There is a limited understanding of the mechanisms through which citizen engagement creates trust. The social psychological concept of mattering may be a helpful way of understanding that process. This paper applies mattering to the experience of participants in Chapel Hill 2020, a community visioning and comprehensive planning effort undertaken by the Town of Chapel Hill. The study finds that positive prior experience with their local governments and assuming a leadership role are associated with higher levels of mattering for participants at the close of the citizen engagement effort. The paper concludes with practical recommendations based on these findings.
Researchers in the field of citizen engagement are searching for new ways to measure the quality of local governments’ engagement efforts. Yang points out that new research can contribute to theory development by applying concepts from other research fields to citizen engagement. Barnes and Williams suggest a connection between citizen engagement and the concept of mattering taken from social psychology. This paper uses the social psychological concept of mattering as a lens through which to examine a specific citizen engagement effort.

Although research indicates citizen engagement can play an important role in building citizen trust, there is a limited understanding of the mechanisms through which engagement actually creates trust. The concept of mattering may be a helpful way of understanding that process because the research on mattering already highlights its role in developing greater trust within relationships in the mental health field and within educational settings.

Mattering
Rosenberg and McCullough introduced the concept of mattering in 1981 and it has been widely studied since then. Elliott, Kao, and Grant define mattering as “the extent we make a difference in the world around us. People matter simply because: others attend to them (awareness), invest resources in them (importance), or look to them for resources (reliance).” Elliott, Kao, and Grant recognize situations in which these factors may be present without leading a person to feeling they matter. For example, if another person is transparently trying to ingratiate themselves to me, I may see them paying attention to me, investing resources in me, and relying on me, yet not feel as though I matter to that person. For this reason, Elliott, Kao, and Grant add that “mattering is distinguished by the sense that others are relating to a person largely as an end in itself and not as a means to some other end.” After the initial condition of being treated as an end is satisfied, the degree of mattering a person experiences then expands to the degree that the mattering factors are satisfied (Figure 1).

When applying the concept of mattering to citizen engagement, it is necessary to expand the condition that individuals be treated as means rather than ends. On the one hand, there are instrumental reasons for participating in citizen engagement efforts. Participants may desire a particular result from their participation, but they expect to be treated as ends in themselves as well.

Chapel Hill 2020
In September of 2011, the Town of Chapel Hill began a process that blends community visioning into the development of a new comprehensive plan. They named it Chapel Hill 2020. The town engaged citizens and stakeholders in early meetings to develop six themes participants saw as the most important dimensions of a strong community. With the facilitation of town staff, the community organized discussion groups around these themes with each group led by a team of three volunteer group leaders. As
the six theme groups continued to meet through the spring of 2012, the conversations they fostered between citizens, group leaders, and support staff grew into more specific goals. Each group also developed a bank of action items, a record of what participants believe will be necessary to achieve each theme’s goals. On June 25, 2012, the Town Council unanimously adopted the Chapel Hill 2020 comprehensive plan.

Research Question
This study’s research question is: *What aspects of citizen engagement affect citizens’ perceived sense of mattering to their local government?*

Methodology
This study analyzes data from a survey distributed to Chapel Hill 2020 participants. The survey yielded sixty-one complete responses. It adapted ten items from The General Mattering Index to measure participants’ sense of mattering to the Town of Chapel Hill after their participation in Chapel Hill 2020.

The survey included independent variables to cover the frequency, form, and duration of participants’ engagement with Chapel Hill 2020. The survey also asked why participants joined Chapel Hill 2020, what their level of involvement with the Chapel Hill Town Government was prior to Chapel Hill 2020, and what their expectations of participating in Chapel Hill 2020 were prior to their decision to become involved. The analysis below breaks out data by high, medium and low mattering index scores then presents the frequency of responses to the independent variable questions to present relationships between the independent variables and respondents' mattering index scores. Statistical analysis was conducted to determine the significance of the associations among the variables.

