



CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY
FOUNDATION

Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey: Data Highlights from the Los Angeles Sample

This paper summarizes some of the data gathered by the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey conducted in Los Angeles, comparing the Los Angeles results with the results from the national sample. It also includes an interpretative analysis of some key findings. Six of the seven areas highlighted - Trust, Tolerance, Religion, Giving and Volunteering, Civic Engagement and Informal Social Interaction - largely correspond to “facets” or “dimensions” of social capital identified by the designers of the survey. The seventh area, Quality of Life, looks at Angelenos’ attitudes about Los Angeles as a place to live, as well as some factors influencing access to social capital, such as transience and commute time.

A final section, “Socioeconomic Differences in Social Capital,” discusses some of the ways in which income, education, and race/ethnicity correspond to greater or lesser levels of social capital.

An Overview of the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey

From July through November last year, the Saguro Seminar and Professor Robert Putnam of Harvard University conducted the largest-ever survey of civic engagement in America, the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey. Respondents to the survey - nearly 30,000 of them - answered more than 130 questions intended to measure levels of social connectedness and civic engagement. The questions touched on a wide range of behaviors and attitudes, from attendance at religious services, to diversity of friends, to leading community meetings and throwing dinner parties, to voting. The interviews were conducted by telephone using random-digit-dialing and averaged 26 minutes.

The total pool of respondents included 26,200 people in 40 distinct communities across the country and an additional national random sample of 3,000 individuals. The local community samples, which ranged in size from 500 to 1,500 respondents, were sponsored largely by community foundations, and a few private foundations. The communities surveyed vary significantly in geographic scope; some samples represent cities, some counties, some larger regions or even specific ZIP codes, and were determined by the foundations sponsoring the individual local surveys. The Los Angeles survey, sponsored by the California Community Foundation, represents a random sample of 500 individuals county-wide. The survey was conducted in English, and in Spanish to Spanish speaking-only respondents.

For more detailed information about the survey and the broader social capital study of which it is a part, visit the survey Web site: <http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey>.

How Los Angeles Compares to the National Sample

A Note About the Presentation of Data Results

What does it mean when this report says people in Los Angeles are different from the national average, for example less trusting, or more diverse in their friendships? The local survey of 500 Los Angeles County residents was designed to be representative of Los Angeles, and the national sample of 3,000 individuals representative of the country as a whole.

In comparing the results of the two surveys to find ways in which Los Angeles is different, it is important to keep in mind that only a small portion of the population was surveyed, and that the survey averages may not be exactly the total population averages. When the local and national survey averages are different, statistics are used to assess the likelihood that people in L.A. are really different from people nationwide.

If there is no more than a five percent chance that the surveys could look so different if Los Angeles and the nation actually have the same attitudes, we consider the difference to be more than just a statistical artifact; we report that L.A. is (significantly) different. Otherwise, we say that Los Angeles is not clearly different, even though the survey estimates may not be exactly identical. When data are presented below, both Los Angeles and national averages are given when they are statistically significantly different. Where they are not statistically significantly different, only the Los Angeles data are given.

Social Capital and Civic Engagement in Los Angeles

Trust

The survey highlights two broad measures of interpersonal trust. One refers to social trust, both of people in general and of people encountered in specific social roles, such as coworkers, store clerks, neighbors, and the local police. The second is a measure of reported degrees of trust of persons from different racial or ethnic backgrounds, across the categories of Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and European Americans. On both of these measures, Los Angeles looks less trusting than the nation as a whole.

When asked, “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” 36 percent of Angelenos say that people can be trusted; 55 percent say you can’t be too careful; and 9 percent say that it depends. This profile is a less trusting one than the national profile, in which 47 percent say people can be trusted, 46 percent say you can’t be too careful, and 7 percent say that it depends.

The survey also asks about trust in specific, community-based situations. People in Los Angeles are significantly less trusting of their neighbors, of people with whom they work, of people at their place of worship, and of their local police. Attitudes towards the local news media, while not very trusting, are not significantly less trusting in L.A. than elsewhere.

