2-2-2015

Family and Community Social Capital: A Case Study of One Private and One Public Secondary School

Kathleen Sue Miller
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SOCIAL CAPITAL:

A CASE STUDY OF ONE PRIVATE AND ONE PUBLIC

SECONDARY SCHOOL

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Kathleen Sue Miller

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2014

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Professional Studies in Education

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Kathleen Sue Miller

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

_____   _____
                                             Valeri R. Helterbran, Ed.D.
                                             Professor of Professional Studies in
                                             Education, Advisor

_____   _____
                                             George Bieger, Ph.D.
                                             Professor of Professional Studies in
                                             Education

_____   _____
                                             J. Thomas Frantz, D.Ed.
                                             Professor of Professional Studies in
                                             Education

ACCEPTED

_____   _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Family and Community Social Capital: A Case Study of One Private and One
        Secondary School

Author: Kathleen Sue Miller

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Valeri R. Helterbran

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. George Bieger
                                   Dr. J. Thomas Frantz

This case study involves one private and one public high school of similar demographics to collect data about the perceptions of social capital. For the purpose of this dissertation, social capital will be defined as the networks in life that can lead to upward mobility, that is, the ability to improve life circumstances. The researcher included administrators and faculty members.

The tools were an adaptation of *The 2006 Social Capital Community Survey* made available through the Harvard Kennedy School (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006b), an addendum to the survey that honed in on school specific topics, and a review of artifacts made available by the school. The administrators were surveyed in a face-to-face interview. Administrators completed both the researcher-created addendum and the community survey. Faculty members completed the community survey together in a group setting as a paper packet. Artifacts were collected through the main and guidance offices.

The results of the study encourage continued research in the area of social capital and education. The results were remarkably close to each other and had interesting similarities to the national survey conducted in 2006. No definite conclusions can be made at this time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A college junior informed his professor that he was working with at-risk middle school students in a mentoring program. He explained that this program assigned each child a university student as a mentor. The mentor and student had dinner, completed homework, then chose a fun activity to spend positive social time. The professor praised the young man for pouring his heart into these children; the college student confidently responded stating how important it was to support kids today. This young man had not realized he discovered the importance of building social capital.

Social capital is an expanding topic that has been researched extensively by many experts in the field, including Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman & Hoffer, 1987; Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein 2003). Social capital is difficult to limit to a single definition due to multidimensional applications, but it can be described as the personal ties with others that produced benefits (Portes, 2000).

Robert Putnam (2000) wrote a dense book mapping the need for social contacts that affect the productivity of individuals. In it, he cited statistics showing a steady decline in networking and social activities, and he linked this decline to negative outcomes or, at the very least, stagnation in areas of economic growth, health and education. Putnam's (1995) book came after criticism of his 1995 article about the decline of social networking in communities. In the book, Putnam provided a plethora of data illustrating the declination of social networks at a rapid rate and evidence supporting the importance of maintaining strong social capital.

Robert Putnam analyzed bowling league memberships as an example, hence the name of his book, *Bowling Alone*. He found that in the United States, more people were bowling than in the past. However, many were bowling alone rather than in a bowling league or in a group of people. Putnam used this simple example to illustrate how individuals may have been losing important contact with others that provided avenues to information or services (Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003).

Schools, communities, and families that build connections to strengthen each other allow for avenues to greater success (Israel and Beaulieu, 2004). After school tutoring programs, food pantries, and health clinics are important social networks. One area of social capital in the school system involves uniting schools with families and communities to make services, such as these, easily accessible (Holt, 2008).

Large portions of social capital involve communication, sharing, and trust between entities. The Connector, a newsletter available from the SCI (Social Capital Incorporated) website, aimed to build connections within communities. In the November 2006 publication, Social Capital Incorporated boasted about the progress of partnering a school with its surrounding parents and community (Sances, 2006). Evidence of this progress included an increase in attendance at community events compared to previous years. In particular, a significant attendance increase at a civil rights speech displayed a connection among social capital and education.

Information about the importance of social ties for educators is steadily growing. Within school systems, teacher social networks were examined to investigate the importance of sharing professional information, trust, and implementation of professional strategies for the good of education (Coburn & Russell, 2006). Coburn and Russell

examined eight elementary schools in two major urban school districts and discovered

significant progress in a newly implemented mathematics curriculum. Through the

sharing of information, there was an increase of innovation.

This dissertation is an examination of the differences in the perceptions of social

capital between one private and one public school. The researcher studied the

perceptions of administrators and faculty in these high school (9th through 12th grade)

environments. For this dissertation's purpose, social capital is summarized as

experiences and networks in one's life that can lead to upward mobility, the ability to

improve life circumstances. Specifically, the researcher investigated topics including

school, family, and community. The positive outcomes gained through this unification

could be measured by social capital (Lockhart, 2005; Putnam, 2000).

In this case study, school networking in the community consisted of school

involvement in the community through activities, business ventures, encouragement of

student participation in community activities, the school assisting in community

improvement programs and vice versa (McKenzie, Skrla, Scheurich, & Rice, 2011;

Plagens, 2010). For instance, schools may have hosted events or advertised activities

and/or opportunities through their websites, newsletters, and/or announcements.

The communication among family and school was defined as verbal or written

reports of student progress and school happenings, willingness to allow family volunteers

into the school system, school employees' involvement in the home life of their students,

and family support of the school (Bassani, 2006; Plagens, 2010). As an example, many

schools were using software programs that allowed parents to easily track student

progress. With a click of a mouse, parents could see what homework was assigned or grades had been recorded.

Statement of the Problem

One example of upward mobility is educational achievement. It had been found that the stronger the network is between school, community, and family, the better chance of student success (Meier, 1999). For example, the community may have offered an after school tutoring program. If the schools supported and encouraged students to get involved in the program, participation could have increased student achievement and, in-turn, the school's performance.

If students lived in poverty, social networking could have helped improve their circumstances (Curley, 2010). If there was no social capital in their life, their opportunities may have been limited causing stagnation in mobility. Support services could include family support such as day care, a food bank, or career link opportunities (Lockhart, 2005). Such a network may provide an avenue for families to become more independent and as a result yielded possibilities for the students. These services should be structured as not to impose an additional financial burden on the school district. If schools allow these services to come in and utilize their facilities, programs can be very successful. To promote the services, schools can simply advertised on literature already going home with their students, such as newsletters, or their website. If the school encourages the connection between families and communities, the awareness of otherwise unknown services benefit the families, which in-turn benefits the welfare of the community, and finally benefits the school with a healthier, more educated community (ASCD, 2007; Lockhart, 2005).

Indeed, several researchers concluded that children's social capital was a vital part of success (Anderson, 2013; ASCD, 2007; Baker, 2000; Blank & Berg, 2006; Coleman & Hoffer, 1987; Hoyle & Slater, 2001; Israel & Beaulieu, 2004; Lockhart, 2005; Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003; Yan & Lin, 2005). Some believed that the integration of cooperative groups supported this claim by developing social skills in the pursuit of academic success (Slavin, 2007). As a matter of fact, it has been claimed that the cooperative learning movement was evidence of the need for Americans to increase their personal networking (Hoyle & Slater, 2001).

Statistics showed a decrease of social capital in the business world (Putnam, 2000). Public high schools had increased security to the point where the community was kept on the outside (Bracy, March 2011). Grants and government funding was crucial to operational costs, which encouraged schools to utilize their own programs rather than collaborating with outside sources. Private schools, on the other hand, relied on the support of the community to financially survive (Spradling, 2009). Therefore, these schools were more open to collaboration and volunteer services (Sikkink, 2012).

There was much controversy in the school choice arena about the quality of different types of school settings, particularly whether these settings had an effect on academic achievement (Lubienski, Weitzel, & Lubienski, 2009, Spradling, 2009). There were many new trends in hopes of finding the best methods for educating children. The alternative settings were being examined, and states were contemplating whether school choice programs were the answer to failing public schools. Differences in networking the family, community, and schools could have been a contributing factor to the disparate levels of achievement.

Many high schools had built a firewall between families and communities and had not met the objective of training teenagers to be active citizens (Brooks, 2009; Stern, 2009). Early experts in education, such as Hanifan and Dewey, stressed the importance of connecting the community to families in order to build social capital. The researcher investigated differences in the perception of these networks between similar private and public secondary schools. The schools were located in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia in similar locations and had students with similar socioeconomic-status.

The challenge with the topic of social capital was the lack of research in the educational setting. This dissertation expanded the data on social capital supporting the significance of social networking on upward mobility. The study provided some insight into administrative and faculty perspectives in private and public high schools. This work was completed to analyze the differences in perception of social capital between one private and one public high school. This dissertation did not attempt to solve the controversy surrounding the differences in the quality of education between various school settings, but may provide some insight.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to make a contribution to social capital research in the area of education. The results were added to existing research correlating the level of social capital to the probability of student success (Coburn & Russell, 2006). Educators may have also used the results of the study to incorporate ideas in school systems and classrooms (Sances, 2006).

Research had provided evidence that social capital improves economic growth (Coleman & Hoffer, 1987; Lockhart, 2005; Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein 2003).

For instance, communities had been noted to come together to improve conditions, which, in-turn, resulted in more productive industries (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). The impact social capital had on the business world supported theories showing the importance of building a positive social capital in the lives of students. It likewise created an urgency to stop the downward trend that existed in the amount of networking among communities, families, and schools (Putnam, 2000). The researcher believed that social capital in school was just as important, if not vital, in the lives of high school students.

Definitions

Researchers agreed that social capital was a growing topic and had several different, though comparable, definitions according to the context used. For instance, social capital for a business may have meant networking to increase customer satisfaction, whereas in education it may have meant networking to increase student achievement. The commonality was networking and communication that resulted in positive growth.

Social Capital. Social capital was originally described as the personal ties one had with others that produced benefits (Portes, 2000). For the purposes of this study, a person's social capital was summarized as the accessibility to resources and networks that provided positive results in their life. The examination of social capital included school, family, and community.

Bonding. Bonding used groups to connect individuals to others with similar interests. Examples of *bonding* were organizations and clubs within a population (Cheung & Kam, 2010; Iyer, Kitson, & Toh, 2005; Lockhart, 2005; Putnam, 2000). The

people in a certain community who joined the Chess Club like chess. As a result, the game of chess bonded people who may not know each other from that community.

Bridging. Bridging, on the other hand, cross-cut social ties and connected individuals who had not otherwise had anything in common (Cheung & Kam, 2010; Iyer, Kitson, & Toh, 2005; Lockhart, 2005; Putnam, 2000). For instance, in disaster situations such as Hurricane Katrina, evidence of *bridging* saved many lives when people aided others regardless of backgrounds or status (Hawkins & Maurer, 2010).

Family Social Capital. A student's family social capital described how that student was connected within their family (Coleman, 1988). Stepfamilies have been a new focus of family capital. Research had shown that a stepparent can enhance a child's social capital, thus producing a higher level of academic achievement (Shriner, Mullis, & Schlee, 2009).

Community Social Capital. A person's community social capital referred to the networks that tied that person to the community (Putnam, 2000). Individuals may have volunteered at a food bank and met each other. Later, the same individuals may expand the program.

Linking. Linking referred to the deliberate building of relationships with an organization or entity that had enough power over people to have provided resources or benefits to the individual doing the linking (Hawkins & Maurer, 2010).

School Social Capital. The school supported the family and community by communicating and encouraging participation in opportunities available outside of school. This networking was school social capital. Many schools had web-based communication programs that allowed parents to retrieve information about student

grades, community events, or communicate with teachers and other school officials (Lopez, 2005).

Research Questions

Researchers have claimed that social capital could have positive effects on a person's quality of life (Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). In 2003, Rodney Hero published two articles disputing this claim ("Multiple Traditions in America and Racial Policy Inequality"; "Social Capital and Racial Inequality in America"). This study took a closer look to see if the topic of social capital was worth investigating as it relates to the effects on education.

Research questions in this study pertained to the perceptions of social capital among the administration and faculty. From the survey responses, did the administrator and faculty display levels of social capital in their personal lives and in the general practices of the school? Did the perceptions of social capital display notable results, either different or similar, between public and private high school administration and faculty with similar demographics? Were results of the study notably comparable to the 2006 national study? Did these results support existing research for or against the importance of building one's social capital? Also, could the case study data have strengthened or led to new theories?

Method of Study

To examine the possible effects school, family, and community capital have had on secondary education, a case study was done with one private and one public high school of similar demographics, socioeconomic status, and enrollment. Both schools

were located in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia. The high school institutions were carefully selected from demographic information.

Tools used to measure the perception of social capital were personal interviews of the faculty and administrators, surveys, and an examination of existing materials and communication protocol including newsletters, web pages, notices, and advertisements. The quantitative and qualitative data included interviews with administrators and faculty rating their perceptions of the family and community capital. The survey included a script for the interviews to strengthen the validity. A researcher-created addendum to the survey was given honing on school-specific communication procedures. In addition, the researcher conducted all interviews to ensure the same demeanor when reading the script. Artifacts such as newsletters, web pages, and memos sent to the home were also examined.

After an initial interview with the administration, a survey was given to the administration and the faculty. The survey was an adaptation of *The 2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire*, Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University Study (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006b). The principal was verbally read each survey question and the responses were recorded. The faculty was administered the survey in a group setting. The faculty read the survey questions and anonymously filled in their responses directly on the survey.

The high schools were independent to each other; one being public, the other private, with no connection. Data were displayed in a template provided by the Harvard Kennedy School for *The 2006 Social Capital Community Survey* (Saguaro Seminar: Civic

Engagement in America, 2006b). The template was also adapted to suit the questions. All quantitative and qualitative data were then analyzed, and the results were recorded in a formal report.

Significance of the Study

Social capital was a rising topic in the sociological study, but was it important to the field of education? This case study was completed to determine if there was any evidence of positive effects according to the perception of the level of family or community social capital. It also attempted to find any differences between private and public schools. If the study indicated there could be an effect, what should have been done to channel this resource for our students? The results had been added to the database at the Harvard Kennedy School.

Limitations of the Study

This was a small case study. Realizing that this study was not on a global, national, state, or even county scale, the findings should not be generalized to other areas. The researcher suggests further studies be conducted and compared to expand the findings.

In addition, three methods of data collection were used: interviewing, written response survey, and review of artifacts. Results may have varied when different forms of data collection were used.

Summary

Social capital is a seasoned topic. The importance of communication between school, families, and communities was first noticed in the days of small-town living and had been echoed by giants in the field of education. John Dewey devoted much of his

literature to emphasizing the importance of community being an integral part of the educational process (Farr, 2004).

As our communities and classrooms grew, this network had been weakened for a variety of reasons (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). This dissertation examined two different educational environments to see if there were variances between them. Once data were collected and compared, differences and similarities were examined to see if they supported any existing theories or provided the groundwork to new theories.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

As interest in whole child education increased, researchers sought evidence supporting the importance of the components that fostered developmental growth in emotional, spiritual, social, physical, and academic areas. Schools could not be held responsible for the total child development. Community, family, and society at large must be united to assist educational leaders. A person's social capital could have been an indicator of accessibility to resources of developmental growth.

General Overview on Social Capital

A thorough examination of the research on social capital could be overwhelming - the topic is growing very quickly in a variety of directions. Because of the concern for educating the whole child, social capital theories were grabbing the attention of educational researchers (ASCD, 2007). This chapter provides an overview of support and criticism that social capital had received from experts in the field.

Defining social capital is a complex task. There were multiple definitions that all had commonalities and differences. The original concepts that shaped the theory evolved using a lens examining the role of culture in economic growth (Baker, 2000). Social and political scholars Karl Marx (1818-1883), Emile Durkheim (1858 -1917), Georg Simmel (1858 -1918), and Max Weber (1864- 1920) all had major influence in the theories involving culture and society. Although John Dewey (1859- 1952) was mostly known for his influence in education, his theories also involved communal power of civil society. These theories had been explored and developed since their inception and had

been applied to new theories that linked socio-cultural phenomena and economic growth. One of these theories was social capital (Bhandari & Yasunobu, 2009).

Pierre Bourdieu (1986) first honed in on defining the modern day theory of social capital by studying club membership and the valuable resources gained from being a part of organized groups. To Bourdieu, the social network created by memberships was an avenue to benefits that may have been otherwise unattainable. These benefits may have been of economic or social value. Bourdieu theorized that social capital was created when individuals obtained access to the tools needed to provide some benefit. This benefit would not have been available, or at the very least, not as much would have been available, without the aid of the group membership.

James Coleman was a sociologist who first studied the theory social capital in the educational arena (Gamoran & Long, 2006). In addition to his interest in the desegregation in schools, Coleman began examining the effect on school resources linked with family structure. To Coleman, social capital was defined by the production of the capital that the members provided for each other. The final measure of the benefit was that which placed a value on the capital derived. The amounts of obligation, expectations and trust, as well as access to information sources were output Coleman viewed as valuable. His article, "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital," helped shape different categories of social capital when the theory was very new by name (1988).

Some organizations provided information to members for their benefit. Churches often posted community information in the church bulletin, on a continuous slide show, or made verbal announcements (Garland, Wolfer, & Myers, 2008). Other organizations announced food distribution from a local food bank or the need for volunteers to come

and assist with that distribution. Both opportunities could have led to valuable outcomes.

Coleman described the distribution of information as *information channels* (1988).

He also described another attribute of social capital, *reciprocity*, or mutual aid.

For instance, a neighbor may have had a piece of heavy machinery that a family needed

to excavate their yard.   These neighbors may have decided to trade livestock for use of

the heavy machinery. Each party received a benefit from the other that could have cost

them much more otherwise (Molm, 2010).

Another form of social capital involved shared social norms (Bhandari &

Yasunobu, 2009; Coleman, 1988). Coleman (1988) described a mother who moved from

one city to another because she felt her children would be safer traveling across town to

catch a ride on the school bus. She felt safer due to the social capital the community

provided. In her absence, she was comfortable that other adults would have a watchful

eye on the children in the community.

Political scientist and professor, Robert Putnam (1995) was responsible for the

rising popularity of the topic by sparking a debate with his article "Bowling Alone:

America's Declining Social Capital." This debate fueled the release of his controversial

book also titled *Bowling Alone* (Lagon, 2002; Putnam, 2000; Smith, 2007). The title

derived from statistics that showed that more Americans were bowling than ever before,

but people were bowling alone instead of with a group or companion.

His definition emphasized the networks between individuals. Putnam warranted

that involvement in groups, activities, families, or any interactive social event built value

to a person, and perhaps even to associates. These networks may have provided

reciprocity and built trust that would, in-turn, improve society as a whole. For instance,

if an owner of a new business was seen with a highly successful, well established, and supported businessman, this owner might have been given a stamp of approval by onlookers.

Putnam's (2000) book also provided a dense volume of statistics on civic engagement. For example, in comparison to other countries, the significantly low participation rates in United States politics and voting was said to have been a sign of a low community social capital among Americans (Holye & Slater, 2001; Putnam, 1995; Putnam, 2000). Putnam believed social capital was a vital part of accomplishment and one must have had a strong personal social capital for a higher probability of success. He stated that we must do something to stop the decline of a person's social capital and to nurture civic involvement to enrich society. If people did not stop the decline of their social capital, society would suffer.

Better Together: Restoring the American Community (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003) continued to provide supporting evidence of the significance of rebuilding a person's social capital in their communities. Putnam published this article after critics continued to claim that conclusions of a need to increase a person's social capital had no credence (Smith, 2007). To counter this critique, he explained why social capital was important and the differences between *bonding* social capital and *bridging* social capital, which will be elaborated in a different section of this dissertation (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003).

<div align="center">**Supporters and Critics**</div>

Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam were not the only researchers intrigued with the theory of social capital. Lockhart (2005), a strong supporter of Putnam, described the need for personal social capital in America, especially

among the poor. He believed that the poor would benefit greatly from information about community services, encouragement, and support provided through personal social capital. For instance, Lockhart discussed the role of the faith-based organizations in communities and how they provided a wealth of diverse social capital.

Lockhart (2005) discovered that faith-based organizations developed long lasting relationships and produced benefits educationally, socially, and spiritually. Benefits included job search information and training, social support, preparation to achieve a high school diploma, material goods, and services. These findings were contradictory to others who found faith-based social services to be short-term services that had not made any significant positive change in lifestyle or capital (Chaves and Tsistos, 2001). Continued research was needed in the area of faith-based organizations.

University of Maryland professor, Eric Uslaner (2004) brought interesting support to the argument through research involving trust. He concluded that trust had a positive, not negative, effect on relationships in society. Trust could have connected people to others who may differ in race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or other differences. The study implied a person's social capital would increase trust, which was a positive outcome.

Uslaner claimed the issue of trust was a much bigger part of social capital than generally thought. He also provided a counter for some of the studies on social capital that may have shown no or a negative association. Uslaner believed these studies downplayed the area of trust building or ignored it all together. He recalculated some statistics given the particulars about the data and found supporting evidence of the importance of trust building between two people or entities.

Much evidence existed to show benefits resulting from a high level of social

capital. The *British Journal of Political Science* recently published an article that boasted

a positive association between college graduates and a high personal social capital

(Alexander, 2007). Alexander (2007) also offered evidence that correlated a higher

farming presence to a higher rate of social capital. In farming communities, neighbors

had sources of products that others could have only found in a larger commercial store.

When goods were purchased from local farmers, a relationship and a sense of trust were

established between neighbors.

There were those who disagreed and found the theory of social capital to have

been a result of coincidence or other factors such as socioeconomic status. A wealthy

family may have been privy to networks to which impoverished families did not have

access, for example. Other critics did not just dismiss benefits of social capital, but

claimed social capital could have damaging effects. In the same article written by

Alexander (2007), higher rates of church attendance and unemployment showed a

negative social capital. The most surprising result from this article was the positive

correlation of poverty with high social capital (Alexander, 2007). It may have been that

more spiritual people chose a life of simplicity (Bush, 1999). Financial success was not

as important as spiritual richness (Cherrier, 2009).

Rodney Hero (*Multiple traditions in American politics and racial policy

inequality*, 2003) had been a strong critic of the social capital theory. Although social

capital proponents brought a large amount of statistics to the table to support their claims,

Hero argued these statistics did not hold true across racial and economic lines. In fact,

Hero claimed that minorities were negatively affected by a high level of capital.

Hero examined Putnam's statistics and argued that states with a more homogeneous racial structure had a higher social capital than those that were more diverse. Putnam used several indicators to give an overall measurement of social capital. Since Putnam argued that voter registration was an indicator of civic engagement, Hero used voter registration to show that states with a larger gap in ethnic and racial voting registration also had a higher social capital. The higher the overall measurement of social capital in certain states, the larger the gap in voter registration along racial groups. This supported Hero's argument that social capital measurement did not accurately measure social capital in minorities. When broken down by race in the United States, Hero claimed social capital theories were supported in statistics of the white race but not so in other races (*Social capital and racial inequality in America*, 2003).

Iyer, Kitson, and Toh (2005) stressed the need to distinguish between the local and non-local forms of social capital. Their research suggested a more region specific approach to the examination of development and impact of a person's social capital. Putnam had addressed this issue and showed that regions with higher level of trust show higher level of capital.

Other researchers described separate issues that needed to be further examined in order to get a bigger picture of the effects of a person's social capital (Israel & Beaulieu, 2004; Lin, 2000). Lin argued that *bonding* and networking in groups caused social inequality for those who had not shared the same characteristics of the group. As an example, people who had not liked chess would not have joined the chess club, and would have, therefore, been excluded from that group. As a result, if the chess club was given free tickets to the movie theater, those not in the group were excluded. The

structure of single gender networks also needed to be examined further.   Lin found

that networks of women involved more kinship than those of men.

Social capital was certainly a complex topic, and research into the field was in its

infancy. Claims stemming from the positive, negative, and nonexistent measures of

social capital seemed valid. More extensive research is necessary, and more data should

be collected. Compiling the results of all research may be required to understand social

capital and its outcome.

Whole Child Education

Curriculum is a comprehensive guide of what a school was expected to teach and,

theoretically, what students would have learned. Tomlinson and Germundson (2007)

stated it best: "Even exemplary curriculum remains flat on the page if it is all the teacher

has to offer." The factors that had affected curricula included a wide variety of political,

social, and even historical circumstances. These powerful influences also affect

economy, media, and nearly every aspect of one's life. These factors contribute to the

difficulties faced when government controlled the school.

In education during this time, there was a trend toward school choice (Tice,

Princiotta, Chapman, Bielick, 2006). Parents increasingly chose to place their children in

nontraditional school settings, and curriculum was a factor in their decision. There was a

philosophy driving private, charter, community, home, and some public schools that was

a welcome shift from the test-driven curriculum that had pervaded most of the public

school systems in the United States: *whole child education* (ASCD, 2007).

With the trend in education, and with the various government mandates that had

been put forth, the theory of educating the whole child was coming back into the

forefront of educational thought and discussion. Whole child education had a

tremendous impact on curricula structure, content, and assessment (Schaps, 2006).

Education theory had come full circle once again. The push to move from surface

learning to improving a child's life was a positive pendulum shift. The philosophy behind

educating the whole child could have been summarized by Pablo Casals' quote:

> Do you know what you are? You are a marvel. You are unique. In all the world
>
> there is no other child exactly like you. In the millions of years that have passed,
>
> there has never been another child exactly like you. You may become a
>
> Shakespeare, a Michelangelo, a Beethoven. You have the capacity for anything.
>
> Yes, you are a marvel. (ASCD, 2007, p. 5)

> Whole child education was defined as curricula designed to develop a child

academically, emotionally, spiritually, socially, and physically. The ASCD, formerly

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, compiled a whole child

education report in 2007. The report amplified the common thread in the several

definitions of educating the whole child; it suggested the curriculum must move from a

test-centered, teacher-centered philosophy to a student-centered philosophy and a portion

of this holistic education must consist of the child's connection to the community (ASCD,

2007). A snippet from this report stated,

> If the whole child were truly at the center of each educational decision, as ASCD
>
> Executive Director Gene Carter posits (p. 4), we would create learning conditions
>
> that enable all children to develop all of their gifts and realize their fullest
>
> potential. (p. 2)

In other words, a student-centered approach best met the needs of a child.

The Need for Change

Before focusing on what whole child curricula entailed, a review of relevant literature should be done. Leaders in education, such as ASCD, had reported evidence of the need to change current policies in education. In nearly all new proposals to improve the No Child Left Behind Act, a plan that offered a comprehensive education to our children was at the core. It was also recognized that testing students in reading and math was not improving but depriving students of a quality education (ASCD, n.d.).

Children were lacking in qualities that build success. Service industries and professional organizations were looking for honesty, integrity, motivation, initiative, interpersonal, communication, a strong work ethic, and teamwork skills (Rothstein, 2004, p. l5). School must have not excluded academic studies in core subjects; however, schools must have done more to integrate the building of a child's emotional, physical, social, and spiritual health as well (Blank & Berg, 2006; Doyle, 2004; Schaps, 2006). Looking at the entirety of the child's life could have transformed the flat page curricula from surface learning to understanding. The big picture or big idea for curriculum should be to educate the whole child (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

How to Change

Educating the whole child could be accomplished with major curricular and structural changes (Schaps, 2006). Schools spent a tremendous amount of time pulling students out of courses to teach them how to take the state assessment tests, money was being poured into programming that ensured improvement of district test scores (Popham, 2007), and academic coaches were hired (Lehr & Lang, 2003). Research showed that this is in contrast to educating the whole child, which effectively integrated

academics, emotions, spirituality, social skills, and physical growth. Students were focused on the letter grade or percentage score they received on these tests and had no desire to actually learn for application later in life (ACSD, n.d.).

Schools should have instead used this money to create smaller classroom environments allowing for the cultivation of student-teacher relationships. Logically, smaller classrooms, yielded more time for teachers to work with individual students. By captivating the attention of students in individual or small classroom environments, teachers could better model attributes needed for student success (Tomlinson & Germundson, 2007).

In addition, networking with the community and family has been shown to tremendously impact learning (Blank & Berg, 2006; Malone, 2008). Students could have become involved in their community and learned what services may be available for them and their families. They could have also made a difference by becoming active citizens through volunteerism and participation in activities. Studies showed that an educating the whole child philosophy created a curriculum that focused on the needs of the learner and generated leaders for tomorrow's future (ASCD, 2007).

Many community resources provided free instruction and materials for student development. For example, the United States Department of Agriculture (n.d.) provided many free resources for enhancing health and wellness. Local community outreaches were eager to enter the schools to educate youth on issues of character education, social justice, fine arts, and government. Integrating these topics into the schools could have been as simple as inviting speakers into the classroom, using elective periods, or running a modified schedule once a week.

Unfortunately, this was easier said than done, as public schools were quaking while they waited to see if the state was going to hold them accountable for reading and mathematics scores on standardized tests (Popham, 2007). They must meet the required benchmark to stay under the radar. Until the focus in the public school system is changed from test-centered to child-centered, there will be little teacher control over what takes place in the public classroom. However, not all schools were test-driven. Private, charter, and home schools resisted the emphasis to be compared to their public schools and not be influenced to fall into the test-driven philosophy (McTighe, 2004).

Child-Centered Environment

A child-centered environment emphasized the health and welfare of children and encouraged self-actualization development - the basis of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In Alfie Kohn's (2004) article, "A Fresh Look at Abraham Maslow," Maslow's work was constructively criticized. Although under scrutiny, many professionals in the field of sociology and education agreed on Maslow's first level, which stated that if people's basic physiological needs were not met, they would not have reached their full potential or even begun to learn any curriculum (Doyle, 2004; Kohn, 2004; Tomlinson & Germundson, 2007). Creating a curriculum that educates the whole child was a way to ensure that the needs of each student were met, which in-turn allowed all students to reach their full potential.

The Final Say

Those in charge of making the curriculum decisions had the final say. If the public schools remained test-centered, the curriculum did, too. Making changes to focus attention back on the child were difficult in educational settings that were judged by state

assessments. In others with a whole child philosophy, it was an attainable goal. Children were gifts entrusted to educators to prepare for life after school. Lobbying to fight for the future was worth the effort. Educators should have been challenged to stand up for the future and cultivate the whole child. Children were counting on educators to be mentors in all areas of life. The difference whole child education schools made in the lives of children was a priceless reward. Whole child educators had a personal relationship with every child.

<div align="center">

Reciprocity, Bridging, and Bonding

</div>

This section examines family, community, and school social capital, and the combinations of school-family and school-community social capital. Three elements of social capital should be clarified to ease the understanding of specific types of social capital. These elements are *reciprocity*, *bridging*, and *bonding*.

Reciprocity

Reciprocity was an integral part of social capital. Although *reciprocity* seemed to carry the attribute of self-interest by expecting the possibility of some return, it was still considered a great networking tool (Torche, 2004). Molm (2010) defined *reciprocity* as the giving of benefits to another in return for benefits received. This characteristic of social capital seemed to be underestimated and difficult to measure.

Molm (2010) noted how there were different types of exchange. These types were defined by the structure of the process between parties. The first two structures of interest to Molm involved a direct result. *Reciprocal exchange* took place when one was compelled to give to another without the guarantee of receiving something in return, or when the return may have happened at a later time (Torche, 2004). For example,

Bhattacharya (2011) found reciprocal exchange to be extremely important in the immigration of men from India. These men relied on friends already settled in the United States to teach them American mannerisms, help with understanding accents, and adjust to social customs. Another example was religious support groups that provided services to others without expecting a return benefit (Sosin & Smith, 2006; Urwin, Di Pietro, Sturgis, & Jack, 2008).

The second structure was a *negotiated exchange* where the parties gave benefits unilaterally after terms were met by both parties (Barrera, 2007; Molm, 2010). In this exchange, benefits were guaranteed in an official agreement and happened simultaneously. Two business firms may have gone through extensive conciliation to avoid deceit by either party. This exchange was at a low level of trust. On the other hand, if the two businesses continued to work together, they may have moved to a reciprocated exchange and avoided the costs of attorneys. This only would have happened after successful transactions between the two parties (Barrera, 2007).

The third structure was indirect. A chain reaction occurred when party A provided to party B. Because party B benefited, they provided to party C. As a result, party C yielded benefits to party A. This exchange, called *generalized exchange*, was neglected for years by sociologists, but later had caught the attention of some, including Molm (2010). Generalized exchange could have happened in many community organized groups (Urwin, Di Pietro, Sturgis, & Jack, 2008).

For instance, a crime-troubled neighborhood may have organized a watch group. This group volunteered their time to keep the community safe, a benefit. As a result, a neighbor's house was protected. Because of this provided protection, the neighbor

decided to begin a youth group at the community basketball court. This was a benefit to the youth, who otherwise may have been a crime problem. Because of this youth group, a young man discouraged crime activities from the other youth in the community, a benefit given back to the crime watch.

The different types of exchange yielded different levels of trust and bonds that were formed between parties. Molm (2010) found surprising results when examining the structures of *reciprocity*. The strongest level of trust and greater bonds were found in the indirect structure of generalized exchange. Between the direct exchanges of negotiated and reciprocal structures, the greater bonds and trust levels were consistently found in the reciprocal exchange and not the negotiated exchange (Barrera, 2007; Molm, 2010).

These findings encouraged more research. Not all researchers were convinced of the relevance, and some considered the phenomenon a political topic of ambiguity (Narotzky, 2007). For the focus of this dissertation, the relevant result was the importance of network building.

Bridging

Social capital *bridging* existed when commonalities between different groups were present. For instance, Catholic and Presbyterian affiliations both publically defended the sanctity of life. This common stance was a bridge between the two Christian denominations, allowing the two groups to have been focused on a shared ideal as opposed to differences. *Bridging* spurred growth in the community as it built networks by having used resources from outside of group membership (Beyerlein & Hipp, 2005). For instance, the church congregations mentioned above would have made use of the Pro-Life Federation for resources to support their cause spurred from religious belief.

Without *bridging* between the groups, these groups may have been isolated from one another.

Bridging was generally associated with volunteer organizations, which typically included members of different socioeconomic backgrounds (Saijun, Anderson, & Min, 2011). Social capital had been found to positively impact the economy because of this mix of individuals. For instance, Saijun, Anderson, and Min (2011) found that blacks who were networked within groups containing whites had more information about job opportunities. Researchers had also described a foundation that launched a decade long project in ten cities in the United States to help disseminate information to a community about jobs, financial seminars, and social services (Saijun, Anderson, & Min, 2011). The analysis portrayed the importance of shared information across group lines that had a significant effect on future economic well-being.

Wuthnow (2002) described two additional types of *bridging*: *identity-bridging* and *status-bridging*. His study analyzed data collected from religious congregations. The data collected from a large national survey was examined for any significance in church attendance and networks involving these two types of *bridging*.

Identity-bridging involved ties between groups of different cultural attributes (Wuthnow, 2002). These may have included race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, or geographical location. For instance, someone might have said, "us Pennsylvanians" or "women feel" as a way of identifying themselves within a group. *Identity-bridging* would have generally surfaced in discussions involving diversity and tolerance.

Status-bridging, on the other hand, involved vertical networks such as power, rank, influence, wealth, fame, or prestige (Wuthnow, 2002). Others may have benefited

from their connections to people who had a higher socioeconomic status. If a powerful

county official spoke on behalf of a citizen about a school board concern, more attention

may have been given to that issue because of the citizen's connection to the official.

Even if the relationship was not very strong, the official was still aware of the issue and

may have checked to see if any action was taken. This would have strengthened the

desire for accountability on the school board's part. The initial contact may have been

that the citizen spoke to this county official at a church service where both attended,

which indicated parties were bridged by their membership.

Bonding

Social capital *bonding* described ties that linked a group to its members

(Beyerlein & Hipp, 2005). For instance, the people who joined the National Rifle

Association all believed in defending the second amendment rights of United States

citizens. The *bonding* that groups contained built social capital among the members of

the group, and a level of trust was natural due to the like-mindedness on social topics.

Bonding had also been described as a support system (Saijun, Anderson, & Min, 2011).

For instance, relatives aided families by providing housing, child care, and support during

emergencies. This type of assistance had not been shown to lead to economic growth,

but rather was a safety net that kept families out of poverty. On the other hand, *bonding*

networks were often very strong ties versus the weaker ties that were often associated

with *bridging*.

Hawkins & Maurer (2010) studied the aspects of *bonding* social capital in 40

families after Hurricane Katrina hit in August 2005. Survivors scrounged for any

resources available to secure shelter, food, and medical services. This process provided

data for measuring *bridging* and *bonding* social capital. Data suggested that networks

available through *bonding* were critical in the beginning stages of the disaster. It was the

strong family, friend, and support networks that provided the trust and caring that were

necessary for individuals to endure the circumstances left from the incredible damage.

Relationships were all that many had left after all their worldly possessions were swept

away. *Bonding* networks had been shown to positively impact survival rates, not only in

Katrina, but other catastrophes such as the 1980 earthquake in Italy (Hawkins & Maurer,

2010).

Bonding had provided surprising benefits to community members. Research had

shown that community residents who shared organizational memberships had lower

crime rates (Beyerlein & Hipp, 2005). The premise was that neighbors who knew each

other watched for the safety of their neighbors. If something seemed to be out of the

ordinary or if there was a disturbance, neighbors were more apt to become involved when

they know each other, and even more so when they shared common interests.

Some *bonding* research indicated the converse result, based on a sense of distrust.

If there was a small bonded group, they became withdrawn from the community and

would have been less likely to help their other neighbors because they had not shared the

bonded kinship. Some militia groups had been found to have a strong inner social capital

but a weak network outside of their organization which caused crime rates to climb

versus fall (Beyerlein & Hipp, 2005). With that being said, the research overall seemed

to find more positive benefits for the community than negative when it came to the

bonding of organizational groups.

The Mix

Following Katrina, after the immediate need, *bridging* across racial and socioeconomic lines became necessary to secure longer term resources. Different groups shared information, resources, and food to begin the rebuilding process. *Bonding* and *bridging* types of social capital were found to be vital for recovery.

There existed informal and formal type of *bridging* and *bonding* (Brisson, 2009). Neighbors of the same community spoke to each other at the local grocery store about their opinions on the newly introduced school budget, which threatened to increase taxes. This was an example of *informal bonding*. The encounter was not formally arranged and therefore was an informal bond concerning the tax issue. As a result of this heated issue, the mayor may have called a town hall meeting and invited community members to voice their opinions. This would have been a *formal bonding* among community members who came together to be heard on the issue. If the mayor then contacted a neighboring mayor in the same school district, they may have scheduled a meeting to discuss the increase in school tax. This would have been a *formal bridging* between the elected officials. It was formal because of the official positions they hold and it was *bridging* since they are mayors in two different communities.

Types of *informal bonding*, *formal bonding*, and *formal bridging* social capital can become intertwined (Brisson, 2009). One often transforms to another. A formal meeting of group members voting on an issue may have produced friendships which could have then resulted in *informal bonding*. For example, two church members became friends after discussing the church budget at a congregation meeting (*formal bonding*). As a result of this friendship, they shared personal information about resources for

childcare, borrowed items, shared recipes, or other information that may benefit one another (*informal bonding*).

Family, School, and Community Capital

This dissertation involved three broad types of social capital: family, schools, and community. In order to clarify the characteristics of each type, an overview was provided. Family, school, and community capital will be described respectively.

Family Capital

Family capital described a person's connection with their family. As the dynamics of family continued to change, so did the research of family capital. The following presented family capital pertaining to ethnicity, traditional family structure, blended families, single parent families, extended families, and socioeconomic status of the families.

Ethnicity. There was supporting evidence of positive and negative capital with regard to ethnicity and family capital. Positive capital provided upward mobility, stability, and may have resulted in an increase of power. Negative capital resulted from networks that caused stagnation or decreased power or benefits.

Some family structures were defined foremost through their ethnicity. Zontini (2010) presented research showing both negative and positive family social capital in Italian families. She found positives in these Italian families *bridging* differences of gender, generation, location, and language. Families devoted much time and energy to maintaining trustworthy relationships through frequent communication or personal visits. In addition, many families benefited financially from strong family capital by living together. They shared expenses, took care of dependent family members, and completed

household responsibilities. Couples who shared the same ethnicity, community, and

social status who married and nurtured families were said to have had common goals,

providing an advantage in developing a strong family network (Furstenberg, 2005).

Furthermore, Immigrant families often lived together in communities. These families

could have developed additional relationships of trust through churches, cultural, or

political organizations.

Many times, children helped their families mainstream with the outside

population by acting as a language network or through their social networks at school.

For instance, children were often translators for their parents, as children learned the new

language quickly due to school instruction. The trusting relationship between parents and

children created a tight network for adults who would otherwise have suffered from the

language barrier.

Zontini (2010) also suggested that many family structures with a strong sense of

ethnicity had networks that were formed from obligation and dependency as opposed to

personal gain or upward mobility. However, Furstenberg (2005) indicated that lack of

research made it difficult to know whether parents' expectations for their children created

a sense of obligation to family members.   A sense of obligation did not necessarily

indicate a negative network. Zontini (2010) interviewed a young woman who identified

herself as Italian, meaning she was an extension of something bigger, "The Family." The

sense of belonging and cooperation between family members were strong positives in

Italian families.

