



Soul of the Community State College, PA - MSA

GALLUP POLL®
Soul of the Community

September 2009



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.

KF 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 explore how community qualities influence residents' feelings about where they live, and how those perceptions relate to local economic growth and vitality. We make a distinction between people who are passive residents of an area versus Citizens who are active members in the community where they dwell. In this second year of the project we continue to measure citizens' attachment in each of the 26 Knight Foundation Communities and their surrounding areas. Gallup defines Community Attachment (CA) as an individual's psychological connection with the community in which they live. CA goes beyond a citizen's satisfaction with the community and extends to the passion and pride they take in living there.

Gallup has found that communities with higher proportions of attached 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 attached citizens. These communities show stronger population growth and other desirable vitality attributes 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 Attachment (CA). 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 CA.

Gallup has further identified five key dimensions, or domains, of community and a citizen's connection to it which drive their overall CA. These five 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

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 is intended to be used to track the attachment 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 Attachment 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 attachment. 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 Attachment (CA) 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 CA, Loyalty, Passion, and the five key domains (dimensions that drive overall attachment). Pages 7 through 12 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.

The fourth section shows how breakouts are provided by citizen gender, age, race, ethnicity, presence of children in the household, length of residence in the community, primary city geography, and CA attachment groups.

One new dimension was added for 2009. The Life Expectations Index was added which measures an individual's evaluation of their present and future life situation. This metric was added in 2009 along with an overall US benchmark that will allow comparisons of Knight Communities well being to national well being.

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 t

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 17th through April 26, 2009. The interview was approximately 18 minutes in length and covered 86 questions. The sample for each community was a representative selection of residential household telephone numbers in the defined area. Once a household within the identified area was reached, Gallup randomly selected one adult within the sampled household. Each county within a community was sampled proportionally to the adult population in each area. About 400 citizen interviews were completed in most of the Knight communities. Roughly 1500 citizens were interviewed in the three communities of Akron, Charlotte, and Detroit.

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. This type of weighting corrects for over or under representation of population groups (such as minority groups or college age adults) who may be harder to reach or participate less in sample surveys. 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. Urbanicity was defined using Census Bureau classifications based on the population density per square mile ("urban" areas are defined as territory, population, and housing units located within an urbanized area, which consists of: (a) core census block groups or blocks that have a population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile; and (b) surrounding census blocks that have an overall density of at least 500 people per square mile; 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 7-12 and is titled "KF Comparison Group." The communities in the comparison group for this report include:

Medium/Low Urban - Medium/Low Population

Aberdeen, SD - μ SA

Biloxi, MS - MSA

Duluth, MN - MSA

Fort Wayne, IN - MSA

Grand Forks, ND - MSA

Macon, GA - MSA


Milledgeville, GA - μ SA

Myrtle Beach, SC - MSA

State College, PA - MSA

Geography Definitions

For the purpose of this survey, Gallup selected government geography definitions




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 Attachment (CA). 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 average correlation to CA for the Knight Comparison Group. 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 Attachment (CA). 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 attachment. These areas are critical opportunities and the ones recommended for initial focus for the community.



2009	2008	Attributes for State College, PA - MSA
a	a-08	Basic Services (1.69, 0.43)
b	b-08	Economy (1.56, 0.34)
c	c-08	Safety (2.07, 0.19)
d	d-08	Leadership (1.46, 0.43)
e	e-08	Education (2.27, 0.47)
f	f-08	Aesthetics (2.34, 0.51)
g	g-08	Social Offerings (1.93, 0.58)
h	h-08	Openness (1.82, 0.51)
i	i-08	Social Capital (2.16, 0.17)
j	j-08	Civic Involvement (1.98, 0.02)
k	k-08	Emotional Wellness (1.82, 0.32)