To illustrate, here are the proportions of the Los Angeles and national surveys answering, for each group mentioned, that they “trust them only a little” or “not at all”:

<i>Trust only a little or not at all:</i>	Los Angeles	U.S.
<i>People in your neighborhood</i>	32%	17%
<i>People you work with</i>	23%	13%
<i>People at your place of worship</i>	14%	6%
<i>People who work where you shop</i>	35%	23%
<i>Local news media</i>	43%	(not statistically different from L.A.)
<i>Local police</i>	21%	17%

When it comes to trusting people in broad racial or ethnic groups (whites, African Americans, Asian Americans and Latinos/Hispanics), the attitudes in Los Angeles were not significantly different from national norms.

To see who is wary of whom, the following table gives the percent responding that they trust people in the given category “only a little” or “not at all. (Read the table as, “Whites are trusted only a little or not at all by 11 percent of whites, 22 percent of African Americans, 5 percent of Asian Americans,” etc.)

<i>How much do you trust:</i>	Los Angeles: % trusting only a little or not at all			
	White	Af Am	As Am	Hispanic
<i>Whites?</i>	11%	22%	5%	37%
<i>African Americans?</i>	12	23	12	54
<i>Asian Americans?</i>	11	27	4	40
<i>Latino/Hispanics?</i>	11	18	5	43

The one area in which Angelenos express more trust than is found nationwide has nothing to do with local circumstances. Angelenos express greater than average levels of trust in their national government. The survey poses the question, “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?” In Los Angeles, 11 percent respond “Just about always,” and 32 percent say “most of the time,” higher than the national sample in which only 3 percent say “just about always” and 25 percent respond “most of the time.”

While it is clear that Los Angeles scores relatively low on measures of trust, it is equally clear that the low scores are due in part to the relatively high incidence of newcomers in Los Angeles, who are less trusting than persons who have been here five years or longer. In other words, Los Angeles is a relatively new home to many of its residents, and when people are new in town, they are more cautious than longer-term residents.

For example, one component of the social trust index is general trust. As noted earlier, survey respondents were asked, “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” Based on survey results, it is estimated that, among people who have lived in L.A. for less than five years, only 29 percent feel that people can generally be trusted. For people who have lived here five years or more,

the percentage is 46 percent. People in the Los Angeles survey were far more likely to have lived in their community less than five years than people in the national sample as a whole: Forty percent of the Los Angeles survey, compared to 29 percent of the national sample, had moved to their community within the past five years. Part of the relatively low level of trust seen among Angelenos, then, can be attributed to the high proportion of newcomers in the population. Living in Los Angeles is apparently a positive enough experience that, after five years, residents voice trust in far greater proportions than they do when they are recent arrivals.

Tolerance

People in Los Angeles share national perspectives on whether controversial books should be kept out of local public libraries, and whether immigrants are too pushy in their demands for equal civil rights. Twenty-two percent agree strongly that “Immigrants are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.” Thirteen percent agree strongly that “A book that most people disapprove of should be kept out of my local public library.”

While scores on attitudinal variables such as trust may be low, Los Angeles scores well on behavioral measures that reflect involvement in faith-based groups and in charitable activity.

Religion

People in Los Angeles are no more or less likely than the rest of the country to say they have a religious identity. In both samples, 87 percent gave a religious preference. Among Angelenos who have a religious preference, 38 percent say they attend church at least weekly, and another 30 percent attend at least once or twice a month. Angelenos are also as likely as other Americans to agree with the statement, “Religion is very important in my life,” a statement agreed with by 82 percent of the population. Lack of religious identity was also similar across the samples: In both the Los Angeles and the national data, 12 percent of the population give “no religion” as their response to a question asking about their religious preference.

Even though these baselines of religiosity are the same in Los Angeles and nationwide, religiosity in Los Angeles translates into less involvement with a spiritual community. Only 50 percent of Angelenos who identify with a religious tradition are members of a church, synagogue, mosque or similar spiritual community, compared with 65 percent nationwide. Only 39 percent report being involved with members of their congregation in an activity outside regular services within the twelve months prior to the survey, contrasted with 46 percent nationwide.