The survey also asked participants to share specific observations that guided their responses to the General Mattering Index questions and analyzes their feedback for connections to the mattering construct. Thirty-one survey respondents provided their observations. I categorized these thirty-one responses by whether they were relevant to one of the three mattering factors, the need Elliot, Kao, & Grant point out for people to be treated as ends rather than means, or were primarily about improvements to the survey.

Limitations
The low number of survey responses compromises the generalizability of any findings to the general population of Chapel Hill. This study reports relationships and suggests actions the Town of Chapel Hill can take to further test those relationships. There were some relevant independent variables that are not yet testable. The survey was administered only after the initial phase of Chapel Hill 2020 capped by the Town Council’s unanimous vote for the Chapel Hill 2020 Comprehensive Plan passed. It is not possible to compare before and after data. Additionally, I only measure mattering in a single sample. Finally, this survey was conducted before the implementation of Chapel Hill 2020. As participants see projects unfold from through the Chapel Hill 2020 process, their sense of mattering may change.

Data
To better understand the findings below, it is necessary to keep in mind two distinctions the survey used. The first distinction is between leading and attending Chapel Hill 2020 meetings. Chapel Hill 2020 used citizen-facilitated discussion groups to develop the goals and objectives contained in the final plan. Leading a meeting is defined as serving as a facilitator for at least one meeting. Attending a meeting is defined as participating in a discussion group as a participant rather than as a facilitator.

The second important distinction is between positive and negative prior experience with the Town of Chapel Hill. Participants were asked whether at the outset of their participation in Chapel Hill 2020 they were looking forward to their involvement because of prior positive experience with the Town, were skeptical of getting involved with Chapel Hill 2020 because of prior negative experience, or were unsure...
of what to expect from their involvement because they had little or no prior experience with the Town. Three participants wrote in that none of the choices fit them because overall, their experience with the Town was both positive and negative without one overshadowing the other.

5 Key Findings—Quantitative Survey Analysis
Finding 1: Eighty-five percent of survey participants experienced a medium or high sense of mattering in light of their engagement in Chapel Hill 2020 (Table 1).

Table 1: Levels of Mattering among Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mattering Level</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding 2: There is a statistically significant difference between the mattering index scores of participants who led meetings and participants who either did not attend or lead meetings or attended meetings without leading them (Table 2).\(^{18}\)

Table 2: Comparing Mattering Scores of Meeting Leaders and Meeting Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Led Meetings (N=11)</th>
<th>Attended Meetings (N=46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Mattering Index Score</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey data shows no way to predict a survey participant’s level of mattering based on whether they attended Chapel Hill 2020 meetings. However, if a survey respondent led Chapel Hill 2020 meetings, they are much likelier to have a higher sense of mattering after the experience. However the relationship expressed here is not necessarily one of causation.

Finding 3: There is no statistically significant relationship between participants’ duration of involvement and their mattering index scores. Participants were given various periods of time for which they might have participated ranging from the period of time required for a single activity to three months or more. No significant differences in mattering scores emerged among participants in any one duration period. Even when the five categories were condensed into two, no pattern emerged among the participants completing this survey.

Finding 4: There was no statistically significant relationship between participants’ level of involvement with the Town prior to Chapel Hill 2020 and their mattering index scores. Chapel Hill attracted some people who are regular attendees at council meetings and others who do not consider themselves involved with Chapel Hill Town government at all. Survey respondents were given five choices describing ranges of possible involvement and chose which fit them best prior to their involvement with Chapel Hill 2020. None of those choices correlated to higher levels of mattering, even when the five categories were condensed to two categories.

Finding 5: There is a statistically significant relationship between positive prior experience with the Town of Chapel Hill and a higher mattering index score (Table 3).\(^{19}\)

Table 3: The Influence of Prior Positive Experience on Mattering Scores
If survey participants’ experience participating with the Chapel Hill Town government was positive, they were likelier to have a higher sense of mattering after participating in Chapel Hill 2020. If their previous experience was negative overall, they were likelier to have lower levels of mattering after participating in Chapel Hill 2020.

