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The first Positive Psychology Summit to study positive aspects of human behavior and growth rather than illness held in 1999, emerged with a group of hypothetical descriptors of the “good life.” The existing survey instrument consists of questions related to the individual fields that were written by The Gallup Organization to describe the postulated constructs. The purpose of the initial research conducted in 2001 was to hold up a mirror to the St. Louis metropolitan community in order to

1) create a benchmark of research results for St. Louis
2) provide feedback and action planning
3) stimulate actions through stakeholder groups at the grass roots level and policy makers in the public and private sectors to, as Regional Center for Education and Work (RCEW) suggests, “think regionally and act locally”

With the benchmark of research results completed in 2001, these survey results will focus on change as a result of efforts by individuals, groups, organizations, and businesses across the community to improve well-being between 2001 and 2002.

Gallup conducted a follow-up survey of the St. Louis metropolitan region (n=1,001) between June 21 and July 25, 2002, using the instrument consisting of 12 dimensions and 67 items, plus two overall measures for a total of 75 items.

This was to serve as a follow-up study to the 2001 survey to measure change within the wellspring dimensions. The wellspring dimensions include the following

- Aesthetics (appreciating and experiencing beauty)
- Altruism/Civility (volunteer service, community improvement)
- Courage (taking a stand for beliefs)
- Creativity (using imagination, originality)
- Friendships (developing relationships with others)
- Future Focus (setting and using goals)
- Learning (learning and growing)
- Principle-Centered (using values and beliefs)
- Self-Regulation (structure and discipline)
- Spirituality (spiritual beliefs)
- Wisdom (making sense of experience)
- Workplace Satisfaction (enjoyment and satisfaction from work)
Detailed Findings

Wellspring Dimensions
The St. Louis 2002 and 2001 wellspring dimension means are very similar, suggesting that the St. Louis perceptions were relatively unchanged.

The St. Louis 2002 scores by wellspring dimension range from a high of 4.49 for Learning to a low of 3.39 for Altruism/Civility. This range reflects a similar pattern found in 2001.

Based on the number of items given a “5” on a scale of one-to-five with “5” high within a dimension, St. Louis respondents rate Learning, Principle-Centered, Friendships, and Spirituality highest, the same as in 2001. Workplace Satisfaction, Altruism/Civility, Wisdom, Creativity, and Future Focus rate lowest on the percent of “5s” compared to Workplace Satisfaction, Altruism/Civility, Wisdom, and Self-Regulation in 2001.

Ladder
The Ladder is an overall assessment, using ladder steps of “0” to describe the worst to “10” for the best possible life. Unprompted by references to any quality or description, overall perceptions of the step on the Ladder result in a mean of 7.26 for St. Louis, equivalent to 7.33 in 2001. The present ladder step correlates to all 12 wellspring dimensions. Respondents aged 55+, those with more education, higher annual household incomes, and Whites rated their present situation in the “Top Box” (steps 7-10) on the ladder more frequently, as was the case in 2001 (6.87 vs. 6.41).

However, comparisons between the mean scores from 2001 to 2002 indicate that Non-Whites in the current study rate the present step of the Ladder significantly higher in 2002 than in 2001 (6.87 vs. 6.41).

When asked to rate the step of the ladder respondents were on five years ago, similar to the 2001 study, present standing on the ladder tended to be higher than perceived standing five years ago. In St. Louis, those under age 55, those with more than a high school education, those with annual household incomes of $30,000+, and Whites increased the most from five years ago to the present in the “Top Box.”

Respondents from St. Louis are hopeful when asked to project the step five years into the future. In 2002, those anticipating a step on the “Top Box” (steps 7-10) increase by 14% from the present (73%) to five years from now (87%), similar to 2001 results.

Comparing the 2001 and 2002 study, there are no significant differences based upon mean scores for perceptions of where respondents stood on the ladder five years ago.
Friendships and Workplace Satisfaction are the wellspring dimensions that best predict the overall perception of the Ladder, explaining approximately 15% of the variance.

**Subjective Well-Being**

Subjective Well-Being is the sum of five individual questions and serves as another overall measure. The mean of the item means for St. Louis 2002 is 3.66, statistically equivalent to the 3.71 recorded in 2001. Subjective Well-Being is significantly correlated to all 12 wellspring dimensions as it was in 2001.

Friendships, Learning, Principle-Centered, Self-Regulation, Wisdom, and Workplace Satisfaction are the wellspring dimensions that best predict Subjective Well-Being, explaining approximately 40% of the variance.

**Quality of Education in Your School District**

The mean for the quality of education for schools in the respondents’ school district for St. Louis 2002 is 3.69 compared to 3.66 in 2001. The difference in means is not significant. The rating of the quality of education was correlated to 10 of the 12 wellspring dimensions (excepting Aesthetics and Courage) the Ladder and Subjective Well-Being.

Slightly more than one-fifth (21%) rate the quality of the schools in their school district a “5” and 40% rate the school district a “4.” Sixty-one percent (61%) of the St. Louis respondents rate the schools in their school district a “4” or “5.” This is similar to the trend observed in 2001 when 59% of the respondents responded favorably to this item.
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Introduction and Methodology

Introduction

Gallup’s Quality of Community Life survey is different from traditional lists and publications of communities in three ways. First, most rankings of communities comprise an index of statistics such as school drop out rates, unemployment rates, average home values or availability of recreation activities. Gallup’s approach starts from a theoretical base of constructs that are believed important to overall happiness and satisfaction. Gallup’s approach emerges from the belief that asking community members about their happiness and satisfaction with life yields the best information to improve that community. Second, most statistical indices measure a community’s past situation. Gallup believes that a community should focus on its future. Third, a community’s score may go up or down with no apparent reason, and community members and leaders possess little ability to impact that score. Gallup’s approach is to highlight current perceptions of a community, stimulate a community to reflect upon and discuss what the community can be in the future, and plan strategies to get there.

We now have two sets of data: the initial data from the survey in 2001 and current data from the survey conducted between June 24 and July 25, 2002. The function of these two surveys is to hold up a mirror for the St. Louis community and help it understand how individuals see the community and, when individual data is combined, how the community sees itself in terms of well-being. It is a process of coming to know ourselves. Hopefully, the survey results will stimulate a broad-based dialogue at both the policy and grass roots levels. Therefore, the survey is not the end, but the beginning, of efforts by individuals and groups across the community to improve. As the Regional Center for Education and Work (RCEW) suggests, we need to “think regionally and act locally.”

