SEEKING SENSE OF COMMUNITY:
A CASE STUDY OF COLORADO SPRINGS

A Thesis
Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology
Colorado College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelors of Arts in Sociology

By

Evalyn Grant
December 2014

Acknowledgements

On my honor
I have neither given nor received
unauthorized aid on this thesis.

Evalyn Grant

December 2014

ABSTRACT

This study explores where residents of Colorado Springs find sense of community (SOC). The focus of the study is specifically two questions: 1) what relationship religion has to SOC in a city setting and 2) whether SOC measures should be limited to communities that an individual is physically close to. Quantitative analysis was run on survey data collected in Colorado Springs. There were five major findings. 1) Religion is positively related to neighborhood SOC and negatively related to organizational SOC. 2) Homeownership is positively related to neighborhood and organizational SOC. 3) There is no one method of communication that is related to SOC. 4) There is no one distance from the community that is related to SOC. 5) There is no relationship between new urbanist design and neighborhood SOC.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Research contests whether community can exist outside of neighborhood units. There is an argument that only dense social ties with people who live near a given location can result in a sense of community (SOC) (Duany et al. 2000, Ellis 2002, Talen 2005). This stems from the theory that SOC is dependent on religious affiliation, kin ties and locality in tandem (Tönnies & Loomis 1957, Fischer 1982). Others find that strong social ties based on mutual interests and skills create a SOC that liberates people from their immediate surroundings (Castells 1996, Fischer 1982, Kolb 2008, Meier 1968, Wellman and Leighton 1979, Wellman 1999, Webber 1963).

The focus on how to create SOC has endured because of the ways SOC affects our wellbeing. Studies show a strong positive correlation between SOC and higher levels of life satisfaction, political engagement and social engagement (Davidson & Cotter 1989, Fried 1984, McMillian & Chavis 1986). Because of the relationship between SOC and wellbeing, and the history of assuming SOC is connected to our location, scholars have put great effort into finding out whether our local surroundings facilitate or hinder SOC.

This study explores if it is possible for a mid-sized city, with a culture similar to a small town, to facilitate the formation of local ties and SOC. This study demonstrates that in a city people have not exclusively adapted to a SOC created from interest-based ties. Colorado Springs is the location of the case study, with its large population of religious residents. Using statistical analysis to investigate residents of Colorado Springs, the study examines if religion can also be a large part

of SOC for city dwellers. Furthermore, this study determines whether residents rely on ties within their local areas for SOC in the same way they do in a small town or if they find SOC in more diverse ways as they do in a city.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Arguments for Locally Based Sense of Community

The idea that humans need a tightly knit neighborhood for SOC is in large part rooted in Tönnies' 1912 theories that people naturally group in small population pockets. In Tönnies' theory, humans relate to those near them through a mutual belief system or religion. This grouping is what Tönnies calls "gemeinschaft" which has been translated to "community" (Tönnies & Loomis 1957). The opposite of "gemeinschaft" is "gesellschaft," which is translated as "society." According to Tönnies, the city (the center of "gesellschaft") causes people to lose their connection to a common religion that guides their actions and they are left with nothing to connect them to others. The city is a place of cultural decay and isolation, he says, where people only make connections over trifling interests with no lasting impact (Tönnies & Loomis 1957).

The assumption in Tönnies' argument is that SOC is only authentic if it is based on a specific location. Modern scholars that support "gemeinschaft" over "gesellschaft" do not believe that people can have SOC if it is not tied to a neighborhood (Tönnies & Loomis 1957). Hillery (1955) compiled scholarly definitions of community and found that the majority of research includes locality as central to SOC. While popular, this definition of SOC does not take into account ties

people may have outside of their neighborhood, ignoring the social networks that people build around work, organizations and special interests.

Following Tönnies' point of view leads to research concerning SOC in neighborhood units (Duany, Platter-Zyberk & Speck 2000, Ellis 2002, Jacobs 1961, Tallen 2005, Wood et al. 2010). Focused on SOC in the neighborhood unit in their research, Duany, Platter-Zyberk & Speck (2000) find that neighborhoods need higher population density, public open space, heterogeneous populations and pedestrian traffic to support SOC. Duany et al. (2002), Jacobs (1961), and Freeman (2001) all point to automobile dependency in the neighborhood as detrimental to SOC. Freeman (2001) goes on to say that dependence on the automobile in the neighborhood is more harmful than a lack of density. This is because relying on a car to move through a neighborhood lessens the rate of interaction between neighbors. Wood et al. (2010) found that SOC in neighborhoods was most successful when the neighbors did plenty of leisure walking and had high rates of homeownership.

Arguments Against Locally Based Sense of Community

Countering Tönnies' theory, Durkheim speculates that as the majority of people move to cities, community adapts to the new built environment and population (Durkheim & Halls 1984). The division of labor is at the core of this adaptation from towns to cities. Durkheim theorized that when humans live in towns, they are connected by a collective consciousness or a common set of beliefs. The foundation of this common belief system lies in the fact that each person has the same role within his or her community. Because the townspeople have little division

of labor, they lack individuality and are consumed by the collective. Durkheim refers to this as "mechanical solidarity" (Durkheim & Halls 1984).

As people establish cities as centers of population and production, they also divide up the roles within the community to avoid competing for the same jobs and resources. Durkheim argues that with divided roles each person acts like an organ in the body, doing different tasks that ultimately help the entire society function. Durkheim says that this division of labor fosters an interdependence that he calls "organic solidarity." When people have their own individual purpose within the society, they are free to act and believe as they please. This development allows for the expression of the individual, while still fostering SOC and the need for others (Durkheim & Halls 1984).

Modern research supports this shift from mechanical and organic solidarity in the shift of people from towns to cities (Castells 1996, Fischer 1982, Kolb 2008, Wellman 1999). People choose their social networks in cities. They can decide what area of interest or skill to focus on when seeking out relationships (Fischer 1982, Kolb 2008, Wellman 1999). Where Tönnies saw the city as an isolating force, Durkheim saw its potential to unite people. This is supported by modern research that shows city dwellers have the equivalent to or stronger than social ties town dwellers (Fischer 1982, Wellman & Leighton 1979, Wellman 1999).

Liberating Sense of Community from the Neighborhood

Many scholars posit to define SOC without accounting for local surroundings. Hillery's (1955) study demonstrates that many scholars fixate on local area when they define sense of community, even though SOC was not significant in those

scholars' findings. The preoccupation with locality in researching SOC is no longer seen as justified by some. Webber (1963) developed the theory of "community without propinquity" in which community is demonstrated to be completely separate from an individual's immediate surroundings. Subsequent research has supported Webber's (1963) findings (Fischer 1982, Wellman 1999, Riger & Lavrakas 1981). For example, Fischer (1982) found that residents of cities had more SOC outside of the neighborhood than town folk had within the neighborhood. Fischer (1982) helped specify that the disconnection of SOC from the neighborhood does not mean that SOC ceases to exist. People's SOC separated from locality may be a result of access to cheap transportation or access to communication over the Internet (Kolb 2008, Fischer 1982, Meier 1968, Wellman 1999). Meier (1968) argued that with the rise of the car, cheap and easy transportation freed people from their reliance on locality for SOC. Wellman (1999) demonstrated that connections facilitated by the Internet helped SOC grow, rather than hinder its development.

