Statistically significant differences exist between Ithaca residents and Non-Ithaca residents in political participation, giving and volunteering, civic and association involvement, and socializing with friends of a different race.

No significant differences exist in the views of Ithaca residents and Non-Ithaca residents regarding trust. However, in terms of political participation Ithaca residents reported more interest in politics and national affairs and attended more political meetings and rallies, though 50% of each group has never done so. Though Ithaca residents measured higher on the Volunteerism Index than Non-Ithaca residents, over 80% of both groups reported having worked on a community project or volunteered at least once over the past twelve months.

In terms of civic and association involvement, Ithaca residents attend more public meetings, more organizational or club meetings, and serve on more committees, all of which are statistically significant. The only result regarding informal social ties that yielded statistically significant results were those regarding having been in the home of a different race or had a member of that race over. Ithaca residents reported socializing more often with members of a different race than their Non-Ithaca counterparts, though approximately 70% of Non-Ithaca residents and 80% of Ithaca residents reported doing so at least once.

Recommendations

Based on the above findings, the following recommendations have been developed. These recommendations may be used by the CFTC as it seeks to develop its efforts to measure and develop social capital in Tompkins County. Though Tompkins County reports high levels of trust, giving and volunteering, and community engagement, the CFTC may wish to address key differences between the levels that particular groups reported.

Recommendation 1: Prioritize building political engagement and trust in local government in Tompkins County.

Overall the results are positive and efforts may revolve more around sustaining the level of social capital that is reflected in the results of this survey. However, one deficit that may be important to investigate further is the relatively low level of trust in local government and participation in public meetings. Of all of the measures of social capital indicated in the survey, those regarding government and political participation were among the lowest. The CFTC may wish to use its role as a leader and convenor to further investigate what it can do to develop more trust and participation in this regard. Building trust and participation among individuals of lower socioeconomic status will be particularly important since these groups show the least amount of

trust, interest, and involvement in their local government. A potential way to obtain feedback from this population is through focus groups aimed at understanding the source of their lack of trust.

Beyond the importance of citizen participation in democratic governance these results may also have practical implications. As literature indicates, trust is a lubricator and facilitator of collective processes (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995; Sagawa & Jospin, 2009). Accordingly, the CFTC may wish to convene meetings with local elected officials and government administrators to investigate the implications of these results and determine ways to address citizen trust and involvement in their local government. Other leaders will also be important to include such as those from religious and educational institutions as well as community organizations since all play important roles in developing knowledge of and engagement in civic and community processes. In this way, the results of this survey can serve as the "conversation starter" that other community foundations have used to develop and share knowledge about the community's strengths as well as create strategies for addressing weaknesses.

Recommendation 2: Prioritize building "bridging social capital" across racial/ethnic and socioeconomic lines.

In general, inter-racial trust is lower than general social trust and residents bridge less across racial/ethnic and neighborhood lines. This is despite high levels of interaction with friends in general. In this way, the findings support the CFTC's concerns about trust and relationships between those from different racial/ethnic backgrounds. This finding presents an opportunity for building more trust and relationships across racial/ethnic lines. In particular, those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds report the lowest levels of bridging ties and inter-racial trust. Therefore, the CFTC should focus their efforts on these individuals specifically.

In line with its mission to improve quality of life for all Tompkins County residents, the CFTC should consider how it can build trust and community engagement among those with less income and education. Particular opportunities exist in the areas of volunteerism and club/organizational involvement. The CFTC could develop programs similar to the Kalamazoo Community Foundation example identified in the literature review. Through grantmaking activities infused with the language of social capital the Kalamazoo Community Foundation has supported both the formal and informal ways that people build trusting relationships and give back to each other. Furthermore, their Changemaker Workshops look not only to address deficits, but to empower individual citizens with skills and strategies that can be used at the grassroots level to develop leaders and build social capital (Kalamazoo Community Foundation, 2011).