The goals of the previous and current study include the following:

- Providing annual feedback to the St. Louis community from the Quality of Community Life survey;
- Conducting yearly summits to put the survey results into positive action through community priority setting and action planning sessions;
• Focusing the St. Louis metropolitan community on developing specific strategies at community, business, group, and individual levels;

• Impacting the St. Louis metropolitan area’s future;

• Emphasizing strengths, well-being, and a positive direction for St. Louis.

Methodology

To accomplish the objectives of this study, Gallup conducted a telephone survey of adults in metropolitan St. Louis, Missouri. The present telephone survey was conducted between June 24 and July 25, 2002 with 1,001 adults from the St. Louis metropolitan area participating in the survey. The 2001 study was conducted between June 22 and August 3 with 999 adults from the St. Louis metropolitan area.

Sample Design

Gallup conducted research with two independent random digit dial samples, using non-replacement sampling. The target population for the “St. Louis” data was the 13-county Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) plus St. Francoise County. The “National” data represent a proportional sample of the 48 contiguous states in the United States. The response rate for the St. Louis MSA was 14%.

Gallup uses a list-assisted probability design in which the frame consists of all valid telephone blocks within a study area which contain at least three directory-listed residential numbers. Valid blocks are sets of 100 contiguous telephone numbers in which the first eight digits are common. This technique provides coverage of virtually all residential telephone households in a study area. Gallup then randomly generates the last two numbers for a full 10-digit phone number within each valid block.

Once a household is reached, the interviewer determines how many household members are aged 18 or older. In households containing more than one adult, interviewers ask to speak with the adult who had the most recent birthday. If that individual is unavailable at the first contact, additional callbacks are made in order to protect the integrity of the random sample.

Call Design

The call design for this project consisted of at least five callbacks to each phone number released. Calls were distributed across a combination of days of the week as well as times of day.
Weighting

Weighting occurred in multiple stages and was designed to equalize selection probabilities at the individual level as well as adjust for nonresponse bias by demographics. Each step was made using data weighted from the previous step. The first weighting equalized selection probabilities at the individual level (number of eligible household members). Then the proportion of Hispanics/Non-Hispanics and of Whites/Non-Whites was sequentially adjusted to reflect the most recent Census Bureau estimates. Finally, the distribution of gender by age (using three age categories: 18-34, 35-54, 55+) was corrected.
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### Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>2002 Actual</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2002 Actual</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>2002 Actual</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post high school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate or greater</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>2002 Actual</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30K</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K-$50K</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K-$75K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75K+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The procedures for weighting the survey data collected are designed to project the results to the characteristics of the population surveyed, i.e., adults, aged 18 and over, residing in telephone households in the St. Louis MSA.

“Don’t know” or “Refused” percentages are not reported in these breakdowns.
Introduction and Overview

Survey Instrument

The Positive Psychology group postulated 17 dimensions thought of as “wellsprings” of a good life, and the survey instrument consisted of 106 items reflecting those dimensions plus demographics. This survey was first field tested in 1999. The original instrument was then used with the St. Louis and a National sample in 2001. The follow-up survey was conducted in 2002 to measure change. The complete survey instrument can be found in Appendix A. The wellspring dimensions used in the 2002 follow-up study include 67 items and describe the following constructs:

I. Aesthetics (appreciating and experiencing beauty)

II. Altruism/Civility (volunteer service, community improvement)

III. Courage (taking a stand for beliefs)

IV. Creativity (using imagination, originality)

V. Friendships (developing relationships with others)

VI. Future Focus (setting and using goals)

VII. Learning (learning and growing)

VIII. Principle-Centered (using values and beliefs)

IX. Self-Regulation (structure and discipline)

X. Spirituality (spiritual beliefs)

XI. Wisdom (making sense of experience)

XII. Workplace Satisfaction (enjoyment and satisfaction from work)
Two over-reaching constructs are represented in the survey as well

- The Ladder

The Ladder is an overall measure of how respondents view the status of their lives in a time-relative perspective of now, five years into the future, and five years in the past. These questions were created, reportedly in the 1930s, through the collaboration of Dr. George H. Gallup and Dr. Hadley Cantril, a well-known and respected social psychologist, who was head of Public Opinion Research for the U.S. government during World War II. Gallup has maintained records of national samples since 1964. These questions have been especially useful in obtaining comparable data across countries’ borders because each person regardless of nationality could "self anchor" at the bottom and the top of the ladder.

- Subjective Well-Being

Subjective Well-Being is an overall measure, using the Satisfaction with Life Scale developed by Ed Diener and others at the University of Illinois. The Satisfaction with Life Scale measures general satisfaction with life, rather than pointing to specific domains such as finances. As a result, the Satisfaction with Life Scale referred to here as Subjective Well-Being allows a person to form an assessment of well-being by combining and valuing various aspects of his/her life on an individual basis.

A more detailed description of each construct is contained in Appendix B, and a listing of the items by wellspring dimension is available in Appendix C.
Detailed Findings

St. Louis Metropolitan Results

Question 1

Are there significant differences in wellspring dimension means between the St. Louis metropolitan region 2002 and the St. Louis metropolitan region 2001?

WELSPRING DIMENSION MEANS FOR ST. LOUIS (2001 versus 2002)

Graph 1
### WELLSPRING DIMENSION MEANS BY ST. LOUIS (2001 versus 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>St. Louis 2001</th>
<th>St. Louis 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=999)</td>
<td>(n=1,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism/Civility</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Focus</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle-Centered</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

- In 2002, the St. Louis mean scores by wellspring dimension range from a high of 4.49 for Learning to a low of 3.39 for Altruism/Civility. These results are very similar to the study conducted in 2001.

- Of the 12 wellspring dimensions, Courage, Learning, Friendships, Creativity, Principle-Centered, Wisdom, and Future Focus appear to have the highest relationships with the 5 other wellspring dimensions.

- The reliability of the instrument of 67 items and 12 dimensions is .90 (Cronbach Alpha).

- There are no significant differences from 2001 and 2002 among the wellspring dimension means as well as the Ladder and Subjective Well-Being constructs.

- Two summary constructs, the Ladder and Subjective Well-Being are correlated at .529 (p<.01), similar to the previous study correlation of .495 (p<.01).
Question 2

Are there significant differences in perceptions of the wellspring dimensions based on gender, age, race, educational attainment, or income?

WELSPRING DIMENSION MEANS BY AGE

St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism/Civility</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Focus</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle-Centered</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

Age groups respond differently on nine of the twelve wellspring dimensions (Altruism/Civility, Courage, Creativity, Friendships, Future Focus, Learning, Principle-Centered, Self-Regulation and Wisdom, as well as Subjective Well-Being).

