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On May 23, 2017, Philadelphia-area residents came together in conversation to talk about issues that impact Philadelphia and the quality of life in and around the city. Known as On the Table Philly, this conversation-oriented initiative was an opportunity for friends, families, neighbors, colleagues, and even people who were meeting for the first time to gather around a shared meal and have a real dialogue about what is important to them with the intention of fueling meaningful change.

The Philadelphia Foundation (TPF) organized On the Table Philly with support from The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Knight Foundation has brought On the Table to 10 cities across the country in 2017: Lexington, KY (March 15); Philadelphia, PA (May 23); Long Beach, CA (September 23); Gary, IN (September 26); Akron, OH (October 3); Detroit, MI (October 4); Miami, FL (October 17); Charlotte, NC (October 25); Columbus, GA (November 7); and San Jose, CA (November 15). This On the Table replication project draws from an initiative that originated in Chicago in 2014 as part of The Chicago Community Trust’s Centennial celebration. Since its inception and expansion into other cities, On the Table has been an occasion for residents of a city or region to convene and discuss local opportunities and challenges while focusing on strategies to make their communities safer, stronger, and more dynamic.

All 10 cities designated one day in 2017 to convene residents in mealtime conversations for discussions on how to make their city a better place to live, work, and play. Following the conversations, participants have the opportunity to take a survey about their On the Table experience. This survey features 28 questions that are standard across all 10 cities, plus up to five additional questions that are unique to each city. Cities then receive a report summarizing and analyzing the survey data and a link to a data exploration tool. Community foundations can use insights from the data to inform strategic planning, and local decision-makers, organizations, and residents can use the data to collaborate around improving the quality of life in their cities. A national report incorporating data from all 10 cities and exploring correlations and comparisons in the full data set will be produced in early 2018.

TPF organized the inaugural On the Table Philly in order to provide an opportunity for Philadelphia-area residents to come together, collaborate, connect with others, and become more involved in their communities. As a catalyst for conversation, On the Table Philly allowed area residents to take that first step in becoming powerful civic actors driving change. Like any community, Philadelphia faces its own unique set of challenges, and while organizers of On the Table Philly recognize there is no “quick fix” to the region’s problems, they believe progress can spring from residents naming what they consider to be their communities’ needs and identifying the opportunities that can help move Philadelphia forward.

Research Methodology
Knight Foundation invited the University of Illinois at Chicago’s (UIC) Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) to serve as the research partner for this On the Table initiative. We set out to gain a deeper understanding of the conversations through results gathered from a survey of On the Table Philly participants. This report presents the results of the survey and incorporates analyses to provide insight into the summary data. The data itself can be accessed and explored through ipce.shinyapps.io/OTTPhillydata.

The central questions guiding this research include: Who responded to the survey? How did the conversations go? How did the conversations impact respondents? Additionally, TPF was interested in learning more specifically about respondent’s views on the quality of life in Greater Philadelphia,

---

1 See Appendix A for the full survey.
important community issues, and informational needs within communities. These research questions and learning objectives influenced the formatting of the survey, which included a total of 33 questions.

We collected survey data using three methods: a public web link to the Qualtrics survey, an e-mailed unique link to the Qualtrics survey, and distributed print surveys, upon request. To accommodate non-English speakers, the survey was translated into Spanish. The collection of survey data began the morning of the On the Table Philly conversations (May 23) when the public web link opened. On the same day and immediately following conversations, print surveys were made available to participants. Following the conversations, 1,191 participants received an e-mail invitation to take the survey. Surveys were collected through June 26.

The respondent population discussed in this report is a self-selected sample of participants who partially or fully completed the survey. All three survey sources yielded a total of 974 responses (354 through the e-mailed unique link, 0 through the web link, and 620 through the print survey). Because this group constitutes a non-random sample of total participants, conclusions cannot be scientifically generalized beyond the respondent group. Even with that caveat, however, the data and analysis provide useful insight into the opinions, habits, and backgrounds of a number of engaged Philadelphia-area residents.

THE CONVERSATIONS

Who Responded?
Given that the perspectives, ideas, and experiences of nearly 1,000 respondents inform this report, it is worth exploring what we know about who responded to the survey. This section summarizes data about respondent demographics such as gender, age, level of educational attainment, race and/or ethnicity, geography, length of residence, and homeownership status; it also presents information about respondents’ civic attitudes and engagement behaviors. Additionally, it incorporates Philadelphia County comparison data and national comparison data where available.

2 We had contact information (e-mail address) only for those who provided it through the registration process or during sign-in on the day of their conversation. Registration and signing in were not required for participation, and those who did not register or sign in were able to access the survey through the public web link shared by TPF or through print surveys. In total, we sent a survey to 1,191 unique and valid e-mail addresses, correcting for duplicates and inaccurate e-mail addresses.

3 See Appendix B for a summary report featuring visualizations of responses for all survey questions.

4 In general, response rates are calculated by the number of surveys completed divided by the number of individuals asked to participate in the survey. In this case, some of the surveys came from people with whom we may not have had contact—i.e., paper surveys that could not be matched with an e-mail address in the registrant database—and some paper survey respondents may have given us a different email than the one used for registration. Accordingly, we calculate a response rate range as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{Respondents with matched registrant contact info}}{\text{Total Registrants}} \leq \text{Response Rate} \leq \frac{\text{Total Respondents}}{\text{Registrants}}
\]

This results in a response rate no less than 51% and no higher than 82%. The calculation of response rate is typically a precise measure in survey research based on knowing the full universe of potential respondents who had equal opportunity to complete a survey. However, since we do not know the full universe of On the Table Philly participants, we caution against drawing conclusions based on this estimate.

5 When comparing On the Table Philly data to Philadelphia County resident data, only those respondents who live in Philadelphia County (and not the full data set) are compared to the representative data.
Without having survey data for everyone who participated in the *On the Table Philly* initiative, we are unable to explain differences (if any) between our respondent group and regional and national comparison groups. While we have survey data for respondents, this data should not be assumed to fully reflect participation in the *On the Table Philly* initiative. It is important to note that this study did not incorporate a random sample but instead represents a subset of *On the Table Philly* participants—a subset of the Greater Philadelphia population—who self-selected to respond to the survey.

**Demographics**
The gender of respondents tilted heavily female (68%), as less than one-third (31%) of respondents identified as male (see Figure B.1). The largest age group was made up of respondents aged 60 years and up, with 28% of respondents having reported an age in this range. Those aged 18-29 as well as those in their 40s made up the smallest age groups at 16% (see Figure B.2). The percentage of respondents who reported living in Philadelphia County and who fell within the 60 years and up age group was similar to the county percentage of those in this age range. Just over one-quarter (26%) of Philadelphia County respondents were aged 60 years and up, and 23% of all of Philadelphia County residents are aged 60 years and up. Philadelphia County respondents who made up the youngest age group (18-29) were underrepresented. Whereas 20% of Philadelphia County respondents were aged 18-29 years, 28% of all of Philadelphia County residents make up this age group. At 15%, the percentage of Philadelphia County respondents in their 40s was representative of county data (see Figure B.3).

Respondents reported high levels of educational attainment. Both respondent data and Philadelphia County data reflect highest degree obtained. Forty-four percent of respondents have earned a graduate degree, and 30% have earned a bachelor’s degree (see Figure B.4). When compared to Philadelphia County at large, there was overrepresentation of Philadelphia County respondents who are in possession of a graduate or bachelor’s degree. Whereas 11% of all Philadelphia County residents have a graduate degree, 42% of Philadelphia County respondents have earned the same. Likewise, whereas 15% of all Philadelphia County residents have a bachelor’s degree, 32% of Philadelphia County respondents have earned the same. Respondents who have completed less than high school were highly underrepresented. While 18% of all Philadelphia County residents have completed less than high school, only 1% of Philadelphia County respondents have the same level of education (see Figure B.5).

Just under one-half (47%) of respondents identified as White, and 39% identified as Black or African American. Small percentages identified themselves as Multiracial (5%), Asian (3%), Hispanic or Latino/a (3%) (see Figure B.6). At 40%, the percentage of Philadelphia County respondents who identify as

---

6 For example, the respondent group contains 68% female and 31% male. While it is possible that this accurately reflects participant make-up, it is also possible that the participant breakdown was closer to 50/50, but females responded to the survey at disproportionately higher rates. Without having data for all participants, we cannot know if the rate at which certain groups participated was proportional or disproportional.

7 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).

8 For the ‘education’ variable, in addition to including only those respondents who live in Philadelphia County when comparing to representative data, only those 25 years of age or older are included as well (as opposed to the full data set).

9 U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1501; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).

10 Unlike census data, the *On the Table Philly* ‘race’ variable features an “Other” response option. Because of this, the *On the Table Philly* race percentages are very modestly lower than they would be if the “Other” was not a featured category.
White was equivalent to the percentage of people in all of Philadelphia County who identify as White. There was slight overrepresentation of Black or African American respondents, as 44% of respondents in Philadelphia County identified as Black or African American, compared to 40% of all Philadelphia County residents. Furthermore, there was overrepresentation of Multiracial respondents and underrepresentation of Asian respondents in Philadelphia County; while 6% of Philadelphia County respondents identified as Multiracial, 1% of all Philadelphia County residents identify as Multiracial, and while 4% of Philadelphia County respondents identified as Asian, 7% of all Philadelphia County residents identify as Asian. Philadelphia County respondents who identified as Hispanic or Latino/a were also underrepresented, as only 4% of Philadelphia County respondents selected this ethnicity compared to 12% of all Philadelphia County residents who identify as Hispanic or Latino/a (see Figure B.7).\(^{11}\)

A majority of respondents (72%) indicated that they currently live in Philadelphia (see Figure B.8). The top respondent ZIP codes include 19143 (5%), 19146 (3%), 19147 (3%), 19144 (3%), 19119 (3%), 19134 (3%), 19104 (3%), 19132 (3%), 19131 (3%), 19130 (3%) (see Figure B.9). Furthermore, the top geographic groups within Philadelphia include North Philadelphia (15%), South Philadelphia (11%), and West Philadelphia (10%). There was also strong representation from Delaware County, PA (9%) and Montgomery County, PA (9%) (see Figures B.10 and B.11).