The first step may be sharing this report with other community organizations and leaders, which will be a crucial way to engage others who may have the interest, resources, and relationships with specific communities to promote a project that builds social capital. Since social capital refers to many different aspects of a community's social fabric, it would behoove the CFTC to work with stakeholders from all sectors. Furthermore, if the resources are not available to begin separate social capital building initiatives, the CFTC can share this report with donor advisors who display a particular passion for building trust, community engagement, and stronger social networks in the community. In addition to convening meetings with the community, perhaps one of the simplest ways the CFTC could begin using the results of this survey is by including questions on grant applications that ask prospective grantees how their project or organization builds social capital.

Recommendation 3: Continue to develop the HSCB short form survey as a social capital benchmarking tool and take precautions to ensure a more representative sample.

Since the CFTC seeks to use the SCBS short form survey to benchmark community efforts to sustain and build social capital in Tompkins County it will be important to apply lessons learned from this first iteration. Though the data obtained is useful in terms of illuminating some of the ways that residents in Tompkins County differ in terms of their social capital, the lack of representativeness complicates more general conclusions. A more representative sample would provide a clearer understanding of social capital in Tompkins County. Therefore, if the CFTC's goal is to use this tool for benchmarking purposes, it will be important to base its initial efforts off of a sample that is more reflective of Tompkins County. Future benchmarking efforts should build on the foundation and relationships built through their initial efforts by, in particular, seeking out ways to include more individuals of lower socioeconomic status in the sample.

In discussion with other community leaders and organizations, the CFTC may wish to add additional measures to the survey instrument. For example, the CFTC may wish to add a question regarding trust in Asians, for example, to the Inter-Racial Trust Index since this group constitutes a substantial minority group in the county. Also, the CFTC may wish to add a question regarding trust in co-workers, for example, to the Social Trust Index since the workplace constitutes an important environment where trust and relationships develop. Likewise, the CFTC may also wish to include more community specific measures of informal social ties that residents may participate in with others to gain a more comprehensive sense of the other ways they interact with each other. Regardless, it will be important for the CFTC and partners who helped shape this effort to reflect upon what worked and what did not work so as to create

more accurate and comprehensive measures. This will ensure a more accurate benchmarking effort.

Conclusion

The results of this survey indicate that there is significant amount social capital in Tompkins County. Yet, the results of this effort to measure social capital reflect differences in how various groups trust, engage their community, and interact with others. Therefore it will be important to address deficits to create a more inclusive community. It will be important for the CFTC to learn from this initial effort to measure and benchmark social capital. In the meantime, the CFTC can use this report to begin developing knowledge and convening key stakeholders around efforts to build and sustain Tompkins County's social capital.

References

Ballard, C.S. (2007). *Community foundations and community leadership.* Retreived from http://www.cfleads.org/resources/ccfy_pubs/docs/cfleads_cls1_2007.pdf

Bernholz, L., Fulton, K., & Kasper, G. (2005). *On the brink of new promise: The future of U.S. community foundations*. Retrieved from http://www.blueprintrd.com/text/foc_FINALfutureofcommunity_complete.pdf

Carman, J.G. (2001). Community foundations: A growing resource for community development. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *12*, 7-24.

Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital and the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, 95-120.

Community Foundation of Tompkins County. (2005). *Our history.* Retrieved 11/08/2010, from http://www.communityfoundationoftc.org/about/about_history.php

Central New York Community Foundation, Inc. (2009). *Community grant application guidelines*. Retrieved 01/21/2011 from https://www.cnycf.org/cnycf/Portals/16/docs/Community%20Grant%20Guidelines%20and%20Application%202009-r.pdf

Charlotte Mecklenburg Community Foundation. (n.d.) *Grants*. Retrieved 01/21/2011 from http://www.fftc.org/Page.aspx?pid=1395

Community Foundations Leadership Team. (2000). *National standards for U.S. community foundations*. Retrieved 11/21/10, from http://www.cof.org/files/Documents/Community_Foundations/nationalstandards.pdf

Duluth Superior Area Community Foundation. (2009). *Social capital benchmark survey*.

Retrieved 01/21/2011 from http://www.dsacommunityfoundation.com/initiatives/Social_Capital_Benchmark.shtml

Easterling, D. (2008). The leadership role of community foundations in building social capital. *National Civic Review, 97*, 39-51.

