

**An Examination of Responses to a Decline in Social Capital, Civic Engagement and
Membership within American Freemasonry**

APPROVED BY:

Graduate Committee:

Dr. Angela Mertig, Committee Chair

Dr. Foster Amey

Dr. William Canak

Dr. Jackie Eller, Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Dr. Michael D. Allen, Dean of Graduate Studies

**An Examination of Responses to a Decline in Social Capital, Civic Engagement and
Membership within American Freemasonry**

By

James M. Kinslow

Submitted to the Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies of Middle Tennessee State
University

In partial fulfillment of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

August 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank my family for their loving support toward me during this entire process. I am thankful that we are a close and good family dedicated to serving others. Holly, I love and adore you. You are both my hero and number one fan. Easton and Charlie, you are both great and respectable people and I am honored to be your coach and friend.

Dr. Mertig, thank you for your enduring oversight during this arduous yet worthy learning experience. I will go on to teach, research, and assist society. You have inspired me to do so in a professional and approachable manner.

I would like to express my sincere and heartfelt appreciation to the participating Worshipful Masters, Wardens, and Brethren of the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons serving under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the State of Colorado. Without your contributions this study would not be possible. It is a testimony of your commitment toward self improvement and assisting others through voluntary civic virtue.

I would like to thank all of the professors and faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and the Department of Political Science at Middle Tennessee State University. Your knowledge and desire to teach others has had an immeasurable, positive effect on my intellectual, emotional, and social well-being.

ABSTRACT

Social capital theory and associated theories of civic engagement are at the center of study in major branches of Sociology. This exploratory study is rooted in the contemporary theory of Robert Putnam, founded in the classical theory of Alexis De Tocqueville, and examines perceived decline in social capital and civic engagement within America. This study analyzed responses to decline in membership and therefore social capital and civic engagement within the unique, historical organization of the Masons. Three Masonic lodges were surveyed to examine differences in response to decline in membership among two types of Masonic Lodges in America and to measure four types of civic engagement in relation to members' age, level and type of education, and group size. Additionally, follow-up questions were sent to the leadership of each lodge. While membership in these two lodges was different in some ways, this research suggests that most Masons, regardless of age, education or lodge membership, are already highly civically engaged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	2
<i>Social Capital Theory Roots: Tocqueville</i>	3
<i>Contemporary Social Capital Theory: Putnam</i>	4
<i>The Masons</i>	6
<i>The Contemporary Lodge Movement</i>	9
<i>The Traditional Observance Lodge Movement</i>	9
<i>Civic Engagement and Age</i>	10
<i>Civic Engagement and Education</i>	12
<i>Civic Engagement and Group Size</i>	13
<i>Summary</i>	14
METHODS	15
<i>Data Collection and Sampling</i>	15
<i>Variables and Measurements</i>	17
<i>Analytic Approach</i>	18
FINDINGS	20
<i>Participant Characteristics</i>	20
<i>Lodge Characteristics</i>	20
<i>Hypothesis Tests</i>	22

	Page
DISCUSSION	26
CONCLUSION.....	33
REFERENCES	36
APPENDIXES	40
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	41
APPENDIX B: FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR LODGE LEADERS	54
APPENDIX C: TABLES	55
APPENDIX D: EMAILS TO SURVEY RESPONDENTS	63
IRB APPROVAL.....	66

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	Page
1. Measurement of Civic Engagement.....	55
2. Measurement of Masonic Affiliation	59
3. Measurement of Independent Variables	61
4. Additional Organizations Mentioned by Respondents	62

INTRODUCTION

Civic engagement is considered vital for the existence and perpetuation of democracy, especially within America (Coleman 1988; Putnam 2000; Boggs 2002; Fried 2002; Schultz 2002; Lichterman 2006). The study of civic engagement and social capital has influenced the work of many academicians and led to the formation of entire university centers. Furthermore, research and theories concerning civic engagement and social capital have been central in influencing American, European, and global socio-political and economic policy (Putnam 2000; Schultz 2002).

In a general sense, civic engagement can be defined as all collective interaction above the level of the family and below the government (Tocqueville 1838; Coleman 1988; Putnam 2000). The term civic engagement has also been referred to in previous studies as civic interaction, civic participation, and political participation. For the sake of consistency, I use the term civic engagement throughout. In this analysis civic engagement refers to the volunteer based interaction found in religion, interest groups, and membership associations.

Social capital is a term closely associated with the concept of civic engagement (Coleman 1988; Putnam 2000; Fried 2002). Putnam (2000) views social capital as the communal value that arises from social networks; social networks lead people to help one another and the collective good. In other words, social capital and civic engagement are entwined. Social capital is the ‘capital’ or social ‘surplus’ that is produced by civic engagement (Coleman 1988; Putnam 2000; Fried 2002). Social capital theory,

specifically that of Tocqueville (1838) and Putnam (2000), exhaustively examines the concept of civic engagement.

This research is an exploratory analysis of civic engagement in America. I analyze civic engagement in America by examining Masons in America as a unique example of a volunteer membership association within the framework of social capital theory and civic engagement. Within this manuscript the term “Masons” is used to refer to an association that has gone by various names, including the Freemasons, Masonic Institution, Masonic Organization, Free and Accepted Masons and Ancient Free and Accepted Masons. Specifically, I use an online survey of Mason members from three different Masonic lodges within Colorado to examine variations in civic engagement. These three lodges illustrate the two types of responses to decline in civic engagement by the Masons, namely the emergence of what I call Contemporary Lodges (CL) and Traditional Observance Lodges (TOL). Further, in order to explore possible civic engagement trends in America I compare the level of civic engagement between these two types of lodges in relation to the age of members, level and type of education of members, and lodge size.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this literature review, I first explain key historical and current aspects of social capital theory and how they relate to civic engagement. Next, I demonstrate how the Masons are unique in relation to the theory of social capital. Then, I review specific

studies that have examined the Masons with reference to components of social capital theory.