A large proportion (40%) of respondents were long-term residents who have lived in their local community for 20 or more years; comparatively, 32% of people in the U.S. have lived in their local community for this length of time. At 27%, newcomers, or those who have lived in their local community for 0-4 years, featured the next greatest number of respondents. This was nearly equivalent to the 28% of people in the U.S. who have lived in their local community for this short time (see Figure B.12).\(^{12}\) Regarding home ownership status, 65% of respondents indicated that they own their primary residence and 31% indicated that they rent (see Figure B.13).\(^{13}\) Compared to Philadelphia County as a whole, respondent homeowners were an overrepresented group and respondent renters were an underrepresented group. Whereas 62% of respondents living in Philadelphia County reported owning their primary residence, 53% of all Philadelphia County residents are homeowners. And whereas 34% of Philadelphia County respondents reported renting their primary residence, 47% of all Philadelphia County residents are renters (see Figure B.14).\(^{14}\)

While a number of respondents reported a variety of previous interactions between themselves and TPF, a plurality said they had no relationship to the Foundation. Nearly one-half (47%) of respondents had not heard of TPF prior to participating in an On the Table Philly conversation. However, many respondents have actively participated with TPF in the past: 25% have attended one of their events, 14% have received grant funds from them, 4% have volunteered with them, 3% are funders, and 1% work there. Sixteen percent indicated some other relationship to TPF than that which were listed (see Figure B.15).


\(^{13}\) Just like the ‘race’ variable, the On the Table Philly ‘homeownership’ variable also features an “Other” response option (unlike in the Census data), which has slight implications for the On the Table Philly homeownership percentages showing lower than they otherwise would.

\(^{14}\) U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table DP04; generated using American FactFinder; <http://factfinder2.census.gov>; (17 May 2017).
Civic Attitudes and Activities
Respondents reported largely positive attitudes toward their local community and their own potential for influencing change. With regard to how much impact respondents think people like themselves can have in making their community a better place to live, 56% indicated that they believe they can have a big impact and 32% said they believe they can have a moderate impact. The 56% of respondents who think they can have a big impact was much higher than the 32% of people in the United States who believe they have this level of efficacy, while the 32% of respondents who believe they can have a moderate impact was slightly lower than the national level of 37% (see Figure B.16). Respondents also reported high levels of attachment to their local community. Over one-half (58%) reported being very attached, which was much higher than the 19% of people in the U.S. who say they are very attached (see Figure B.17). Finally, respondents positively rated the livability of their communities. Nearly one-third (32%) of respondents rated their community as an excellent place to live, which was only slightly lower than the 55% nationally who rate their community this way (see Figure B.18).

When asked what they are happy about, 61% of respondents responded with their neighborhood. Just over one-half (51%) said they are happy with their city or town, 48% are happy with their house/apartment, 43% are happy with their public transportation, and 43% are happy with their recreational opportunities (see Figure B.19). When asked what they are unhappy about, 50% indicated their local school. Forty-four percent said they are unhappy with their public safety, 40% are unhappy with their local government, 35% are unhappy with their air and water quality, and 32% are unhappy with their healthcare (see Figure B.20).

According to 34% of respondents, economic issues and poverty is the most important problem facing their communities today (see Figure B.22). Respondents widely mentioned poverty, noting the “huge gap between rich [and] poor” and describing poverty as “rampant” and “persistent . . . in the region.” Often when they mentioned poverty, they mentioned interrelated problems such as violence and public safety, public education, and homelessness. Respondents also cited what is lacking economically in their communities, such as jobs, resources, and economic opportunities. They see the presence of economic inequality and economic disparities in their communities and find the overall “economic landscape” to be problematic. Those who are considered “low-income” especially face economic difficulties such as “proposed cuts” that would impact families, “eviction laws,” and “lack of affordable housing.” In terms of economic development, however, there is a general sense of “over development” and “excessive,” “unrestrained” development in “unnecessary areas.”

Public safety and the judicial system is considered to be the next most important problem facing communities, according to 28% of respondents. Crime in general is of concern, especially as it relates to economic conditions such as poverty. Respondents frequently brought up violence and poverty together, as well as violence and drugs. Respondents mentioned the “proliferation of drugs,” including the “growth” of drug use and the current drug “epidemic”; in some instances, they related drugs to

---

16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
18 More detail on this theme and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in Appendix C, which describes the themes that make up the issues codebook.
increased crime. Respondents also talked about public safety, “especially for black and brown communities,” as noted by one respondent.

Over one-quarter (27%) of respondents find education and youth development to be the most important problem facing their communities. Many made note of “underinvestment in education,” especially public education that is typically “underfunded and underresourced.” Education for “economically deprived families” is not up to par, and many families do not have “access to affordable[,] high quality education.” The characterizations of a suffering, “subpar” educational system were numerous, and respondents highlighted problems such as “quality” public schools, “education equality,” and underemployment due to a “lack of proper education.” According to one respondent, “the failing public schools in Philadelphia contribute directly to the achievement gap, they reinforce wealth disparity, and they don’t serve our most vulnerable youth.”

Finally, 23% of respondents believe equity and social inclusion to be the most important problem facing their communities. Respondents largely mentioned a “lack” in their communities and talked about it in two ways: a lack of diversity (economic as well as racial and ethnic diversity), inclusion, and unity; and a lack of quality programs, activities, and opportunities, particularly for youth. Similarly, respondents mentioned access needs, such as access to resources, jobs, and quality education, especially with regard to youth. Respondents also expressed concern for gentrification and displacement; they would like to see “equitable development instead of gentrification” in their communities. The apparent inequality in communities is also problematic, especially across gender, income, and economic lines.

When respondents were asked to identify the social issues that are most important to them, 60% said education and youth development, 54% said economic issues and poverty, and 34% said equity and social inclusion (see Figure B.23). Following this, using the same set of issue areas, respondents were asked to identify the social issues to which they primarily contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources. Nearly one-half (47%) of respondents said they contribute to education and youth development, 33% to economic issues and poverty, 27% to equity and social inclusion, and 26% to arts and culture (see Figure B.24).19

When asked what they wish they knew more about in their local community, 24% said government, policy, and politics (see Figure B.25).20 Respondents want to know more about local government in general, although some respondents were more specific and indicated that they wanted to know more about local government structures, initiatives, and agencies. They want to know “how the local government functions,” including “how it works, its history[,] and how [residents] can improve it through greater community involvement.” They also want to know about local politics, such as “politics and how it works,” “what local politicians are doing,” and “how to get involved in local politics in a meaningful, impactful way.” Some wanted to know more about budget decisions, such as “how services get allocated through the political process[—]the who, what[,] and why that drives the money in our local budget.”

Respondents also wish they knew more about resources, with 13% of respondents citing this need. While many respondents reference resources in general, a number of other respondents named specific

---

19 We used our issues codebook (see Appendix C) to populate the response options for these two survey questions highlighting issues and causes.
20 More detail on this theme and the other themes that emerged within this variable can be found in Appendix D, which describes the themes that make up the codebook for “Know More.”
types of resources they want to know more about, such as community, financial, recreational, government, and small business resources. Respondents want to know what resources are available to them locally and “how to apply for resources.” Some also named specific populations for which they want to know what kinds of resource are available specifically resources for children, for the homeless, and for low-income families. Additionally, respondents want to learn more about organizations, including those that are local, those that are community-based, those led by immigrants, and those attending to juvenile justice, to name a few. They also want to know “what other organizations are doing.”

Twelve percent of respondents wish they knew more about economic issues and opportunities. Many respondents said they wanted to know more about matters related to the economy, such as economic development and employment opportunities. Some respondents indicated they wanted to know more about poverty; this would include statistics on poverty and “how to really confront an issue like poverty,” such as through “innovative anti-poverty” measures so that “we can have less poverty in Philadelphia.” A few other respondents said they wanted to know more about opportunities, such as job opportunities as well as opportunities for the needy and for children.

Eleven percent of respondents wish they knew more about other people and groups in their local community. In addition to wanting to know about “people’s individual lives, philosophies[,] and struggles,” they also want to know “how to best connect with more people.” Some respondents were more specific and indicated they wanted to know more about their neighbors and their neighbors’ stories as well as find out about chances to meet with their neighbors.

Finally, 11% of respondents wish they knew more about the present and past of their community. With regard to the present, they want to know more about their communities and their communities’ needs as well as “what go[es] on in the community,” including programs, resources, events, and organizations. Respondents also want to know about their own neighborhood and each of the other neighborhoods that make up the larger community. Specifically, they are interested in local neighborhood leadership and “external dynamics driving neighborhood change.” In terms of history, respondents are interested in local history and the history of their community, its social history, and any historical trends that might be noticeable in their community.

Respondents reported high levels of engagement across all measures. Over one-third (37%) of respondents said they were very involved in neighborhood and community activities, whereas only 11% of people nationally indicate this level of involvement. A slightly greater percentage (40%) of respondents said they are somewhat involved, which was on par with the 39% of people at the national level who report this degree of involvement (see Figure B.26).

In terms of how they engaged with their community over the past year, respondents were most likely to donate and volunteer, with 72% saying that they donated more than $25 to a charitable organization within the past year and 70% saying they volunteered within the past year (see Figure B.27). With regard to how Philadelphia County respondents compare to Philadelphia County residents as a whole, respondents who donated and respondents who volunteered were both overrepresented. While 70% of respondents in Philadelphia County reported donating this past year, only 43% of Philadelphia County residents did the same. And while 72% of respondents in Philadelphia County reported volunteering this past year, only 26% of Philadelphia County residents did the same (see Figure B.28).

---

Respondents also reported working with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something this past year, with 62% of respondents indicating this kind of engagement. When compared to Philadelphia County as a whole, the percentage of respondents who reported this activity was 10 times the county rate. Whereas 61% of Philadelphia County respondents said they have worked with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something, only 6% of Philadelphia County residents have done the same. Finally, 59% have attended a public meeting about community affairs this past year. The percentage of respondents who reported this activity was 15 times the county rate. Whereas 63% of respondents living in Philadelphia County said they have worked with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something, only 6% of Philadelphia County residents have done the same. When it comes to voting in local elections, 75% of respondents reported that they always vote (see Figure B.29).

Respondents reported connecting with others in a variety of places. Forty-one percent said they connect with others at schools, 39% cited parks, and 38% identified religious institutions. Just over one-third (35%) of respondents indicated they connect at libraries, 34% said community recreation centers, and 31% specified public squares (see Figure B.30).