- St. Louis respondents 35 and older have significantly higher mean scores than the 18-34 age category for Altruism/Civility.
- In 2002, respondents in the 18-34 age category have significantly higher mean ratings than those respondents aged 55+ on Courage, Friendships, and Learning.
Those respondents 18-34 years of age have significantly higher mean scores than those in the other age groups for Creativity, Future Focused, and Wisdom. In addition, respondents in the 35-54 age group have significantly higher scores than those in the 55+ age group for both Creativity and Future Focus wellspring dimensions.

The 35-54 year old respondents tend to have a higher dimension rating than 18-34 year olds for Principle-Centered, while the 55+ age group has a significantly higher dimension rating than those 18-34 years old for Self-Regulation.

The dimension rating for Wisdom is significantly higher among those 18-34 years old than those aged 35+ in the 2002 study.

55+ years of age or older respondents have significantly higher Subjective well-being ratings than those 35-54 years of age.
## Wellspring Dimension Means by Highest Level of Education Completed

St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High School or Less</th>
<th>Post High School</th>
<th>College or Greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism/Civility</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Focus</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle-Centered</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

Education groups respond differently on eight of the 12 wellspring dimensions: Aesthetics, Altruism/Civility, Courage, Creativity, Future Focus, Learning, Principle-Centered, and Spirituality, as well as Subjective Well-Being.

- Respondents with a high school education or less have significantly lower mean scores than both Post High School and College Graduates on the Aesthetics, Altruism/Civility, Future Focus, Learning, Principle-Centered, and Spirituality, as well as Subjective Well-Being.

- Post High School (some college or technical training) respondents report significantly higher mean scores than College Graduates for both the Spirituality and Courage dimensions. In addition, this group also has a significantly higher dimension rating than High school graduates or less for Creativity.

- College Graduates have significantly higher mean scores on the Subjective Well-Being dimension than those without college degrees.
Figures 4

Differences by household income exist for Altruism/Civility, Courage, Friendships, Future Focus, Learning, Principle-Centered, Spirituality, as well as the Ladder and Subjective Well-Being.

- Respondents reporting between $30,000 and $75,000 annual household income levels have significantly higher mean scores than those with income levels under $30,000 on Altruism/Civility.
- For the current study, respondents reporting annual household incomes of $50,000 or more score significantly higher on the Friendships dimension than their counterparts.
- In 2002, respondents in the $30,000 to less than $50,000 income level have significantly higher mean ratings than those in the $75,000 or higher level for Courage.
- Respondents in the $75,000 or higher annual household income range tend to have significantly higher mean ratings for Future Focus than those respondents with annual household incomes of $30,000 or less.

- Learning mean ratings are significantly higher among those reporting an annual household income between $50,000 to less than $75,000 in comparison to those reporting incomes of $30,000 or less.

- Spirituality dimension scores are significantly higher among those reporting less than $50,000 annual household income levels compared to those with an annual income of $75,000 or greater.

- Respondents with annual household incomes of $30,000 or less have significantly lower scores on the Ladder than the remaining three income categories. This group also reports lower mean scores on the Subjective Well-Being index and Principle-Centered dimension compared to those with household incomes of $30,000 or higher.

- Those participants with annual household incomes of $75,000 or more have significantly higher ratings for both the Ladder and Subjective well-being index compared to those with annual incomes between $30,000 to less than $50,000.

WELSPRING DIMENSION MEANS BY RACE

St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism/Civility</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Focus</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle-Centered</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

- Whites and Non-Whites respond differently on five of the wellspring dimensions (Courage, Future Focus, Learning, Spirituality, and Wisdom) as well as the Subjective Well-Being index.
➢ Non-Whites score significantly higher than their counterparts on Courage, Future Focus, Learning, Spirituality and Wisdom dimensions than Whites.

➢ Whites score significantly higher mean scores than Non-Whites on the Subjective Well-Being index.
Question 3

*Are some of the wellspring dimensions more descriptive of St. Louis than others?*

Given a scale of “1” to “5” with “5” being high, we know that a selection of “5” is a very different response than even a “4.” When a person does select a “5” on a 5-point scale, it reflects an intensity with which one embraces that response. When selecting a “5” for numerous items, the dimension pretty well fits the individual. Graph 2 displays the percentage of persons scoring at a 4.80 level (the equivalent of five or six items a “5” within a wellspring dimension).

### SELECTION OF “5s” BY WELSPRING DIMENSION ST. LOUIS (n=1,001)

**Graph 2**

- As shown in Graph 2, the four wellspring dimensions with the highest percent of "5s" are Learning, Principle-Centered, Friendships and Spirituality, while the
dimensions with the lowest percentage of "5s" include Workplace Satisfaction, Altruism/Civility, Wisdom, Creativity, and Future Focus.

- These results were very similar to the previous wave with the addition of Creativity and Future Focus in 2002 as low scoring dimensions.
Question 4

“Imagine a ladder with steps numbered from zero, the lowest step, to ten, the highest. The bottom rung represents the worst possible life for you and the top step represents the best possible life for you. On which step do you personally stand at the present time?”

PRESENT STEP OF THE LADDER MEANS FOR ST. LOUIS AND NATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</th>
<th>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6

- As displayed in Figure 6, mean scores for the present step of the ladder are the same as the previous St. Louis study. Differences however exist for the current study when comparing age, education, income and race.

- The present step on the ladder is significantly correlated with all 12 wellspring dimensions with the highest correlation for Friendships and Workplace Satisfaction ($r=.36$ and $.34$ respectively).

- For the current study, the wellspring dimensions that best predict the perception of respondents’ present step on the ladder include: Friendships, Self-Regulation, Workplace Satisfaction, and Principle-centered. These three dimensions explain approximately 14% of the variance.

Given the Ladder steps described in the question above with steps 0-10, the steps may be divided into a "Top Box" (steps 7 through 10), a "Middle Box" (steps 4 through 6), and a "Bottom Box" (steps 0 through 3). Analysis at this level provides further insights into those respondents expressing the strongest positive feelings.
PRESENT STEP ON LADDER BY "TOP," "MIDDLE," AND "BOTTOM" BOX

St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7

In the St. Louis 2002 results, approximately 7 of 10 respondents select a step in the "Top Box." These results are similar to results from the 2001 study.