Giving and Volunteering

About half the population in L.A. volunteered at some point during the twelve months prior to the survey. Fifteen percent volunteered more frequently than once a month.

The survey asked about monetary donations to both religious and nonreligious causes. Both in Los Angeles and nationwide, the median gift to religious causes, including one’s congregation, was in the \$100 to \$500 range. Seventy percent of Angelenos made donations to religious organizations or causes, compared with 75 percent nationwide. Fifty-nine percent of the L.A. respondents gave money to nonreligious charities, compared with 69 percent nationwide. The median household donation to nonreligious causes was less than \$100 in the Los Angeles sample, and in the \$100 to \$500 range in the national sample.

Civic Engagement

Forty-seven percent of Angelenos reported having voted in the 1996 presidential election, with 8 percent saying they were ineligible to vote. This is a lower rate of participation in voting than is reported in the national sample, in which 65 percent say they voted and 6 percent say they were ineligible. Angelenos also read the newspaper less often, 2.8 days a week compared to 3.3 in the national sample.

Informal Social Interaction

The survey asks about several forms of informal social interactions, such as hanging out with friends or coworkers, visiting with friends or relatives at home, and playing cards or board games. People in Los Angeles have on more occasions had a friend of another race visit them at home or at the friend’s home; on the other measures, people in Los Angeles report fewer interactions.

<i>How many times in the past twelve months have you:</i>	Los Angeles	U.S.
<i>Played cards or board games with others?</i>	8.7	11.9
<i>Visited relatives in person or had them visit you?</i>	20.1	25.3
<i>Had friends over to your home?</i>	18.5	22.5
<i>Been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them in your home?</i>	13.9	11.5
<i>Socialized with coworkers outside of work?</i>	10.2	14.4

Quality of Life

The survey asked respondents to rate their community as a place to live. On a four-point scale ranging from excellent to poor, Angelenos gave their communities an average rating just above “good.” The national average was higher. Fewer Angelenos expect to remain in their communities; 66 percent of Angelenos expect to be living in their current community five years from now, compared to 76 percent nationally. And more of the Los Angeles workforce is employed far from home (or at least a time-consuming distance from home): 21 percent of those surveyed report that on a typical day it takes them at least an hour to get to work, compared with only 11 percent with so long a commute in the national survey.

In Los Angeles: 31 percent rate their community as an “excellent” place to live; 44 percent “good,” 21 percent “fair” and 4 percent “poor.” In the national sample, reported community quality was 41 percent excellent; 44 percent good; 13 percent fair; 2 percent poor.

Socioeconomic Differences in Social Capital

As noted in the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey Executive Summary, ethnically diverse communities tend to show far greater socioeconomic differences in levels of social capital than in the nationwide sample.

In Los Angeles, social capital is far more closely linked to measures of privilege than in the rest of the country. Several measures of social trust and engagement are more strongly associated with income, education, and/or race and ethnicity in Los Angeles than in the nation as a whole.

The benchmark survey correlated eight broad dimensions, or indices, of social capital with income, education, and race/ethnicity. To investigate the areas in which social capital shows especially strong links to income, education or race/ethnicity in the Los Angeles population, the correlations in the national data were compared to those from L.A. If the L.A. correlation was at least one and a half times the size of the national correlation, this was considered to be an especially high level of association. Of the 24 correlations (eight kinds of social capital x three measures of privilege), there are ten that, by this standard, are especially high: Four measures of social capital vary especially strongly with both income and education; another two vary with race/ethnicity.

The two measures of trust are more linked to levels of income and education in Los Angeles than they are elsewhere. General interpersonal trust increases with education across the scale, with a big jump corresponding to having completed a four-year college degree. In the components of the index on social trust, much of the variation comes at lower levels of education. Responses to how much one trusts the local police and clerks where one shops show jumps in the level of trust between the group that did not finish high school and people for whom high school was their highest level of education, and another jump moving to the group with some education beyond high school. Trust of coworkers and neighbors increased throughout the education scale, with the biggest gain seen in moving from a high school degree to those with some further education.

