

# The Center on Philanthropy & Public Policy

## **SOCIAL CAPITAL IN LOS ANGELES**

**Findings from the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey**

**Eleanor Brown  
James M. Ferris**

**Research Paper - 8  
September 2001**

# **SOCIAL CAPITAL IN LOS ANGELES**

## **Findings from the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey**

**Eleanor Brown  
James M. Ferris**

**Research Paper - 8  
September 2001**

Eleanor Brown: Professor, Pomona College; 425 North College Avenue, Room 211; Claremont, CA 91711

James M. Ferris: Professor and Director, The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy; School of Policy, Planning, and Development, University of Southern California, Lewis Hall 210; Los Angeles, CA 90089-0626

## **ABOUT THE CENTER ON PHILANTHROPY AND PUBLIC POLICY**

The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy promotes more effective philanthropy and strengthens the nonprofit sector through research that informs philanthropic decision making and public policy to advance public problem solving. Using California and the West as a laboratory, the Center conducts research on philanthropy, volunteerism, and the role of the nonprofit sector in America's communities.

In order to make the research a catalyst for understanding and action, the Center encourages communication among the philanthropic, nonprofit, and policy communities. This is accomplished through a series of convenings and conversations around research findings and policy issues to help key decision makers work together more effectively to solve public problems and to identify strategies for action.

The opinions presented in this paper represent those of the authors and not those of The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy.

Copyright © 2001 by The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy

The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy  
School of Policy, Planning, and Development  
University of Southern California  
Lewis Hall, Room 210  
Los Angeles, California 90089-0626

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Eleanor Brown** is currently the James Irvine Professor of Economics at Pomona College in Claremont, CA. She has faculty status at the Claremont Graduate University and is currently a Faculty Fellow of the University of Southern California's Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy. Her current research agenda is centered on individual philanthropy and volunteer labor in the United States. Dr. Brown earned her B.A. degree from Pomona College and her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in Economics from Princeton University. Her early research focused on unemployment insurance design and its effects on short-term unemployment. She has taught at the University of Florida and at Princeton University, and is a past co-editor of *Economic Inquiry*. She is currently a deputy editor of *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* and conference program chair for the Association for the Study of the Grants Economy.

**James M. Ferris** holds the Emery Evans Olson Chair in Nonprofit Entrepreneurship and Public Policy in the School of Policy, Planning and Development at the University of Southern California. He directs the USC Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy. Professor Ferris specializes in the economics of the public and nonprofit sectors, public finance, and public policy. His research examines the shifting roles of the public, nonprofit and for-profit sectors in governance and the economy. He has done extensive work on public service delivery, focusing on the contracting decisions of local governments and strategies to improve public sector performance through competition, decentralization, and privatization. He is currently investigating the causes and consequences of the conversion of healthcare organizations from nonprofit to for-profit status and the implications for the nonprofit role in healthcare; the changing landscape of philanthropy; and intersectoral alliances for urban problem solving.

## FOREWORD

Over the last decade, there has been an increasing recognition of the importance of social capital – the glue that connects individuals within our communities – in shaping our ability to work cooperatively to solve our public problems. Along with this realization, there has been an ongoing debate over trends in our stock of social capital. Is it declining? If so, why and what can be done to reverse the decline?

In an effort to begin to document the level of social capital in our communities and variations across them, a national study of social capital was spearheaded by Robert Putnam to establish a benchmark of social capital in communities across the United States. The California Community Foundation and some 33 other foundations across the nation collaborated with Robert Putnam of Harvard University and his colleagues at the Saguaro Seminar in conducting an extensive survey of social capital based on personal interviews.

This report presents preliminary findings from the Los Angeles survey. It includes an analysis of that data in the context of the results of the larger study, including those in similarly situated communities.

The work reported here represents a collaborative effort of the California Community Foundation and the Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy. We hope that these initial results will provide insight into social capital in Los Angeles and what might be done to increase its stock so as to build greater connections in the community and enable us to work more effectively to solve public problems.