Community Attachment (CA) = Attitudinal Loyalty + Passion

	Community			Mean Score Comparison
	N Size	Mean Score	Past Mean Score	KF Comparison Group
Overall Community Attachment Mean				
<i>Overall Community Attachment is a citizen's psychological connection with their community. The metric is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>	403	4.00	3.90	3.73 ↑
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>	403	3.88	3.79	3.64 ↑
Community Passion				
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>	403	4.11	4.00	3.82 ↑
Community Domains				
<i>The five domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall attachment in a community.</i>	403	1.97	1.97	1.91 ↑
EMOTIONAL WELLNESS <i>Emotional Wellness: The personal well being of citizens.</i>	403	1.82	1.84	1.88 ↓
SOCIAL CAPITAL <i>Social Capital: The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.</i>	403	2.16	2.11	2.15
OPENNESS <i>Openness: Perceptions of openness of the community to different groups.</i>	403	1.82	1.84	1.71 ↑
CIVIC INVOLVEMENT <i>Civic Involvement: What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>	403	1.98	2.00	2.02
COMMUNITY OFFERINGS Basic Services • Leadership • Education • Safety • Social Offerings • Aesthetics • Economy <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>	403	1.91	1.91	1.78 ↑



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.

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

Community: State College, PA - MSA

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


CA Groups

Community Distribution



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

CA Group Community Distribution



N Size	Community		Mean Score Comparison
	Mean Score	Past Mean Score	KF Comparison Group

403	4.00	3.90	3.73 ↑
-----	------	------	--------

Community Loyalty

Community Distribution



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 with community



Likely to recommend community to others



Outlook for community 5 years from now



403	3.88	3.79	3.64 ↑
403	2.13	2.14	1.89 ↑
400	2.22	2.09 ↑	1.96 ↑
402	1.66	1.49 ↑	1.72

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



403	4.11	4.00	3.82 ↑
402	2.27	2.23	2.11 ↑
400	2.14	2.03	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.

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

Community: State College, PA - MSA

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

Community Offerings	Community Distribution			Community		Mean Score Comparison	
	Low	Medium	High	N Size	Mean Score	Past Mean Score	KF Comparison Group
<i>The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>				403	1.91	1.91	1.78 ↑
Basic Services				403	1.69	1.63	1.78 ↓
Highways and freeway system	36%	43%	21%	402	1.85	1.80	1.75 ↑
Availability of quality healthcare	36%	40%	24%	402	1.88	1.76 ↑	1.91
Availability of affordable housing	72%			395	1.35	1.31	1.68 ↓
Economy				403	1.56	1.64 ↓	1.46 ↑
Economic conditions	51%	39%	9%	401	1.58	1.62	1.29 ↑
Economy getting better/worse	64%	19%	17%	394	1.53	1.79 ↓	1.63 ↓
Availability of job opportunities	62%	29%	9%	396	1.48	1.46	1.24 ↑
Company hiring momentum	12%	69%	19%	221	2.07	2.26 ↓	1.98 ↑
Job provides income needed	28%	35%	36%	227	2.08	1.74 ↑	2.00
A good time to find a job in my community	85%			394	1.19	1.28 ↓	1.19
Safety				403	2.07	2.13	1.87 ↑
Level of community crime	40%	28%	31%	403	1.91	1.89	1.73 ↑
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home	23%	29%	48%	400	2.24	2.37 ↓	2.02 ↑

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.

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

Community: State College, PA - MSA

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

Community Offerings (Continued)

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

Community Offerings (Continued)	Community Distribution			Community		Mean Score Comparison	
	Low	Medium	High	N Size	Mean Score	Past Mean Score	KF Comparison Group
				403	1.91	1.91	1.78 ↑
Leadership				398	1.46	1.43	1.44
Community leaders represent my interests	67%	29%	5%	397	1.38	1.38	1.40
Leadership of elected city officials	54%	38%	8%	394	1.54	1.48	1.50
Education				403	2.27	2.29	2.01 ↑
Quality of public schools (K-12)	24%	43%	34%	397	2.10	2.15	1.82 ↑
Quality of colleges and universities	13%	28%	58%	403	2.45	2.42	2.19 ↑
Aesthetics				403	2.34	2.39	2.06 ↑
Parks, playgrounds, and trails	22%	34%	45%	400	2.23	2.27	2.04 ↑
Beauty or physical setting	10%	34%	56%	403	2.45	2.51	2.08 ↑
Social Offerings				402	1.93	1.88	1.85 ↑
Vibrant night life	34%	29%	37%	392	2.03	1.97	1.83 ↑
Good place to meet people	31%	34%	35%	400	2.03	1.95	1.94 ↑
Other people care about each other	42%	42%	16%	400	1.73	1.71	1.78

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.