Involvement in electoral politics was also more tied to status in L.A. than elsewhere. Among persons with less than a high school education, fewer than one in 12 reported having voted in the previous presidential election. The reported voting rate jumps to one in three among high school graduates, three out of four college grads, and nine out of ten persons with education beyond a B.A.

Perhaps most striking is the extent to which not finishing high school is associated with diminished levels of interactions with friends. Nicknamed “Schmooz,” this aspect of social capital measures how often one socializes with friends at home and in public places, with coworkers outside of work, with family, and how often one plays cards or board games. On every single one of these dimensions, the level of interaction roughly doubles when moving from the respondents who did not finish high school to those for whom a high school diploma is their highest degree.

Two of the eight measures of social capital measure personal involvement in groups other than religious congregations. Both of these display greater degrees of association with being white in L.A. than in other places. One is a measure of political activism, dubbed “protest politics,” which shows involvement with labor unions, rallies and marches, local reform efforts, and civil rights organizations. The other looks at membership in a broad array of groups, from the PTA to adult sports leagues to bible study groups to neighborhood associations.

Follow-up to the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey

The California Community Foundation has a long-term commitment to identify the needs of the Los Angeles community and maximize charitable resources to fulfill those needs. Survey research like the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey is a primary tool the foundation uses to assess community well-being. This new survey builds on other efforts by the California Community Foundation in this area, including a partnership with Field Research Corporation, now in its fifth year, to conduct an annual study of the giving and volunteering patterns in Los Angeles County. This ongoing research helps the community foundation quantify how Angelenos feel about their city and their role as active members of the community.

The California Community Foundation has asked scholars at the University of Southern California’s Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy to conduct an in-depth analysis of the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey data. When the results of the analysis become available, the community foundation will work with these academic partners to review the policy implications of the data.

Frequencies on Social Capital Indices and Survey Questions

Indices	National	L.A.
Social Trust SK Index [High] (Q 6, 7A/B/C/D/F)	33%	21%
Social Trust SK Index [Medium] (Q 6, 7A/B/C/D/F)	33%	27%
Social Trust SK Index [Low] (Q 6, 7A/B/C/D/F)	33%	51%
Civic Participation Index [High] (Q 23, 26A/B/C/D)	24%	20%
Civic Participation Index [Medium] (Q 23, 26A/B/C/D)	24%	16%
Civic Participation Index [Low] (Q 23, 26A/B/C/D)	32%	25%
Civic Participation Index [Very Low] (Q 23, 26A/B/C/D)	21%	38%
Electoral Politics Index [High] (Q 17, 21, 23, 28)	30%	25%
Electoral Politics Index [Medium] (Q 17, 21, 23, 28)	33%	25%
Electoral Politics Index [Low] (Q 17, 21, 23, 28)	37%	50%
Protest Politics Index [High] (Q 26A/B/D, 33I/L/M)	27%	24%
Protest Politics Index [Medium] (Q 26A/B/D, 33I/L/M)	26%	24%
Protest Politics Index [Low] (Q 26A/B/D, 33I/L/M)	47%	52%
Charity Index [High] (Q 37A/B, 58, 59A/B/C/D/E/G)	35%	29%
Charity Index [Medium] (Q 37A/B, 58, 59A/B/C/D/E/G)	32%	31%
Charity Index [Low] (Q 37A/B, 58, 59A/B/C/D/E/G)	33%	40%
Group Involvement Index (Including Church) [High] (Q32, 33)	32%	29%
Group Involvement Index (Including Church) [Med] (Q32, 33)	25%	18%
Group Involvement Index (Including Church) [Low] (Q32, 33)	30%	31%
Group Involvement Index (Including Church) [Very Low] (Q32, 33)	12%	22%
Group Involvement Index (excluding local place of worship) [High] (Q 33)	26%	23%
Group Involvement Index (excluding local place of worship) [Med] (Q 33)	24%	20%
Group Involvement Index (excluding local place of worship) [Low] (Q 33)	30%	28%
Group Involvement Index (excluding local place of worship) [Very Low] (Q 33)	21%	29%
Schmoozing Index [High] (Q 56C/D/F/H/I)	33%	26%
Schmoozing Index [Medium] (Q 56C/D/F/H/I)	33%	29%
Schmoozing Index [Low] (Q 56C/D/F/H/I)	33%	45%
MACHER [High] (Q 33, 35, 56E/L)	34%	29%
MACHER [Medium] (Q 33, 35, 56E/L)	28%	26%
MACHER [Low] (Q 33, 35, 56E/L)	38%	44%
Org Inter Index [High] (Q 56A/E/L)	33%	26%
Org Inter Index [Medium] (Q 56A/E/L)	33%	30%
Org Inter Index [Low] (Q 56A/E/L)	33%	43%
Composite Racial Group Trust Scale [High] (Q 7G/H/I/J)	27%	23%
Composite Racial Group Trust Scale [Medium] (Q 7G/H/I/J)	52%	45%
Composite Racial Group Trust Scale [Low] (Q 7G/H/I/J)	21%	33%
Diverse Types Of Friends Index [High] (Q 55)	20%	22%
Diverse Types Of Friends Index [Medium high] (Q 55)	23%	26%
Diverse Types Of Friends Index [Medium] (Q 55)	27%	17%
Diverse Types Of Friends Index [Low] (Q 55)	29%	36%
Faith-based SK Index [High] (Q 30, 31, 32, 33A)	32%	27%