Although ethnic family bonds could have been very positive, networks could have

been negative in certain situations. For instance, in divorced families, extended family

members often took sides with the blood related party and shunned the former in-law. Also, in the area of domestic abuse and ethnic traditions, families could have protected select members while they turned against others. The female gender could be considered stagnated by the obligation of household duties or in a lower position of power within the family (Zontini, 2010). Women did not always see this as a negative, but when they did, it often involved emotional abuse by inflicted feelings of guilt, obligation, or fear. For instance, many ethnic families protected one another. On the other hand, if a woman attempted to become more independent from the family when expected to fulfill a specific role, her protection or family support may have been removed from her.

Another negative outcome in the area of ethnicity was found when migrants actually used their ethnicity to create boundaries between themselves and the rest of the population (Zontini, 2010), effectively formulating an "us against them" mentality. In a study that involved Latino families, it was found that poorer families built boundaries, shut out school officials, but nevertheless still had strong family networks (Gamoran, López Turley, Turner, & Fish, 2011). It was suspected that this could partially account for the achievement gap that existed between Latinos and Whites.

Wenfan Yan and Qiuyun Lin (2005) reported some ethnicities may not have been comfortable communicating with schools due to language barriers and/or cultural traditions. On the other hand, in the same article, Yan explored different ethnicities and their attitudes toward school. He found that Asian-American families held education in high regard and tended to be very involved in their child's education. Findings that involved Hispanic American families were mixed, with most families that indicating they wanted their children to do well in school. However, their involvement in their child's

education suggested it may actually be less of a priority. Whether this was a measure of comfort in school communication or a matter of cultural priorities was unknown.

Traditional family structure. For the purpose of this dissertation, a traditional or nuclear family is defined as married heterosexual parents and children living in the same residence. Children in these families developed a strong sense of trust, obligation, and expectations of how family members behaved and as a result they strived to act accordingly (Shriner, Mullis, & Shriner, 2010). As with many ethnic families, traditional families must have had continuous interaction with members to maintain the expectations and social relationships formed by family. For instance, a high level of social capital had been found in farm families when married couples and their children worked together for a common goal (Furstenberg, 2005). As these families interacted, they built a business, sustained income, and strengthened bonds while they relied on each other. They had no hesitation about counting on one another because it was an expected way of life. The same characteristics have been found in small family businesses involving immigrants.

Close-Knit families had a high level of social capital as they benefited from collective support. The bond strength, level of trust, and reliability built within these family networks provided benefits that would have otherwise been unattainable. For instance, when a child had a crisis, if that child had a strong family capital, they knew they could have counted on family members to provide assistance. Whether perceived as good or bad, some believed close-knit families had pressure for conformity to shape the egos of their children (Widmer, 2007).

Yan and Lin (2005) supplied evidence associating stronger parental relationships with higher academic achievement, which could link close-knit families with a strong

social capital, as academic achievement could have provided upward mobility. When raised in a nuclear family, absent from divorce and step-parents, social capital was higher, producing strong versus weak networks. These strong networks coincided with success in school, inter-family and subsequent relationships.

Blended families. The established norms of families may have had less of an impact on children of blended families. For instance, if two families came together as a result of remarriage, each parent brought separate family capital. These attributes may or may not have blended easily. Widmer (2007) described these families as "peculiar" after analyzing relationships between family members. Contrary to the traditional family structure, post-divorce families had more shallow relationships with parents, step-parents, and the variety of family members or partnerships they may have provided. Instead of the dense, interwoven, strong trust group relationship, there were more individualized acquaintance-type relationships not at the same level of trust. In addition, to develop and maintain the family connectivity, much work was required by each participant.

Research supporting positive social capital among blended families was growing (Shriner, Mullis, & Shriner, 2010). In fact, there were documented cases in which step-parents could have provided more social capital (Shriner, Mullis, & Schlee, 2009). Marjoribanks (2002) found that when stepparents were actively involved with children academically, the involvement will enhance performance. Strong stepfamilies had stepparents that were more actively involved with their stepchildren and participated in situations allowing them to teach, communicate with, and support stepchildren. Eggebeen and Knoester (2001) found that stepfathers who were actively involved with their new families were also very active in their community, providing more networks for

the stepchildren. Findings by Marsiglia and Hinojosa (2007) reflected a strong social capital for children whose step and biological fathers worked together to raise them.

Other research had shown a weakness and even broken ties between step-parents and children displaying less intimate and trusting relationships that involved conflict (Widmer, 2007). The different values, traditions, or lifestyles brought into the family structure could have caused this conflict or a resistance to change by children. These difficulties may have restricted the development of the relationship between step-parents and children. A farming family may have had a completely different set of priorities than a suburban family. If the two families came together, the transition could have been difficult due to each parent's expectations of their spouse's children. If Johnny was used to sleeping in until 10AM on the weekends and now he had to get up at 7AM to gather eggs, resentment could have set in due to new responsibilities.

Single parent families. A high social capital was said to give children an added advantage providing channels of support and success (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 2000; Yan & Lin, 2005). Freistadt and Strohschein (2012) found much weaker networks among single parent families than nuclear families. Specifically, there was a much stronger connection within some neighborhoods between married families than single-parent families. Single parents did not have the spousal support that traditional or blended families provided. Accordingly, single-parent families needed to have access to a source to strengthen social capital. Some believed this may have encouraged single-parents to marry or seek resources that would have been normally provided by a spouse (Freistadt & Strohschein, 2012). For instance, if single parents were members of a single parent support group, they could have sought advice from others who may have experienced the

same types of struggles. This network could have provided emotional support, friendships, and even dating opportunities.

Johnson, Honnold, and Threlfall, (2011) found that increasing single parents social capital increased their opportunities for employment and marriage. They also emphasized that a stable social capital was necessary for these parents to establish long term stability. The focus on a plan to increase capital stemmed from Coleman (1988) who emphasized issues with the decline of family capital. It was generally agreed that a high social capital had more positives than negatives. Research on social capital indicated that more established and stable family structures had higher social capital. The higher social capital provided more opportunity for benefits and upward mobility. There were some characteristics that reached across different family structures and had a common effect. Two of these characteristics were extended families and socioeconomic status.

Extended families. A reliance on extended families was found in all of the types already discussed (Elliott, 2009). Furstenberg (2005) found that extended family members had valuable capital, including community networks, churches, and social services. For instance, a grandmother may have been a longstanding member of a church that operated a food pantry or child-care services. These services may have been available to her grandchildren and great-grandchildren due to the family network.

Extended family members had a vested interest in children, and consequently helped the family when there was a need (Keene, Prokos, & Held, 2012). The most common resource given by extended family members, mainly grandparents, was a residence for their grandchildren.   Other support was through childcare and financial

assistance. In addition to this support, extended families spent a lot of time with young children out of the desire to have a relationship with the younger generation and to pass along family history and traditions.

Socioeconomic status of the families. Many critics of the social capital theory argued that socioeconomic status was much more of an influence than any type of network (Maquila Solidarity Network and the Project on Organizing, Development, Education, and Research, 2011). Although economic class of families was a major influence, it was the networks between the families that gave the opportunities for these benefits or detriments (Putnam, 2000). In upper and middle class families, family capital provided the benefits already discussed in this chapter.

On the other hand, families that came from long-term poverty environments had much difficulty in finding any upward mobility when relying solely on family social capital (Jones, Clark, Grusec, Hart, Plickert, Tepperman, & Human Resources Development Canada, 2002). The members of families who lived in long-term poverty shared characteristics of their extended family members (Morrison, 2004). The family capital that existed in poverty-stricken neighborhoods mainly provided protection, child care, and shared resources, but could have trapped families in their socioeconomic situation. Family members often had habits that kept their environment stagnant, or suffered from depression or frustration. Families in poverty most often lived in poor neighborhoods, limiting opportunities to change their circumstances. Even transportation from the neighborhood became a challenge due to lack of income.

There was mounting evidence indicating an avenue to economic prosperity when outside networks were added to areas of poverty (Abdul-Hakim, Abdul-Razak, & Ismail,

2010; Saracostti, 2007; Amin, 2005). Research showed a combination of micro and macro levels of networks to balance the cost resulting in worthwhile benefits. This linking to outside networks will be examined more thoroughly in a later section.

This section was intended to give an overview of family capital and what that represented in different family structures. The studies available reflected that the denser the family structure the stronger the bonds of trust creating a higher social capital. This was not to say that other family structures did not have social capital, but the rate of social capital may have been weaker or the ties more superficial. There was no doubt that it is more difficult for single parent families to network with family members and neighborhoods due to a nonexistent spousal support. On the other hand, communities and family could make a conscious effort to increase the social capital of these families.

Extended families are an important part of all family structures often providing resources and positive benefits. The socioeconomic status of families was an important factor when studying social capital. Long-term poverty had a negative effect, but there were avenues out of poverty when connecting families with outside resources and benefits.

Community Capital

Communities and families can work together to build strong family capital. This opened another topic of social capital, community capital. According to Condeluci (2002), a community was a network of people who came together for a common theme, cause, or celebration. Community did not necessarily imply geographic proximity, as the Internet has created new possibilities. This portion of the dissertation examined different research on community capital. Specifically exploring how organizations, public service,

politics and public affairs, social events, online communities, and socioeconomic status affected social capital.

Community organizations. A confused "Bowling alone?" was the reaction of many people who read the title of Robert Putnam's book (Putnam, 2000). As discussed previously, Putnam's dense collection of statistics portrayed a need for concern in the United States because of a sharp decline of civic engagement. Putnam argued that the decrease in belonging to networks had far more negative results than positive. He also recognized that the definition of community had changed over time and the perception of a community by those born before 1946 was very different than those born after 1964.

A large American Survey about the meaning of community was conducted by Yankelovich Partners at the end of the twentieth century, in which they asked the question: In what ways do you get a real sense of belonging (Putnam, 2000)? The survey compared the results of people born before 1946 and those after 1964. Significant percentage drops showed that younger generations felt less of a connection to local neighbors, churches, newspapers, communities, and groups or organizations. Not surprisingly, the younger generation felt more of a connection in online communities, which may have had no geographical commonality.

Putnam also displayed several charts involving local organizational memberships from the 1970's through the 1990's. These data showed a pattern of decrease in club meetings, card playing, bowling leagues, informal social activities, and church attendance (Putnam, 2000). Putnam credited much of the decline to the increase in television programming (Putnam, 2000; Young, 2001). In fact, Putnam displayed several graphs

showing how people who considered television their primary form of entertainment were less involved in other group activities.

Smith (2003) explored religious involvement and concluded that adolescents involved in church activities were more likely to have healthy associations and fewer suicidal incidents. Condeluci (2002) emphasized the benefit of being safer when involved in group activities and advantages of *reciprocity*. For instance, group members often developed trust and caring relationships. If a member of a group unexpectedly missed a meeting, it was common for other group members to follow up to ensure the member was safe and sound. Research also showed a stronger bond between mothers and children even through adulthood if they were involved in church membership (Sherkat & Ellison, 1999).

Community public service. Safety and trust were two areas of social capital that influenced the upward mobility of people in communities. For instance, studies showed the safer people felt in a community the higher the social capital. Fire service performance was an area that showed a strong positive correlation between social capital and fire service outcomes (Andrews & Brewer, 2010). Seventy-two percent of fire services were provided through volunteers in the United States. Therefore, a community's sense of networking, trust, and engagement had a huge impact on such emergency services.

In addition, communities that had a lower social capital were also statistically more at risk for situations that were conducive to emergencies. For instance, low social capital areas had a low level of trust and civic involvement and a higher level of antagonism. Communities with low social capital characteristics had higher fire incidents

and fatalities. Communities with a higher social capital tended to know more about each

other, allowing for emergency volunteers to have access to pertinent information when

needed. If a local farmer's home was on fire, for example, it helped to know ahead of

time how many people were living in that household (Andrews & Brewer, 2010).

Putnam (2000) also provided statistics reflecting the positive association between higher

community capital, and safer communities with more involvement in volunteer services.

Churches were also involved in providing services to the community (Condeluci,

2002; Garland, Wolfer, & Myers, 2008; Smith, 2003). Churches may have provided

clothing, food, and child services to local families. Church unity could have provided

strong political support for moral causes such as poverty, hunger, or life.

Public affairs and political involvement were closely related to access to public

service (Andrews & Brewer, 2010; Putnam, Spring 1993; Putnam 2000). People who

were aware of the needs of the community and voiced their needs to the appropriate

agencies or political officials provided support to volunteer organizations, eased

volunteers' burdens, and reduced burn-out. A grant may have been submitted to the

county for funding for more efficient equipment. If the members of the community

voiced their needs to the public officials who were the decision makers, the whole

community benefited.

Community politics and public affairs. Politics and public affair involvement

could have provided important avenues to many resources otherwise unattainable.   The

decline of voter registration and participation in the United States paralleled other social

declines. There was evidence that civic, political, and public affairs involvement directly

affected the level of governmental trust and respect for civic laws (Iyer, Kitson, & Toh,

2005). The more involved the members of the community were in public affairs and politics, the more the community respected the law, resulting in lower crime rates.

The percentage of eligible American voters that exercised their right to vote fell from 62.8% in 1960 to 48.9% in 1996 (Putnam, 2000). Putnam noted this drop occurred despite the fact that it had become increasingly simpler to register and access voting locations. The ease of voting and lifts on many restrictions should have resulted in a higher participation rate in voting, but the data portrayed the opposite picture. This may have supported Putnam's argument that community apathy was much higher than the statistics present. Low voter participation has been credited to a general distrust in government and the perception that a citizen's vote made little difference in the outcome (Putnam, 2000).

In an earlier article, Putnam (Spring 1993) discussed the view of many in areas such as Sicily and Calabria. These areas were considered "uncivic" as the residents' generally viewed politics and public affairs as someone else's problem. The result, Putnam claimed, was one of unhappiness and distrust. Although, some studies in the United States showed that people had a tendency to become more involved in local public affairs regardless of whether or not they voted in elections (Andrews & Brewer, 2010; Putnam 2000).

Community social events. People who isolated themselves from community groups were known to have higher death rates. Social isolation was documented as being responsible for more deaths per year than smoking cigarettes (Condeluci, 2002). The documentation and research fell short of concluding that organizational involvement could have been the difference between life and death. However, researchers had found

that efforts to connect neighbors could have at least empowered communities and resulted in higher social capital (Mandell, 2010). Neighborhood block parties, picnics, and other public events could have developed relationships between neighbors and strengthened connections that could have resulted in effective engagement making the community safer and friendly.

Mandell (2010) also found that community members responded positively after participating in neighborhood improvement projects. Members reported that "community work does not feel like work" when coupled with fun, food, and conversation. This same researcher also found that community events increased political interest, participation, and activism.

Arcodia and Whitford (2006) also found much support for community events building social capital. They looked closely at community festivals and reported that early in the planning stages, organizers were interacting with local businesses and neighbors. This process allowed organizers to discover resources in the community that they may not have known existed. It also encouraged cooperation between groups that may not otherwise have interacted with each other.

Festivals resulted in other social capital building benefits (Arnoldi, 2012). They gave many political and social advocates a venue to voice their positions and distribute information to the neighborhoods. Festivals could have also brought tourism and business into the community. They also provided opportunities to celebrate community and individual accomplishments. For example, a display about a local citizen who went on to medical school and discovered the cure for a fatal disease may instill a sense of pride and belonging to the neighborhood.

Online communities. The definition of community expanded greatly with the Internet. Putnam and Feldstein described the effect online tools had on social capital (2003). Internet-based connections could have greatly enhanced personal relationships with local communities. In 2002, it was reported that 62.5% of all Americans used some type of email or instant message program. Facebook®, Twitter®, and other social networks had reconnected past friends and schoolmates who otherwise might not have continued relationships.

These types of communication programs could have enhanced already existing personal ties and could have expedited the development of new relationships much more quickly than mail delivery, or "snail mail." A tool for enhancing resources in our communities had skyrocketed: Craigslist®. Craigslist® was similar to classified ads in the local newspaper, but it was much more timely and editable. Because such programs did the same job as the past communication methods, they did not necessarily create new social capital. However, there were situations in which new networks were established. Families that had a member suffering from a rare medical or environmental situation had been able to create informational support communities. In this respect, creating a network through mutual interest could have been more important than physical location or face-to-face relationships (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003).

Due to online communities, the research on social capital changed daily. New developments in technology and online interaction were unanticipated by early critics of online social capital (Kittilson & Dalton, 2011). Participation in face-to-face clubs and activities were in decline, but virtual interactions via the Internet rapidly increased and became more enhanced. A 2009 study showed 47% of Internet users frequently visited

virtual societies such as Facebook®, MySpace®, or LinkedIn® (Zickuhr, 2010). It has been found that participants were more likely to voice their opinions in virtual societies than in face-to-face interactions.

Kittilson and Dalton (2011) also noted several studies that demonstrated an increase in political participation among Internet users especially during presidential elections. Virtual societies such as Facebook® not only enhanced political participation, but also civic engagement and social trust. In the 2005-2010 era, social capital was built virtually while the generations of the past engaged in dart ball, choir, or church events.

Community socioeconomic status. Awareness of local organizations that supplied resources, such as housing, medical, and employment information, was especially important in poverty level communities (Lockhart, 2005; Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). Unfortunately, it seemed that communities with lower socioeconomic status lacked the availability of many resources needed, making the issue moot.

Some believed that placing low income families into a mixed economic community would have increased the level of social capital. The argument stemmed from the theory that there were resources readily available in mixed communities that were more economically stable than low income communities (Curley, 2010). The research indicated that increased levels of safety and trust found in these communities were important contributors to the increase of social capital of families.

Putnam claimed that communities did not become civically involved because of wealth. Rather, they became wealthy due to civic involvement. Social capital has been found to increase the economic growth within communities, and communities received

obvious benefits from this growth (Iyer, Kitson, & Toh, 2005). These benefits translated

into improved facilities, enhanced programs, employment, and higher salaries.

David Hume's parable of the two farmers displayed how each neighboring farmer

may have helped the other in order to save the harvest out of economic gain, not caring or

trust (Putnam, Spring 1993).

'Tis profitable for us both, that I should labour with you today, and that you

should aid me tomorrow. I have no kindness for you, and know you have as little

for me. I will not, therefore, take any pains upon your account; and should I

labour with you upon my own account, in expectation of a return, I know I should

be disappointed, and that I should in vain depend upon your gratitude. Here then

I leave you to labour alone; You treat me in the same manner. The seasons

change; and both of us lose our harvests for want of mutual confidence and

security. - David Hume (The prosperous community: Social capital and public

life, para.1).

This parable demonstrated a business decision between farmers. It seemed the farmer's

decision would be very different if there was a competitive venue where one farmer

might benefit without the other. Social capital in communities was much more than that.

A business-like relationship may have had an economic advantage at times, but many

more benefits came from building a relationship of trust. Uslaner (2004) described a

communal spirit in which neighbors cared for each other and took a proactive stand to

protect their community and looked out for those who might have needed their help.

School Social Capital

With the multitude of social capital research in the arenas of business, community, and family, it was not a far stretch to examine the networks within a school system. Educational giant John Dewey emphasized the importance of social basic skills quoting social capital as a valuable resource in education (Plagens, 2011). Communication within a school system involved networking between teachers, administrators, professional employees, and other schools. Any support, communication, *reciprocity*, or trust from within the school system that benefited the school would have built school social capital.

Researchers, politicians, and educators pondered why, given the same resources, some schools outperformed others (Plagens, 2010). Data supported class size, teacher experience and quality, leadership, and spending as significant factors in this issue. It was worth exploring if social capital within the school may also have had significant effect on school performance.

Plagens (2010) described seven benefits educators may have reaped from building a high social capital. Individuals with a high social capital were generally more cooperative. Educators cooperating with peers and administrators were more likely to receive less resistance when implementing new ideas in the classroom or when making other formal requests. The second and third listed benefits of high social capital directly involved the local community. Educators who took an interest in and having knowledge of community needs were more apt to work with surrounding business leaders and also understood struggles encountered by families.

The fourth and fifth indicators of high social capital included caring and identifying with others in need. Once educators had knowledge of problem issues in the local community, they were armed with the information needed to become part of the solution. Educators who sought to instill service-learning attitudes in students needed to possess these norms to teach by example.

The last two benefits to having a high social capital were trust and the willingness to belong in groups and associations. Trust and group association were examined throughout this dissertation as products of social capital. Trust had been noted as neglected by researchers in the social capital venue (Uslaner, 2004).

Sense of belonging. As mentioned previously, Dewey knew of the importance of social capital in education.

A society is a number of people held together because they are working along common lines, in a common spirit, and with reference to common aims. The common needs and aims demand a growing interchange of thought and growing unity of sympathetic feeling. The radical reason that the present school cannot organize itself as a natural social unit is because just this element of common and productive activity is absent. —John Dewey (Clift, 2005)

When a school displayed a sense of spirit and belonging, a social curriculum was present. Although the curriculum was not in writing, the leaders and faculty who felt a sense of belonging fostered these desired attributes in students. One such school was the High School for the Performing and Visual Arts (HSPVA) in Houston, Texas (Clift, 2005). Faculty at HSPVA treated students with a caring firmness. Other schools in this

50

Houston area struggled with racial upheavals, but HSPVA was racially diverse and students coexisted with loyalty to the school and each other.

The presence of spirit and belonging had cultivated *bonding* and *bridging* attributes of social capital (Clift, 2005). Abraham Maslow, influenced by Dewey, listed the "need to belong" as the third essence of humanity only behind psychological and safety needs. In the HSPVA, leadership and faculty were carefully selected for their positions based on their goals aligning with the school. Creating the atmosphere of caring, learning, and acceptance, had built a social capital in this school that directly affected performance and success.

Trust within the school. It was difficult to implement new ideas and curriculum without encouragement and support. Research had shown that trust between educators could be built by organizing time for professionals to share ideas and discuss strategies (Coburn & Russell, 2006; McKenzie, Skrla, Scheurich & Rice, 2011; Plagens, 2010). Positive school leadership fostered and supported relationships (Ekinci, 2012). Administrators should have provided an environment for teachers to develop relationships with each other which enabled an easy flow of information sharing.

A school administrator who was visible and available to teachers built a trusting relationship and became a resource for teachers who may have otherwise isolated themselves in their classrooms (Friedkin & Slater, 1994; Plagens, 2010). Researchers discovered the importance of faculty knowing that the competence and expertise of the principal was legitimate and beneficial to their professional growth. Schools that had great leaders who utilized interpersonal networks, and were visible and available to their staff, had better performance outcomes (Ekinci, 2012; Haghighat, 2005; Plagens, 2010).

In fact, schools that fostered a positive environment for the teachers by building their social capital enhanced student learning performance.

Social capital within a school system spawned from trusting and encouraging relationships might have been no different than social capital within a family that possessed the same dynamic (Plagens, 2010). Educators spent most of the weekday time with their students. When teachers had a positive school capital and were dedicated to the learning of and caring for their students, they increased the child's social capital and built a sense of trust (Clift, 2005; McKenzie, Skrla, Scheurich & Rice, 2011).

Outcomes of capital built in schools included shared resources, knowledge, efficiency, and unified enforcement of rules (Plagens, 2010). For instance, if an educator had been teaching geometry for a few years, he or she could have supplied resources to younger colleagues. The experience of the educator could also have provided valuable guidance to others, saved time and energy, and increased effectiveness. In addition, when trust was built between the teachers, *reciprocity* may have resulted.

Some schools had mentoring programs for new faculty (Armstrong, 2012). Instead of formal evaluations, the veteran teacher spent a significant amount of time in the classroom with the new teachers. When these programs were organized in a non-threatening manner, new teachers built a trust with the veteran teachers and relied on them for advice and support.

Other schools have built strong levels of school capital through professional development (Phelps & Graham, 2008). One study provided sixteen schools with a professional development program in technology. This program yielded positive results

including a positive attitude toward technology, a can-do attitude when trying new methods, enhancing relationships with school leaders, and increasing faculty confidence.

Learning environment. Cooperative and consistent implementation of rules, regulations, and consequences thereof, were vital in maintaining an environment focused on learning (Austin, Reynolds, & Barnes, 2012; Ekinci, 2012; Plagens, 2010). Teachers and educators who were unified were successful when enforcing rules and regulations. This consistency validated the importance of policies within the school and resulted in less resistance among the students. The need to discipline students was less of an issue when teachers and administrators succeeded in working together and had trusting and supportive relationships. When such relationships did not exist, an atmosphere of frustration and distrust was cultivated. Fewer discipline issues resulted in a better learning environment. A better learning environment led to lower school-safety costs.

Not all school employees had the same attitude toward educating youth. It was logical to compare a school with a low school capital, producing less positive outcomes, to a family with low social capital (Plagens, 2010). Resentment among staff members could have resulted from poor relationships. Poor relationships led to isolated educators who did not share resources or information. Information about a student's learning strengths and weaknesses, or methods of successful discipline, was worthless when not shared. Resources, opportunities for educational growth, and achievement increase may have been missed if educators and administrators did not trust each other.

Post-secondary plans. Studies showed an increase in post-secondary interest when creating a culture encouraging education (Weinstein, & Savitz-Romer, 2009). Schools could have created an atmosphere of excitement for continuing education after

high school by distributing college information, having clear expectations for the students, providing resources, involving the faculty members, and offering test preparation. Secondary schools should have sought partnerships with technical schools, colleges, and universities, planned visits to a variety of post-secondary institutions and college fairs, and invited these organizations to come to the school.

Although social capital matters, it did not replace academic preparation in importance for college preparation. As high schools ramped up the enthusiasm for graduating students and post-secondary education, schools must also have informed students that college readiness was just as important as being accepted to a college (Liou, Antrop-Gonzalez, & Cooper, 2009). Students who had academic and study skills increased their probability of success. Accumulation of social capital could have been an added advantage. Relationships in a typical workplace had a significant effect on the overall performance of a business. Similarly, positive social capital in schools produced greater academic and social achievement.

Schools working together. It was difficult to find research pertaining to schools working together. Networking was rare unless a high school was serving an area elementary school. Even such schools had very little collaboration with the exception of teacher in-service days or an occasional time when older students could volunteer to help the younger students. When a collaborative effort could be found through training, the report of increase in school capital is tremendous (Phelps & Graham, 2008).

Networks have been built between schools, providing resources and encouragement. The Networked Learning Communities program was an effort to connect 1000 schools into 80 networks to collaboratively share information in an effort to

improve school systems. Even after the program closed in 2006, some of the schools continued to work together (Chapman, 2008).

The Memphis schools initiated a reform effort (Armstrong, 2012). This effort involved site visits to other schools to witness success attainable in all schools. The rationale behind the plan read:

> When districts look to exemplars and models of professional learning that result in teacher and student learning, they accelerate their own learning and create a vision of how they can establish effective, results oriented communities of learners (Armstrong, 2012, pp. 51-52)

As a result of these visits and exchanges of knowledge between the schools, Memphis schools adopted mentoring and evaluation processes to decrease the learning gap within their school system. The program result was a clear argument for building social capital between schools.

Social Capital Between School, Family, and Community

In the United States, schools were a major part of a youth's upbringing. Because students spent so much time in schools, networking within the school could have made a positive impact on the community, families, and the school itself. This next section presented an overview of research about school social capital when working with communities and families.

School-to-Community Social Capital

School-to-community social capital in this dissertation specifically examined school networks distributing community information, increasing economic growth, reaching out to broader networks, providing assistance to community members, and

increasing trust and fellowship using efforts within the school. Researchers found

efforts to connect a school to its community could have combated negative outside

influences and prevented having to shut the draw bridge while school was in session

(Brooks, 2009).

      Community information. Community violence could have been a detriment to

school achievement in many urban schools. Patton and Johnson (2010) investigated

communities where urban violence was a prevalent part of life. Three schools that

overcame negative effects of community violence were closely examined to find any

advice that may be rendered to similar environments. One of the suggested strategies

was to develop close ties with local organizations that could join in the effort to help

youth in these violent atmospheres.   When schools had information about direct services,

programming, or initiatives to curb urban youth violence, these resources were put into

action with the encouragement of teachers and school leaders who already had a

relationship with students.

      Increasing economic growth. Researchers have found schools that involved

community increased economic growth, especially in impoverished neighborhoods

(Bingler, Blank, & Berg, 2008). Secular and faith-based organizations provided poverty-

to-work programs that created positive personal networks (Lockhart, 2005). These

programs were structured to enable economic growth for families. Schools provided

classrooms for these programs that otherwise may have been inaccessible. Schools may

have hosted adult training classes to provide computer, literacy, mathematics, and/or job

training skills, preparing residents for employment opportunities.

In an effort to revitalize rural New Mexico, The Rural Education Bureau (REB) and the Center for Relational Learning (CRL) partnered in a program including both public and private organizations (Pitzel, et al., 2007). During the first year, six schools were involved. The superintendents and mayors of the communities were mandated to participate. A real desire for improvement in the economic status was necessary for successful programming. The schools in the community committed to playing a major role in the process by providing community education focused on the overall revitalization.

This program began with extensive discussions involving members of the community, the REB, and the CRL about the needed change and what mattered most to the residents. Within a year, improvements were made including a five million dollar capital works project for school improvement, town beautification projects, fine arts after school programs for community members, availability of community health services, and partnerships with community colleges.

Reaching out to broader networks. Along with provided space for community programs, schools could have provided a location for outside businesses to host training seminars for employees (*W.H. Kellogg Foundation Handbook*, 2004). Access to the school may have encouraged local outside business owners to have considered a business branch within the community. This offer may also have cultivated a desire for the businesses to reciprocate with donations or opportunities. One school offered a teacher as an extern to a business, to present seminars to their employees on how to become more involved in their child's education (*Adopt-a-school in reverse?: District 'loans' teacher to utility company*, 1993).

Distance learning had become a broad network for schools (Kirby, & Sharpe, 2010). Schools could have offered courses they could not had otherwise made available to students or they had to utilize distance learning in areas where there were a shortage of teachers or for advanced level students (Wallace, 2009). For instance, a gifted student may have had a desire to study Japanese language. The school could have made a distance classroom an option.

Distance learning could have also linked students from very different parts of the globe. Spanish teachers in the United States may have been able to connect with a high school in Spain. Not only could the students have had the opportunity to practice their speaking skills, but also learned more about the culture and learning environments. A few other benefits when students linked to distance education courses included the ability to take university level courses, a higher self confidence in using technology, and a more positive attitude toward school.

Many outside business and education leaders, politicians, public service employees, tribal group leaders, parents and extended family members came together for a summit to create a strong local economy in Alaska North Slope (Patkotak, 2010). This area was the home of the Iñupiaq and was located in the northernmost city of the United States. The goal was to create a smooth transition from high school to higher education or employment. The emphasis was on *bridging* the youth to opportunities, while preserving their language and culture. The adults let the youth express their fears and concerns and broke them into small groups so as not to overwhelm them. The summit ended with a commitment to smooth the transition when *bridging* youth to opportunities in higher education and careers.

Providing assistance to community members. Projects such as the *Second Tuesday Project* can encourage students to become vested in their community (Cole, 2010). This project utilized classrooms to build ties within the community by requiring seniors to identify a community problem and then find a community agency or organization that is targeted to fixing the problem. After finding an appropriate agency, seniors volunteered monthly, researched the problem, wrote a research paper, and finally, presented their project at a research symposium.

There were also direct benefits for students when schools build caring community connections (Hoyle & Slater, 2001). The growth of the cooperative-learning movement had aided the process of improving communication and working together. Students can learn teamwork and develop a feeling of self-worth when helping others. In one example, a student in an affluent neighborhood joined a community outreach program. This student often discussed how he made a difference in the lives of others even though his life was less than perfect, having been raised by nannies and tutors. Teens were given opportunities to build some effective networks, storing this information for themselves or others for when it is needed.

As stated earlier, strong social capital within the schools could have built a mutual agreement about acceptable and expected behavior (Gottfredson & Di Pietro, 2011). This capital became instilled in students which would have been carried outside school boundaries and applied in their communities. For example, when schools fostered caring and nurturing attributes in their students, students cared and were more willing to help others in need.

Community schools had been successful in dozens of communities across the nation (Bingler, Blank, & Berg, 2008). Some examples included East Elementary in Kings Mountain, North Carolina; Elliott Elementary School in Lincoln, Nebraska; Francis Scott Key Elementary School in Indianapolis, Indiana; Howe Elementary School in Greenbay, Wisconsin; and many others profiled in the 2003 article, *Coalition for Community Schools* (Blank, Melaville, & Shah, 2003). These schools were built around community resources and address the physical, social, and emotional needs of students. Schools offered the community refuge centers during disasters, family health centers, after school tutoring programs, parent involvement, and family resource rooms. The attitude was to include everyone in order to work together for success.

Schools needed to foster a sense of community and partnership with their students instead of radical individualism (Hoyle & Slater, 2001). Without a positive social capital, student self-interest could have led to the loss of the desire to be connected with others. Schools can change radical individualism by nurturing a student's social capital as in the *Second Tuesday Project* previously mentioned (Cole, 2010). Community schools were successful in developing young citizens who care about the neighborhood in which they live, and consequently they became actively involved in the betterment of society (Gottfredson & Di Pietro, 2011).

School social workers were often employed by the school providing counseling needs to the community and school in times of crisis (Massat, Moses & Ornstein, 2008). Whether employed by the school or provided by an outside agency, social workers often have the uncomfortable task of dealing with the loss of life, whether it is a parent, sibling, teacher, or other significant figure in the school system. It is important for social workers

60

to be in communication with the involved families, the school, and the public to report accurate and sensitive information to help with the grieving process.

Increase trust and fellowship. It has been a mere sixty years since education in the United States severed the trust with many families (Brooks, 2009). As a result of school desegregation, 91,009 African American teachers and administrators were fired. These individuals, when replaced, were replaced with White Americans. The affect is still present today, as only 8.9% of teachers are African American compared to the 12% in 1950.

Data express a loss in social capital, isolating African American and other minority communities due a history of broken relationships with school authorities (Brooks, 2009). Along with economic decline, higher drop-out rates, loss of belonging to community, and increased racism, trust had very little chance of existing.

In order to rebuild the social capital in these communities, school leaders must reach out and build alliances with community members and businesses. For instance, a school that builds a relationship with the local press is more likely receive positive reports, which will be read by the community members. Leaders must also do their homework about the background of the communities in their districts to know how the residents react and overcome the challenges they are faced with on a day-to-day basis.

Principals who encouraged community and family members to be an integral part of the school environment acknowledged, value, and show respect to the community members. Principals must be less hierarchical and more open to suggestions from those who live and operate business in the area. Empowering the community and recognizing

the benefits reaped from a positive social capital can increase success in struggling schools replacing the destruction of trusting relationships with a stronger unified trust.

School-to-Family Social Capital

The 19th century brought a need for childcare services as women increasingly entered the workforce (Conley, 2010). Schools have provided not only childcare, but education and social skills to children while parents are at work. Through governmental and private funding many programs have been available to the poor, making these resources accessible to all children. Programs such as Head Start, church supported programs, and poverty initiated governmental programs are examples. Government subsidies have been intermittent, but made available during times of great need such as The Depression, World War II, and when female employment increased during the 20th century. Schools making childcare available to their communities are increasing opportunities for all children to build their family social capital.

Community information to families. School districts can increase social capital by relaying both direct and indirect services that provide benefits to families. Awareness of local organizations that supply resources, such as housing, medical, and employment information is especially important in poverty level communities (Lockhart, 2005; Meier, 1999; Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). For instance, schools may supply information about community services by sending home literature, holding informational meetings, or posting the services on a web page or outside marquee. When schools build a strong network within the community, schools increase the social capital of the residents by becoming an avenue to needed services.

Informational meetings at the school can also aid parents with procedures necessary to prepare students for post-secondary education. In many cases, parents do not know where to start, how to set-up college visits, or where to find scholarship possibilities. Because children often neglect or are ignorant of these steps, parents need to be aware of how to apply for aid and of the steps and deadlines involved in getting their children accepted to the college of their choice. This is especially important with first generational college-bound students, whose parents have not experienced the process within their immediate family (Liou, Antrop-Gonzalez, & Cooper, 2009). For example, high school counselors could schedule parent planning meetings for the student, parents, and counselor to look at possibilities for the student. At the very least, an auditorium style information session in the evenings may suit parent schedules.

Increasing economic growth. Social capital increases the economic growth within a district (Iyer, Kitson, & Toh, 2005). The levels of education and social capital have a strong association. Schools increase human capital through providing education, which in turn will allow for better career choices for students, thus increasing prosperity and the overall quality of life. As a result, schools receive fiscal benefits from this growth, which could translate into improved facilities, enhanced programs, and higher salaries for educators. As the students succeed in life, many will return to their hometowns for employment. When students have positive high school experiences, they will want to invest in the future of the school for their own children.

The three-year New Hope program showed significant results when assessed five years later in academic, social, and career success in African American boys (Huston, et al., 2001; McLoyd, Kaplan, Purtell, & Huston, 2011). This project

encouraged adults in poverty to work full-time by providing wage supplements to raise the income above the poverty threshold, and subsidies for health and child care. New Hope was a three year-project to test an employment-based antipoverty program's successfulness.

The program displayed promise in academic achievement and social behavior, particularly in boys. The possibility that this program may have redirected the antisocial and unwanted behavior in boys living in poverty is an exciting result. If problems would have been corrected at a young age, these boys may have had a better adolescent experience, resulting in greater success.

Preparing for higher education. Preparing students for higher education opportunities is an avenue for greater student success (Liou, Antrop-Gonzalez, & Cooper, 2009; Meier, 1999). School professionals can help students apply for colleges and universities, financial aid, and employment (Bryan, Moore-Thomas, Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2011). School counselors can make up for the parents' limited resources, knowledge, and time to prepare their child for secondary education. This is especially the case for low-income students, given they may be the first generation to continue their education after high school graduation.

Many schools have integrated these processes into their curriculum. For instance, classes designed for student success will give high school credit on assignments involving creating resumes, cover letters, college and university applications, grants, and scholarships. Schools could have offered training to the parents. Many parents were not given the opportunity to attend college. They may not know where to begin the process now. If schools offer admissions assistance to all

families, it will benefit families by increasing income, which in-turn will benefit the community through economic growth. The schools would benefit through *reciprocity* and by having more parents in the district who know the value of education. Studies show that better educated parents encourage the education of their children (Overstreet, Devine, Bevans, & Efreom, 2005). Nonetheless, having a support system for families will decrease the burden on those who are frustrated by these processes, whether the parents are educated or not.

On the other hand, students not meeting with their high school counselors about the application process for college generally will not apply. Students, who visited their high school counselor by tenth grade, were more likely to apply to more than one college, which yielded a higher acceptance probability (Bryan, Moore-Thomas, Day-Vines, & Holcomb-McCoy, 2011). Thus relationships between high school counselors and students can affect the chances of students continuing their education. If counselors take a vested interest in meeting with students, the students become more motivated and follow through with college applications.

Schools can empower families with the education needed to break poverty patterns. The challenge for these schools involves the lack of resources and the resulting inability to recruit master teachers (Bryan, Moore-Thomas, Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2011). This poses a particular problem in low-income schools where counselors have duties other than providing academic advice. If the counselors are not given time to meet with the students, they may either not meet at all or hand select the students that they feel are most likely to succeed at the college level.

Some colleges and universities provide resources and experience opportunities to students. Science and math experiences have been made available to K-12 public school students by East Carolina University (James, Laatsch, Bosse, Rider, Lee & Anderson, 2006). The objective is to spark interest in areas of mathematics and science to increase success in fields requiring these skills. Faculty members are guests in the classroom, demonstrating an inquiry learning approach. Faculty then, work with the school teachers, helping them to align curriculum to initiate education reform. Some of these interactions also take place via video conferencing.

Result of a School-Community-Family Network

This brief overview of school-community and school-family social capital honed in on the topics of schools' ability to distribute community information, increase economic growth, reach out to broader networks, provide assistance to community members, and increase trust and fellowship from within the school. There are many other aspects of school social capital, each of which could be developed into a separate dissertation. For the purpose of this dissertation, the researcher's objective is to offer a glimpse of the topics in order to provide a better understanding of how connecting school, family, and community social capital may look.

A Look at Public and Private Schools

No one can examine every aspect of the school systems present during the time of this dissertation. The researcher used one public and one private high school, similar in demographics and structure, to gather information that may be helpful when combined with other quality research. To clarify the difference between the two systems, this section summarizes what it is meant to be a public and a private school.

Private schools and public schools shared some characteristics. To clarify a couple of the connections, we will use Coleman & Hoffers definitions of *value community* and *functional community* (1987). *Functional community* refers to a community that lived by a dominant set of norms. These norms may have reflected similar values among members of the community, but some members may not have shared those values. A *value community* was a group that shared the same values, but may not necessarily by a part of a functional community. Private and public schools can contain both.

Public Schools in the United States

The public school in the United States are themselves a very diverse group. In 1781, the southern aristocrat and revolutionary, Thomas Jefferson, published *Notes on the State of Virginia* in which he suggested a state funded education for all white children in America (Reese, 2007). His suggestion was ground-breaking but denied by the Virginia legislature. Jefferson did not get to witness his suggestion come to fruition, but nineteenth century reformers were greatly influenced by his work. Before state funded schools, education was reserved for only those born into an elite social class. Jefferson and others recognized that brilliance could come from any class and all (Whites) should be given the opportunity to an education for economic success and advancement.

State funded schools prior to the 1860's in the New England area reflected Christian values. Horace Mann claimed state funded schools to be the opportunity that immigrants and current residents needed to defeat poverty, maintain and protect the rich, and instill social order (Reese, 2007). Early on, schools were given the responsibility of finding solutions to all of life's problems. Schools would soon be responsible for feeding

the poor, providing vocational alternatives for the less academic, sex education, and basic living skills such as cooking and driving.