Ferrari, G. P. (2010). *Community Foundation of Tompkins County: 2009 report to the community*. Ithaca, New York: Arnold Printing.

Graddy, E.A., Morgan, D.L. (2006). Community foundations, organizational strategy, and public policy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *35*, 605-630.

Grand jury clears Ithaca police officer in shooting death. (2010). Retrieved 11/7/2010, from http://www.9wsyr.com/news/local/story/Grand-Jury-clears-Ithaca-police-officer in/Q34jwO9RD0O7FK5sj7L5lg.cspx

Hamilton, R., Parzen, J, & Brown, P. (2004). *Community change makers: The leadership roles of community foundations*. Retrieved from http://www.chapinhall.org/sites/default/files/old_reports/137.pdf

Harris, O. T. (2006). *Conciliating conflicts in American communities*: *Community Relations Service Annual Report FY 2006*. Retrieved 11/7/2010, from http://www.justice.gov/crs/pubs/fy2006/annualreport2006.pdf

Kalamazoo Community Foundation. (2011). *Better together kalamazoo*. Retrieved 01/21/2011 from http://www.kalfound.org/page8755.cfm

King, N.K. (2004). Social capital and nonprofit leaders. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *14*, 471-486.

Maine Community Foundation. (n.d.). *Social capital: Cultivating community connections in Maine.* Retrieved from http://www.mainecf.org/portals/0/pdfs/8/soccap2006ccc.pdf

Ostrower, F. (2007). The relativity of foundation effectiveness: The case of community foundations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *36*, 521-527.

Princeton Area Community Foundation. (2011). *Greater mercer grants guidelines*. Retrieved 01/21/2011 from http://pacf.org/grants/polCalendarEvent.cfm?Program_Code=12

Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 65-78.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks.

Putnam, R. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *30*, 137-173.

Reynolds, D. (2008). *The balancing act: The role of a community foundation as a community leader.* Retrieved from http://www.cfleads.org/resources/commleadership_pubs/docs/TheBalancingAct_10.2008.pdf

Robbins, D. (2010). *Ithaca race relations remain fragile after police officer's house burned.* Retrieved 11/7/2010, from http://cornellsun.com/section/news/content/2010/08/26/ithaca-race-relations-remain-fragile-after-police-officer's-house-bur

Rochester Area Community Foundation. (2011). *Request for proposals in the area of civic engagement*. Retrieved 01/21/2011 from http://www.racf.org/Grants/SearchforFunding/tabid/278/Default.aspx?sm=435

Sagawa, S., Jospin, D. (2009). *The charismatic organization*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America. (n.d.). *Social capital community benchmark*

survey executive summary. Retrieved 11/7/2010, from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/docs/exec_summ.pdf

Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Short Form. (2002). Retrieved 04/03/2011 from, http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/pdfs/socialcapitalshortform.pdf.

Stone, W. & Hughes, J. (2002). *Measuring social capital: Towards a standardized approach.* http://www.aes.asn.au/conferences/2002/PAPERS/Hughes.pdf

The James Irvine Foundation. (2003). *Community catalyst: How community foundations are acting as agents for local change.* Retrieved from http://www.irvine.org/assets/pdf/pubs/philanthropy/CFI_Paper.pdf

The Social Capital Benchmark Survey. (2001a). *Maine community foundation.* Retrieved 01/21/2011, from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/me2d.html

The Social Capital Benchmark Survey. (2001b) *What we are doing at the CNY community foundation*. Retrieved 01/21/2011, from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/ny2d.html

The Social Capital Benchmark Survey. (2001c). *Kalamazoo county scores high in "schmoozing" and diversity of friendships according to national social capital survey.* Retrieved 01/21/2011 from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/mi4c.html

University of Rochester. (2002). *Learning the community: An urban experience for college students.* Retrieved 11/21/2010, from http://rochester.edu/news/show.php?id=991

U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*. Retrieved 04/13/2011, from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ACSSAFFFacts?_event=Search&_lang=en&_sse=on&geo_id=05000US36109&_county=Tompkins+County

Walkenhorst, P. (2002). *Building Philanthropic Social Capital: The Work of Community Foundations.* Bertelsmann Foundation Publishers.