Respondents also reported the frequency with which they get information about their local community from common online and offline sources. Two-thirds (66%) of respondents said they receive information about their local community from word of mouth several times a week to every day, which was over double the percentage of people who rely on word of mouth this frequently nationally (31%). Over one-half (55%) of respondents indicated they rely on social networking sites several times a week to every day to consume information about their local community, which was five times the percentage at which people nationally use social media sites to get local information this frequently (11%). With regard to local newspapers, 45% of respondents said they consult a newspaper for information about their community several times a week to every day, while 28% of people nationally do the same. Similarly, with regard to local radio, 45% of respondents said they tune in for information about their local community several times a week to every day, while 35% of people nationally listen to the radio for news this frequently. The 45% of respondents who indicated they watch local television news several times a week to every day was slightly less than the national percentage of 51%. Respondents reported gathering information from newsletters or e-mail listservs less frequently than the previously mentioned sources, with 26% saying they do so several times a month; this was two and a half times the percentage of people who rely on a newsletter or e-mail listserv this frequently nationally (10%). Finally, 55% of respondents indicated they read blogs for information about their local community less often or never, which was less than the national percentage of 90% for this level of frequency (see Figure B.31).

**How Did the Conversations Go?**
An essential aspect of this research is exploring the conversations themselves. This section groups data on how and why respondents were drawn to the conversations, where the conversations took place, and the relative familiarity or unfamiliarity with the other participants in the conversation. It also uncovers the range of issues respondents raised in conversation, and it describes solutions or next steps.
that respondents reported were generated from their conversations. Finally, it discusses content shared about On the Table Philly on social media.

Conversation Dynamics
Over one-half (51%) of respondents heard about On the Table Philly through someone they know. Organizations also played a role in spreading the word, as 33% of respondents heard about the conversations through this type of source. E-mail was another important factor, with 23% of respondents learning about the initiative through this means (see Figure B.32). As for why respondents participated in the conversations, 68% wanted to discuss and address important issues in their community, 63% wanted to learn from and listen to others, and 46% wanted to meet and build relationships with new people (see Figure B.33).

A great majority (83%) of conversations took place in Philadelphia. Other top cities include Chester (4%), Media (2%), Lansdale (2%), and Bala Cynwyd (2%) (see Figure B.34). A large number of conversations took place in Center City (32%). The geographic groups with the next highest percentage of conversations include Delaware County, PA (12%) and North Philadelphia (11%) (see Figures B.35 and B.36). In terms of who made up the other people at the conversations, 53% of respondents reported they were mostly people respondents did not know before the conversation. Nearly one-third (32%) of respondents said there were an equal mix of both people respondents knew and did not know before the conversation. Only 15% said others at the conversation were mostly people they knew before the conversation (see Figure B.37).

Issues Discussed
On the Table is an opportunity for participants to raise and discuss issues that impact the quality of life in and around Philadelphia. A majority of respondents (76%) reported raising an issue of concern in their conversation. The issues that emerged help identify respondents’ priorities and concerns and where they would like to see their communities headed.

According to the issue areas we developed, education and youth development ranked first as the most talked about issue in On the Table Philly, with 31% reporting having raised it (see Figure B.38). Many mentioned education in general as an issue. Others were more specific, with some raising the problem of the education gap and the need to provide “equal access” to “quality” education, especially given “race and class inequities in education.” Other respondents brought up the “failing education system” and called for “improv[ing]” and “reform[ing]” education. Funding was another prominent topic within education, especially with regard to “the mounting cost of our current education system” and the need for “equitable funding of educational resources.” According to one respondent, “I feel like the state of Pennsylvania is starving the city of Philadelphia of resources for education.” Respondents also brought up youth development, particularly through youth programs; “there needs to be more support of evidence-based programs for youth,” one respondent said. Furthermore, respondents brought up education’s intersection with other community issues, such as poverty and criminal justice. With regard to poverty, one respondent said, “Philadelphia’s deep poverty creates a host of problems for children in schools. What resources do we need? What about the stark differences between suburban and Philly schools?” With regard to criminal justice, another respondent said, “I talked about the problems with Philadelphia youth getting sent to corrections facilities, then returning and not being able to enter high school because their credits from being incarcerated don’t transfer.”

Equity and social inclusion was another prominent issue raised by 28% of respondents. A number of respondents brought up access for those in need, such as access to food and grocery stores, access to
services, and access to employment for high school students. One respondent wants to see “people in poor communities [have] access to people and resources,” and another respondent wants to see “resources [provided] for entrepreneurs and small business owners of color.” Respondents also mentioned people and community, such as “bringing more people into [the] community from diverse backgrounds” and the “integration of new people into established institutions in our community.” One respondent contemplated “how to feel accepted by a community that is made up of people traditionally not like you.” More specific than people, some respondents focused in on groups such as youth and women. They discussed the need for youth programs (as mentioned in education) and the problem of youth homelessness, especially for LGBT youth. With regard to women, they mainly discussed women in the workplace and the need for pay equity and “women at the table” as “decision makers.” Several noted “the impediments women and minority women face getting ahead in their careers” as well as “the limitations women face in the corporate world in advancing above a certain level, and the factors (self-generated or external) that contribute to this.” A few respondents were also concerned with gentrification, as they brought up the “displacement of community people,” the “impact on the poor,” and the effects of gentrification on “under resourced neighborhoods.”

Just under one-quarter of respondents (22%) raised issues related to economic issues and poverty. Poverty was top of mind for respondents, especially regarding the “need to reduce it.” There appeared to be overlap in discussions on issues related to poverty and education, as some respondents explored the relationship between education and “communities with high poverty rates.” Within this theme, respondents also mentioned business, including “how to own and operate your own business” and how members of a businesses can become more involved in the neighborhood. A few respondents also brought up income inequality as well as low-income communities.

Fifteen percent of respondents raised issues around public safety and the judicial system. Respondents largely discussed safety in general, with some respondents specifying public safety and community safety in the face of violence. Respondents also mentioned drugs as a safety issue and talked about “drug addicts and dealers,” “drug abuse,” and the relationship between violence and drugs. According to one respondent, “drugs [are] being bought and sold near two neighborhood schools,” alluding to the dangers this presents to the community. Furthermore, respondents mentioned gun safety and gun the violence in their communities, asking “what measures need to be taken for gun control” and pointing out the “need to ban guns in our city.” Policing was another topic of conversation, whether it had to do with “more community involvement with police,” “community policing,” or the “shortage of police manpower.” A few respondents brought up justice as it pertains to the criminal justice system, and one respondent made note of the “corrupted criminal justice system.”

Solutions Generated
On the Table Philly is rooted in the idea that dialogue can spur new ideas for action. In addition to the discussion and dissection of issues in conversations, just under two-thirds of respondents (64%) said their conversation/s generated a specific solution. Additionally, nearly 400 respondents submitted one or multiple ideas for how to solve specific community problems. While it is not feasible to report on each one, we randomly selected 10 solutions to share for illustrative purposes only.24 These demonstrate the range respondents put forward—from high-level and complex ideas to simple actions.

24 The mention of a specific solution does not indicate an endorsement from IPCE or TPF. Furthermore, TPF should not be assumed to take responsibility for a solution mentioned in this report. We randomly selected the 10 ideas referenced above in order to show the types of solutions that respondents proposed.
that impact everyday life. Solutions submitted via the *On the Table Philly* survey are available for viewing in the data exploration tool (ipce.shinyapps.io/OTTPhillydata).\(^{25}\)

One of the ten randomly selected solutions proposes more green jobs in the region and suggests prioritizing climate resiliency and innovation centers as economic investment opportunities. Another solution describes looking at Philadelphia housing forecasts for certain neighborhoods that are at risk for gentrification and potentially pursuing crowd funding as a means of buying homes in those neighborhoods in order to intervene in the gentrifying process. Still yet, another solution proposes placing the safe injection site in need of a location on hospital property, and an additional solution wants to see transportation provided for youth so that they can get to programs and events.

According to one of the other solutions, the Free Library could be used as a place to distribute information about the community to new library card applicants. Two solutions have a focus on funding, with one suggesting that funders sustainably fund collaborations and the other recommending that funders underwrite small non-profit taxes. Another solution proposes more accountability at home and in government, and an additional solution wants to see conversations generate action.

One final solution stands apart from the others provided, as it is one marked by personal assistance. As a result of the conversation, one respondent received resources in the form of “a specific film and book” and “the offer of a visit to my classroom.” While seemingly small, this solution prompting a transfer of resources can have an impact that reverberates beyond one person. Furthermore, it is a solution already put into place rather than a proposed idea.

**Social Media**

Social media provided an opportunity to deepen engagement efforts with *On the Table Philly* and expand participation in the initiative. TPF launched its social media campaign in March 2017 as a method of promoting *On the Table Philly* and creating a virtual space where conversations could begin or continue. The campaign served as a useful tool in capturing live content from conversations as they occurred and providing opportunities for online engagement by those who were not able to participate in physical conversations.

We used the social-media-monitoring platform Meltwater Buzz to analyze social media activity and understand the influence of this initiative in the digital realm.\(^{26}\) We tracked the TPF-designated hashtag #LetsTalkPhilly in our analysis. In total, #LetsTalkPhilly saw 1,628 public mentions; these mentions were amplified, generating 2.3 million total impressions. The month of May saw the highest number of mentions, which not surprisingly, peaked on the day of the *On the Table Philly* initiative.

Social media captured the enthusiasm surrounding the initiative through an array of posts and picture-sharing on various platforms, including Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook; of these, Twitter was the most popular medium used throughout the social media campaign, with 1,501 total mentions. Additionally, Twitter saw 479 unique influencers. When it comes to breaking down the levels of engagement, 49% were original tweets, 49% were retweets, and 2% were @message tweets. Furthermore, 44% of tweets featured links; however, only 14% of tweets contained any media. In terms of tweeters’ platforms, 48% used a mobile device, 21% used a desktop, and 29% are unknown.

---

\(^{25}\) The responses within the data exploration tool have been scrubbed of all identifiers.

\(^{26}\) See Appendix E for a visual summary of key findings from the social media analysis.
Social connections went beyond advertising the initiative and spreading the word. Many offered commentary on what social media users were thinking about in the context of On the Table Philly or what they had discussed in conversations. Some comments from social media users include: “Preparing our youth for self[-]-sustaining wages requires self[-]-sustaining skills. #LetsTalkPhilly about starting the career pipeline earlier”; “Workforce diversity is critical to helping neighborhoods have access to resources”; “Conversation is essential to a healthy democracy”; “If we don’t accept that not everyone starts at the same point, we can’t help these vulnerable populations.”