In the 1920's, a study examined American public schools and found they reflected their communities. Because public schools were products of these communities, there was little conflict between family and school norms. On the flip side, the originally founded Christian institutions that were said to reflect American community, removed prayer and the Bible from school systems in the 1960's (Jeynes, 2010).

Much has changed since the 1700's, but the notion that schools bear the responsibility of societal problems remains the same. Attributes that define a public school include, structure of governance, funding, and students who attend. Coleman & Hoffer published a book describing public and private schools and their differences (1987). Public schools are described as societal instruments to broaden horizons, defeat poverty, or implement a common American identity; they reflect the early history of American schools.

Governance. The U.S. Department of Education does not govern public schools. Instead, its primary purpose is to disseminate and monitor federal funds supporting education, ensure equal opportunities, protect from discrimination, bring attention to key educational issues, and collect data from American schools for research (U. S. Department of Education, *About ED: Overview and mission statement*). A public school is governed by the state in which it operates through a State Department of Education.

Some state departments of education names are slightly different, such as Washington's State Education Agency. Nonetheless, it is this government run office that regulates the public schools. Organizational charts for the department of education vary

from state to state. Schools are broken up into manageable groups called districts, some by counties and some by location. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, schools are separated into districts by locations. In neighboring West Virginia, schools are grouped by counties (U.S. Department of Education, *State Contacts*). The state department of education is responsible for overseeing several specific areas in each district. In Tennessee, for example, the State Department of Education regulates organizational and operational structures, administration, evaluation of licensed personnel, state curriculum, graduation requirements, library, pupil personal services, and special education programs and services (Rules of the State Board of Education, 2008).

Regardless of how districts are determined, public schools are operated locally by school boards either elected or appointed (Watson, February, 2008). The school board is generally responsible for hiring a superintendent and approving the hiring of principals, faculty, and other school employees. Sometimes the district superintendent may have an assistant or deputy superintendent. The superintendent is in charge of delegating a principal or head of school to each individual school, and hires other district staff members as well, including any assistant principals. There also may be assistant principal positions. The principals recruit licensed teachers for recommended hire.

At the time of this research, there was no federal regulation on curriculum; each state decided what was taught in their school systems. The curriculum may have been quite different from state to state and the same was true of the standardized tests used. A student, who took a standardized test in Ohio and passed with proficiency, could have conceivable failed with a score of "below basic" in another state. There was a strong movement for a common core curriculum to be adopted by all states to alleviate the

differences, but an array of controversy including the development of the common core was also an issue (Stewart & Varner, 2012; Tienken, 2012).

Funding. Public school funding is just as controversial and complicated. Government funding for education was reported as one fifth of the total state and local budgets in 1996 (Moser & Rubenstein, 2002). According to the U.S. Census and rounding to the nearest billion, about 600 billion government dollars were reported as revenue for elementary and secondary United States public school systems in 2011 (*Public Education Finances: 2011,* 2013). The federal government supplied $74 billion, states funded $266 billion, and local governments $260 billion. State spending varied greatly, from the Dakotas and the District of Columbia each spent only $1.3 billion, to California, who spent about $68 billion.

Comparing total spending budgets, the U.S. Census Bureau reported 27% ($861 billion) of the total local and state expenditures in the United States went toward education (*State and Local Government Finances Summary: 2011,* 2013). Since $599 billion is reported as revenue for the elementary and secondary schools and $861 billion (27%) is reported as total education expenditures, a few calculations show 19% of expenditures represent elementary and secondary education systems. This percentage matches the one-fifth reported in 1996 by Moser and Rubenstein (2002).

While state and local spending remained fairly constant at about 20% of the total state and local budgets, federal spending increased from 5.7% to 8.3% of the total budget from 1991 to 2004 (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Federal funds were mainly sent directly to states and local districts, to support programming to help improve

education. For instance, $13.3 billion has been used to support ESEA Title I programs for low income families.

Total education funding has increased at all levels of government even taking into account confounding variables such as enrollment levels and inflation (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). By the end of the 2004-2005 school-year, spending had increased a staggering 105% since 1991-1992 school year. The increase was believed to be associated to the legislature's attempt to ensure school accountability.

With the total amount of spending close to $600 billion, the cost to educate each child for one school year is worth examining. The U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics released a table displaying the unadjusted and adjusted dollars spent per pupil from 1961 through 2009 (2012). In 1961, the amount, adjusted to 2009's value, is reported at $2,835 per pupil. The numbers have increased annually, to a reported adjusted amount of $10,694 (unadjusted $10,591) in 2008 - 2009.

States also vary in the amount spent per pupil. In 2009, Utah reported the lowest per pupil expenditure for public elementary and secondary students at $6612 per pupil for the 2008-2009 school-year. Other low reporting states include Idaho, Arizona, Oklahoma, and Tennessee all trickling in around $7500 per pupil. On the other end, the District of Columbia topped the chart at $19,698 per pupil. Runners up include New Jersey and New York in the $17,000's per pupil. However, these amounts are not reported as adjusted to current day, nor did they consider the cost of living per state.

Public schools are mainly funded through their government affiliations. In addition, schools fundraise and write grants for specific needs, but these efforts are quite time consuming. Schools may hire a grant writer or assign the duty of grant writing to an

employee, such as the guidance counselor. Guidance counselors in many schools are

responsible for many fiscal areas, and grant writing can play a large part in saving money

for school districts (Vernon & Rainey, 2009).   Resources for grants are easily found

through internet searches. Public schools have an advantage in being eligible for federal

or state funded grants that exclude private schools with religious affiliations.

Students. After examining governing and funding in the United States public

school systems, an overview of students attending public schools is the last attribute

added to this research. In 2012, 49.8 million students attended public schools as reported

by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (*Fast

facts: Back to school statistics,* 2012). The public school that children have access to

generally depends on residence, but there are some specific exceptions.

A group of attorneys established the Educational Law Center in 1973 to ensure

children receive the educational programs necessary for their needs (Education Law

Center, 2005). Adequately meeting the specific needs of children often involves proper

placement in public schools and the implementation of programs in these schools.

In December of 2001, New Jersey's Department of Education adopted policies to

protect children's educational opportunities during residency disputes (Education Law

Center, 2005). Students can attend a specific public school if the student's parent or

guardian is domiciled within the school district. A student can only have one domicile at

a time, even if they have more than one home, and they must be presently domiciled in

the school district. A family that intends to move to a district or leaves a district at any

period throughout the school-year, does not have a right to attend that particular public

school. Emancipated students may have their own permanent residence, but bear the burden of proving their independence.

When parents are divorced, the process may be more complicated, especially when there is no court order. The bottom is that a child has only one domicile, and will be provided transportation from that domicile only. Parents need to consider the residence of the children during separation or divorce. A district is not obligated to transport a child from more than one residence; even they are within the same district.

In New Jersey, when situations arise where the child does not have legal status or is residing in a home that violates local zoning laws, it is illegal to deny that student an education (Education Law Center, 2005). For example, if a child is permanently living in a camper on someone else's property and that camper violates the local zoning ordinances, that child must still be allowed to attend the public school in that district. Similarly, a child who is temporarily living with their parents in a school district cannot be denied access to attend the public school in that district.

There are always conditions that do not meet the norm (Education Law Center, 2005). If a family's home is located in more than one school district, then the district that received the most property tax from the family will be considered the family's domicile. If the amount is equal, there are guidelines that will determine the domiciled district.

If a student's family is experiencing severe economic hardship, a caregiver's home may become a domicile of that student for no longer than one school year (Education Law Center, 2005). It is not necessary for the caregiver to have legal custody or guardianship of the student and the school district may not demand proof of custody or guardianship. A written affidavit is sufficient.

There are instances of hardship that render a child homeless. If a child is homeless, the school should provide as much aid as possible to assist the family in enrolling the child and assisting with processes to grant the family relief (Illinois State Board of Education, 2012). The determination of which public school a homeless child is to attend can be complicated, but a few guidelines have been established. In Illinois, a homeless child can attend public school in the last district in which they had permanent residence, the last school in which they were enrolled, or in the public school where they may be temporarily staying with non-homeless residents.

The United States Supreme Court ruled it illegal to deny admission to a student based on immigrant status (Education Law Center, 2005; Illinois State Board of Education, 2012). There is an exception for students who are in the United States under a Certificate of Eligibility for Nonimmigrant Student Status (INS form I20) in order to receive an F-1 Visa. These children do not have a right to a public education. They may attend a school for the purpose of limited study on a tuition basis.

Deciding which public school a child will attend may seem simple to most residents, however, certain situations can be quite complicated. When determining residency, many states follow guidelines similar to those previously discussed, the goal in all situations is to ensure that a child never be denied a public education.

Private Schools in the United States

Before state-funded schools, private education was the only option in America. There were several, but lack of timely transportation restricted options and most schools served their communities or were limited to those of social privilege. Today's United States private schools are a vast array of sizes, shapes, and philosophies, but can be

74

limiting in curricula and enrollment. The Council for American Private Education (2013) reports 25% of all United States schools are categorized as private. In 2011, there were 30,861 private elementary and secondary schools with 4,494,845 pupils and 420,880 full-time equivalent teachers (Broughman & Swaim, 2013).

The U.S. Department of education operates the Office of Non-public Education (ONPE). The objectives of this office are (a) represent the U.S. Department of Education, (b) assist with the Department of Education matters involving nonpublic schools, (c) communicate with national, state and local education agencies on nonpublic school topics, (d) provide parents with information on educational options for children, and (e) provide technical assistance, workshops and publications (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Non-public Education, 2013). Since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965, certain federal programs are available to private schools, The ONPE website boasts of fostering "maximum participation of nonpublic school students and teachers in federal education programs and initiatives."

Several attributes are common to private schools. Attributes described in this review will include structure of governance, funding, and students who attend. In their book, Coleman and Hoffer (1987) describe private schools as more of an extension of family, supporting the same values and ideals. Parents will choose schools based on an agreement of philosophy and values.

Governance. Because education is regulated by each individual state, private school regulation varies. The U.S. Department of education published a document, "State Regulation of Private Schools," as a resource for public and nonpublic schools on state requirements to be recognized as a nonpublic school in each state (U.S. Department

of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). The legal requirements listed for each state include areas of accreditation, registration, health and safety, transportation, tax exemption status, public aid, professional development and more.

The U.S. Department of Education clearly states the document is informational only and is meant to demonstrate the ability of the nation to offer a variety of options in the area of elementary and secondary education. The document also clarifies the difference between private and religious private schools, which often have fewer regulations.

A portion from the report of West Virginia will be outlined in this section (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement, 2009). West Virginia non-public schools are not required to seek accreditation, licensing, or approval. The entity must register with the state superintendent of schools or seek approval from the local school board of education to operate or participate in comprehensive testing of basic skills. The teachers employed at the non-public schools need not be certified, and the length of the school year must be equal to that in the county school system or a minimum of 180 days with five instructional hours.

The requirements concerning curriculum include a year of West Virginia history by eighth grade and continued history courses similar to the public school. The nonpublic West Virginia schools must also use a state prescribed course of study in fire prevention. If the school offers driver's education, the course must comply with the minimum state board of education standards. There is also a responsibility to develop the students to become literate citizens and the basic language of instruction for all registered or approved schools is English.

Non-public schools are required to keep updated and accurate records of attendance, immunizations, and submit this information to the state superintendent along with the name of the school, the address, and the head administrator. These records aid schools in reporting the students who need transportation. The county boards of education provide transportation to private schools that must comply with bus safety regulations, and also provide state adopted textbooks for pupils with financial need.

Another state provision requires the state superintendent to provide for exceptional needs children in private schools. In the areas of health and safety, the county boards of education may provide health screenings for vision, hearing, speech and language. A private school must allow the fire marshal to inspect and report his findings and recommendations to the administration, and be subject to fire, health, and safety inspections by the proper demographic authorities. There are also strict distance guidelines for anyone convicted of a felony for distribution of controlled substances or possession of firearms.

There are several areas in which there are no state policies including nursing and health, technology, professional development, and reimbursement for state and local functions. Nonpublic schools are also tax exempt. There are no constitutional provisions nor are there programs available for tuition assistance.

As mentioned earlier, not all states have the same regulations (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). The District of Columbia has a constitutional provision involving religious entities; in Connecticut, there is no state requirement for the length of school year; Florida schools are mandated to register with the state, whereas Georgia has no requirements for accreditation, registration, licensing,

or approval. As far as tuition assistance, some states have financial assistance programs and others do not. Some of these areas will be expanded upon in the funding section.

Since the schools are private and softly, if at all, regulated by governmental agencies, the structure of private schools varies as well. Parents are responsible for investigating the structure of a private school and determining if the structure is what is desired for their child's education. Some private schools are operated by non-profit boards of directors, others by businesses, and others by religious institutions. The only regulations are those required by the state.

Funding. All schools, whether private or public, need money to operate. In the United States, private schools set their own tuition and admission requirements. There is very little, if any, federal, state, or local government funding for private schools. The funding that is available is restricted to specific needs such as textbooks, transportation, and exceptional students. There has been a plethora of lawsuits, policies, and controversies over any government money supporting private schools (Bassett, 2008). Some argue funding supports the mission regardless of where the funding is applied. Others believe it is not support, but impartiality provided by utilizing funds for private education. Without government funding, the expense falls back on the families unless there are significant backers, like a diocese, benefactors, or financial scholarship programs available (James, 2007).

With Catholic schools in the mix, the average tuition is about $6500 (Garnet, 2010). In 2008, average elementary tuition levels ranged from close to $5000 at Catholic schools to $15,945 at non-sectarian schools. Other religious school tuition are closer to the level at Catholic schools, with an average of about $6500 (Council for American

Private Education, 2013). All tuition amounts could be out of reach for students living in poverty, but some programs have been put in place to provide financial relief in participating areas.

With the weary state of many urban public schools, some suggest cities take a closer look at tax incentives to make private schooling affordable to middle class families (Garnet, 2010). In 2004, one fourth of families reported their main reason for moving to their current residence was the public schools available. The attraction of affordable urban private schools could draw families that would otherwise avoid the city due to poor public school options. As of 2009, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Indiana have scholarship tax credit programs.

Pennsylvania's *Educational Income Tax Credit Program* (EITC) is governed through the Department of Community and Economic Development (Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, 2013). In the EITC program, businesses can receive up to a 90% tax credit if they pay certain taxes such as Corporate Net Income Tax, Capital Stock Franchise Tax, or Insurance Premiums Tax. Once approved for the credit, the business will make a contribution to an approved scholarship foundation for the amount normally paid in the qualified taxes. Designating the amount to a specific private K-12 entity to be used strictly for scholarships to financially needy students is one such possibility. If a two-year commitment is made, the business will receive a 90% tax credit and a federal tax deduction for the donation.

The families receiving the scholarship must apply according to the approved scholarship foundation's guidelines. Currently, a family in Pennsylvania qualifies for aid if their income does not exceed $75,000 plus an additional $15,000 per dependent. Some

scholarship organizations determine the amount that qualifying families receive while others allow the school to compute the amount, but families cannot be awarded 100% of the tuition cost.

Some people believe competition between schools result in higher achievement. In order for that to happen, all students must be given an opportunity to attend the school of their choice. To level the tuition playing field, some suggest the implementation of voucher programs (Barrow & Rouse, 2008). A voucher is a coupon redeemable for tuition to private schools or higher performing public schools. The amount of the voucher is the maximum dollar amount spent per child in the local public school district.

In 2007 – 2008, Florida, Ohio, Wisconsin and the District of Columbia supplied vouchers to 55,000 students to attend the K – 12 school of their choice (Barrow & Rouse, 2008). Washington D.C. provides a federally funded opportunity scholarship to families whose income does not exceed 185 percent of the federal poverty level. Beyond academic achievement, benefits of the voucher program include safer school environments, equal opportunity to attend private schools, and greater parent satisfaction with their school choice.

Catholic schools emerged as a result of concern over the sectarian influence on the translated Bible used in public schools (James, 2007). Catholic parish schools started with one school in 1783 in Philadelphia, and quickly flourished. The goal was to have one school for each parish. It was common practice for Catholic families to include tithing to the church as part of their budget, and both the diocese and the parish financially supported the parish school as a part of their mission. As a result, Catholic

schools were able to keep tuition costs lower than other private school options. The average Catholic elementary school tuition was still under $5000 in 2003-2004.

As our United States culture has become more secular, Catholic school enrollment has started declining drastically, and parish schools are disappearing (James, 2007). It has been claimed that the decline is due to lack of a perceived difference between the values taught in Catholic and public schools. Nonetheless, those struggling Catholic schools that still remain have been able to maintain a lower tuition than other private schools.

Private schools also utilize fundraising, grants, and business sponsors to provide for financial needs of the school (Rogalski, 2003). Fundraising and grant writing duties may be assigned to school employees, or they may be farmed out to outside agencies (Vernon & Rainey, 2009). Private schools are not eligible for many state and federal grants. Religious private schools are even less likely to qualify for grants. On the other hand, some grants are only available to specific types of private schools. It takes patience and perseverance to be successful at grant writing.

Students. It is obviously more expensive for families to have their children attend private schools unless they reside in a state offering full vouchers and they are eligible. The Council for American Private Education (2013) reported that 10% of all U.S. students attended private schools in 2009-2010. This section will explore the characteristics of students who attend private schools.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 12% of families with annual incomes of over $75,000 enroll their students in private schools and 3% actually have children in both public and private schools (Council for American Private Education, 2013). From 1993 – 2007, the overall percentage of students attending religious private schools

increased by about 8.5; for non-religious private schools the increase was about 2.3%

(U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009).

In all regions of the country, there is evidence of a trend away from enrolling

children in the assigned public school in which they reside for White, Black, students not

from low-income families, students with parents of higher education accomplishments,

and two-parent households (Grady & Bielick, 2010). Particularly in religious private

schools, there is an enrollment increase in White, Black, high school students, students

living in the South, and two-parent households. Also, a greater percentage of students

residing in cities versus rural or small towns enroll in private schools.

The composition of student bodies in nonsectarian schools is similar to students

who enroll in religious private schools (Grady & Bielick, 2010), but a few differences

resonate. A lower percentage of students enroll in nonsectarian private schools than in

their religious private counterparts. The greatest difference is seen when comparing the

level of education of the parents. Parents who hold graduate degrees or higher are more

apt to choose a nonsectarian private school.

When looking at race, White students are the majority of those enrolling in private

schools both religious and nonsectarian, with 73% and 69% of the enrollment

respectively (Grady & Bielick, 2010). Black and Hispanic students are next in line at

about 10%, followed by Asian or Pacific Islander and other minorities. Southern areas

account for 35% of religious private school and 33% of nonsectarian private school

enrollment, while 32% of nonsectarian private school enrollment is in the West.

Students of low-income are definitely at a disadvantage if they want to attend

private school, as statistics indicate that finances play a key role in the ability to attend.

Some states are moving toward financial assistance through tax credits and voucher programs to level the access field. There remains much controversy in the school choice arena, and while that remains, private schools will be limited to those who can afford tuition.

Summary of Literature Review

This Literature Review is intended to give the reader some background on topics related to the case study performed by the researcher. Social capital is a dense topic and has been credited for success in business, communities, and families. There also remains criticism of repression and racism in situations involving families and *bonding* of social capital. It is worth investigating evidence of any impact social capital may play in education.

Before making conclusions, topics related to social capital must be understood. Whole child education leads to increased success, not only academically, but socially, emotionally, and even spiritually. The effort of educating the whole child involves a variety of resources that can be obtained using social capital.

The concepts of *reciprocity, bridging*, and *bonding* further explain how networks can link individuals, with beneficial results. These concepts are evident in all areas of family, community, and school capital. Linking the three can result in a whole new area of creating networks otherwise unobtainable.

CHAPTER THREE

PROCEDURES

As stated in chapter one, this dissertation consisted of a case study of one public

and one private school with similar demographics, socioeconomic status, and enrollment.

To keep the Pennsylvania researcher socially removed from schools involved in the case

study, two schools were chosen in the neighboring state of West Virginia. The schools

are both located in the Northern Panhandle, in the same Regional Education Service

Agency (RESA), RESA VI, and enroll between 175 and 225 students. The high school

institutions' demographic information was obtained, through a web search, from the 2012

U.S. Census, the West Virginia Department of Education, the schools' websites, and the

RESA VI agency (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County Quickfacts, 2013). The study

investigates the perceptions of administrators and faculty members about levels of social

capital in their schools, families, and surrounding communities.

Structure of the Educational System

The West Virginia Department of Education is run by a State Board of Education

consisting of twelve members (West Virginia Department of Education, 2013). The

board consists of nine citizens, no five of which can belong to the same political party,

and three ex-officio members: the state superintendent of schools, the chancellor of the

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, and the chancellor of Community

and Technical College Education. In 2013, the board was led by a State Superintendent

James B. Phares, a West Virginia constitutional officer. James Phares began his role in

January, 2013 after gaining a wealth of experience in the field of education and a

reputation of turning around troubled schools.

The state of West Virginia is divided into eight Regional Education Service Agencies, RESA I through RESA VIII. Each RESA is subdivided into the existing West Virginia counties. The counties are comprised of high schools and their corresponding elementary schools. The map displays the subdivision of West Virginia into Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA) and counties. (West Virginia Department of Education, 2013).

Figure 1. West Virginia map of regional education service agencies.

Demographics

The U.S. Census Bureau estimated the 2012 West Virginia population to be approximately 1,856,680 compared to the 313,914,000 in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2013). In West Virginia, the population was approximately 94% White, 3.5% Black, and 2.5% other; about 50.7% of the population was female. The median income was about $40,400. About 83.4% of residents completed their high school education and 17.9% earned at least a bachelor's degree.

Hancock County, WV to City

Hancock County, WV is located at the top of West Virginia's Northern Panhandle. For 2012, Hancock County reported a population of about 30,000. Racially, 95.8% was White, 2.4% was Black or African American, and Hispanic, Latino, and Asian Americans accounted for the rest. Females comprised 51.8% of the population and the median family income was approximately $37,465 (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2013). Hancock County reported 88.2% of its residents were high school graduates and 16.5% had earned at least a bachelor's degree.

The city of Weirton is located in Hancock County. In 2012, Weirton reported a population of 19,503 with 93.7% White, 3.9% Black or African American, 1.0% Hispanic or Latino, and the remaining races each under 1% (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2013). The population was 52.7% female, and the median household income was $38,317. Weirton reported that 90.2% of its residents were high school graduates and 19.2% had at least a bachelor's degree.

Wetzel County, WV to City

Wetzel County, WV is located at the bottom end of the Northern Panhandle. The 2012 U.S. Census reported a population of 16,580, 98.5% of whom were White, and with the remaining races each under 1% (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2013). Females accounted for 50.8% of the county population and the median household income was approximately $37,897. About 82.7% of residents were high school graduates, and 11.7% held at least a bachelor's degree.

The city of New Martinsville is located in Wetzel County. In 2012, New Martinsville reported a population of 5,350 with 98.2% White ethnicity and the

remaining races each under 1% (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2013). Females comprised 52.8% of the population and the median household income was $38,469. About 84% of the population had graduated from high school and 16.4% held at least a bachelor's degree. Table 1 displays a side-by-side comparison of the statistics.

Table 1

Demographics Comparison Table 2012 Information

| | Population | Ethnicities | | | Female Persons | Median Household Income | High School Graduate or Higher | Bachelor's Degree or Higher |
		White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino				
West Virginia	1,856,680	94.0%	3.5%	1.3%	50.7%	40,400	83.4%	17.9%
Hancock County	30,305	95.8%	2.4%	1.1%	51.8%	37,465	88.2%	16.5%
Weirton	19,503	93.7%	3.9%	1.0%	52.7%	38,317	90.2%	19.2%
Wetzel County	16,580	98.5%	0.3%	0.6%	50.8%	37,897	82.7%	11.7%
New Martinsville	5,350	98.2%	0.2%	0.6%	52.8%	38,469	84.0%	16.4%

Note. This table was created by the researcher to display a side-by-side comparison of the statistics reported in the previous text taken from the U.S. Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2013).

Existing Data on Volunteering

The Corporation for National and Community Service (2012) was a federal agency that worked with thousands of non-profit and faith-based groups to generate a spirit of volunteering to provide benefits to their fellow citizens. Their website was also a

source for data collected on volunteer rates and ranking, civic engagement trends, and analysis.

At the production of this dissertation, the most recent data was collected from 2011 (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2012). The site reported 64.3 million Americans volunteered through an organization in 2011, a 1.5 million volunteer increase from 2010. Percentage-wise, 26.8% of U.S. residents volunteered over 7.85 billion volunteer-hours. Rural residents had the highest percentage of individuals whose volunteer rate was at 27.7%, suburban areas were a close second at 27.5%, and urban residents reported at 23.4%. Religious volunteering accounted for 34.4% of all volunteering, educational opportunities for 26.6%, social services for 14.2%, and the remaining types were each below 10%.

With an overall active volunteer rate of 22.7%, West Virginia is ranked 46th among the 50 states. West Virginia reverses the U.S. percentages with 20% of rural residents, 24.1% of suburban residents, and 26.4% of urban residents reported as volunteers. The researcher also notes these environments may vary widely from state to state. For instance, the urban culture in the State of California may be very different from the urban culture in West Virginia. Nonetheless, the West Virginia percentages only range by 6%.

The Corporation for National and Community Service (2012) did not list any large city volunteer rates for West Virginia. The cities closest to the case study were Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (approximately 93 miles from New Martinsville and 36 miles from Weirton) at 27.6% and Columbus, Ohio (approximately 150 miles from each case study location) at 28% volunteer rates. When examining midsize cities, the only city

listed in West Virginia was Charleston, which is approximately 150 miles from the research area and had a 33.8% volunteer rate. These three cities form a triangle around the two counties in the case study.

Methods

Robert Putnam initiated the group, Saguaro Seminar: Civic engagement in America, in 1995 at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University (Harvard University, 2013). The seminar focused on developing strategies to encourage and increase civic engagement in America. The participants were a diverse group including high elected officials, religious leaders, and common laborers. All members of the seminar were committed to connecting Americans. The seminar produced much data, including the *Better Together Report*, led to the published book (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003).

As of 2000, the largest benchmark survey conducted to measure civic engagement in America included 30,000 respondents from 40 communities in 29 of the states (Harvard University, 2013). A national survey six years later, *2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire* (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006b), was completed by 11 of the communities from the 2000 survey and included an additional 11 new communities.

This Case Study

To examine the administrator and faculty perceptions of social capital in a secondary education setting, a case study was completed with one suburban private and public school of similar demographics, socioeconomic status, and enrollment. The two

schools were located in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia. The high school

institutions were carefully selected using demographic information.

This dissertation is not completely quantitative or qualitative. It is more of a

quantitative study with qualitative tendencies. An extensive Literature Review was

explored, a survey was filled out by each participating faculty member to gather statistics,

visits were made to experience each school setting, and face-to-face administrator

interviews were also incorporated. This combination was important to gain a better

overall picture of the perceptions of social capital.

The survey used in this research was an adaptation of the *2006 Social Capital*

Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire, Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in

America (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006b). The adaptations

made to the survey included the visual format, removal of a few irrelevant questions, and

changing the wording of some questions to suit a school setting versus a home setting.

This survey now named *2013 Social Capital Community Survey Adapted* (Appendix A).

To record the responses, a spreadsheet provided by Harvard University was also

adapted to correspond with the survey. Changes included the removal of rows for

weighted and un-weighted participants. In addition, any adaptation made to the original

2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire was also made to the

response sheet. An answer sheet for the survey was created to record faculty responses

(Appendix B).

Letters and emails were sent to the West Virginia State Superintendent and to the

Wheeling-Charleston Diocese State Superintendent requesting permission to complete

the case study (Appendix C). Once superintendent permissions were granted, the

corresponding principals were contacted for permission to complete the study

(Appendix D).

After all permissions were granted and measurement tools including accessories

were completed, all documentation was sent to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for

the Protection of Human Subjects. The board regulates all research that involves human

participants to protect both the participants and researchers.

The researcher first interviewed the administration to schedule the remainder of

the study procedures at times and places convenient for those who participated

(Appendix E) (Thomas, 2003). The administrator scheduled a time for the researcher to

come in and discuss the study and procedure with the faculty and have them sign a

consent form to participate in the study (Appendix F). The adapted survey will be given

verbally to the administrator, and then to the participating faculty.

The community survey lacked questions specifically pertaining to a school

environment. Therefore, an addendum created by the researcher will be included, honing

in on school specific communication procedures, *Addendum to the Social Capital Survey

2014* (Appendix G). For instance, questions addressing parent-to-teacher communication

via progress reports or grade reporting systems were included on this addendum. Also,

questions assessing the school's participation in social media such as Facebook® and

Twitter® were also included in this addendum. These questions were more for

information versus opinion, therefore, they were only included in the administrative

portion of the case study.

The participating faculty completed the survey in a group setting. The faculty

responded directly on the survey and the researcher completed the answer sheet

(Appendix B). In both the administration and faculty surveys, the researcher personally

conducted the sessions to ensure the same demeanor when reading the script. The

schools provided access to artifacts such as newsletters, website pages, and memos sent

to the home for examination.

Results

The two selected schools were independent of each other, one being public and

the other private, with no connection. All results were recorded and then organized in a

formal report. The reported included raw data as well as the mean and standard deviation

where applicable. Raw data was used instead of the percent format implemented by the

Saguaro Seminar's 2006 national survey, due to the small sample sizes.

Once the dissertation is defended, the data will be given to the individual schools

for their reference and also given to John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard

University to add to their database.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA AND REPORT

As summarized in Chapter Three, this case study consisted of two high schools, one private and the other public located in Hancock and Wetzel counties in West Virginia. These schools were chosen for the case study to make a contribution to social capital research in the area of education.   Data collection will contribute to existing research correlating the level of social capital to the probability of student success (Coburn & Russell, 2006). Results of the study may be used by educators to incorporate new ideas or tweak old ideas in school systems and classrooms (Sances, 2006).

Public High School: Located in Wetzel County, WV

The educational system in West Virginia clustered counties into eight Regional Education Service Agencies named RESA I through RESA VIII. The public high school selected for the case study was in Wetzel County and located in RESA VI. The following data were reported from the West Virginia Department of Education's 2011 - *2012 NCLB Report Card* (West Virginia Department of Education, 2011). Families whose income was categorized by the state government as "low income" included 43.37% of enrollment. The school reported being 100% White. The average class size was reported at 10.2 students with 89.83% graduation rate and 53 graduates in 2012. Approximate enrollment of the school was listed at 209 students. The faculty consisted of 41.2% earning at least a Master's Degree, 17.6% held a Master's +45credits, and 5.9% with a Doctorate.

In this study, one administrator from the public high school participated. The initial contact was made after receiving approval from the State Superintendent of West

Virginia. A brief meeting was held for introduction purposes, and the Initial Intake

Questionnaire was completed by the administrator (Appendix E). The Initial Intake

Questionnaire collected basic school information such as the full name of the school,

grades offered, administrator's name and contact information, details about the governing

body, number of faculty members and a timeline of the school's participation in the

study.

Upon arrival at the school, the atmosphere was welcoming, and the office had a

tremendous amount of informational flyers available to students and visitors. The

information included community outreach, community and school activities, scholarship

information for seniors, and college testing information. Local business and college

information was also available. The guidance office also had a plethora of information

readily available concerning health, wellness, career, and college opportunities with

contact information in the form of brochures, pamphlets, and flyers.

Addendum From the Public High School Administrator

After the initial meeting with the faculty, the researcher reported to the

administrator's office to administer the addendum and the survey. The *2013 Social

Capital Community Survey Adapted* (Appendix A) lacked school specific questions and

was more perceptional than informational. In order to gain an accurate picture of the two

school environments, a researcher-created addendum was added to the case study

(Appendix G). The addendum to the survey included areas of media, parental

communication, community involvement, news, and student activities as it pertained

specifically to a school environment and was conducted as an interview.

The researcher met with the principal in her office for the addendum interview. It was during the last month of school, after one of the coldest winters and slower to emerge springs, so the school had many make up days and tasks that needed to be complete before the summer break. The principal was eager to be involved in the case study and was accommodating even during this busy time of the year. After taking care of her immediate morning business (checking in with the daily school schedule, receiving messages from her secretary, and reviewing her to-do list), she sat behind her desk, and the researcher sat on the other side. The interview process lasted approximately one hour.

Addendum media-public school. After a brief talk about the morning drive to work, the researcher began the interview. In the area of media, this public school reported publishing a school website which was updated weekly. The school did not manage Facebook®, Twitter®, Pinterest® or other social media pages. The school did not send out mass emails to families. Students only had school designated email accounts if they participated in online classes. There was no policy about texting either parent to teacher or teacher to student. The principal indicated that she was working on making improvements in these areas because the school needed to modernize some of media communication, especially related to technology.

Addendum parental information-public school. Pertaining to parental communication, the school utilized Edline®, one of the many electronic grading communication programs available. The principal reported that through Edline® the faculty had their own web page in which they posted homework, grades, and announcements. For telecommunication, mass phone calls were sent to families utilizing

School Messenger® to update families on the latest schedule changes or important school information.

Traditional paper methods to report student progress were also implemented. Printed progress reports were sent home at mid-quarter (four and one-half weeks into the nine week grading period), followed by report cards at the end of every quarter. The principal also reported that teachers may have sent progress reports home in addition to the required reports if they noticed a drop in grades, behavioral change, or at the request of the parent for more frequent reporting.

Since teenagers do not often give information directly to parents, quarterly newsletters were mailed home to increase the likelihood of the information arriving to the families. The newsletter was also posted to the school website. The guidance office also provided specialized newsletters providing college and university scholarship information, financial aid deadlines, and contact information for services for career and scholarship preparation.

To ensure the safety and accountability of the students, this public high school also contacted families about attendance issues. An automated phone call was made to the primary family contact number if a student is absent from school. Because many parents work during the day, this message was sent the evening of the student absence. This also decreased the likelihood of the student intercepting the call during the day if they decided to stay home without their parents' knowledge.

Addendum community-public school. At this time, the administrator took a break from the addendum survey to perform a scheduled fire drill. After completion of the drill, the researcher and administrator reconvened to complete the addendum. Still

enthusiastic, she reported that volunteers were welcomed to the school daily and parents were encouraged to participate. The volunteers were board-approved and most volunteered for sporting events and building maintenance projects, such as changing light bulbs or painting handrails.

The school also had group parent meetings each semester and scheduled one-on-one parent meetings as needed. There was a specific protocol for faculty members to contact families via phone calls. The principal stated that if a student grade drops below a C average, the teacher must contact the parent or guardian. Also, the administrator directed that a phone call must also be made if there is a behavioral issue before the teacher may formally write up a student discipline form. For other forms of communication between the families and faculty, parents all had access to teacher email addresses and some faculty members requested parent emails and communicated regularly.

When asked about the number of Partners in Education who were supporting the school, the principal's response reflected disappointment. In the local community, this school had one Partner in Education, that is, a business that shared resources with the school. She indicated the desire to broaden the schools network with community businesses to partner with the school. Partners in Education link schools and businesses to shared resources benefiting both parties. Businesses may provide training, supplies, or donations while school may provide training facilities.

As is common in many American school systems, this school used a Public Address system for daily school announcements including community sporting opportunities, local events, and advertising for businesses. These announcements were

made at the beginning and end of each day. This system also could be used at any time when needed to make impromptu announcements. In order to make opportunities available to students and families, the school also made available flyers containing community opportunities, since students do not always relay announcements heard on the Public Address system.

To communicate with the outside community, there was a marquee at the school, donated by a non-profit organization, positioned in front of the school building. At the time of the interview, it was under repair. The principal had hoped repairs would be completed by the next school year. In order for that to happen, funding decisions had to be made as to what category from the budget the money had to be pulled. The process had been stalled due to having to make this decision.

The principal reported that community service was a requirement for some of the clubs in which students were members. Beyond club requirements, community service was not monitored by the school. One of the clubs that had a service requirement was the National Honor Society. According to the official website, the National Honor Society's aspiration is to reflect student members who not only succeeded academically, but desire to serve. This was the motive behind the community service requirement (National Honor Society, 2014).

When asked about resources outside of the school that may benefit families, the school did not advertise governmental programs such as energy assistance or food banks, nor did it advertise for church services. On the other hand, the school facilities were made available for three blood drives during the school year at the time of the study.

Addendum news-public school. To keep students updated on current events, the school library received local and national newspapers and students watched news programming in their history classes. Students also had daily access to the Internet from which they retrieved news information. As mentioned before, students also received guidance and school newsletters which often contained community, local, and sometimes national news.

Addendum student activities-public school. The principal was then asked about student involvement in extracurricular activities and curricula offerings. When inquiring about student clubs, one club was political, three involve community service, and one competed with other schools. There were also 10 sports teams available for participation and opportunities to stay in good physical shape. As far as programming beyond the traditional high school curriculum, this school also offered vocational programs, a chapter of FFA (formerly referred to as Future Farmers of America), and some early entrance courses. However, the school did not have any articulation agreements with colleges or universities. Educational opportunities outside of the school facility included students taking an average of three to five field trips annually.

Finally, we discussed the operation of the school's guidance department. The guidance counselor scheduled meetings with all students. The students fill out a *Personalized Education Plan* (PEP). This PEP mapped out the student's goals, and a plan of action to accomplish said plan. The counselor made the effort to see all of the students and did not rely on them to seek him. As mentioned before, the guidance department also delivered a newsletter to students to keep the communication lines flowing between families and the school.

Public High School Administrator Survey

Once the addendum was complete, the researcher and administrator continued the interview session from the *2013 Social Capital Community Survey Adapted*. This survey process was also completed in the administrator's office. Since the administrator was interviewed face-to-face, the results of the survey were kept separate from the faculty results.

The principal was a white female in her early thirties and selected "graduate or professional degree" when asked about her educational background. She reported she had "always been a United States citizen," registered to vote, and voted in the last election. When she responded to questions of "who" she was, this administrator ranked her occupation, religion, and being an American as "very important," her place of residence as "moderately important," and her race and ethnicity as "not important at all." She resided 35 minutes from the school and reported working 60 to 70 hours a week. She was married with 2 young children and was "somewhat satisfied" with her financial situation reporting a family income of greater than $75,000 and less than $100,000.

She reported that generally trusting others "depends," but when asked about specific groups, she ranked all categories as "trust them a lot." She also rated people as cooperative and honest, and she "neither favored nor opposed" marriage to any race. When asked "do you have warm or cold feelings toward a number of well-known groups" with 100 being the warmest and 0 being the coldest, evangelical Christians ranked the highest at 100, all other groups were rated at 50. Most of her answers were "yes" when asked if she knew people in specific groups. She had friends who are White and would feel most comfortable living in an area with mostly her own race.

She rated satisfaction with life at a "nine out of 10" and her health as "very good." At that time, the administrator owned her current residence, rated her community as good, and reported someone like her would have a "moderate impact" in the community. She perceived the community as being very conservative and Republican. She believed the national government could be trusted to do what is right "some of the time," local governments could be trusted "most of the time," and you get the most for your money from the state government.

This administrator selected that funding should be "increased" for public school and should "neither be increased nor decreased" for all other funding questions. She believed people are "not doing enough" to change impoverished circumstances in their lives.

She reported involvement in petition signing, community projects, blood drives, parent groups, youth organizations, and hobby, investment, or garden club or societies. She strongly agreed that religion was important, was a member of a Pentecostal Church of God, attended service every week, and was involved in additional religious activities.

This administrator reported the community cared a lot about what happened to her, agreed "somewhat" with "there are too many things to worry about and pay attention to" and "I feel overwhelmed." She also agreed "strongly" with "I feel used up at the end of a typical day," but also agreed "somewhat" to "I lead a calm and relaxed life."

Response Rate of the Public High School Faculty Surveys

The *Initial Intake Questionnaire* revealed 6 part-time and 16 full-time faculty members. Knowing time constraints and scheduling issues of meeting with teachers during the school day, the researcher suggested a group setting for them to complete the

faculty survey. Faculty members were accustomed to morning meetings before the first period class. The administrator dedicated two consecutive days to meet with faculty. The first day was a briefing about the theory of social capital, the study, procedure, and distribution of the introduction letter and signing of the consent form (Appendix F). Fifteen of the faculty members signed the consent form.

The second day was exclusively planned to complete the faculty survey. The room was prepared with a survey and pen at each desk before their arrival. The faculty reported to the designated room to take the survey. To keep the numbering on the surveys consistent with the original Harvard survey and to not confuse the participants, the faculty answered the questions directly on the survey by circling their responses. The researcher then transposed responses on the answer sheet to aid in the calculation of results.

Of the six part-time and 16 full-time faculty members, 15 signed the consent form. Of these 15, 12 faculty members reported to complete the survey, but one faculty member completed half of the survey due to time constraints, which resulted in 11 completed surveys. Once the surveys were complete, the researcher gathered the surveys and departed.

From the answer sheet, responses were tallied on the Microsoft Excel® form. Tallies were then translated to numbers and, where applicable, to the mean and standard deviation (Appendix H). The Microsoft Excel® spreadsheet was then formatted for presentation and is available in the enclosure section of this dissertation (Appendix H).