James M. Ferris  
Director  
Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy  
University of Southern California

Jack Shakely  
President  
California Community Foundation

## **SOCIAL CAPITAL IN LOS ANGELES: Findings from the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey**

### **Introduction**

There has been an increasing focus in recent years on governance – the capacity of communities to undertake collective action – either through the formal structures of government or the more informal networks and processes of nonprofit organizations and community groups. With this emphasis has come the recognition of the importance of social capital – the social networks among individuals and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them.<sup>1</sup> The reciprocity and trustworthiness created through dense networks of interactions among individuals, particularly within a community, increase the ability of individuals and groups to work together for common purposes. Thus, like other forms of capital – financial, physical, human – social capital increases productivity.

Of particular importance in the contribution of social capital to governance is “bridging” social capital. Bridging social capital arises from networks that extend across various social groups. As such, this type of social capital helps to build reciprocity and trust across groups. In contrast, bonding social capital is derived from networks that are inward-looking and that build solidarity within established groups, without necessarily creating value outside of the group. While bridging social capital is more productive in terms of building a capacity for public problem solving, it is also likely to be more difficult foster because it requires building connections among individuals who are not likely to interact on a regular basis.

Even with a widespread belief that social capital matters, we know very little about how to measure it, let alone how much there exists, how much it contributes, or what steps can be taken to increase the stock of social capital. In an effort to expand our understanding of social capital, a survey was conducted to gauge the level of social capital in Los Angeles and various other communities across the United States. This report presents and interprets the initial findings for Los Angeles. It briefly describes the survey project and measures of social capital constructed from the questionnaire, reports the survey results and provides, based on some analysis, possible interpretations.<sup>2</sup>

### **The Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey**

The Social Capital Community Benchmark (SCCB) survey is the result of a partnership among Robert Putnam of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, the Ford Foundation, and 33 community foundations across the United States.<sup>3</sup> The survey was specifically designed to measure the levels of various kinds of social capital within a community.

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone*, Simon and Schuster, 2000, p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Analysis of the survey data is continuing with the support of a research grant to the authors from the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation.

<sup>3</sup> Additional details on the Social Capital Community Benchmark survey are available at: [www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey](http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey).

The measures of social capital are constructed based on the patterns of individual attitudes, behavior and activities in a community as revealed in the survey.

The interviews elicited information on individual characteristics (education, age, income, length of time in residence in the community), a variety of behaviors and activities (giving, volunteering, church attendance, voting and other forms of political participation), attitudes, and perceptions about the local community. This questionnaire was designed to make possible the creation of several indicators of social capital, including social trust, associational involvement, faith-based engagement, diversity of friendships, and political participation.

The survey, conducted by phone interview, includes a representative national sample of 3003 individuals, as well as representative samples within particular communities such as Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles survey represents a random sample of 515 individuals countywide. Interviews were conducted in English or, at the respondent's request, in Spanish. The data were weighted to be representative of the community. Selected characteristics of the Los Angeles sample are presented in the appendix.

The SCCB national sample allows us to compare Los Angeles's stocks of social capital with national averages. SCCB data from individual communities make it possible to examine just how distinct the patterns of social capital in Los Angeles are. Within California, Los Angeles can be contrasted with San Diego, San Francisco, and the Silicon Valley. It also can be compared with cities in southwestern border states such as Phoenix and Houston; and across the country it can be contrasted with other major urban areas such as Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Denver, and Seattle.

## **Dimensions of Social Capital**

Theoretical understanding of social capital informed the work of Putnam's team as they created indexes of social capital based on several survey questions. For example, the answers to six questions about trusting people in various contexts are combined to form a Social Trust index. Preliminary index formulations were then tested against the data to see whether the constituent questions elicited answers that showed high levels of correlation. If the items did not seem to form a well-defined index, the preliminary index was replaced by a reformulation that made theoretical sense and better fit the data.