How Did Conversations Impact Respondents?
The short-term impact On the Table Philly conversations had on respondents demonstrates the significance and value of these types of civic conversations. This section brings together data regarding the outcomes of the conversations, including new connections forged and an understanding of how to address community issues. Additionally, it reports the likelihood of a respondent taking action following their conversation and the actions that respondents are most likely to take.

Conversation Outcomes and Future Action
Nearly three-quarters (74%) of respondents reported connecting with others at their conversation by speaking with one or more attendees whom they did not already know before and/or after the conversation. Forty-one percent of respondents exchanged contact information with one or more attendees they did not already know, and 26% of respondents made specific plans to work with one or more attendees (see Figure B.39).

Two-thirds (66%) of respondents indicated they have a somewhat-to-much-better understanding of how they, personally, can help address the issues facing their communities (see Figure B.40). At 92%, an even greater number are somewhat-to-very likely to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed (see Figure B.41). Of the actions or next steps respondents are likely to take, 73% are interested in building relationships and collaborating. Sixty percent intend to raise awareness and educate others, and 48% want to get more involved in community (see Figure B.42).

ANALYSIS

We conducted a set of analyses that go beyond the original guiding questions of this study. These analyses help deepen understanding of the survey response summary data and are useful in identifying areas of opportunity for further investigation or action. These additional analyses include an exploration of subgroup comparisons for groups such as gender, age, education level, race, homeownership status, and geography across responses to the following questions: I am happy/unhappy about my . . . ; what is the most important problem facing your community today?; which of the following social issues are most important to you?; to which social issues do you primarily contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?; and issues raised during the conversation. The analysis section also includes two disparity analyses, with the first exploring disparities between the social issues respondents report are most important to them and the social issues to which they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources, and the second exploring differences between rates of happiness and unhappiness about given topics.

Subgroup Comparisons
Each question analyzed in this section contains comparisons between various subgroups based on gender, age, level of education, race, homeownership status, and county of residence.
**Gender**
Regarding gender, analyses were conducted between male- and female-identifying respondents. While the original survey provided an “Other” gender option, too few respondents selected this option for inclusion in subgroup analyses.

**Age**
Based on the original survey question, there were five age groups categorized by decade: the youngest group (made up of respondents who are 18-29 years old), the 30s group, the 40s group, the 50s group, and the oldest group (made up of respondents who are 60 years old and older).

**Education Level**
Though more specific information regarding respondents’ educational background was obtained, responses were dichotomized for the purpose of analysis. Responses were divided into two categories: college educated (made up of respondents with a college degree or higher) and non-college educated (made up of respondents with some college or less).

**Race**
For an analysis by race, four racial subgroups were created: Blacks (consisting of respondents indicating Black or African American), Whites (consisting of respondents indicating White), Latinos (consisting of respondents indicating Hispanic or Latino/a), and other racial groups (which includes respondents indicating American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Other).

**Homeownership Status**
Respondents were also split into two groups by their indicated homeownership status: homeowner versus renter. Respondents who responded “Other” to this question were not included in the analysis, as there were too few of such responses.

**County of Residence**
For the county variable, respondents were categorized by their self-reported place of residence into Philadelphia County versus non-Philadelphia County.

**I am happy/unhappy about my . . .**
Respondents were asked to identify from a given list which things they are both happy and unhappy about in their community (see Figures B.19 and B.20). Responses from these closed-ended questions reveal various differences among subgroups. Below is a summary of the findings revealed by analyzing the average rates of happiness (or unhappiness) across all indicators by subgroup. For example, a happiness rate of 40% means that within any particular subgroup, 40% indicated they were happy about an individual item; an overall average happiness rate of 50% refers to the average of happiness rates across all indicators, for any one subgroup.

While there were no noteworthy differences between males and females when respondents were grouped by gender, grouping respondents by age revealed multiple disparities. In general, the youngest age group (18-29 year olds) tended to be the least happy, with an overall average happiness rate of 28% across all indicators, while respondents in their 30s were the most happy, with an overall average happiness rate of 37%. The specific individual indicators with the greatest discrepancies between age groups regarding happiness were healthcare, childcare, and local schools. For example, whereas 48% of respondents in the oldest group (60 years old and up) indicated they are happy with their childcare, less
than half as many (21%) of the youngest group feel similarly.

Notable differences were also found among respondents by their self-reported level of education. Respondents holding a college degree or higher were typically happier, with an overall average happiness rate of 37%, compared to 27% for those without a college degree. College-educated respondents were more than twice as happy with their financial situation, as 39% of this group reported being happy with their financial situation, compared to only 16% of non-college-educated respondents. Similarly, people who hold a college degree tended to be happier about their neighborhood (66% vs. 44% no college degree) and their house/apartment (54% vs. 32% no college degree). Looking at education level differences in rates of unhappiness, we saw that those without a college degree were nearly two times as unhappy with recreation opportunities (35% unhappy), compared to college educated individuals (18% unhappy). Non-college-educated respondents also expressed more unhappiness regarding their city/town (28%), while only 12% of college-educated respondents felt similarly unhappy.

When results were analyzed by racial group, White respondents had the highest overall average happiness rate (41%), compared to Blacks (26%), Latinos (27%), and other racial groups (33%). More specifically, the greatest racial disparities in happiness were in regards to neighborhood, house/apartment, and recreation.

Happiness rates also tended to vary by homeownership status. Overall, homeowner respondents had a slightly higher overall average happiness rate, compared to those who rent (37% vs. 31%). Homeowners reported being substantially happier than renters concerning their financial situation (39% vs. 25%) and their local schools (26% vs. 14%).

Lastly, geography also appeared to play an important role in rates of happiness, as differences were revealed in analyses that group respondents by whether they live within or outside of Philadelphia County. Respondents who live outside of Philadelphia County had a higher overall average happiness rate (41%) compared to respondents who live within Philadelphia County (32%). With regard to specific indicators, compared to respondents who live within Philadelphia, respondents who live outside of Philadelphia County are significantly happier with their local schools (47% vs. 11%), public safety (57% vs. 27%), air and water quality (34% vs. 20%), and their local government (26% vs. 14%).

**Most Important Community Problem**

The analyses in this section examine subgroup-level differences on what participants view as the most important problem currently facing their community. Respondents were asked to answer the open-ended question, “What is the most important problem facing your community today?” We then categorized their responses using our issues codebook.27

When group differences were investigated by gender, age, and homeownership status, no notable differences were found. Thus, no problems were viewed as more important between males and females, across various ages, and between homeowners and renters.

However, analyses by educational background indicated observable differences between college-educated respondents and non-college-educated respondents. Overall, those without a college degree were roughly twice as likely to be concerned with issues related to both public safety and the judicial

---

27 See Appendix C for the issues codebook and the relevant definitions.
system (41% vs. 22% college educated) and health (24% vs. 11% college educated). Conversely, those with a college degree were more likely to express concern with a problem related to economic issues and poverty (38%), compared to those without a college degree (24%).

Views on the most important problem currently facing the community also differed by race. The largest differences by race were related to issues around public safety and the judicial system, with 50% of Latino respondents mentioning it as the most important problem, compared to 35% of Blacks and 21% of Whites. Other significant differences were related to problems concerning government, with 13% of White respondents providing a government-related problem, compared to 8% of Latinos and 5% of Blacks.

Comparable to the findings from racial group analyses, geographic analyses also revealed differences between groups regarding their views on public safety and the judicial system. Within Philadelphia County, 30% of respondents mentioned this issue as the most important problem, compared to 20% of respondents outside of Philadelphia County.

Social Issue Priority
In this section, subgroups were analyzed by their responses to a close-ended, multiple-choice question asking, “Which of the following social issues are most important to you?”

Statistical analyses revealed no notable differences between homeowners and renters and between respondents who live in Philadelphia County and outside of Philadelphia County on any social issue indicator.

Analyses by gender indicated that health was typically more important to female respondents than male respondents. Over one-quarter (29%) of females felt that health is the most important social issue, while 21% of males felt the same.

When respondents were analyzed by age, there were discrepancies regarding multiple social issues, including religion and morals, equity and social inclusion, and housing. Religion and morals was the most important issue to respondents 60 years and older, compared to any other age group; 19% of the oldest age group chose this option. Conversely, the two youngest age groups (18-29 year olds and 30-39 year olds) felt that equity and social inclusion was the most important social issue, with an average of 42% across both groups choosing it (compared to 28% of the oldest group). Another controversial issue was housing: while 30% of the youngest age group chose this option, in comparison, only about half as many (16%) of the 30s group did the same.

Respondents without a college degree cited a few social issues considerably more often than their college-educated counterparts. Issues related to the family were more important to respondents without a college degree (47% vs. 17% with a college degree), as were issues of public safety and the judicial system (32% vs. 16% with a college degree) and food access (27% vs. 13% with a college degree).

When participants were grouped by race, differences were seen regarding how groups prioritized social issues related to religion and morals, the family, and public safety and the judicial system. Compared to 21% of both Blacks and Latinos who chose religion and morals as the most important social issue, only 7% of Whites did the same. Similarly, 35% of Blacks and 28% of Latinos chose family issues, compared to

28 See Appendix C for the full list of issues and their definitions.
only 18% of Whites. Lastly, public safety and the judicial system is about equally important for Blacks and Latinos (27% and 28%, respectively), but significantly less important for Whites (16%).

**Primary Social Issue Contribution**

The following subgroup analyses were based off the closed-response question, “To which social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?” Response options were identical to the question above regarding social issue priorities.

Gender analyses reveal that, compared to female respondents, male respondents were more likely to contribute to economic issues and poverty (40% vs. 29%) and public safety and the judicial system (14% vs. 7%).

Furthermore, 60% of respondents in their 40s reported contributing to education issues, which was more than that of all other age groups (48% on average). Regarding religion and morals, respondents in the oldest group (60 years old and up) were most likely to contribute to this issue area (25%), compared to respondents younger than 50 years old (10% on average).

When we analyzed the findings by education level, we saw many similarities between social issue priorities and social issue contributions. Respondents without a college degree were most likely to contribute to the issues that they also found most important: family issues (38% vs. 17% of college-educated respondents) and issues of public safety and the judicial system (15% vs. 8%). Though college educated individuals did not find equity and social inclusion to be a significantly more important issue than non-college educated individuals (refer to previous section), participants with a college degree were significantly more likely to contribute to these issues (31% vs. 19% no college degree).

Most notable from the racial group findings were the stark differences between Latino respondents and Black and White respondents. More than one-quarter (27%) of Latinos reported contributing to immigration-related issues, compared to only 7% of Whites and 3% of Blacks. Similarly, more than one-third (37%) of Latinos reported contributing to family-related issues, compared to 28% of Blacks, and 17% of Whites.