Indices (cont.)	National	L.A.
Faith-based SK Index [Medium] (Q 30, 31, 32, 33A)	35%	33%
Faith-based SK Index [Low] (Q 30, 31, 32, 33A)	33%	40%

Q#	Questions	National	L.A.
Q 5A	Friends provide a sense of community	89%	85%
Q 5B	Neighbors provide a sense of community	80%	81%
Q 5C	City provides a sense of community	79%	78%
Q 5D	Place of worship provides a sense of community	82%	82%
Q 5E	Colleagues/schoolmates provide a sense of community	80%	81%
Q 5F	Members of ethnic group provide a sense of community	71%	72%
Q 5G	Individuals met online provide a sense of community	17%	20%
Q 6	Most people trustworthy	47%	36%
Q 7A	Trusts neighbors a lot	49%	28%
Q 7A	Trusts neighbors some	34%	39%
Q 7A	Trusts neighbors a little/not at all	18%	33%
Q 7B	Trusts co-workers a lot	53%	40%
Q 7B	Trusts co-workers some	31%	31%
Q 7B	Trusts co-workers a little/not at all	16%	28%
Q 7C	Trusts fellow attendees at place of worship a lot	72%	54%
Q 7C	Trusts fellow attendees at place of worship some	20%	29%
Q 7C	Trusts fellow attendees at place of worship a little/not at all	8%	17%
Q 7D	Trusts local store employees a lot	29%	20%
Q 7D	Trusts local store employees some	47%	42%
Q 7D	Trusts local store employees a little/not at all	24%	37%
Q 7E	Trusts local media a lot	14%	12%
Q 7E	Trusts local media some	44%	43%
Q 7E	Trusts local media a little/not at all	41%	45%
Q 7F	Trusts local police a lot	51%	41%
Q 7F	Trusts local police some	32%	37%
Q 7F	Trusts local police a little/not at all	18%	22%
Q 7G	Trusts whites a lot	31%	25%
Q 7G	Trusts whites some	56%	51%
Q 7G	Trusts whites a little/not at all	13%	23%
Q 7H	Trusts blacks a lot	26%	18%
Q 7H	Trusts blacks some	58%	51%
Q 7H	Trusts blacks a little/not at all	16%	31%
Q 7I	Trusts Asians a lot	25%	22%
Q 7I	Trusts Asians some	57%	52%
Q 7I	Trusts Asians a little/not at all	17%	26%
Q 7J	Trusts Hispanics a lot	24%	22%
Q 7J	Trusts Hispanics some	58%	53%
Q 7J	Trusts Hispanics a little/not at all	19%	25%
Q 8A	Ever felt that people think you are dishonest	23%	30%
Q 8B	...this happens very often or often	15%	15%