Three of the originally proposed indexes were replaced. An index of civic participation was reconceptualized as two indexes, one measuring activist ("protest") political involvement and the other electoral participation. Indexes on faith-based social capital and community leadership were also reworked. In the end, the Harvard team computed ten indexes they felt were the most meaningful indicators of various aspects of social capital. The indexes measure: social trust; interracial trust; electoral politics; protest politics; civic leadership; associational involvement; informal socializing; diversity of friendships; giving and volunteering; and faith-based engagement.

For this analysis we adopted the Harvard team's preferred indexes, with one exception. The redefined index for faith-based engagement contains information on religion-focused giving and volunteering, whereas the alternative version does not. In a research context that demands the most comprehensive measure of faith-based social capital, the broad index is a natural choice. In the current context, however, we are focusing on Los Angeles and all ten dimensions of social capital. For our purposes, which include measures of both giving and volunteering on the one hand and faith-based engagement on the other, we chose the narrower faith-based social capital index. In this way we avoid having the same questions influence more than one dimension of social capital.

In this section, we describe the indexes, and then turn to a comparison of Los Angeles and the national sample in each of these dimensions of social capital.

*Social Trust.* Six questions go into the social trust index. One is the question on general trust, "Would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?" The other five are about trusting people encountered in specific community-based contexts. Respondents were asked whether they trust "a lot, some, only a little, or not at all" the "people in your neighborhood;" "people you work with;" "people at your place of worship;" "people who work in the stores where you shop;" and "the police in your local community." The questions were weighted equally and scores were standardized by subtracting the mean and then dividing by the standard deviation of the national sample for each question.

*Racial Trust.* Respondents are asked whether they trust "a lot, some, only a little, or not at all" people in each of four racial/ethnic categories, and the responses to categories other than the respondent's are equally weighted in computing an index of racial trust.

*Diversity of Friendships.* This index counts how many of eleven types of friends the respondent says are represented in the set of people that includes "everyone that you would count as a PERSONAL FRIEND, not just your closest friends." The eleven categories cover people who: own their own business; are manual workers; have been on welfare; own a vacation home; have a different religious orientation (not Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, depending on the respondent's affiliation, or who is very religious, if the respondent gave "no religion" as an affiliation); are white; are Latino or Hispanic; are Asian; are black /African American; are gay or lesbian; and those who can be described as community leaders.

*Formal Group Involvement.* This counts the number of kinds of groups the respondent has been involved with in the 12 months prior to the interview. Two versions of this index are calculated, varying in whether they include an item asking about taking part in "any sort of activity with people at your church or place of worship other than attending services." The 18 questions included in both versions of the index cover the following kinds of groups: an organization affiliated with religion other than a place of worship; an adult sports or outdoor activity club or league; youth organizations such as scouts or youth sports leagues; a parents organization or other school support group; a veteran's group; a neighborhood association; organizations for seniors; a service-providing charity organization; a labor union; a professional or trade association; service clubs or fraternal (sorrowful) associations; ethnic, nationality, or civil rights groups; a literary or fine arts group; other hobby or pastime (e.g. investing, gardening) societies;



support groups and self-help groups for persons with specific problems; groups that meet only over the Internet; and other clubs or organizations. To avoid duplication of items incorporated into the faith-based social capital index, we use the Formal Group Involvement index that excludes the question on activities with people from the respondent's place of worship.

*Faith-Based Social Capital.* Four items are used for the construction of this index. They are whether or not the respondent is a member of a local religious community; frequency of attendance at religious services, measured in five ranges from at least every week to less than a few times per year; whether or not the respondent had participated in an activity other than services with people from his or her local religious community in the past 12 months; and whether the respondent was involved with a religious group other than his or her congregation. An alternative index is available that also includes charitable contributions to religious causes, standardized by the national mean and standard deviation; and number of times volunteered, also standardized by the national sample's mean and standard deviation.