**Issues Raised during Conversation**

Survey respondents were asked to respond to the question, “Did you raise an issue of concern regarding your community? If yes, please specify.” We again categorized their responses using our issues codebook.

Statistical analyses of issues raised show no noteworthy differences between subgroups by educational background, homeownership status, or county of residence.

In response to the aforementioned question, males were twice as likely to bring up issues related to the government, compared to their female counterparts (14% vs. 7%, respectively). The oldest group (60 years and older) brought up issues around public safety and the judicial system and issues of transportation almost twice as much as all other age groups, on average (27% of oldest group vs. 15% of all other age groups combined, and 9% vs. 5%, respectively). Notably, Latino respondents were more likely to bring up issues of immigration and migration by a large margin (23% of Latinos, compared to only 3% of Whites and 1% of Blacks).
As seen throughout the above subgroup comparison section, there was not much between-group difference for three out of the top four themes. Public safety and the judicial system saw the most amount of between-group difference among groups analyzed. In comparison, economic issues and poverty, equity and social inclusion, and education and youth development saw the least amount of between-group difference, which suggests similarity across subgroups.

**Top Responses by Geographic Group**

Analyses of proportions were conducted to provide more insight into the 15 geographic areas of interest to TPF. For six survey items, the top response and corresponding percentage of respondents is reported by geographic group in Appendix F. Please note that the sample sizes for each region vary widely, and data should be interpreted with this consideration.

**Happy**

Across the various counties and regions, the item that people tended to be most happy about was neighborhood. In 10 out of 15 regions, the greatest proportion of respondents selected this item, ranging from 49% in Olney/Oak Lane to 85% in Chestnut Hill/Roxborough/Manayunk. Other interesting findings included 72% of Camden County respondents being happy about public transportation and 71% of Center City respondents being happy about their house/apartment.

**Unhappy**

Conversely, the item that people in most regions were most unhappy about was local schools. Eleven out of 15 geographic regions had the greatest proportion of respondents choosing it, ranging from 46% in Olney/Oak Lane to 64% in Northeast Philadelphia. Notably, in Montgomery County, the highest proportion of unhappy responses was only 29% for air and water quality, indicating a lack of majority opinion on items that people are unhappy about.

**Most Important Community Problem**

For 10 out of 15 regions, the most important community problem was economic issues and poverty; between 33% of respondents in Delaware County and 64% of respondents in Camden County chose this problem. The only two other highest-rated problems were education and youth development in Center City and in Chestnut Hill/Roxborough/Manayunk and public safety and the judicial system in Kensington/Port Richmond, in Northeast Philadelphia, and in Olney/Oak Lane.

**Most Important Social Issue**

Eleven out of 15 geographic regions had respondent agreement on the most important social issue: education and youth development. Between 50% of respondents in Chester County and Chestnut Hill/Roxbourough/Manayunk and 71% of respondents in Burlington County chose this issue as most important. The only other issue receiving the greatest proportion of responses was economic issues and poverty, where between 59% in Center City and 64% in Delaware County reported this choice.

**Social Issue Contribution**

A resounding 13 out of 15 geographic regions had respondents choosing education and youth development most frequently for the issue to which they primarily contribute, ranging from 41% of respondents in Germantown/Mt. Airy to 65% of respondents in Burlington County. The only two other top responses were equity and social inclusion, as noted by 50% of respondents in Camden County, and economic issues and poverty, as noted by 35% of respondents in Chester County.
Issues Discussed
More difference based on respondent geographic group resulted from the question that asked respondents to report an issue that they brought up in their conversation. The issue discussed most across geographic regions was education and youth development, with 9 out of 15 regions having this as the issue respondents mentioned the most. Of particular note, this question yielded fewer proportions over 50%, indicating more diversity in responses for this item. The only two geographic regions with a majority were Burlington County, with 60% of respondents discussing education and youth development and Camden County, with 50% of respondents also bringing up issues surrounding education and youth development.

Issues-to-Causes Disparity
When considering social issues that were most important to respondents (important issues) and social issues to which they said they contribute their time, talent, and financial resources (causes), the data revealed disparities between these two variables (see Appendix G). These disparities can be useful indicators of social issues where greater contributions of time, talent, and financial resources are needed.

Transportation resulted in the greatest issues-to-causes-disparity. Among the people who mentioned transportation as an important social issue, only 25% also reported that they contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources to this cause. Public safety and the judicial system as well as immigration and migration tied for the next two greatest disparities, with only 31% of those concerned with these two social issues also making contributions toward them. Notably, economic issues and poverty had the second highest number of respondents considering it the most important problem (n=492), yet only half of these respondents reported contributing their time, talent, and/or financial resources. Conversely, arts and culture received a moderate amount of attention in the problems section (n=237), but had 68% of concerned respondents making contributions.

Happiness Disparities
Calculating the difference between rates of happiness and unhappiness regarding certain items demonstrated which features respondents were more happy than unhappy about and which respondents were more unhappy than happy about (see Figure B.21). The largest difference was seen with neighborhood, where 42% more respondents were happy than unhappy with their neighborhood. Respondents were also more happy than unhappy with their city or town and their house/apartment, with differences of 34% and 31%, respectively. On the other hand, the largest differences from unhappy to happy were for local school (-28%) and local government (-22%), which indicates that respondents were 28% and 22% more unhappy than happy about these topics, respectively.

CONCLUSION
This report was an exploratory study examining the content of On the Table Philly conversations and information about survey respondents. While results cannot be generalized to the broader Philadelphia population, this study reveals important insights that are worth highlighting.

First, On the Table Philly respondents were a highly engaged group across all measures considered, especially when comparing Philadelphia County respondents to all county respondents. The majority of respondents said they are involved in community and neighborhood activities, with notable proportions of respondents reporting having donated and volunteered this past year. Slightly smaller but still
noteworthy percentages were seen for respondents who have been involved in less common but highly impactful engagement activities, such as working with people in their neighborhood to fix or improve something and attending a public meeting about community affairs. Given their habits, these respondents are in unique position to do work to help improve the community and to enhance the quality of life for other Philadelphia residents. Having such an engaged respondent group can be useful to TPF as it seeks to broaden the reach and impact of these kinds of community conversations. Respondents can, in a sense, serve as community liaisons to bring the outcomes and aftereffects of these conversations to residents who are less involved in and less connected to their communities.

Second, economic issues and poverty, education and youth development, equity and social inclusion, and public safety and the judicial system were four main issue areas of primary concern to respondents. Respondents raised these issues most frequently in their conversations and identified them as the most important problems facing their communities today. With these four issue areas being top of mind for Philadelphia respondents, TPF has an opportunity to work with the community to address these areas of concern and improve the Philadelphia region. TPF can potentially prioritize these issue areas in their funding and grant-making initiatives and can help create a platform for each of these areas upon which the community can problem-solve and inform local decision-makers.

Additionally, economic issues and poverty, education and youth development, and equity and social inclusion are the social issue areas most important to respondents and are the top issue areas to which they primarily contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources; according to the disparity analysis, at least half of respondents who mentioned one of these three as an important social issue also indicated it was a social issue to which they contribute. On the contrary, public safety and the judicial system is tied for second (with immigration and migration; transportation is first) as featuring the largest issues-to-causes disparity, showing that respondents are not contributing to public safety and the judicial system in the same proportion to which they say it is an issue of importance. In comparison to the percentage of respondents who feel public safety and the judicial system is one of the most important issues and are also contributing to it (31%), more than twice as many respondents (64%) feel and act similarly regarding education and youth development (see figure G.1). This variation begs the question: why are so few of the people who are concerned about public safety and the judicial system also actively working to address issues in this area? Given that public safety and the judicial system is one of the top four issues in this report and that it ranks as the ‘biggest problem’ facing Philadelphia’ in Pew’s 2017 ‘Philadelphia 2017: The State of the City’ report, this disparity highlights the opportunity for institutions focused on public safety and the judicial system to focus on increasing citizen engagement and community involvement.

Third, some of the largest differences among subgroups had to do with public safety and the judicial system. Males were twice as likely as females to contribute their time, talent, and/or financial resources to public safety and the judicial system. The oldest age group (60s and up) brought up issues around public safety and the judicial system almost twice as much as all other age groups, on average. Compared to those with a college degree, those without a college degree were twice as likely or nearly twice as likely to name public safety and the judicial system as the most important problem facing their community; as a social issue most important to them; and as a social issue to which they contribute. With regard to racial/ethnic group, Latinos were most likely to mention public safety and the judicial system as the most important problem, and Latinos and Blacks named it as the social issue most important to them. Compared to respondents from outside of Philadelphia County, respondents from Philadelphia County were more likely to mention public safety and the judicial system as the most
important problem. Knowing which respondent subgroups are most concerned with this issue area can help TPF determine with whom it should be connecting in order to begin to address this issue.

*On the Table Philly* was an opportunity for residents of the Philadelphia region to get together with old friends and new acquaintances to have conversations about the issues that they care about the most. In doing so, many people came together to share their experiences about life in Philadelphia and how they would like to see it become an even better city that serves all of its residents. Conversations served as a catalyst for generating ideas and potential actions and created a space for participants to make personal connections so that they might find ways to ignite change with fellow residents.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: On the Table Philly Survey

Welcome, and thank you for taking part in this survey!

The purpose of this research is to understand who participated in On the Table and the nature and quality of the conversation event in which you participated on May 23, 2017, coordinated by The Philadelphia Foundation. The University of Illinois at Chicago’s Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement (IPCE) is administering the survey.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Completion of this survey is voluntary, you may skip any question, and there are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will be kept confidential. Collected data will be stored in locked offices in a locked suite, and data with direct identifiers will be password protected. Data will be kept throughout the research study period and will be deleted after five years. No personally identifiable data will be reported, and confidentiality will be protected to the fullest extent possible. IPCE and The Philadelphia Foundation will have access to your e-mail address, but The Philadelphia Foundation will not have access to your individual responses. Results of this study will be publicly available at www.ipce.uic.edu and onthetablephl.org.

The principal investigator of this research is IPCE Director Joseph Hoereth. If you have any questions about the survey, you may contact IPCE by phone at 312-355-0088 or by e-mail at jhoereth@uic.edu. You may also contact the Office for the Protection of Human Subjects (OPRS) by phone at 312-996-1711 or by e-mail at uicirb@uic.edu.