PRESENT STEP ON LADDER "TOP BOX" (STEPS 7-10) AND MEAN BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8

- In the present study, the percentage of persons in the "Top Box" (steps 7-10) increases numerically with each older age group, however there is no significant difference between the three age groups. This trend is similar to results observed for the previous study.

- Respondents in the 18-34 and 35-54 age groups in St. Louis have significantly lower mean scores than those in the 55 and older age group for the present step of the ladder.
• Comparison between the study conducted in 2002 and 2001 indicate that there are no significant differences based upon mean ratings or “Top Box” percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>High School Grad or Less</th>
<th>Post High School</th>
<th>College Graduate or Greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9

• As education increases, so do the mean scores for the present step of the ladder, with College Graduates and higher in St. Louis rating this variable significantly higher than their counterparts.

• In 2002, there are no significant differences across educational attainment for top box percentages.

• Year to year comparisons indicate no significant differences based upon mean ratings or Top Box percentages.
PRESENT STEP ON LADDER: “TOP BOX” (STEPS 7-10) AND MEAN BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;$30K</td>
<td>$30K-</td>
<td>$50K-</td>
<td>$75K+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10

In 2002, respondents reporting $30,000 or more for annual household incomes tend to rate this step of ladder higher than those reporting less than $30,000.

- For the current study, as household income increases the percentage of respondents who rated this item in the "Top Box" range also increases. Those with household incomes of under $30,000 were significantly less likely to respond favorably to this item than those in the three remaining income categories.

- Based upon mean ratings, those participants reporting a $75,000 annual household income or greater have significantly higher ratings on the present step of the ladder than those respondents with less than $75,000 annual household income.

- Comparisons between 2001 and 2002 indicate no significant differences on the mean ratings or percentage “Top Box” for the present step of the Ladder.
PRESENT STEP ON LADDER: "TOP BOX" (STEPS 7-10) BY RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11

- Similar to the previous wave, White respondents in the current study are significantly higher than Non-Whites in rating this step of the Ladder more favorably. In addition, White respondents tend to have higher mean scores than Non-White respondents for this step.

- Comparisons between the mean scores of the two studies indicate that Non-Whites in the current study rate the present step of the Ladder significantly higher in 2002 than in 2001.
“On which step did you stand five years ago?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Louis 2001</th>
<th>St. Louis 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=999)</td>
<td>(n=1,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12

Similar to the previous study, present standing on the ladder tended to be higher than the perceived standing for five years ago. Also similar to the previous study, the 55 and older age group, High School or Less educational group, under $30,000 annual household income group, and the Non-White group gained smaller percentages in the "Top Box" rating than their counterparts.

- Comparing the 2001 and 2002 study, there are no significant differences based upon mean scores for perceptions of where respondents stood on the ladder five years ago.

- For the current study, 52% chose a step in the "Top Box" (steps 7-10) for five years ago, but 73% rated their present step in the "Top Box," an increase of 21%. This change between past and present step on the ladder is significantly lower than the 26% difference found in the previous year.

- For the current study across all age groups increases from past standing to present standing exist; however as age increases the percentage of "Top Box" responses decreases (27% for the 18-34 group, 25% higher for 35-54 age group, and 11% higher for 55 and older age group).

- Compared to the previous year, these increases are slightly lower.
  
  - 18-34: 33% higher in previous study compared to 27% – these scores are statistically equivalent.
  - 35-54: 29% higher in previous study compared to 25% – these scores are statistically equivalent.
  - 55+: 18% higher in previous study compared to 11% – these scores are statistically significant.
• In 2002, the gain in percentage for the "Top Box" increases as education increases.
  
  ➢ High School Graduate or Less: 11% gain from past step of ladder to present step
  ➢ Post High School: 23% gain from past to present
  ➢ College Graduate or higher: 28% gain from past to present

• In the current study, respondents in the 55 and older age group were significantly more likely than their counterparts to respond favorably to perceived standing on the ladder five years ago, 65% compared to 43% and 49% respectively for 18-34 and 35-54 age groups. Incidentally, this is the age group that had the least gain from past to present standing.

• For the current study, percentage gain trends from past standing to present standing on the ladder were similar to that observed for education. As income increases, percentage gains also increased (3% for respondents with less than $30,000 annual household income, 24% for $30,000 to less than $50,000, 28% for $50,000 to less than $75,000, and 31% for annual household incomes of $75,000 or higher).

• In 2002, there were no significant differences between Whites and Non-Whites perceived past standing on the ladder.
“On which step do you expect to stand five years into the future?”

**STEP FIVE YEARS INTO THE FUTURE OF THE LADDER MEAN FOR ST. LOUIS 2001 versus 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</th>
<th>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13

In general, most respondents are hopeful of the future with nearly three-fourths (73%) perceiving a step in the "Top Box" (steps 7-10) for the present compared to almost nine out of ten respondents (87%) for five years into the future. This trend is similar to the trend observed for the previous study.

- Across all age categories with the exception of those respondents who are in the 55 or higher age group, “Top Box” percentage comparisons from the present standing on the ladder to the future standing were higher. For the 55 or higher age group, the percentage dropped from 76% in the present to 71% for the future.

- Based upon "Top Box" percentages, the most hopeful of future standing are 18-34 year olds (96%), College Graduates or higher (91%), those with annual household incomes of $75,000 or greater (96%), and Non-Whites (93%).

- Across educational groups, comparisons between current standing and future standing was greatest for those with some college or technical training.

- Non-White respondents’ present standing comparison with future standing was greater than Whites present standing compared to future standing (29% and 9% respectively).

- The wellspring dimensions that best predict the step a person anticipates five years in the future are Altruism/Civility, Friendships, Future Focus, Spirituality, and Workplace Satisfaction. These four dimensions explain 14% of the variance.
Question 5

“*In most ways my life is close to ideal.*”

“I am completely satisfied with my life.”

“The conditions in my life are excellent.”

“If I could live my life over, I would not make any major changes.”

“So far I have gotten the important things I want in my life.”

Subjective Well-Being is an overall measure, using the Satisfaction with Life Scale developed by Ed Diener and others at the University of Illinois. The Satisfaction with Life Scale measures general satisfaction with life by allowing a person to form an assessment of well-being by combining and valuing various aspects of life important to that individual. Subjective Well-Being, as used in this study, is the grand mean of the five items above.

---

**SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING MEANS FOR ST. LOUIS 2001 versus 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</th>
<th>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14

- The mean of the items for the previous study is 3.71 compared to the current study of 3.66. There is no significant difference between the two studies.