Winston-Salem Foundation. (2010). *Community grants guidelines*. Retrieved 01/21/2011 from http://www.wsfoundation.org/netcommunity/page.aspx?pid=595

Appendix A – Short Form Survey

1. What is your sex?
    a. Female
    b. Male

2. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?
    a. People can be trusted
    b. You can't be too careful
    c. Don't know

3. Generally speaking, how much can you trust people in your neighborhood?
    a. Trust them a lot
    b. Trust them some
    c. Trust them only a little
    d. Trust them not at all

4. Generally speaking, how much can you trust the police in your community?
    a. Trust them a lot
    b. Trust them some
    c. Trust them only a little
    d. Trust them not at all

5. Generally speaking, how much can you trust people who work in the stores where you shop?
    a. Trust them a lot
    b. Trust them some
    c. Trust them only a little
    d. Trust them not at all

6.Generally speaking, how much do you trust White people?

    a. Trust them a lot
    b. Trust them some
    c. Trust them only a little
    d. Trust them not at all

7. General speaking, how much can you trust African Americans or Blacks?

    a. Trust them a lot
    b. Trust them some
    c. Trust them only a little

d. Trust them not at all

8. Generally speaking, how much can you trust Hispanics or Latinos?

a. Trust them a lot
b. Trust them some
c. Trust them only a little
d. Trust them not at all

9. How interested are you in politics and national affairs?

a. Very interested
b. Somewhat interested
c. Only slightly interested
d. Not at all interested

10. Are you currently registered to vote?

a. Yes
b. No

11. How much of the time do you think you can trust the national government to do what is right?

a. Just about always
b. Most of the time
c. Some of time
d. Hardly ever

12. How much of the time do you think you can trust your local government to do what is right?

a. Just about always
b. Most of the time
c. Some of time
d. Hardly ever

13. Thinking politically and socially, how would you describe your own general outlook?

a. Very conservative
b. Moderately conservative
c. Middle-of-the-road
d. Moderately liberal
e. Very Liberal

14. How many times in the past twelve months have you worked on a community project?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

15. How many times in the past twelve months have you donated blood?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

16. How many times in the past twelve months have you attended any public meeting in which there was discussion of town or school affairs?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

17. How many times in the past twelve months have you attended a political meeting or rally?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

18. How many times in the past twelve months have you attended any club or organizational meeting?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

19. How many times in the past twelve months have you had friends over to your home?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

20. How many times in the past twelve months have you been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them in your home?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

21. How many times in the past twelve months have you been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them in your home?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

22. How many times in the past twelve months have you been in the home of someone you consider to be a community leader or had one in your home?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

23. How many times in the past twelve months have you volunteered?

a. Never did this
b. Once
c. A few times
d. 2-4 times
e. 5-9 times
f. About once a month on average
g. Twice a month
h. About once a week on average
i. More than once a week

24. In the past twelve months, have you served as an officer or served on a committee of any local club or organization?

a. Yes
b. No

25. Not including weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services?

a. Every week or more often
b. Almost every week
c. Once or twice a month
d. A few times per year
e. Less often than that
f. Never

26. During the past 12 months, approximately how much money did you and the other family members in your household contribute to secular causes and religious causes, including your local religious congregation?

a. None
b. Less than $100
c. $100-$500
d. $500-$1,000
e. $1,000-$5,000
f. More than $5,000

27. All things considered, how happy are you?

a. Very happy
b. Happy
c. Not very happy
d. Not happy at all

28. How would you describe your overall state of health?

a. Excellent
b. Very good
c. Good
d. Fair
e. Poor

29. Is television your primary form of entertainment?

a. Agree strongly
b. Agree somewhat
c. Disagree somewhat
d. Disagree strongly

30. Are you a student?

a. Yes
b. No

31. Are you permanently disabled?

a. Yes
b. No

32. What is your current employment situation?

a. Working
b. Temporarily laid off
c. Unemployed

d. Retired
e. Housemaker

33. What year were you born?

Year:

34. What is the highest grade of school or year of college you have completed?

a. Less than high school (Grade 11 or less)
b. High school diploma (including GED)
c. Some college
d. Associates degree (2 year) or specialized technical training
e. Bachelor's degree
f. Some graduate training
g. Graduate or professional degree

35. Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino?

a. Yes
b. No

36. If you answered yes to the previous questions, would you say your background is Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or something else?

a. Mexican
b. Puerto Rican
c. Cuban
d. Other
e. Not Hispanic or Latino

37. Do you consider yourself to be White or Black?

a. Yes
b. No

38. How do you self identify?

a. White

b. Middle Eastern
c. European
d. African American or Black
e. Asian or Pacific Islander
f. Alaskan Native/Native American
g. Hispanic
h. Latino
i. Other

39. If you consider yourself to be Asian, what would you say your background is?

a. Chinese
b. Korean
c. Japanese
d. Filipino
e. Something else
f. Not Asian

40. Are you a citizen of the United States of America?

a. Yes
b. No

41. How many different telephone numbers does your household have, not counting those dedicated to a fax machine or computer?

a. 0
b. 1
c. 2
d. 3
e. 4
f. 5
g. 6+

42. If you added together the yearly incomes, before taxes, of all the members of your household for last year, 2009, what would the total be?

a. $20,000 or less
b. Over $20,000 but less than $30,000
c. $30,000-$50,000
d. $50,000-$75,000
e. $75,000-$100,000
f. $100,000 or more

43. Which city, village or town do you live in?

a. Ithaca (Town)
b. Ithaca (City)
c. Dryden
d. Caroline
e. Danby
f. Enfield
g. Groton
h. Lansing
i. Newfield
j. Ulysses
k. Other

44. What is your current marital status?

a. Currently married
b. Separated
c. Divorced
d. Widowed
e. Partnered
f. Never Married

45. How many children, aged 17 or younger, live in your household?

a. 0
b. 1
c. 2
d. 3
e. 4
f. 5
g. 6
h. 7+

46. Do you or your family own the place where you are living in now, or do you rent?

a. Own
b. Rent

47. What is your ZIP code?

Zip Code:

48. How many years have you lived in Ithaca?

a. Less than 1
b. 1 – 2 years
c. 3 – 4 years
d. 5- 10 years
e. 10+ years

Appendix B – Group Categories

The chance of finding significant differences decreases as sample size decreases for the groups identified on the survey. Since the goal of this research is to examine group differences certain decisions were made to group various sub-groups of individuals so as to not miss statistically significant results. Though the nuances of various inter-group results may be missed, for example, between Blacks and Whites, this decision was necessitated by the desire to find differences that the CFTC can have the most confidence in. Below is a description of how racial/ethnic, income, education, and geographic categories were grouped.

Race/Ethnicity

Ideally the results from this survey would be examined based upon various sub-groupings of racial/ethnic categories in order to catch important inter-group differences. However, small sub-group samples pose difficulties for finding significant findings that the CFTC can have confidence in. Though 45 Black/African Americans responded to this survey along with 29 Asian/Pacific Islanders and 16 Latino/Hispanics it would be difficult to generalize results to these broader populations from such a small sample. Other groups were represented at even smaller numbers. Therefore, one group "People of Color" was used to compare the following groups to Whites: Black/African American, Asian Pacific Islander, Latino/Hispanic, Middle Eastern, and Native American. This group was created with the rationale that it would be important to investigate how social capital varied between the White population in Tompkins County and People of Color, which constitute a minority of the overall population. This lent itself to establishing a general picture of the racial/ethnic dynamics of social capital in the county. People of Color as a whole are overrepresented in this sample, yet due to the fact that they account for a lower percentage of the population in Tompkins County this makes sense as to ensure that their views are adequately represented in the survey.

Income

Groups according to household income were created based upon the closest approximation of the median household income in Tompkins County. In 2009, this figure was estimated at $46,506. Therefore the survey enabled the creation of one group "Less than $50,000", which included the following ranges: "$20,000 or less", "Over $20,000 but less than $30,000", and "$30,000 - $50,000". Another group, "More than $50,000" was created from the following ranges: "$50,000 - $75,000", "$75,000 - $100,000", and "$100,000 or more".