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

Community: State College, PA - MSA

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

Civic Involvement	Community Distribution			Community		Mean Score Comparison	
	Low	Medium	High	N Size	Mean Score	Past Mean Score	KF Comparison Group
<i>What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>				403	1.98	2.00	2.02
Volunteer	48%		52%	403	2.04	2.15	2.03
Voted in local election	24%		76%	403	2.53	2.33 ↑	2.59
Attend local community meetings	68%		32%	403	1.63	1.75	1.67
Work with residents to make change	63%		37%	402	1.73	1.76	1.79
Openness							
<i>Perceptions of openness of the community to different groups.</i>				403	1.82	1.84	1.71 ↑
Good place for older people	25%	37%	38%	403	2.13	2.15	2.03 ↑
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities	42%	37%	21%	401	1.80	1.77	1.70 ↑
Good place for family with kids	17%	43%	41%	402	2.24	2.23	2.00 ↑
Good place for gays and lesbians	54%	34%	12%	378	1.57	1.64	1.47 ↑
Good place for talented college graduates	60%	28%	12%	402	1.51	1.50	1.38 ↑
Good place for immigrants	51%	32%	17%	396	1.66	1.74	1.62
Social Capital							
<i>The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.</i>				403	2.16	2.11	2.15
Belong to formal/informal groups/clubs	22%	50%	28%	402	2.06	2.04	1.96 ↑
Spend time with neighbors	12%	54%	35%	402	2.23	2.17	2.29
Close friends in community	7%	64%	29%	402	2.21	2.22	2.23
Family in community	24%	37%	38%	403	2.14	2.03 ↑	2.12

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.

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

Community: State College, PA - MSA

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

	Community N Size	Gender		Age			Kid < 18 in HH	
		Community Overall	Males	Females	18-34	35-54		55+
Overall Community Attachment Mean		4.03	184	219	47	167	177	127
<i>Overall Community Attachment is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>		4.00	3.95	4.04	4.00	3.84	4.18	4.14
Community Loyalty		3.88	3.86	3.90	3.94	3.73	4.01	4.03
<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		4.11	4.05	4.18	4.05	3.95	4.34	4.25
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>								
Community Domains		1.97	1.99	1.95	1.90	1.98	2.02	2.01
<i>The five domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall attachment in a community.</i>								
EMOTIONAL WELLNESS	<i>Emotional Wellness: The personal well being of citizens.</i>	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.76	1.73	1.94	1.80
SOCIAL CAPITAL	<i>Social Capital: The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with other.</i>	2.16	2.18	2.15	2.09	2.19	2.20	2.12
OPENNESS	<i>Openness: Perceptions of openness of the community to different group.</i>	1.82	1.81	1.83	1.73	1.80	1.92	1.86
CIVIC INVOLVEMENT	<i>Civic Involvement: What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>	1.98	2.03	1.94	1.89	2.07	1.97	2.14
COMMUNITY OFFERINGS Basic Services • Leadership • Education • Safety • Social Offerings • Aesthetics • Economy	<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>	1.91	1.94	1.87	1.89	1.87	1.98	1.92

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: State College, PA - MSA

	Community Overall	Gender		Age			Kid < 18 in HH
		Males	Females	18-34	35-54	55+	
Community N Size	403	184	219	47	167	177	127
Community Offerings	1.91	1.94	1.87	1.89	1.87	1.98	1.92

The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.

