



Soul of the Community Grand Forks, ND

GALLUP POLL®
Soul of the Community

July 2008



This document contains proprietary research, copyrighted materials, and literary property of Gallup, Inc. It is for the guidance of your company's executives only and is not to be copied, quoted, published, or divulged to others outside of your organization. Gallup®, Gallup Poll® CE¹¹®, A⁸™, and L³™ are trademarks of Gallup, Inc.

 John S. and James L.
Knight Foundation
Writing the Story of Transformation

GALLUP POLL®

Introduction

The goal of the Knight Foundation-Gallup Soul of the Community project is to measure citizens' engagement in each of the 26 Knight Foundation Communities and their surrounding areas. Gallup defines community citizen engagement as an individual's psychological connection with the community in which they live. It goes beyond their satisfaction with the community and extends to the passion and pride they take in living there.

Engaged citizens within a community are inspired by the community around them. They are connected to many aspects of community life. As a result, the community is a better place to live — this helps to grow and sustain citizen positivity and engagement to the community. There is a reciprocal relationship where they put energy into the community and the community gives back the energy.

Gallup has found that communities with higher proportions of engaged citizens (that is, have high Loyalty to and Passion for their communities) had stronger GDP (Gross Domestic Product) growth over the past five years, than those with smaller proportions of engaged citizens. These communities show stronger population growth as well.

As many communities struggle to grow, attract, and retain key citizen groups such as recent college graduates, understanding what connects citizens to a community and makes them want to stay there is powerful information to have.

Gallup has identified two key components of Community Citizen Engagement (CCE). The first, Attitudinal Loyalty, describes citizens' general satisfaction with place, their likelihood to recommend it to others, and their outlook for their community's future. The second component is Passion, and captures the connection to place and the pride taken in living there. Taken together, these two components define the emotional construct of CCE.

Gallup has further identified four key dimensions, or domains, of community and a citizen's connection to it which drive their overall CCE. These four domains describe citizen perceptions of the basic structural, economic, and leadership offerings of the community (what the community gives or offers its residents), perceptions of the community's openness to different groups (what the community stands for in diversity), citizen involvement in the community (what citizens give back to the community), and the people connections they have to that community (how citizens belong to the community). Communities which are strong on all four domains have the greatest opportunity to attract and retain the most desirable citizens for driving economic and social success.

Uncovering the Story of Each Community

No two communities are alike. Each has a unique character and identity — dominant traits shaped over the years through its leaders, geography, culture, economic base, population, urban planning, and a multitude of other factors. Together these create a community's narrative. If you dig deep into the soul of two cities that seem demographically or geographically similar, you will find a vastly different personality; a different emotional make-up, a different path to each community's identity, and a different narrative. These narratives must be understood and clearly defined as a first step in leveraging strengths and addressing challenges in the community.

The Knight Foundation has spent a great deal of time and effort uncovering and documenting the narratives in each of its communities in recent years. The purpose of this work is to add to that growing body of knowledge and help inform resulting investments.

What This Report Contains

This report adds to the ongoing community narrative by showing how the citizens of the community feel about the place they live, what it has to offer them, and what they offer back to it. The data from this Soul of the Community project are intended to be used to track the engagement of the community over time and to identify key strengths and opportunities for the communities. Applying the findings in such a way can provide a baseline for tracking community engagement and resulting outcomes, and identify focus areas to maximize community quality of life, attachment, and attractiveness. The data will help tell the story of the community's citizens and how they see their community develop over time.

The report is broken into four main sections:

The Introduction section describes the purpose, methodology, and layout of the report. It also defines the comparison groups of data used through section three of the report.

The second section, Strength-Weakness Opportunity Map, provides highlights of the key strengths and opportunities for the community based on its citizen ratings. It displays the overall ratings by the community's citizens on each of the key dimensions of community against the relative importance of each dimension in driving overall engagement. This section provides a quick glance at where the community is winning and where initial areas of focus could be.

The third section shows the detailed results of each of the components of Community Citizen Engagement (CCE) and the specific dimensions which drive it, as well as the detailed attributes which make up each of the dimensions. The section begins with the overall constructs of CCE, Loyalty and Passion, and the four key domains (dimensions that drive overall engagement). Pages 7 through 11 show more detail of the attributes that connect citizens to their communities through the specific questions which make up each of the domains. Each section contains the scores for the individual questions and a composite score for the dimension or index, a number known as the "index" score.