Overview of the public high school faculty responses. Of the 11 public school faculty members, three reported being male, seven female, and one left the gender

question blank. All 11 reported to have completed at least a bachelor's degree, four were

between the ages of 18 to 34 years old, three were between the ages of 35 to 49 years old,

three were between the ages of 50 to 64 years old, and one did not answer the age

question. Likewise, of the 11 participants, 10 reported being of White race and one left

the question of race blank. The identifying questions left blank were by three different

people.

When examining the results, the questions left blank with these specific

characteristics would have caused significant differences in percentage answers. As a

result and especially due to the small sample size, the researcher decided to display data

as numbers instead of percentages. Similarly, throughout the survey, some participants

chose "refuse," "don't know," or left questions blank. It is for this reason the numbers

will not always total 11.

Many of the responses to the survey were diverse. There were areas, on the other

hand, that displayed characteristics of the group. It is these characteristics that will be

highlighted, but the entire response report is available for review in Appendix H.

Public high school faculty survey specifics. Survey questions reflecting a sense

of identity revealed occupation, residence, and being an American were "moderately" to

"very important" to this group. When presented with the choices of "A lot," "Some," "A

little," or "Not at all," trust levels were strongest with people they worked and worshiped

with, the police, store owners, and people of their own race.

The respondents rated satisfaction with "your life" to be at least a seven on a scale

of one to 10 and their health to be "good," "very good," or "excellent." The respondents

also perceived they made some impact on the community. All who responded reported

being United States citizens, had lived in the United States their entire lives, were registered to vote, and all but one voted in the 2012 Presidential election. Even with this participation, the responses for trusting the national government to do what is right weighed more toward hardly ever (six participants responded "hardly ever," three "some of the time," and one "most of the time").

All participants who responded indicated they worked on a community project and also a blood drive in the past twelve months. When asked about increasing or decreasing funding, respondents all responded affirmatively to increasing public school funding. Of the eight who responded to the question about the cause of poverty, seven believed people "were not doing enough to help themselves."

Seven of 10 responded to a type of Christianity being their religious preference, seven out of eight respondents also reported to being a church member, but most do not participate in church activities or other religious organizations outside of a once-a-week service. Other responses indicated participants' lack of involvement in groups and organizations, but were split when asked about involvement in hobby, investment, or garden club societies. When responding to leadership questions, most indicated being friends with a community leader.

Some responses elicited certain gender differences. Most female respondents agreed that "I often feel that there are too many things to worry about and pay attention to," "I feel overwhelmed," and "I feel used up" by the end of the day, whereas the males indicated they lead a life that is "calm and relaxed."

Generally, respondents agreed when asked if immigrants were getting too demanding in their push for equal rights, but disagreed about keeping a book that most

disapproved out of their public library. All respondents indicated they would "feel most comfortable" living in a neighborhood with mostly or all their own race and ethnic background. All respondents reported to having friends who are their own race, White, with very few reporting friends of any other race.

Public high school free response survey questions. Many of the questions involved participants giving a free response, such as how many hours, or choosing a number from one to 100, or how often. For these questions, there were many that were quite diverse in responses. For this reason, the researcher decided it was important to list the number of participants, the arithmetic mean, and the standard deviation to show the spread. Once again, a full report of these survey questions is available in Appendix H.

The first set of 12 free response survey questions asked whether they "have warm or cold feelings toward a number of well-known groups." The groups encompassed a variety of races, religions, economics, and immigrants. Each question read as follows: "I'll read you a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it." Table 2 and Table 3 display data by illustrating the number of respondents, the mean, and the standard deviation. Two tables are used for format purposes. Table 2 will display data by race, and Table 3 will illustrate the remainder of the categories.

Table 2

Public School Feeling Thermometer Scores - Race

		Gender		Education	Age			Race
Group		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
Blacks	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	63.33	67.14	66	67.5	63.33	50	67.78
	SD	23.09	36.38	31.69	20.62	23.09	70.71	33.02
Whites	n	4	6	10	4	3	2	9
	M	72.5	86.67	81	80	63.33	100	84.44
	SD	26.30	19.66	22.34	21.60	23.09	0	20.68
Asian Americans	n	3	7	10	4	2	3	9
	M	63.33	68.57	66	67.75	70	50	65.56
	SD	23.09	33.38	31.69	20.62	28.28	50	32.06
Latinos or Hispanic-Americans	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	50	58.57	56	65	50	25	56.67
	SD	0	34.36	28.36	23.80	0	35.36	30

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

Table 3

Public School Feeling Thermometer Scores - Other

		Gender		Education	Age			Race
Group		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
Homosexuals	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	30	48.57	43	35	46.67	25	42.22
	SD	26.46	38.91	35.29	43.59	5.77	35.36	37.34
Catholics	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	63.33	62.14	62.65	58.75	63.33	50	63.89
	SD	23.09	35.81	31.20	17.5	23.09	70.71	32.77
Protestants	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	63.33	81.43	76	67.5	63.33	100	78.89
	SD	23.09	22.68	23.19	20.62	23.09	0	22.61
Muslims	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	33.33	45	41.5	41.25	50	25	40.56
	SD	28.87	25.66	25.61	35.68	0	35.36	26.98
Evangelical Christians	n	3	5	8	4	3	2	7
	M	63.33	58	60	60	63.33	50	61.43
	SD	23.09	27.75	24.49	31.62	23.09	70.71	26.10
Immigrants	n	3	6	9	4	3	2	8
	M	50	55.83	53.87	58.75	50	50	54.38
	SD	0	34.71	27.59	17.5	0	70.71	29.45
Poor people	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	63.33	67.14	66	55	63.33	75	67.87
	SD	23.09	25.63	23.66	17.32	23.09	35.63	24.38
Rich People	n	3	7	10	4	3	2	9
	M	63.33	65.71	65	52.5	63.33	75	66.67
	SD	23.09	25.07	23.21	12.58	23.09	35.36	23.98

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

All of the participants had a college degree, the researcher used this column which combined the males and females. The participants rated their warmest feelings toward Whites at 10 respondents with a mean of 81 and a standard deviation of 22.34. The second highest ratings were Protestants at 10 respondents with a mean of 76 and a

standard deviation of 23.19. The coldest or most negative feelings rated were with

Muslims with 10 respondents at a mean of 41.5 and a standard deviation of 25.61. The

second coolest average rates were with Homosexuals with 10 respondents at a mean of 43

and a standard deviation of 35.29.

Female responses averaged higher in all categories except toward Catholics where

the comparison was three males with an average of 63.33 and a standard deviation of

23.09, whereas the seven females calculated a mean of 62.14 and a standard deviation of

35.81. The remainder of the scores hovered around the mean of mid-fifties and mid-

sixties with a standard deviation range of 23 to 32.

The next set of 15 free response questions measured the number of times the

respondents went to or participated in activities and visited with others. Like before, the

college degree column had the most consistency with 10 to 11 responses for each

question. The ranges may be different for certain questions making it difficult to

compare. For instance, there may be limited number public meetings to discuss school or

town affairs whereas the possibility of visiting a neighbor could theoretically happen

every day.

Taking each one of these questions into consideration by examining the number,

mean and standard deviation, only a few seemed to be representative of the group. One

such question was about the number of times respondents played cards or board games

with others. Out of the 10 who responded with an average of 5.8 times and standard

deviation was 4.32. Similarly, the average of the 11 respondents who played a team sport

was 2 with a standard deviation of 3.58. Another asked the number of times the 10

respondents had a friend of a different race in their homes. The arithmetic mean to this

question was 2.1 with a standard deviation of 2.23.

The largest spread in data existed in the question concerning number of online

discussions. Of the 11 who responded with an average of 38.82, the standard deviation

was 91.98. Examining age categories closer, the eight respondents in the age range of 18

to 49 had a mean of 79 with a standard deviation of 147.41, and the two respondents in

the 50 to 64 range had a mean of 0.5 times with a standard deviation of 0.71. To view the

full results, Table 4 and Table 5 display data the number of respondents, the mean, and

the standard deviation. Table 4 illustrates Public School Activity Participation and Table

5 illustrates Public School Activity Visitation.

Table 4

Public School Activity Participation

		Gender		Education	Age			Race
The number of times in the last twelve months		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
parades, local sports or art events	n	2	7	10	4	2	3	9
	M	26.5	15.86	16.9	15.25	11.5	26.67	16.56
	SD	33.23	22.48	22.29	23.19	12.02	33.29	23.62
artistic activities with a group	n	2	8	10	4	2	3	9
	M	6	7.63	6.8	3.75	5	12.67	7
	SD	5.66	12.84	11.72	2.76	7.07	21.94	12.16
played cards or board games with others	n	2	7	10	4	2	3	9
	M	9	4.71	5.8	8.5	3	5.67	6.11
	SD	8.49	3.30	4.32	5.45	0	2.31	4.46
attended a club meeting	n	3	7	11	4	3	3	10
	M	19	30.43	24.55	45.75	20.33	12	24.6
	SD	34.18	34.48	29.10	40.19	6.35	12	30.68
played a team sport	n	3	7	11	4	3	3	10
	M	5	1	2	3.75	1.33	1	2.1
	SD	6.24	1.41	3.58	5.68	1.53	1.73	3.75
online Internet discussions	n	3	58.86	11	4	4	2	10
	M	5	112.98	38.82	79	79	0.5	32.3
	SD	6.24	8	91.98	147.41	147.41	0.71	94.13
attended public meeting discussing school or town affairs	n	3	7	11	4	3	3	10
	M	2	4.86	3.91	1.5	2	9.33	4.3
	SD	1.73	8.51	6.77	1.29	1.73	12.74	7.01
volunteered	n	4	5	10	4	3	2	9
	M	29.75	3.2	13.5	6.75	1.33	52.73	14.89
	SD	49.76	2.86	32.03	3.86	1.53	73.54	33.65

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

Table 5

Public School Activity Visitation

		Gender		Education	Age			Race
The number of times in the last twelve months		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
Visited with relatives	n	3	7	11	4	3	3	10
	M	31.67	41.43	37.18	37.75	54.33	27.67	30.5
	SD	22.81	45.8	37.44	64.49	48.54	22.72	31.81
had friends over to your home	n	3	6	10	3	3	3	9
	M	38.33	23.33	25.8	35	22.33	20.67	22.89
	SD	53.59	23.59	32.58	56.31	26.08	27.21	35.15
had a friend of a different race at your home or visited theirs	n	3	6	10	5	2	3	10
	M	30.33	1.83	2.1	1.6	5	1	2.1
	SD	3.51	1.47	2.23	1.52	2.83	1.73	2.23
Frequency of socializing with coworkers	n	2	7	10	4	2	3	9
	M	15.5	25.29	21.5	33.25	4	23.67	23.78
	SD	12.02	37.48	31.54	45.46	4.24	24.66	32.57
hung out with friends in a public place	n	2	7	10	4	2	3	9
	M	28.5	9.87	13.3	21.25	4.5	9	14.56
	SD	30.41	3.73	14.41	21.42	3.54	2.65	14.69
in the home of a neighbor	n	3	7	11	4	3	3	10
	M	20	5.29	8.82	14	3.67	2	9.6
	SD	26.06	8.36	15.22	24.06	3.06	1.73	15.81
in the home of someone in your city but outside your neighborhood	n	3	7	11	4	3	3	10
	M	3.33	19.71	14.09	25	7.33	7	9.6
	SD	3.51	34.82	28.14	48.68	4.51	0	15.81

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

Private High School: Located in Hancock County, WV

Out of the eight Regional Education Service Agencies named RESA I through RESA VIII, this private school was also located in RESA VI. Private high schools in West Virginia do not have the same statistical data reporting system as public schools. During the initial interview with the private school principal, the following statistics were

reported. Total enrollment in grades 9 – 12 was 178 students. Families whose income was considered by the state government as "low income" included 0% of the enrollment. The school reported being 97% White, 2% Black, and 1% of other ethnicity. The average class size was reported at 15 students with 93% graduation rate and 33 graduates in 2012. The faculty consists of 12% earning at least a Master's Degree, none of which holding a Master's +45 or a Doctorate.

There were three administrators employed at the school as Principal, Dean of Students, and Athletic Director. Unlike public school boards that make crucial decisions, this particular private school was governed by diocesan board that made the crucial and general decisions affecting all schools in their demographic area. The principal utilized an advisory board made up of nine members. However, the advisory board was meant to aid the administrator in his decision making by offering perspectives, ideas, and moral support. Basically, the principal attended to report information and received specific advice.

The principal from the private high school was the administrator who participated in the study. The initial contact was made after receiving approval from the school's Superintendent. After a phone introduction, the Initial Intake Questionnaire (Appendix E) was mailed and emailed to the school. As with the public high school, the Initial Intake Questionnaire collected basic school information such as the full name of the school, grades offered, administrator's name and contact information, details about the governing body, number of faculty members and a timeline of the school's participation in the study. The principal completed the questionnaire and faxed it back to the researcher.

There were only a few weeks difference in the participation of the case study between the two schools. Like the public high school, this private school also endured the difficult winter and was subject to making up school days canceled due to snowy weather conditions. During the first visit, the researcher conducted the initial interview. The atmosphere of the school was welcoming. There were boxes and bags in front of the office full of food products that appeared to be for a food drive. The researcher then met the guidance counselor, who was also the athletic director. His office was directly in the main office and contained general and contact information on testing, colleges, and emotional health in the form of flyers and pamphlets.

Addendum From the Private High School Administrator

Again, because the 2013 Social Capital Survey lacked school-specific survey questions, the same researcher-created addendum was used for the public high school was completed for this private high school. To review, the addendum to the survey included areas of media, parental communication, community involvement, news, and student activities as it pertained specifically to a school environment.

The principal was enthusiastic about participating in the study. He believed the private high school would receive valuable information from the study results that would aid in improvements for the future. The principal was leaving the organization and wanted to leave his replacement the tools necessary for a transparent view of the school. The researcher and administrator met in a small conference room near his office to avoid interruption. The interview process lasted approximately an hour.

Addendum media-private school. Once settled in the conference room, the researcher began the interview. In the section asking about media, the addendum

revealed the private school having a website that is updated weekly. Individual teachers did not have a webpage, but had access to posting information, messages, and grades on the electronic grading website. In addition, the school had a Facebook® and a Twitter® account. Occasionally, mass emails were sent out to the families. Students did not have email accounts provided by the school. When asked about communication between teachers and students via text, the principal indicated there was a policy that teachers and students did not communicate via text unless in the case of a coach to students about sporting events. There was no restriction or policy about teachers and parents text communicating.

     Addendum parental information-private school. When responding to questions about parental communication, this private school had an electronic grade communication system to update parents on homework, grades, and announcements. General school announcements were also posted on the school website. Replacing the email method of communication, mass texts and phone calls were delivered through School Reach®, a program that automatically texted or called phone numbers. In the event a student was absent from school, the parent or guardian was notified via telephone to make sure the family was aware of the absence and to check on the student's welfare.

     To communicate about the academic progress of the student, traditional paper progress reports were sent home at the mid-quarter mark (four times a year), followed by report cards at the end of each quarter. In addition, if there was any significant change in behavior or grades, additional progress reports may be sent home. Other assessment reports sent home included standardized test scores and PSAT scores. The school did not have a paper newsletter.

This private school encouraged parent participation. Parents were welcomed to volunteer on a daily basis. Clearances must be provided to the school before being allowed to volunteer at the school or any event allowing direct contact with students. The clearances checked for criminal records and convictions of child abuse by those who wished to volunteer. Both state and federal clearances were required by the school. Once cleared, parents normally volunteered in the cafeteria during lunch.

To keep the communication lines flowing between the school and parents, the school also had parent meetings, generally twice a year. One of these meetings was one-on-one, and the other was as a group. As far as faculty and parent communication, there was no protocol for parents or teachers to contact each other through telephone, but it was encouraged. Parents and teachers were provided with each other's email addresses.

Addendum community-private school. Partners in Education link schools and businesses to shared resources benefiting both parties. Regarding the community, the school did not have any official Partners in Education, but community leaders occasionally did come to speak with the students. To provide community information to students, this private school made community announcements regarding events or community service, but they did not advertise for community sports leagues. There were no communications regarding resources such as reading enrichment, or energy assistance, but they did advertise for the local food bank. The school had advertised for some parochial church services.

All students had a required amount of community service hours and were provided with a broad array of opportunities such as the senior center and Vacation Bible School. The school also provided a location for some community services, such as a

blood drive. In addition, donations were encouraged to local charities, such as the local food bank indicative of the many bags of food in front of the office during the case study.

Addendum news-private school. When examining the areas involving news, the school did not subscribe to any local, national, or world newspapers and students did not watch any news programming during school hours. On the other hand, students can access news information though the Internet when directed by faculty as part of the lesson objective. In some instances, teachers allowed for the students to use their cell phones in the classroom for educational purposes, but generally cell phones were not permitted to be seen or heard in the school. Otherwise, they would be confiscated. iPads® were available to be used for education purposes, but they were not connected to the Internet.

Addendum student activities-private school. Students had club opportunities. None of these clubs were political, nor did they compete with other schools academically, and a minimum of four of the clubs focused on community service. There were on average 15 field trips taken in a typical year, but not all students were involved in all trips. The school did have 11 sports teams for boys and girls.

Academically, the school offered a dual enrollment program with a local university and also a vocational option through a cooperative program. Guidance counselors were available for students to work on future planning. These guidance sessions were initiated by the students and by the guidance counselors depending on the circumstance. For instance, guidance counselors were not as concerned to meet with freshman about their decision to go to college or enter the work force. Students made an appointment even as a freshman to discuss these options if they like. Once a student

achieves junior standing, guidance counselors were more involved in initiating these meetings.

Private High School Administrator Survey

After completing the addendum portion of the survey, the interview process was continued completing the *2013 Social Capital Community Survey* Adapted. Since the delivery of the survey was through interview, the results of the survey were kept separate from the faculty results. In addition, the administrator was only given the choices "don't know" or "refused" when he struggled to answer. This method also discouraged any questions to be left blank.

The principal was a white male in his mid-fifties who had completed a bachelor's degree and "some" graduate level courses. He had "always" been a United States citizen, was registered to vote, and voted in the last election. When asked to reflect on a sense of "who" he was, the administrator ranked his occupation and being an American as "very important," his residence and religion as "moderately important," and his race and ethnicity as "not important at all." He lived only a few minutes from the school and worked an average of 60 hours a week. The administrator was married with five grown children and was somewhat satisfied with his financial situation reporting a family income of greater than $75,000 and less than $100,000.

He reported that overall people "can be trusted," and all trust questions were answered with "Trust them a lot." He also rated people as "cooperative and honest." He "neither favored nor opposed" marriage to any race. When asked "do you have warm or cold feelings toward a number of well-known groups," Catholics ranked the highest at

100, all races ranked at 80, most other groups ranked at 70, with immigrants ranking at 60 and gays ranking at 40.

Most of his answers were "yes" when asked if he knew of people involved in certain groups. He had friends that were White and African American, also responding to race being completely irrelevant when shopping for a home.

He rated satisfaction with life at a six out of 10 with good health overall. He rented his current residence, rated the community as "only fair" and responded that he could have only a "small impact." He perceived the community to be politically and socially "middle of the road." He believed national and local government agencies could be trusted to make the right decision "most of the time" with local government that gave him the most for his money. This administrator selected that funding should be "increased" for public school and poverty, and people are impoverished because of "circumstances not in their control."

He reported involvement in political meetings, community projects, blood drives and organizations that help the needy, support groups, and professional organizations. He agreed religion was "somewhat important," was a member of the Catholic Church, attended service every week, and was involved in church, other religious, youth, and parent activities.

He reported the community "did not care about what happened to him," but did not think there was "too much to worry about," and agreed "strongly" with "I feel used up at the end of a typical day." As an administrator, he reported to being involved in many parades, celebrations, artistic activities, and events outside of his neighborhood home.

Response Rate of the Private High School Faculty Surveys

Two meetings were scheduled with the faculty members. The first day was a briefing about the theory of social capital, the study, procedure, and distribution of the introduction letter and signing of the consent form (Appendix F). Knowing the time constraints and scheduling issues, the researcher suggested a group setting to administer the faculty survey. The next visit scheduled to the school was designated to complete the faculty surveys.

Faculty invited were 16 members, 7 part-time and 9 full-time. Eleven consent forms were signed and 10 faculty members participated. The room was prepared ahead of time with a survey and pen at each desk before their arrival. The administrator made a reminder announcement to the faculty to report to the library room. Before the announcement was made, a few faculty members trickled in to the classroom with the remaining coming shortly after.

Just as before, to keep the numbering on the surveys consistent with the original Harvard survey, the faculty answered the questions directly on the survey by circling their responses. To review, since the survey started at 5A1 and jumped inconsistently, an answer sheet could have confused the participants (due to omission of irrelevant questions). To simplify the process, participants responded directly on the survey. The researcher then transposed responses on the answer sheet to aid in calculating the results. Once the surveys were complete, the researcher gathered the surveys and departed.

From the answer sheet, responses were tallied on the Microsoft Excel® form. Tallies were then translated to numbers and, where applicable, to the mean and standard

deviation. The Microsoft Excel® spreadsheet was then formatted for presentation and is available in the enclosure section of this dissertation (Appendix I).

Overview of the private high school faculty responses. Of the 10 private school faculty members, three reported being male, six female, and one left the gender question blank. Nine reported being of at least a bachelor's degree and one left it blank, three were between the ages of 18 to 34 years old, two were between the ages of 35 to 49 years old, four were between the ages of 50 to 64 years old, and one did not report an age (this person was different from the last omission). Likewise, of the 10 participants, eight reported being of White race and two left the question of race blank.

As before, the questions unanswered of these specific characteristics would have caused significant differences in percentage answers. As a result and due to the small sample size, the researcher decided to display the final data as numbers instead of percentages.

Once again, throughout the survey, some participants chose "refuse," "don't know," or did not respond to different questions. It is for this reason the numbers did not always total 10.

Similar to the public school, the responses to the private school survey were diverse. There were areas, on the other hand, that displayed characteristics of the group. It is these characteristics that will be highlighted, but the entire response report is available for review in Appendix I.

Private high school faculty survey specifics. Most survey questions reflecting a sense of identity indicate occupation, religion, and being an American were "moderately" to "very important" to this group. Trust levels were not strong in any category. The most

compelling trust level measured five out of eight "trusting some," two trusting "a lot," and one trusting "a little" came from people at their church or place of worship. On the other hand, people were perceived as "cooperative" when needing to conserve resources in the community. Like the other trust issues, response for trust in national and local governments to "do what is right" was in the middle, not confident either way.

Respondents rated their satisfaction with "your life" to be at least a six on a scale of one to 10, and eight respondents measured their health "very good" or "excellent" with two who reported "fair" health. All participants reported being United States citizens, had lived in the United States their entire lives, were registered to vote, and voted in the 2012 election.

Eight of the respondents reported being of the Catholic faith while nine responded to being a church member, leading to the conclusion that one is not Catholic. Eight responded to regularly attending church weekly, and most "agreed" religion was important in their lives.

Also, about half of the participants either did not respond, responded with "I don't know," or "refused" questions pertaining to participating, funding, and politics. The response rates again dwindled to about half when asked about participation in church, religious and other group activities. When answering questions about race, most responded with "neither favor nor oppose" to marriage or living in an area of either the same or different race.

There was a small distinction among gender when asked if "I feel overwhelmed." Males tended to select "disagreed" and females generally "agreed." More males agreed

to having led a "calm and relaxed" life while more females responded in favor to "I feel used up" at the end of the day.

Private high school free response survey questions. Seven of 10 faculty answered free response questions asking "do you have warm or cold feelings toward a number of well-known groups" with the exception of the Evangelical Christian question which six responded. The groups encompassed a variety of races, religions, economics, and immigrants. The instructions gave an example of very warm or positive being 100, very cold or negative being zero, and neither warm nor cold being 50.

Each question read as follows: "I'll read you a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it." Table 6 and Table 7 display data by illustrating the number of respondents, the mean, and the standard deviation. Two tables are used for format purposes. Table 6 will display by race, and Table 7 by the remainder of the categories.

Table 6

Private School Feeling Thermometer Scores - Race

Group		Gender		Education	Age			Race
		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
Blacks	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	40	65	55	40	50	71.67	55
	SD	17.32	13.23	18.93	17.32	0	2.89	18.93
Whites	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	93.33	71.67	80.71	93.33	50	78.33	80.71
	SD	11.55	22.55	18.80	11.55	0	14.43	18.80
Asian Americans	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	50	65	59.29	50	50	71.67	59.29
	SD	20	13.23	16.44	20	0	2.89	16.44
Latinos or Hispanic-Americans	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	45	65	57.14	45	50	71.67	57.14
	SD	8.67	13.23	14.68	8.66	0	2.89	14.68

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

Table 7

Private School Feeling Thermometer Scores - Other

| Group | | Gender | | Education | | Age | | Race |
		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
Homosexuals	N	2	4	7	3	1	3	7
	M	30	60	50	46.67	35	58.33	50
	SD	0	21.21	20.62	28.87	0	14.43	20.62
Catholics	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	96.67	88.33	89.29	96.67	95	80	89.29
	SD	5.77	16.07	13.67	5.77	0	17.32	13.67
Protestants	N	3	3	7	3	1	30	7
	M	66.67	85	75	66.67	90	78.33	75
	SD	28.87	13.23	20.62	28.87	0	14.33	20.62
Muslims	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	33.33	58.33	49.29	3.33	50	65	49.29
	SD	20.82	14.43	21.30	20.82	0	13.23	21.3
Evangelical Christians	N	2	3	6	2	1	3	6
	M	50	78.33	67.5	50	90	71.67	67.5
	SD	0	10.41	15.41	0	0	2.89	15.41
Immigrants	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	50	78.33	59.29	50	90	71.67	65
	SD	0	10.41	11.7	0	0	2.89	15.55
Poor people	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	40	76.67	60	40	70	76.67	60
	SD	10	11.55	20.82	10	0	11.55	20.82
Rich People	N	3	3	7	3	1	3	7
	M	60	60	58.57	60	50	60	58.57
	SD	17.32	26.46	18.64	17.32	0	26.46	18.64

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

Using the college degree column which combined the males and females, these

data rated high for Catholics at a mean of 89.29 with a standard deviation of 13.67,

Whites at mean of 80.71 with a standard deviation of 18.8, and Protestants at a mean of

75 with a standard deviation of 20.62. The remainder of the categories all measured at

means from 49 to 60 with standard deviations ranging from 12 to 21. Unlike the public school data, there were no low markings with large standard deviations.

The next set of 15 free response questions measured the number of times the respondents went to or participated in activities and visited with others. Once again, the college degree column had the most consistency with mostly nine and a few at eight who had responded to each question. The ranges were different for certain questions making it difficult to compare. To review, there may have been a limited number of public meetings to discuss school or town affairs, whereas the possibility of visiting a neighbor could theoretically have happened every day.

Each question was considered by examining the number, mean and standard deviation; only a few seemed to be representative of the group. One such question measured the number of times the respondent attended a club meeting. Out of the eight who responded with an average of 2 times and standard deviation was 2.33. Another representation, the average respondents who attended a public meeting was calculated at 1.44 with a standard deviation of 2.3.

The largest spread in the data existed in the response concerning number of visits with relatives. Of the nine who responded with an average of 66.44, the standard deviation was 116.68. Examining closer, the four respondents in the age range of 18 to 34 had a mean of 125.5 with a standard deviation of 165.02, and the two respondents in the 35 to 49 range had a mean of 33.5 with a standard deviation of 37.48 and the 50 to 64 range had a mean of 9.67 times with a standard deviation of 2.52. To view the full results, Table 5 displays data stacking the number of respondents, the mean, and the standard deviation.

Table 8

Private School Activity Participation

The number of times in the last twelve months		Gender		Education	Age			Race
		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
parades, local sports or art events	n	3	5	9	4	2	4	8
	M	71	30.6	41.11	31.5	64	6.5	33.25
	SD	57.16	39.33	46.54	48.38	56.57	5.51	42.90
artistic activities with a group	n	3	5	9	4	2	3	8
	M	22.67	14.6	15.67	16	33.5	3.33	16.75
	SD	25.42	25.71	23.28	24.29	37.48	5.77	24.64
played cards or board games with others	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	13.33	4.33	7.33	10	6.5	4.33	7.38
	SD	9.29	1.75	6.61	9.7	0.71	2.31	7.07
attended a club meeting	n	3	5	8	3	2	3	6
	M	4	2	2	3	3.5	0	2.17
	SD	1.73	2.83	2.33	3	0.71	0	2.56
played a team sport	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	11.67	0.67	4.33	8	3.5	0	4.5
	SD	10.97	1.63	7.87	11.31	0.71	0	8.4
online Internet discussions	n	2	6	8	4	1	3	8
	M	3.5	2	9.13	16.75	6	0	9.13
	SD	30.41	2.45	17.62	23.67	0	0	17.62
attended public meeting discussing school or town affairs	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	2	1.17	1.44	2.25	2	0	1.63
	SD	3.46	1.83	2.3	2.87	2.83	0	2.39
volunteered	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	38.67	4.33	15.22	29	5.5	3.33	16.75
	SD	56.66	4.76	33.45	50.14	3.54	3.51	35.42

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

Table 9

Private School Activity Participation

The number of times in the last twelve months		Gender		Education	Age			Race
		Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites
visited with relatives	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	127	39	66.44	125.5	33.5	9.67	74.25
	SD	206.12	36.57	116.68	165.02	37.48	2.52	122.26
had friends over to your home	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	38.7	11.83	21.22	30	4.5	20.67	23.5
	SD	56.66	19.83	34.82	49.48	2.12	27.21	36.5
had a friend of a different race at your home or visited theirs	n	3	5	8	4	1	3	8
	M	17.67	1.6	8.5	14	4	2.67	8.5
	SD	10.97	1.82	9.81	11.58	0	3.79	9.81
Frequency of socializing with coworkers	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	21.33	5.17	11.33	16.75	7.5	6.67	11.88
	SD	26.58	3.76	15.42	23.56	0.71	3.51	16.39
hung out with friends in a public place	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	21.33	14.5	16.44	31.25	5.5	4	18.3
	SD	26.73	18.62	20.45	23.99	3.54	3.61	21.19
in the home of a neighbor	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	19	6.33	9.22	14.75	3	6	10.38
	SD	28.69	5.92	16.72	24.90	4.24	7.94	17.48
in the home of someone in your city but outside your neighborhood	n	3	6	9	4	2	3	8
	M	5.33	13.33	10.67	6.5	3	21.33	12
	SD	4.73	19.00	15.72	2.52	4.24	26.58	16.26

Note. Each cell displays the number of respondents (n), mean (M), and the Standard Deviation (SD).

2006 Social Capital Community Survey

2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire on the civic engagement of Americans to measure social capital was funded through several foundations including the Surdna Foundation, the Audrey and Bernard Rapoport Foundation, and the Kansas Health Institute (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006b). The survey was conducted via telephone and ran in two "waves." The first wave, Wave 1, was conducted from mid-January to late April 2006 and included areas from Baton Rouge, LA; Dulth, MN; Superior, WI; Greenboro, NC; Houston, TX; Kalamazoo, MI; Rochester, NY; San Diego, CA; Winston-Salem, NC; Yakima, WA; several cities in Arkansas; Lewiston-Auburn, ME; and a National sample.

The second wave, Wave 2 was conducted from May to August 2006 and included statewide areas from New Hampshire and Kansas, as well as Sarasota County, FL, and another National sample. There was a combination of 12,100 respondents interviewed in both waves.

The 2006 responses were much more diverse in *The 2006 Social Capital Community Survey* (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006a), possibly due to the inclusion of many educational levels and races. Even so, the researcher compared the highlighted topics discussed in this chapter in Table 6 for a side by side comparison. The top choices were listed in each category. The researcher encourages the reader to visit the Harvard Kennedy School Saguaro Seminar website to learn more about the national results (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006a).

Table 10

Side by Side Comparison: Case Study to the 2006 Social Capital Community Survey

	Private (total gender)	Public (total gender)	National (%)
Who you are (very important)	American (8/9) 88% Religion (7/9) 78%	American (9/10) 90% Occupation (8/10) 80%	American 77% Religion 57%
Trust Levels (a lot/some)	Church (7/8) 88% Police (6/8) 75% Whites (6/8) 75%	Church (8/8) 100% Police (10/10) 100% Colleagues(10/10) 100% Whites (8/9) 88%	Church 92% Police 83% All Races 80s %
Satisfied with life >7	(7/9) 78%	(11/11) 100%	83%
Community impact(moderate/big)	(5/7) 71%	(6/8) 75%	79%
Registered to vote	(9/9) 100%	(9/9) 100%	81%
Voted in 2012	(8/8) 100%	(9/10) 90%	74% (in 1996)
National Govt right (highest category)	Some time (4/7) 57%	Hardly ever (6/9) 67%	Some time 46%
Religion (highest category)	Catholic (8/8) 100%	Protestant (3/10) 30% Christian type(3/10) 30%	Protestant 46% Catholic 24%
Feel overwhelmed (gender comparison) M=Male F=Female	Disagree M (3/3) 100% F (0/5) 0% Agree M (0/3) 0% F (5/5) 100%	Disagree M (3/3) 100% F (1/7) 14% Agree M (0/3) 100% F (6/7) 86%	Disagree M 51% F 39% Agree M 49% F 61%
Calm and Relaxed (gender comparison)	Disagree M(0/3)0% F(3/5) 60% Agree M(3/3)100% F(1/5)20%	Disagree M (0/3) 0% F (6/7) 86% Agree M (3/3)100% F(1/7)14%	Disagree M 26% F 28% Agree M 74% F 72%
Warm (highest) or Cold (lowest)	Warm: Catholics 89% Cold: Muslims 49%	Warm: Whites 81% Cold: Muslims 41.5%	Warm:Whites70.85% Cold: Muslims 52%

Note. The private and public schools are displayed as "so many out of the total responses" for each question. For instance, comparing a "sense of who you are" was displayed in the private school at "Being an American (8/9)" which meant the private school respondents chose being an American eight out of the nine responses. This percentage (88%) was displayed beside it. The national survey was reported, and therefore, displayed in percentages.

Summary of Results

High schools in the case study were purposely chosen based on their similar demographics. In addition, the enrollment and operations of the school were similar. The only glaring difference in organization was the structure and responsibilities of the school boards. The public school's governing board was the school board, whereas the private school's board strictly advisory and the governing decisions came directly from the organization's religious organization.

Both the public and private high school were welcoming, enthusiastic, and accommodating during the case study. The interviewed principal from each school had similar responses, even with one being a female public school principal in her early thirties and the other a male private school principal in his mid-fifties. They were both enthusiastic about being involved in the case study and indicated the case study could provide beneficial information. In addition, the participation and response rate were similar in each school as most participated in the study with occasionally a participant leaving a question blank.

The similarities did not stop with the administrators. The faculty responses also agreed many times throughout the survey. For instance, both schools identified "being an American" as very important to a sense of "who" they are. They were also similar in questions involving trust levels, satisfaction with life, community impact, and voter registration and participation. Gender similarities occurred in questions posed "I feel overwhelmed" with women who agreed more than men. The opposite was the case with men who agreed more than women about leading a "calm and relaxed" life.

Even though there were 12,100 respondents versus the small case study with 10 – 12 respondents, the case study with the National results reflected some of the same similarities. Being an American once again rated as the top identifier of one's sense of "who" they are. Trust levels, satisfaction with life, community impact, voter registration and participation, and the previously stated responses reflecting gender agreement were also comparable. The researcher will explore these results in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The impotence for this dissertation was sparked by a report by a college junior to his professor. This young man was excited about working with at-risk middle school students. He was adamant about the need to support kids today. The support he referenced is the building of personal social capital. The emphasis on social capital in this dissertation was defined as personal ties with others that produce benefits (Portes, 2000). That was what excited this college junior. He believed his participation in this college-sponsored mentoring program made a positive difference providing support to at-risk middle school students.

Summary

Robert Putnam recognized the theory of social capital as an asset in human life (Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). He published the dense collection of statistics that displayed a significant decline in people's participation in social activities and warned this trend may have a negative effect on personal achievement, company success, and the function of society (Putnam, 2000).

Growth, innovation, discovery, and success have resulted when effective people, business leaders, and other professionals shared their knowledge based on their experiences (Lockhart, 2005; Putnam, 1995; Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). When schools, communities, and families interact and strengthen each other, benefits were greater than when they stood alone (Bassani, 2006; Coburn & Russell, 2006; Israel & Beaulieu, 2004; Plagens, 2010). As teachers worked together with communities and families, avenues for needed resources were discovered (Lockhart, 2005; ASCD, 2007).

Research supported educational achievement as an instrument necessary for upward mobility leading to success (Anderson, 2013; ASCD, 2007). Schools, communities, and families, who worked together to assist children in achieving academically increased opportunities, increased productivity, and improved economic situations (Curley, 2010). Without social capital among the three, opportunities are more limited or left unknown.

For instance, a faculty member may have been involved in a youth science camp outside of the school, and as a result, students joined. The community may have needed a location for blood drives or food banks, and the school provided the space. Families may have been employed by businesses who offered services to the school, such as a guest speaker in economics.

The opposite may have existed when a school was closed off to the community due to security, differences in religious doctrine, focus on test scores, or policies that prohibit collaboration with local businesses or volunteers (Bracy, March 2011; Brooks, 2009; Stern, 2009). For instance, if a school had a policy of not making community announcements, families may not had known about the literacy program at the local library.

Research

Publications by social, political, and economic scholars on social capital theory have researched the effect on economic growth (Coleman & Hoffer, 1987; Lockhart, 2005; Putnam 2000; Putnam & Feldstein 2003). Social capital has been shown to provide networking that incubates life improvements, leading to upward mobility in economic growth.

Within the social capital arena, topics such as *bridging*, *bonding*, and *reciprocity* honed on aspects of sameness, differences, and mutual aid (Smith, 2007; Torche, 2004). These topics examined different attributes, but have same points of curiosity: Is social capital a valuable asset to humankind?

Supporters and critics exist who report valid arguments for both sides. Proponents argued areas of fighting poverty, developing lasting relationships, and increasing trust were benefits of building social capital (Gamoran & Long, 2006, Uslaner, 2004). Opponents believed an increased social capital could have stagnated lifestyle, seclude others, and did not accurately measure minority populations (Alexander, 2007; Hero, Social capital and racial inequality in America, 2003).

Education

Social capital theory has gained interest in the area of education (ASCD, 2007). The whole child education movement increased curricula to involve lifestyle, relationships, communication, and teamwork instead of just reading, writing, and mathematics (Blank & Berg, 2006; Doyle, 2004; Schaps, 2006; Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). While many schools struggle with time constraints in a test-centered environment, research indicates schools should devote more funding toward smaller classrooms which foster relationships between the teacher and student (Tomlinson & Germundson, 2007).

The whole child education movement encouraged community involvement. Some schools implemented graduation requirements involving community service (ASCD, 2007). School clubs and activities fostered becoming an active citizen by encouraging the support of social justice and political issues. Some schools invited speakers to address a topic in the classroom or at school events. The difficulty was

finding the time to implement opportunities when the state held the school accountable for reading and mathematics scores as a result of No Child Left Behind (ASCD, n.d.).

This Case Study

At the time of this study, Robert Putnam was a leading researcher in the field of social capital at Harvard Kennedy School. Harvard's Saguaro Seminar was dedicated to studying the theoretical framework of social capital having completed many national studies. One such study used the *2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire* developed by the Saguaro Seminar to gather national data (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006b). The researcher was given permission to adapt this survey for purposes of this case study.

Changes made to the survey included the deletion of irrelevant questions and an addendum specifically pertaining to school settings. The researcher used the survey script included during the administrator interviews. Each of the schools allowed for a similar group setting to direct the faculty surveys.

School Selection

The two high schools were in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia, both had enrollment close to 200 students, were similar in demographics, and were completely removed from the researcher. The high schools were purposely chosen. Data for public schools were easily accessible through the West Virginia Department of Education's statistics on existing schools and the 2012 U.S. Census (U. S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts, 2013; West Virginia Department of Education, 2013). Due to limited private school information available through the West Virginia Department of

Education, the researcher contacted superintendents of private school organizations to gather additional data needed to select the private high school.

After all permissions were granted, the researcher visited each school three to five times. Initial interviews, informational meetings, consent forms, administration of the addendum and surveys, and gathering of informational documents were completed during these visits. Both the private high school and the public high school were welcoming and cooperative.

Conclusions

Each high school administrator provided school specific information through the addendum (Appendix G). Both schools had websites and provided electronic grading communication programs a means for their faculty to provide information to parents. The private high school had social media sites, and the public high school did not; however, the public school principal did indicate her desire to create social media sites representing the high school before the beginning of the next year. Both schools contacted parents about attendance and grade issues using mass telephone services, individual phone calls, progress reports, and report cards.

Volunteers were encouraged to assist both schools. The public school had a business partner in education, whereas the private school brought community speakers into the classroom. Both schools made and distributed community announcements, were used for blood drives, and had clubs involving community service. The public school also had a vocational program which they sustained by selling the resulting goods and produce to the community. The private school had a requirement for community service

hours for all students while the public school only required certain groups to complete community service. Both had club and athletic opportunities.