Q#	Questions (cont.)	National	L.A.
Q 8B	...this happens sometimes	39%	38%
Q 8B	...this happens rarely	46%	47%
Q 9	Very happy	38%	31%
Q 9	Happy	56%	61%
Q 9	Not very happy/not at all happy	6%	8%
Q 10	Excellent health	22%	20%
Q 10	Very good health	36%	30%
Q 10	Good health	28%	29%
Q 10	Fair/poor health	15%	20%
Q 11	Community very likely to conserve energy in emergency	44%	38%
Q 11	Community likely to conserve energy in emergency	48%	47%
Q 11	Community unlikely/very unlikely to conserve energy in emergency	8%	14%
Q 13	Expect to remain in community 5+ years	80%	72%
Q 14	Excellent neighborhood as place to live	41%	31%
Q 14	Good neighborhood as place to live	44%	44%
Q 14	Fair/poor neighborhood as place to live	15%	25%
Q 16	Perceives inability to impact community	23%	25%
Q 16	Perceives moderate ability to impact community	43%	45%
Q 16	Perceives large ability to impact community	34%	30%
Q 17	Days in past week read daily newspaper	3.3	2.8
Q 18	Average weekday hours spent watching TV	3.8	4.0
Q 19	Zero internet use at home	51%	59%
Q 19	More than zero, less than 5 hours of home internet use	36%	28%
Q 19	6+ hours of home internet use	14%	13%
Q 20	Has internet access at home	55%	49%
Q 21	Very interested in politics/national affairs	30%	28%
Q 21	Somewhat interested in politics/national affairs	36%	32%
Q 21	Slightly/not at all interested in politics/national affairs	34%	40%
Q 22	Registered to vote	80%	64%
Q 23	Voted in 1996 Presidential election	65%	47%
Q 24	Trusts national government always/most of the time	29%	43%
Q 24	Trusts national government some of the time	52%	44%
Q 24	Trusts national government hardly ever	19%	13%
Q 25	Trusts local government always/most of the time	43%	45%
Q 25	Trusts local government some of the time	46%	43%
Q 25	Trusts local government hardly ever	11%	12%
Q 26A	Signed a petition in last 12 months	35%	32%
Q 26B	Attended political meeting/rally in past 12 months	16%	13%
Q 26C	Worked on community project in past 12 months	38%	28%
Q 26D	Participated in demonstration in past 12 months	7%	7%
Q 26E	Donated blood in past 12 months	18%	16%
Q 27	Conservative	50%	44%
Q 27	Middle of the road	25%	25%
Q 27	Liberal	24%	30%

Q#	Questions (cont.)	National	L.A.
Q 28	Named 0 Senators	59%	61%
Q 28	Named 1 Senator or close on both names	21%	17%
Q 28	Named both Senators	19%	22%
Q 30	Church member	65%	50%
Q 31	Attends religious services weekly	41%	39%
Q 31	Attends religious services monthly	29%	31%
Q 31	Attends religious services a few times a year	17%	17%
Q 31	Attends religious services less than a few times a year	13%	14%
Q 32	Involved in church activities other than services	45%	39%
Q 33A	Involved in non-church religious organization (past 12 months)	16%	16%
Q 33B	Involved in sports/outdoor activity club (past 12 months)	21%	21%
Q 33C	Involved in youth organization (past 12 months)	22%	17%
Q 33D	Involved in parents association (past 12 months)	22%	19%
Q 33E	Involved in veterans group (past 12 months)	9%	7%
Q 33F	Involved in neighborhood association (past 12 months)	20%	19%
Q 33G	Involved in seniors group (past 12 months)	14%	12%
Q 33H	Involved in social welfare organization (past 12 months)	32%	31%
Q 33I	Involved in labor union (past 12 months)	12%	10%
Q 33J	Involved in trade/farm/business organization (past 12 months)	25%	19%
Q 33K	Involved in service/fraternal organization (past 12 months)	14%	8%
Q 33L	Involved in ethnic/nationality/civil rights organization (past 12 months)	7%	7%
Q 33M	Involved in public interest/political group (past 12 months)	9%	8%
Q 33N	Involved in literary/art/music group (past 12 months)	17%	24%
Q 33O	Involved hobby/investment/garden club (past 12 months)	25%	21%
Q 33P	Involved in self-help/support group (past 12 months)	17%	17%
Q 33Q	Involved in online only group (past 12 months)	3%	3%
Q 33R	Involved in other type of group (past 12 months)	15%	13%
Q 34	Involved in local reform group	20%	25%
Q 35	Served as a group officer	20%	16%
Q 36A	Share race with all members of most important group	26%	13%
Q 36A	Share race with most members of most important group	43%	32%
Q 36A	Share race with few/no members of most important group	32%	55%
Q 36B	Share gender with all members of most important group	16%	10%
Q 36B	Share gender with most of members of most important group	35%	34%
Q 36B	Share gender with some/few/none members of most important group	49%	56%
Q 36C	Share college education with all/most members of most important group	44%	46%
Q 36C	Share college education with some members of most important group	34%	32%
Q 36C	Share college education with few/no members of most important group	22%	22%
Q 37A	Gave no money to religious organizations	30%	36%
Q 37A	Gave \$1-\$500 to religious organizations	36%	39%
Q 37A	Gave \$500+ to religious organizations	34%	25%
Q 37B	Gave no money to non-religious causes	36%	47%
Q 37B	Gave \$1-\$500 to non-religious causes	46%	35%
Q 37B	Gave \$500+ to non-religious causes	18%	18%