Basic Services	1.69	1.74	1.65	1.57	1.69	1.84	1.61
Highways and freeway system	1.85	1.93	1.77	1.68	1.91	1.96	1.78
Availability of quality healthcare	1.88	1.90	1.85	1.73	1.89	2.06	1.79
Availability of affordable housing	1.35	1.40	1.29	1.30	1.30	1.47	1.26
Economy	1.56	1.60	1.53	1.52	1.56	1.62	1.61
Economic conditions	1.58	1.63	1.53	1.53	1.50	1.72	1.58
Economy getting better/worse	1.53	1.61	1.45	1.57	1.42	1.64	1.49
Availability of job opportunities	1.48	1.47	1.49	1.36	1.42	1.62	1.50
Company hiring momentum	2.07	2.10	2.04	•	2.13	1.96	2.09
Job provides income needed	2.08	2.17	2.00	•	2.00	1.94	2.18
A good time to find a job in my community	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.15	1.27	1.15
Safety	2.07	2.30	1.85	2.20	2.17	1.90	2.24
Low crime	1.91	2.07	1.76	2.03	1.96	1.79	2.02
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home	2.24	2.53	1.95	2.37	2.38	2.01	2.45
Leadership	1.46	1.40	1.52	1.40	1.41	1.60	1.41
Community leaders represent my interests	1.38	1.32	1.44	1.27	1.37	1.55	1.32
Leadership of elected city officials	1.54	1.48	1.60	1.54	1.45	1.66	1.49
Education	2.27	2.29	2.26	2.28	2.13	2.40	2.28
Quality of public schools (K-12)	2.10	2.08	2.12	2.05	1.95	2.29	2.08
Quality of colleges and universities	2.45	2.48	2.41	2.52	2.29	2.53	2.49
Aesthetics	2.34	2.37	2.31	2.27	2.32	2.43	2.38
Parks, playgrounds, and trails	2.23	2.27	2.19	2.16	2.23	2.32	2.26
Beauty or physical setting	2.45	2.46	2.44	2.39	2.40	2.56	2.50
Social Offerings	1.93	1.92	1.94	1.95	1.81	2.04	1.88
Vibrant night life	2.03	1.99	2.07	2.05	1.91	2.12	1.94
Good place to meet people	2.03	2.00	2.06	2.09	1.84	2.15	2.01
Other people care about each other	1.73	1.76	1.71	1.72	1.66	1.88	1.70

	Community N Size	Community Overall	Gender		Age			Kid < 18 in HH
			Males	Females	18-34	35-54	55+	
		403	184	219	47	167	177	127
Civic Involvement								
<i>This index describes what residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>		1.98	2.03	1.94	1.89	2.07	1.97	2.14
Volunteer		2.04	1.97	2.10	2.04	2.08	1.95	2.29
Voted in last local election		2.53	2.60	2.45	2.35	2.58	2.65	2.57
Attend local community meetings		1.63	1.72	1.54	1.46	1.81	1.63	1.77
Work with residents to make change		1.73	1.81	1.66	1.71	1.83	1.66	1.93
Openness								
<i>This index describes the openness of the community to different groups.</i>		1.82	1.81	1.83	1.73	1.80	1.92	1.86
Good place for older people		2.13	2.13	2.12	2.02	2.15	2.19	2.16
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities		1.80	1.75	1.84	1.72	1.76	1.92	1.84
Good place for family with kids		2.24	2.25	2.23	2.20	2.24	2.26	2.37
Good place for gays and lesbians		1.57	1.56	1.59	1.56	1.54	1.60	1.65
Good place for talented college graduates		1.51	1.49	1.53	1.39	1.43	1.69	1.44
Good place for immigrants		1.66	1.64	1.68	1.50	1.66	1.83	1.69
Social Capital								
<i>This index describes the people connections citizens have to the community, and how they share time with others.</i>		2.16	2.18	2.15	2.09	2.19	2.20	2.12
Belong to formal/informal clubs/groups		2.06	2.07	2.05	2.09	2.05	2.03	2.04
Spend time with neighbors		2.23	2.28	2.18	2.12	2.30	2.27	2.28
Number of close friends in community		2.21	2.19	2.23	2.18	2.20	2.25	2.18
Number of family in community		2.14	2.16	2.12	1.97	2.22	2.24	1.97
Emotional Wellness								
<i>The mixture of mental and physical well being items. The metric is an overall measure of personal and community well being.</i>		1.82	1.82	1.82	1.76	1.73	1.94	1.80
Treated with respect in my community		1.99	1.98	2.00	1.89	1.87	2.26	1.99
Felt well rested yesterday		1.68	1.69	1.67	1.55	1.58	1.85	1.54
Felt a high level of stress yesterday		1.83	1.84	1.82	1.87	1.77	1.76	1.94
Learned or did something interesting yesterday		1.77	1.76	1.78	1.74	1.67	1.91	1.74