To provide context to the absolute ratings for each community, comparisons are provided for all items to a like group of communities within the Knight Foundation communities ("KF Comparison Group" column) as described on page 4. In addition, comparisons are provided against the U.S. population overall ("Total U.S." column) for indexes where Gallup had similar data from a large national sample as described on page 4 of the introduction section.

The fourth section shows how different groups within the community feel about the community. Breakouts are provided by citizen gender, age, race, ethnicity, presence of children in the household, and length of residence in the community.

Interpreting Data in This Report

Citizens were asked to rate their community on more than four dozen different aspects in the survey. The rating scales for these questions included simple "yes" and "no" responses, 5-point rating scales of their personal agreement with the statement, 5-point rating scales of how good or bad they perceived the community to be on an attribute, 3-point scales rating if the community was "better," "the same," or "worse" than it was in the past, and larger numerical scales indicating numbers of times, occurrences, or proportions citizens did a particular activity. For simplicity in interpreting and comparing results on the different aspects of community, all question results were rescaled to a 3-point scale of "high," "medium," or "low." A complete list of question items and their scale recodes are available in the separate methodology report.

Several different numbers are presented for each item and index in the report. For the overall components of Community Citizen Engagement and the supporting domains, four columns of data are shown:

- 1. Community N Size:** The first column; the total number of interviews completed for this area. This is an unweighted number of respondents. Results not shown with fewer than 30 responses.
- 2. Community Mean Score:** The second column; the average (mean) score given by all citizens' interviewed in this community for the composite score or domain on the 3-point scale.
- 3. KF Comparison Group:** The third column; the mean composite rating for Knight communities of comparable size and urbanicity, displayed from left to right. Arrows to the right of the score indicate if the community rating is significantly different from the comparison group at a 95% confidence level (meaning that 95 times out of 100 we would expect the result). Significant ratings are flagged using upward and downward facing arrows indicating the mean score for a particular index/question are either higher (up arrow) or lower (down arrow) in relation to the mean score for the comparison group and/or the U.S. population overall.
- 4. Total U.S.:** The fourth column; the mean composite rating from a national Gallup Panel study conducted among nearly 30,000 adults, displayed from left to right. Results are only available for select group of indexes where Gallup had comparable data. Again, arrows are used to indicate if the community ratings are significantly different from the U.S. population ratings of their communities at a 95% confidence level.

For the detailed question/index results on pages 8-11, additional information is provided in the Answer Distribution bar. This provides the proportion of citizens rating the community "low," "medium," or "high" on that attribute. Percentages on some attributes may not total 100% due to rounding. Percentages less than 7% may not be shown due to space constrictions on printing the number.

Interviewing

Gallup interviewed a group of randomly selected adults age 18 or older, currently residing in each of the 26 Knight Foundation communities. Interviews took place from February 1 through April 26, 2008. The interview was approximately 15 minutes in length and covered 73 questions. About 400 citizen interviews were completed in most of the Knight communities. Roughly 1500 citizens were interviewed in the three communities of San Jose, Philadelphia, and Miami.

Weighting

The survey data were weighted within each community to reflect the known adult population by age, gender, race, and ethnicity based on U.S. Census data. The data across the Knight Foundation communities were then weighted by population size to put each community into the correct proportion relative to the other communities.

Community Comparisons

Each community was aligned with a group of other "like" communities in terms of urbanicity level and size of the metropolitan area. This was done to provide basic comparisons for each community. The data for this combined group of communities appears as the second to last column on pages 7-11 and is titled "KF Comparison Group." The communities in the comparison group for this community include:


Medium/Low Urban - Medium/Low Population

Aberdeen, SD	Biloxi, MS
Duluth, MN	Fort Wayne, IN
Grand Forks, ND	Macon, GA
Milledgeville, GA	Myrtle Beach, SC
State College, PA	

Geography Definitions

For the purpose of this survey, Gallup selected government geography definitions (Core Based Statistical Areas or CBSA) that most closely aligned to the Knight Foundation's definition of a Knight community. For most areas, this was determined to be either Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) for larger urban communities, or Micropolitan Statistical Areas (μSAs) for smaller communities.

The geography definition and map for the Grand Forks community appears below.



Copyright © and (P) 1988–2006 Microsoft Corporation and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved. <http://www.microsoft.com/mappoint/>
Portions © 1990–2005 InstallShield Software Corporation. All rights reserved. Certain mapping and direction data © 2005 NAVTEQ. All rights reserved. The Data for areas of Canada includes information taken with permission from Canadian authorities, including: © Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, © Queen's Printer for Ontario. NAVTEQ and NAVTEQ ON BOARD are trademarks of NAVTEQ. © 2005 Tele Atlas North America, Inc. All rights reserved. Tele Atlas and Tele Atlas North America are trademarks of Tele Atlas, Inc.