Finding 6: Sixteen out of seventeen survey respondents who described themselves as having not much prior experience with the Town of Chapel Hill emerged with either a medium or high level of mattering. As a group they had a mean mattering score only a few points lower than participants who described themselves as having positive prior experience with the Town. The Town of Chapel Hill spent significant resources advertising Chapel Hill 2020 throughout the community to reach beyond the group of citizens who regularly attend public meetings. From the perspective of mattering, this was a wise decision because it gave the Town a better chance to engage with citizens who were more likely to have high levels of mattering after the engagement process was complete.

Findings—Qualitative Survey Analysis Findings
Although there were thirty-one responses to the qualitative survey question, some of the longer responses addressed multiple topics. Therefore, the numbers in the Table 4 below add up to thirty-six.
The majority of comments expressed concern about the Chapel Hill 2020 process through the lens of one of the three factors of mattering.

Table 4: Comments by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three factors</th>
<th>End not means</th>
<th>Primarily about survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding 7: Approximately one fifth of survey respondents reported that limited staff or volunteer capacity impacted their sense of mattering. Of the twenty-three comments addressing one of the three factors of mattering (Table 4), twelve addressed the factor of importance. Of those twelve, all but one expressed concerns about the capacity of group leaders to facilitate group meetings effectively. Nearly all of the importance comments expressed concerns about the capacity of group leaders’ facilitation skills (Table 6).

Table 6: Areas of Concern around Group Leaders’ Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of concern</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing and distributing data from individual meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking questions that will yield specific, actionable suggestions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating discussion into written reports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving from brainstorming to converging around common themes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing challenging personalities/contentious conversations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining continuity in the discussion even as different people showed up in different weeks.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finding 8: Six participants expressed their belief that the Town or group leaders pre-determined the outcomes of Chapel Hill 2020 and steered discussions to arrive at those ends. Those six participants had a much lower mattering index score (23) than the average mattering score for the survey pool (35). Referring back to Figure 1, because these six participants did not fully satisfy the necessary condition for mattering, the ceiling for their sense of mattering was lower than for the rest of the survey pool. There is likely to be some group of citizens who do not find their views on process goals adopted by the majority. When that occurs, it will likely place a low ceiling on their mattering scores.

Recommendations
Because my focus is to provide practice-oriented recommendations based on survey data and all of the data were collected in connection with Chapel Hill 2020, my recommendations are primarily directed to the Town of Chapel Hill. However, other local governments may adopt these as well to the extent that there are parallels between their experiences and the Town of Chapel Hill’s experiences during Chapel Hill 2020. Based on the findings above, the following recommendations will allow the Town of Chapel Hill to further test the relationships from this study’s data.

1. Serving as a group leader was highly correlated to a high sense of mattering. To spread those possible benefits to a wider group of residents, The Town of Chapel Hill could expand its use of citizen-led discussion groups into other areas.²⁰

2. The Town can increase the capacity of volunteers by requiring pre-service facilitation training for discussion group leaders. Increasing the leader capacity may turn attendance at discussion groups into a more effective tool for building participants’ sense of mattering. It may also further increase leaders’ sense of mattering by increasing the importance factor that deals with resources invested in a person’s welfare. Although the comments in this survey can serve as a starting point for developing training competencies, a more detailed analysis is needed given this study’s limitations.

3. The Town should emphasize mattering as a goal for high service quality in any interaction between Town staff and residents. Such action can reinforce the strong connections between positive experience and high mattering scores as well as between negative experience and low mattering scores. Cultivating positive service experiences and minimizing negative ones is a foundational habit for local governments aiming to increase residents’ sense of mattering.

4. Because mattering levels of participants who do not have much experience with their local government were higher after the citizen engagement process was completed, the Town should continue its efforts to engage new participants as it moves forward.

Gregory Elliott, a psychologist who pioneered the study of mattering over three decades, believes “mattering is the fundamental human motivation; to be a social nonentity is intolerable, and people will do anything to escape this plight.”²¹ To the extent that part of the goal of a citizen engagement effort is to change behavior in some way, local government leaders forego the use of a powerful tool by ignoring the concept of mattering. Through further integration of mattering within the context of local government, communities can benefit from programs better tailored to meeting the most basic needs of those involved.