Q#	Questions (cont.)	National	L.A.
Q 38A	People running my community don't really care much what happens to me (agree)	34%	43%
Q 38A	People running my community don't really care much what happens to me (disagree)	63%	54%
Q 38B	TV is primary entertainment source	35%	44%
Q 38B	TV isn't primary entertainment source	64%	55%
Q 38C	Thinks immigrant's push for equal rights is excessive	44%	52%
Q 38C	Doesn't view immigrant's push for equal rights as excessive	52%	45%
Q 38D	Thinks public libraries shouldn't carry disapproved of books	27%	33%
Q 38D	Doesn't think disapproved of book should be kept from libraries	70%	60%
Q 38E	Religion is very important to respondent	84%	82%
Q 38E	Religion unimportant to respondent	15%	17%
Q 39	Any barriers to becoming involved with the community	47%	36%
Q 39A	Occupational demands very much limit involvement	52%	46%
Q 39A	Occupational demands somewhat limit involvement	26%	25%
Q 39A	Occupational demands do not limit involvement	22%	29%
Q 39B	Inadequate transportation very much limits involvement	32%	34%
Q 39B	Inadequate transportation somewhat limits involvement	14%	22%
Q 39B	Inadequate transportation does not impede involvement	54%	43%
Q 39C	Feeling unwelcome very much limits involvement	20%	24%
Q 39C	Feeling unwelcome somewhat limits involvement	27%	26%
Q 39C	Feeling unwelcome does not impede involvement	53%	49%
Q 39D	Safety concerns very much limit involvement	40%	47%
Q 39D	Safety concerns somewhat limit involvement	19%	16%
Q 39D	Safety concerns do not impede involvement	41%	37%
Q 39E	Lack of information very much limits involvement	34%	44%
Q 39E	Lack of information somewhat limits involvement	33%	33%
Q 39E	Lack of information does not impede involvement	33%	23%
Q 39F	Perceived inability to effect change very much limits involvement	24%	32%
Q 39F	Perceived inability to effect change somewhat limits involvement	32%	32%
Q 39F	Perceived inability to effect change does not impede involvement	44%	37%
Q 41	Average hours worked per week	45.9	43.3
Q 42	Sometimes telecommute	15%	18%
Q 42	Work at home 1 day or less per week	37%	50%
Q 42	Work at home 2-3 days per week	27%	24%
Q 42	Work at home 4+ days per week	17%	16%
Q 44	Average hours to commute to work	0.4	0.7
Q 45	Very financially satisfied	25%	28%
Q 45	Somewhat financially satisfied	59%	53%
Q 45	Financially unsatisfied	15%	18%
Q 49	Number of people treated as though family members	3.5	2.8
Q 50A	Favors close relative marrying an Asian person	42%	48%
Q 50A	Indifferent to relative marrying an Asian person	48%	41%
Q 50A	Opposes relative marrying an Asian person	10%	12%