Strength — Weakness Opportunity Map

Another way to understand the perceived relative strengths and weaknesses of the community is to examine the performance of the community constructs (domains and sub-domains) compared to the overall importance of that construct in driving overall community citizen engagement. Gallup performed an optimization analysis to determine which of the community constructs are considered "critical opportunities" (items of top priorities for the community to focus on), and which are considered "strengths areas" (areas to maintain). The Opportunity Map displays the importance of the construct (y axis going up the page) in predicting overall community strength and how the community is rated on that area (x axis across the bottom).

Reading Opportunity Maps


The Opportunity Map is divided into four sections or quadrants based on the median score of importance for the comparison group and performance for this community. The vertical axis shows the importance level based on the average correlation to CCE. If a construct correlated higher than the median correlation of all constructs, it is considered important (and will appear in the top half of the box). If it correlated lower, it is relatively not as important (and will appear in the bottom half). The horizontal axis shows perceived performance, or how the community is rated on a given construct. If a construct was rated above the community median, the community is considered to be performing relatively well on this area (and will appear on the right side of the box). If a construct scores below the community's mean score, the community is performing relatively lower in this area (and will appear on the left side).

The Opportunity Map shows each of the performance constructs against these two measures. The constructs that appear in the upper right-hand quadrant are those in which citizens perceive the community as both performing well and as important in driving overall community engagement. These areas can be thought of as "strengths" of the community and are areas that the community will want to maintain at or above their current service levels and promote outward. Constructs falling in the upper left-hand quadrant are rated low in performance by citizens, but are important in driving overall community engagement. These areas are critical opportunities and the ones recommended for initial focus for the community.



Attributes for Grand Forks, ND	
a	Basic Services (1.85, 0.39)
b	Economy (1.79, 0.38)
c	Safety (2.12, 0.14)
d	Leadership (1.62, 0.45)
e	Education (2.36, 0.47)
f	Aesthetics (2.00, 0.45)
g	Social Offerings (1.89, 0.55)
h	Openness (1.76, 0.51)
i	Social Capital (2.19, 0.16)
j	Involvement (1.90, 0.06)

Community Citizen Engagement (CCE) = Attitudinal Loyalty + Passion

	Community	Mean Score	Mean Score Comparison	
	N Size	Mean Score	KF Comparison Group	
Overall Community Citizen Engagement Mean				
<i>Overall Community Citizen Engagement is a citizen's psychological connection with their community. The metric is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>	400	3.80	3.77	
Community Loyalty				
<i>Community Loyalty measures how likely citizens are to stay in the community, recommend it to others as a place to live, and their outlook for the community's future.</i>	400	3.76	3.71	
Community Passion				
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>	400	3.85	3.83	
Community Domains				
<i>The four domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall engagement in a community.</i>	400	1.95	1.89 ↑	
	<i>Social Capital: The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.</i>	400	2.19	2.13 ↑
	<i>Openness: Perceptions of openness of the community to different groups.</i>	400	1.76	1.71
	<i>Involvement: What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>	400	1.90	1.91
	<i>Community Offerings: The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>	400	1.94	1.81 ↑

In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4. Comparisons to the total U.S. adult population (2007), made where available.

↓↑ Indicates if the community score is statistically higher or lower than its comparison group

Community: Grand Forks, ND


KF Comparison Group: Medium/Low Urban-Medium/Low Population

Total U.S. Adults: Total U.S. Adults

CCE Groups

Citizens were categorized into groups based on their overall CCE mean score.

CCE Group Community Distribution



Community		Mean Score Comparisons	
N Size	Mean Score	KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
400	3.80	3.77	

Community Loyalty

Community Loyalty measures how likely citizens are to stay in the community, recommend it to others as a place to live, and their outlook for the community's future.

Overall Satisfaction

Likely to recommend the community

Future outlook 5 years compared to now




Community		Mean Score Comparisons	
N Size	Mean Score	KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
400	3.76	3.71	3.63 ↑

Community Passion

Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.

Proud to live in community

Perfect community for me



Community		Mean Score Comparisons	
N Size	Mean Score	KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
400	3.85	3.83	
398	2.13	2.13	
399	1.96	1.96	

Percentages shown when 7% or higher

In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4.

Comparisons to the total U.S. adult population (2007), made where available.