	Community N Size	Years in Community				Race/Ethnicity				
		Community Overall	< 3 <30	3-5 32	6-19 93	20+ 256	Hispanic <30	Non-Hisp. White 375	Black <30	Other <30
Overall Community Attachment Mean										
<i>Overall Community Attachment is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>		4.00	•	3.86	4.00	4.00	•	3.99	•	•
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>		3.88	•	3.89	3.87	3.85	•	3.88	•	•
Community Passion										
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>		4.11	•	3.83	4.13	4.15	•	4.09	•	•
Community Domains										
<i>The five domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall attachment in a community.</i>		1.97	•	1.87	1.96	1.99	•	1.97	•	•
Emotional Wellness: <i>The personal well being of citizens.</i>		1.82	•	1.83	1.78	1.83	•	1.81	•	•
Social Capital: <i>The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.</i>		2.16	•	1.91	2.04	2.27	•	2.16	•	•
Openness: <i>Perceptions of openness of the community to different group.</i>		1.82	•	1.90	1.79	1.81	•	1.81	•	•
Civic Involvement: <i>What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>		1.98	•	1.80	2.08	1.97	•	1.99	•	•
Community Offerings: <i>The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>		1.91	•	1.87	1.91	1.90	•	1.91	•	•



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: State College, PA - MSA

	Community N Size	Years in Community				Race/Ethnicity				
		Community Overall	< 3	3-5	6-19	20+	Non-Hisp.			
			<30	32	93	256	Hispanic	White	Black	Other
Community Offerings	403	1.91	•	1.87	1.91	1.90	•	1.91	•	•
<i>The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>										
Basic Services		1.69	•	1.51	1.76	1.71	•	1.69	•	•
Highways and freeway system		1.85	•	1.55	2.02	1.85	•	1.84	•	•
Availability of quality healthcare		1.88	•	1.59	1.94	1.91	•	1.87	•	•
Availability of affordable housing		1.35	•	1.40	1.29	1.36	•	1.35	•	•
Economy		1.56	•	1.47	1.49	1.60	•	1.57	•	•
Economic conditions		1.58	•	1.47	1.55	1.60	•	1.58	•	•
Economy getting better/worse		1.53	•	1.44	1.32	1.65	•	1.54	•	•
Availability of job opportunities		1.48	•	1.45	1.39	1.50	•	1.47	•	•
Company hiring momentum		2.07	•	•	1.90	2.10	•	2.07	•	•
Job provides income needed		2.08	•	•	2.10	2.05	•	2.07	•	•
A good time to find a job in my community		1.19	•	1.24	1.17	1.18	•	1.19	•	•
Safety		2.07	•	2.19	2.11	2.04	•	2.09	•	•
Low crime		1.91	•	2.04	1.90	1.88	•	1.91	•	•
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home		2.24	•	2.33	2.32	2.21	•	2.27	•	•
Leadership		1.46	•	1.35	1.46	1.50	•	1.47	•	•
Community leaders represent my interests		1.38	•	1.20	1.42	1.41	•	1.39	•	•
Leadership of elected city officials		1.54	•	•	1.49	1.58	•	1.55	•	•
Education		2.27	•	2.38	2.27	2.23	•	2.27	•	•
Quality of public schools (K-12)		2.10	•	2.16	2.16	2.05	•	2.08	•	•
Quality of colleges and universities		2.45	•	2.60	2.37	2.41	•	2.46	•	•
Aesthetics		2.34	•	2.22	2.45	2.31	•	2.34	•	•
Parks, playgrounds, and trails		2.23	•	2.14	2.32	2.20	•	2.22	•	•
Beauty or physical setting		2.45	•	2.31	2.58	2.42	•	2.46	•	•
Social Offerings		1.93	•	1.94	1.85	1.93	•	1.94	•	•
Vibrant night life		2.03	•	2.12	1.84	2.07	•	2.05	•	•
Good place to meet people		2.03	•	2.04	2.00	2.02	•	2.06	•	•
Other people care about each other		1.73	•	1.65	1.71	1.72	•	1.72	•	•