- Subjective Well-Being is significantly correlated to all 12 of the wellspring dimensions with correlations ranging from .27 to .52.

- For the current study Subjective Well-Being is predicted by Learning, Wisdom, Friendships, Principle-Centered, Self-Regulation and Workplace Satisfaction. These dimensions explain approximately 40% of the variance.
Question 6

"In terms of the quality of education, on a one-to-five scale, with “5” high and “1” low, how would you rate the schools in your school district?"

QUALITY OF EDUCATION RATING MEANS FOR ST. LOUIS 2001 versus 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</th>
<th>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15

- As shown in Figure 15, the means for the quality of education rating for schools in the respondents' school district were 3.66 for the previous study and 3.69 for the current study. There were no significant differences between the two administrations of this instrument.

- With the exception of two wellspring dimensions, Aesthetics and Courage, the quality of education rating is correlated to the remaining ten dimensions as well as the Ladder and Subjective Well-Being index.
"5" RATING OF THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS OF THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One in five respondents rated the quality of education in the schools of their school district a "5" on a scale from one to five with "5" being high, while four in ten (40%) respondents rated this item a 4. Together the "Top Two Box" score combining the "4s" and "5s" is 61%. This is similar to the trend observed for 2001 where 59% of the respondents responded favorably to this item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon mean ratings, in the present St. Louis study, significant age differences exist in how respondents rate the quality of education in the schools of their school districts.
In 2002, respondents between 18-34 years of age rate the quality of education in the schools in their school districts significantly lower than those who are in the 35+ age category.

In the current study, as age increases, the percentage of respondents who rate the quality of education more favorably also increases, with 55+ participants rating a “5” more frequently than those in the 18-34 age group.

Based upon mean scores, there are no significant differences in which respondents rate the quality of education in schools in their school districts between 2001 and 2002.

---

### “5s” RATINGS AND MEANS FOR QUALITY OF EDUCATION BY EDUCATION ATTAINMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>High School or Less</th>
<th>Post High School</th>
<th>College or Greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “5”</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “5”</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18

In 2002, significant differences exist between the highest level of education completed and how respondents rate the quality of education in the schools in their school districts.

Those respondents who indicate that they have achieved some college or technical training rated the quality of education in their school districts significantly higher than did High School graduates or those with some college or technical training.
In the current study there is no significant differences among educational attainment and the percentage of respondents rating the quality of education favorably.

Comparisons between the 2001 and 2002 study indicate significantly higher mean ratings as well as percentages of those providing “5s” for respondents with some college or technical training.

### “5s” RATINGS AND MEANS FOR QUALITY OF EDUCATION BY ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>&lt;$30K</th>
<th>$30K-$50K</th>
<th>$50K-$75K</th>
<th>$75K +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “5”</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% “5”</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19

In 2002, based upon mean ratings, respondents with higher annual incomes ($50,000 and above) rate the quality of education in the schools in their school districts significantly higher than those with annual incomes in less than $30,000.

Comparisons between 2001 and 2002 indicate that there are no significant income differences based upon mean rating or percentages of “5s” for quality of education in the schools in respondents’ school districts.
“5s” RATINGS AND MEANS FOR QUALITY OF EDUCATION BY RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2001 (n=999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis 2002 (n=1,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Box</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20

- In the current study, slightly more than one-in-five White respondents (22%) rate the local school district a “5” as compared to about one-in-six Non-White respondents (16%). These scores are statistically equivalent.

- In 2002, significant differences exist in the mean ratings for quality of education in the schools in respondents’ school districts with Whites rating this item significantly higher than Non-Whites (3.74 versus 3.45, respectively). This is the same pattern seen in 2001.

- There are no significant changes between race for 2001 or 2002.
Appendix A

Survey Questionnaire

The following pages include the fielded questionnaire
Hello, my name is __________ with The Gallup Organization. We are conducting a study to understand issues related to the quality of your life and the life of your community.

1. Respondent available - (Continue)

7. Respondent not available -
   (Set time to call back)

8. (Soft Refusal)

9. (Hard Refusal) - (Thank and Terminate)
S1. Including yourself, how many members of this household are age 18 or older? 
(Open ended and code actual number)

00 None - (Thank and Terminate)
01 One - (If other than respondent, ask to speak to that person, and Skip to S3)
02- 96 96+ (Continue)
97 Not available - (Set time to call back)
98 (DK) (Thank and Terminate)
99 (Refused) (Thank and Terminate) 

S2. Of those (response in S1) adults, may I please speak to the one who had the most recent birthday?

1 Yes, respondent available - (Continue)
7 Respondent not available - 
(Set time to call back)
8 (Refused) - (Thank and Terminate) 

S3. (If necessary, ask:) Hello, my name is ________ with The Gallup Organization. We are conducting a study to understand issues related to the quality of your life and the life of your community. I need to confirm that you are 18 years of age or older. Is that correct?

1 Yes - (Continue)
2 No - (Reset to Introduction)
3 (DK) (Thank and Terminate)
4 (Refused) (Thank and Terminate) 

Copyright © 2002 The Gallup Organization, Princeton, NJ. All rights reserved
1. Imagine a ladder with steps numbered from zero, the lowest step to ten, the highest. The bottom step represents the worst possible life for you and the top step represents the best possible life for you. On which step do you personally stand at the present time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Best possible life</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Worst possible life</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>(DK)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>(Refused)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1301\] \[1302\]

2. On which step did you stand five years ago? *(Repeat scale, if necessary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Best possible life</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Worst possible life</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>(DK)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>(Refused)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1303\] \[1304\]

3. On which step do you expect to stand five years into the future? *(Repeat scale, if necessary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Best possible life</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Worst possible life</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>(DK)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>(Refused)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1305\] \[1306\]
4. Overall, how satisfied are you with the way your life is going? Would you say you are (read 5-1)?

5 Very satisfied
4 Satisfied
3 Okay
2 Dissatisfied
1 Very dissatisfied

6 (DK)
7 (Refused)   _____(1307)

5. Overall, how satisfied are you with your workplace? On a one-to-five scale with "5" high and "1" low, how would you rate your satisfaction with work?