↓↑ Indicates if the community score is statistically higher or lower than its comparison group

Community: Grand Forks, ND

KF Comparison Group: Medium/Low Urban-Medium/Low Population

Total U.S. Adults: Total U.S. Adults

Community Offerings	Community Distribution			N Size	Community Mean Score	Mean Score Comparisons	
	Low	Medium	High			KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
<i>The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>				400	1.94	1.81 ↑	
Basic Services				399	1.85	1.74 ↑	1.75 ↑
Highways and freeway system	27%	46%	27%	398	2.00	1.71 ↑	
Availability of quality healthcare	34%	34%	32%	397	1.98	1.90	
Affordable housing	59%	28%	13%	391	1.54	1.61	
Economy				400	1.79	1.65 ↑	2.1 ↓
Economic conditions	52%	38%	10%	396	1.58	1.39 ↑	
Economy getting better	39%	12%	49%	385	2.10	2.01	
Availability of job opportunities	62%	24%	14%	390	1.52	1.39 ↑	
Company hiring momentum	11%	40%	49%	225	2.38	2.28 ↑	
Job provides income needed	37%	30%	34%	230	1.97	1.93	
Now is a good time to find a job	61%	26%	14%	385	1.53	1.37 ↑	
Safety				399	2.12	1.85 ↑	1.83 ↑
Low crime	42%	28%	31%	399	1.89	1.69 ↑	
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home	19%	27%	54%	397	2.35	2.01 ↑	

Percentages shown when 7% or higher

In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4.

Comparisons to the total U.S. adult population (2007), made where available.

↓↑ Indicates if the community score is statistically higher or lower than its comparison group

Community: Grand Forks, ND

KF Comparison Group: Medium/Low Urban-Medium/Low Population

Total U.S. Adults: Total U.S. Adults

Community Offerings (Continued)

The basic offerings that residents receive from a community. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.

	Community Distribution			N Size	Community Mean Score	Mean Score Comparisons	
	Low	Medium	High			KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
Leadership				400	1.94	1.81 ↑	
Leaders share my views				389	1.56	1.48 ↑	
Leadership of elected officials				387	1.66	1.55 ↑	
Education				396	2.36	2.01 ↑	1.95 ↑
Quality of public schools (K-12)				388	2.29	1.81 ↑	
Quality of colleges and universities				391	2.44	2.20 ↑	
Aesthetics				399	2.00	2.05	2.14 ↓
Parks and green spaces				395	2.12	2.01 ↑	
Physical beauty of place				399	1.87	2.08 ↓	
Social Offerings				399	1.89	1.87	1.73 ↑
Vibrant night life				380	1.56	1.85 ↓	
Good place to meet people				397	1.97	1.95	
Citizens care about each other				397	2.11	1.80 ↑	

Percentages shown when 7% or higher

In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4.

Comparisons to the total U.S. adult population (2007), made where available.

↓↑ Indicates if the community score is statistically higher or lower than its comparison group

Community: Grand Forks, ND

KF Comparison Group: Medium/Low Urban-Medium/Low Population

Total U.S. Adults: Total U.S. Adults

Community Involvement

Community Distribution



What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.

	Community Distribution	N Size	Mean Score	KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
Volunteer	48% Low, 52% High	399	2.03	1.96	
Voted in last local election	45% Low, 55% High	396	2.11	2.29 ↓	
Attend local community meetings	64% Low, 36% High	400	1.72	1.63	
Work with residents to make change	63% Low, 37% High	399	1.74	1.77	

Openness

Perceptions of openness of the community to different groups.

	Community Distribution	N Size	Mean Score	KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
Good place for older people	17% Low, 48% Medium, 35% High	400	2.18	2.01 ↑	
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities	50% Low, 32% Medium, 19% High	392	1.69	1.71	
Good place for family with kids	15% Low, 45% Medium, 40% High	399	2.25	1.98 ↑	
Good place for gays and lesbians	72% Low, 19% Medium, 9% High	364	1.37	1.47 ↓	
Good place for talented college graduates	74% Low, 18% Medium, 9% High	396	1.35	1.40	
Good place for immigrants	49% Low, 36% Medium, 14% High	392	1.65	1.64	

Social Capital

The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.

	Community Distribution	N Size	Mean Score	KF Comparison Group	Total U.S. Adults
Belong to formal/informal clubs/groups	26% Low, 43% Medium, 32% High	400	2.06	1.97 ↑	
Spend time with neighbors	11% Low, 51% Medium, 38% High	399	2.27	2.25	
Number of close friends in community	7% Low, 50% Medium, 43% High	399	2.37	2.20 ↑	
Number of family in community	20% Low, 52% Medium, 27% High	400	2.07	2.10	

Percentages shown when 7% or higher

In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4.