*Organizational Activism.* This score builds on four items. The first of these is the version of the Formal Group Involvement index (described above) that does not include church-based activities. Also included is the number of times in the past twelve months the respondent attended a club meeting, and the number of times he or she attended any meeting at which school or town affairs were discussed. The fourth item asks whether the respondent has served as an officer or served on a committee of any local club or organization. The index value is described in the codebook as consisting of "the factor score resulting from a principal components analysis" of these four variables.

*Informal Social Interactions.* This index is based on the answers to five questions about socializing over the past twelve months. Respondents are asked how many times they played cards or board games with others, visited with relatives, entertained friends at home, socialized with friends in public places, and socialized with co-workers outside of work. Their scores on each question are standardized by the national mean and standard deviation. The index is the mean value of the standardized scores.

*Giving and Volunteering.* Respondents were asked two questions about charitable contributions and a longer series of questions about volunteer activities. Contributions of "money, property or other assets for a wide variety of charitable purposes" in the past twelve months were queried first for religious causes and then for all "non-religious charities, organizations, or causes." Responses were coded into six ranges, from "none" to "more than \$5,000." Volunteering was defined as "any unpaid work you've done to help people besides your family and friends or people you work with." The first question asked how many times in the past month the respondent had volunteered. If the respondent indicated a positive amount of volunteering, a series of six questions asked if any of the volunteering was for a specific cause. The six areas of volunteer activity queried are: for one's place of worship; for health care or fighting particular diseases; for school or other youth-centered programs; to help the poor or the elderly; for the arts or other cultural organizations; for any neighborhood or civic group. The number of volunteer activities is converted to a monthly measure, and the index is computed as the average of the scores on the two contributions questions, number of times volunteered monthly, and, for each of the activity areas, dummy variables indicating whether the individual volunteered.

*Electoral Politics.* This index is based on five questions relating to interest in and involvement in electoral politics. Two yes-or-no questions are whether the respondent is registered to vote and whether he or she voted in the most recent (1996) presidential election. One question asks how many days last week the respondent read a newspaper; this is divided by seven to produce an answer that can range from zero to one. The respondent is asked to name the two senators from her state; partial credit is given for getting close to a correct name, and again the scores are standardized so that getting both correct confers one point and neither even approximately correct confers zero points. The fifth question asks whether the respondent is “not at all interested,” “only slightly interested,” “somewhat interested,” or “very interested” in politics and national affairs. The answers are scaled to range from zero to one. The index is then the average of these five scores.

*Activist (or “Protest”) Politics.* This measures issue-related involvement in politics beyond general electoral participation, with all questions referring to the previous twelve-month period. Respondents are asked whether they have signed a petition; attended a political meeting or rally; and/or have participated in demonstrations, boycotts, or marches. Three further questions ask about involvement with politically active groups such as labor unions; ethnic, nationality or civil rights groups; and other public interest or political action groups or party committees. A seventh question asked whether any group in which the respondent was involved had taken any local action for social or political reform. The index is calculated as the mean of the answers to these questions.

## **Social Capital: Los Angeles and the National Sample**

Scores of the social capital indexes for the Los Angeles sample and the national sample are presented in Table 1. The data are from the weighted samples.