Even research targeted at understanding neighborhood SOC kept finding that locality and SOC were not directly connected (Riger & Lavrakas 1981, Rogers & Sukolratanametee 2009, Wood et al. 2010). Riger and Lavrakas (1981) found that people generally evaluate SOC by quality of interactions over quantity of interactions. This validates the idea that physical closeness and social bonding are separate. Roger and Sukolratanmetee (2009) discovered that it is not the neighborhood that ties people together today. In fact neighborly interaction has an insignificant relationship to SOC. Instead it is demographics that correlate most strongly with SOC. Roger and Sukolratanmetee (2009) learned that to share socio-

economic class, race, and to be interested in creating a community in your neighborhood had the most significance to SOC. This ties to Tönnies' argument that communities form around the similarities between people, but eliminates Tönnies' theory that people need to be close with those who live near them to have SOC.

Wellman (1999) and Wellman & Leighton (1979) build on the idea that the neighborhood is now insignificant to SOC by saying that people are liberated from their neighborhoods. The participants in Wellman and Leighton's 1979 study of whether community was lost, saved or liberated in modernity heavily supported that they felt community was liberated. For example, participants indicated that while they were not close with their neighbors they had dense social networks from organizations and work. Respondents were demonstrating that their communities were founded around interest groups rather than sharing a local area. Wellman (1999) found that even connection and communication through the Internet enhanced SOC, further de-emphasizing the neighborhood.

Fischer (1982) complicates Wellman's (1999) exploration of the liberation of SOC from the neighborhood by examining community ties in a variety of contexts. Fischer (1982) finds that his participants living in city areas name more people within a 60-minute radius of their residence as central to their support network than participants living in semi-rural and small town areas. He suggests that this difference is based on the number of available of people in that radius and the effort it takes to get there. In rural areas, there are fewer people within that radius. In the city, there are many people spread out, so the likelihood of a close friend living within 60 minutes is greater, especially since an individual's network is not based

on locality as networks are in small towns. This is significant because it could be argued the effort to keep up with these far away friends is the same in small towns and cities, but in the city the close ties are more likely not based on common interest unrelated to location. In the small town, the ties in this radius are most likely to be based on locality, so there are fewer ties in the 60-minute radius.

Sense of Community Scales

Within this quest to define what affects SOC, scholars have created many scales to discuss SOC. The logic behind this is to create a universal scale for SOC that is understandable. McMillian and Chavis (1986) created the most widely used definition of SOC. They built their definition of SOC by exploring how previous researchers had tackled studying SOC. Through this analysis, McMillian and Chavis (1986) determined that SOC is the combination of four elements: membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs, and emotional connection. Based on these four elements, McMillian and Chavis and many other scholars have created their questions that come together as SOC composite variables (Long & Perkins 2003, Davidson & Cotter1989). For example, Long and Perkins (2003) asked "If there is a problem in this neighborhood the people who live here can get it solved" on their survey to gage integration and fulfillment of needs. Scholars defining SOC scales say that SOC does not need a connection to place to be considered valid (Long & Perkins 2003, Davidson & Cotter1989). Long & Perkins (2003) determined that their questions of place attachment had an insignificant correlation with other markers for SOC.

A Multifaceted Sense of Community

This study explored how these aforementioned conflicting theories and studies blend together. By applying a consistent measure of SOC to neighborhoods, organizations, workplaces and friend groups; this study's definition of SOC was broadened from a marker indicating connection or separation from a local area to a new multifaceted definition that included multiple SOCs. The initial focus of the study is on how religion affects SOCs in a city; a relationship Fischer (1982) argues does not exist in a significant way. Then the significance of homeownership, a relationship noted by Wood et al. (2010), to the SOCs was explored. Inspired by Wellman (1999), this study researches the significance of communication methods on different SOCs. Finally, the relationship between new urbanist design and neighborhood SOC was explored in response to the writings of Duany & Plater-Zyberk (2000), Ellis (2002), and Talen (2005).

Colorado Springs, Colorado was selected as the appropriate location for the case study. Colorado Springs is the second largest city in Colorado with 645,613 people in 2010 and spread over 186.1 square miles. At this size, the city can be described as a sprawling megacity (United States Census Bureau 2014). Regardless of its status as a megacity, the culture of Colorado Springs resembles that of a traditional small town community. Data from 2010 showed that 98,164 (15%) of the residents are affiliated with an evangelical Christianity, 54,095 (08%) of the resident are Catholic and 214,728 (33%) of the residents of Colorado Springs are affiliated with a religion ("Metro-Area Membership Report" 2010). This deep connection of the city's population to religion is similar to the SOC in small towns. My questions were: whether Colorado Springs's residents make ties the same way

as small town residents regardless of being in a megacity? Are an individual's local surroundings significant to SOC in all parts of their life?

METHODS

I gathered data from within Colorado Springs, Colorado by distributing a survey I designed (see Appendix A for survey). The survey was distributed in a variety of locations in town and online. 101 responses were collected. There were 48 male and 53 female respondents. The overall racial composition of Colorado Springs was reflected in my study with 83 white non-Latino respondents, 8 black respondents, 4 Latino respondents and 5 respondents of other ethnicities (United States Census Bureau 2014). Most respondents were employed (77%), half were married (50%) and 53% of them owned their own home. There was a wide breadth in highest level of education of respondents with 1% having attended some high school, 5% having graduated high school, 30% having attended some college, 32% having graduated college, 8% having attended some graduate school and 22% having earned a graduate degree. There was a similarly diverse representation of religious affiliation with 21% Protestant, 6% Catholic, 2% Jewish, 17% non-denominational Christian, and 10% other and 40% no affiliation.

I measured SOC in the neighborhood, organization, workplace and friend group with a composite of questions based on studies by Long & Perkins (2003), Wellman & Leighton (1979), and McMillian & Chavis (1986). I used the same questions to determine SOC for neighborhoods, organizations, workplaces and friend groups to ensure that SOC was consistently measured across different areas of people's lives. I ensured that the questions that made up the composites for SOC

in neighborhoods, organizations, workplaces, and friend groups worked well

together by calculating a Cronbach's alpha. All SOC composites had Cronbach's

alphas higher than 0.85. High Cronbach's alphas indicate that each SOC measure is a

strong composite variable. With some experimentation regarding different sets of

questions, I am confident that the questions included in my composite are

appropriate. These SOC composites were used as my dependent variables.

ANALYSIS

I examined the data with Multiple Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression

models of the relationship between SOC composites and a variety of variables. SOC

was evaluated in neighborhoods, organizations, workplaces, and friend groups. The

analysis of this paper focuses on the relationships of five variables to SOC: 1)

religion, 2) homeownership, 3) distance, 4) communication methods and 5) new

urbanist design. Religion and homeownership were the only demographic variables

that were significant to any of the SOCs (e.g. neighborhood SOC, organizational SOC,

workplace SOC, and friend group SOC), including when other variable controls were

applied. As a result religion and homeownership were the only demographic

variables discussed. The way distance of the respondent from the community

influences their SOC measures was also tested for, again controlling for the

appropriate demographic, religious and social information. The relationship

between communication method (e.g. telephone, online, in person) and the SOCs

was investigated, controlling for religious affiliation and demographic information.