Comparisons to the total U.S. adult population (2007), made where available.

↓↑ Indicates if the community score is statistically higher or lower than its comparison group

Community: Grand Forks, ND

KF Comparison Group: Medium/Low Urban-Medium/Low Population

Total U.S. Adults: Total U.S. Adults

	Community N Size	Gender		Age			Kid < 18 in HH	
		Community Overall	Males	Females	18-34	35-54		55+
Overall Citizen Engagement Mean		3.80	3.63	3.96	3.42	3.89	4.14	3.69
<i>Overall Community Citizen Engagement is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>								
Community Loyalty		3.76	3.60	3.90	3.53	3.78	4.01	3.64
<i>Community Loyalty measures how likely citizens are to stay in the community, recommend it to others as a place to live, and their outlook for the community's future.</i>								
Community Passion		3.85	3.67	4.02	3.31	4.00	4.26	3.73
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>								
Community Domains		1.95	1.92	1.98	1.83	1.97	2.04	1.93
<i>The four domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall engagement in a community.</i>								
	Social Capital: The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with other.	2.19	2.17	2.21	2.06	2.25	2.26	2.19
	Openness: Perceptions of openness of the community to different group.	1.76	1.68	1.83	1.70	1.73	1.86	1.71
	Involvement: What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.	1.90	1.90	1.90	1.70	2.02	1.96	1.94
	Community Offerings: The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.	1.94	1.91	1.97	1.87	1.89	2.09	1.88

In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4.

- Mean scores not shown when N size is less than 30

Community: Grand Forks, ND

	Community Overall	Gender		Age			Kid < 18 in HH
		Males	Females	18-34	35-54	55+	
Community N Size	400	189	211	46	161	186	124
Community Offerings	1.94	1.91	1.97	1.87	1.89	2.09	1.88
<i>The basic offerings that residents receive from a community. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>							
Basic Services	1.85	1.83	1.86	1.75	1.75	2.06	1.76
Highways and freeway system	2.00	1.95	2.04	1.92	1.87	2.23	1.95
Availability of quality healthcare	1.98	2.06	1.91	1.80	1.90	2.26	1.89
Affordable housing	1.54	1.45	1.62	1.49	1.48	1.67	1.43
Economy	1.79	1.77	1.81	1.84	1.72	1.83	1.75
Economic conditions	1.58	1.56	1.61	1.58	1.46	1.73	1.50
Economy getting better	2.10	2.09	2.10	2.22	2.02	2.09	2.06
Availability of job opportunities	1.52	1.49	1.54	1.55	1.42	1.62	1.41
Company hiring momentum	2.38	2.32	2.47	2.50	2.33	2.33	2.47
Job provides income needed	1.97	2.02	1.91	1.83	2.00	2.13	1.92
Now is a good time to find a job	1.53	1.50	1.56	1.59	1.40	1.64	1.42
Safety	2.12	2.26	1.99	2.23	2.08	2.08	2.23
Low crime	1.89	1.93	1.85	1.93	1.86	1.91	1.98
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home	2.35	2.59	2.12	2.53	2.31	2.24	2.49
Leadership	1.62	1.47	1.76	1.52	1.54	1.81	1.53
Leaders share my views	1.56	1.43	1.69	1.45	1.49	1.77	1.43
Leadership of elected officials	1.66	1.51	1.80	1.57	1.60	1.82	1.61
Education	2.36	2.30	2.41	2.28	2.33	2.49	2.37
Quality of public schools (K-12)	2.29	2.24	2.33	2.24	2.21	2.44	2.34
Quality of colleges and universities	2.44	2.37	2.50	2.33	2.46	2.54	2.42
Aesthetics	2.00	1.95	2.04	1.85	1.95	2.21	1.80
Parks and green spaces	2.12	2.11	2.13	2.00	2.03	2.37	1.96
Physical beauty of place	1.87	1.78	1.95	1.70	1.86	2.05	1.64
Social Offerings	1.89	1.85	1.93	1.64	1.88	2.15	1.71
Vibrant night life	1.56	1.51	1.61	1.30	1.53	1.87	1.38
Good place to meet people	1.97	1.93	2.01	1.72	1.99	2.24	1.74
Citizens care about each other	2.11	2.07	2.14	1.89	2.13	2.31	2.03