**Table 1: Social Capital Indexes: Mean Scores for Los Angeles and the U.S.**

<i>Index</i>	<i>Los Angeles</i>	<i>U. S.</i>	<i>Statistically Different?</i>
Formal Group Involvement (FGI)	2.84	3.00	yes
Organizational Activism (OA)	-.06	-.02	yes
Faith-based Social Capital (FB)	-.11	-.04	yes
Giving and volunteering (GV)	4.64	5.12	yes
Protest Politics (PP)	.99	1.03	no
Electoral Politics (EP)	2.42	2.86	yes
Social Trust (ST)	-.30	-.00	yes
Interracial Trust (IT)	1.83	2.04	yes
Informal Socializing (IS)	-.16	-.01	yes
Diversity of Friendships (DF)	5.92	6.04	no

All of the indexes are constructed so that a higher value indicates a higher level of social capital. Los Angeles scores lower on each index, and the differences are statistically significant in all areas but two: protest politics and diversity of friendships. This comparison indicates that Los

Angeles has a social capital deficit. How do we explain these results? In the next section of this paper, we look at some possible explanations of the widespread "shortfall" in social capital in Los Angeles.

## Social Capital Deficits in Los Angeles: How Do We Interpret Them?

### *Social Capital in Large Metropolitan Areas*

A first natural question is whether all big cities look like Los Angeles. Table Two provides a look at index values for other large cities in the Social Capital Benchmark survey, comparing them to the nationally representative sample. A "+" indicates that the metropolitan region's social capital score on a particular index is statistically significantly higher than the national average; a "-" indicates that it is lower. The names of the indexes are abbreviated as shown in Table One.

**Table 2: Average Social Capital Index Scores in Selected Metropolitan Areas:  
Statistically Significant Variations from National Averages**

<i>Metro Area</i>	<i>Index</i>									
	<i>FGI</i>	<i>OA</i>	<i>FB</i>	<i>GV</i>	<i>PP</i>	<i>EP</i>	<i>ST</i>	<i>IT</i>	<i>IS</i>	<i>DF</i>
<i>California:</i>										
Los Angeles	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	
San Diego		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	
San Francisco			-	-	+		-	-		+
Silicon Valley	-	-	-	-					-	
<i>Other Southwest:</i>										
Houston	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	
Phoenix	-	-	-	-	-		-	-		
<i>Other:</i>										
Atlanta	+		+	+	-		-		-	+
Boston			-	-	+	+	-		-	+
Chicago				-			-	-	-	
Denver			-	-	+		-			+
Seattle	+	+	-		+	+	+	+		+

- + metropolitan region displays a statistically significantly higher level of social capital than the national average
- metropolitan region displays a statistically significantly lower level of social capital than the national average

The results in Table 2 are striking. Of the six cities in the southwestern U.S., only San Francisco scores higher than the national average on any measure of social capital. Of the five metropolitan regions outside the southwest, only Chicago fails to exceed the national average on at least one measure. The other four cities exceed the national average on at least as many dimensions of social capital as the number of dimensions on which they fall short.

We cannot conclude, then, that big American cities lag the country in their stocks of social capital. The concentration of social capital deficits in the southwest links Los Angeles to a particular group of cities that may share certain features, such as rapid population growth and large immigrant populations.

Looking down the columns in Table 2, it is apparent that certain dimensions of social capital are consistently more or less prevalent in metropolitan parts of the country. The results in Table 2 suggest that people in large cities enjoy a broader spectrum of friendships than do other Americans. It is not to be taken for granted that the diversity of one's friendships would be greater in a large and diverse city, because size allows for stratification and the kinds of diversity measured in this index, as discussed above, include diversity across socio-economic groups that might be subject to stratification.

City residents are less likely to express trust, however. With the exception of Seattle, no city is more trusting, either generally (ST in the Table 2) or across racial lines (IT), than the country as a whole, and residents of most of the cities in this sample express less trust. It may be that large and anonymous cities require of their residents a certain sophistication in dealing with others that makes them less likely to agree, as the question asks, that "most people can be trusted" rather than "you can't be too careful." It may be that higher crime rates have given city residents more reasons not to trust. As for the interracial trust variable, the higher scores in non-metropolitan America may say little more than that it is easier to trust people you view as different in the abstract than up close, and it is easier to trust "them" when you have them vastly outnumbered.