The final analysis concerns the insignificance of new urbanist design on

neighborhood SOC. Gender, race, employment, and marital status were insignificant

in all of these regressions, so these variables were not included in the models.

Homeownership, education level, suburban living environment and frequency of

religious service attendance were included in all models because these variables

were most frequently statistically significant and were discussed in the literature.

However, these variables were not always significant to each of the models. Every

combination of these variables was tested. Models that were most interesting were

chosen. In some cases, not all variables are significant to the model. If a relationship

was significant, it was put in the model. Refer to Table 19 at the end of the analysis

for a summary of the significant findings.

Does Religion have a Relationship with the SOC of City Dwellers?

A Multiple OLS regression analysis performed on SOC and religious variables

showed religion was only significant to certain SOCs. Catholicism was positively

related to neighborhood SOC (t = 3.75, p<.001, see Table 1) and frequency of

religious service attendance was negatively related to organizational SOC (t= -2.91,

p<.001, see Table 3). Religious affiliation had no relationship with SOC in the

workplace, friend group or organization. Similarly frequency of religious service

attendance was not related to workplace, friend group or neighborhood SOC.

Table 1. OLS of SOC in the neighborhood focusing on religious affiliation

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Catholic	3.75***					
Protestant		-0.20				
Jewish			0.44			
Non-denom.				-0.49		
Other					-1.14	
No religious affil.						-0.78

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Religious affiliation was significant only in SOC in the neighborhood.

Catholicism had a strong positive relationship with neighborhood SOC (t = 3.75,

p<.001, see Table 1). This was maintained even when controlled for education,

homeownership, frequency of church attendance and suburban living environment (see Table 2). It is possible that being Catholic enforces a need for engagement in the neighborhood to validate SOC in general and results in a stronger SOC in the neighborhood as suggested by Durkheim (1951). Highest level of education was statistically significant to supporting neighborhood SOC controlled for with Catholicism until homeownership was added. Homeownership was still significant to neighborhood SOC. This relationship is explored in further depth in Table 4.

Table 2. OLS of SOC in the neighborhood focusing on Catholicism

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Catholic	3.75***		3.68***	3.56***	3.65***	4.02***	3.93***	3.74***	3.78***
Frequency of church attend.		0.61	0.21				0.33		0.03
Homeownership				3.77***	3.96***			2.61*	2.77**
Suburban					-1.94				-1.92
Education Level						3.15**	3.14**	1.79	1.79

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Durkheim's (1951) study on suicide and religious affiliation supports my finding of a strong relationship between Catholicism and strong neighborhood SOC. Catholicism is a religious tradition that emphasizes a communal connection to God through a central religious figure. Durkheim (1951) noted that Catholicism fostered a stronger SOC that inhibited more people from suicide than religions without a communal connection to God. The communal connection to God seen in Catholicism is not central to Protestant practice. Durkheim (1951) attests that Protestant individuality leads people to interact and depend on each other less, ultimately diminishing SOC. As a result, Durkheim (1951) recorded higher rates of suicide within Protestant communities. The results of this study support the results of Durkheim (1951), with Catholics demonstrating a higher engagement and SOC in locally based community (e.g. the neighborhood) and Protestants having no significant relationship to neighborhood SOC. The significance of Catholicism on SOC

has remained the same for over a century, from Durkheim's study in 1897 to my own.

The significance of frequency of religious service attendance to SOC was also investigated. In neighborhood, work place, and friend group, frequency of religious service attendance had no significant relationship with SOC. This insignificance was verified when subsequent models controlled for education, homeownership, frequency of church attendance and suburban living environment. Frequency of attendance at religious services did have a strong negative relationship with organizational SOC (see Table 3). When education, homeownership, religious affiliation and suburban living environment were controlled for, the significance of frequency of church attendance was maintained (t = -2.70, p<.01, see Table 3).

This can be interpreted as frequency of church attendance decreasing the amount of time individuals are willing to dedicate or engage with organizations. Religious involvement may take away from the SOC people feel in organizations by removing them from organizational opportunities. Homeownership was consistently significant to organizational SOC and was further explored in Table 6.

Table 3. OLS of organizational SOC focusing on frequency of church attendance

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Frequency of church attendance	-2.91***	-2.48**	-2.48**	-3.30***	-3.31***	-2.70***	-2.75**	-2.70**
Religious affil.		0.68	0.68			0.50		0.58
Homeownership				2.95**	2.96**	3.00**		2.81**
Suburban			-0.52		-0.59	-0.72		-0.55
Education							0.45	-0.59

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

These findings directly relate to Fischer's comparison of SOC between small towns and cities. Fischer (1982) found religion to be a central element of community formation in small town settings. In the results of this study, it is clear that religion has a relationship to SOC in the neighborhood and organization even

though the study is of a city. Catholicism is the only religious affiliation that supports

SOC in one's neighborhood. In this way, Catholicism recreates a small town style of

SOC for its adherents even within the context of a city. The significance of religious

affiliation with SOC, one that was emphasized by Fischer (1982) in small town

settings, is lost on all other religions. The negative effect of frequency of religious

service attendance on organizational SOC could be explained by religiosity forcing

people to not make or maintain ties in interest groups.

In summary, Catholicism fosters strong neighborhood SOC. This is potentially

related to Durkheim's (1951) study of suicide, which indicates that a communal

connection to God encourages strong community reliance and bonding. Frequency

of church attendance has a negative relationship with organizational SOC; this can

be explained by the limited time frequent churchgoers have to give to other groups.

Is a Connection to a Local Area Significant to the SOC of City Dwellers?

An individual's connection to a local area is demonstrated as significant to

neighborhood and organizational SOC through homeownership. The results of this

study demonstrated that homeownership is significant in neighborhoods and

organizations. Age and homeownership were correlated (coef = 0.50), so age is

excluded from my all of the models that include homeownership. However,

homeownership had no other significant correlations. Other variables examined

such as, suburban living environment (coef = 0.03), marriage (coef = 0.47),

education level (coef = 0.42), employment (coef = 0.05) and intended stay in

residence (coef = 0.47) were all not correlated to homeownership. Length of

residency in a neighborhood and intended stay in residency were slightly correlated

(coef = 0.45). Other correlations with homeownership were tested for and none were as high or interesting as these so they were not worth mentioning. For this reason, these variables were included in the same models as homeownership.

In the neighborhood, owning a home has a strong positive relationship with SOC (t = 3.96, p<.001, see Table 4). This is a logical conclusion since owning a home signifies a long-time commitment to a neighborhood, independent of length of time having lived there. While Table 2 also demonstrates this finding, Table 4 to allows for further emphasis and modeling. Intending to live in a home longer is also statistically significant to neighborhood SOC (t = 4.35, p<.001, see Table 5). Table 5 demonstrates that duration of residency in a neighborhood is only significant when not controlled for by intended future residency. This commitment to stay would largely support a dedication to socializing with neighbors and creating SOC. Suburban living environment, education level, Catholicism, and frequency of church attendance were controlled for in these models. Catholicism maintains its significance to neighborhood SOC in Table 4 and Table 5.