—

²⁰

²¹


8 Elliott, Kao, and Grant, p. 342

9 Figure 1 was not created by Elliott, Kao, and Grant. It is this author’s attempt to provide a graphic representation of the mattering concept.


11 There were eighty-three total responses. Twenty-two incomplete responses were missing data on the dependent variable, independent variables, or both. Due to which answers were missing in the partial responses, I decided to discard them and analyze only the complete responses.

12 This is the instrument Elliott, Kao, and Grant develop and validate in “Mattering Empirical Validation of a Social-Psychological Concept.”

13 All GMI items used a five option Likert scale for measurement. After adding the responses from each item to arrive at the index, I divided respondents’ index scores into three groups (high, medium, and low) for ease of presentation. All index scores were between ten and fifty. Low scores range from ten to twenty-three. Medium scores range from twenty-four to thirty-six. High scores range from thirty-seven to fifty.

14 The following table shows the criteria I used to categorize comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Is the comment primarily about being listened to vs. being ignored?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Does the comment address the investment of resources by the Town in the 2020 process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance</td>
<td>Is the comment mostly concerned with resources participants contributed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated as an end</td>
<td>Does the comment suggest the participant had a role in developing the 200's results or that they were in a situation where other groups pre-determined the outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments about survey</td>
<td>Is the comment's purpose to express concern or praise about this study's survey?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 A coefficient alpha was calculated for the GMI items used in this study with a result of .941. This suggests the index results are reliable for individuals like those who completed the survey. The limitation exists in the fact that there may be large portions of the population who participated in Chapel Hill 2020 but did not complete the survey.
For example, it is possible Chapel Hill 2020 drew people who are more likely to feel that they matter to others in all aspects of their lives. If that is the case, it would further undermine the generalizability of this study’s findings. However I was unable to identify an instrument to measure this more general form of mattering without biasing the survey data.

Additionally, the data’s reliability is questionable as there were significant differences between the mattering index scores and respondent’s responses to the statement: “My participation in Chapel Hill 2020 strengthened my belief that I matter to the Town.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mattering Index</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering Statement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) With a p-value of .004
\(^{19}\) A chi-square test was conducted with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mattering Index (Low, Med, High)</th>
<th>Quality of Prior Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.869</td>
<td>11.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, the Town is in the process of conducting studies to create land use recommendations for six Future Focus Areas identified in the Chapel Hill 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The Town might also use a citizen-led discussion group model to gather feedback on major service changes, such as a long-term plan for solid waste disposal.
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Appendix 1: The Survey

Chapel Hill 2020 Participant Survey

You are being asked to take a survey that is part of a research study measuring the effects of your participation in Chapel Hill 2020. Only people who participated in Chapel Hill 2020 should complete the survey. It should take about twenty minutes to complete. All responses will be anonymous meaning that no one will be able to link your responses to any identifiable information about you. Answering the survey questions will involve your feelings about the Chapel Hill Town government. If these questions cause you any concern, please remember that no one can connect your answers to you. While having as many responses as possible will help the study be most effective, the survey is completely voluntary and you may stop taking it at any time. While you may not receive any direct benefit from this survey, you will be providing valuable information to the Chapel Hill Town government about how it engages citizens. All participants must be 18 years of age or older. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Ben Chambers (bhchambe@live.unc.edu 919.969.5053) or Rick Morse (rmorse@sog.unc.edu).

Ben Chambers is a student researcher, and Rick Morse is a faculty advisor overseeing Ben’s work.

Gift Card Drawing At the end of this survey, you will have a chance to enter a drawing for a $25 gift card to Amazon by providing your name, e-mail address, and phone number. The drawing is completely voluntary and it is not necessary to enter in order to complete the survey. The contact information you provide will be password-protected and will be deleted as soon as the drawing is complete.

Your Rights as a Research Participant All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a university committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the Institutional Review Board at (919) 966-3113 or via email at IRB_subjects@unc.edu with study number 12-2355. If you consent to be part of the study and you are 18 or older, please choose “Agree” after the statement below.