	Community N Size	Community Overall	Gender		Age			Kid < 18 in HH
			Males	Females	18-34	35-54	55+	
		400	189	211	46	161	186	124
Community Involvement		1.90	1.90	1.90	1.70	2.02	1.96	1.94
<i>This index describes what residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>								
Volunteer		2.03	2.01	2.05	1.84	2.22	2.03	2.18
Voted in last local election		2.11	2.16	2.06	1.63	2.27	2.38	2.02
Attend local community meetings		1.72	1.66	1.78	1.61	1.83	1.72	1.82
Work with residents to make change		1.74	1.78	1.70	1.72	1.77	1.74	1.76
Openness		1.76	1.68	1.83	1.70	1.73	1.86	1.71
<i>This index describes the openness of the community to different groups.</i>								
Good place for older people		2.18	2.15	2.21	2.32	2.06	2.19	2.18
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities		1.69	1.58	1.80	1.50	1.75	1.82	1.65
Good place for family with kids		2.25	2.19	2.31	2.17	2.27	2.35	2.21
Good place for gays and lesbians		1.37	1.30	1.45	1.33	1.37	1.40	1.31
Good place for talented college graduates		1.35	1.25	1.44	1.38	1.23	1.46	1.24
Good place for immigrants		1.65	1.60	1.70	1.52	1.65	1.79	1.67
Social Capital		2.19	2.17	2.21	2.06	2.25	2.26	2.19
<i>This index describes the people connections citizens have to the community, and how they share time with others.</i>								
Belong to formal/informal clubs/groups		2.06	2.04	2.08	1.96	2.07	2.15	2.04
Spend time with neighbors		2.27	2.27	2.27	2.11	2.32	2.37	2.20
Number of close friends in community		2.37	2.35	2.38	2.25	2.41	2.45	2.41
Number of family in community		2.07	2.02	2.12	1.93	2.19	2.07	2.11

	Community N Size	Years in Community				Race/Ethnicity				
		Community Overall	< 3	3-5	6-19	20+	Hispanic	Non-Hisp. White	Black	Other
Overall Citizen Engagement Mean		400	<30	<30	82	268	<30	369	<30	<30
<i>Overall Community Citizen Engagement is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>		3.80	•	•	3.68	4.02	•	3.82	•	•
Community Loyalty		3.76	•	•	3.72	3.91	•	3.77	•	•
<i>Community Loyalty measures how likely citizens are to stay in the community, recommend it to others as a place to live, and their outlook for the community's future.</i>		3.76	•	•	3.72	3.91	•	3.77	•	•
Community Passion		3.85	•	•	3.65	4.13	•	3.88	•	•
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>		3.85	•	•	3.65	4.13	•	3.88	•	•
Community Domains		1.95	•	•	1.96	2.00	•	1.96	•	•
<i>The four domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall engagement in a community.</i>		1.95	•	•	1.96	2.00	•	1.96	•	•
Social Capital		2.19	•	•	2.16	2.27	•	2.20	•	•
<i>Social Capital: The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.</i>		2.19	•	•	2.16	2.27	•	2.20	•	•
Openness		1.76	•	•	1.70	1.82	•	1.75	•	•
<i>Openness: Perceptions of openness of the community to different group.</i>		1.76	•	•	1.70	1.82	•	1.75	•	•
Involvement		1.90	•	•	2.08	1.91	•	1.93	•	•
<i>Involvement: What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>		1.90	•	•	2.08	1.91	•	1.93	•	•
Community Offerings		1.94	•	•	1.87	2.01	•	1.94	•	•
<i>Community Offerings: The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>		1.94	•	•	1.87	2.01	•	1.94	•	•



In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4.