The principal in both the public and private high school were very friendly and forthcoming with information and encouraged their faculty to participate. Both principals were very active in the school, working at least 60 hours a week, and made time to attend school events and activities. Both had high trust responses and had no extreme opinions about race. Both also considered religion very important in their life and were actively involved in religious and community activities. They also believe there should be an increase in public school funding, but had opposite opinions on why people were in poverty.

Even though one was a private and the other was a public run school, both had very similar faculty responses (see Tables 2 through 10). Considering the similarity in demographics, enrollment, and structure, this was not too surprising. However, the surprise surfaced with how similar the results were to the nationally-given *2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire* due to the diverse demographics, educational backgrounds, income levels, races, and occupational statuses of the 12,100 respondents. Since it was a national survey, the main commonality was being a U.S. citizen, scoring in the ninety percentages (Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, 2006a).

The purpose of this dissertation was to further explore social capital in educational settings by contributing more data, support research, and gather evidence that may lead to new discoveries. This case study revealed perceptions of social capital levels by an administrator and faculty of two different types of educational facilities: one public

and one private high school. The participants reported their perceptions of social capital in their own lives and surrounding community.

Research Questions

From the survey responses, did the administrator and faculty display levels of social capital in their personal lives and in the general practices of the school? Did the perceptions of social capital display notable results, either different or similar, between public and private high school administration and faculty with similar demographics? Were results of the study notably comparable to the 2006 national study? Did these results support existing research for or against the importance of building one's social capital? Also, could the case study data strengthen or lead to new theories?

Administrator and faculty levels of social capital. From the survey responses, did the administrator and faculty display levels of social capital in their personal lives and in the general practices of the school? This dissertation's Literature Review supported the theory of social capital that creates and strengthens networking, trust, and *reciprocity*. Both schools' participants reported positive levels of social capital from their responses. The results showed a willingness to participate in the community, volunteerism by families within the school and community, and great efforts to communicate information to families. The administration and faculty also remained actively involved in school and community activities. It was evident through the responses that both schools perceived a strong social capital as beneficial to the school, families, and community.

This result was supported by the research in the Literature Review of this dissertation. There was evidence reporting that educators benefit from a high social capital. These benefits included cooperation with the families, community, and

administration; less resistance when the schools implemented new ideas; being more apt

to work with surrounding businesses; understanding struggles encountered by school

families; instilling an attitude to become a part of the solution to solve community

problems; having a higher level of trust; and being involved in more groups and activities

(Clift, 2005; Plagens, 2010).

      Notable results between schools. Did the perceptions of social capital display

notable results, either differences or similarities, between public and private high school

with similar demographics? Results of the survey were quite similar between the two

high schools, regardless of one being a private and the other being a public high school.

As the researcher combed through each question, the responses were remarkably similar.

Few notable differences occurred. One such difference was the private school

participants viewed religion as more important in their lives than the public school

participants. Being this was a religious private school, this response was not surprising.

On the other hand, even though one was a private and the other a public school, both

groups of participants responded in favor of increasing public school funding. The state

of West Virginia does not financially support private schools, but it could reflect a

mindset of those who are in the field of education, particularly in like settings.

      Comparison to 2006 national survey. Were results of the study notably

comparable to the 2006 national study? Even though the case study was small in

comparison to *The 2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire*

consisting of 12,100 respondents, the similarities were surmountable (Table 10). For

instance, when addressing trust, the first choice was the same when comparing the two

high schools. Private high school respondents (88%) and public high school respondents

(100%) mostly trusted the people they worshiped or went to church with. Interestingly, trusting those at church and worship also came in number one in the 2006 national survey, ranking at 92% of respondents.

All three, public (100%), private (75%), and national respondents (83%) trusted police second overall. Continuing the similarities, the three groups also scored above 75% when asked if they trusted their race. Table 10 displays other likenesses between the three results.

Results support existing research. Did these results support existing research for or against the importance of building one's social capital? Trust, as discussed in Chapter Two, can build networks and encourage growth in school settings (Coburn & Russell, 2006; McKenzie, Skrla, Scheurich & Rice, 2011; Plagens, 2010). James Coleman also emphasized trust as an asset resulting from a high level of social capital being significant to education (Gamoran & Long, 2006). Research has shown that with trust, teachers will share ideas, relationships will become stronger, and people will be willing to assist one another (Clift, 2005; McKenzie, Skrla, Scheurich & Rice, 2011; Plagens, 2010). Given there are areas in the respondents' lives where they strongly trust others was encouragement to explore benefits that building trust in the school setting could produce.

Robert Putnam claimed voter registration and participation was also a strong indicator of social capital (Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). The case study reported both public and private high school faculty and administration with 100% voter registration. Participation in the 2012 election was reported at 100% for the private high school and 90% for the public high school. According to Putnam's (2000) claims, this

would conclude that participants have high levels of social engagement, also concluding the respondents' higher probability of personal success.

Putnam (2000) warranted that involvement in groups, activities, families, and any interactive social event builds value to a person. He continued to claim involvement can also build value to those who know others with high levels of involvement. Table 4 and Table 8 report the respondents' involvement in these areas, also indicating the presence of social capital. Personally, once the results are shared with the participating schools, the respondents' perceptions may spark the beginning of self-reflection that could encourage an expansion of networking and involvement increasing their own social capital. The results also encourage more research to be continued to compare levels of social capital to areas of education within schools and the possible effects.

Strengthen current or lead to new theories. Could the case study data strengthen or lead to new theories? Given the small case study, the nature of the results, and the data collected, it is difficult to determine whether the positive atmosphere of either school is a direct result of social capital or other underlying variables. On the other hand, the similarities between the schools and the national survey once again encourage continued research in these areas. The Literature Review provided evidence supporting involvement in the community leading to increased economic growth and a deterrent to community violence (Bingler, Blank, & Berg, 2008; Lockhart, 2005; Patton & Johnson, 2010). These schools both were active in their surrounding community; it is worth exploring this prospect further. Perhaps increasing the sample size in increments to examine whether the similarities continue would be a worthwhile study.

Also given the small size of the study, the results should not be used to generalize

in other global, national, or even state areas. On the other hand, the comparison to the

2006 national study displayed many of the same results as displayed in Table 10. This

spurred several questions for extended research. Although it is possible the results reflect

a mindset of those in the field of education in similar settings, the national results were a

strong indicator there may be more to be considered. The national results reported in the

90 percentages of participants being U.S. citizens. The question could be raised about

whether some of the results could reflect American culture in general. When asked to

reflect a sense of identity, the national survey also revealed being an American as the top

response. Even though being an American rated so highly, also similar was a lack of

confidence in the national government to "do what is right."

New theories in education surrounding the topic of social capital should be

explored. Once the levels of social capital have been measured, correlations with

educational achievement, personal success, and economic prosperity could be

investigated. Results may determine if a concentrated effort to increase social capital is

worth investing time and resources to improve educational systems and environments.

Sharing the results. The researcher does believe the results can add value to a

database for educational systems. The sample sets are too small to come to generalize

results, but similar enough to the national data to encourage further research. The

researcher will provide the results of this case study to The Harvard Kennedy School,

The Saguaro Seminar.

The researcher will also provide the results to each participating school and give

them information on the theory of Social Capital, particularly the Harvard Kennedy

School, The Saguaro Seminar for Civic Engagement in America. The researcher will

also encourage the administrators to visit the Saguaro Seminar web site which contains tools, articles, and information about the theory of social capital and how they may benefit from researching on their own. Of course, this dissertation will be made available to them as well.

Recommendations

There was little difference between the two schools on a variety of levels. Both administrators were dedicated and passionate about educating children and were excited about the prospect of using the results as a tool to make improvements. The faculty and staff were cooperative and forthcoming with information. The schools, both private and public, were vested in making a difference in the community, developing relationships with students' families, and providing opportunities to students outside of the regular curriculum.

The school employees were an active part of the community. The conversations and responses illustrated that both schools were not isolated institutions, but resources for students and families. The evidence of participation in extracurricular activities, membership in clubs, involvement in community service, and efforts to create an awareness to the students and families about community opportunities all display high levels of social capital in both private and public high schools.

The researcher encourages both schools to continue and expand on areas of communication, building relationships, and sharing resources with families and communities. This social capital builds relationships and trust. These relationships open doors to opportunities that would otherwise be left unknown.

As an example, a student was sitting across from her principal sobbing because

she received a grade of a "B" in physics. The principal patiently listened to this student explain how she just could not understand the teacher. After the student finished, the administrator asked the student if she had talked to the teacher about her struggles and concerns in the class. This triggered an outburst of tears with the answer of, "No." Through further conversations with the student, it was discovered that this student rarely spoke in the classroom. She did not ask questions, she did not greet the teacher, and she did not respond when prompted by the teacher.

The student was a teenage female, who kept to herself and her close circle of friends. She was a serious student and would only accept success out of any performance. A month earlier, the administrator placed this same student in a leadership position to stretch her circle and allow for her to make a difference in the lives of her peers.

The teacher was a very tall, athletic build, with an intimidating and brash voice, great for his part-time job as a referee. The administrator knew his heart and was confident in his passion for educating youth and keeping the standards high. Her job now was to build the student-teacher relationship between the two.

The administrator gave the student an assignment. During the next week, she was to have a conversation with the teacher. This conversation did not have to be academic, she could ask the teacher how his day was going, or if he worked the evening before, or how his family was doing.

The next Monday, the administrator and teacher met again. To the administrator's dismay, the student had not completed the assignment. So she assigned it again, but this time with a bit of intervention. After a few days, the administrator

approached the teacher and asked if this student had made an effort to have a conversation with him. A little confused, the teacher responded that he thought she told him to have a good day when she left the classroom. At this, the administrator explained to him about the situation presented to her by the student. Immediately concerned, the teacher said he had noticed resistance from her and shared some of the recent techniques he used to increase the communication in the classroom. The teacher, a father of two teenage girls of his own, was eager to find a solution.

The administrator went and escorted the student to the teacher's classroom where they sat in a circle and talked. As the conversation ensued between the two, the stress was lifted from the student as she could see the genuine concern the teacher had for her success. Sitting in a circle, instead of a lecture stance towering over the student, allowed for the teacher to be at the same eye level with the student, which made it easier for this student to connect with what he was saying.

After the meeting, the administrator encouraged both the student and the teacher to remember this experience and continue to build upon their student-teacher relationship. In addition, after the student left the meeting, the administrator encouraged the teacher to follow-up with the parents and build a trust relationship to increase the communication between the parties.

Students

The above story revealed a common scenario between students and teachers. Students and teachers can take an active part in building a trust relationship with each other to allow for ease of student communication to express their understanding of class material. Students should make effort to respectfully greet their instructors upon entering

the classroom. Teachers choose their profession to make a difference in the lives of children; it is encouraging to teachers when they know students appreciate their efforts. In addition, this added communication displays an active role in the classroom and students can become more comfortable with asking questions. This also encourages educators when they know the course is important to the student and they see effort the student puts forth to understand the material.

Also, students' involvement in clubs, activities, and leadership positions allow for students to work on collaborative and communication skills that are critical in building a strong social capital. These interactions can also build upon teacher-student relationships as teachers are often the extracurricular advisors, coaches, and supervisors.

Teachers

Teachers are in a place of authority and control the atmosphere of the classroom. They would benefit from becoming aware of their own attributes and how they are perceived by their students. Taking a few minutes to inquire about students' lives outside of school can show that teachers care and are concerned. Educators should also be involved in the local communities of their schools to be a physical presence. It also helps for teachers to share experiences with students that emphasize the importance of networking and building relationships, and how these experiences produced benefits in their own lives.

Students also appreciate seeing their teachers at local and student events. When teachers support, encourage, and even cheer on their efforts, students become empowered with confidence. Students look to teachers for approval and when educators can portray an interest in the lives of their students, trust levels are built. Teachers who actively

146

participate in community service and civic engagement foster these attributes in their students. When a teacher informs students about participation in the voting process and how important it is to exercise their right to vote, students can become excited about being a part of a community.

Schools

Schools can become institutions isolated from the community at-large. When schools become a part of community, neighborhoods take ownership. Administrators and faculty members can *bond*, *bridge*, and *reciprocate* with communities with a few easy steps. Administrators must be a physical presence in the community. If the administrator takes the time to be outside of the school building and communicate with families when students arrive or depart from the school, trust and relationships are built. Just as the faculty, it is also important that administrators are present and involved at local activities. Administrators should make efforts to mingle with different groups of students and families during these outings.

Administrators can also provide a network of opportunities for their schools by visiting with local businesses, charities, and organizations. Many businesses have resources, experiences, and advice they would love to provide for the future generation. Inviting the businesses to become a part of the school by participating in some way could also result in financial sponsorship for programs provided by the school. For instance, if the local farm store was made aware of the agricultural program at the school, they may offer extra supplies to aid in their school projects.

Also, being aware of community resources and charity organizations can arm the administrator with information to relay to the families for assistance or volunteer

opportunities. Business, community, and charity organizations may also need support from the school through use of classrooms, multipurpose rooms, cafeterias, or other resources including multimedia and technology. Working together reciprocates opportunities and increases success.

The college junior was correct when he said kids need our support these days. It did not take long for him to see the positive results while working with at-risk youth. The connections made and networks built when being involved in activities, clubs, and a good communication system allow for opportunities that would not otherwise be exposed. While it is true that it is a choice of whether or not individuals take advantage of such opportunities, a friendly voice of encouragement and a good support system can make the opportunities that much more successful.

Schools are a venue in which teachers, administrators, and volunteers work in close proximity to youth. When schools work collaboratively with families and communities, the support system provides the same type of social capital that is created in the business world. Any network that can be made to provide a bridge to other organizations may be beneficial. The goal of these benefits is to provide an avenue to success for students, leading to upward mobility in their lives. A high level of social capital opens doors, builds relationships, and increases trust that provide opportunities, otherwise not available.

References

Abdul-Hakim R., Abdul-Razak, N. A., & Ismail, R. (2010). Does social capital reduce poverty? A case study of rural households in Terengganu, Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 14*(4), 556-566.

Adopt-a-school in reverse? District 'loans' teacher to utility company. (1993). *Curriculum Review*, *33*(3), 20.

Alexander, M. (2007). Determinants of social capital: New evidence on religion, diversity, and structural change. *British Journal of Political Science, 37*(2), 368-377.

Amin, A. (2005). Local community on trial. *Economy and Society, 34*(4), 612-633.

Anderson, P. (2013). Faces of poverty: Helping poor kids - From one who knows. *Educational Leadership, 70*(8). Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may13/vol70/ num08/Helping-Poor-Kids%E2%80%94From-One-Who-Knows.aspx

Andrews, R., & Brewer, G. A. (2010). Social capital and fire service performance: Evidence from the U.S. States. *Social Science Quarterly*, *91*, 576-591. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00708.x

Arcodia C., & Whitford M., (2006). Festival attendance and the development of social capital. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, *8*(2), 1-18. doi:10.1300/J452v08n02_01

Armstrong, A. (2012). A step in the right direction: Learning walk brings districts together to examine teacher evaluation and support roles. *Journal of Staff Development*, *33*(5), 50-54.

Arnoldi, M. J. (2012). "From Timbuktu to Washington": Reflections on the 2003 Mali

    program at the Smithsonian Folklife Festival. *Africa Today, 59*(1), 3-24.

ASCD. (2007). *The learning compact redefined: A call to action.* A report for the

    Commission on the Whole Child convened by the ASCD, Alexandria, VA.

ASCD. (n.d.). *Whole child state policy recommendations*. Retrieved from

    http://www.ascd.org/public-policy/wholechildpolicies.aspx#intro

Austin, S. M., Reynolds, G. P., & Barnes, S. I. (2012). School leadership and counselors

    working together to address bullying. *Education, 133*(2), 283-290.

Baker, W. (2000). Achieving success through social capital: Tapping the hidden

    resources in your personal and business networks. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-

    Bass.

Barrera, D. (2007). The impact of negotiated exchange on trust and trustworthiness.

    Social Networks, *29*(4), 508-526. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2007.03.004

Barrow, L., & Rouse, C. (2008). School vouchers: Recent findings and unanswered

    questions. *Economic Perspectives*, *32*(3), 2-16.

Bassani, C. (2006). A test of social capital theory outside of the American context:

    Family and school social capital and youths' math scores in Canada, Japan, and

    the United States. *International Journal of Educational Research, 45*, 380-403.

Bassett, W. W. (2008). Changing perceptions of private religious schools: Public money

    and public trust in the education of children. *Brigham Young University Law*

    Review, *2008*(2), 243-274.

Beyerlein, K., & Hipp, J. R. (2005). Social capital, too much of a good thing? American

    religious traditions and community crime. *Social Forces*, *84*(2), 995-1013.

Bhandari, H., & Yasunobu, K. (2009). What is social capital? A comprehensive review of the concept. *Asian Journal of Social Science, 37*(3), 480-510. doi:10.1163/156853109X43684

Bhattacharya, G. (2011). Is social capital portable? Acculturating experiences of Indian immigrant men in New York City. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *32*(1), 75-90. doi:10.1080/07256868.2010.524919

Bingler, S., Blank, M., & Berg, A. (2008). Bringing back the neighborhoods. *Education Digest, 73*(8), 25-27.

Blank, M., & Berg. A. (2006). *All together now: sharing responsibility for the whole child.* A report for the Commission on the Whole Child convened by the ASCD, Alexandria, VA.

Blank, M. J., Melaville, A., & Shah, B. P. (2003). Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools. *Washington, D.C.: Coalition for Community Schools*. Retrieved from Coalition for Community Schools website: http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/Page/CCSFullReport.pdf

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

Bracy, N. L. (March 2011). Student perceptions of high-security school environments. *Youth & Society*, 43, 365-395. doi:10.1177/0044118X10365082

Brooks, S. M. (2009). A case study of school-community alliances that rebuilt a community. *School Community Journal, 19*(2), 59-80.

Broughman, S. P., & Swaim, N. L. (2013). *Characteristics of private schools in the United States: Results from the 2011–12 Private School Universe Survey* (NCES 2013-316). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch

Bryan, J., Moore-Thomas, C., Day-Vines, N. L., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2011). School counselors as social capital: The effects of high school college counseling on college application rates. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 89*(2), 190-199.

Brisson, D. (2009). Testing the relationship of formal bonding, informal bonding, and formal bridging social capital on key outcomes for families in low-income neighborhoods. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *36*(1), 167-183.

Bush, T. (1999). Plain living: The search for simplicity. *Christian Century*, *116*(19), 676-681.

Chapman, C. (2008). Towards a framework for school-to-school networking in challenging circumstances. *Educational Research, 50*(4), 403-420.

Chaves, M., & Tsistos, W. (2001). Congregations and social services: What they do, how they do it, and with whom. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 30*(4), 660-683.

Cherrier, H. (2009). Disposal and simple living: Exploring the circulation of goods and the development of sacred consumption, *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, *8*(6), 327-339.

Cheung, C., & Kam, P. (2010). Bonding and bridging social capital development by social workers. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *36*(5), 402-413. doi:10.1080/01488376.2010.510945

Clift, E. (2005). A place to belong: Student agency in the social capital of a magnet school. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*, *20*(4), 271-297.

Coburn, C. E., & Russell, J. L. (2006). *Exploring the determinants of teacher social networks*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Sociological Association, Berkeley, CA.

Cole, A. G. (2010). School-community partnerships and community-based education: A case study of a novice program. *The University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education's Online Urban Education Journal, 7*(1), 15-26.

Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T. (1987). *Public and private high schools: The impact of communities.* New York: Basic Book Incorporated.

Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, 95-120. doi:10.1086/228943

Condeluci, A. (2002). *Cultural shifting: Community, leadership, and change*. St. Augustine, FL: Training Resource Network.

Conley A. (2010). Childcare: welfare or investment? *International Journal of Social Welfare, 19*(2), 173-181.

Corporation for National Community Service, The Federal Agency for Service and Volunteering. (2012). *Volunteering and civic life in America.* Retrieved from http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/rankings/States/Volunteer-Rates/2011

Council for American Private Education. (2013). *Facts and studies.* Retrieved from http://www.capenet.org/facts.html

Curley, A. M. (2010). Relocating the poor: Social capital and neighborhood resources. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 32*(1), 79-103. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9906.2009.00475.x

Doyle R. (2004). A social development curriculum: Applying nurture group principles

and practices to support socially and emotionally vulnerable children within

mainstream classrooms. *British Journal of Special Education, 31*(1), 24-30.

doi:10.1111/j.0952-3383.2004.00322x

Education Law Center. (2005). *Understanding public school residency requirement: A*

guide for advocates. Sponsored by New Jersey State Bar Foundation. Retrieved

from http://www.edlawcenter.org/assets/files/pdfs/

publications/ResidencyRequirementsGuide.pdf

Eggebeen, D. J., & Knoester, C. (2001). Does fatherhood matter for men. *Journal of*

Marriage and Family, 63, 381-393.

Ekinci, A. (2012). The effects of social capital levels in elementary schools on

organizational information sharing. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice,*

12(4), 2513-2520.

Elliott, D. (2009). *How Nuclear is the Nuclear Family? Extended Family Investments in*

Children. Ann Harbor, MI: ProQuest.

Farr, J. (2004). Social capital: A conceptual history. *Political Theory, 32*(1), 6-33.

Friedkin, N. E., & Slater, M. R. (1994). School leadership and performance: A social

network approach. *Sociology of Education, 67*(2), 139-157.

Freistadt, J., & Strohschein, L. (2012). Family structure differences in family functioning:

Interactive effects of social capital and family structure. *Journal of Family Issues,*

34(7), 952-974. doi:10.1177/0192513X12447054

Furstenberg, F. F. (2005). Banking on families: How families generate and distribute

social capital. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(11), 809-821.

Gamoran, A., & Long, D. (2006) *School Effects in Comparative Perspective: New Evidence from a Threshold Model.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal Convention Center, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, Aug 10, 2006. Available on line at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p103569_index.html

Gamoran, A., López Turley, R. N., Turner A., & Fish, R. (2011). Differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic families in social capital and child development: First-year findings from an experimental study. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 30*(1), 97-112.

Garland, D. R., Wolfer, T. A., & Myers, D. R. (2008). How 35 congregations launched and sustained community ministries. *Social Work & Christianity, 35*(3), 229-257.

Garnet, N. (2010). Affordable private education and the middle class city. *University of Chicago Law Review*, *77*(1), 201-222.

Gottfredson, D. C., & Di Pietro, S. M. (2011). School size, social capital, and student victimization. *Sociology of Education, 84*(1), 69-89. doi:10.1177/0038040710392718

Grady, S., & Bielick, S. (2010). *Trends in the Use of School Choice: 1993 to 2007* (NCES 2010-004). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Haghighat, E. (2005). School social capital and pupils' academic performance. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 15*(3), 213-235.

Harvard University. (2013). *The Harvard Kennedy School. Saguaro Seminar: Civic engagement in America* [Seminar]. Retrieved from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/programs/saguaro/

Hawkins, R. L., & Maurer, K. (2010). Bonding, bridging and linking: How social capital operated in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina. *British Journal of Social Work. 40*, 1777-1793. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcp087

Hero, R. (2003). Multiple traditions in American politics and racial policy inequality. *Political Research Quarterly, 56*(4), 401-408.

Hero, R. (2003). Social capital and racial inequality in America. *Perspectives on Politics, 1*(1), 113-122.

Holt, K. D. (2008). *Bowling together or bowling alone: Continuation high school students tell their stories.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego, CA.

Hoyle, J. R., & Slater, R. O. (2001). Love, happiness, and America's schools: The role of educational leadership in the 21st century. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(10), 790-794.

Huston, A. C., Duncan, G. J., Granger, R., Bos, J. McLoyd V., Mistry R., Crosby D., Gibson C., Magnuson K., Romich J., & Ventura A. (2001). Work-based antipoverty programs for parents can enhance the school performance and social behavior of children. *Child Development, 72*, 318-336.

Illinois State Board of Education. (2012). Registration guidance for the 2012-2013 school year: Residency & enrollment, immigrant pupils, homeless pupils and school fees & waivers (Non-Regulatory Guidance). Retrieved from http://www.isbe.state.il.us/pdf/guidance_reg.pdf

Israel, G. D., & Beaulieu, L. J. (2004). Laying the foundation for employment: The role of social capital in educational achievement. *The Review of Regional Studies, 34*(3), 260-287.

Iyer, S., Kitson, M., & Toh, B. (2005). Social capital economic growth and regional development. *Regional Studies, 39*(8), 1015-1040.

James, L. E., Laatsch, S., Bosse, M., Rider, R., Lee, T., & Anderson, C. J. (2006). Science center partnership: Outreach to students and teachers. *Rural Educator, 28*(1), 33-38.

James, J. T. (2007). Changes in funding and governance of Catholic elementary education in the United States. *British Journal of Religious Education, 29*(3), 287-301. doi:10.1080/01416200701479687

Jeynes, W. (2010). A call for character education and prayer in the schools. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Johnson, J. A., Honnold, J. A., Threlfall, P. (2011). Impact of social capital on employment and marriage among low income single mothers. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *38*(4), 9-31.

Jones, C., Clark, L., Grusec, J., Hart, R., Plickert, G., Teppperman, L., & Human Resources Department Canada. (2002). *Poverty, social capital, parenting and child outcomes in Canada*. Report retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.194.5543&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Keene, J. R., Prokos, A. H., & Held, B. (2012). Grandfather caregivers: Race and ethnic differences in poverty. *Sociological Inquiry, 82*(1), 49-77. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682X.2011.00398.x

Kirby, D., & Sharpe, D. (2010). High school students in the new learning environment: A profile of distance e-learners. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET, 9*(1), 83-88.

Kittilson, M., & Dalton, R. (2011). Virtual civil society: The new frontier of social capital? *Political Behavior, 33*, 625-644.

Kohn, A. (2004). *What does it mean to be well educated?* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Lehr, C. A., & Lang, C. M. (2003). Alternative schools serving students with and without disabilities: What are the current issues and challenges? *Preventing School Failure, 47*(2), 59-65.

Lagon, M. P. (2002). Bowling alone (Book). [Review of the book *Bowling Alone,* by R.D. Putnam]. *Perspectives on Political Science, 31*(1), 61.

Lin, N. (2000). Inequality in social capital. *Contemporary Sociology, 29*(6), 785-795.

Liou, D. D., Antrop-Gonzalez, R., & Cooper, R. (2009). Unveiling the promise of community cultural wealth to sustaining Latina/o students' college going information networks. *Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational Studies Association, 45*(6), 534-555.

Lockhart, W. H. (2005). Building bridges and bonds: Generating social capital in secular and faith-based poverty-to-work programs. *Sociology of Religion, 66*(1), 45-60.

Lopez, C. (2005). Southern California Catholic School, community praise web-based communication solution. *T.H.E. Journal, 32*(10), 47.

Lubienski, C., Weitzel, P., & Lubienski, S. T. (2009). Is there a "consensus" on school

    choice and achievement? Advocacy research and the emerging political economy

    of knowledge production. *Educational Policy, 23*(1), 161-193.

Malone, H. J. (2008, Winter/Spring). Educating the whole child: Could community

    schools hold an answer. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum, 88*(1), 16-25.

Mandell, J. (2010). Picnics, participation and power: Linking community building to

    social change. *Community Development, 41*(2), 269-282.

    doi:10.1080/15575330903548760

Maquila Solidarity Network and the Project on Organizing, Development, Education, and

    Research (PODER). (2011). Can CSR ratings help improve labour practices in

    global supply chains? *Maquila Solidarity Network*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cbern.ca/kr/One.aspx?objectId=18273139&contextId=

    677979&lastCat=10539789

Marjoribanks, K. (2002). Family and school capital: Towards a context theory of

    students' school outcomes. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publisher.

Marsiglio, W. and Hinojosa, R. (2007). Managing the multifather family: Stepfathers as

    father allies. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*, 845-862.

Massat, C., Moses, H., & Ornstein, E. (2008). Greif and loss in schools: A perspective for

    school social workers. *School Social Work Journal, 33*(1), 80-96.

McKenzie, K. B., Skrla L., Scheurich, J. J., & Rice, D. (2011). Math and science

    academic success in three large, diverse, urban high schools: A teachers' story.

    Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 16, 100-121.

McLoyd V. C., Kaplan R., Purtell, K. M., & Huston A. C. (2011). Assessing the effects of a work-based antipoverty program for parents on youth's future orientation and employment experiences. *Child Development, 82*(1), 113-32.

McTighe, J. (2004). Private school accountability. *Journal of Education, 185*(3), 51-59.

Meier, A. (1999). *Social capital and student achievement among adolescents*. Paper for the presentation at the 1999 American Sociological Association Annual Meeting in Chicago. Retrieved from http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/cde/cdewp/99-18.pdf

Molm, L. D. (2010). The structure of reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *73*(2), 119-131. doi:10.1177/0190272510369079

Morrison, K. B. (2004). The ties that bind: The impact of isolation on income in rural America. *Journal of Public Affairs, 7*(1), 17-38.

Moser, M., & Rubenstein, R. (2002). The equality of public school district funding in the United States: A national status report. *Public Administration Review*, *62*(1), 63-72.

Narotzky, S. (2007). The project in the model: Reciprocity, social capital, and the politics of ethnographic realism. *Current Anthropology*, *48*(3), 403-424.

National Honor Society. (2014). About us. http://www.nhs.us/about-us.aspx

Overstreet, S., Devine, J., Bevans, K., & Efreom, Y. (2005). Predicting parental involvement in children's schooling within an urban, African American sample. *Psychology in the Schools, 42*, 101-111.

Patkotak, E. (2010). Culture of sharing: North Slope leaders forge trail into future. *Tribal Journal of American Indian Higher Education, 22*(1), 30-31.

Patton, D. U., & Johnson, D. W. (2010). Exposure to community violence and social

    capital: African American students in the critical transition to high school.

    Harvard Journal of African American Public Policy, 16, 53-72.

Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development. (2013).

    Educational improvement tax credit program. Retrieved from

    http://www.newpa.com/find-and-apply-for-funding/funding-and-program-

    finder/educational-improvement-tax-credit-program-eitc

Phelps, R., & Graham, A. (2008). Developing "technology together," together: A whole-

    school metacognitive approach to ICT Teacher Professional Development.

    Journal of Computing in Teacher Education, *24*(4), 125-133.

Pitzel, G. R., Benavidez, A. C., Bianchi, B. C., Croom, L. L., de la Riva, B. R., Grein, D.

    L., & Rendon, A. T. (2007). Rural revitalization in New Mexico: A grass roots

    initiative involving school and community. *Rural Educator, 28*(3), 4-11.

Plagens, G. K. (2010). Social capital in schools: perceptions and performance. *The*

    International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 5, 17-30.

Plagens, G. K. (2011). Social capital and education: Implications for student and school

    performance. *Education & Culture*, *27*(1), 40-64.

Popham, W. J. (2007, November). Accountability tests' instructional insensitivity: The

    time bomb ticket. *Education Week, 27*(12), 30-31.

Portes, A. (2000). The two meanings of social capital. *Sociological Forum, 15*(1).

Putnam, R. D. (Spring, 1993) The prosperous community: Social capital and public life.

    The American Prospect, 13, Retrieved from

    http://epn.org/prospect/13/13putn.html

Putnam, R. D. (1995) Bowling alone: America's declining social capital, *The Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65-78.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R. D., & Feldstein, L. M. (2003). *Better together: Restoring the American community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Reese, W. J. (2007). Why Americans love to reform the public schools. *Educational Horizons, 85*(4), 217-231.

Rogalski, R. (2003). Financial winds. *Lutheran Education*, *138*(4), 277-281.

Rothstein, R. (2004). Class and schools: Using social, economic, and educational reform to close the black-white achievement gap. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Rules of the State Board of Education (2008). *Minimum requirements for the approval of public schools* (Chapter 0520-1-3). Retrieved from http://tntel.tnsos.org/TEL-Dept_of_Ed-Legislation-0520-01-03.pdf

Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America. (2006a). *SK 2006 social capital community survey* [Data file]. Available from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/programs/saguaro/measurement/sk-2006-community-benchmark-survey

Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America. (2006b). *The 2006 social capital community survey*. Retrieved from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/programs/saguaro/measurement#benchmark

Saijun, Z., Anderson, S. G., & Min, Z. (2011). The differentiated impact of bridging and

    bonding social capital on economic well-being: An individual level perspective.

    Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, *38*(1), 119-142.

Sances (Eds). (Fall 2006). *The connector*. Retrieved from SCI Social Capital

    Incorporated website: http://www.socialcapitalinc.org/

Saracostti, M. (2007). Social capital as a strategy to overcome poverty in Latin America:

    An overview. *International Social Work, 50,* 515.

Schaps, E. (2006). *Educating the whole child.* For the Commission on the Whole Child

    convened by the ASCD, Alexandria, VA.

Sherkat, D. E. and Ellison, C. G. (1999). Recent developments and current controversies

    in the sociology of religion. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25*, 363-394.

Shriner, M., Mullis, R. L., & Schlee, B. M. (2009). The usefulness of social capital theory

    for understanding the academic improvement of young children in stepfamilies

    over two points in time. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 50*, 445.

    doi:10.1080/10502550902970553

Shriner, C. J., Mullis, R. L., & Shriner, B. M. (2010). Variations in family structure and

    school-age children's academic achievement: A social and resource capital

    perspective. *Marriage and Family Review, 46*(6), 445-467.

Sikkink, D. (2012). Religious school differences in school climate and academic mission:

    a descriptive overview of school organization and student outcomes. *Journal of*

    School Choice, 6(1), 20-39. doi:10.1080/15582159.2012.651394

Slavin, R. (2007). Preventing reading failure: through intensive reading instruction, the

    reading edge gives adolescents the boost they need to become successful readers.

    Educational Leadership, 65(2), 22-27.

Smith, M. K. (2007). 'Robert Putnam'. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education,*

    Retrieved from www.infed.org/thinkers/putnam.htm

Smith, C. (2003). Theorizing religious effects among American adolescents. *Journal for*

    the Scientific Study of Religion, 46(1), 17-30.

Sosin, M. R., & Smith, S. (2006). New responsibilities of faith-related agencies. *Policy*

    Studies Journal, *34*(4), 533-562. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.2006.00190.x

Spradling, R. (2009). Sleeping peacefully?. *Schools: Studies in Education, 6*(2), 243-250.

Stern, D. (2009). Expanding policy options for educating teenagers. *Future of Children,*

    19(1), 211-239.

Stewart, C., & Varner, L. (2012). Common core and rural student. *National Teacher*

    Education Journal, 5(4), 67-73.

Thomas, R. M. (2003). Blending qualitative and quantitative research methods in theses

    and dissertations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tice, P., Princiotta, D., Chapman, C., & Bielick, S. (2006). Trends in the use of school

    choice: 1993 to 2003 (NCES 2007-045), *National Center for Education Statistics*,

    U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Tienken, C. H. (2012). The common core state standards: The emperor is still looking for

    his clothes. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 48*(4), 152-155.

Tomlinson, C., & Germundson, A. (2007). Teaching as jazz. *Educational Leadership,*

    64(8), 27-31.

Torche, F. (2004). Reciprocity and trust: A theoretical model of two types of social

capital. *Conference Papers - American Sociological Association*, 1.

doi:asa_proceeding_34770.PDF

United States Department of Agriculture. (n.d.). *Education and outreach.* Retrieved from

http://www.usda.gov

U.S. Census Bureau, Government Printing Office. (2013). *State and Local Government*

Finances Summary: 2011 (G11-ALFIN, U.S). Washington, DC.

U. S. Census Bureau, Government Printing Office. (2013). *Public Education Finances:*

2011 (G11-ASPEF, U.S). Washington, D.C.

U. S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts. (2013). *Data derived from*

Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Census of Population and

Housing, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns,

Nonemployer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building

Permits [Data]. Last Revised: Thursday, 27-Jun-2013 13:52:14 EDT. Retrieved

on August 9, 2013 http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html#

U. S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *About ED: Overview and mission statement*.

Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/landing.jhtml

U. S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *State contacts.* Retrieved from

http://www2.ed.gov/about/contacts/state/index.html

U. S. Department of Education. (2005). *10 facts about K-12 education funding*,

Washington, D.C.. Retrieved from

http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/10facts/index.html

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *The condition of education 2009* (NCES 2009-081). Table A-32-1.

U. S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. (2009). *State regulation of private schools*. Washington, D.C.. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/admins/comm/choice/regprivschl/regprivschl.pdf

U. S. Department of Education, Office of Non-public Education. (2013). *Office of innovation and improvement*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oii/nonpublic/index.html

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2011* (NCES 2012-001). Table 191 and Chapter 2. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=66

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Fast facts: Back to school statistics*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Private school universe survey (PSS)*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pss/tables/table_2009_14.asp

Urwin, P., Di Pietro, G., Sturgis, P., & Jack, G. (2008). Measuring the returns to networking and the accumulation of social capital: Any evidence of bonding, bridging, or linking?. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *67*(5), 941-968.

Uslaner, E. (2004). Trust and social bonds: Faith in others and policy outcomes reconsidered. *Political Research Quarterly, 57*(3), 501-507.

Vernon, D., & Rainey, J. (2009). The school counselor as grant writer. *Journal of School Counseling*, 71-21.

Wallace, P. (2009). Distance learning for gifted students: Outcomes for elementary, middle, and high school aged students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 32*(3), 295-320.

Watson, S. (February, 2008). *How public schools work*. Retrieved from HowStuffWorks.com. website: http://people.howstuffworks.com/public-schools.htm

W. H. Kellogg Foundation Handbook (1998; 2004 update). Retrieved from http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2010/W-K-Kellogg-FoundationEvaluation-Handbook.aspx

Weinstein, L. A., & Savitz-Romer, M. (2009). Planning for opportunity: applying organizational and social capital theories to promote college going cultures. *Educational Planning, 18*(2), 1-11.

West Virginia Department of Education (2013). Map of Counties of WV [County map]. Retrieved from https://wvde.state.wv.us/ed_directory/#resa.

West Virginia Department of Education. (2013). *West Virginia Board of Education.* Retrieved from http://wvde.state.wv.us/boe/

West Virginia Department of Education. (2011). *Quick Reports: Wetzel County. Magnolia High School.* Retrieved from http://wveis.k12.wv.us/nclb/pub/rpt1112/printrp/test.cfm?cn=092&school=502&sn=502&coname=WETZEL&rpage=index.cfm&rptnum=rpt12

Widmer, E. D. (2007). Social capital in wide family contexts: An empirical assessment

    using social network methods. *International Review of Sociology. 17*(2), 225-238.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (expanded 2nd ed).

    Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Wuthnow, R. (2002). Religious involvement and status-bridging social capital. *Journal*

    for the Scientific Study of Religion, *41*(4), 669-684.

Yan, W., & Lin, Q. (2005). Parent involvement and mathematics achievement: Contrast

    across racial and ethnic groups. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(2),

    116-127.

Young, F. (2001). Review essay: Putnam's challenge and community sociology. *Rural*

    Sociology, 66, 468-74.

Zickuhr, K. (2010). *Generations 2010* (Report). Retrieved from Pew Research Internet

    Project website: http://www.pewinternet.org/2010/12/16/generations-2010/

Zontini, E. (2010). *Transnational families, migration and gender*: *Moroccan and Filipino*

    women in Bologna and Barcelona. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

2013 Social Capital Community Survey Adapted

GENDER
1 Male
2 Female

5A. We would like to know how important various things are to your sense of who you are. When you think about yourself, how important are the questions below to your sense of who you are? **(Very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not at all important)**

5A1 …your OCCUPATION?
1 Not at all important
2 Slightly important
3 Moderately important
4 Very important
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

5A2 …your PLACE OF RESIDENCE?

1 Not at all important
2 Slightly important
3 Moderately important
4 Very important
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

5A3 …your ETHNIC OR RACIAL BACKGROUND?

1 Not at all important
2 Slightly important
3 Moderately important
4 Very important
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

5A4 Your RELIGION (if any) ?
1 Not at all important
2 Slightly important
3 Moderately important
4 Very important
5 Not relevant (not religious)

8 Don't Know
9 Refused

5A5 Being an AMERICAN ?
1 Not at all important
2 Slightly important
3 Moderately important
4 Very important
5 Not relevant (not American)
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

6. I'd like to first ask you some questions about how you view other people. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?
1 People can be trusted
2 You can't be too careful
3 Depends
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7. Next, we'd like to know how much you trust different groups of people. First, think about the following groups. Generally speaking, would you say that you can trust them a lot, some, only a little, or not at all?

7A. Families in the school's neighborhood

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7B. (How about) People you work with at this school (would you say that you can trust them a lot, some, only a little, or not at all?)

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7C. People at your church or place of worship

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7D. People who work in the stores near this school.

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7F. The police in *this* local community

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused
7G. (How about) White people

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7H. What about African Americans or Blacks?

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all

5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7I. What about Asian people?

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

7J. How about Hispanics or Latinos?

1 Trust them a lot
2 Trust them some
3 Trust them only a little
4 Trust them not at all
5 Does not apply
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

8A . If you lost a wallet or a purse that contained two hundred dollars, and it was found in this neighborhood, how likely is it to be returned with the money in it? Would you say very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely or not at all likely?

1 very likely
2 somewhat likely
3 somewhat unlikely
4 not at all likely
8 Don't know
9 Refused

8B. And if it was found by a complete stranger, how likely is it to be returned with the money in it? Would you say that was very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely or not at all likely?