Education

According to level of education, respondents were grouped according to those with an "Associate's Degree or Less" and those with a "Bachelor's Degree or More". Due to the highly skewed sample regarding education level, this was done to ensure statistical power so that important, significant results were not missed. The group *Associate's Degree or Less* includes: "High school diploma (including GED)", "Some college", and "Associates degree (2 years) or specialized technical training". The group *Bachelor's Degree or More* includes: "Bachelor's degree", "Some graduate training", and "Graduate or professional degree".

Geography

Respondents were also grouped according to whether they live in either the City of Ithaca or Town of Ithaca and those who live elsewhere in the county. The category "Ithaca Resident" was created out of those who live in the Town of Ithaca or City of Ithaca". Another category was created called "Non-Ithaca Resident" out of those living in Dryden, Caroline, Danby, Enfield, Groton, Lansing, Newfield, Ulyssess, or other.

Appendix C – Social Capital Indices

The indices used in this analysis were informed by the dimensions of social capital included in the long form survey, which was administered in 2000. The questions included in the short form survey used by Tompkins County were used to create the indices included here. Using Cronbach's Alpha to measure inter-item reliability the following indices were created. Cronbach's Alpha of .70 or higher is typically used as the benchmark for accepting a set of measures as being sufficiently associated to create an index. For the Social Trust Index I accepted a Cronbach's Alpha of .689 due to its proximity to this threshold.

The Social Trust Index was created using the following questions:

1. Generally speaking, how much can you trust people in your neighborhood?
2. Generally speaking, how much can you trust the police in your community?
3. Generally speaking, how much can you trust people who work in the stores where you shop?

Social Trust Index

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.689	3

The Inter-Racial Trust Index was created using the following questions:

1. Generally speaking, how much do you trust White people?
2. Generally speaking, how much can you trust African Americans or Blacks?
3. Generally speaking, how much can you trust Hispanics or Latinos?

Inter-Racial Trust Index

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.896	3

The Volunteerism Index was created using the following questions:

1. How many times in the past twelve months have you worked on a community project?
2. How many times in the past twelve months have you volunteered?

Volunteerism Index

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.742	2

Appendix D – Elements of Social Capital

Not all of the questions could be converted into indices, yet many still fit under a common theme. Social capital means many things, including: *Trust, Political Participation, Giving and Volunteering, Civic and Association Involvement, and Informal Social Ties.* Therefore, in addition to the indices used, the results of the survey were examined thematically according to the following elements of social capital outlined by the short form version of the Harvard Social Capital Benchmarking Survey (Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Short Form, 2002).

Trust:

In addition to the Social Trust Index and the Inter-Racial Trust Index, the following questions were used as measures of trust:

1) Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people? Where 0 = "Don't Know", 1 = "You Can't be too careful", and 2 = "People can be trusted"
2) How much of the time do you think you can trust the national government to do what is right? Where 0 = "Hardly Ever", 1 = "Some of the Time", 2 = "Most of the Time", and 3 = "Just about always".
3) How much of the time do you think you can trust your local government to do what is right? Where 0 = "Hardly Ever", 1 = "Some of the Time", 2 = "Most of the Time", and 3 = "Just about always".

Political Participation:

The following questions were used to measure interest in politics:

1) How interested are you in politics and national affairs? Where 0 = "Not at all interested", 1 = "Only slightly interested", 2 = "Somewhat interested," and 3 = "Very interested".
2) Are you currently registered to vote? Where 0 = "No" and 1 = "Yes".
3) How many times in the past twelve months have you attended a political meeting or rally? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once," 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times," and 4 = "More than 9 times".

Giving and Volunteering:

In addition to the Volunteerism Index, the following questions were used as measures of one's willingness to give and volunteer or the norms of reciprocity that are a focal point of social capital:

1) How many times in the past twelve months have you donated blood? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once," 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times," and 4 = "More than 9 times."
2) During the past 12 months, approximately how much money did you and the other family members in your household contribute to secular causes and religious causes, including your local religious congregation? Where 0 = "None", 1 = "Less than $100", 2 = "$100-$500", 3 = "$500-$1,000", 4 = "$1,000-$5,000", and 5 = "More than $5,000."