By responding to the survey, you acknowledge the following:
• You have read the above information
• You voluntarily agree to participate in this study
• You are at least 18 years of age

**Answer Selection:** Correct = ⬜ Incorrect = ❌ ✗

**Begin here**

1. Please provide the e-mail address used to register you for On the Table. If you DID NOT register online, please provide your e-mail address below.

E-mail Address: __________________________

2. Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in On the Table? (Select all that apply)

○ To discuss and address important issues in my community
○ To learn from and listen to others
○ To meet and build relationships with new people
○ To get more involved in my community
○ To support the organizer of the conversation
○ Other (please specify): __________________________

If you participated in MORE THAN ONE On the Table conversation, please refer to only one of your conversations for the next two questions.

3. Where did your conversation take place?

City or Town: __________________________

Neighborhood (if applicable, please specify):

4. The other people at my conversation were:

○ Mostly people I did NOT know before the conversation
○ Mostly people I knew before the conversation
○ An equal mix of both

5. Did you raise an issue of concern regarding your community?

○ Yes
○ No

If yes, please provide examples:

________________________

________________________
6. Did your conversation(s) generate any specific solutions?

○ Yes
○ No

*If yes, please provide examples:*

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)? (Select all that apply)

○ I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know before and/or after the conversation(s)
○ I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know
○ I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees to address a new idea, issue, or project in the future
○ None of the above

8. After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?

○ Much better
○ Somewhat better
○ A little better
○ No change

9. How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?

○ Very likely
○ Somewhat likely
○ Not too likely
○ Not at all likely

*If you answered NOT TOO LIKELY or NOT AT ALL LIKELY, please skip to Question 11.*

10. Please select the actions or next steps you are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed. (Select all that apply)

○ Build relationships and collaborate
○ Get more involved in community
○ Improve myself through personal development and learning
○ Raise awareness and educate others
○ Become more politically involved
○ Donate
○ Volunteer
○ Provide support for my family
○ Take action through my job
○ Mentor or motivate others
○ Other (please specify): _______________________

11. How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?

○ A big impact
○ A moderate impact
○ A small impact
○ No impact at all

12. In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?

○ Very attached
○ Somewhat attached
○ Not very attached
○ Not at all attached

13. Which of the following social issues are most important to you? (CHOOSE UP TO THREE)

○ Arts and Culture
○ Economic Issues and Poverty
○ Education and Youth Development
○ Environment and Parks
○ Religion and Morals
○ Equity and Social Inclusion
○ Family
○ Food Access
○ Government
○ Health
○ Housing and Homelessness
○ Immigration and Migration
○ Public Safety and Judicial System
○ The Media
○ Technology
○ Transportation
○ Other (please specify): _______________________
○ Other (please specify): _______________________
○ Other (please specify): _______________________
14. To which of the following social issues do you primarily contribute your time, talent (knowledge or skills), and/or financial resources? (Choose up to three)

- Arts and Culture
- Economic Issues and Poverty
- Education and Youth Development
- Environment and Parks
- Religion and Morals
- Equity and Social Inclusion
- Family
- Food Access
- Government
- Health
- Housing and Homelessness
- Immigration and Migration
- Public Safety and Judicial System
- The Media
- Technology
- Transportation
- Other (please specify): ____________________________
- Other (please specify): ____________________________
- Other (please specify): ____________________________

15. How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?

- Very involved
- Somewhat involved
- Not too involved
- Not at all involved

16. Since May 2016, have you: (Select all that apply)

- Worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something?
- Donated money, assets, or property with a combined value of more than $25 to charitable or religious organizations?
- Done any volunteer activities through or for an organization?
- Attended any public meetings in which there was discussion of community affairs?
- None of the above

17. How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board? Across the nation, these elections have about 20% voter turnout.

- Always vote
- Sometimes vote
- Rarely vote
- Never vote
- Prefer not to answer / Not eligible to vote

18. Where do you like to connect with others? (Select all that apply)

- Parks
- Library
- Community rec center
- Schools
- Public squares
- Religious institution, such as a church
- Community garden
- Shopping centers
- Other (please specify): ____________________________

19. How often, if ever, do you get information about your local community from each of the following sources, whether online or offline?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
<th>Several times a month</th>
<th>Less Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local television news</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blog about your local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person or organization you follow on a social networking site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A newsletter or e-mail listserv about your local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth from friends, family, co-workers and neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To help us better understand who participated in On the Table, please respond to the following demographic questions. Your responses are confidential.

20. Where do you currently live?

ZIP code: ____________________________

City or Town: ____________________________

Neighborhood (if applicable, please specify):

21. About how many years have you lived in your local community?

Number of Years: _____________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22. Do you own or rent your primary residence?                          | O Own  
O Rent  
O Other (please specify): ___________                                                                                       |
| 23. What is your current gender identity?                               | O Male  
O Female  
O A gender identity not listed here (please specify): ___________                                               |
| 24. What is the highest level of education you have completed?          | O Less than high school  
O High school diploma or GED  
O Some college  
O Associate/Vocational degree  
O Bachelor’s degree  
O Graduate degree                                                                                                           |
| 25. In what year were you born? Year:                                  | ___________                                                                                                                      |
| 26. How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity?                 | O American Indian/Alaska Native  
O Asian  
O Black or African American  
O Hispanic or Latina/o  
O Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander  
O White  
O Other (please specify): ___________                                      |
| 27. What is your relationship to The Philadelphia Foundation?          | O Funder  
O Grantee (my organization has received funds from them)  
O I have volunteered with them  
O I work there  
O I’ve attended one of their events  
O I had not heard of The Philadelphia Foundation before On the Table.  
O Other (please specify): ___________                                      |
| 28. Overall, how would you rate your community as a place to live?     | O Excellent  
O Good  
O Only fair  
O Poor                                                                                                                         |
| 29. I am happy about my: (Select all that apply)                       | O Public safety  
O Air and water quality  
O Local school  
O Public transportation  
O Local news  
O Recreational opportunities  
O Local government  
O Healthcare  
O Childcare & pre-K  
O House/apartment  
O Neighborhood  
O Personal finances  
O City or town                                                                                                                 |
| 30. I am unhappy about my: (Select all that apply)                    | O Public safety  
O Air and water quality  
O Local school  
O Public transportation  
O Local news  
O Recreational opportunities  
O Local government  
O Healthcare  
O Childcare & pre-K  
O House/apartment  
O Neighborhood  
O Personal finances  
O City or town                                                                                                                 |
| 31. What is the most important problem facing your community today?    | _____________________________________________________________________ |
| 32. Thinking about my local community, I wish I knew more about:       | _____________________________________________________________________ |
| 33. I heard about On the Table Philly through: (Select all that apply)  | O TV/radio  
O Newspaper  
O Social media  
O Email  
O Someone I know  
O An organization  
O Other (please specify): ___________                                      |
Appendix B: Summary Visualizations of Survey Responses

On the Table Philly
Summary of Results for All Respondents

Following On the Table Philly, 354 participants responded to the survey by clicking on an e-mail link, 0 responded by clicking on the web link, and 620 responded by submitting a print survey.

In total, 974 On the Table Philly participants fully or partially responded to the survey. This document provides a summary of responses by question. The 'n' provided in each question is the number of respondents for that question.

Section 1: Who Participated?

Respondent Demographics

Figure B.1: What is your current gender identity?

% of respondents (n = 904)

- Female Alone: 68%
- Male Alone: 31%
- Another Gender Identity: 1.0%
Figure B.2: Age of Respondents by Decade
% of respondents (n = 814)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s and up</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.3: Age of Respondents by Decade, Comparison
% of Phil. County RESPONDENTS (n = 587) compared to Phil. County RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Respondents Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>20% vs 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>22% vs 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>15% vs 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>17% vs 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s and up</td>
<td>26% vs 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.4: What is the highest level of education you have completed?
% of respondents (n = 906)

- Graduate degree: 44%
- Bachelor’s degree: 30%
- Associate/Vocational degree: 7%
- Some college: 9%
- High school diploma or GED: 8%
- Less than high school: 2%

Figure B.5: Highest Level of Education, Comparison
% of Phil. County RESPONDENTS (n = 534) compared to Phil. County RESIDENTS

- Graduate degree: Phil. County RESPONDENTS 42%, Phil. County RESIDENTS 10%
- Bachelor’s degree: Phil. County RESPONDENTS 32%, Phil. County RESIDENTS 15%
- Associate/Vocational degree: Phil. County RESPONDENTS 8%, Phil. County RESIDENTS 5%
- Some college: Phil. County RESPONDENTS 10%, Phil. County RESIDENTS 17%
- High school diploma or GED: Phil. County RESPONDENTS 8%, Phil. County RESIDENTS 34%
- Less than high school: Phil. County RESPONDENTS 1%, Phil. County RESIDENTS 18%
Figure B.6: How would you identify your race and/or ethnicity?

% of respondents (n = 907)

- White Alone: 47%
- Black or African American Alone: 39%
- Multiracial: 5%
- Asian Alone: 3%
- Hispanic or Latino/a Alone: 3%
- Other: 1%
- American Indian/Alaska Native Alone: 0.4%
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Alone: 0.2%

Figure B.7: Racial and/or Ethnic Identity, Comparison

% of Phil. County RESPONDENTS (n = 643) compared to Phil. County RESIDENTS

Figure B.8: Where do you currently live? Top cities:
% of respondents (n = 919)

- PHILADELPHIA, PA: 72%
- CHESTER, PA: 3%
- LANSDALE, PA: 2%
- MEDIA, PA: 1%
- WEST CHESTER, PA: 1.0%
- WALLINGFORD, PA: 0.9%
- MOORESTOWN, NJ: 0.9%
- CAMDEN, NJ: 0.7%
- CHELTENHAM, PA: 0.5%
- ARDMORE, PA: 0.5%

Figure B.9: Where do you currently live? Top Zip Codes:
% of respondents (n = 912)

- 19143: 5%
- 19146: 3%
- 19147: 3%
- 19144: 3%
- 19119: 3%
- 19134: 3%
- 19104: 3%
- 19132: 3%
- 19131: 3%
- 19130: 3%
**Figure B.10:** Where do you currently live? TPF geographic groups:

% of respondents (n = 892)

- North Phila: 15%
- South Phila: 11%
- West Phila: 10%
- Delaware County, PA: 9%
- Montgomery County, PA: 9%
- Germantown/Mt. Airy: 7%
- Center City: 7%
- Southwest Phila: 7%
- Olney/Oak Lane: 5%
- Kensington/Port Richmond: 5%
- Northeast Phila: 5%
- Chester County, PA: 4%
- Chestnut Hill/Roxborough/Manayunk: 3%
- Burlington County, NJ: 2%
- Camden County, NJ: 2%

**Figure B.11:**

Where Respondents LIVE

# of Respondents by Neighborhood or County

[Map showing the distribution of respondents by neighborhood or county]
Figure B.12: About how many years have you lived in your local community?
% of respondents (n = 911) compared to National Rate

Figure B.13: Do you own or rent your primary residence?
% of respondents (n = 898)

Figure B.14: Homeownership Comparison
% of Phil. County RESPONDENTS (n = 640) compared to Phil. County RESIDENTS
Figure B.15: What is your relationship to the Philadelphia Foundation?