I am 18 years of age or older. I have read the information above and consent to be part of this study.

☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
Q1 How did you participate in Chapel Hill 2020? Please check all that apply and give your best guess of how many times you participated through the activities you select.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1-5 times</th>
<th>5-10 times</th>
<th>10-15 times</th>
<th>More than 15 times</th>
<th>I did not participate in this way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posted Comment to the Chapel Hill 2020 blog.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Chapel Hill 2020 meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led meetings as a citizen co-chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read documents (newspaper articles, blog entries, drafts of the Chapel Hill 2020 Plan, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended council meetings focused on Chapel Hill 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent e-mail about Chapel Hill 2020 to the Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled out a Chapel Hill 2020 comment card</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (If needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 How long did your participation in Chapel Hill 2020 last?

- I only participated once.
- One week or less
- Between one week and one month
- Between one month and three months
- More than three months

Q3 Why did you decide to participate in Chapel Hill 2020 (select one or more)?

- I cared about a specific issue
- My friends or family were participating
- Because I was invited
- I was asked to participate as a part of my job
- Because I wanted to learn more about the Town in general
- Other ____________________

Q4 Select the statement that best describes your level of participation with the Chapel Hill Town government before Chapel Hill 2020.

- Very involved (regularly attended public meetings and/or served on a board or commission)
- More involved than most (three or more public meetings or contacts with the Town in a year)
- Vote in local elections and attend public meetings depending on the issue (fewer than three public meetings or contacts with the Town in a year)
- I vote in local elections and that's usually it.
- I was not involved with the Chapel Hill Town government before Chapel Hill 2020.

Q5 What statement best describes your relationship with the Chapel Hill Town government before Chapel Hill 2020?

- I didn't have much experience participating with the Town, so I didn't really know what to expect from Chapel Hill 2020
- I had some negative experiences with the Town in the past that made me skeptical about participating in Chapel Hill 2020
- My experiences participating with the Town in the past were very positive overall, so I was looking forward to being a part of Chapel Hill 2020
- Other ____________________
Please read the following statements and select the response that fits your reaction best.

Q6 The Town did a good job of recognizing my participation in Chapel Hill 2020.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q7 For whatever reason, it was difficult to get the Town’s attention as a 2020 participant.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q8 Whatever else happened, the Town did not ignore me.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q9 The Town did not really care whether I found it meaningful to participate in Chapel Hill 2020.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q10 During Chapel Hill 2020, the Town used a lot of resources creating opportunities for me and other people to speak our minds when it could have created a new comprehensive plan on its own.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q11 I brought up an issue that I believe the Town did not really want to hear about.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q12 During Chapel Hill 2020 the Town was indifferent to my needs.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q13 Chapel Hill 2020 showed me the Town does not look to citizens for input on important issues.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q14 I felt Chapel Hill 2020 relied on me for success.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q15 Chapel Hill 2020 showed that the Town is willing to trust its citizens with important tasks.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q16 My participation in Chapel Hill 2020 strengthened my belief that I matter to the Town.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
Q17 Please share any specific observations or experiences you had as a Chapel Hill 2020 participant that guided your answers in questions 6-16.

Q18 What is your age?

☐ 18-30
☐ 30-45
☐ 45-60
☐ 61+

Q19 Are you male or female?

☐ Male
☐ Female

Q20 What is your approximate household income?

☐ Less than $20,000
☐ Between $20,000 and $39,999
☐ Between $40,000 and $59,999
☐ Between $60,000 and $79,999
☐ Between $80,000 and $99,999
☐ $100,000 or more

Q21 How do you describe yourself (select one or more)?

☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
☐ Asian
☐ Black or African American
☐ Hispanic or Latino
☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
☐ White

Q22 What connects you to the Town of Chapel Hill (select one or more)?

☐ I am a resident
☐ I work in Chapel Hill
☐ I am a student at the University
☐ I use the Town’s facilities (library, bus service, parks and recreation facilities and programming, etc.)
☐ Other ____________________

Q23 How long have you lived in Chapel Hill?