Moreover, homeownership also has a strong positive relationship with SOC in organizations (t = 2.51, p<.05, see Table 6). This finding mirrors the logic of homeownership as a proxy for commitment to an area. Owning a home in a town makes people more likely to dedicate themselves to an organization that works in the region. This dedication fosters organizational SOC. This finding was controlled for any religious affiliation, frequency of church attendance, having a suburban living environment and education. As previously discussed, frequency of religious attendance was significant to organizational SOC (t = -3.30, p<.001, see Table 6)

even as a control for homeownership. Frequency of church attendance does not diminish the significance of homeownership to organizational SOC.

Homeownership is not significant to work place or friend group SOC.

Table 4. OLS of SOC in the neighborhood focusing on homeownership

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Homeownership	3.96***		4.08***	3.92***	3.77***	3.96***	3.92***	4.04***	3.74***	2.58**
Suburban		-1.35	-1.67			-1.94		-1.65		
Education Level				1.23						0.078
Catholic					3.56***	3.65***			3.51**	3.68***
Frequency of church attend.							0.50	0.46	0.05	0.15

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 5. OLS of SOC in the neighborhood focusing on duration of and intended residency

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Duration of residency	2.90***		1.34		1.17					0.74
Intended future res.		4.35***	3.30***	2.87**	2.21*	2.78**	3.95***	4.73***	3.95***	2.08*
Homeownership				2.45*	2.35*	2.56*				2.33*
Suburban						-1.43				
Catholic							3.33***		3.22**	3.11***
Church Frequency								0.72	0.52	

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

McMillian & Chavis (1986) and Wood et al. (2010) established the significance of homeownership for SOC in the neighborhood. In the study by Wood et al. (2010), the focus was exclusively on SOC within the scale of the neighborhood. My study expanded this by demonstrating the relationship between homeownership and more diverse forms of SOC (e.g. in the organizational setting). These results help indicate that the connection between the financial commitment of homeownership and SOC is significant but limited to the neighborhood and organizational SOC.

Regardless of the significance of homeownership in neighborhood and organizational SOC, an individual's homeownership is not significant to finding SOC in the workplace or friend group. Many new urbanists would argue that people need to connect to other in their local surroundings, something that homeownership

fosters, to find SOC. Homeownership is only significant to neighborhood and organizational SOC. People are finding SOC without needing to be connected to their neighborhood or local area. The insignificance of homeownership to workplace and friend group SOC observed in this study supports Fischer (1982) and Wellman's (1999) studies. Fischer and Wellman demonstrate that one's local surroundings are not the only place where SOC is fostered and relied upon. As mentioned above, homeownership has no relationship to workplace and friend group SOC.

Table 6. OLS of organizational SOC focusing on homeownership

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Homeownership	2.51*	2.51*	2.27*	2.27*	2.95**	3.00***	2.81**
Suburban		-0.44		-0.27		-0.72	-0.55
Frequency of church attendance					-3.30***	-2.70***	-2.70**
Religious affil.						0.50	0.58
Education			-0.34	-0.35			-0.59

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

To summarize, homeownership supports neighborhood and organizational SOC, likely because it connects people to their region and establishes an easy common point of interest. It is important to remember that workplace SOC and friend group SOC have no relationship to homeownership and demonstrate that connection to the region is not always necessary to having SOC.

Does the Distance from a Community Matter to the SOC of City Dwellers?

Whether the distance of respondents from those involved in their organization, workplace, or friend group had a relationship with SOC in these areas of their lives was examined. The question of whether physical distance from a community is related to strength of SOC is a focus in the literature on SOC (Duany et al. 2000, Ellis 2002, Talen 2005, Fischer 1982, Kolb 2008, Meier 1968, Wellman & Leighton 1979, Wellman 1999, Webber 1963). The findings of this study indicated

that distance was significant in organizational and workplace SOC but not to friend group SOC.

There was a positive relationship between organizational SOC and having other members of the organization living within the same town (t = 10.16, p<.001) or same neighborhood (t = 2.60, p<.05, see Table 7). These findings continue to be significant even when frequency of church attendance, homeownership, suburban living environment, and education level are controlled for. Even when type of communication was controlled for, neighborhood and town stayed significant (see Table 8a). Additionally the number of organizations an individual was affiliated with was significant regardless of controls (t = 7.21, p<.001, see Table 7). The number of people an individual was close to in an organization was only significant to organizational SOC until it was controlled for by the number of organizations an individual was affiliated with (see Table 7). The frequency of church attendance continues to be significant to organizational SOC in these models. The significance of homeownership to organizational SOC dissipates once it is tested with organizational peers from the same neighborhood, same town and a suburban environment (see Table 8).

The relationship between distance and organizational SOC can be explained by considering that those with strong organizational SOC, who likely have invested in their local area with homeownership, continue to foster this investment in the area by being in an organization with people in the same town or neighborhood as their home (see Table 8). It is interesting to note that homeownership loses its

significance to organizational SOC once having peers from the neighborhood, from the town and a suburban living environment are included in the model (see Table 8).

There was a strong positive relationship between workplace SOC and having colleagues from the same neighborhood (t = 3.70, p<.001), town (t = 9.84, p<.001) and country (t = 2.60, p<.01) once each distance from colleagues was controlled for the other distances (see Table 9). Having colleagues who live outside of the country had a negative relationship with SOC in the workplace (t = -2.39, p<.05, see Table 9). These findings were controlled for frequency of church attendance, education, religious affiliation, homeownership, and living in a suburban environment (see Table 10). Additionally, when type of communication was controlled for, having colleagues from the same town stayed significant. However, having colleagues from the neighborhood stopped being significant once communicating with colleagues in person was controlled for (see Table 10a).

Table 7. OLS of organizational SOC focusing on distance from peers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Peers from: neighborhood	2.60*					2.22*				2.02*		2.61**
Town		10.16***				10.24***					6.22***	7.09***
State			1.78			0.22						
Country				1.46		0.50						
Different Country					1.91	1.60						
# of orgs affiliated with							7.21***		5.49***	5.51***	3.13**	3.56**
# of ties in organization								5.51***	3.37***	3.05**	1.91	

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 8. OLS of organizational SOC focusing on distance from peers and demographics

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Peers from: neighborhood	2.46*	2.43*	2.62**	2.58*	2.77**	2.57*	2.70**			2.81**
Town			9.56***	6.98***	7.29***	6.95***		10.22***	9.94***	9.98***
# of Orgs. affiliated with				3.44***	3.42***	2.57***				
Homeownership	2.37*	2.37*	0.81	0.23						
Suburban		-0.34	-0.03							
Freq. of church attend.					-3.09**		-3.00**	-3.08**	-3.02**	-3.16**
Education level						-1.07			-0.41	-0.40

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Having colleagues from the same neighborhood and town may enhance workplace SOC because the proximity allows employees to interact more consistently and outside of the explicit workday hours. The positive relationship between having colleagues throughout the country and workplace SOC may be explained by the substantial military presence in Colorado Springs. One of the main employers of the city is the military ("Major Employers" 2014). Working for the military is linked to frequent travel around the country and moving from base to base. The workplace of the military would have a high rate of colleagues around the country, bound to a common goal and sense of belonging that supports strong SOC (McMillian & Chavis 1986). Having colleagues outside the country may indicate the opposite. Being so far away from colleagues diminishes the potential for the casual run-ins Jacobs (1961) argues are central to SOC.