	Community Overall	Years in Community				Race/Ethnicity				
		< 3	3-5	6-19	20+	Non-Hisp.				
		Hispanic	White	Black	Other					
Community N Size	403	<30	32	93	256	<30	375	<30	<30	
Civic Involvement										
<i>This index describes what residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>	1.98	•	1.80	2.08	1.97	•	1.99	•	•	
Volunteer	2.04	•	1.89	2.21	1.98	•	2.05	•	•	
Voted in last local election	2.53	•	1.91	2.57	2.60	•	2.57	•	•	
Attend local community meetings	1.63	•	1.41	1.69	1.66	•	1.65	•	•	
Work with residents to make change	1.73	•	2.00	1.84	1.66	•	1.70	•	•	
Openness										
<i>This index describes the openness of the community to different group.</i>	1.82	•	1.90	1.79	1.81	•	1.81	•	•	
Good place for older people	2.13	•	2.13	2.09	2.11	•	2.09	•	•	
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities	1.80	•	2.10	1.72	1.79	•	1.78	•	•	
Good place for family with kids	2.24	•	2.25	2.24	2.22	•	2.22	•	•	
Good place for gays and lesbians	1.57	•	•	1.56	1.57	•	1.59	•	•	
Good place for talented college graduates	1.51	•	1.39	1.48	1.53	•	1.49	•	•	
Good place for immigrants	1.66	•	1.87	1.69	1.62	•	1.66	•	•	
Social Capital										
<i>This index describes the people connections citizens have to the community, and how they share time with others.</i>	2.16	•	1.91	2.04	2.27	•	2.16	•	•	
Belong to formal/informal clubs/groups	2.06	•	2.04	2.11	2.07	•	2.07	•	•	
Spend time with neighbors	2.23	•	2.13	2.15	2.26	•	2.22	•	•	
Number of close friends in community	2.21	•	1.97	2.14	2.30	•	2.22	•	•	
Number of family in community	2.14	•	1.51	1.75	2.45	•	2.15	•	•	
Emotional Wellness										
<i>The mixture of mental and physical well being items. The metric is an overall measure of personal and community well being.</i>	1.82	•	1.83	1.78	1.83	•	1.81	•	•	
Treated with respect in my community	1.99	•	1.92	2.03	2.00	•	2.01	•	•	
Felt well rested yesterday	1.68	•	1.75	1.57	1.70	•	1.63	•	•	
Felt a high level of stress yesterday	1.83	•	2.12	1.69	1.83	•	1.80	•	•	
Learned or did something interesting yesterday	1.77	•	1.54	1.81	1.77	•	1.78	•	•	

	Community N Size	Primary City Geography		Community Attachment Group		
		City	Non-City	Not Attached	Neutral	Attached
Overall Community Attachment Mean	403	178	225	84	164	155
<i>Overall Community Attachment is a weighted average of Community Loyalty and Community Passion.</i>	4.00	4.22	3.85	2.63	3.95	4.76
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>	3.88	4.10	3.74	2.66	3.83	4.57
Community Passion						
<i>Community Passion describes the level of pride and connectedness citizens have to the place.</i>	4.11	4.34	3.97	2.60	4.07	4.95
Community Domains						
<i>The five domains measure what citizens take and receive from their community. The domains help us understand what factors are driving overall attachment in a community.</i>	1.97	2.01	1.94	1.71	1.93	2.15
Emotional Wellness: <i>The personal well being of citizens.</i>	1.82	1.91	1.76	1.57	1.79	1.99
Social Capital: <i>The people-connections citizens have to the community and how they share time with others.</i>	2.16	2.16	2.16	2.00	2.14	2.27
Openness: <i>Perceptions of openness of the community to different group.</i>	1.82	1.92	1.76	1.44	1.72	2.15
Civic Involvement: <i>What residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>	1.98	1.96	2.00	1.85	2.03	1.98
Community Offerings: <i>The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>	1.91	2.01	1.84	1.54	1.83	2.19