% of respondents (n = 833 // select all that apply)

- I had not heard of the Philadelphia Foundation: 47%
- I've attended one of their events: 25%
- Other*: 16%
- Grantee: 14%
- I have volunteered with them: 4%
- Funder: 3%
- I work there: 1%

*Other' response: Heard of them (7.1%).

Civic Attitudes and Activities

Figure B.16: How much impact do you think people like you can have in making your community a better place to live?

% of respondents (n = 926) compared to National Rate

SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, 'Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits'

- A big impact: 32%
- A moderate impact: 32%
- A small impact: 11%
- No impact at all: 0.9%

Respondents | National Rate
Figure B.17: In general, how attached do you feel to your local community?
% of respondents (n = 919) compared to National Rate
SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

- Very attached: Respondents 58%, National Rate 19%
- Somewhat attached: Respondents 33%, National Rate 48%
- Not very attached: Respondents 8%, National Rate 25%
- Not at all attached: Respondents 1%, National Rate 8%

Figure B.18: Overall, how would you rate your community as a place to live?
% of respondents (n = 906) compared to National Rate
SOURCE: Pew Research Center, November, 2016, ‘Civic Engagement Strongly Tied to Local News Habits’

- Excellent: Respondents 32%, National Rate 29%
- Good: Respondents 52%, National Rate 55%
- Only fair: Respondents 12%, National Rate 13%
- Poor: Respondents 4%, National Rate 3%
Figure B.19: I am happy about my:
% of respondents (n = 823)

- Neighborhood: 61%
- City or town: 51%
- House/apartment: 48%
- Public transportation: 43%
- Recreational opportunities: 43%
- Healthcare: 35%
- Public safety: 35%
- Personal finances: 33%
- Air and water quality: 24%
- Local school: 22%
- Local news: 20%
- Local government: 17%
- Childcare & pre-K: 12%

Figure B.20: I am unhappy about my:
% of respondents (n = 779)

- Local school: 50%
- Public safety: 44%
- Local government: 40%
- Air and water quality: 35%
- Healthcare: 32%
- Public transportation: 28%
- Personal finances: 27%
- Local news: 27%
- Childcare & pre-K: 26%
- Recreational opportunities: 22%
- Neighborhood: 19%
- House/apartment: 17%
- City or town: 17%
Figure B.21: Happiness disparities

% difference between rates of happiness and unhappiness about the following topics. Respondents are more happy than unhappy about topics with a positive value.
Figure B.22: What is the most important problem facing your community today?

% of respondents (n = 721)

- Economic Issues and Poverty: 34%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 28%
- Education and Youth Development: 27%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 23%
- Health: 15%
- Housing and Homelessness: 10%
- Government: 9%
- Community Development: 6%
- Environment and Parks: 5%
- Religion and Morals: 4%
- Media and Awareness: 4%
- Transportation: 3%
- Family: 3%
- Collaboration: 3%
- Misc.: 3%
- Community Engagement: 2%
- Food Access: 2%
- Philanthropy: 1%
- Immigration and Migration: 1%
- Arts and Culture: 0.7%
- Technology: 0.3%
- International: 0.1%
**Figure B.23:** Which of the following social issues are most important to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Issue</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth Development</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Poverty</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety and Judicial System</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Parks</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Access</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Morals</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Migration</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other* responses: Community Engagement (0.2%), and Philanthropy (0.1%).
Figure B.24: To which social issues do you PRIMARILY contribute your time, talent, and/or financial resources?

% of respondents (n = 910 // choose up to three)

- Education and Youth Development: 47%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 33%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 27%
- Arts and Culture: 26%
- Family: 22%
- Health: 17%
- Religion and Morals: 16%
- Environment and Parks: 16%
- Government: 13%
- Housing and Homelessness: 12%
- Food Access: 11%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 10%
- The Media: 7%
- Immigration and Migration: 6%
- Technology: 6%
- Transportation: 3%
- Other*: 2%

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Community Engagement (0.9%), Community Development (0.4%), and Philanthropy (0.4%).
**Figure B.25:** Thinking about my local community, I wish I knew more about . . .

% of respondents (n = 455)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government, Policy, and Politics</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Issues and Opportunities</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other People and Groups</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Past / Present</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Get Involved</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Development</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Group-Specific Information</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities / Events</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions and Successes</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and the Criminal Justice System</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure B.26: How involved are you in community and neighborhood activities where you live?

% of respondents (n = 917) compared to National Rate


Figure B.27: Engagement Activities in the Past Year

% of respondents (n = 917 // select all that apply)
Figure B.28: Engagement Activities in the Past Year, Comparison
% of Phil. County RESPONDENTS (n = 649) compared to Phil. County RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donated more than $25 to a charitable organization</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with people in your neighborhood to fix or improve something</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a public meeting about community affairs</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B.29: How often do you vote in local elections, such as for mayor or a school board?
% of respondents (n = 912)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Frequency</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always vote</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes vote</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely vote</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never vote</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer / Not eligible</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure B.30:** Where do you like to connect with others?

% of respondents (n = 876 // select all that apply)

- Schools: 41%
- Parks: 39%
- Religious institution: 38%
- Library: 35%
- Community rec center: 34%
- Public squares: 32%
- Other*: 24%
- Community garden: 20%
- Shopping centers: 15%

*The top 3 'other' responses are: Restaurants (4.9%), Community events / meetings (4.5%), and Community service activities (2.4%).

**Figure B.31:** How often, if ever, do you get information about YOUR LOCAL COMMUNITY from each of the following sources, whether online or offline?

% of respondents
Section 2: Conversation Dynamics, Topics, and Impact

Conversation Dynamics and Topics

Figure B.32: How did you hear about On the Table?
% of respondents (n = 880 // select all that apply)

- Someone I know: 51%
- An organization: 33%
- Email: 23%
- Social media: 10%
- Other: 10%
- Newspaper: 6%
- TV/radio: 5%

Figure B.33: Which best describes your MOST IMPORTANT reason(s) for participating in On the Table?
% of respondents (n = 954 // select all that apply)

- Discuss and address important issues in my community: 68%
- Learn from and listen to others: 63%
- Meet and build relationships with new people: 46%
- Support the organizer of the conversation: 38%
- Get more involved in my community: 34%
- Other: 4%
Figure B.34: Where did your conversation take place? Top cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, PA</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media, PA</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansdale, PA</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bala Cynwyd, PA</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of respondents (n = 932)

Figure B.35: Where did your conversation take place? TPF geographic groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center City</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County, PA</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Phila</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, PA</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Phila</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Phila</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown/Mt. Airy</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington/Port Richmond</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Phila</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Phila</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Hill/Roxborough/Manayunk</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester County, PA</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney/Oak Lane</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden County, NJ</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington County, NJ</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of respondents (n = 655)
Figure B.36:
Where Respondents Attended On The Table Conversations
# of Respondents by Neighborhood or County

Figure B.37: ‘The other people at my conversation were …'
% of respondents (n = 928)
Figure B.38: Issues Raised During the Conversation

% of respondents (n = 624)

- Education and Youth Development: 31%
- Equity and Social Inclusion: 28%
- Economic Issues and Poverty: 22%
- Public Safety and Judicial System: 15%
- Government: 10%
- Community Engagement: 10%
- Collaboration: 10%
- Media and Awareness: 9%
- Philanthropy: 9%
- Health: 9%
- Community Development: 9%
- Housing and Homelessness: 6%
- Religion and Morals: 6%
- Environment and Parks: 6%
- Family: 6%
- Arts and Culture: 5%
- Transportation: 5%
- Misc.: 3%
- Immigration and Migration: 3%
- Food Access: 3%
- Technology: 2%
- International: 0.2%
Impact of the Conversation

**Figure B.39:** How did you connect with others at your conversation(s)?
% of respondents (n = 914 // select all that apply)

- I spoke with one or more attendees I did not already know: 74%
- I exchanged contact information with one or more attendees I did not already know: 41%
- I made specific plans to work with one or more attendees: 26%
- None of the above: 9%

**Figure B.40:** After participating in your conversation(s), to what extent do you better understand how you, personally, can help address the issues facing your community?
% of respondents (n = 918)

- Much better: 25%
- Somewhat better: 41%
- A little better: 24%
- No change: 10%
Figure B.41: How likely are you to take specific actions or next steps regarding an issue or solution discussed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too likely</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of respondents (n = 915)

Figure B.42: Actions or next steps respondents are likely to take regarding an issue or solution discussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build relationships and collaborate</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness and educate others</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get more involved in community</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take action through my job</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor or motivate others</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve myself through personal development and learning</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become more politically involved</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support for my family</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of respondents (n = 867 // select all that apply)
Appendix C: Issues Codebook – Defined

Arts and Culture
An arts and culture code may refer to art initiatives such as art for social change as well as public art and art infrastructure, or it may acknowledge culture through cultural institutions (such as historic buildings) and city events and activities (such as festivals) as well as through opportunities for ethnic cultural awareness.

Collaboration
A collaboration code refers to working together and building relationships to create partnerships and expand networks. It may function at the community or individual level and often involves crossing divides and building bridges while working toward collective impact. Sharing resources and holding dialogues/conversations are other indicators of collaboration.

Community Development
A community development code refers to identifying community assets and building up the community, particularly through local economic development, in order to improve quality of life. It also refers to building a sense of community and creating community for those who live there.

Community Engagement
A community engagement code refers to overall involvement and participation in one’s neighborhood or community in order to make a difference. Often there is an organizing element at the grassroots level as well as intentions for improved neighbor relations and opportunities for neighborhood gatherings.