- Mean scores not shown when N size is less than 30

Community: Grand Forks, ND

	Community N Size	Community Overall	Years in Community				Race/Ethnicity			
			< 3	3-5	6-19	20+	Non-Hisp.			
			<30	<30	82	268	Hispanic	White	Black	Other
Community Offerings		1.94	•	•	1.87	2.01	•	1.94	•	•
<i>The basic offerings that residents receive from a community. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>										
Basic Services		1.85	•	•	1.73	1.93	•	1.85	•	•
Highways and freeway system		2.00	•	•	1.88	2.10	•	1.99	•	•
Availability of quality healthcare		1.98	•	•	1.89	2.09	•	2.00	•	•
Affordable housing		1.54	•	•	1.40	1.60	•	1.53	•	•
Economy		1.79	•	•	1.83	1.80	•	1.77	•	•
Economic conditions		1.58	•	•	1.51	1.65	•	1.55	•	•
Economy getting better		2.10	•	•	2.02	2.08	•	2.05	•	•
Availability of job opportunities		1.52	•	•	1.48	1.56	•	1.50	•	•
Company hiring momentum		2.38	•	•	2.56	2.36	•	2.38	•	•
Job provides income needed		1.97	•	•	2.05	1.99	•	1.99	•	•
Now is a good time to find a job		1.53	•	•	1.65	1.51	•	1.51	•	•
Safety		2.12	•	•	2.14	2.09	•	2.13	•	•
Low crime		1.89	•	•	1.98	1.84	•	1.90	•	•
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home		2.35	•	•	2.30	2.34	•	2.35	•	•
Leadership		1.62	•	•	1.56	1.71	•	1.62	•	•
Leaders share my views		1.56	•	•	1.54	1.63	•	1.55	•	•
Leadership of elected officials		1.66	•	•	1.57	1.77	•	1.66	•	•
Education		2.36	•	•	2.30	2.44	•	2.35	•	•
Quality of public schools (K-12)		2.29	•	•	2.25	2.34	•	2.27	•	•
Quality of colleges and universities		2.44	•	•	2.35	2.54	•	2.43	•	•
Aesthetics		2.00	•	•	1.75	2.13	•	1.99	•	•
Parks and green spaces		2.12	•	•	1.92	2.23	•	2.11	•	•
Physical beauty of place		1.87	•	•	1.57	2.03	•	1.86	•	•
Social Offerings		1.89	•	•	1.78	1.99	•	1.90	•	•
Vibrant night life		1.56	•	•	1.45	1.69	•	1.56	•	•
Good place to meet people		1.97	•	•	1.85	2.10	•	1.99	•	•
Citizens care about each other		2.11	•	•	2.04	2.18	•	2.13	•	•

	Community N Size	Community Overall	Years in Community				Race/Ethnicity			
			< 3	3-5	6-19	20+	Hispanic	Non-Hisp. White	Black	Other
		400	<30	<30	82	268	<30	369	<30	<30
Community Involvement		1.90	•	•	2.08	1.91	•	1.93	•	•
<i>This index describes what residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>										
Volunteer		2.03	•	•	2.37	1.99	•	2.09	•	•
Voted in last local election		2.11	•	•	2.14	2.23	•	2.15	•	•
Attend local community meetings		1.72	•	•	2.05	1.70	•	1.74	•	•
Work with residents to make change		1.74	•	•	1.78	1.73	•	1.74	•	•
Openness		1.76	•	•	1.70	1.82	•	1.75	•	•
<i>This index describes the openness of the community to different group.</i>										
Good place for older people		2.18	•	•	2.11	2.22	•	2.17	•	•
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities		1.69	•	•	1.60	1.78	•	1.67	•	•
Good place for family with kids		2.25	•	•	2.22	2.34	•	2.26	•	•
Good place for gays and lesbians		1.37	•	•	1.38	1.44	•	1.35	•	•
Good place for talented college graduates		1.35	•	•	1.30	1.37	•	1.31	•	•
Good place for immigrants		1.65	•	•	1.60	1.69	•	1.65	•	•
Social Capital		2.19	•	•	2.16	2.27	•	2.20	•	•
<i>This index describes the people connections citizens have to the community, and how they share time with other.</i>										
Belong to formal/informal clubs/groups		2.06	•	•	2.19	2.04	•	2.06	•	•
Spend time with neighbors		2.27	•	•	2.21	2.31	•	2.30	•	•
Number of close friends in community		2.37	•	•	2.40	2.49	•	2.39	•	•
Number of family in community		2.07	•	•	1.85	2.25	•	2.07	•	•

	Community N Size	Primary City Geography		Community Citizen Engagement Group		
		City	Non-City	Non Engaged	Neutral	Engaged
Overall Citizen Engagement Mean	400	197	203	96	168	136
<i>Overall Community Citizen Engagement is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>	3.80	3.74	3.85	2.62	3.96	4.81
Community Loyalty						
<i>Community Loyalty measures how likely citizens are to stay in the community, recommend it to others as a place to live, and their outlook for the community's future.</i>	3.76	3.70	3.81	2.75	3.85	4.66
Community Passion						
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>	3.85	3.79	3.89	2.48	4.07	4.96
Community Domains						
<i>The four domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall engagement in a community.</i>	1.95	1.92	1.97	1.75	1.95	2.15
Social Capital						
<i>Social Capital: The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.</i>	2.19	2.17	2.21	2.11	2.19	2.28
Openness						
<i>Openness: Perceptions of openness of the community to different group.</i>	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.45	1.74	2.11
Involvement						
<i>Involvement: What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>	1.90	1.81	1.99	1.79	1.95	1.94
Community Offerings						
<i>Community Offerings: The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>	1.94	1.96	1.93	1.64	1.93	2.27



In the KF comparison group column, we list the combined scores of other Knight communities of similar size and urbanicity. Actual cities appear on page 4.