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: State College, PA - MSA

	Community Overall	Primary City Geography		Community Attachment Group		
		City	Non-City	Not Attached	Neutral	Attached
Community N Size	403	178	225	84	164	155
Community Offerings	1.91	2.01	1.84	1.54	1.83	2.19
<i>The structural, physical, and social offerings that a community presents to its residents. Without basic support from a community, citizens cannot thrive.</i>						
Basic Services	1.69	1.77	1.64	1.40	1.61	1.95
Highways and freeway system	1.85	1.92	1.81	1.56	1.76	2.11
Availability of quality healthcare	1.88	2.00	1.79	1.48	1.77	2.22
Availability of affordable housing	1.35	1.39	1.31	1.15	1.31	1.49
Economy	1.56	1.67	1.50	1.30	1.49	1.80
Economic conditions	1.58	1.76	1.46	1.18	1.48	1.91
Economy getting better/worse	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.36	1.45	1.73
Availability of job opportunities	1.48	1.61	1.39	1.24	1.33	1.81
Company hiring momentum	2.07	2.09	2.06	1.84	2.06	2.21
Job provides income needed	2.08	2.17	2.02	1.43	2.13	2.34
A good time to find a job in my community	1.19	1.27	1.14	1.11	1.10	1.35
Safety	2.07	2.13	2.04	1.75	2.04	2.29
Low crime	1.91	2.00	1.85	1.57	1.83	2.20
Safe to walk within 1 mile of home	2.24	2.27	2.23	1.93	2.26	2.39
Leadership	1.46	1.47	1.46	1.18	1.38	1.71
Community leaders represent my interests	1.38	1.41	1.36	1.12	1.35	1.55
Leadership of elected city officials	1.54	1.53	1.55	1.23	1.41	1.86
Education	2.27	2.50	2.13	1.82	2.20	2.61
Quality of public schools (K-12)	2.10	2.37	1.92	1.77	1.97	2.44
Quality of colleges and universities	2.45	2.63	2.33	1.88	2.42	2.79
Aesthetics	2.34	2.57	2.19	1.83	2.29	2.67
Parks, playgrounds, and trails	2.23	2.61	1.99	1.76	2.16	2.56
Beauty or physical setting	2.45	2.54	2.40	1.92	2.42	2.78
Social Offerings	1.93	1.99	1.89	1.51	1.83	2.29
Vibrant night life	2.03	2.03	2.03	1.78	1.87	2.37
Good place to meet people	2.03	2.12	1.97	1.45	1.95	2.44
Other people care about each other	1.73	1.81	1.68	1.29	1.66	2.06

	Community N Size	Primary City Geography		Community Attachment Group		
		Community Overall	City	Non-City	Not Attached	Neutral
	403	178	225	84	164	155
Civic Involvement						
<i>This index describes what residents give to the community in terms of civic involvement.</i>	1.98	1.96	2.00	1.85	2.03	1.98
Volunteer	2.04	2.03	2.04	1.73	2.07	2.15
Voted in last local election	2.53	2.58	2.49	2.43	2.55	2.55
Attend local community meetings	1.63	1.50	1.71	1.60	1.70	1.56
Work with residents to make change	1.73	1.73	1.74	1.65	1.81	1.68
Openness						
<i>This index describes the openness of the community to different group.</i>	1.82	1.92	1.76	1.44	1.72	2.15
Good place for older people	2.13	2.31	2.01	1.66	1.99	2.55
Good place for racial and ethnic minorities	1.80	1.79	1.80	1.44	1.72	2.08
Good place for family with kids	2.24	2.45	2.10	1.71	2.12	2.67
Good place for gays and lesbians	1.57	1.61	1.55	1.32	1.49	1.81
Good place for talented college graduates	1.51	1.51	1.52	1.27	1.42	1.77
Good place for immigrants	1.66	1.81	1.56	1.25	1.56	1.99
Social Capital						
<i>This index describes the people connections citizens have to the community, and how they share time with others.</i>	2.16	2.16	2.16	2.00	2.14	2.27
Belong to formal/informal clubs/groups	2.06	2.17	1.99	1.97	2.08	2.09
Spend time with neighbors	2.23	2.26	2.21	2.09	2.14	2.42
Number of close friends in community	2.21	2.29	2.16	2.00	2.18	2.37
Number of family in community	2.14	1.90	2.29	1.95	2.18	2.19
Emotional Wellness						
<i>The mixture of mental and physical well being items. The metric is an overall measure of personal and community well being.</i>	1.82	1.91	1.76	1.57	1.79	1.99
Treated with respect in my community	1.99	2.08	1.93	1.46	1.94	2.34
Felt well rested yesterday	1.68	1.75	1.63	1.54	1.65	1.79
Felt a high level of stress yesterday	1.83	1.92	1.78	1.67	1.81	1.95
Learned or did something interesting yesterday	1.77	1.87	1.70	1.61	1.76	1.87