Q#	Questions (cont.)	National	L.A.
Q 50B	Favors close relative marrying an African-American person	38%	42%
Q 50B	Indifferent to relative marrying an African-American person	43%	43%
Q 50B	Opposes relative marrying an African-American person	19%	15%
Q 50C	Favors close relative marrying a white non-Hispanic person	54%	50%
Q 50C	Indifferent to relative marrying a white non-Hispanic person	42%	41%
Q 50C	Opposes relative marrying a white non-Hispanic person	4%	9%
Q 50D	Favors close relative marrying a Latino/Hispanic person	45%	52%
Q 50D	Indifferent to relative marrying a Latino/Hispanic person	45%	41%
Q 50D	Opposes relative marrying a Latino/Hispanic person	10%	7%
Q 51	Interacts with immediate neighbors several times a week	53%	49%
Q 51	Interacts with immediate neighbors weekly or monthly	28%	24%
Q 51	Interacts with immediate neighbors several times per year/less	19%	26%
Q 52	Got neighbors to collaborate to fix something (in past 2 years)	32%	28%
Q 53	Has 2 or less close friends	22%	24%
Q 53	Has 3-5 close friends	36%	36%
Q 53	Has 6+ less close friends	42%	40%
Q 54	Confides in 0-1 people	15%	21%
Q 54	Confides in 2 people	17%	19%
Q 54	Confides in 3 or more	67%	61%
Q 55A	Friends with a business owner	64%	57%
Q 55B	Friends with a manual worker	72%	58%
Q 55C	Friends with a welfare recipient	38%	35%
Q 55D	Friends with a vacation home owner	44%	39%
Q 55E	Friends with people from a different religion	77%	72%
Q 55F	Friends with a white non-Hispanic	91%	76%
Q 55G	Friends with Latino/Hispanic	49%	80%
Q 55H	Friends with an Asian	34%	51%
Q 55I	Friends with an African-American	61%	57%
Q 55J	Friends with a homosexual	35%	36%
Q 55K	Friends with a community leader	48%	37%
Q 56A	Number of times attended a celebration, parade, local sports or art event (last 12 mos)	7.3	4.9
Q 56B	Number of times done group arts (last 12 mos)	6.8	7.3
Q 56C	Number of times played cards or board games with others (last 12 mos)	11.7	8.6
Q 56D	Number of times visited relatives or had them visit (last 12 mos)	25.0	19.9
Q 56E	Number of times attended a club meeting (last 12 mos)	6.0	5.4
Q 56F	Number of times had friends over to your home (last 12 mos)	22.1	18.1
Q 56G	Number of times been in home of friend of different race or had them over (last 12 mos)	11.0	13.2
Q 56H	Number of times socialized with co-workers outside of work (last 12 mos)	14.1	10.2
Q 56I	Number of times hung out with friends at park/shopping mall/other public place (last 12 mos)	15.5	15.3
Q 56J	Number of times played team sport (last 12 mos)	5.9	6.1
Q 56K	Number of times participated in Internet/on-line discussion (last 12 mos)	7.5	6.7

Q#	Questions (cont.)	National	L.A.
Q 56L	Number of times attended public meeting where town or school affairs were discussed (last 12 mos)	2.5	2.0
Q 58	Number of times volunteered in last 12 months	9.5	8.1
Q 59A	Volunteered at a place of worship (in past 12 months)	79%	78%
Q 59B	Volunteered for health care (in past 12 months)	35%	35%
Q 59C	Volunteered for school/youth program (in past 12 months)	59%	58%
Q 59D	Volunteered assistance to poor/elderly (in past 12 months)	53%	55%
Q 59E	Volunteered or arts/cultural organization (in past 12 months)	22%	26%
Q 59F	Volunteered for neighborhood/civic group (in past 12 months)	39%	35%