- Mean scores not shown when N size is less than 30

Community: Grand Forks, ND

	Community N Size	Community Overall	Primary City Geography		Community Citizen Engagement Group		
			City	Non-City	Non Engaged	Neutral	Engaged
Community Offerings		1.94	1.96	1.93	1.64	1.93	2.27
<i>The basic offerings that residents receive from a community. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>							
Basic Services		1.85	1.87	1.82	1.52	1.83	2.20
Highways and freeway system		2.00	2.07	1.93	1.70	1.98	2.33
Availability of quality healthcare		1.98	2.01	1.96	1.62	1.95	2.41
Affordable housing		1.54	1.50	1.58	1.24	1.55	1.84
Economy		1.79	1.80	1.78	1.51	1.84	2.00
Economic conditions		1.58	1.62	1.55	1.21	1.66	1.86
Economy getting better		2.10	2.13	2.07	1.79	2.20	2.26
Availability of job opportunities		1.52	1.50	1.53	1.25	1.49	1.84
Company hiring momentum		2.38	2.33	2.43	2.30	2.41	2.44
Job provides income needed		1.97	2.00	1.94	1.75	1.97	2.24
Now is a good time to find a job		1.53	1.58	1.49	1.26	1.58	1.75
Safety		2.12	2.06	2.18	2.18	2.02	2.20
Low crime		1.89	1.87	1.90	1.90	1.82	1.98
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home		2.35	2.24	2.45	2.47	2.22	2.43
Leadership		1.62	1.60	1.63	1.21	1.63	2.02
Leaders share my views		1.56	1.55	1.57	1.20	1.57	1.93
Leadership of elected officials		1.66	1.63	1.68	1.21	1.67	2.11
Education		2.36	2.52	2.22	1.98	2.40	2.69
Quality of public schools (K-12)		2.29	2.46	2.14	1.87	2.34	2.63
Quality of colleges and universities		2.44	2.60	2.30	2.11	2.47	2.74
Aesthetics		2.00	1.93	2.06	1.64	1.95	2.42
Parks and green spaces		2.12	2.20	2.06	1.73	2.12	2.53
Physical beauty of place		1.87	1.65	2.06	1.56	1.78	2.30
Social Offerings		1.89	1.92	1.87	1.46	1.86	2.38
Vibrant night life		1.56	1.61	1.52	1.22	1.50	2.03
Good place to meet people		1.97	2.01	1.94	1.48	1.95	2.51
Citizens care about each other		2.11	2.11	2.11	1.69	2.07	2.58

	Community N Size	Primary City Geography		Community Citizen Engagement Group			
		Community Overall	City	Non-City	Non Engaged	Neutral	Engaged
Community Involvement		1.90	1.81	1.99	1.79	1.95	1.94
<i>This index describes what residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>							
Volunteer		2.03	1.99	2.08	1.93	2.09	2.06
Voted in last local election		2.11	1.98	2.22	1.98	2.10	2.25
Attend local community meetings		1.72	1.54	1.89	1.58	1.81	1.75
Work with residents to make change		1.74	1.71	1.76	1.68	1.80	1.71
Openness		1.76	1.76	1.76	1.45	1.74	2.11
<i>This index describes the openness of the community to different group.</i>							
Good place for older people		2.18	2.14	2.21	1.94	2.10	2.54
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities		1.69	1.68	1.71	1.31	1.70	2.10
Good place for family with kids		2.25	2.30	2.21	1.84	2.28	2.64
Good place for gays and lesbians		1.37	1.35	1.39	1.11	1.37	1.67
Good place for talented college graduates		1.35	1.36	1.34	1.14	1.31	1.62
Good place for immigrants		1.65	1.65	1.65	1.33	1.65	1.99
Social Capital		2.19	2.17	2.21	2.11	2.19	2.28
<i>This index describes the people connections citizens have to the community, and how they share time with other.</i>							
Belong to formal/informal clubs/groups		2.06	2.06	2.06	2.00	2.08	2.09
Spend time with neighbors		2.27	2.29	2.25	2.16	2.27	2.38
Number of close friends in community		2.37	2.31	2.42	2.23	2.35	2.54
Number of family in community		2.07	2.03	2.11	2.06	2.05	2.11