Civic and Associational Involvement:

The following questions were used to measure involvement in formal meetings and organizations. These questions convey a sense of one's networks as evidenced by their engagement in these various settings:

1) How many times in the past twelve months have you attended any public meeting in which there was discussion of town or school affairs? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once," 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times," and 4 = "More than 9 times."
2) How many times in the past twelve months have you attended any club or organizational meeting? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once," 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times," and 4 = "More than 9 times."
3) Not including weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services? Where 0 = "Never", 1 = "Less often than that", 2 = "A few times per year", 3 = "Once or twice a month", 4 = "Almost every week", and 5 = "Every week or more often".
4) In the past twelve months, have you served as an officer or served on a committee of any local club or organization? Where 0 = "No" and 1 = "Yes".

Informal Social Ties:

One may have social capital even though they may not volunteer formally or engage in associations or organizations of various types. The following questions were used to measure the networks that are formed in by interacting with others in the home setting:

1) How many times in the past twelve months have you had friends over to your home? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once, 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times", and 4 = "More than 9 times.
2) How many times in the past twelve months have you been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them in your home? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once, 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times", and 4 = "More than 9 times".
3) How many times in the past twelve months have you been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them in your home? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once, 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times", and 4 = "More than 9 times".
4) How many times in the past twelve months have you been in the home of someone you consider to be a community leader or had one in your home? Where 0 = "Never did this", 1 = "Once, 2 = "2-4 Times", 3 = "5-9 Times", and 4 = "More than 9 times".

Appendix E

Race/Ethnicity (Difference significant at the .05 level)*

		Whites	*People of Color*
Trust			
	General Trust (out of 2)	1.56	1.24*
	Social Trust Index (out of 9)	7.05	5.85*
	Interracial Trust Index (out of 9)	6.67	5.85*
	National Government Trust (out of 3)	1.1	1.28*
	Local Government Trust (out of 3)	1.41	1.32
Political Participation			
	Interest in politics(out of 3)	2.26	1.98*
	Registered to vote (out of 1)	0.92	0.6*
	Attended political meeting/rally (out of 4)	0.72	1.14*
Giving and volunteering			
	Volunteerism Index (out of 8)	4.74	4.47
	Donated blood (out of 4)	0.53	0.82*
	Gave to a cause (out of 5)	2.19	2.12
Civic and Association Involvement			
	Attended a public meeting (out of 4)	1.43	1.56
	Attended club/organizational meeting (out of 4)	2.64	2.43
	Attended religious services (out of 5)	2.04	2.52*
	Served on a committee (out of 1)	0.51	0.39*
Informal Social Ties			
	Number of times been in the home of friends or had friends over (out of 4)	3.16	2.65*
	Number of times been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them over (out of 4)	1.87	2.37*
	Number of times been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them over (out of 4)	2.72	2.31*
	Number of times been in the home of someone considered a community leader or had them over (out of 4)	1.12	1.28

Income (Difference significant at the .05 level)*

		Under $50,000	*Over $50,000*
Trust			
	General Trust (out of 2)	1.39	1.57*
	Social Trust Index (out of 9)	6.26	7.1*
	Interracial Trust Index (out of 9)	6.1	6.65*
	National Government Trust (out of 3)	1	1.18*
	Local Government Trust (out of 3)	1.24	1.45*
Political Participation			
	Interest in politics (out of 3)	2.13	2.27
	Registered to vote (out of 1)	0.78	0.9*
	Attended political meeting/rally (out of 4)	0.84	0.82
Giving and volunteering			
	Volunteerism Index (out of 8)	4.35	4.93*
	Donated blood (out of 4)	0.61	0.57
	Gave to a cause (out of 5)	1.64	2.46*
Civic and Association Involvement			
	Attended a public meeting (out of 4)	1.29	1.56*
	Attended club/organizational meeting (out of 4)	2.36	2.76*
	Attended religious services (out of 5)	2.22	2.07*
	Served on a committee (out of 1)	0.37	0.56
Informal Social Ties			
	Number of times been in the home of friends or had friends over (out of 4)	3.01	3.14
	Number of times been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them over (out of 4)	2.11	1.96
	Number of times been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them over (out of 4)	2.58	2.7
	Number of times been in the home of someone considered a community leader or had them over (out of 4)	1.07	1.23