Table 8a. OLS of org. SOC focusing on distance from and communication with peers

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peers from: neighborhood	1.22		1.98	2.56*		2.10*
Town		6.78***	7.00***			
Communicate in: person	6.77***	3.31***	2.74**		8.57***	
Within the organization				4.62***	2.19*	2.96**
# of orgs. affiliated with						5.22***
# of ties in organization						2.37*

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

However, in the friend group, distance from friends has no impact on SOC whatsoever. In friendships, distance has no weight in how much SOC an individual feels. This supports Wellman (1999) and Fischer's (1982) definitions of SOC, particularly in the context of a city.

These findings affirm both sides of the arguments surrounding the significance of distance to SOC. In the organization and workplace, being from the same town was important to SOC. These results support the belief that living close

to those in your community fosters SOC because it is easier to casually run into each other (Jacobs 1961). From this perspective of community, being physically present when interacting is significant to SOC. Kolb (2008) argues that with the prevalence of the automobile, an entire city can be as accessible. In this sense having peers and colleagues that live within Colorado Springs are is enough to sustain strong SOC. The findings in this study support Kolb (2008), since I found that having colleagues and peers from the same town strengthens SOC in the workplace or organization. There is no indication in my study's findings that living in a city with prevalent automobile reliance for transportation hinders SOC.

Table 9. OLS of workplace SOC focusing on distance from colleagues

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Peers from: neighborhood	1.78					3.70***	3.94***
Town		8.55***				9.84***	9.61***
State			1.84			0.77	0.01
Country				2.04*		2.60**	2.50*
Different Country					1.60	-2.39*	2.47*
# of close colleagues							1.20

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 10. OLS of workplace SOC focusing on distance and demographics

	1	2	3	4	5
Peers from: Neighborhood	3.62***	4.17***			
Town	9.55***	10.31***	8.14***	8.43***	8.45***
Country	3.03**	3.06**			
Different Country	-2.24*	-2.55*			
# of ties in workplace					
Freq. of church attend.				-1.04	
Catholic		0.25			
Homeownership			0.77		
Education	1.68				0.95

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 10a. OLS of workplace SOC focusing on distance and communication with colleagues

	1	2	3	4
Peers from: neighborhood	0.62	-0.08	5.63***	
Town				6.54***
Communicate in person	6.62***	7.24***	5.26***	4.79***
Communicate only at work		3.97***	2.78**	

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

That the respondents' have colleagues from outside their state and a strong positive SOC would support Wellman (1999) and Fischer (1982). Wellman (1999) and Fisher (1982) argue that our society has moved beyond the need to find SOC only within our neighborhood and walk-able zone. People are still able to find and create a strong SOC without living within the same neighborhood. This finding shows that greater distance can even help foster stronger SOC in the organization and workplace. The large distance fostering SOC could indicate that people working and gathering around a niche interest do not rely on existing within the same city. Physical closeness to each other (e.g. same neighborhood or town) is still important to people in finding SOC but it is no longer the main determinant of SOC, especially once it is recognized that people are finding SOC in multiple places in their lives. For example, being close with your neighbors is no longer necessary to finding SOC.

The detachment of people from their immediate area to find SOC is particularly relevant to friendship groups and workplaces. People are free now to find their niches outside of their direct surroundings. In this exploration of niches outside of one's surroundings, friendship groups could be equivocated to Fischer's (1982) interest groups. People demonstrate that they do find SOC outside of their surroundings in how they seek out friend groups and workplace. In both of these instances, people have found strong SOC either completely removed from any relationship to distance (such as in the case of friend group SOC) or with the same strong positive relationship across the country as in the same town (such as in the case of workplace).

In summary, living in the same neighborhood and town as peers and colleagues was only significant to organizational SOC and workplace SOC. Workplace SOC was also supported by having colleagues across the country and friend group SOC had no relationship to any distance from friends. This indicates that having local ties is not necessary to finding SOC.

Does Method of Communication Matter to SOC of City Dwellers?

The significance of methods of communication on SOC was also explored in this study. The variables of communication in this study were if a respondent communicated on the telephone, online, in person, or exclusively at work or at the organization with neighbors, peers, colleagues and friends. None of the communication method variables were collinear for communicating with neighbors, peers, colleagues, or friends.

Organizational SOC is positively related to communicating in person (t = 7.34, p<.001), only communicating at the organization (t = 4.65, p<.001), and the number of people an individual is close with in the organization (t = 2.13, p<.05, see Table 11). To support organizational SOC, people are communicating in ways that require some kind of physical proximity. Additionally, as an individual is affiliated with more organizations their organizational SOC increases at the organization (see Table 12). This finding was controlled for with frequency of church attendance, Catholicism, number of close ties in the organization, number of organizations affiliated with, homeownership (see Table 12).

Table 11. OLS of organizational SOC focusing on communication methods with peers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Communicate: in person	7.34***				6.01***	5.18***	4.74***
Online		6.93***				0.85	1.28
On the telephone			3.73***		1.06	1.52	0.77
Only in organization				4.65***		4.87***	4.14***
# of close ties in organization							2.13*

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 12. OLS of organization SOC focusing on communication methods with peers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Communicate: in person	6.79***			6.62***	7.65***		8.28***	6.97***
In the organization		5.02***		4.97***		3.80***	4.68***	4.31***
# of ties in the organization				2.32*				2.35*
# of organizations			7.03***					
Freq. of church attendance	-1.81	-3.50**	-2.58*	-2.27*				
Homeownership					3.13**	0.33	0.54	-0.15

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Similarly, communicating with colleagues in person (t = 7.13, p<.001) and only within the workplace (t = 3.05, p<.001) were positively related to sense of community in the workplace (see Table 13). Telephone communication in the work place had no relationship to SOC. Online communication was positively related to workplace SOC without controlling for education level was controlled for. Then online communication lost its significance (see Table 13). Online communication was left out of Table 14 for being inconsistently significant. Table 14 demonstrates that communicating in person and within the workplace are significant to workplace SOC even when frequency of church attendance, homeownership and education level were controlled for. Once people who communicate in person with colleagues were controlled for, the number of people in the work place an individual is close to was not statistically significant.

Communicating in person was the only means of communication that had any significant relationship to SOC in the neighborhood (see Table 15).

Communicating in person with neighbors had a strong positive relationship to SOC in the neighborhood (t = 4.73, p<.001). Once people who communicate in person with neighbors, Catholic affiliation and homeownership were controlled for, the number of neighbors an individual was close to was not statistically significant (see Table 16). The significance of communicating in person supports the argument that to have SOC people need to be physically together and connecting. This relationship between physical presence in communication and neighborhood SOC is logical, since what connects people in the neighborhood is the fact that they live there. Homeownership, suburban living environment, the number of ties in the neighborhood, church frequency, Catholicism and education were controlled for (see Table 16).