5 High
4
3
2
1 Low

6 (DK)
7 (Refused)
8 (Not applicable/Don't work)   _____(1308)

(READ:) For the following, rate each statement on a five-point scale where "5" means strongly agree, "4" means agree, "3" means undecided, "2" means disagree, and "1" means strongly disagree. (Read and rotate #6-#106)

5   Strongly agree
4   Agree
3   Undecided
2   Disagree
1   Strongly disagree

6   (DK)
7   (Refused)

6. In most ways my life is close to ideal.   _____(1309)

7. I am completely satisfied with my life.   _____(1310)
8. The conditions in my life are excellent.   ____ (1311)  
9. If I could live my life over, I would not make any major changes.   ____ (1312)  
10. So far I have gotten the important things I want in my life.   ____ (1313)  
11. There are people in my life who care as much about my feelings and well being as they do about their own.   ____ (1314)  
12. I look forward to going to work each day.   ____ (1315)  
13. In the last two days, I have performed acts that were helpful to another person, but had no direct personal benefit for me.   ____ (1316)  
14. In the last month I have spent five or more hours providing services as a volunteer worker.   ____ (1317)  
15. In the last 24 hours, I have personally spent 30 minutes in prayer, meditation or contemplation.   ____ (1318)  
16. I have clear pictures in my mind about what I want to happen in the future.   ____ (1319)  
17. In the past week, I have had an exciting, pleasant emotion evoked by beauty.   ____ (1320)  
18. My mind is always asking questions.   ____ (1321)  
19. I have a set of principles that govern my life.   ____ (1322)  
20. My imagination stretches far beyond that of my associates.   ____ (1323)  
21. I think work should be fun.   ____ (1324)  
22. I have taken a stand in the face of strong resistance.   ____ (1325)  
23. I did today what I planned yesterday.   ____ (1326)  
24. I try to treat everyone the same.   ____ (1327)
25. I make day-to-day decisions based on reason rather than on desire. _____ (1328)
26. I have grown in wisdom in the last five years. _____ (1330)
27. I believe I am the most important person in someone else’s life. _____ (1331)
28. I have a neighbor or someone at work who cares about me as a person. _____ (1332)
29. I feel comfortable allowing others to help me. _____ (1333)
30. I voted in the last mayoral election. _____ (1334)
31. I believe that each person has a soul. _____ (1335)
32. I set challenging goals so big that I sometimes achieve them and sometimes I do not. _____ (1336)
33. I sometimes have a craving for experiencing great art, such as music, drama, or paintings. _____ (1337)
34. In my intellectual life, I choose to know a lot about a few things, rather than a little about a lot of things. _____ (1338)
35. I think most people will cheat if they think they will not get caught. _____ (1339)
36. In the last month I have found an original solution to a problem in my life. _____ (1340)
37. Play is a very important part of my life. _____ (1341)
38. I sometimes call for action while others talk. _____ (1342)
39. I am a highly disciplined person. _____ (1343)
40. I try to get close to the people with whom I work or associate. _____ (1344)
41. I have a best friend that I see on a daily basis. _____(1344)

42. I think most behavior is motivated by selfishness. _____(1345)

43. I always express appreciation to people who provide service to me – regardless of the position, such as doormen, food servers, airline agents or housekeepers. _____(1346)

44. I believe there is a spirit that survives after the death of the body that can communicate with persons still living. _____(1347)

45. I currently know over 100 persons whom I could rally to achieve a goal I believed in. _____(1348)

46. I have created something of beauty in the last year. _____(1349)

47. I am thrilled whenever I learn something new. _____(1350)

48. I feel I must stand up for what I believe even though there are negative consequences. _____(1351)

49. In the last week I have had the opportunity to use my imagination to make something better. _____(1352)

50. During the last week I have played a practical joke on someone. _____(1353)

51. I think it is all right to use fear to get someone to do something that is good for him or her. _____(1354)

52. I am a goal-oriented person. _____(1355)

53. I have publicly claimed my strengths. _____(1356)

54. I always pay my bills on time. _____(1357)

55. Others come to me for advice. _____(1358)
56. Others trust me to keep their secrets. _____(1359)
57. I have opportunities to do what I do best every day. _____(1360)
58. I believe unselfish love is the best method for securing real peace of mind. _____(1361)
59. I have a genuine respect for people who are public servants. _____(1362)
60. I believe in a universal power, a god. _____(1363)
61. As a leader, I rely more on building on my strengths than on overcoming my weaknesses to achieve rigorous goals. _____(1364)
62. In the last month I have made a special effort to take someone to experience something of beauty. _____(1365)
63. In the last month I have enjoyed classical music, art, drama, science or mathematics. _____(1366)
64. I believe integrity is the basis for trust. _____(1367)
65. I have a powerful urge to do something original during this next year. _____(1368)
66. I believe that humor can actually help a patient heal. _____(1369)
67. Challenges increase my determination. _____(1370)
68. I have a plan for what I want to be doing five years from now. _____(1371)
69. In school, every student should be able to earn an "A" in something. _____(1372)
70. "A place for everything and everything in its place" describes me perfectly. _____(1373)
71. I feel a comfort in my understanding of the world. _____(1374)
72. I have cared deeply about someone for ten or more years. _____(1375)
73. I have received praise for good work in the last seven days.  

74. I have voluntarily helped a neighbor in the last month.  

75. I am a good loser.  

76. I have had dreams that foretold what was going to happen.  

77. I have some values and beliefs I never expect to change.  

78. I often experience emotions evoked by beauty.  

79. I am a true life-long learner.  

80. I believe there are clear guidelines about what is good or evil that apply to everyone regardless of their situation.  

81. When someone tells me how to do something, I spontaneously think of alternative ways to get the same thing done.  

82. I seem to have an uncanny sense for making others feel good.  

83. I can keep cool while others are freaking out.  

84. I have the capacity for concentrating on the goals I set for myself.  

85. I can sense the feelings of other people.  

86. I intentionally seek conversations with people whom I believe to be wise.  

87. I always feel the presence of love in my life.
88. Every day, I have opportunities to learn and grow.  

89. My beliefs make me feel my life is important.  

90. I have friends who would come to see me even if I were in prison.  

91. In the last year I have publicly expressed an idea for the improvement of my community or state.  

92. I believe that there are reasons for everything that happens – that there are no real coincidences.  

93. More than three persons have told me that I am their mentor.  

94. I often see beauty that other people pass by without noticing.  

95. Others seek me out to discuss topics in depth.  

96. It is sometimes justifiable to tell a lie.  

97. I try to surprise at least one person every day.  

98. I express my courage several times every day.  

99. I have three events or more I am looking forward to next month.  

100. I prefer to be paid for my productivity rather than on a standard salary plan.  

101. I am a detail-oriented person.  

102. I seem to know things I do not know how I learned.  

103. I consider myself to be a wise person.
104. Life has taught me lessons I could not have learned from school or books. _____(1407)

105. I have confidence in my intuitive ways of doing things. _____(1408)

106. Overall, others consider me to be a wise person. _____(1409)

DEMOGRAPHICS BEGIN HERE:

D1. GENDER:  (Code only, Do not ask)

1 Male
2 Female _____(1500)

D2. In terms of the quality of education, on a one-to-five scale, with "5" high and "1" low, how would you rate the schools in your school district?