The other dimension of social capital along which large cities are disadvantaged is informal socializing (IS). It may be that urban sprawl leaves people commuting when they should be schmoozing, and living too far from their workplace friends to have the kind of social life that can be sustained in a smaller setting.

### ***Living in Los Angeles: What it means for Social Capital***

Along most of the dimensions measured in the Social Capital Benchmark survey, Los Angeles has less social capital than the nation on average. In this section, we explore these social capital gaps. For policy purposes, it is useful to know which parts of the gap are attributable to the distinctive population of Los Angeles. For example, LA is a haven for persons ambitious to begin a new life. If LA accommodates more newcomers than the national average, and if newcomers everywhere are less plugged into networks of social capital, the relatively low social capital scores for LA may be little more than a restatement that LA attracts people. If, on the other hand, the dynamism and scope of LA make it hard to weave social capital more globally, the challenges for public policy are quite different. In this section, we explore the impact on

social capital indexes of the length of time people have lived in LA, their levels of educational attainment, and citizenship status.

### *Social Capital and Length of Residence in Los Angeles*

Becoming involved in a community's organizations takes time. When the Los Angeles data are weighted to mirror the nation in terms of length of residency within the community, Los Angeles' scores on the three organization-intensive measures of social capital improve. The gap in scores between LA and the national sample on formal group involvement and on organizational activism both close by over 40 percent and cease to be statistically significant. The social capital index measuring faith-based social capital relies in part on questions about involvement with a religious community, both in service attendance and in doing things with fellow congregants beyond service attendance; its gap shrinks by 30 percent and it too becomes statistically insignificant.

### *Social Capital and Citizenship*

One of the biggest demographic differences between the Los Angeles and the national samples lies in the proportion of respondents who are not citizens of the United States. In the national data, five percent of respondents report that they are not citizens; in Los Angeles, 26 percent report that they are not citizens. Citizenship is almost certainly related to involvement in electoral politics, one of the dimensions of social capital along which Los Angeles scores poorly.

To see the effect of citizenship on electoral politics and other measures of social capital, non-citizens are dropped from the data and comparisons between Los Angeles and the national sample are repeated on the subsamples of respondents who report themselves to be US citizens. When attention is focused on respondents who are US citizens, Los Angeles looks like a typical large city. It scores significantly below the national average on the three dimensions of social capital that large cities tend to score poorly on: social trust, interracial trust, and informal socializing. It also scores significantly above the national average on the two dimensions in which large cities tend to do well more often than they do badly: diversity of friendships and protest politics. Much of what is distinctive about Los Angeles, in terms of explaining its stock of social capital, is that Los Angeles is an attractive city to noncitizens, and noncitizens do not score as well as citizens on the measures of social capital included in the survey.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to reflect at length on the civic responsibilities of noncitizens or to invent measures of social capital appropriate to immigrant communities. We note that the status of noncitizen is not permanent; noncitizens choose to become citizens; they give birth to citizens. To say that Los Angeles has a large population of noncitizens who bring down average social capital scores is to say that it has a lot of residents who, like newcomers, are in many ways at an early stage of the process of weaving themselves and their families into the social fabric. It is not a mark of community failure. Further, Los Angeles is rich in ethnic communities whose forms of social capital (belonging, for example, to a revolving credit group) lie below the radar screen of the SCCB survey; indeed, their networks are likely to extend back to their home countries. It is also likely that immigrant communities are rich in informal helping and sharing arrangements that go unmeasured in the SCCB survey; there is evidence from other sources that

sizable proportions of Californians' giving and volunteering flows through personal networks rather than through formal organizations.<sup>4</sup>

### *Social Capital and Education*

More troubling is the importance of education in explaining the social capital gap in Los Angeles. In a city that attracts newcomers, being at the bottom of the educational attainment hierarchy can mean fierce competition for jobs; it can mean living in lower-cost neighborhoods with high levels of residential mobility and the social turmoil that comes with that mobility.