*Education (*Difference significant at the .05 level)*

		Associates Degree or Less	*Bachelor's Degree or More*
Trust			
	General Trust (out of 2)	1.42	1.55*
	Social Trust Index (out of 9)	6.46	6.98*
	Interracial Trust Index (out of 9)	6.08	6.67*
	National Government Trust (out of 3)	.99	1.18*
	Local Government Trust (out of 3)	1.18	1.46*
Political Participation			
	Interest in politics (out of 3)	1.92	2.35*
	Registered to vote (out of 1)	.84	.87
	Attended political meeting/rally (out of 4)	.54	.92*
Giving and volunteering			
	Volunteerism Index (out of 8)	3.79	5.17*
	Donated blood (out of 4)	.61	.56
	Gave to a cause (out of 5)	1.54	2.44*
Civic and Association Involvement			
	Attended a public meeting (out of 4)	.96	1.69*
	Attended club/organizational meeting (out of 4)	2.15	2.82*
	Attended religious services (out of 5)	1.91	2.19
	Served on a committee (out of 1)	.38	.54*
Informal Social Ties			
	Number of times been in the home of friends or had friends over (out of 4)	2.91	3.16*
	Number of times been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them over (out of 4)	1.88	2.07
	Number of times been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them over (out of 4)	2.40	2.77*
	Number of times been in the home of someone considered a community leader or had them over (out of 4)	.87	1.31*

Residence (Difference Significant at .05 level)*

		Ithaca	*Non-Ithaca*
Trust			
	General Trust (out of 2)	1.5	1.52
	Social Trust Index (out of 9)	6.79	6.86
	Interracial Trust Index (out of 9)	6.46	6.51
	National Government Trust (out of 3)	1.16	1.08
	Local Government Trust (out of 3)	1.42	1.34
Political Participation			
	Interest in politics (out of 3)	2.31	2.13*
	Registered to vote (out of 1)	0.84	0.89
	Attended political meeting/rally (out of 4)	0.9	0.71*
Giving and volunteering			
	Volunteerism Index (out of 8)	5.15	4.35*
	Donated blood (out of 4)	0.57	0.58
	Gave to a cause (out of 5)	2.33	2*
Civic and Association Involvement			
	Attended a public meeting (out of 4)	1.61	1.31*
	Attended club/organizational meeting (out of 4)	2.81	2.41*
	Attended religious services (out of 5)	2.19	2.02
	Served on a committee (out of 1)	0.54	0.44*
Informal Social Ties			
	Number of times been in the home of friends or had friends over (out of 4)	3.05	3.11
	Number of times been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them over (out of 4)	2.22	1.79*
	Number of times been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them over (out of 4)	2.73	2.56
	Number of times been in the home of someone considered a community leader or had them over (out of 4)	1.27	1.07

Overall Results

		Overall
Trust		
	General Trust (out of 2)	1.51/2
	Social Trust Index (out of 9)	6.82/9
	Interracial Trust Index (out of 9)	6.49/9
	National Government Trust (out of 3)	1.12/3
	Local Government Trust (out of 3)	1.38/3
Political Participation		
	Interest in politics (out of 3)	2.22/3
	Registered to vote (out of 1)	.86/1
	Attended political meeting/rally (out of 4)	.81/4
Giving and volunteering		
	Volunteerism Index (out of 8)	4.75/8
	Donated blood (out of 4)	.57/4
	Gave to a cause (out of 5)	2.17/5
Civic and Association Involvement		
	Attended a public meeting (out of 4)	1.46/4
	Attended club/organizational meeting (out of 4)	2.62/4
	Attended religious services (out of 5)	2.17/4
	Served on a committee (out of 1)	.49/1
Informal Social Ties		
	Number of times been in the home of friends or had friends over (out of 4)	3.08/4
	Number of times been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them over (out of 4)	2.01/4
	Number of times been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them over (out of 4)	2.65/4
	Number of times been in the home of someone considered a community leader or had them over (out of 4)	1.17/4