1 very likely
2 somewhat likely
3 somewhat unlikely
4 not at all likely
8 Don't know
9 Refused

9. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays? Please answer using a scale where 1 means extremely dissatisfied and 10 means extremely satisfied.
Number: _____
88 DK
99 Refused

10. And how would you describe your overall state of health these days? Would you say it is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?

1 Excellent
2 Very Good
3 Good
4 Fair
5 Poor
8 Don't Know
339 Refused

11. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about the local community where the school is located. If public officials asked everyone to conserve water or electricity because of some emergency, how likely is it that people in this community would cooperate — would you say it is very likely, likely, unlikely, or very unlikely?

1 Very likely
2 Likely
3 Neither/Depends
4 Unlikely
5 Very Unlikely
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

11A. How likely do you think it is that you may be the victim of a crime in the next 12 months? (very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, very unlikely)

1 Very likely
2 Somewhat Likely
3 Neither/Depends
4 Somewhat Unlikely
5 Very Unlikely
8 Don't Know
9 Refused
12. How many years have you worked at this school in this community?

1 Less than one year
2 One to five years

3 Six to ten years SKIP TO 13
4 Eleven to twenty years SKIP TO 13
5 More than twenty years SKIP TO 13
6 All my life SKIP TO 13
8 Don't know SKIP TO 13
9 Refused SKIP TO 13

12A. What was the ZIPCODE (OR COUNTRY IF YOU LIVED OUTSIDE THE U.S.) of your prior position? _____

8 DK
9 Refused

13. Do you expect to be working in this community five years from now?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

13A. Would you leave this position, away from this neighborhood, if you could?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

14. Overall, how would you rate this community as a place to live — excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

1 Excellent
2 Good
3 Only Fair
4 Poor
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

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

1 Own
2 Rent
8 Don't know
9 Refused

16. Overall, how much impact do you think PEOPLE LIKE YOU can have in making

this community a better place to live — no impact at all, a small impact, a moderate impact, or a big impact?

1 No impact at all
2 A small impact
3 A moderate impact
4 A big impact
8 Don't know
9 Refused

17. Next I'd like to ask you a few questions about television and newspapers. How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper?

DAYS:____
8 Don't know
9 Refused

18. How many hours per day do you spend watching TV (television) on an average weekday, that is Monday through Friday?

HOURS:____
98 Don't know
99 Refused

19. How many hours do you spend using the Internet or email IN A TYPICAL WEEK, not counting the times you do so for work. (IF NECESSARY: By a week, we mean 7 days.)

1 None
2 Less than 1 hour
3 1 to 5 hours
4 6 to10 hours
5 11 to 20 hours
6 more than 20 hours
8 Don't know
9 Refused

21. My next questions are about public affairs. How interested are you in politics and national affairs? Are you very interested, somewhat interested, only slightly interested, or not at all interested?

1 Very interested
2 Somewhat interested
3 Only slightly interested
4 Not at all interested
8 Don't know

9 Refused

22. Are you currently registered to vote?

1 Yes
2 No
3 Not eligible to vote
8 Don't know
9 Refused

23. As you may know, around half the public does not vote in presidential elections. How about you – did you vote in the presidential election in 2012 when Mitt Romney ran against Barack Obama, or did you skip that one?

1 Yes, Voted
2 No, Skipped that one
3 Was not eligible
8 Don't know
9 Refused

24. How much of the time do you think you can trust the NATIONAL government to do what is right − just about always, most of the time, only some of the time, or hardly ever?

1 Just about always
2 Most of the time
3 Some of the time
4 Hardly ever
8 Don't know
9 Refused

25. How about the *school area's* LOCAL government? How much of the time do you think you can trust *this* LOCAL government to do what is right? (Would you say just about always, most of the time, only some of the time, or hardly ever?)

1 Just about always
2 Most of the time
3 Some of the time
4 Hardly ever
8 Don't know
9 Refused

26. Which of the following things has *the school* participated in the past twelve months:

26A. Petition signing?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

26B. Attended a political meeting or rally?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

26C. Worked on a community project?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

26D. Participated in any demonstrations, protests, boycotts, or marches?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

26E. Hosted a blood drive?

1 Yes
2 No
3 Can't give blood
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27. Thinking POLITICALLY AND SOCIALLY, how would you describe the majority
of families in this school system—as being very conservative, moderately conservative,
middle-of-the-road, moderately liberal or very liberal?

1 Very conservative
2 Moderately conservative
3 Middle-of-the-road
4 Moderately liberal
5 Very Liberal
6 Something else
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27A. Generally speaking, do you usually think of most of the people in this area as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or what?

1 Republican
2 Democrat
3 Independent
4 Other
5 No Preference
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27B. Next I am going to read you a list of federal programs. For each one, I would like you to tell me whether you would like to see spending increased or decreased. The first program is:

27B1 Public schools? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

1 Decreased
2 neither increased nor decreased
3 Increased
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27B2 Dealing with crime? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

1 Decreased
2 neither increased nor decreased
3 Increased
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27B3 Tightening border security to prevent illegal immigration? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

1 Decreased
2 neither increased nor decreased
3 Increased
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27B4 Aid to blacks? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

1 Decreased
2 neither increased nor decreased
3 Increased

8 Don't know
9 Refused

27B5 Aid to the poor? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

1 Decreased
2 Neither increased nor decreased
3 Increased
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27C. From what level of government do you feel you get the most for your money?
    (federal/national, state, or local)

1 Local
2 State
3 Federal/National
8 Don't know
9 Refused

27D. In your opinion, which is the bigger cause of poverty today - that people are not
doing enough to help themselves out of poverty, or that circumstances beyond their
control cause them to be poor?

1 people are not doing enough
2 circumstances cause them to be poor
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

28. Could you tell me the names of the two U.S. Senators from your state?

SEN1: _____

SEN2: _____

29. First, what is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, another type of
Christian, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?

1 Protestant SKIP TO 29A
2 Catholic SKIP TO 30
3 Another type of Christian SKIP TO 29B
4 Jewish SKIP TO 30
5 Some other religion SKIP TO 29C
6 No religion SKIP TO 33
8 Don't know SKIP TO 30
9 Refused SKIP TO 33
29A. What denomination is that, if any?

20 Non-denominational Protestant
30 Community church
40 Inter-denominational Protestant
98 Don't know
99 Refused
100 7th Day Adventist/Fundamentalist Adventists/Adventist
110 Episcopalian; Anglican; Worldwide Church of God
135 Baptist-Southern Baptist
149 Baptist-all other
150 United Church of Christ (includes Congregational, Evangelical and Reformed, and Congregational Christian)
169 Mennonite/Amish/Quaker/Brethren
180 Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA)
182 Church of the Nazarene
183 Free Methodist Church
184 Salvation Army
185 Wesleyan Church
201 Independent Fundamentalist Churches of America/ Independent
220 Lutheran-Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, all other
221 Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (LC-MS) or Wisconsin Synod
230 Methodist-United Methodist Church-Evangelical United Brethren; all other
231 Methodist-African Methodist Episcopal Church or African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
250 Pentecostal-Assemblies of God
269 Pentecostal (not specified); Church of God
279 Presbyterian
280 Christian Reformed Church or Dutch Reformed
281 Reformed Church in America
289 Reformed-all other references
290 Disciples of Christ
291 Christian Churches
292 Churches of Christ
293 Christian Congregation
997 Other, Specify
998 Don't Know
999 Refused

ALL ANSWERING Q.29A SKIP TO Q.30
29B. And what is that?

099 Christian (NEC); "just Christian"
300 Christian Scientists
700 Eastern Orthodox or Greek Rite Catholic (includes: Greek Orthodox, Russian
Orthodox, Rumanian Orthodox, Serbian Orthodox, Syrian Orthodox, Armenian
Orthodox,
Georgian Orthodox, Ukrainian Orthodox)
306 Fundamentalist Adventist (Worldwide Church of God)
304 Jehovah's Witnesses
301 Mormons; Latter Day Saints
302 Spiritualists
303 Unitarian; Universalist
305 Unity; Unity Church; Christ Church Unity
997 Other, Specify
ALL ANSWERING Q.29B SKIP TO Q.30
29C. (IF OTHER) What religion would that be?

724 American Indian Religions (Native American Religions)
723 Bahai
721 Buddhist
722 Hindu
720 Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam
997 Other, Specify

ALL ANSWERING Q.29C SKIP TO Q.30
30. Are you a MEMBER of a local church, synagogue, or other religious or spiritual
community?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

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

1 Every week (or more often)
2 Almost every week
3 Once or twice a month
4 A few times per year
5 Less often than that
8 Don't know
9 Refused

32. In the past 12 months, have you taken part in any sort of activity with people at your church or place of worship other than attending services? This might include teaching Sunday school, serving on a committee, attending choir rehearsal, retreat, or other things.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33. Now I'd like to ask about other kinds of groups and organizations. I'm going to read a list; just answer YES if you have been involved in the past 12 months with this kind of group.

33A. (Besides your local place of worship,) Any organization affiliated with religion, such as the Knights of Columbus or B'nai B'rith (BA-NAY BRITH), or a bible study group?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33B. An adult sports club or league, or an outdoor activity club.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33C. A youth organization like youth sports leagues, the scouts, 4-H clubs, and Boys & Girls Clubs.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33D. A parents' association, like the PTA or PTO, or other school support or service groups.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33E. A veteran's group.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33F. A neighborhood association, like a block association, a homeowner or tenant association, or a crime watch group.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33G. Clubs or organizations for senior citizens or older people.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33H. A charity or social welfare organization that provides services in such fields as health or service to the needy.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33I. A labor union.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33J. A professional, trade, farm, or business association.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33K. Service clubs or fraternal organizations such as the Lions or Kiwanis or a local women's club or a college fraternity or sorority. (Includes Alumni Organizations)

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33L. Ethnic, nationality, or civil rights organizations, such as the National Organization for Women, the Mexican American Legal Defense or the NAACP?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33M. Other public interest groups, political action groups, political clubs, or party committees.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33N. A literary, art, discussion or study group OR a musical, dancing, or singing group.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused
33O. Any other hobby, investment, or garden clubs or societies.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

33P. A support group or self-help program for people with specific illnesses, disabilities, problems, or addictions, or for their families.

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

IF 30 = 2 (NO) AND 33A-P = 2 (NO) OR 9 (REFUSED), SKIP TO 37 [R INVOLVED WITH NO GROUPS]

34. Did any of the groups that you are involved with take any LOCAL action for social or political reform in the past 12 months?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

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

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

37. People and families contribute money, property or other assets for a wide variety of charitable purposes. During the past 12 months, approximately how much money did you and the other family members in your household contribute to…

37A. All religious causes, including your local religious congregation
    (By contribution, I mean a voluntary contribution with no intention of making a profit or obtaining goods or services for yourself.) (Remember this is CONFIDENTIAL)

1 None
2 Less than $100
3 $100 to less than $500
4 $500 to less than $1000
5 $1000 to less than $5000
6 More than $5000
8 Don't know
9 Refused

37B. To all non-religious charities, organizations, or causes
    (By contribution, I mean a voluntary contribution with no intention of making a profit or obtaining goods or services for yourself. (Remember this is CONFIDENTIAL)

1 None
2 Less than $100
3 $100 to less than $500
4 $500 to less than $1000
5 $1000 to less than $5000
6 More than $5000

8 Don't know
9 Refused

38. For each, please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly.
    (Randomize order of items A-I)

38A. The people running *this* community don't really care much what happens to me.

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38B. Television is my primary form of entertainment.

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38C. Immigrants are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38D. A book that most people disapprove of should be kept out of *this* local public library.

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat

5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38E. I often feel that there are too many things to worry about and pay attention to.

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38F. Sometimes, I feel overwhelmed by everything that is going on

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 (VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38G. I feel used up at the end of a typical day.

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38H. I lead a calm and relaxed life

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38I. Religion is very important in my life.

1 Agree strongly
2 Agree somewhat
3 Neither/depends
4 Disagree somewhat
5 Disagree strongly
8 Don't know
9 Refused

38J. Do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be increased a lot, increased a little, remain the same as it is, reduced a little, or reduced a lot?

1 Increased a lot
2 Increased a little
3 Remain the same as it is
4 Reduced a little
5 Reduced a lot
6 Can't Choose
8 Don't know
9 Refused

41. About how many hours do you work in the average week? Count everything, including extra jobs or paid work you do at home.

HOURS:_____
98 Don't know
99 Refused

44 On a typical day (when you do go to your workplace), about how long does it take you to get to work?
HOURS: ___   MINUTES: ___
8 Don't know
9 Refused

45. So far as you and your family are concerned, would you say that you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or not at all satisfied with your present financial situation?

1 Very satisfied
2 Somewhat satisfied
3 Not at all satisfied
8 Don't know
9 Refused

46. Now, I want to ask you some questions about family, friends, and neighbors. First, I'd

like you to describe your household. Are you currently married, separated, divorced, widowed, or have you never married?

1 Currently married SKIP TO 47; if PANEL=1, SKIP TO 48
2 Separated
3 Divorced
4 Widowed SKIP TO 47; if PANEL=1, SKIP TO 48
5 Never Married
9 Refused SKIP TO 47; if PANEL=1, SKIP TO 48

46A. Are you currently living with a partner?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

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

VALID RANGE 0-20
CHILDREN:_____
98 Don't know
99 Refused
IF NO KIDS, SKIP TO 48

47A. And how many of these children are six years old or older?

CHILDREN SIX YEARS OR OLDER:_____
98 Don't know
99 Refused

48. Including yourself, how many adults live in your household?

ADULTS:_____
98 Don't know
99 Refused

50. Suppose a CLOSE RELATIVE or family member were marrying one of the following groups? Would you very much favor it happening, somewhat favor, neither favor nor oppose, somewhat oppose, or very much oppose it happening?

50A. an Asian person?

1 Very much favor
2 Somewhat favor
3 Neither favor nor oppose
4 Somewhat oppose
5 Very much oppose
8 Don't know
9 Refused

50B. African-American or Black person?

1 Very much favor
2 Somewhat favor
3 Neither favor nor oppose
4 Somewhat oppose
5 Very much oppose
8 Don't know
9 Refused

50C. White person?
1 Very much favor
2 Somewhat favor
3 Neither favor nor oppose
4 Somewhat oppose
5 Very much oppose
8 Don't know
9 Refused

50D. Latino or Hispanic person?

1 Very much favor
2 Somewhat favor
3 Neither favor nor oppose
4 Somewhat oppose
5 Very much oppose
8 Don't know
9 Refused

50E. Next, I'd like to know whether you have warm or cold feelings toward a number of well-known groups. I'll read out a group and ask you to rate it from zero(0) to one hundred (100). The higher the number, the warmer or more favorable you feel toward it. If you have very warm or positive feelings, you might give it 100. If you have very cold or negative feelings, give it a zero. If you feel neither warm nor cold toward it, give it a 50. You can use all the numbers from zero to 100. The first group is . . . .

50E1 Gay Men and Lesbians, that is, homosexuals? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E2 Blacks? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E3 Whites? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E4 Asian-Americans? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E5 Latinos or Hispanic-Americans? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E6 Catholics? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E7 Protestants? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E8 Muslims? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused
50E9 Evangelical Christians? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E10 Immigrants? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E11 Poor people? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

50E12 Rich people? _____

888 Don't know
999 Refused

51. Next I have a few questions about your IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS. These are the 10 or 20 households that live closest to you. About how often do you talk to or visit with your immediate neighbors — just about every day, several times a week, several times a month, once a month, several times a year, once a year or less, or never?

1 Just about everyday
2 Several times a week
3 Several times a month
4 Once a month
5 Several times a year
6 Once a year or less
7 Never
8 Don't know
9 Refused

52. In the past two years, have you worked with others to get people in your immediate neighborhood to work together to fix or improve something?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

52A. "If you were looking for a house, and found affordable houses in a few different neighborhoods, in which of the following neighborhoods would you personally feel most comfortable?" (Neighbors entirely of your own race or ethnic background; Neighbors mostly of your own race or ethnic background; Neighbors mostly of different racial or ethnic background from your own race or ethnic background; or the Racial or ethnic background of neighbors is completely irrelevant)

1 Neighbors entirely of your own race or ethnic background;
2 Neighbors mostly of your own race or ethnic background;
3 Neighbors mostly of different racial or ethnic background from your own race or ethnic

background;
4 Racial or ethnic background of neighbors is completely irrelevant
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

53. Now, how about friends? About how many CLOSE FRIENDS do you have these days? These are people you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, or call on for help. Would you say that you have no close friends, one or two, three to five, six to ten, or more than that?

1 No close friends
2 1-2 close friends
3 3-5 close friends
4 6-10 close friends
5 More than 10 close friends
8 Don't know
9 Refused

54. Right now, how many people do you have in your life with whom you can share confidences or discuss a difficult decision – nobody, one, two, or three or more? (INCLUDES FAMILY)

1 Nobody SKIP to 55
2 One SKIP to 55
3 Two SKIP to 55
4 Three or more, 54A
8 Don't Know SKIP to 55
9 Refused SKIP to 55

54A. How many would that be?   _____

55. Thinking now about everyone that you would count as a PERSONAL FRIEND, not just your closest friends—do you have a personal friend who…

55A (Do you have a personal friend who) Owns their own business?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

55B. (Do you have a personal friend who) Is a manual worker? (Works in a factory, as a truck driver, or as a laborer.)

1 Yes

2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

55C. (Do you have a personal friend who) Has been on welfare?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

55D. (Do you have a personal friend who) Owns a vacation home?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

55E. (Do you have a personal friend with) A different religious orientation

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

55F. (Do you have a personal friend who) Is White?

1 Yes
2 No SKIP to 55G
8 Don't know SKIP to 55G
9 Refused SKIP to 55G

How many personal WHITE friends would that be? _____, SKIP to 55G
8888 Don't know, SKIP to 55G
9999 Refused, SKIP to 55G
55G. (Do you have a personal friend who) Is Latino or Hispanic?

1 Yes
2 No, SKIP to 55H
8 Don't know, SKIP to 55H
9 Refused, SKIP to 55H

How many personal HISPANIC friends would that be? _____
8888 Don't know, SKIP to 55H
9999 Refused, SKIP to 55H

55H. (Do you have a personal friend who) Is Asian?

1 Yes
2 No, SKIP to 55I
8 Don't know, SKIP to 55I
9 Refused, SKIP to 55I

How many personal ASIAN friends would that be? _____ ,   SKIP to 55I
8888 Don't know, SKIP to 55I
9999 Refused, SKIP to 55I

55I. (Do you have a personal friend who) Is Black or African American?

1 Yes
2 No, SKIP to 55K
8 Don't know, SKIP to 55K
9 Refused, SKIP to 55K
How many personal BLACK friends would that be? _____, SKIP to 55K
8888 Don't know, SKIP to 55K
9999 Refused, SKIP to 55K

55K. (Do you have a personal friend who) You would describe as a community leader?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused
56. Now, I'm going to ask you how many times you may have done certain things in the past twelve months. For all of these, I want you just to give me your best guess, and don't worry that you might be off a little. About how many times in the past 12 months did you…

56A. Attend a celebration, parade, or a local sports or art event in your community? How many times?:_____
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month

8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56B. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) Taken part in artistic activities with others such as singing, dancing, or acting with a group? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56C. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) played cards or board games with others? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56D. (How many times in the past 12 months have you) visited relatives in person or had them visit you? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused
If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56E. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) attended a club meeting? How many times?:_____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

 56F. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) had friends over to your home? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56G. (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? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused
IF Q40 = 1 OR Q4OA = 1 (R WORKS) ASK 56H - ALL OTHERS SKIP

56H. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) socialized with coworkers outside of work? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this

2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56I. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) hung out with friends at a park, shopping mall, or other public place? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56J. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) played a team sport? How many times?:_____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average

7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56K. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) participated in an on-line discussion over the Internet? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56L. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) attended any public meeting in which there was discussion of town or school affairs? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56M. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) been in the home of a neighbor? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused
If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

56N. (How many times in the past twelve months have you) been in the home of someone in this city, but outside your neighborhood? _____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

58. How many times in the past twelve months have you volunteered?
(By volunteering, I mean any unpaid work you've done to help people besides your family and friends or people you work with.) How many times?:_____

98 Don't Know
99 Refused

If you are not sure….

1 never did this
2 once
3 a few times (ENTER ONLY IF FIGURE CANNOT BE CLARIFIED)
4 2-4 times
5 5-9 times
6 about once a month on average
7 twice a month
8 about once a week on average
9 more than once a week
98 Don't Know
99 Refused

60. In what year were you born? _____

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

1 Less than high school (Grade 11 or less) CONTINUE
2 High school diploma (including GED) SKIP TO 62
3 Some college SKIP TO 62
4 Assoc. degree (2 year) or specialized technical training SKIP TO 62
5 Bachelor's degree SKIP TO 62
6 Some graduate training SKIP TO 62
7 Graduate or professional degree SKIP TO 62
8 Don't know SKIP TO 62
9 Refused SKIP TO 62

61A. Do you have a GED or high school equivalency?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused
62. Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino?

1 Yes
2 No SKIP TO 63
8 Don't know SKIP TO 63
9 Refused SKIP TO 63

62A. Would you say your background is Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, or something else and if so what?

1 Mexican
2 Puerto Rican
3 Cuban
4 Dominican
5 El Salvadoran
6 Guatemalan
7 Colombian
8 Venezuelan
9 Haitian
10 Jamaican
11 Honduran
12 Brazilian
13 Other
88 Don't know
99 Refused

62B. Do you consider yourself to be White or Black?

1 White SKIP TO 64
2 Black SKIP TO 64
3 Other SKIP TO 64
8 Don't Know SKIP TO 64
9 Refused SKIP TO 64

63. Do you consider yourself to be White, Black or African American, Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American, or some other race?

1 White SKIP TO 63C
2 African American or Black SKIP TO 64
3 Asian or Pacific Islander SKIP TO 63B
4 Alaskan Native SKIP TO 64
5 Native American SKIP TO 64
6 Other
8 Don't know SKIP TO 64
9 Refused SKIP TO 64

63A. If Other: What do you consider your race to be, please specify:

63B. Would you say your background is Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Filipino, or something else, and if so what?

1 Chinese SKIP to 64
2 Korean SKIP to 64
3 Japanese SKIP to 64
4 Filipino SKIP to 64

5 Asian Indian SKIP to 64
6 Vietnamese SKIP to 64
7 Cambodian SKIP to 64
8 Indian SKIP to 64
9 Pakistani SKIP to 64
10 Other SKIP to 64
98 Don't know SKIP to 64
99 Refused SKIP to 64

63C. From what country did your ancestors come? Choose up to 2 from the list below:

_____, _____

104 Afghanistan	954 Burkina Faso
108 Albania	208 Burundi
112 Algeria	216 Cambodia
244 America	220 Cameroon
116 American Samoa	224 Canada
120 Andorra	232 Cape Verde
124 Angola	236 Cayman Islands
760 Anguilla	240 Central African Republic
110 Antarctica	248 Chad
128 Antigua And Barbuda	252 Chile
132 Argentina	256 China
151 Armenia	262 Christmas Island
633 Aruba	266 Cocos (Keeling) Islands
136 Australia	270 Colombia
140 Austria	274 Comoros
131 Azerbaijan	278 Congo
144 Bahamas	284 Cook Islands
148 Bahrain	288 Costa Rica
150 Bangladesh	284 Cote D'ivoire
152 Barbados	291 Croatia
212 Belarus	292 Cuba
156 Belgium	296 Cyprus
184 Belize	303 Czech Republic
304 Benin	308 Democratic People's Republic
160 Bermuda	308 Denmark
164 Bhutan	362 Djibouti
168 Bolivia	312 Dominica
170 Bosnia And Herzegowina	314 Dominican Republic
172 Botswana	726 East Timor
174 Bouvet Island	318 Ecuador
176 Brazil	918 Egypt
186 British Indian Ocean Territory	322 El Salvador
196 Brunei Darussalam	326 Equatorial Guinea
200 Bulgaria	241 England and Wales

332 Eritrea
333 Estonia
331 Ethiopia
338 Falkland Islands (Malvinas)
334 Faroe Islands
342 Fiji
346 Finland
907 Former Yugoslav Republic Of Macedonia
350 France
354 French Guiana
358 French Polynesia
360 French Southern Territories
366 Gabon
370 Gambia
368 Georgia
376 Germany
388 Ghana
392 Gibraltar
400 Greece
404 Greenland
408 Grenada
412 Guadeloupe
416 Guam
420 Guatemala
424 Guinea
724 Guinea-Bissau
428 Guyana
432 Haiti
434 Heard And Mc Donald Islands
245 Holland
440 Honduras
444 Hong Kong
448 Hungary
452 Iceland
456 India
460 Indonesia
464 Iran (Islamic Republic Of)
468 Iraq
472 Ireland
476 Israel
480 Italy
488 Jamaica
492 Japan
500 Jordan
498 Kazakhstan

504 Kenya
396 Kiribati
514 Kuwait
517 Kyrgyzstan
518 Lao People's Democratic Republic
528 Latvia
522 Lebanon
526 Lesotho
530 Liberia
534 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
538 Liechtenstein
540 Lithuania
542 Luxembourg
546 Macau
550 Madagascar
554 Malawi
558 Malaysia
562 Maldives
566 Mali
570 Malta
684 Marshall Islands
574 Martinique
578 Mauritania
580 Mauritius
275 Mayotte
349 Metropolitan France
584 Mexico
683 Micronesia (Federated States Of)
592 Monaco
596 Mongolia
600 Montserrat
604 Morocco
608 Mozambique
204 Myanmar
616 Namibia
620 Nauru
624 Nepal
628 Netherlands
630 Netherlands Antilles
640 New Caledonia
654 New Zealand
658 Nicaragua
662 Niger
666 Nigeria
670 Niue
674 Norfolk Island

680 Northern Mariana Islands
678 Norway
612 Oman
686 Pakistan
685 Palau
691 Panama
698 Papua New Guinea
700 Paraguay
704 Peru
708 Philippines
712 Pitcairn
716 Poland
720 Portugal
258 Province Of China Taiwan
730 Puerto Rico
734 Qatar
510 Republic Of Korea
598 Republic Of Moldova
738 Reunion
742 Romania
743 Russian Federation
746 Rwanda
759 Saint Kitts And Nevis
762 Saint Lucia
770 Saint Vincent And The Grenadines
982 Samoa
774 San Marino
778 Sao Tome And Principe
782 Saudi Arabia
242 Scotland
786 Senegal
790 Seychelles
794 Sierra Leone
802 Singapore
803 Slovakia
905 Slovenia
190 Solomon Islands
806 Somalia
339 South Georgia/The South Sandwich Is
810 South Africa
824 Spain
244 Sri Lanka
754 St. Helena
766 St. Pierre And Miquelon

836 Sudan
840 Suriname
844 Svalbard And Jan Mayen Islands
848 Swaziland
852 Sweden
856 Switzerland
860 Syrian Arab Republic
862 Tajikistan
864 Thailand
868 Togo
872 Tokelau
876 Tonga
880 Trinidad And Tobago
888 Tunisia
892 Turkey
895 Turkmenistan
896 Turks And Caicos Islands
898 Tuvalu
900 Uganda
904 Ukraine
681 United States Minor Outlying Is
884 United Arab Emirates
926 United Kingdom
934 United Republic Of Tanzania
958 Uruguay
960 Uzbekistan
648 Vanuatu
436 Vatican City State (Holy See)
962 Venezuela
804 Vietnam
192 Virgin Islands (British)
950 Virgin Islands (U.S.)
976 Wallis And Futuna Islands
832 Western Sahara
243 West Indies
987 Yemen
991 Yugoslavia
280 Zaire
994 Zambia
816 Zimbabwe
[If country or state not provided on list, record verbatim]
8888 Don't Know
9999 Refused

64. Are you an American citizen?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know
9 Refused

64A. Were you born in the United States?

1 Yes SKIP TO 64B
2 No SKIP TO 64C
8 Don't know SKIP TO 64D
9 Refused SKIP TO 64D

64B. What state were you born in?

1 Alabama	28 Nebraska
2 Alaska	29 Nevada
3 Arizona	30 New Hampshire
4 Arkansas	31 New Jersey
5 California	32 New Mexico
6 Colorado	33 New York
7 Connecticut	34 North Carolina
8 Delaware	35 North Dakota
9 District of Columbia	36 Ohio
10 Florida	37 Oklahoma
11 Georgia	38 Oregon
12 Hawaii	39 Pennsylvania
13 Idaho	40 Rhode Island
14 Illinois	41 South Carolina
15 Indiana	42 South Dakota
16 Iowa	43 Tennessee
17 Kansas	44 Texas
18 Kentucky	45 Utah
19 Louisiana	46 Vermont
20 Maine	47 Virginia
21 Maryland	48 Washington
22 Massachusetts	49 West Virginia
23 Michigan	(2237) 50 Wisconsin
24 Minnesota	51 Wyoming
25 Mississippi	52 Other, Specify
26 Missouri	998 Don't Know
27 Montana	999 Refused

64B. Were either of your parents born outside the United States?

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't Know
9 Refused
ALL WHO ANSWER 64B 1, SKIP TO Q64D
64C. What country were you born in?

001 Afghanistan
002 Albania
003 Algeria
004 American Samoa
005 Andorra
006 Angola
007 Anguilla
008 Antarctica
009 Antigua And Barbuda
010 Argentina
011 Armenia
012 Aruba
013 Australia
014 Austria
015 Azerbaijan
016 Bahamas
017 Bahrain
018 Bangladesh
019 Barbados
020 Belarus
021 Belgium
022 Belize
023 Benin
024 Bermuda
025 Bhutan
026 Bolivia
027 Bosnia And Herzegowina
028 Botswana
029 Bouvet Island
030 Brazil
031 British Indian Ocean Territory
032 Brunei Darussalam
033 Bulgaria
034 Burkina Faso
035 Burundi
036 Cambodia
037 Cameroon
038 Canada

039 Cape Verde
040 Cayman Islands
041 Central African Republic
042 Chad
043 Chile
044 China
045 Christmas Island
046 Cocos (Keeling) Islands
047 Colombia
048 Comoros
049 Congo
050 Cook Islands
051 Costa Rica
052 Cote D'ivoire
053 Croatia
054 Cuba
055 Cyprus
056 Czech Republic
057 Democratic People's Republic Of
058 Denmark
059 Djibouti
060 Dominica
061 Dominican Republic
062 East Timor
063 Ecuador
064 Egypt
065 El Salvador
066 Equatorial Guinea
067 Eritrea
068 Estonia
069 Ethiopia
070 Falkland Islands (Malvinas)
071 Faroe Islands
072 Fiji
073 Finland
074 Former Yugoslav Republic Of
Macedoni
075 France

076 French Guiana
077 French Polynesia
078 French Southern Territories
079 Gabon
080 Gambia
081 Georgia
082 Germany
083 Ghana
084 Gibraltar
085 Greece
086 Greenland
087 Grenada
088 Guadeloupe
089 Guam
090 Guatemala
091 Guinea
092 Guinea-Bissau
093 Guyana
094 Haiti
095 Heard And Mc Donald Islands
096 Honduras
097 Hong Kong
098 Hungary
099 Iceland
100 India
101 Indonesia
102 Iran (Islamic Republic Of)
103 Iraq
104 Ireland
105 Israel
106 Italy
107 Jamaica
108 Japan
109 Jordan
110 Kazakhstan
111 Kenya
112 Kiribati
113 Kuwait
114 Kyrgyzstan
115 Lao People's Democratic Republic
116 Latvia
117 Lebanon
118 Lesotho
119 Liberia
120 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
121 Liechtenstein

122 Lithuania
123 Luxembourg
124 Macau
125 Madagascar
126 Malawi
127 Malaysia
128 Maldives
129 Mali
130 Malta
131 Marshall Islands
132 Martinique
133 Mauritania
134 Mauritius
135 Mayotte
136 Metropolitan France
137 Mexico
138 Micronesia (Federated States Of)
139 Monaco
140 Mongolia
141 Montserrat
142 Morocco
143 Mozambique
144 Myanmar
145 Namibia
146 Nauru
147 Nepal
148 Netherlands
149 Netherlands Antilles
150 New Caledonia
151 New Zealand
152 Nicaragua
153 Niger
154 Nigeria
155 Niue
156 Norfolk Island
157 Northern Mariana Islands
158 Norway
159 Oman
160 Pakistan
161 Palau
162 Panama
163 Papua New Guinea
164 Paraguay
165 Peru
166 Philippines
167 Pitcairn

168 Poland
169 Portugal
170 Province Of China Taiwan
171 Puerto Rico
172 Qatar
173 Republic Of Korea
174 Republic Of Moldova
175 Reunion
176 Romania
177 Russian Federation
178 Rwanda
179 Saint Kitts And Nevis
180 Saint Lucia
181 Saint Vincent And The Grenadines
182 Samoa
183 San Marino
184 Sao Tome And Principe
185 Saudi Arabia
186 Senegal
187 Seychelles
188 Sierra Leone
189 Singapore
190 Slovakia
191 Slovenia
192 Solomon Islands
193 Somalia
194 South Georgia/The South Sandwich Is
195 South Africa
196 Spain
197 Sri Lanka
198 St. Helena
199 St. Pierre And Miquelon
200 Sudan
201 Suriname
202 Svalbard And Jan Mayen Islands
203 Swaziland
204 Sweden
205 Switzerland
206 Syrian Arab Republic
207 Tajikistan
208 Thailand
209 Togo
210 Tokelau
211 Tonga
212 Trinidad And Tobago

213 Tunisia
214 Turkey
215 Turkmenistan
216 Turks And Caicos Islands
217 Tuvalu
218 Uganda
219 Ukraine
220 United States Minor Outlying Is
221 United Arab Emirates
222 United Kingdom
223 United Republic Of Tanzania
224 United States
225 Uruguay
226 Uzbekistan
227 Vanuatu
228 Vatican City State (Holy See)
229 Venezuela
230 Vietnam
231 Virgin Islands (British)
232 Virgin Islands (U.S.)
233 Wallis And Futuna Islands
234 Western Sahara
235 Yemen
236 Yugoslavia
237 Zaire
238 Zambia
239 Zimbabwe
997 Other, Specify
998 Don't Know
999 Refused

64D. How many years have you lived in the United States? _____

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

66A. If you added together the yearly incomes, before taxes, of all the members of your household for last year, 2013, would the total be:

1 Less than $30,000 or
2 $30,000 or more
TRY TO GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE
8 Don't Know
9 Refused
IF 66A = 2, SKIP TO 66C. IF 66A = 8 or 9, SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE 68

66B. Would that be:

1 $20,000 or less
2 Over $20,000 but less than $30,000
TRY TO GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

IF Q66B WAS ASKED, SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE 68

66C. Would that be:

1 $30,000 but less than $50,000
2 $50,000 but less than $75,000
3 $75,000 but less than $100,000
4 $100,000 or more
TRY TO GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE
8 Don't Know
9 Refused

Appendix B

2013 Social Capital Community Survey Adapted Answer Sheet

The following survey is an adaptation of the 2006 Social Capital Community Survey
Wave 1 Questionnaire, Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, Kennedy
School of Government, Harvard University Study #135633 January 13, 2006.

GENDER   1 Male   2 Female

5A1   OCCUPATION   _____

5A2   RESIDENCE   _____

5A3   ETHNIC OR RACIAL BACKGROUND _____

5A4   RELIGION   _____

5A5   AMERICAN   _____

6   TRUST   _____

7A   TRUST NEIGHBORHOOD   _____

7B   TRUST WORKERS SCHOOL   _____

7C   TRUST   CHURCH   _____

7D   TRUST STORES   _____

7F   TRUST POLICE   _____

7G   TRUST WHITE PEOPLE   _____

7H   TRUST AFRICAN AMER/BLACKS   _____

7I   TRUST ASIANS   _____

7J   TRUST HISPANICS/LATINOS   _____

8A   RETURNED WALLET   _____

8B   RETURNED BY STRANGER   _____

9   SATISFIED WITH LIFE   _____

10	OVERALL HEALTH	_____
11	COOP CONSERVE	_____
11A	VICTIM OF CRIME	_____
12	HOW MANY YEARS WORKED	_____
12A	ZIPCODE	_____
13	WORK FIVE YEARS	_____
13A	WOULD YOU LEAVE	_____
14	RATE COMMUNITY	_____
15	OWN OR RENT	_____
16	IMPACT	_____
17	NEWSPAPER	_____
18	WATCH TV	_____
19	INTERNET	_____
21	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	_____
22	REGISTERED TO VOTE	_____
23	VOTE 2012	_____
24	NATIONAL RIGHT	_____
25	LOCAL RIGHT	_____
26A	PETITION SIGNING	_____
26B	POLITICAL MEETING	_____
26C	COMMUNITY PROJECT	_____
26D	DEMONSTRATIONS	_____
26E	BLOOD DRIVE	_____

27	POLITICALLY/SOCIALLY	_____
27A	POLITICAL AFFILIATION	_____
27B1	PUBLIC SCHOOLS FUNDING	_____
27B2	CRIME FUNDING	_____
27B3	BORDERS	_____
27B4	AID TO BLACKS	_____
27B5	AID TO POOR	_____
27C	LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	_____
27D	POVERTY	_____
28	US SENATORS WV	_____
29	RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE	_____
29A	DENOMINATION	_____
29B	WHAT IS IT	_____
29C	WHAT RELIGION	_____
30	MEMBER	_____
31	RELIGIOUS SERVICES	_____
32	CHURCH ACTIVITY	_____
33A	OTHER RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY	_____
33B	ADULT SPORTS/LEAGUE	_____
33C	YOUTH ORGANIZATION	_____
33D	PARENT ORGANIZATION	_____
33E	VETERANS	
33F	NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION	_____

33G	SENIORS	_____
33H	NEEDY	_____
33I	LABOR UNION	_____
33J	PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION	_____
33K	SERVICE OR FRATERNAL	_____
33L	ETHNIC/NATIONALITY/CIVIL	_____
33M	PUBLIC INTEREST	_____
33N	FINE ARTS	_____
33O	HOBBY	_____
33P	SUPPORT	_____
34	LOCAL ACTION	_____
35	OFFICER/COMMITTEE	_____
37A	RELIGIOUS CONTRIBUTION	_____
37B	NONRELIGIOUS CONTRIBUTION	_____
38A	COMMUNITY CARE	_____
38B	TELEVISION	_____
38C	IMMIGRANTS	_____
38D	BOOK DISAPPORVAL	_____
38E	WORRY	_____
38F	OVERWHELMED	_____
38G	USED UP	_____
38H	CALM AND RELAXED	_____
38I	RELIGION IMPORTANT	_____

38J	IMMIGRANTS	_____
41	HOURS WORKED	_____
44	TRAVEL TO WORK	_____
45	FINANCIAL SITUATION	_____
46	MARITAL STATUS	_____
46A	PARTNER	_____
47	KIDS 17 OR YOUNGER	_____
47A	KIDS SIX OR OLDER	_____
48	ADULTS	_____
50A	MARRYING ASIAN	_____
50B	MARRYING AFRICAN/BLACK	_____
50C	MARRYING WHITE	_____
50D	MARRYING LATINO/HISPANIC	_____
50E1	GAY LESBIANS	_____
50E2	BLACKS	_____
50E3	WHITES	_____
50E4	ASIAN AMERICANS	_____
50E5	LATINOS HISPANICS	_____
50E6	CATHOLICS	_____
50E7	PROTESTANTS	_____
50E8	MUSLIMS	_____
50E9	EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS	_____
50E10	IMMIGRANTS	_____

50E11 POOR PEOPLE   _____

50E12 RICH PEOPLE   _____

51   IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORS   _____

52   FIX OR IMPROVE   _____

52A   AFFORDABLE HOUSE   _____

53   CLOSE FRIENDS   _____

54   DIFFICULT DECISION   _____

54A   HOW MANY   _____

55A   OWN BUSINESS   _____

55B   MANUAL WORKER   _____

55C   WELFARE   _____

55D   VACATION HOME   _____

55E   RELIGIOUS   _____

55F   WHITE   _____ HOW MANY   _____

55G   LATINO/HISPANIC _____ HOW MANY   _____

55H   ASIAN   _____ HOW MANY   _____

55I   AFRICAN AMERICAN   _____ HOW MANY   _____

55J   COMMUNITY LEADER   _____

56 IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

        56A   CELEBRATION/PARADE/LOCAL _____

        56B   ARTISTIC ACTIVITIES   _____

        56C   CARDS/BOARD GAMES   _____

        56D   VISIT WITH RELATIVES   _____

56E	CLUB MEETING	_____
56F	HAD FRIENDS OVER	_____
56G	DIFFERENT RACE HOME	_____
56H	COWORKERS OUTSIDE	_____
56I	HUNG OUT IN PUBLIC	_____
56J	PLAYED A TEAM SPORT	_____
56K	ONLINE DISCUSSION	_____
56L	PUBLIC MEETING	_____
56M	NEIGHBOR'S HOME	_____
56N	OUTSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD HOME	_____
58	VOLUNTEERED	_____
60	YEAR OF BIRTH	_____
61	HIGHEST GRADE	_____
62	YOURSELF HISPANIC/LATINO	_____
62A	MEXICAN, PUERTO RICAN…	_____
62B	BLACK OR WHITE	_____
63	RACE	_____
63A	YOUR RACE	_____
63B	BACKGROUND	_____
63C	ANCESTORS	_____
64	AMERICAN CITIZEN	_____
64A	BORN IN THE USA	_____
64B	STATE BORN	_____

64B1   PARENTS OUTSIDE US   _____

64C   COUNTRY BORN   _____

64D   YEARS IN THE US   _____

65   TELEPHONE NUMBERS   _____

66A   FAMILY INCOME   _____

66B   INCOME   _____

66C   INCOME CONTINUED   _____

Appendix C

Sample Permission Letter - Superintendent

Greetings,

I am a doctoral candidate completing a degree in Curriculum and Instruction at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I have completed my coursework and am currently working on my dissertation which will fulfill the requirement to earn a Doctoral in Education. I would like to invite _____ to participate in a case study.