5 High
4
3
2
1 Low

6 (DK)
7 (Refused) _____(1501)

D3. AGE: What is your age? (Open ended and code actual age)

00 (Refused)
99 99+

___________________________________________ (1502) (1503)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)
D4. EDUCATION: What is the highest level of education you have completed?
(Open ended and code)

1 Less than high school graduate (0-11)
2 High school graduate (12)
3 Some college
4 Trade/Technical/Vocational training
5 College graduate
6 Post-graduate work/Degree
7 (DK)
8 (Refused)   _____(1504)

D5. ETHNICITY: Are you, yourself, of Hispanic origin or descent, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish background?

1 Yes
2 No
3 (DK)
4 (Refused)   _____(1505)

D6. RACE: What is your race? Are you white, black, or some other race?

01 Some other race (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 HOLD
05 HOLD
06 White
07 African-American/Black
08 (Hispanic)   

(If code "08" in D6, Continue; Otherwise, Skip to D8)

(DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED)
D7. Do you consider yourself to be white-Hispanic or black-Hispanic?

01 Other (list)
02 (DK)
03 (Refused)
04 HOLD
05 HOLD
06 White Hispanic
07 Black Hispanic
08 (Hispanic/Respondent refuses to discriminate)

D8. INCOME: Is your total annual household income, before taxes, over or under $20,000?

(If "Under", ask:) Is it over or under $10,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $30,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $40,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $50,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $75,000?
(If "Over", ask:) Is it over or under $100,000?

1 Under $10,000
2 $10,000 to $19,999
3 $20,000 to $29,999
4 $30,000 to $39,999
5 $40,000 to $49,999
6 $50,000 to $74,999
7 $75,000 to $99,999
8 $100,000 or more
9 (DK)
0 (Refused)
(VALIDATE PHONE NUMBER AND THANK RESPONDENT BY SAYING:)

Again, this is _____, with the Gallup Organization of _____._ I would like to thank you for your time. Our mission is to “help people be heard” and your opinions are important to Gallup in accomplishing this.

INTERVIEWER I.D. #: _____(571-574)
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Appendix B

Wellspring Dimension Descriptions

Aesthetics

When a community is high on Aesthetics, people appreciate beauty. They respond to beauty in the environment with pleasant emotions. They appreciate great works of art, and tend to be patrons of music, art, drama, science, and mathematics. Community members crave the opportunity to experience great art, such as music, drama, or paintings.

When Aesthetics are combined with Creativity, people enjoy creative art. When Aesthetics are low in a community, people are likely to tolerate disorder. When high Aesthetics become the expectation, it is reflected in the buildings, the art, and even in the way people dress. A community high on Aesthetics supports art museums and art displays. They know the value of making their community beautiful.

Altruism/Civility/Volunteerism

Civility suggests that people observe etiquette positively in social behavior. People value courtesy and politeness in everyday behavior; their positive and sincere consideration of others comes from inherent thoughtfulness. Residents of a neighborhood that is high in Civility extend their courtesy to strangers. Within the community, people get to know one another, and volunteer to help each other when
necessary, particularly when a neighbor needs help. People see the value of mentoring. A community high in Civility has people who take responsibility for improvement and growth in the community. Overall, members of the community have a positive attitude about making continuous improvements.

**Courage**

Courage indicates people’s ability to meet resistance with increased determination. They tend to handle difficult, dangerous, or painful problems, rather than withdraw from them. When people have Courage, they do what they think is right. Courageous persons ask for action in the community. They are willing to claim their goals and strengths publicly. Courage is something they use in their normal, everyday lives, and not just in traumatic situations. Courageous people bring about change and improvement in the community.

**Creativity**

Creative people within the community show imagination and artistic intellectual inventiveness. They do things that stimulate the imagination and inventive powers. In the community, they find unique solutions to everyday problems. They have a special capacity for helping people appreciate and understand beauty, and encourage the community to maintain beautiful places and works of art. When creative people live within the community, they are driven to do something original each year.
**Friendships**

A community high in Friendships includes many people who are fond of each other and have intimate relationships or close acquaintances. Many people in the community help and trust each other. Overall, trust within the community is high when friendship is high. A community high in Friendships includes people who are ready to greet other people and bond with them. They care about the feelings and well-being of other people in the community. Every person in the community most likely has someone who cares about him or her as a person. Individuals say they feel a presence of love in their lives. There are many unconditional relationships between people. Regardless of what happens, people are likely to stand by each other.

**Future Focus**

When a community is high on Future Focus, people are able to center their attention on the future of the community. This attention is evident in people’s goals and visions for the future. There are people in the community who talk continuously about what “can be” instead of what “is.” Many people in the community know what they plan to be doing five years from now. They are likely to have challenging goals – big goals. Visioning is a regular activity in community meetings. People create artwork and write editorials that feature the community’s future.

**Learning**

A Learning community is continuously improving. Opportunities exist in all parts of a Learning community to discuss ideas and grow. Schools are likely to have courses
available for everyone in the community, such that schools are actually community centers as well as learning centers. People want to feel they are growing in their knowledge and wisdom, and working continuously toward making sense of what is happening in their world. Learning something new is a thrill for them. People in the community love to ask questions and do so frequently. In a Learning community, the goal is to have every person feel that they are always learning and growing.

**Principle-Centered**

In the Principle-Centered community, people adopt principles and live by them. They show integrity in expressing their values and principles. People regularly discuss the principles of the community in writing and in groups. In the Principle-Centered community, people appreciate common standards and lawfulness – in short, “They walk their talk.”

**Self-Regulation**

In a Self-Regulation community, people appreciate individual discipline. Many people in the community say they are highly disciplined. Community members emphasize the importance of planning. People are more likely to take responsibility for their financial obligations. Communities high in Self-Regulation are likely to be very neat communities. People make most of their decisions based on reason.

**Spirituality**

The Spirituality of a community refers to people’s thinking, motivating, and feeling abilities. The people in a community high in Spirituality think about the will, vivacity,
vigor, enthusiasm, frame of mind, disposition or mood, and loyalty of the people. They think about the connectedness of all things. Spirituality includes both the religious behaviors and beliefs of the people. People who are not religious in practice may be spiritual in that they possess a sense of connectedness. A community that is high in Spirituality is also likely to have more people who participate in religious activities, such as attending church and meaningful participation in living out their faiths.