Economic Issues and Poverty
An economic issues and poverty code refers to economic development, on one end, and economic insecurity, or poverty, on the other, covering in the intermediate unemployment and jobs as well as income inequality and wage issues.

Education and Youth Development
An education and youth development code refers primarily to schools (such as school system or curriculum) and students (often at the high school level) with additional focal points on mentoring and general youth development. It is also inclusive of other related topics such as community relationships, parent involvement, and research.

Environment and Parks
An environment and parks code refers to overall environmental sustainability efforts and clean up as well as recreational opportunities for all. It is inclusive of greenspace as well as farmland and agriculture.

Equity and Social Inclusion
An equity and social inclusion code uses a social justice lens to account for forms of exclusion and issues of access and equality for underserved groups. Reference is largely made to youth access and engagement concerns as well as to issues of disparity as noted across income levels, racial groups, and neighborhoods.

Family
A family code refers to the overall functioning and behavior of the family unit, particularly through parent involvement and support (or lack thereof) and child concerns such as childcare.
Food Access
A food access code refers primarily to food insecurity, focusing on problems of hunger and food deserts and solutions regarding food assistance and urban agriculture.

Government
A government code refers to the governing habits of the state and regional municipalities, especially regarding fiscal issues and taxes, including pensions and cuts to social services, as well as transparency, accountability, and corruption. It also involves the function of government, particularly through elections, public engagement, and public policy.

Health
A health code refers to the wellbeing of both people and communities, considering in particular mental health issues and addiction while also taking into account public health, quality of life issues, nutrition and wellness, and health care.

Housing and Homelessness
A housing and homelessness code primarily refers to homelessness and issues around home ownership and renting responsibilities.

Immigration and Migration
An immigration and migration code refers to the displacement, movement, and integration of immigrant communities, including those who are undocumented and those who are refugees.

International
An international code refers to world affairs.

Media and Awareness
A media and awareness code refers to raising awareness around issues of importance and addressing ignorance, particularly through the media and social media. It includes improving communication and building new narratives, especially around persistent stigmas.

Religion and Morals
A morals and religion code refers largely to personal attributes and attitudes, such as apathy or hope. It is also inclusive of faith-based community work.

Philanthropy
A philanthropy code refers to increased funding and support for programs and nonprofit organizations and often incorporates a need for organizational capacity building, institutional community outreach, and corporate social responsibility. On the individual level, it refers to civic responsibility and volunteering, with individuals taking action for the greater good.

Public Safety and Judicial System
A public safety and judicial system code may refer to public safety and crime as well as the criminal justice system, including instances of gang violence, gun violence, drugs, and trafficking, and how officials such as police can better provide community security.
Technology
A technology code refers to technology in a general sense and includes references to access, training, and improvement.

Transportation
A transportation code refers to transportation access and transportation infrastructure.
Appendix D: ‘Know More’ Codebook – Defined

Activities / Events
An Activities/Events code refers to any recreation (such as the arts or sports); any program organized by an individual, organization, or community; or a non-specific cultural event.

Housing and Development
A Housing and Development code refers to housing-related issues (primarily homelessness and ownership/renting responsibilities), in addition to issues concerning community growth (displacement, gentrification, overcrowding) and structural development (facilities, infrastructure, transportation).

Community Past / Present
A Community Past/Present code refers to both the history and current status of a community. Often there is a focus on happenings that build a sense of community, organized by groups and organizations at the grassroots level. It also includes relevant community members, such as local leaders and advocates.

Crime and the Criminal Justice System
A Crime and the Criminal Justice System code refers to the antecedents and consequences of criminal activity (primarily violence and drugs), police systems and structures that ensure public safety, and topics related to incarceration.

Economic Issues and Opportunities
An Economic Issues and Opportunities code refers to both economic growth through local businesses and employment opportunities and economic insecurity (i.e. poverty, low income). Also included are resources that can enhance economic prosperity, such as financial literacy instruction, affordability of necessities, and job training.

Education
An Education code uses an ecological lens to account for both formal (i.e. school) and informal (i.e. parenting/family) educational sources that guide and shape young people. Also included are any opportunities for youth to learn, engage or develop.

Environment
An Environment code refers to environmental sustainability efforts, including but not limited to green technology and use of public transit, as well as cleanliness and health-related environmental concerns, such as litter, waste, and air and water quality.

Government, Policy, and Politics
A Government, Policy, and Politics code may include references to policy, primarily regarding taxes, funding, and zoning, as well as political agendas and citizen rights.

Identity Group-Specific Information
An Identity Group-Specific Information code indicates a reference to a particular group defined by race, gender, age, beliefs, abilities, etc. Often times this code will appear as a double code with another code that speaks to the topic of interest within a group.
How to Get Involved
A How to Get Involved code encaptures a sentiment of desire to help, volunteer, make a difference, contribute, participate, or engage others. This code also may refer to those leading these efforts, such as change makers and people interested in running for office.

Solutions and Successes
A Solutions and Successes code refers to positive, impactful initiatives or examples of success and accomplishment, embodying an interest in being refreshed with good news. It may also refer to how to solve a problem or fix something.

Other People and Groups
An Other People and Groups code refers to networking and building connections with both local residents/neighbors and people from other geographic locations. It also includes people of different, unspecified cultures, heritages, or backgrounds.

Resources
A Resources code refers to any initiative that works to better lives and communities, including both the services, supports, and information themselves, as well as the responsible organization or agency.
Hashtag Usage

1,628
total mentions

2.3M
Total impressions

The event occurred on May 23. Not surprisingly, social activity peaked on the event day.
Platform Breakdown

479
Unique Twitter Influencers

Insights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twitter User</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@onthetablephl</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@SmallBizPhilly</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@livebeautifulcow</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@CorrectionsPA</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@knightfdn</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@COLSIA</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@EvoluirrHouse</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@IAMissCheryl</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@yvetteconunez</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@lesleymwanker4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twitter Insight

Tweeters Platform

Links

Media

Engagement

Top Sources
- Twitter for iPhone: 33.5%
- Hootsuite: 22%
- Twitter Web Client: 18.1%
- Twitter for Android: 12.3%
- Twitter Lite: 3.1%
- Other: 11%
Appendix F: Geographic Group Comparisons

Figure F.1

Geographic Group Comparisons for what respondents are Most Happy and Unhappy About

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Group</th>
<th>Most Happy About</th>
<th>Most Unhappy About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington County, NJ (n=21)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (63%)</td>
<td>Local government (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden County, NJ (n=18)</td>
<td>Public transportation (72%)</td>
<td>Local school (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City (n=60)</td>
<td>House/apartment (71%)</td>
<td>Local school (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester County, PA (n=34)</td>
<td>City or town (73%)</td>
<td>Public transportation (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Hill/Roxborough/Manayunk (n=28)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (85%)</td>
<td>Local government (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County, PA (n=80)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (55%)</td>
<td>Local school // Local government (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown/Mt. Airy (n=65)</td>
<td>House/apartment (57%)</td>
<td>Local school (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington/Port Richmond (n=45)</td>
<td>City or town (55%)</td>
<td>Local school (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, PA (n=77)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (69%)</td>
<td>Air and water quality (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Phila (n=134)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (51%)</td>
<td>Local school (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Phila (n=42)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (64%)</td>
<td>Local school (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney/Oak Lane (n=45)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (49%)</td>
<td>Local school (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Phila (n=99)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (71%)</td>
<td>Local school (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Phila (n=58)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (57%)</td>
<td>Local school (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Phila (n=86)</td>
<td>Neighborhood (58%)</td>
<td>Local school (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure F.2

Geographic Group Comparisons for Issues, Problems and Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Group</th>
<th>Top Issue Discussed</th>
<th>Most Important Problem</th>
<th>Most Important Social Issue</th>
<th>Top Social Issue to which I Contribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington County, NJ (n=21)</td>
<td>Ed (60%)</td>
<td>Econ (45%)</td>
<td>Ed (71%)</td>
<td>Ed (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden County, NJ (n=18)</td>
<td>Ed (55%)</td>
<td>Econ (64%)</td>
<td>Econ (61%)</td>
<td>Equity (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center City (n=60)</td>
<td>Ed (38%)</td>
<td>Ed (44%)</td>
<td>Econ (59%)</td>
<td>Ed (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester County, PA (n=34)</td>
<td>Econ (26%)</td>
<td>Econ (39%)</td>
<td>Ed (50%)</td>
<td>Econ (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Hill/Roxborough/Manayunk (n=28)</td>
<td>Ed (33%)</td>
<td>Econ // Ed (38%)</td>
<td>Ed (50%)</td>
<td>Ed (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County, PA (n=80)</td>
<td>Equity (25%)</td>
<td>Econ (33%)</td>
<td>Econ (64%)</td>
<td>Ed (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown/Mt. Airy (n=65)</td>
<td>Econ (27%)</td>
<td>Econ (44%)</td>
<td>Econ // Ed (60%)</td>
<td>Ed (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington/Port Richmond (n=45)</td>
<td>Safety (33%)</td>
<td>Safety (62%)</td>
<td>Ed (58%)</td>
<td>Ed (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, PA (n=77)</td>
<td>Equity (40%)</td>
<td>Ed (37%)</td>
<td>Ed (60%)</td>
<td>Ed (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Phila (n=134)</td>
<td>Ed (36%)</td>
<td>Econ (35%)</td>
<td>Ed (68%)</td>
<td>Ed (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Phila (n=42)</td>
<td>Econ // Equity (21%)</td>
<td>Safety (35%)</td>
<td>Ed (60%)</td>
<td>Ed (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney/Oak Lane (n=45)</td>
<td>Ed (39%)</td>
<td>Safety (45%)</td>
<td>Ed (69%)</td>
<td>Ed (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Phila (n=99)</td>
<td>Ed (33%)</td>
<td>Econ (39%)</td>
<td>Ed (60%)</td>
<td>Ed (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Phila (n=58)</td>
<td>Ed (30%)</td>
<td>Econ (37%)</td>
<td>Econ (66%)</td>
<td>Ed (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Phila (n=86)</td>
<td>Ed (36%)</td>
<td>Econ (36%)</td>
<td>Ed (64%)</td>
<td>Ed (53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Visualization of Issues-to-Causes Disparity

Figure G.1

Themes Disparity Between Important Issues and Contributions
For example, only 25% of respondents who mentioned Transportation (n=69) as an important social issue also mentioned it as social issue to which they contribute their time, talent or financial resources. The ‘n’ represents the number of respondents who chose the corresponding variable as an important issue and also responded to the contribution question.