Table 13. OLS of workplace SOC focusing on communication methods with colleagues

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Communicate: in person	7.13***				5.28***	4.67***	4.56***	5.25***
Online		5.50***				2.20*	1.85	2.22*
On the telephone			4.51***		1.61	1.17	1.25	
Only in workplace				3.05***		3.77***	3.59***	3.49***
# of close ties in workplace								1.25
Education							0.78	

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 14. OLS of workplace SOC focusing on communication methods with colleagues

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Communicate: in person	7.02***	7.10***	6.97***	7.55***	7.10***	6.99***	7.49***
In the workplace				3.71***			3.94***
Freq. of church attend.						-0.74	-1.07
Homeownership	1.68						
Education			1.61	1.04			

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 15. OLS of neighborhood SOC focusing on communication methods with neighbors

	1	2	3	4	5
Communicate: in person	4.73***			4.35***	3.78***
Online		1.35		-0.04	0.14
On the telephone			1.33	0.05	-0.29
# of close neighbors					2.19*

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Communicating online is the only means of communication that has any significant relationship to SOC in the friend group (t = 2.82, p<.01, see Table 17). No other style of communication was important to maintaining or creating SOC in

friend groups. This suggests that those who use online communication are those

who are most dedicated to that community and therefore create a strong SOC. To

communicate online, people are allowed to connect casually and frequently

regardless of any distance separating them. They may also communicate in person

and on the telephone. By also communicating online they are more likely to have

stronger SOC in these friendships. Wellman's (1999) study that indicated that online

communication bolsters SOC rather than diminishes it supports this relationship

between online communication and friend group SOC in this study. Number of

friends, level of education, frequency of church attendance, Catholicism,

homeownership and suburban living environment were controls (see Table 18).

Table 16. OLS of neighborhood SOC focusing on communication methods with neighbors

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Communicate: in person	3.84***	3.60***	2.90**	4.71***	3.91***	4.69***	3.23**	3.36***	3.61***
# of ties in the neighborhood			2.35*				2.19*	1.76	
Freq. of church attend.						0.27			0.06
Catholic				3.77***	3.62***	3.69***		3.41***	3.63***
Homeownership	2.92**	3.02**	3.05**		2.80**		2.91**	2.78**	2.94**
Suburban		-1.13	-1.42						-1.42

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

An individual's highest level of education also had a positive relationship to

friend group SOC, even when controlling for online communication (t = 2.74, p<.01,

see Table 18). This could be explained by the fact that people with higher levels of

education are also likely of a wealthier socioeconomic class and have more free time

to find and dedicate time to friends outside of the workplace, neighborhood,

organization or church. If the individuals with higher levels of education are of a

wealthier socioeconomic class, they may also have more consistent access to

computers and online communication. This would enforce the significance of online

communication to friend group SOC.

Table 17. OLS of friend group SOC focusing on communication methods with friends

	1	2	3	4	5
Communicate: in person	2.41*			1.81	1.77
Online		3.41***		2.91**	2.82**
On the telephone			0.28	-0.13	-0.08
# of close friends					0.24

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 18. OLS of friend group SOC focusing on communication methods

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Online	3.25**		3.15**	2.07**	3.41***	3.39***
Freq. of church attend.			0.63	0.57		
Catholic						0.64
Homeownership				0.67		
Suburban					0.44	
Education	2.74**	2.05**	2.67**	2.25*		

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

In summary, in organizational, neighborhood, and workplace SOC all have a positive relationship with communicating in person (this includes communicating exclusively at work or in the organization). This indicates a strong relationship of physical presence to some areas of SOC, which is related to being close to the community to facilitate SOC. However, online communication was the only method of communication significant to friend group SOC. While being physically present can be important to SOC, people can find SOC without it. This finding shows that sometimes, communicating without being present can foster SOC more than meeting in person would.

Does New Urbanist Design Matter to Sense of Community?

Finally I would like to address the influence of new urbanist (NU) design elements in the neighborhood on neighborhood SOC. Not a single NU element (e.g. sidewalks, front porches, mixed-use properties, multifamily properties, public parks, private yards) had any significant relationship to neighborhood SOC. This insignificance was maintained once homeownership, suburban living environment and education level were controlled for. This finding indicates how unimportant people's neighborhood design is in Colorado Springs to their neighborhood SOC.

People will seek out and sustain SOC in any number of ways; they have any number

of outlets to support SOC. This study has demonstrated how people still support SOC

with physical closeness, but they no longer need physical closeness to establish SOC.

People have SOC in their organizations, workplaces and friend groups. None of these

SOCs require a specific neighborhood design. Even in the neighborhood people find

neighborhood SOC without NU design elements. Design does not change how people

interact and it may be valuable for NU developers to evaluate their marketing pitch

as more empirical research has indicated that they are currently lying about how

their designs revolutionize SOC.

Table 19. A summary table of all consistently significant relationships to each SOC
(+ Positive significance, - Negative significance, X No relationship)

SOC	Catholic	Church Freq	Homeowner	Comm. In pers.	Comm. at org/work	Comm. online	Same neigh	Same town	Same country	Different country
Neigh.	+	X	+	+	N/A	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Org.	X	-	+	+	+	X	+	+	X.	X
Work.	X	X	X	+	+	X	+	+	+	-
Friend.	X	X	X	X	N/A	+	X	X	X	X

CONCLUSION

Previous to this study, SOC had been researched in a way that concluded with

either reliance on local community or rejection of local community entirely. The

findings of this study indicate that people develop and maintain SOC in a variety of

areas in their life. People do not rely only on the neighborhood nor only on

physically distant interest groups for SOC. SOC is found in neighborhoods,

organizations, workplaces and friend groups. Within the distinction of these groups,

being physically close to a community is only significant to neighborhood,

organizational and workplace SOC.

The findings of this study supported both the importance of connection with

local people and acting independently from local connections to facilitate SOC.

Homeownership, a physical connection to a location, enhanced only organizational

and neighborhood SOC. While living at least in the same town as peers from

organizations and workplaces was significant to SOC, SOC in friend groups had no

relationship to distance at all. In friend groups one is just as likely to feel SOC with

the group if they are in the same neighborhood as if they are in a different country.

This independence of SOC from distance is supported by the way that people

communicate with their communities. In the neighborhood, organization, and

workplace interacting in person or exclusively within the location of that

community was strongly significant to SOC. However, SOC in friend groups is

fostered by communicating online. These findings demonstrate how both sides of

the argument for and against locally based SOC need to consider more nuance in the

way they look at SOC. Research surrounding SOC needs acknowledge that SOC can

exist in many different places in a person's life and can be facilitate with or without

a mutual location.