My dissertation topic explores the theory of social capital in relevance to education. Social capital explores accessibility to resources and networks, reciprocity, and trust. Past research on social capital, mainly in economic venues, can provide positive results to families and communities. In this study, the examination of social capital will include school, family, and community.

I selected _____ purposely based on demographic information and convenience of location from my residence. The case study will involve administrator interviews, the completion of a survey by the administration and faculty members and an addendum to the survey to examine communication with families and community.

I would like permission to contact the principal, , to offer an invitation to participate in the study.

The administrator interview will involve a survey exploring social capital. The survey is

an adaptation of the *2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire*,

Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, Kennedy School of Government,

Harvard University Study #135633 January 13, 2006. It will take approximately 45

minutes. I would then like to distribute the same survey to the faculty members during a

faculty meeting or in-service day. I would distribute the survey at the same time, in the

same room, with all participants present. It will also take approximately 45 minutes to

complete.

Because the survey lacks specifics pertaining to school settings, I may also seek

permission to review several artifacts distributed to the school community. These artifacts

would include the past school year of newsletters, announcements, mass emails, web site

posting, and any other social media communications, i.e. a Facebook page, Twitter,

Pinterest or the like.

This process would involve gathering the information for my review. I would spend

approximately two school days reviewing materials. I will be non-intrusive and can sit in

a designated area to quietly work on the review.

There should be no risk during this process and the inconveniences would be restricted to

the time it would take to complete the surveys and to gather the information for my

review.

The benefits to the study will include your full disclosure to the results of the study and

resources to examine if you wish to pursue the topic. This study will provide great benefit to research as there is little research on social capital and schools.

All research will be confidential. There will be no identification of those surveyed nor of the school. Demographic information will be used in the study for reporting purposes, but neither the address nor other contact information will be provided in the published work.

In addition, participation is voluntary and there will be no negative consequences for withdrawal from the study. Participants are under no obligation to participate. They can contact me via email or phone if they choose to withdraw at which all data pertaining to them will be destroyed.

I am looking forward to being an integral part of a study that may benefit educational research. Please contact me at _____ or through my email address, _____. My Dissertation Chair is _____. You may contact _____ or via email at _____. The contact email for the Institution Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects is _____ and the phone number for the School of Graduate Studies and Research is _____ if you wish to follow up with either of these departments.

Educationally yours,

Appendix D

Sample Permission Letter - Principal

Greetings,

I am a doctoral candidate completing a degree in Curriculum and Instruction at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I have completed my coursework and am currently working on my dissertation which will fulfill the requirement to earn a Doctoral in Education. I have received permission from Superintendent Schmidt to invite _____ to participate in a case study.

My dissertation topic explores the theory of social capital in relevance to education. Social capital explores accessibility to resources and networks, reciprocity, and trust. Past research on social capital, mainly in economic venues, can provide positive results to families and communities. In this study, the examination of social capital will include school, family, and community.

_____ was selected based on demographic information and convenience of location from my residence. The case study will involve administrator interviews, the completion of a survey by the administration and faculty members and a review of artifacts to examine communication with families and community.

I would like permission to meet with you to have the initial introduction to discuss a time to complete the interview.

The administrator interview will involve a survey exploring social capital. The survey is an adaptation of the *2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire*, Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University Study #135633 January 13, 2006. It will take approximately 45 minutes. I would then like to distribute the same survey to the faculty members during a faculty meeting or in-service day. I would distribute the survey at the same time, in the same room, with all participants present. It will also take approximately 45 minutes to complete. An alternative assignment approved by you will be given to those who do not wish to participate.

Because the survey lacks specifics pertaining to school settings, I am also seeking permission to review several artifacts distributed to the school community. These artifacts would include the past school year of newsletters, announcements, mass emails, web site posting, and any other social media communications, i.e. a Facebook page, Twitter, Pinterest or the like.

This process would involve gathering the information for my review. I would spend approximately two school days reviewing materials. I will be non-intrusive and can sit in a designated area to quietly work on the review.

There should be no risk during this process and the inconveniences would be restricted to the time it would take to complete the surveys and to gather the information for my review.

The benefits to the study will include your full disclosure to the results of the study and resources to examine if you wish to pursue the topic. This study will provide great benefit to research as there is little research on social capital and schools.

All research will be confidential. There will be no identification of those surveyed nor of the school. Demographic information will be used in the study for reporting purposes, but neither the address nor other contact information will be provided in the published work.

In addition, participation is voluntary and there will be no negative consequences for withdrawal from the study. Participants are under no obligation to participate. They can contact me via email or phone if they choose to withdraw at which all data pertaining to them will be destroyed.

I am looking forward to being an integral part of a study that may benefit educational research. Please contact me at _____. My Dissertation Chair is _____. You may contact _____. The contact email for the Institution Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects is _____and the phone number for the School of Graduate Studies and Research is _____ if you wish to follow up with either of these departments.

Educationally yours,

Initial Intake Questionnaire

Date Completed _____

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SOCIAL CAPITAL

Participating School Name: _____

Superintendent: _____ Grades Offered: _____

Address: _____

Principal (or Head School Administrator) _____

School Phone: _____ Second Phone: _____

Email: _____ whose email: _____

Second email if necessary: _____ who? _____

Enrollment number: _____

Number of administrators: _____ Titles _____

_____

_____

School Board? Yes   or   No   If yes, number of members on the board _____

Are administrators on the board Yes or No ?   If yes, Who?

_____

How many faculty members are employed at the school? Part-time ___ Full-time ___

_____ Date of initial interview with administrator to verify processes

_____Date of administrator interview

_____Date of scheduled faculty interview

_____Back up date

_____Date of follow-up visit

Additional notes:

_____

_____

Appendix F

Voluntary Consent Form

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SOCIAL CAPITAL

I am a doctoral candidate completing a degree in Curriculum and Instruction at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Your school has agreed to participate in a case study exploring the theory of social capital in relevance to education. Social capital addresses accessibility to resources and networks, reciprocity, and trust. Past research on social capital, mainly in economic venues, can provide positive results to families and communities. In this study, the examination of social capital will include school, family, and community.

Your school was selected based on demographic information and convenience of location from my residence. The case study will involve administrator interviews, the completion of a survey by the administration and faculty members and a review of artifacts to examine communication with families and community.

The faculty interview will involve a survey exploring social capital. The survey is an adaptation of *The 2006 Social Capital Community Survey Wave 1 Questionnaire*, Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University Study #135633 January 13, 2006. It will take approximately 45 minutes.

There should be no risk during this process and the inconveniences would be restricted to the time it would take to complete the survey. The benefits to the study will include your full disclosure to the results of the study and resources to examine if your school wishes to pursue the topic. This study will provide great benefit to research as

there is little research on social capital and schools.

All research will be confidential. There will be no identification of those surveyed nor of the school. Demographic information will be used in the study for reporting purposes, but neither the address nor other contact information will be provided in the published work.

In addition, participation is voluntary and there will be no negative consequences for withdrawal from the study. Participants are under no obligation to participate. They can contact me via email or phone if they choose to withdraw at which all data pertaining to them will be destroyed.

Please sign the attached statement indicating that you have been informed and wish to participate in the survey. If you do not want to participate, simply do not sign the form.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM

I have read and understand the information and I consent to participate in this case study.

I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to

withdraw from the evaluation at any time. I have an unsigned copy of this informed

consent form to keep for my reference.

NAME (please print): _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Phone number: _____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential

benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this case study. I have

answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

_____

Appendix G

Addendum to the Social Capital Survey 2014

MEDIA:

Does the school have a web site?   Yes   or   No

    If yes,

        How often is it updated: Weekly?   Monthly?   Quarterly?

    Annually?   Other: _____

    Does each teacher have a web page?   Yes   or   No

        How often is it updated: Weekly?   Monthly?   Quarterly?

    Annually? Other: _____

Does the school have a social media page such as Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest?

    If yes, which ones: _____

Are there mass emails sent to families about general school information?

Do students have school email accounts?

    If so, do the teachers communicate with the student via email?

Is there a policy about texting parent to teacher? or teacher to student?

    If so, what is it?

PARENTAL COMMUNICATION:

Is there an electronic grade communication system to update parents on grades and

announcements?

    i.e. Edline, Schoolspeak, Renweb

    if so, is there access to

        Student grades?

Homework assignments?

Announcements?

Other types of communication?

Hotchalk?   Remind101?

Are there paper progress reports sent home to report student progress?

If so, what type?

Report Cards? How often?

Progress Reports? How often?

Other reports? Type? How often?

Does this school have a paper newsletter?

If yes,

Is it mailed home?   Sent home?   Emailed?   Posted to a web site?

Other: _____

How often is it produced?

Weekly?   Monthly?   Quarterly?   Annually?

Other: _____

Who all receives it? All residents? Parents only?

If a student does not show up to school, does the school contact the parent/guardian?

If yes, via   Telephone?   Email?   Mail?   Text?

Does the school allow parents to come and volunteer?

Do the volunteers have clearances?

Where are they allowed to volunteer?

How often do they volunteer?

Does the school have parent meetings?

    If yes, how often?

    One on one or group?

Is there a protocol for teachers to call parents? If so, what is it?

Do the parents have access to teacher email addresses?

Do the teachers have access to parent email addresses?

COMMUNITY:

Does this school have any community Partners in Education? Yes or   No

    If so, how many? _____

Does the school make community announcements?

    If yes, what about?

  Sports?   Events?   Business advertising?   Traffic and weather?   Other?

Does the school have a Marque displaying announcements?

    If so, how often is it updated?

Does the school allow community leaders to come and speak to the students?

Do the students have required Community service?

    If yes, describe:

Does the school advertise for COMMUNITY sports leagues?

Does the school advertise for COMMUNITY resources such as reading enrichment?

Does the school advertise for governmental programs such as energy assistance or other assistance?

Does the school advertise for COMMUNITY assistance programs, such as a food bank?

Does the school advertise for church services?

Is the school used for any community services? Such as a blood drive?

NEWS:

Does the school library get the local paper?

National paper such as US today?

World newspaper such as the Boston Globe?

In school do the students watch any news programs?

Do students have access to the Internet? How often?

STUDENT ACTIVITIES:

Do the students have clubs? If yes…

      How many of the clubs are political?

Community service?

Compete with other schools, like a chess club or mathematics team?

How many school sports teams do you offer?

Does the school offer any specialized programs?

    If yes,

        Vocational?

        Agricultural Programs such as FFA?

        Early entrance into college?

Does the school have any articulation agreements with colleges and/or universities to receive dual credit?

Do the students take field trips? If so, what is the average number of field trips students take every school year?

Does each student work with the guidance counselors for future plans?   Or

Is it up to the students to come and see the guidance counselor for future plans?

Is there a newsletter, email, or other means of communication regularly between the guidance department and the students?

Appendix H

<u>2013 ADAPTED Social Capital Community Survey</u>
<u>Case Study Sample - PUBLIC</u>

Note: in the race/ethnic breakouts, non-whites are respondents who provided race who were not white non-hispanics

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Total Participants	11	3	7	11	4	3	3	10	
	11	3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

NUMBERS BELOW ARE RAW NUMBERS, EXCEPT WHEN "*NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION" IS NOTED*

IMPOCCUP 5A1. Your OCCUPATION gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Not at all important									
Slightly important			1		1	1			1
Moderately important		1			1	1			1
Very important		2	6		9	2	3	3	8
		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

IMPRESID 5A2. Your PLACE OF RESIDENCE gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Not at all important									
Slightly important			2		2	2			2
Moderately important		1	2		4	1	2	1	3
Very important		1	3		4	1		2	4
		2	7		10	4	2	3	9

IMPETH 5A3. Your ETHNIC OR RACIAL BACKGROUND gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Not at all important		1	1		3	1	1	1	3
Slightly important		1	2		3	3			3
Moderately important		1	2		3		1	1	3
Very important			1		1			1	1
		3	6		10	4	2	3	10

IMRELIG 5A4. Your RELIGION (if any) gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Not at all important		1	1		2	1	1		2
Slightly important		1	1		2	2			2
Moderately important			3		3	1	1	1	3
Very important		1	2		4		1	2	4
		3	7		11	4	3	3	11

IMPAMER 5A5. Being an AMERICAN gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Not at all important									
Slightly important									
Moderately important			1		2			2	2
Very important		3	6		9	4	4		9
		3	7		11	4	4	2	11

TRUST 6. Whether most people can be trusted or you can't be too careful

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
People can be trusted			1		2	1			2
You can't be too careful			4		4	2	1	1	4
(VOLUNTEERED) Depends		3	2		5	1	2	1	5
Total		3	7		11	4	3	2	11

TRNEI 7A. How much you can *trust families in the school's* neighborhood

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	Age 35-49	Age 50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	Ethnicity/Race non-white
A lot		2	2		4	2		2	4
Some		1	2		4	1	1	1	4
A little			1		1	1			1
Not at all									
Total		3	5		9	4	1	3	9

TRWRK 7B. How much you can trust people you work with *at this school*

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	Age 35-49	Age 50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	Ethnicity/Race non-white
A lot		1	2		3	1	1	1	3
Some		2	5		8	3	2	2	8
A little									
Not at all									
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	11

TRREL 7C. How much you can trust people at your church or place of worship

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	Age 35-49	Age 50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	Ethnicity/Race non-white
A lot		1	2		3	1	1		3
Some		2	3		6	2	1	3	6
A little									
Not at all									
Total		3	5		9	3	2	3	9

TRSHOP 7D. How much you can trust people who work in the stores *near this school*

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	Age 35-49	Age 50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	Ethnicity/Race non-white
A lot		1	1		2	1	1		2
Some		2	4		7	2	2	3	7
A little									
Not at all			1		1	1			1
Total		3	6		10	4	3	3	10

TRCOP 7F. How much you can trust the police in *this* local community

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	Age 35-49	Age 50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	Ethnicity/Race non-white
A lot			3		3	1		2	3
Some		3	4		8	3	3	1	8
A little									
Not at all									
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	11

TRWHT 7G. How much you can trust white people

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	Age 35-49	Age 50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	Ethnicity/Race non-white
A lot			3		3			2	3
Some		3	2		6	3	2	1	6
A little			1		1	1			1
Not at all									
Total		3	6		10	4	2	3	10

TRBLK 7H. How much you can trust African Americans or blacks

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	Age 35-49	Age 50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	Ethnicity/Race non-white
A lot			1		2	1			2
Some		2	2		5	1	2	2	5

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
A little		1	2		3	2	1	3	
Not at all									
Total		3	5	10	4	2	3	10	

TRASN 7I. How much you can trust Asian people

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
A lot			1		1			1	
Some		1	2	4	1	1	2	4	
A little		1	3	4	3		1	4	
Not at all									
Total		2	6	9	4	1	3	9	

TRHIS 7J. How much can you trust Hispanics or Latinos

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
A lot			1		1			1	
Some		2	2	5	1	1	2	4	
A little		1	3	4	3		1	4	
Not at all									
Total		3	6	10	4	1	3	9	

WALLTNEI 8A. If you lost a wallet or a purse that contained two hundred dollars, and it was found *in this neighborhood* , how lik

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
not at all likely		1		1	1			1	
somewhat unlikely		1	2	3	3			3	
somewhat likely		1	1	3		1	2	3	
very likely			3	3		1	1	3	
Total		3	6	10	4	2	3	10	

WALLTSTR 8B. If you lost a wallet or a purse that contained two hundred dollars, and it was found by a stranger how likely is it t

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
not at all likely		2	3	5	3	2		5	
somewhat unlikely			2	2	1			2	
somewhat likely		1	1	3		1	2	3	
very likely			1	1		1		1	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	11	

LIFESAT 9. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays? (1=extremely dissatisfied, 10=extrem

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7			2	2	1		1	2	
8			2	2	1	1		2	
9		2	1	3	1	1		3	
10		1	2	4	1	1	2	4	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	11	

HEALTH 10. Reported overall health

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Poor									
Fair									
Good		1	3	4	1	1	1	4	
Very Good			4	5	2	1	2	5	
Excellent		2		2	1	1		2	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	11	

COOP 11. Likelihood of people cooperating to save water or electricity

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very unlikely									
Unlikely			1		1	1			1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends		1			1		1		1
Likely		1	4		6	3		3	6
Very likely		1			1		1		1
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	9

ROBCHANC 11A. . How likely do you think it is that you may be the victim of a crime in the next 12 months?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very unlikely		2	4		7	4	2	1	7
Unlikely		1			1				1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Likely									
Very likely			2		2				2
Total		3	6		10	4	2	1	10

LIVCOM 12. Number of years *worked in this school* in *this* community

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Less than one year			5		5	2	1	1	5
One to five years		2	1		3	2	1		3
Six to ten years									
Eleven to twenty years									
More than twenty years			1		2			2	2
All my life									
Total		2	7		10	4	2	3	10

STAY 13. Expect to be *working in this* community in 5 years

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			3		4	1		2	4
Yes		3	3		6	3	3		6
Total		3	6		10	4	3	2	10

WANTMOVE 13A. Would you *leave this position* from this neighborhood if you could?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	5		8	2	2	3	8
Yes			1		1	1			1
Total		2	6		9	3	2	3	9

QOL 14. Rating of *this* community as a place to live

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Poor									
Only fair			1		1	1			1
Good		3	3		7	3	2	2	7
Excellent			1		1			1	1
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	9

OWN 15. Own or rent residence

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Rent		2	3		5	3	2		4
Own		1	4		6	1	1	3	6
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

EFFCOM 16. Perceived impact in making community a better place to live

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No impact at all									
A small impact			2	2	2			2	
A moderate impact		1	1	3	1	1	1	3	
A big impact		2	2	4	1	1	2	4	
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	9	

PAPER 17. Days in the past week respondent read a daily newspaper

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
0		2	4	6	3	2		5	
1			1	1			1	1	
2			1	1	1			1	
3									
4				1			1	1	
5									
6									
7		1	1	2		1	1	2	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

TVHRS 18. Hours of TV watched on an average weekday M-F (Mean)
NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
		3:5.13: 4.33	7: 5.8: 6.43	11: 5.16: 5.64	4: 3.87:	3: 5.29: 4	3: 5.69:	10:5.29: 6	

WWWTIME 19. Hours spent using the Internet in a typical week

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
None									
Less than 1 hour			1	2			2	2	
1 to 5 hours		1	1	2		1		2	
6 to 10 hours		2	2	4	2	1	1	4	
11 to 20 hours			1	1	1			1	
More than 20 hours			2	2	2			1	
Total		3	7	11	5	2	3	10	

POLINT 21. Interest in politics and national affairs

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Not at all interested		2	2	4	2	1		4	
Only slightly interested			1	2	1		1	2	
Somewhat interested		1	3	4	1	2	1	3	
Very interested			1	1	1			1	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

REGVOTE 22. Currently registered to vote

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		3	6	10	3	3	3	9	
Total		3	6	10	3	3	3	9	

VOTEUS 23. Voted in *2012* presidential election

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1			1	1		1	
Yes		2	7	10	3	3	3	9	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

TGNAT 24. How often trust national govt to do what is right

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Just about always									
Most of the time					1		1	1	

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Some of the time			3	3	1	1	1	2	
Hardly ever		3	3	6	3	2	1	6	
Total		3	6	10	4	3	3	9	

TGLOC 25. How often trust *schools* local govt to do what is right

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Just about always									
Most of the time		1	1	3	1	1	1	3	
Some of the time		1	2	3	3			3	
Hardly ever		1	1	2		1	1	2	
Total		3	4	8	4	2	2	8	

PETITION 26A. Signed a petition in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			3	4	2		2	4	
Yes		1	2	3	2		1	3	
Total		1	5	7	4		3	7	

RALLY 26B. Attended a political meeting or rally in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	4	6	2	2	2	5	
Yes		1	1	2	1		1	2	
Total		2	5	8	3	2	3	7	

PROJECT 26C. Worked on a community project in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		3	7	10	4	3	2	9	
Total		3	7	10	4	3	2	9	

MARCH 26D. Participated in demonstrations, boycotts, or marches in past 12 months.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	5	8	4	2	2	7	
Yes		1		1		1		1	
Total		3	5	9	4	3	2	8	

BLOOD 26E. *Hosted a blood drive* in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		4	6	11	4	3	3	10	
Total		4	6	11	4	3	3	10	

IDEO 27. *School families* political ideology

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very conservative			2	3	2			2	
Moderately conservative		2	1	3	2	2	3	6	
Middle-of-the-road		1	1	2					
Moderately liberal									
Very Liberal									
Total		3	4	8	4	2	3	8	

PARTYID 27A. Generally speaking, do you usually think of *most of the people in this area* as a Republican, Democrat, Independe

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Republican			2		2	2		2	
Democrat		2	4	7	2	2	3	6	
Independent									

Other

No Preference

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Total		2	6	9	4	2	3	8	

POLKNOW2 28. Political knowledge scale

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Failed to name either		1	5		6	4	2	2	6	
One is close									
One is correct or both are close		1			1	1			1	
One is correct & one is close									4	
Both are correct		1	3		4	2		1		
Total		3	8		11	7	2	3	11	

SPNDSCH 27B1. Public schools? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Decreased										
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decreased										
Increased		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

SPNDCRM 27B2. Dealing with crime? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Decreased		1			1		1		1	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decreased			2		2	1	1		1	
Increased		2	5		8	3	1	3	8	
Total		2	7		11	4	3	3	10	

SPNDBDR 27B3. Tightening border security to prevent illegal immigration? (would you like to see spending increased or decrease

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Decreased		1	1		3	1	1	1	3	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decreased			4		4	2	1		3	
Increased		2	2		4	1	1	2	4	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

SPNDBLK 27B4. Aid to Blacks? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Decreased		2	2		4	2	1	1	4	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decre		1	4		6	2	1	2	6	
Increased										
Total		3	6		10	4	2	3	10	

SPNDPOOR 27B5. Aid to the poor? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Decreased		2	2		4	2	1	1	4	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decre		1	3		5	1	2	2	6	
Increased			2		2	1				
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

SPNDNAT 27C. From what level of government do you feel you get the most for your money?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Local		1	2		3	2		1	3	
State		2	2		5	2	2	1	5	
Federal			1		1		1			
Total		3	5		9	4	3	2	8	

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
WHYPOOR 27D. Bigger cause of pover									

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
People not doing enough		2	4	7	3	1	3		7
Circumstances			1	1					
Don't know									
Refused									
		2	5	8	3	1	3		7

SEN1 AND SEN2.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Failed to name either <SEN1> or <SEN2>		1	3	5	2	1	1		5
One correct		1		1	1				1
Both correct		1	3	4	1	1	2		4
One is "close"									
Both are "close"									
One is correct and one is "close"									
Refused									
		3	6	10	4	2	3		10

RELIG 29. Religious preference

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Protestant			3	3			2		3
Catholic			1	2		1	1		2
Another type of Christian		2	1	3	2	1			3
Jewish									
Some other religion		1		1	1				1
No religion			2	2	1	1			1
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3		10

PROTDOM 29A. Protestant denomination (not asked to all Rs)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Non-denominational Protestant									
7th Day Adventist/Fundamentalist Adventists/Adventist									
Episcopalian; Anglican; Worldwide Church of God									
Baptist-Southern Baptist									
Baptist-all other									
United Church of Christ			1	1					1
Lutheran-Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, all other									
Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (LC-MS) or Wisconsin Synod									
Methodist-United Methodist Church-Evangelical United			1	1					1
Pentecostal-Assemblies of God									
Pentecostal (not specified); Church of God									
Presbyterian		2	2	4	1	1	2		4
Other									
Total		2	4	6	1	1	2		6

CHROTHER 29B. Other Christian religion (not asked to all Rs)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Christian (NEC); 'just Christian'			1	1	1				1
Plymouth Brethren/Independent									
Christian Scientists									
Mormons; Latter Day Saints									
Spiritualists									
Unitarian; Universalist									
Jehovah's Witnesses									
Unity; Unity Church; Christ Church Unity									
Fundamentalist Adventist (Worldwide Church of God)									
Eastern Orthodox or Greek Rite Catholic									
Born again Christian									
Full Gospel									
Bible Church									
Charismatic									
Apostolic									
Other									

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Total				1	1	1		1	

RELOTHER 29C. Other Specified religion (not asked to all Rs)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam									
Buddhist									
Hindu									
American Indian Religions (Native American Religions)									
Wiccan									
Paganism (Unspecified)									
Religious Science									
Taoism									
Other									
Total									

RELMEM 30. Church/synagogue member (not asked to all respondents)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes		1	5		7	3		3	7
No		1			1		1		1
Total		2	5		8	3	1	3	8

RELMEM2 Church/synagogue member (non-church members not asked question coded as no)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes									
No									
Total									

RELATEND 31. How often you attend religious services

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Every week (or more often)			1		2	1		1	2
Almost every week		1	2		3	1		2	3
Once or twice a month			1		1				1
A few times per year			1		1	1			1
Less often than that		1			1		1		1
Total		2	5		8	3	1	3	8

RELPART1 32. Participate in church activities other than attending services

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes			2		2	1		1	2
No		3	4		8	3	2	2	8
Total		3	6		10	4	2	3	10

GRPREL 33A. Participate in organization affiliated with religion

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	6		9	2	3	3	8
Yes			1		1	1			1
Total		2	7		10	3	3	3	9

GRPSPORT 33B. Participate in sports club, league, or outdoor activity club

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	3		5	1	2	1	4
Yes		2	4		6	3	1	2	6
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

GRPYOUTH 33C. Participate in youth organization

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	3		5	1	2	1	4	
Yes		2	4		6	3	1	2	6	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

GRPPTA 33D. Participate in parent association or other school support group

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	2		3		2		2	
Yes		2	5		8	4	1	3	8	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

GRPVET 33E. Participate in veterans group

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	6		10	3	3	3	9	
Yes			1		1	1			1	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

GRPNEI 33F. Participate in neighborhood association

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	
Yes										
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

GRPELD 33G. Participate in seniors groups

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	5		9	3	3	2	8	
Yes			2		2	1		1	2	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

GRPSOC 33H. Participate in charity or social welfare organization

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	6		9	3	3	2	8	
Yes		1	1		2	1		1	2	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

GRPLAB 33I. Participate in labor union

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	6		8	4	1	2	7	
Yes		2	1		3		2	1	3	
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10	

GRPPROF 33J. Participate in professional, trade, farm or business association.

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	4		4	1	2	1	4	
Yes		2	3		6	3	1	2	6	
Total		3	7		10	4	3	3	10	

GRPFRAT 33K. Participate in service or fraternal organization.

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	4		8	3	3	1	7	
Yes			3		3	2		2	3	
Total		3	7		11	5	3	3	10	

GRPETH 33L. Participate in ethnic, nationality, or civil rights organization

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white

GRPPOL 33M. Participate in political group

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		3	6	10	4	3	2	9	
Yes			1	1			1	1	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

GRPART 33N. Participate in literary, art, or musical group

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		3	5	9	3	2	3	9	
Yes			2	2	1	1		1	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

GRPHOB 33O. Participate in hobby, investment, or garden club

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1	4	6	2	1	2	6	
Yes		2	3	5	1	2	2	4	
Total		3	7	11	3	3	4	10	

GRPSELF 33P. Participate in self-help program

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	
Yes									
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

REFORM 34. Belonged to any group that took local action for reform

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1	3	5	2	1	2	4	
Yes									
Total		1	3	5	2	1	2	4	

OFFICER 35. Served as an officer or on a committee.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No			2	3	1	1	1	2	
Yes		1	2	3	2		1	3	
Total		1	4	6	3	1	2	5	

GIVEREL 37A. $ contributed to church or religious causes

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
None			1	1		1			
Less than $100			2	2	2			2	
$100 to less than $500			2	3			2	3	
$500 to less than $1000		1	1	2	2			2	
$1000 to less than $5000			1	1			1	1	
More than $5000									
Total		1	7	9	4	1	3	8	

GIVEOTHR 37B. $ contributed to non-religious charities

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
None			1		1	1		1	
Less than $100		1	2	3			2	1	2

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
$100 to less than $500		1			2	1		1	2
$500 to less than $1000			1		1			1	1
$1000 to less than $5000									
More than $5000									
Total		2	4		7	2	2	3	6

ALIEN1 38A. The people running *this* community do not really care what happens to me

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly		1	1		2	1	1		2
Disagree somewhat		1			2	1		1	2
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Agree somewhat			3		3	2		1	3
Agree strongly			1		1			1	1
Total		2	2		8	4	1	3	8

TVONE 38B. Television is my primary form of entertainment

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly		1	3		4	1	2	1	3
Disagree somewhat		1			1	1			1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends		1	3		4	1	1	1	4
Agree somewhat			1		2	1		1	2
Agree strongly									
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

IMMIG 38C. Immigrants are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly									
Disagree somewhat		1			2		1	1	2
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends			1		1		1		
Agree somewhat		2	2		4	2	1	1	4
Agree strongly			3		3	2		1	3
Total		3	6		10	4	3	3	9

BOOK 38D. A book that most people disapprove of should be kept out of *this* public library

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly		1	4		6	1	2	3	5
Disagree somewhat		2	2		4	3	1		4
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Agree somewhat									
Agree strongly									
Total		3	6		10	4	3	3	9

TOOMUCH 38E. I often feel that there are too many things to worry about and pay attention to.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly			1		1		1		1
Disagree somewhat					1		1		1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends		1	1		1	1			1
Agree somewhat			3		5	3		1	5
Agree strongly			3		3		1	2	2
Total		2	7		11	4	3	3	10

OVERWHLM 38F. Sometimes I feel overwhelmed by everything that is going on

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly			1		1		1		1
Disagree somewhat		2	1		3	1	1		3
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Agree somewhat			2		3	2		1	3
Agree strongly			4		4	1	1	2	3

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

USEDUP 38G. I feel used up at the end of a typical day.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Disagree strongly									
Disagree somewhat		2		2	1	1		2	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends		1	1	2	1	1		2	
Agree somewhat			1	2			1	2	
Agree strongly			5	5	2	1	2	4	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

CALMLFE 38H. I lead a calm and relaxed life

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Disagree strongly			3	3		1	2	2	
Disagree somewhat			3	3	2			3	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Agree somewhat		1	1	3	1	1	1	3	
Agree strongly		2		2	1	1		2	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

RELIMP 38I. Religion is very important in my life

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Disagree strongly		1	1	2		2		1	
Disagree somewhat									
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends			1	1	1			1	
Agree somewhat		2	2	5	2	1	2	5	
Agree strongly			3	3	1		1	3	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

LETIN1 38J. Do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be increased a lot, increased a little, remain the

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
reduced a lot		1	3	4	3		1	4	
reduced a little		1	1	2		1	1	2	
remain the same as it is		1	2	3	1	2		2	
increased a little									
increased a lot									
Total		3	6	9	4	3	2	8	

WRKTIME 41. Hours worked in the average w[eek] *NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION*

WORKTIME Avg weekly work hours (nonworkers included at 0)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
N	3	7		11	4	3	3	10	
Mean	51.67	51.71		52.45	51.75	48.33	48.33	50.7	
SD	7.64	24.81		19.68	18.95	34.03	34.03	19.82	

COMMUTE 44. Hours it takes to get to work (response in minutes)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
N	3	6		9	4	3	2	8	
Mean	23.33	36.17		31.89	35	23.33	38.5	32.13	
SD	16.07	24.81		21.87	10	16.07	51.62	23.37	

ECONSAT 45. Satisfaction with current financial situation

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Not at all satisfied		1	2	3	1		2	3	
Somewhat satisfied		1	4	6	3	1	1	6	
Very satisfied		1	1	2		2		1	
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3	10	

MARITAL 46. Current marital status

	Age			Ethnicity/Race	

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Never Married		2	2		4	2	1	1	4
Widowed									
Divorced			1		1	1			1
Separated									
Currently married		1	4		6	1	2	2	5
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

PARTNER 46A. Living with a partner

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	3		5	3	1	1	5
Yes									
Total		2	3		5	3	1	1	5

KIDS 47. Kids 17 or younger in household

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
0		2	6		8	3	2	2	7
1									
2		1	1		2	1	1		2
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
10+									
Total		3	7		10	4	3	2	9

KIDS_6 47A. Kids 6 or older in household

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
0		2	4		6	3	2	1	5
1		1	1		2		1	1	2
2					1			1	1
3									
4									
5									
6									
10+									
Total		3	5		9	3	3	3	8

SKID 48. Number of adults living in household

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
1		2	1		3	2	1		3
2		1	4		5	1	2	1	3
3			1		2	1		1	2
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
10									
Total		3	6		10	4	3	2	8

MARASN 50A. Favor/oppose marrying an Asian person

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Very much oppose			1		1		1	1	
Somewhat oppose		1			1	1		1	
Neither favor nor oppose		2	4		7	1	3	2	6
Somewhat favor									

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much favor		1		1	1			1	
Total		3	6	10	3	3	3	9	

MARBLK 50B. Favor/oppose marrying a black person

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much oppose			1	1			1	1	
Somewhat oppose		2	1	3	2	1		3	
Neither favor nor oppose		1	3	5		2	2	4	
Somewhat favor									
Very much favor			1	1	1			1	
Total		3	6	10	3	3	3	9	

MARWHT 50C. Favor/oppose marrying a white person

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much oppose									
Somewhat oppose									
Neither favor nor oppose		1	3	5		2	2	4	
Somewhat favor		1	1	2	1	1		2	
Very much favor		1	2	3	2		1	3	
Total		3	6	10	3	3	3	9	

MARHIS 50D. Favor/oppose marrying a Latino or Hispanic person

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much oppose			1	1			1	1	
Somewhat oppose		1		1	1			1	
Neither favor nor oppose		2	4	7	1	3	2	6	
Somewhat favor									
Very much favor				1	1			1	
Total		3	5	10	3	3	3	9	

NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

Mean feeling thermometer scores:

					Age			Ethnicity/Race	
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
FTGAYS 5OE1. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Gay Men and Lesbians, that is homosexuals		3: 30: 26.46	7:48.57 : 38.91	10:43:35.29	4: 35: 43.59	3: 46.67: 5.77	2: 25: 35.36	9: 42.22: 37.34	
FTBLKS 5OE2. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Blacks		3: 63.33: 23.09	7: 67.14: 36.38	10: 66: 31.69	4: 67.5: 20.62	3: 63.33: 23.09	2: 50: 70.71	9: 67.78: 33.02	
FTWHTS 5OE3. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Whites?		4: 72.5: 26.30	6: 86.67: 19.66	10: 81: 22.34	4: 80: 21.60	3: 63.33: 23.09	2: 100: 0	9: 84.44: 20.68	
FTASNS 5OE4. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Asian-Americans?		3: 63.33: 23.09	7: 68.57: 33.38	10: 66: 31.69	4: 67.75: 20.62	2: 70: 28.28	3: 50: 50	9: 65.56: 32.06	

Item							
FTHSPNS 5OE5. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Latinos or Hispanic-Americans?	3: 50:0	7: 58.57: 34.36	10: 56: 28.36	4: 65: 23.80	3: 50: 0	2: 25: 35.36	9: 56.67: 30
FTCATHS 5OE6. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Catholics?	3: 63.33: 23.09	7: 62.14: 35.81	10: 62.65: 31.20	4: 58.75: 17.5	3: 63.33: 23.09	2: 50: 70.71	9: 63.89: 32.77
FTPROTS 5OE7. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Protestants?	3: 63.33: 23.09	7: 81.43: 22.68	10: 76: 23.19	4: 67.5: 20.62	3: 63.33: 23.09	2: 100: 0	9: 78.89: 22.61
FTMUSLM 5OE8. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Muslims?	3: 33.33: 28.87	7: 45: 25.66	10:41.5: 25.61	4: 41.25: 35.68	3:50: 0	2: 25: 35.36	9: 40.56: 26.98
FTFUNDS 5OE9. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Evangelical Christians?	3: 63.33: 23.09	5: 58: 27.75	8: 60: 24.49	4: 60: 31.62	3: 63.33: 23.09	2: 50: 70.71	7: 61.43: 26.10
FTIMMIG 5OE10. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Immigrants?	3: 50: 0	6: 55.83: 34.71	9: 53.87: 27.59	4: 58.75: 17.5	3: 50: 0	2: 50: 70.71	8: 54.38: 29.45
FTPOOR 5OE11. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Poor people?	3: 63.33: 23.09	7: 67.14: 25.63	10: 66: 23.66	4: 55: 17.32	3: 63.33: 23.09	2: 75: 35.63	9: 67.87: 24.38
FTRICH 5OE12. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Rich people?	3: 63.33: 23.09	7: 65.71: 25.07	10: 65: 23.21	4: 52.5: 12.58	3: 63.33: 23.09	2: 75: 35.36	9: 66.67: 23.98

NEISOC 51. How often talk with or visit immediate neighbors

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Never			1	1	1				1
Once a year or less				1	1		1		1
Several times a year			1	1	1				1
Once a month		1		1	1		1		1
Several times a month		1	4	5	1	1	2		5
Several times a week		1		2	1	1			1
Just about everyday				1					
Total		3	7	11	4	3	3		10

NEICOOP 52. Worked with others to get people to fix or improve something in neighborhood

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1	4		6	2	1	2	6
Yes		2	3		5	2	2	1	4
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

NEIDIV 52A. If you were looking for a house, and found affordable houses in a few different neighborhoods, in which of the follo would you personally feel most comfortable?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Neighbors entirely of your own race or ethnic backgroun			2		2	1		1	2
Neighbors mostly of your own race or ethnic bac			3	3		6	3	2	1	6
Neighbors mostly of different racial or ethnic backgrounds f									
Racial or ethnic background of neighbors is completely i			1		2		1	1	1
Total			3	6		10	4	3	3	9

FRIENDS 53. Number of close friends

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No close friends									
1-2 close friends			2		2	1		1	2
3-5 close friends		1	2		4	1	2	1	3
6-10 close friends		2	2		4	2	1		4
More than 10 close friends			1		1			1	1
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

CONFIDE 54. Number of people you can confide in

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Nobody									
One			1		1			1	1
Two		1	1		2	1	1		2
Three or more		2	5		8	3	2	2	7
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

BBUS 55A. Has personal friend who owns a business

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		3	6		10	4	3	2	9
Total		3	6		10	4	3	2	9

BWORKER 55B. Has personal friend who is a manual worker

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		3	7		11	4	3	3	10
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

BWELF 55C. Has personal friend who has been on welfare

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1	1		3	1		2	3
Yes		2	5		7	3	3		6
Total		3	6		10	4	3	2	9

BVACH 55D. Has personal friend who owns a vacation home

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	4		7	2	2	3	6
Yes		1	2		3	1	1		3
Total		3	6		10	3	3	3	9

BREL 55E. Has personal friend with different religious orientation

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white

No
	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes		2	7		10	4	2	3	10
Total		2	7		10	4	2	3	10

BWHT 55F. Has personal friend who is white

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		3	6		10	4	2	3	10
Total		3	6		10	4	2	3	10

BHISP 55G. Has personal friend who is Latino or Hispanic

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1	5		7	3		4	7
Yes		1	1		2	1	1		2
Total		2	6		9	4	1	4	9

BASN 55H. Has personal friend who is Asian

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	6		9	3	2	3	8
Yes			1		1	1			1
Total		2	7		10	4	2	3	9

BBLK 55I. Has personal friend who is black or African-American

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	4		7	3		4	7
Yes			2		2	1	1		2
Total		2	6		9	4	1	4	9

BLEADER 55K. Has personal friend who is a community leader

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No			1		1	1			1
Yes		2	6		9	3	2	3	8
Total		2	7		10	4	2	3	9

NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

Mean numbers of times in the last 12 months that R did:

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
PARADE2 56A. Number of: parades, local sports or art events		2: 26.5: 33.23	7: 15.86: 22.48	10: 16.9: 22.29	4: 15.25: 23.19	2: 11.5: 12.02	3: 26.67: 33.29	9: 16.56: 23.62	
ARTIST2 56B. Number of: artistic activities with a group		2: 6: 5.66	8: 7.63: 12.84	10: 6.8: 11.72	4: 3.75: 2.76	2: 5: 7.07	3: 12.67: 21.94	9: 7: 12.16	
CARDS2 56C. Number of: played cards or board games with others		2: 9: 8.49	7: 4.71: 3.30	10: 5.8: 4.32	4: 8.5: 5.45	2: 3: 0	3: 5.67: 2.31	9: 6.11: 4.46	
FAMVIS2 56D. Number of: visited with relatives		3: 31.67: 22.81	7: 41.43: 45.8	11: 37.18: 37.44	4: 37.75: 64.49	3: 54.33: 48.54	3: 27.67: 22.72	10: 30.5: 31.81	
CLUBS2 56E. Number of: attended a club meeting		3: 19: 34.18	7: 30.43: 34.48	11: 24.55: 29.10	4: 45.75: 40.19	3: 20.33: 6.35	3: 12: 12	10: 24.6: 30.68	
FRNDHOM2 56F. Number of: had friends over to your home		3: 38.33: 53.59	6: 23.33: 23.59	10: 25.8: 32.58	3: 35: 56.31	3: 22.33: 26.08	3: 20.67: 27.21	9: 22.89: 35.15	