Restricting attention to survey respondents with at most a high school degree, the disadvantaged position of persons with low educational attainment in Los Angeles is stark. Even though the smaller sample sizes should make it harder to find statistically significant results, Los Angeles residents with a high school degree or less scored significantly lower than their low-education counterparts nationwide *on every single index of social capital*.

This is a serious enough result to deserve further investigation. Education is correlated with income. It may be that low-income residents enjoy less social capital than others, regardless of their educational attainment. Education is correlated with citizenship status, and we have seen that the high proportion of the Los Angeles sample made up of noncitizens accounts for a great deal of the social capital profile. To control for the effects of citizenship and income while estimating the effects of limited educational attainment on embeddedness in stocks of social capital, we use regression analysis. We regress each social capital index on a dummy variable equal to one if the respondent has no education beyond high school and on two dummy variables indicating respectively a low-income (below \$30,000) or middle-income (from \$30,000 to \$75,000) household. Because birth cohort has been shown to be an important factor in analyzing social capital, and education levels and the proportion of noncitizens varies across cohorts, we also control for age. These regressions are reported in table A-2 in the appendix.

Once again, the relationship between low education and low social capital is striking. Across the ten regressions the coefficient on the low education variable is negative and significant *for every single index of social capital*. The effects of income are much less pervasive. Middle-income households have higher stocks of faith-based social capital relative to the excluded category: households with incomes of \$75,000 or more. Low-income households score significantly lower than affluent ones on the index of giving and volunteering, on electoral politics, and on social trust. (Of course, these results reflect the lines we have drawn in defining "low" and "middle" incomes. The effect of very low incomes is likely to be more devastating than the effects of falling below a threshold of \$30,000. A similar caveat applies to our results on the importance of educational attainment: the effects of being a high school drop-out are likely to be more severe than those reported for a low-education population that includes high school graduates.)

A significant fraction, 48 percent, of the low-education population in Los Angeles consists of noncitizens. As a policy matter, it is important to know whether the deleterious effect on social capital due to low education is felt by noncitizens in particular or by the low-education

---

<sup>4</sup> Michael O'Neill and William Roberts, *Giving and Volunteering in California*, University of San Francisco, 2000.

population generally. To test whether there is an interactive effect between having low educational attainment and being a noncitizen, the regressions were rerun with an additional variable interacting noncitizenship with low education. The new variable is a dummy variable that takes on the value 1 for respondents who are noncitizens with no education beyond high school, and that take on the value of zero otherwise. The new variable is significant only for the index measuring the respondent's diversity of friendships: being both less educated and not a citizen depresses the diversity of one's pool of friends. The only impact on the low-education variable of controlling for a respondent's being both a noncitizen and having no education beyond high school comes in the regression explaining faith-based social capital. In this one instance, the negative effect of low education disappears when its interaction with citizenship is taken into account. The sign remains negative, however, and the variable is significant at the .10 level.

## **Summary**

The results of the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey shine a spotlight on the challenges facing Los Angeles. This analysis reveals that social capital, as measured by the ten indices derived from the survey, is shaped in large part by some of the distinctive features of our community and region. Los Angeles scores lower on social capital indexes than the national average, as do the other large cities in California and the Southwest included in the study. This contrasts with the relatively high scores of large cities in other regions of the United States.

The population dynamics of Los Angeles, in particular its large immigrant community, has an important influence on the levels of social capital in this community. When one accounts for the length of residence and citizenship status of Los Angelenos, much of the gap in social capital between LA and the national sample closes. Thus, the social capital benchmark in Los Angeles as measured by this methodology indicates that norms and networks are more difficult to establish in communities with such mobility. Thus, in some sense it is not that surprising that communities in transition have low stocks of social capital.