   The initial purpose of this research was to find the relationship between religion

and SOC in a city setting. Specifically this was focused on whether or not religion

enhanced SOC in an individual's immediate area. The findings of this study indicate

that only religious affiliation to Catholicism strengthens the local SOC, defined in this

study as the neighborhood. The only other statistically significant relationship

between religion and SOC was that of frequency of church attendance and

organizational SOC. The more frequently an individual attends religious service, the

less SOC they feel in the organization. While the finding concerning Catholicism

supports my hypothesis, the finding regarding frequency of church attendance

demonstrates that religion can negatively affect SOC. This relates specifically to Fischer (1982) and his study on the differences between SOC in the small town and city. Fischer (1982) found that the significance of religion is lost on SOC in the city. My findings show that this statement does not apply to Colorado Springs. Religion can still be central to SOC in the city dweller's life, but religion's centrality may their diminish SOC.

The findings of this study are important for people living in Colorado Springs to fully understand what such religious environment means to their SOC here. Residents of Colorado Springs are removing themselves from other organizations to dedicate their time and their social ties to religious service. This distances residents from each other and holds them back from engaging in other ways in the city. Instead of following interests to find SOC, as Fischer (1982) found people generally do in cities, residents are limiting themselves to following their church. By dedicating more time to a church, the people of Colorado Springs are choosing religion over other opportunities that come with living in a city. Colorado Springs receives criticism for being a dull city ("Colorado Springs Pukes It Up" 2011, Vogin 2012) that has little to offer its inhabitants. My findings demonstrate that Colorado Springs is supporting people with SOC regardless of the sprawling layout of the city. The religiosity of the residents may be what is actually limiting the amount of interest and effort residents are putting back into developing the city's communities.

These findings are also significant to the work of subdivision developers. Most of the pitch for new urbanism against typical suburban development is that neighborhood design needs densely packed homes, public open space, commercial

properties mixed in, and housing accessible to a variety of socioeconomic classes to enhance SOC. By making these design changes, NU developers argue that quality of life increases (Duany et al. 2000). My results would indicate that none of the design elements of NU foster any neighborhood SOC in Colorado Springs. Neighborhood SOC is bolstered by homeownership and having individuals committed to local SOC. Since homeownership accessible to all socioeconomic classes is adverse to the intentions of the developer who wishes to maximize financial gains, NU development may always be a beacon of elitism or at least a form of development that further perpetuates the segregation of people by socioeconomic class.

A short time frame and finite distribution locations limited this study. Data were collected for at most five hours a day, over three weekends. This limited the number of Colorado Springs residents who I could randomly encounter and ask to be participants. Additionally, the study was also limited by where survey distribution was allowed. Most businesses, institutions and churches would not allow me to distribute my survey at their site. These limitations should be taken into account when interacting with my findings.

In future research it would be valuable to investigate what relationship socioeconomic class has with SOC. Furthermore, including an SOC of church measure would be interesting to reveal whether an increase in religious SOC is related to a decrease in other SOCs. Researching how car ownership interacts with these SOC measures would be valuable as well, particularly in areas with urban sprawl. Further research into the relationship between military employment and SOC in the workplace is needed as well. Finally, doing research with a mix of

qualitative and quantitative analysis would be beneficial to addressing the complexity of these concepts and questions.

 This study has opened the scholarly debate surrounding SOC to new possibilities. As a complex concept that includes a wide variety of intertwined features, SOC needs to be explored. Since the beginning of Sociology, scholars, like Durkheim and Tönnies, have been grappling with how people function in groups and what holds them together or tears them apart. Over one hundred years ago, Durkheim's (1951) study on suicide demonstrated that increased SOC decreased suicide. Today, new urbanist developers make enormous profits by selling homes advertised to bring greater SOC to residents' lives, indicating that SOC is in high demand (Duany et al. 2000, Ellis 2002, Talen 2005). This demand for SOC could be explained by the benefits to quality of life and engagement with society associated with SOC (Davidson & Cotter 1989, Fried 1984). Because of the significance of SOC to everyone's lives, it is important that future research on SOC is careful to let the SOC measure be supported by multiple facets of information as it has in this study. Future research needs to broaden the measure of SOC to allow for new understandings of community to emerge.

REFERENCES

Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society. Vol. 1 of The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

"Colorado Springs Pukes It Up." 2011. *The Denver Egoist.* Retrieved December 17, 2014 (http://www.thedenveregotist.com/news/local/2011/november/16/colorado-springs-pukes-it).

Davidson, William and Patrick Cotter. 1986. "Measurement of Sense of Community Within the Sphere of City." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 16(7): 608-619.

Davidson, William, and Patrick Cotter. 1989. "Sense of Community and Political Participation." *Journal of Community Psychology.* 17(2): 119-125.

Duany, Andres, Elizabeth Platter-Zyberk, & Jeff Speck. 2000. *Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream*. New York: North Point Press.

Durkheim, Emile. 1951. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Durkheim, Emile & W. Halls. 1984. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press.

Ellis, Cliff. 2002. "The New Urbanism: Critiques and Rebuttals". *Journal of Urban Design*, *7*(3), 261-291.

Fischer, Claude. S. 1982. *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, Lance. 2001. "The Effects of Sprawl on Neighborhood Social Ties: An Exploratory Analysis". *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 67(1),

69-77.

Fried, Marc. 1984. "The Structure and Significance of Community Satisfaction."

Population and Environment. 7, 61-86.

Giuffre, Katherine. 2013. *Communities and Networks: Using Social Network Analysis*

to Rethink Urban and Community Studies. Malden, Mass.: Polity Press.

Hillery Jr., George A. 1955. "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement." *Rural*

Sociology. 20(2), 111-123.

Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random

House, Inc.

Kolb, David. 2008. *Sprawling Places.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Long, Adam and Douglas D. Perkins. 2003. "Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the

Sense of Community Index and Development of a Brief SCI." *Journal of*

Community Psychology. 31(3): 279-296.

"Major Employers." 2014. Colorado Springs Business Alliance. Retrieved December

19, 2014. (http://www.coloradospringsbusinessalliance.com/economic-

development/business-climate/major-employers-20130417133725).

McMillan, David W., & David M Chavis. 1986. "Sense Of Community: A Definition And

Theory." *Journal of Community Psychology*, *14*(1), 6-23.

Meier, Richard L. 1968. "The Metropolis as a Transaction-maximizing System."

Daedalus 97(Fall): 1293-1313.

"Metro-Area Membership Report." 2010. Retrieved December 18, 2014.

(http://www.thearda.com/rcms2010/r/m/17820/rcms2010_17820_metro_

name_2010.asp)

Riger, Stephanie & Paul Lavrakas. 1981. "Community Ties: Patterns of Attachment and Social Interaction in Urban Neighborhoods." *American Journal of Community Psychology.* 9: 55-66.

Rogers, George O., & Sineenart Sukolratanametee. 2009. "Neighborhood Design and Sense of Community: Comparing Suburban neighborhoods in Houston Texas." *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *92*, 325-334.

Talen, Emily. 2005. *New Urbanism and American Planning: the Conflict of Cultures.* New York: Routledge.

Tönnies, Ferdinand, & C.P. Loomis. 1957. *Community & Society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

United States Census Bureau. 2014. "Colorado Springs (city) QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau." Retrieved October 13, 2014. (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/08/0816000.html).