Variable							
FRNDRAC2 56G. Number of :had a friend of a different race at your home or visited theirs	3: 30.33: 3.51	6: 1.83: 1.47	10: 2.1: 2.23	5: 1.6: 1.52	2: 5: 2.83	3: 1: 1.73	10: 2.1: 2.23
JOBSOC3 [computed from 56H.] Frequency of socializing with coworkers (nonworkers=0)	2: 15.5: 12.02	7: 25.29: 37.48	10: 21.5: 31.54	4: 33.25: 45.46	2: 4: 4.24	3: 23.67: 24.66	9: 23.78: 32.57
FRNDHNG2 56I. Number of: hung out with friends in a public place	2: 28.5: 30.41	7: 9.87: 3.73	10: 13.3: 14.41	4: 21.25: 21.42	2: 4.5: 3.54	3: 9: 2.65	9: 14.56: 14.69
TEAMSPT2 56J. Number of: played a team sport	3: 5: 6.24	7: 1: 1.41	11: 2: 3.58	4: 3.75: 5.68	3: 1.33: 1.53	3: 1:1.73	10: 2.1: 3.75
WWWCHAT2 56K. Number of: online Internet discussions	3: 5: 6.24	7: 58.86: 112.98	11: 38.82: 91.98	4: 79: 147.41	4: 79: 147.41	2: 0.5:0.7 1	10: 32.3: 94.13
PUBMEET2 56L. Number of: attended public meeting discussing school or town affairs	3: 2: 1.73	7: 4.86: 8.51	11: 3.91: 6.77	4: 1.5: 1.29	3: 2: 1.73	3: 9.33: 12.74	10: 4.3: 7.01
NEIHOME2 56M. Times last 12 mos. been in the home of a neighbor (merged)	3: 20: 26.06	7: 5.29: 8.36	11: 8.82: 15.22	4: 14: 24.06	3: 3.67: 3.06	3: 2: 1.73	10: 9.6: 15.81
HMEXNEI2 56N. Times last 12 mos. been in the home of someone in your city but outside your neighborhood (merged)	3: 3.33: 3.51	7: 19.71: 34.82	11: 14.09: 28.14	4: 25: 48.68	3: 7.33: 4.51	3: 7: 0	10: 9.6: 15.81
VOLTIME2 58. Times last 12 mos. volunteered (merged)	4: 29.75: 49.76	5: 3.2:2.8 6	10: 13.5: 32.03	4: 6.75: 3.86	3: 1.33: 1.53	2: 52: 73.54	9: 14.89: 33.65

EDUC 61. Highest education completed

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Less than high school (Grade 11 or less)									
High school diploma (including GED)									
Some college									
Assoc. degree (2 year) or specialized technical training									
Bachelor's degree		1	2	4	1	2		1	3
Some graduate training									
Graduate or professional degree		2	6	7	3			3	7
Total		3	8	11	4	2		4	10

EDUC2 61A. GED or equivalency

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No									
Yes									
Total									

EDUC_ALL [From 61] Education including GED follow-up

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Less than high school									
High school diploma/GED									
Some college									
Assoc degree (2 years) or specialized technical training									
Bachelors degree									
Some graduate training									
Graduate or professional training									

Total

HISPNAT 62A. Nationality background of Hispanics (percentages are out of Hispanics)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Mexican									
Puerto Rican									
Cuban									
Dominican									
El Salvadoran									
Guatemalan									
Colombian									
Honduran									
Other									
Total									

HISPRACE 62B. Race of Hispanics (percentages are out of Hispanics)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
White									
Black									
Other									
Total									

RACE 63. Race of Non-Hispanics (percentages are of non-Hispanics)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
White		2	6		9	4	1	3	9
African American or Black									
Asian or Pacific Islander									
Alaskan Native/Native American									
Other (specify)									
Total		2	6		9	4	1	3	9

ASNNAT 63B. Specific Asian nationality (data not provided since Asian base in national sample too small)

CITIZ 64. Citizenship status

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		3	7		11	4	3	3	10
Total		3	7		11	4	3	3	10

YRSINUS 64B. How many years have you lived in the United States? (means)

NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
	3:				3:	3:		8:	
	34:5.5		5:41.2:		27.33:	36.67:	3: 59:	41.63:	
YRSINUS 64B. Years lived in the Unit	7	16.08	9: 41: 14.34		2.08	2.08	4.36	15.19	

INCOME [From 66.] 2005 Total household income

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
$20,000 or less									
Over $20,000 but less than $30,000			2	2	1		1	2	
Less than $30,000 unspecified		1		1	1	1		2	
$30,00 but less than $50,000		1		1					
$50,000 but less than $75,000									
$75,000 but less than $100,000									
$100,000 or more									
Over $30,000 unspecified			4	5	2		2	5	
Total		2	6		9	4	1	3	9

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

			5: 2:			2: 1.5:	2: 3:	7:1.57:	
	NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIA	2: 1: 0	1.73	8: 1.63:1.41	3: 1:0	0.71	2.83	1.51	
						Age			Ethnicity/R:
		Total	Male	Some college	College	18-34	35-49	65+	Whites
	VALID RANGE 1-9								
	>30 <50								
	>50 <75								
	$75,000 but less than $100,000			2		2			2
Total	$100,000 or more			1		1			1
	Over $30,000 unspecified			2		3	2		3
				5		6	2		6

<div style="text-align:center">Appendix I</div>

2013 ADAPTED Social Capital Community Survey
Case Study Sample - PRIVATE

Note: in the race/ethnic breakouts, non-whites are respondents who provided race who were not white non-hispanics

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Total Participants	10	3	6	9	3	2	4		8
	10	3	6	9	3	2	4		8

ALL NUMBERS BELOW ARE RAW NUMBERS, EXCEPT WHEN "*NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION" IS NOTED*

IMPOCCUP 5A1. Your OCCUPATION gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Not at all important									
Slightly important			1	1			1		1
Moderately important		1	1	1		1			
Very important		2	4	7	4	1	2		7
		3	6	9	4	2	3		8

IMPRESID 5A2. Your PLACE OF RESIDENCE gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Not at all important		1	1	2		1	1		1
Slightly important									
Moderately important			2	2		1	1		2
Very important		2	3	5	4		1		5
		3	6	9	4	2	3		8

IMPETH 5A3. Your ETHNIC OR RACIAL BACKGROUND gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Not at all important		1	2	4	1	1	2		3
Slightly important									
Moderately important			3	3	1	1	1		3
Very important		1	1	2	2				2
		2	6	9	4	2	3		8

IMRELIG 5A4. Your RELIGION (if any) gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Not at all important					1		1		1
Slightly important									
Moderately important		1	1	2	2				2
Very important		2	5	6	2	2	2		6
		3	6	9	4	2	3		9

IMPAMER 5A5. Being an AMERICAN gives you a sense of who you are

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Not at all important									
Slightly important									
Moderately important		1		1		1			1
Very important		2	6	8	4	1	1		8
		3	6	9	4	2	1		9

TRUST 6. Whether most people can be trusted or you can't be too careful

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
People can be trusted			1		1		1		1
You can't be too careful		2	1	4	3		1		3

		Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
(VOLUNTEERED) Depends			1	4		4	2		2	4
Total			3	6		9	5	1	3	8

TRNEI 7A. How much you can *trust families in the school's* neighborhood

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot									
Some			2		3	1	1	1	3
A little		2	1		3	2		1	3
Not at all			2		2	1		1	2
Total		2	5		8	4	1	3	8

TRWRK 7B. How much you can trust people you work with *at this school*

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot		1			2	1		1	2
Some		3			3	1	1	1	3
A little		2	1		3	2		1	3
Not at all									
Total		6	1		8	4	1	3	8

TRREL 7C. How much you can trust people at your church or place of worship

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot			2		2		2		2
Some		2	3		6	3		3	6
A little			1		1	1			1
Not at all									
Total		2	6		9	4	2	3	9

TRSHOP 7D. How much you can trust people who work in the stores *near this school*

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot									
Some			3		3		1	2	3
A little									
Not at all		2	2		5	3		2	5
Total		2	5		8	3	1	4	8

TRCOP 7F. How much you can trust the police in *this* local community

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot		1			2	1		1	2
Some			5		5	2		3	5
A little		1			1	1			1
Not at all									
Total		2	5		8	4		4	8

TRWHT 7G. How much you can trust white people

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot		1			1	1			1
Some		1	4		6	2	1	3	6
A little			1		1			1	1
Not at all									
Total		2	5		8	3	1	4	8

TRBLK 7H. How much you can trust African Americans or blacks

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot									
Some			4		5	1	1	3	5
A little		1	1		2	1		1	2
Not at all		1			1	1			1
Total		2	5		8	3	1	4	8

TRASN 7I. How much you can trust Asian people

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot									
Some		1	2		4	2	1	1	4
A little			3		3			3	3
Not at all		1			1	1			1
Total		2	5		8	3	1	4	8

TRHIS 7J. How much can you trust Hispanics or Latinos

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
A lot									
Some		1	2		4	2	1	1	4
A little		1	3		4	1		3	4
Not at all									
Total		2	5		8	3	1	4	8

WALLTNEI 8A. If you lost a wallet or a purse that contained two hundred dollars, and it was found *in this neighborhood*, how likely

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
not at all likely			1		1	1			1
somewhat unlikely		1			1	1			1
somewhat likely			4		5		1	4	5
very likely		1			1	1			1
Total		2	5		8	3	1	4	8

WALLTSTR 8B. If you lost a wallet or a purse that contained two hundred dollars, and it was found by a stranger how likely is it to be

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
not at all likely		1	1		2	2			2
somewhat unlikely		1	3		5	1	1	3	5
somewhat likely			1		1			1	1
very likely									
Total		2	5		8	3	1	4	8

LIFESAT 9. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole nowadays? (1=extremely dissatisfied, 10=extremel

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6			2		2			2	2
7									
8		1	4		5	3	1	1	5
9		1			1		1		
10		1	1		1	1			1
Total		3	7		9	4	2	3	8

HEALTH 10. Reported overall health

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Poor									
Fair		1	1		2	2			2
Good									
Very Good		1	6		7		3	4	6
Excellent		1			1	1			1
Total		3	7		10	3	3	4	9

COOP 11. Likelihood of people cooperating to save water or electricity

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Very unlikely									
Unlikely					1			1	1

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Likely		2	4	6	2	1		3	6
Very likely			1	1	1				1
Total		2	5	8	3	1		4	8

ROBCHANC 11A. . How likely do you think it is that you may be the victim of a crime in the next 12 months?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Very unlikely		1	1	2	2				2
Unlikely			3	3	1	1		1	3
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends			2	2				2	2
Likely				1				1	1
Very likely		1		1	1				1
Total		2	6	9	4	1		4	9

LIVCOM 12. Number of years *worked in this school* in *this* community

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Less than one year		1		1		1			
One to five years		2	3	6	4	1		1	6
Six to ten years			2	2				2	2
Eleven to twenty years									
More than twenty years			1	1				1	1
All my life									
Total		3	6	10	4	2		4	9

STAY 13. Expect to be *working in this* community in 5 years

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1	3	5		1		4	4
Yes		2		2	2				2
Total		3	3	7	2	1		4	6

WANTMOVE 13A. Would you *leave this position* from this neighborhood if you could?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	3	6	1	1		4	5
Yes		1	1	2	1	1			2
Total		3	4	8	2	2		4	7

QOL 14. Rating of *this* community as a place to live

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Poor									
Only fair			1	1	1				1
Good		1	2	3	1			2	3
Excellent		1	1	3	1	1		1	3
Total		2	4	7	3	1		3	7

OWN 15. Own or rent residence

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Rent		2		2	1	1			1
Own		1	6	7	3	1		3	7
Total		3	6	9	4	2		3	8

EFFCOM 16. Perceived impact in making community a better place to live

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No impact at all			1	1	1				1
A small impact			1	1				1	1
A moderate impact		1	2	3	1			2	4
A big impact		1	1	2	2				2
Total		2	5	7	4			3	8

PAPER 17. Days in the past week respondent read a daily newspaper

		Age		Ethnicity/Race

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
0		3	3	5					5
1				1				1	1
2									
3									
4									
5			1	1				1	1
6									
7			1	1				1	1
Total		3	5	8				3	8

TVHRS 18. Hours of TV watched on an average weekday M-F (Mean)
NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
	2: 6.5: 4.95	5: 2.8: 1.3		8: 3.63: 2.77	3: 5.33:	2: 2: 1.41	3: 3: 1	7: 3.71: 2.98	

WWWTIME 19. Hours spent using the Internet in a typical week

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
None									
Less than 1 hour			3	1				1	1
1 to 5 hours		3	2	2	1	1			2
6 to 10 hours			1	5	4			1	5
11 to 20 hours				1				1	1
More than 20 hours									
Total		3	6	9	5	1		3	9

POLINT 21. Interest in politics and national affairs

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Not at all interested			1	2	1			1	2
Only slightly interested			1	1	1				1
Somewhat interested		2	3	4	3			1	4
Very interested		1	1	2		1		1	2
Total		3	6	9	5	1		3	9

REGVOTE 22. Currently registered to vote

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		3	6	9	6			3	8
Total		3	6	9	6			3	8

VOTEUS 23. Voted in *2012* presidential election

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		2	6	7	4	1		3	8
Total		2	6	7	4	1		3	8

TGNAT 24. How often trust national govt to do what is right

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Just about always									
Most of the time			1	1	1				1
Some of the time		2	2	5	1	2	2	2	4
Hardly ever		1	1	2	1			1	2
Total		3	4	8	3	2		3	7

TGLOC 25. How often trust *schools* local govt to do what is right

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Just about always									
Most of the time									
Some of the time		2	3	6	3			3	6

Hardly ever

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Total		2	3		6	3		3	6

PETITION 26A. Signed a petition in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	2		4	2		2	4
Yes									
Total		2	2		4	2		2	4

RALLY 26B. Attended a political meeting or rally in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	2		4	2		2	4
Yes			1		1	1			1
Total		2	3		5	3		2	5

PROJECT 26C. Worked on a community project in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		2	4		7	4		3	7
Total		2	4		7	4		3	7

MARCH 26D. Participated in demonstrations, boycotts, or marches in past 12 months.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		1	3		4	2		2	4
Yes		1			1	1			1
Total		2	3		5	3		2	5

BLOOD 26E. *Hosted a blood drive* in past 12 months

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	4		7	4		3	7
Yes									
Total		2	4		7	4		3	7

IDEO 27. *School families* political ideology

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Very conservative		1			1	1			1
Moderately conservative		1	3		5	3	1	1	5
Middle-of-the-road			2		2			2	2
Moderately liberal									
Very Liberal									
Total		2	5		8	4	1	3	8

PARTYID 27A. Generally speaking, do you usually think of *most of the people in this area* as a Republican, Democrat, Independent,

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Republican			3		3	2	1		3
Democrat		2	2		4	2		2	4
Independent									
Other									
No Preference									
Total		2	5		7	4	1	2	7

POLKNOW2 28. Political knowledge scale

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Failed to name either		1	2		2	2			2
One is close									
One is correct or both are close									
One is correct & one is close			1		1			1	1
Both are correct		1	1		2	1		1	2

Total | | | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | | 2 | 5

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Total			2	4	5	3		2	5

SPNDSCH 27B1. Public schools? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Decreased			1		1		1		1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decre		2	1	2	1	1			1
Increased		1	4	6	3			3	6
Total		3	6	9	4	2		3	8

SPNDCRM 27B2. Dealing with crime? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Decreased					1			1	1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decre		1	1	2	1	1			2
Increased		1	3	4	2			2	4
Total		2	4	7	3	1		3	7

SPNDBDR 27B3. Tightening border security to prevent illegal immigration? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Decreased		1			1	1			
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decre		1	1	2	1			1	2
Increased		1	3	4	2	1		1	4
Total		3	4	7	4	1		2	6

SPNDBLK 27B4. Aid to Blacks? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Decreased		1			1	1			1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decre		2	2	5	2	1		2	5
Increased			1	1	1			1	1
Total		3	3	7	3	1		3	7

SPNDPOOR 27B5. Aid to the poor? (would you like to see spending increased or decreased)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Decreased		1			1	1			1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither increased nor decre		1	1	3	1	1	1		3
Increased		1	4	4	1	1	2		3
Total		3	5	8	3	2	3		7

SPNDNAT 27C. From what level of government do you feel you get the most for your money?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Local		1	1	2	1		1		2
State		1	1	3	1	1	1		3
Federal									
Total		2	2	5	2	1	2		5

WHYPOOR 27D. Bigger cause of pove

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
People not doing enough		2	4	6	3	1	2		6
Circumstances					1		1		1
Don't know			1						
Refused									
Total		2	5	7	3	1		3	7

SEN1 AND SEN2.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Failed to name either <SEN1> or <SEN2>		1	1	4	2			2	4
One correct			1	1	1		1		1
Both correct		1	1	2	1			1	2
One is "close"									
Both are "close"									
One is correct and one is "close"			1		1			1	1
Refused									

	2	4		8	3	1	4	8

RELIG 29. Religious preference

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Protestant									
Catholic		3	5		9	4	2	3	8
Another type of Christian									
Jewish									
Some other religion									
No religion									
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	8

PROTDOM 29A. Protestant denomination (not asked to all Rs)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Non-denominational Protestant									
7th Day Adventist/Fundamentalist Adventists/Adventist									
Episcopalian; Anglican; Worldwide Church of God									
Baptist-Southern Baptist									
Baptist-all other									
United Church of Christ									
Lutheran-Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, all other									
Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (LC-MS) or Wisconsin Synod									
Methodist-United Methodist Church-Evangelical United Brethre									
Pentecostal-Assemblies of God									
Pentecostal (not specified); Church of God									
Presbyterian									
Other									
Total									

CHROTHER 29B. Other Christian religion (not asked to all Rs)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Christian (NEC); 'just Christian'									
Plymouth Brethren/Independent									
Christian Scientists									
Mormons; Latter Day Saints									
Spiritualists									
Unitarian; Universalist									
Jehovah's Witnesses									
Unity; Unity Church; Christ Church Unity									
Fundamentalist Adventist (Worldwide Church of God)									
Eastern Orthodox or Greek Rite Catholic									
Born again Christian									
Full Gospel									
Bible Church									
Charismatic									
Apostolic									
Other									
Total									

RELOTHER 29C. Other Specified religion (not asked to all Rs)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Muslim; Mohammedan; Islam									
Buddhist									
Hindu									
American Indian Religions (Native American Religions)									
Wiccan									
Paganism (Unspecified)									
Religious Science									
Taoism									
Other									
Total									

RELMEM 30. Church/synagogue member (not asked to all respondents)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes		3	6		8	4	2	2	7
No					1			1	1
Total		3	6		9	4	2	3	8

RELMEM2 Church/synagogue member (non-church members not asked question coded as no)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes									
No									
Total									

RELATEND 31. How often you attend religious services

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Every week (or more often)		2	4		5	1	2	2	4
Almost every week		1	1		2	2			2
Once or twice a month					1		1		1
A few times per year			1		1	1			1
Less often than that									
Total		3	6		9	4	2	3	8

RELPART1 32. Participate in church activities other than attending services

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes			5		4	1	1	2	4
No		3	1		5	3	1	1	4
Total		3	6		9	4	2	3	8

GRPREL 33A. Participate in organization affiliated with religion

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			3		4	1		3	4
Yes		3	2		5	4	1		4
Total		3	5		9	5	1	3	8

GRPSPORT 33B. Participate in sports club, league, or outdoor activity club

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			3		4	1		3	4
Yes		3	2		5	4	1		4
Total		3	5		9	5	1	3	8

GRPYOUTH 33C. Participate in youth organization

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	4		6	2	1	3	5
Yes		2	1		3	2	1	1	3
Total		3	5		9	4	2	4	8

GRPPTA 33D. Participate in parent association or other school support group

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	5		9	4	2	3	8
Yes									
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	8

GRPVET 33E. Participate in veterans group

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	5		9	4	2	3	8
Yes									
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	8

GRPNEI 33F. Participate in neighborhood association

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	6	10	5	2	3	9	
Yes									
Total		3	6	10	5	2	3	9	

GRPELD 33G. Participate in seniors groups

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	
Yes									
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	

GRPSOC 33H. Participate in charity or social welfare organization

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	4	6	2	1	3	6	
Yes		2	1	3	2	1		2	
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	

GRPLAB 33I. Participate in labor union

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	
Yes									
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	

GRPPROF 33J. Participate in professional, trade, farm or business association.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	4	7	3	3	3	6	
Yes		1	1	2	1	3		2	
Total		3	5	9	4	6	3	8	

GRPFRAT 33K. Participate in service or fraternal organization.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			5	6	2	1	3	6	
Yes		3		3	3			2	
Total		3	5	9	5	1	3	8	

GRPETH 33L. Participate in ethnic, nationality, or civil rights organization

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	5	8	3	2	3	7	
Yes		1		1	1			1	
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	

GRPPOL 33M. Participate in political group

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		3	4	8	4	1	3	7	
Yes			1	1		1		1	
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	

GRPART 33N. Participate in literary, art, or musical group

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	4	7	4		3	7	
Yes		1	1	2		2		1	
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	

GRPHOB 33O. Participate in hobby, investment, or garden club

	Age			Ethnicity/Race

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	4		6	3		3	6
Yes		2	1		3	1	2		2
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	8

GRPSELF 33P. Participate in self-help program

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		3	5		9	4	2	3	8
Yes									
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	8

REFORM 34. Belonged to any group that took local action for reform

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No			1		2	1		1	5
Yes		2	1		3	1	2		
Total		2	2		5	2	2	1	5

OFFICER 35. Served as an officer or on a committee.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		3	2		6	3	2	1	5
Yes									
Total		3	2		6	3	2	1	5

GIVEREL 37A. $ contributed to church or religious causes

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
None									
Less than $100			2		2	1	1		2
$100 to less than $500		2	1		3	1	1	1	2
$500 to less than $1000									
$1000 to less than $5000			1		2			2	2
More than $5000									
Total		2	4		7	2	2	3	6

GIVEOTHR 37B. $ contributed to non-religious charities

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
None			1		1	1			1
Less than $100		1	2		3		2	1	2
$100 to less than $500		1			2	1		1	2
$500 to less than $1000			1		1			1	1
$1000 to less than $5000									
More than $5000									
Total		2	4		7	2	2	3	6

ALIEN1 38A. The people running *this* community do not really care what happens to me

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly									
Disagree somewhat									
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends			1		1			1	1
Agree somewhat		2	1		4	3		1	4
Agree strongly									
Total		2	2		5	3		2	5

TVONE 38B. Television is my primary form of entertainment

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly			2		1		1		1
Disagree somewhat			1		2	1		1	2
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends			1		1			1	1

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Agree somewhat		3	1	4	3			1	3
Agree strongly			1		1	1			1
Total		3	6	9	5	1	3		8

IMMIG 38C. Immigrants are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly			1		1		1	1	
Disagree somewhat		1			1	1		1	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Agree somewhat			1		1		1	1	
Agree strongly		1	1	2	1				2
Total		2	3	5	2		2		5

BOOK 38D. A book that most people disapprove of should be kept out of *this* public library

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly		1	2	5	2	1	2	5	
Disagree somewhat									
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends		1	2	3	1	1	1	2	
Agree somewhat									
Agree strongly									
Total		2	4	8	3	2	3	7	

TOOMUCH 38E. I often feel that there are too many things to worry about and pay attention to.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly			1	1		1		1	
Disagree somewhat									
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Agree somewhat		2	2	5	3		2	5	
Agree strongly			2	2	2		1	2	
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3	8	

OVERWHLM 38F. Sometimes I feel overwhelmed by everything that is going on

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly		1			1	1		1	
Disagree somewhat		2		3	1	1	1	2	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends									
Agree somewhat			4	4	1	1	2	4	
Agree strongly			1		1	1		1	
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3	8	

USEDUP 38G. I feel used up at the end of a typical day.

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly									
Disagree somewhat			1		1		1	1	
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends		2			2	1	1	1	
Agree somewhat		1	4	6	2		4	6	
Agree strongly			2		1	1		1	
Total		3	7	10	4	2	4	9	

CALMLFE 38H. I lead a calm and relaxed life

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly									
Disagree somewhat			3		3	1	1	1	3
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends			1		1	1			1
Agree somewhat		2	1		4	1	1	2	3
Agree strongly		1			1	1			1
Total		3	5		9	4	2	3	8

RELIMP 38I. Religion is very important in my life

		Age			Ethnicity/Race	

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Disagree strongly								
Disagree somewhat	1		1	1				1
(VOLUNTEERED) Neither/depends			1			1		1
Agree somewhat	1	2	3	3				3
Agree strongly	1	3	4	2		2		3
Total	3	5	9	6		3		8

LETIN1 38J. Do you think the number of immigrants to America nowadays should be increased a lot, increased a little, remain the sar

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
reduced a lot	1		1	1	1			1
reduced a little		1	2			2		2
remain the same as it is	1	2	3	1	1	1		3
increased a little								
increased a lot								
Total	2	3	6	2	1	3		6

WRKTIME 41. Hours worked in the average w *NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION*

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
WORKTIME Avg weekly work hours (nonworkers included at 0)	4: 60: 20.41	5: 51: 8.94	9: 55: 14.79	4: 58.75: 20.97	2: 47.5: 10.61	3: 55: 8.66	8: 55: 15.81	

COMMUTE 44. Hours it takes to get to work (response in minutes)

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
	3: 18.33: 10.41	6: 19: 15.52	9: 16: 12.07	4: 15.75: 11.75	2: 27.5: 17.68	3: 8.67: 2.31	8: 16.13: 12.9	

ECONSAT 45. Satisfaction with current financial situation

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Not at all satisfied		1	1	1	1			1
Somewhat satisfied	2	5	7	2	2	3		6
Very satisfied	1		1	1	1			1
Total	3	6	9	4	2	3		8

MARITAL 46. Current marital status

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Never Married	2		2	1	1			1
Widowed		1	1			1		1
Divorced		2	2	1	1			2
Separated	1		1	1				1
Currently married		1	2	1		1		2
Total	3	4	8	4	2	2		7

PARTNER 46A. Living with a partner

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No	1	1	2	1	1			2
Yes		1	1	1				1
Total	1	2	3	2	1			3

KIDS 47. Kids 17 or younger in household

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	
Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
0	2	3	5	3	2			4
1	1			1		1		1
2	1		1	1				1
3								
4								
5								
6								

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
7									
8									
10+									
Total		3	3	7	4	2	1		6

KIDS_6 47A. Kids 6 or older in household

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
0		2	1	3	2	1			2
1				1			1		1
2		1		1	1				1
3									
4									
5									
6									
10+									
Total		3	1	5	3	1	1		4

SKID 48. Number of adults living in household

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
1		1	2	3		2	1		2
2		1	3	4	3		1		4
3				1			1		1
4		1		1	1				1
5									
6									
7									
8									
10									
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3		8

MARASN 50A. Favor/oppose marrying an Asian person

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much oppose									
Somewhat oppose		1	1	2	1		1		2
Neither favor nor oppose		1	4	6	3	1	2		6
Somewhat favor									
Very much favor									
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3		8

MARBLK 50B. Favor/oppose marrying a black person

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much oppose		1	1	2	1		1		2
Somewhat oppose		1		1	1				1
Neither favor nor oppose			5	6	3	1	2		6
Somewhat favor									
Very much favor									
Total		2	6	9	5	1	3		9

MARWHT 50C. Favor/oppose marrying a white person

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much oppose									
Somewhat oppose									
Neither favor nor oppose			4	5	2	1	2		5
Somewhat favor			1	1			1		1
Very much favor		2		2	2				2
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3		8

MARHIS 50D. Favor/oppose marrying a Latino or Hispanic person

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Very much oppose									

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Somewhat oppose		2			2	2		2	
Neither favor nor oppose			4		5	2	1	2	5
Somewhat favor									
Very much favor									
Total		2	4		7	4	1	2	7

NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

Mean feeling thermometer scores:

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
FTGAYS 5OE1. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Gay Men and Lesbians, that is homosexuals		2: 30: 0	4: 60: 21.21	7: 50: 20.62	3: 46.67: 28.87	1: 35: 0	3: 58.33: 14.43	7: 50: 20.62	
FTBLKS 5OE2. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Blacks		3: 40: 17.32	3: 65: 13.23	7: 55: 18.93	3: 40: 17.32	1: 50: 0	3: 71.67: 2.89	7: 55: 18.93	
FTWHTS 5OE3. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Whites?		3: 93.33: 11.55	3: 71.67: 22.55	7: 80.71: 18.80	3: 93.33: 11.55	1: 50: 0	3: 78.33: 14.43	7: 80.71: 18.80	
FTASNS 5OE4. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Asian-Americans?		3: 50: 20	3: 65: 13.23	7: 59.29: 16.44	3: 50: 20	1:50: 0	3:71.67 : 2.89	7: 59.29: 16.44	
FTHSPNS 5OE5. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Latinos or Hispanic-Americans?		3: 45: 8.67	3: 65: 13.23	7: 57.14: 14.68	3: 45: 8.66	1: 50: 0	3: 71.67: 2.89	7: 57.14: 14.68	
FTCATHS 5OE6. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Catholics?		3: 96.67: 5.77	3: 88.33: 16.07	7: 89.29: 13.67	3: 96.67: 5.77	1: 95: 0	3: 80: 17.32	7: 89.29: 13.67	
FTPROTS 5OE7. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Protestants?		3: 66.67: 28.87	3: 85: 13.23	7: 75: 20.62	3: 66.67: 28.87	1: 90: 0	30: 78.33: 14.33	7: 75: 20.62	
FTMUSLM 5OE8. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Muslims?		3: 33.33: 20.82	3: 58.33: 14.43	7: 49.29: 21.30	3: 3.33: 20.82	1: 50: 0	3: 65: 13.23	7: 49.29: 21.3	
FTFUNDS 5OE9. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Evangelical Christians?		2: 50:0	3: 78.33: 10.41	6: 67.5: 15.41	2: 50: 0	1: 90: 0	3: 71.67: 2.89	6: 67.5: 15.41	

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
FTIMMIG 5OE10. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Immigrants?	3: 50: 0	3: 78.33: 10.41	7: 59.29: 11.7		3: 50: 0	1: 90: 0	3: 71.67: 2.89	7: 65: 15.55	
FTPOOR 5OE11. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Poor people?	3: 40: 10	3: 76.67: 11.55	7: 60: 20.82		3: 40: 10	1: 70: 0	3: 76.67: 11.55	7: 60: 20.82	
FTRICH 5OE12. I'll read a group and ask you to rate it from 0-100. The higher the number the more favorable you feel toward it. - Rich people?	3: 60: 17.32	3: 60: 26.46	7: 58.57: 18.64		3: 60: 17.32	1: 50: 0	3: 60: 26.46	7: 58.57: 18.64	

NEISOC 51. How often talk with or visit immediate neighbors

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Never									
Once a year or less		1			1		1		
Several times a year									
Once a month					1			1	1
Several times a month			1		1			1	1
Several times a week		2	4		5	3	1	1	5
Just about everyday									
Total		3	5		8	3	2	3	7

NEICOOP 52. Worked with others to get people to fix or improve something in neighborhood

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		3	3		7	4	1	2	6
Yes			3		2		1	1	2
Total		3	6		9	4	2	3	8

NEIDIV 52A. If you were looking for a house, and found affordable houses in a few different neighborhoods, in which of the followin would you personally feel most comfortable?

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Neighbors entirely of your own race or ethnic ba		1			1	1			1
Neighbors mostly of your own race or ethnic background			2		2	1	1		2
Neighbors mostly of different racial or ethnic backgrounds f									
Racial or ethnic background of neighbors is completely i			2		3			3	3
Total		1	4		6	2	1	3	6

FRIENDS 53. Number of close friends

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No close friends									
1-2 close friends					1			1	1
3-5 close friends		1	4		4	1	2	1	3
6-10 close friends			1		1	1			1
More than 10 close friends		2	1		3	2		1	3
Total		3	6		9	4	2	3	8

CONFIDE 54. Number of people you can confide in

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Nobody									
One									
Two			1		2			2	2
Three or more		1	5		5	2	2	1	4
Total		1	6		7	2	2	3	6

BBUS 55A. Has personal friend who owns a business

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	3	3	2		1		3
Yes		2	3	6	2	2	2		5
Total		3	6	9	4	2	3		8

BWORKER 55B. Has personal friend who is a manual worker

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			2	3	2		1		3
Yes		3	3	6	2	2	2		5
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3		8

BWELF 55C. Has personal friend who has been on welfare

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		1	4	7	2		3		6
Yes		1	1	2	1	1			2
Total		2	5	9	3	1	3		8

BVACH 55D. Has personal friend who owns a vacation home

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	3	6	3	1	2		5
Yes		1	2	3	1	1	1		3
Total		3	5	9	4	2	3		8

BREL 55E. Has personal friend with different religious orientation

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No									
Yes		2	5	8	4	1	3		8
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3		8

BWHT 55F. Has personal friend who is white

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			1	1	1				1
Yes		2	4	7	3	1	3		7
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3		8

BHISP 55G. Has personal friend who is Latino or Hispanic

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	3	6	3		3		6
Yes			2	2	1	1			2
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3		8

BASN 55H. Has personal friend who is Asian

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No		2	1	4	3		1		4
Yes			4	4	1	1	2		4
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3		8

BBLK 55I. Has personal friend who is black or African-American

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age			Ethnicity/Race	
					18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
No			2	3	1		2		3
Yes		2	3	5	3	1	1		5
Total		2	5	8	4	1	3		8

BLEADER 55K. Has personal friend who is a community leader

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No		2	2	5	2	1	2	4	
Yes		1	3	3	1	1	1	3	
Total		3	5	8	3	2	3	7	

NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

Mean numbers of times in the last 12 months that R did:

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
PARADE2 56A. Number of: parades, local sports or art events		3: 71: 57.16	5: 30.6: 39.33	9: 41.11: 46.54	4: 31.5: 48.38	2: 64: 56.57	4: 6.5: 5.51	8: 33.25: 42.90	
ARTIST2 56B. Number of: artistic activities with a group		3: 22.67: 25.42	5: 14.6: 25.71	9: 15.67: 23.28	4: 16: 24.29	2: 33.5: 37.48	3: 3.33: 5.77	8: 16.75: 24.64	
CARDS2 56C. Number of: played cards or board games with others		3: 13.33: 9.29	6: 4.33: 1.75	9: 7.33: 6.61	4: 10: 9.70	2: 6.5: .71	3: 4.33: 2.31	8: 7.38: 7.07	
FAMVIS2 56D. Number of: visited with relatives		3: 127: 206.12	6: 39: 36.57	9: 66.44: 116.68	4: 125.5: 165.02	2: 33.5: 37.48	3: 9.67: 2.52	8: 74.25: 122.26	
CLUBS2 56E. Number of: attended a club meeting		3: 4: 1.73	5: 2: 2.83	8: 2: 2.33	3: 3: 3	2: 3.5: 0.71	3: 0: 0	6: 2.17: 2.56	
FRNDHOM2 56F. Number of: had friends over to your home		3: 38.7: 56.66	6: 11.83: 19.83	9: 21.22: 34.82	4: 30: 49.48	2: 4.5: 2.12	20.67: 27.21	8: 23.5: 36.5	
FRNDRAC2 56G. Number of :had a friend of a different race at your home or visited theirs		3: 17.67: 10.97	5: 1.6: 1.82	8: 8.5: 9.81	4: 14: 11.58	1: 4: 0	3: 2.67: 3.79	8: 8.5: 9.81	
JOBSOC3 [computed from 56H.] Frequency of socializing with coworkers (nonworkers=0)		3: 21.33: 26.58	6: 5.17: 3.76	9: 11.33: 15.42	4: 16.75: 23.56	2: 7.5: 0.71	3: 6.67: 3.51	8: 11.88: 16.39	
FRNDHNG2 56I. Number of: hung out with friends in a public place		3: 21.33: 26.73	6: 14.5: 18.62	9: 16.44: 20.45	4: 31.25: 23.99	2: 5.5: 3.54	3: 4: 3.61	8: 18.3: 21.19	
TEAMSPT2 56J. Number of: played a team sport		3: 11.67: 10.97	6: .67: 1.63	9; 4.33: 7.87	4: 8: 11.31	2: 3.5: 0.71	3: 0: 0	8: 4.5: 8.4	
WWWCHAT2 56K. Number of: online Internet discussions		2: 3.5: 30.41	6: 2: 2.45	8: 9.13: 17.62	4: 16.75: 23.67	1: 6:0	3: 0: 0	8: 9.13: 17.62	
PUBMEET2 56L. Number of: attended public meeting discussing school or town affairs		3: 2: 3.46	6: 1.17: 1.83	9: 1.44: 2.3	4: 2.25: 2.87	2: 2: 2.83	3: 0:0	8: 1.63: 2.39	
NEIHOME2 56M. Times last 12 mos. been in the home of a neighbor (merged)		3: 19: 28.69	6: 6.33: 5.92	9: 9.22: 16.72	4: 14.75: 24.90	2: 3: 4.24	3: 6: 7.94	8: 10.38: 17.48	
HMEXNEI2 56N. Times last 12 mos. been in the home of someone in your city but outside your neighborhood (merged)		3: 5.33: 4.73	6: 13.33: 19.00	9: 10.67: 15.72	4: 6.5: 2.52	2: 3: 4.24	3: 21.33: 26.58	8: 12: 16.26	
VOLTIME2 58. Times last 12 mos. volunteered (merged)		3: 38.67: 56.66	6: 4.33: 4.76	9: 15.22: 33.45	4: 29: 50.14	2: 5.5: 3.54	3: 3.33: 3.51	8: 16.75: 35.42	

EDUC 61. Highest education completed

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white

				Age			Ethnicity/Race	

Less than high school (Grade 11 or less)
High school diploma (including GED)
Some college
Assoc. degree (2 year) or specialized technical training

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Bachelor's degree	1	1		2	1		1	2	
Some graduate training		2		2	1		1	2	
Graduate or professional degree	2	2		5	2	2	1	4	
Total	3	5		9	4	2	3	8	

EDUC2 61A. GED or equivalency

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No									
Yes									
Total									

EDUC_ALL [From 61] Education including GED follow-up

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Less than high school									
High school diploma/GED									
Some college									
Assoc degree (2 years) or specialized technical training									
Bachelors degree									
Some graduate training									
Graduate or professional training									
Total									

HISPNAT 62A. Nationality background of Hispanics (percentages are out of Hispanics)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
Mexican									
Puerto Rican									
Cuban									
Dominican									
El Salvadoran									
Guatemalan									
Colombian									
Honduran									
Other									
Total									

HISPRACE 62B. Race of Hispanics (percentages are out of Hispanics)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
White									
Black									
Other									
Total									

RACE 63. Race of Non-Hispanics (percentages are of non-Hispanics)

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
White		3	5		8	4	1	3	8
African American or Black									
Asian or Pacific Islander									
Alaskan Native/Native American									
Other (specify)									
Total		3	5		8	4	1	3	8

ASNNAT 63B. Specific Asian nationality (data not provided since Asian base in national sample too small)

CITIZ 64. Citizenship status

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
No									

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	18-34	35-49	50-64	Whites	non-white
Yes		2	6	8	3	2	3	7	
Total		2	6	8	3	2	3	7	

YRSINUS 64B. How many years have you lived in the United States?   (means)

NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
		3: 29.33:	5:45.8:			2:	3:	8: 43:	
					4: 28:	39.5:	62.67:		
YRSINUS 64B. Years lived in the Uni	5.51	16.78	9: 42.11: 16.36		2.71	6.36	.58	17.25	

INCOME [From 66.] 2005 Total household income

	Total	Male	Female	College degree+	Age 18-34	35-49	50-64	Ethnicity/Race Whites	non-white
$20,000 or less									
Over $20,000 but less than $30,000									
Less than $30,000 unspecified			2	2	1	1		2	
$30,00 but less than $50,000									
$50,000 but less than $75,000									
$75,000 but less than $100,000									
$100,000 or more									
Over $30,000 unspecified		3	2	6	2	1	3	5	
Total		3	4	8	3	2	3	7	

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

NUMBER, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIA 3:1:1

	Total	Male	Some college	College	18-34	35-49	65+	Ethnicity/R Whites
	5: 1.4: 1.34		8: 1.13: 1.13	4: 0.75:	1: 0: 0	3: 2:1	8: 1.13: 1.13	

	Total	Male	Some college	College	18-34	35-49	65+	Whites
		5: 1.4: 1.34	8: 1.13: 1.13	4: 0.75:	1: 0: 0	3: 2: 1	8: 1.13: 1.13	
VALID RANGE 1-9	3: 1: 1							
>30 <50		1		2		1	1	1
>50 <75			3	3	1		1	3
$75,000 but less than $100,000								
$100,000 or more		2		2	2			2
Over $30,000 unspecified								
		3	3	7	3	1	2	6