But, it is difficult to escape the fact that a significant driver of the social capital deficit in Los Angeles is low educational attainment. The correlation between low educational attainment and low levels of social capital does not disappear when controlling for population dynamics as proxied by age and citizenship. While the underlying causal relation is not known, the fact that those with low levels of education are disadvantaged not only in the labor market, but in connections with their communities, should serve as a reminder that education is among the most important opportunities a community can provide its residents.

These findings present an initial assessment of social capital in Los Angeles. This analysis suggests several questions for further work. For example, what other factors affect our levels of social capital, and to what extent does such an analysis suggest strategies for intervention? Why is philanthropy and volunteering the one dimension of social capital on which LA falls short that cannot be explained away by appeals to length of residency, a preponderance of noncitizens, or the traits of big cities generally? And, finally, can we devise measures of social capital that are directly linked to the capacity for effective governance in Los Angeles?

## Appendix

Table A-1  
Selected SCCB Survey Data, Los Angeles, Unweighted and Weighted Samples

	Unweighted	Weighted
Gender of respondent:		
% male	46	48
% female	54	52
Age:		
18-34	37	38
35-49	34	33
50-64	18	16
65 and older	12	13
Language of interview:		
% English	84	78
% Spanish	16	22
Citizenship:		
% US citizens	81	74
Race/Ethnicity:		
% white	42	35
% African American	12	9
% Asian American	8	14
% Latino/Hispanic	39	43
Part of LA county:		
% central city of MSA	29	29



Educational Attainment:

Less than high school	14	26
High school diploma/GED	19	15
Some college	25	21
Associate or technical degree	9	7
Bachelors degree	16	16
Some graduate training	5	4
Graduate degree	13	11

Income:

Less than \$30,000	35	40
\$30,000 to \$75,000	39	35
\$75,000 or more	27	24

Homeowner status:

% own	50	48
-------	----	----

Religious preference:

Protestant	25	25
Catholic	39	44
Other Christian	14	11
Jewish	4	3
Other	4	5
No religion	14	13

Employment status:

Working	66	62
Temporarily laid off	3	3
Unemployed	4	5
Retired	12	13
Permanently Disabled	2	2
Homemaker	9	12
Student	5	5

Marital Status:

Never married	32	31
Widowed	6	6
Divorced	12	9
Separated	5	6
Currently married	44	49

Cohabitation among unmarried:		
% living with partner	26	32
Kids in household:		
None	54	50
1	16	17
2	18	19
3-4	11	12
5 or more	2	2

Table A-2  
Regressions of Social Capital Indexes on Explanatory Variables

<i>Coefficient for:</i>					<i>Social Capital Index:</i>					
	IT	DF	FGI	FB	IS	GV	PP	EP	OA	ST
constant	1.819**	5.084**	1.385*	-0.831**	.287*	2.869**	.591*	.649**	-0.412*	-0.490**
Low income	-0.123	-0.283	-0.461	.009	-0.091	-1.162*	-0.133	-0.290*	-0.119	-0.234**
Middle inc.	-0.034	.134	.169	.191*	.082	-0.297	-0.036	.228	-0.078	.122
US citizen	-0.161	1.225**	.827*	.109	.151	2.045**	.672**	1.201**	.181	-0.136
High school or less	-0.637**	-1.535**	-1.926**	-0.213*	-0.260**	-2.480**	-0.716**	-1.040**	-0.482**	-0.550**
Age	0.011**	.019*	.044**	.014**	-0.011**	.056**	.006	.034**	.012**	.014**
<i>n</i>	282	319	319	317	319	319	319	319	319	319
<i>Adj. R<sup>2</sup></i>	.21	.16	.21	.11	.10	.23	.12	.50	.12	.25

Abbreviations used for social capital indexes:

IT	Interracial trust
DF	Diversity of Friendships
FGI	Formal Group Involvement
FB	Faith-Based
IS	Informal socializing
GV	Giving and volunteering
PP	Protest politics
EP	Electoral politics
OA	Organizational activism
ST	Social trust