Vogrin, Bill. 2012. "SIDE STREETS: Ratings confirm Springs not as hip as Boulder". Retrieved December 17, 2014. (http://gazette.com/side-streets-ratings-confirm-springs-not-as-hip-as-boulder/article/145260)

Wellman, Barry, and Barry Leighton. 1979. "Networks, Neighborhoods and Communities: Approaches to the Study of the Community Question." *Urban Affairs Quarterly.* 15(March): in press.

Wellman, Barry. 1999. *Networks in the Global Village: Life in Contemporary Communities.* Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Webber, Melvin. 1963. "Order in Diversity: Community without Propinquity." Pp. 23-54 in *Cities and Space: The Future Use of Urban Land,* edited by Lowdon

Wingo Jr. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Wood, Lisa, Lawrence D. Frank, & Billie Giles-Corti. 2010." Sense of Community and its relationship with walking and Neighborhood Design." *Social Science and Medicine, 70*, 1381-1390.

APPENDIX

Geographic Distribution of Social Ties in Colorado Springs Survey

1) What is your gender? _____   What is your race? _____   What is your age? _____

2) What is your highest level of education? (Circle the appropriate response)

Some high school   Graduated high school   Some college   Graduated college   Some graduate school
Graduated graduate school

3) How many people do you live with (not including your self)? _____

4) How many people that live with you are related by blood, adoption, or marriage?
_____

For questions 5-12 please circle your response.

5) Are you employed?   Yes   No | 6) Are you married?   Yes   No | 7) Do you own
your home?   Yes   No

8) What description best characterizes your neighborhood?   Rural
Suburban   Urban

9) Which of the following features are present in your neighborhood. (Circle as
many as appropriate)

Side walks   Multi-family dwellings   Public parks   Private yards   Front porches

10) How long have you lived in your neighborhood?   0-1 years   2-15 years
16-30 years   31+ years

11) How long do you intend to stay in the neighborhood? 0-1 years   2-15 years
16-30 years   31+ years

12) How often do you socialize in person, on the phone or online with…. (Check the
appropriate response)

	Never	Less than once a month	Once a month	2-3 times a month	Once a week	Daily
Friends from your neighborhood						
Friends outside your neighborhood						
Family						

13) Roughly how people that live in your neighborhood (who you do not live with) are you close with? ____

14) Please rank how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your neighborhood.
(Check the appropriate response for each statement)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	I do not know my neighbors
I can recognize most of the people in my neighborhood						
I know most of my neighbors very well						
I have influence over what this neighborhood is like						
If there is a problem in this neighborhood, the people who live here can get it solved						
People of the neighborhood watch out for each other						
I feel a sense of community in this neighborhood						
My neighbors and I have the same values						
I feel that sense of community is important to a neighborhood						
It is important to me that I live in this neighborhood						

15) How do you maintain your relationship with the neighbors you are close with?
(Circle all that apply)

Telephone   Email or online communication   Meet in person   I am not close with my neighbors

16) Does the way you maintain your relationship with neighbors matter to you?
Yes   No

17) Roughly how many organizations/clubs/groups (that are not a religious institutions or work places) are you affiliated with? _____

18) Roughly how many people are you close with from one organization/club/group (that is not a religious institution or work place) that are you affiliated with? _____

19) Please rank how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about this one organization/club/group (that is not a religious institution or work place) that are you affiliated with.

(Check the appropriate response for each statement)

20) If you are close with people from an organization/club/group (that is not a religious institution or work place), where do they live in relation to you? (Circle all that apply)

Same neighborhood   Same town   Same state   Same country   Different county   I am not in any clubs

20a) If you are close with people from an organization/club/group (that is not a religious institution or work place), does the distance between you matter to you?
Yes   No   N/A

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	I am not a part of any groups
I can recognize most of the people of the organization/club/group						
I know most of members very well						
I have influence over what this organization/club/group is like						
If there is a problem in this organization/club/group, the members can get it solved						
Members watch out for each other						
I feel a sense of community in this organization/club/group						
Members and I have the same values						
I feel that sense of community is important to a organization/club/group						
It is important to me that I am a part of this organization/club/group						

21) How do you maintain your relationship with the members of the organization/club/group you are close with? (Circle all that apply)

Telephone   Email or online communication   Meet in person   At organization   Not affiliated with any organizations

22) Does the way you maintain your relationship with organization/club/group members matter to you?
     Yes   No   N/A

23) Roughly how many people are you close with from your work place? (If you are not employed, please answer zero.) _____

24) Please rank how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your work place.
(Check the appropriate response for each statement)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	I am not employed
I can recognize most of the people at my work place						
I know most colleagues very well						
I have influence over what this work place is like						
If there is a problem in this work place, the employees can get it solved						
Employees watch out for each other						
I feel a sense of community in this work place						
Colleagues and I have the same values						
I feel that sense of community is important to a work place						
It is important to me that I am a part of this work place						

25) If you are close with people from work, where do they live in relation to you? (Circle all that apply)

Same neighborhood   Same town   Same state   Same country   Different county   I am not employed

25a) If you are close with people from work, does the distance between you matter to you?   Yes   No   N/A

26) How do you maintain your relationship with colleagues you are close with? (Circle all that apply)

Telephone   Email or online communication   Meet in person   At work   I am not employed

27) Does the way you maintain your relationship with work colleagues matter to you?   Yes   No   N/A

28) Roughly how many friends are in the group of people you consider yourself closest with? (This does not need to be connected to work or an organization) ____

29) Please rank how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the group of friends you're closest with. (Check the appropriate response for each statement)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I feel I have known these people for a long time					
I have influence over what we do as a group					
If we fight, I know we will get over it					
We watch out for each other					

I feel a sense of community with these people					
I have the same values as these friends					
I feel that sense of community is important to us					
It is important to me that I am a friends with these people					

25) Where do these friends live in relation to you? (Circle all that apply)

Same neighborhood   Same town   Same state   Same country   Different county

25a) Does the distance between your closest friends matter to you?   Yes   No

26) How do you maintain your relationship with your closest friends? (Circle all that apply)

Telephone   Email or online communication   Meet in person

27) Does the way you maintain your relationship with your closest friends matter to you?   Yes   No

28) How often do you attend church or religious service? (Circle appropriate response)

Never   Less than once a month   Once a month   2-3 Times a month   Once a week   2-3 Times a week   Daily

29) What kind of church of religious service do you attend? (Circle appropriate response)

Protestant   Catholic   Mormon   Jewish   Muslim   Other   I do not attend religious service

30) Roughly how many people from church are you close with? (If you do not attend, the answer can be zero)
_____

31) If you are close with people from church, where do they live in relation to you? (Circle all that apply)

Same neighborhood   Same town   Same state   Same country   Different county   I do not attend

31a) If you are close with people from church, does the distance between you matter to you? Yes   No   N/A

32) How do you maintain your relationship with members of your church that you are close with? (Circle all that apply)

Telephone   Email or online communication   Meet in person   At church   I do not attend religious service

32b) Does the way you maintain your relationship with church members matter to you?   Yes   No   N/A