**Wisdom**

When a community is high in Wisdom, they have the capacity for following a course of action based on knowledge, experience, and understanding. We typically say that people who are wise have good judgment. A community high in Wisdom is continuously making sense of experience. They see the connection between their ideas and their actions. People tend to identify and refer to the wise people in their community. Wise people seem to know intuitively how other people feel.

**Workplace Satisfaction**

When Workplace Satisfaction is high in the community, people enjoy what they do for a living and look forward to going to work. At times, they may even say that their work is fun. Work, for them, generally is a place of social satisfaction because they have friends there. In great workplaces, people feel they have opportunities to learn and grow. When they achieve, they receive recognition for their work. When Workplace Satisfaction is high, people tend to have better family lives and take on more responsibilities within the community. Employers can impact the level of Workplace Satisfaction within the community.
Appendix C

Wellspring Items By Dimensions

I. AESTHETICS

Q. 17 – In the past week, I have had an exciting, pleasant emotion evoked by beauty.

Q. 33 – I sometimes have a craving for experiencing great art, such as music, drama, or paintings.

Q. 63 – In the last month I have enjoyed classical music, art, drama, science or mathematics.

Q. 78 – I often experience emotions evoked by beauty.

Q. 94 – I often see beauty that other people pass by without noticing.

II. ALTRUISM/CIVILITY

Q. 14 – In the last month I have spent five or more hours providing services as a volunteer worker.

Q. 45 – I currently know over 100 persons whom I could rally to achieve a goal I believed in.

Q. 74 – I have voluntarily helped a neighbor in the last month.

Q. 91 – In the last year I have publicly expressed an idea for the improvement of my community or state.

Q. 93 – More than three persons have told me that I am their mentor.

Q. 13 – In the last two days, I have performed acts that were helpful to another person, but had no direct personal benefit for me.
III. COURAGE

Q. 22 – I have taken a stand in the face of strong resistance.

Q. 38 – I sometimes call for action while others talk.

Q. 48 – I feel I must stand up for what I believe even though there are negative consequences.

Q. 53 – I have publicly claimed my strengths.

Q. 67 – Challenges increase my determination.

Q. 98 – I express my courage several times every day.

IV. CREATIVITY

Q. 36 – In the last month I have found an original solution to a problem in my life.

Q. 46 – I have created something of beauty in the last year.

Q. 49 – In the last week I have had the opportunity to use my imagination to make something better.

Q. 62 – In the last month I have made a special effort to take someone to experience something of beauty.

Q. 65 – I have a powerful urge to do something original during this next year.

V. FRIENDSHIPS

Q. 11 – There are people in my life who care as much about my feelings and Well-Being as they do about their own.

Q. 27 – I believe I am the most important person in someone else’s life.

Q. 28 – I have a neighbor or someone at work who cares about me as a person.

Q. 41 – I have a best friend that I see on a daily basis.

Q. 72 – I have cared deeply about someone for ten or more years.

Q. 87 – I always feel the presence of love in my life.
Q. 90 – I have friends who would come to see me even if I were in prison.

VI. FUTURE FOCUS

Q. 16 – I have clear pictures in my mind about what I want to happen in the future.

Q. 52 – I am a goal-oriented person.

Q. 68 – I have a plan for what I want to be doing five years from now.

Q. 84 – I have the capacity for concentrating on the goals I set for myself.

Q. 32 – I set challenging goals so big that I sometimes achieve them and sometimes I do not.

VII. LEARNING

Q. 18 – My mind is always asking questions.

Q. 26 – I have grown in wisdom in the last five years.

Q. 47 – I am thrilled whenever I learn something new.

Q. 88 – Every day, I have opportunities to learn and grow.

Q. 79 – I am a true life-long learner.

Q. 104 – Life has taught me lessons I could not have learned from school or books.

VIII. PRINCIPLE-CENTERED

Q. 19 – I have a set of principles that govern my life.

Q. 43 – I always express appreciation to people who provide service to me – regardless of the position, such as doormen, food servers, airline agents or housekeepers.

Q. 64 – I believe integrity is the basis for trust.

Q. 86 – I intentionally seek conversations with people whom I believe to be wise.

Q. 77 – I have some values and beliefs I never expect to change
Q. 66 – I believe that humor can actually help a patient heal.

IX. SELF-REGULATION

Q. 23 – I did today what I planned yesterday.
Q. 39 – I am a highly disciplined person.
Q. 54 – I always pay my bills on time.
Q. 70 – “A place for everything and everything in its place” describes me perfectly.
Q. 101 – I am a detail-oriented person.
Q. 25 – I make day-to-day decisions based on reason rather than on desire.

X. SPIRITUALITY

Q. 15 – In the last 24 hours, I have personally spent 30 minutes in prayer, meditation or contemplation.
Q. 31 – I believe that each person has a soul.
Q. 60 – I believe in a universal power, a god.
Q. 89 – My beliefs make me feel my life is important.
Q. 92 – I believe that there are reasons for everything that happens – that there are no real coincidences.

XI. WISDOM

Q. 82 – I seem to have an uncanny sense for making others feel good.
Q. 83 – I can keep cool while others are freaking out.
Q. 85 – I can sense the feelings of other people.
Q. 95 – Others seek me out to discuss topics in depth.
Q. 106 – Overall, others consider me to be a wise person.

XII. WORKPLACE SATISFACTION

Q. 5 – Overall, how satisfied are you with your workplace? On a one-to-five scale with “5” high and “1” low, how would you rate your satisfaction with work?

Q. 12 – I look forward to going to work each day.

Q. 40 – I try to get close to the people with whom I work or associate.

Q. 57 – I have opportunities to do what I do best every day.

Q. 73 – I have received praise for good work in the last seven days.

LADDER

Q. 1 – Imagine a ladder with steps numbered from zero, the lowest step to ten, the highest. The bottom step represents the worst possible life for you and the top step represents the best possible life for you. On which step do you personally stand at the present time?

Q. 2 – On which step did you stand five years ago?

Q. 3 – On which step do you expect to stand five years into the future?

SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Q. 6 – In most ways my life is close to ideal.

Q. 7 – I am completely satisfied with my life.

Q. 8 – The conditions in my life are excellent.

Q. 9 – If I could live my life over, I would not make any major changes.

Q. 10 – So far I have gotten the important things I want in my life.