Social Capital Theory Roots: Tocqueville

Tocqueville (1838) never used the term “social capital,” yet his primary work, *Democracy in America*, is considered a foundational work for social capital theory and the study of civic engagement (Coleman 1988; Putnam 2000; Fried 2002; Lichterman 2006). Tocqueville (1838) referred often to the notion of civil society. By civil society, he was referring to all social groups and subsequent actions above the family and beneath the government (Tocqueville 1838; Putnam 2000). Hence, his ideas have had a tremendous impact on contemporary studies of civic engagement, which, by definition, occurs within civil society.

Tocqueville studied American democracy on behalf of the French government during the 1830s. The enlightenment motto of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity was prominent in the minds of French Aristocrats such as Tocqueville, who were not sure of their future place in the country. In his (1838) observation of American democracy he noted what he thought to be a conflicting relationship between the concepts of freedom and equality, or “equality of conditions” as he deemed it (Putnam 2000; Boggs 2002; Fried 2002). Tocqueville (1838) viewed Americans as over emphasizing the democratic attribute of equality (Putnam 2000; Fried 2002; Lichterman 2006). In his opinion this threatened individual and collective freedom. According to Tocqueville, atomistic individualism is the resulting destructive force developing from equality of conditions. This force is destructive to democratic societies, namely America, because it fosters a soft despotism or tyranny of the majority (Putnam 2000; Fried 2002). That is, the people

were fine with relinquishing their freedom so long as they felt equal with others and could elect their own representatives that would ensure that the equality of conditions stayed unimpaired. This prohibited freedom to anyone seeking to rise above the equality of conditions, fostered an individualistic mindset of civic irresponsibility, and led to government by the subtle tyranny of majority decree. Tocqueville (1838) concluded that the solution for this inherent flaw of American democracy was a robust civil society (Putnam 2000; Fried 2002; Lichterman 2006).

Tocqueville (1838) saw civic engagement as the balancing factor between the opposing forces of liberty and equality in America. Civic engagement allowed for the formation of civic groups or entities such as, religion, town hall meetings, and the press (Putnam 2000; Fried 2002). These civic entities comprised what Tocqueville called “civil society.” He viewed civil society as essential for liberty to exist in American democracy and civic activity as not only a right but a responsibility of the individual. He stated: “The Americans have combated by free institutions the tendency of equality to keep men asunder, and they have subdued it” (Tocqueville 1838:195). Thus, free institutions combat (through civic engagement) equality of conditions as viewed by Tocqueville by bringing people together who would have normally remained apart. Tocqueville’s ideas have influenced many contemporary theorists. Of special interest in this regard is Robert Putnam, to whom I now turn.

Contemporary Social Capital Theory: Putnam

There are multiple conceptions of social capital. Pierre Bourdieu, Nan Lin, David Schultz, and James Coleman are a few among noted contemporary sociologists who have explored and expounded on the theory of social capital. Robert Putnam is perhaps the

most cited and well known social capital theorist. For the purpose of this paper I will analyze the concept of social capital according to the theory of Robert Putnam, who is considered the “modern Tocqueville”. While potentially useful for understanding the Masons as a formal organization, formal organizational theories are not covered in this thesis as the focus is not on formal organizations per se but rather on civic engagement and social capital as a result of organizational participation

Putnam (2000: 19) describes social capital as “connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them.” Social capital is thus the coordination of group level activity (civic engagement) and the resulting positive societal outcomes. Putnam views civic engagement as positive for the individual and American society (Putnam 2000; Boggs 2002; Fried 2002; Schultz 2002).

Putnam categorizes social capital into two types: bridging and bonding (Putnam 2000; Fried 2002; Schultz 2002). Bridging capital results from “bridging” relationships between existing groups. According to Schultz (2002), bridging capital is similarly individual, such as having access to information that one can use to find jobs. Bonding capital is an increase in capital within a single group. Hence, social capital, according to Putnam, is a positive social force for both the individual and society resulting from civic engagement between (bridging) and within (bonding) social groups.

In *Bowling Alone*, perhaps Putnam’s (2000) most famous work regarding social capital, he presents a massive empirical study which demonstrates a sharp decline in American civic engagement and a corresponding rise in atomistic individualism during the 20th Century, specifically during its latter half (Putnam 2000). He used several sources of data to document this trend, including data from the Distributive Database

Needham Lifestyle archives and from surveys he conducted regarding civic involvement. He analyzed the patterns of membership from 32 charter based civic organizations such as churches and the Girl Scouts and other forms of civic engagement such as voter turnout in Presidential elections (Putnam 2000; Boggs 2002; Fried 2002).

Putnam's conclusion regarding a decline in civic engagement is thus an important negative finding. This research aims to explore the degree to which this apparent decline has affected American civic engagement by examining a prominent voluntary association with a strong and deliberate commitment to civic engagement, namely the Masons.

The Masons

The Masons have existed in America since prerevolutionary times (GLoV 2011; Hollingsworth 2011). They were on the forefront of promoting civic engagement and social capital within a democratic style of government in Europe prior to Colonial America. The Masons teach their members to be civically minded and active, stressing the practice of democratic concepts such as liberty, equality, and civic engagement (GLoV 2011; UGLE 2011). Masons have a democratic style of governance which they were practicing within Masonic Lodges before and during the establishment of those same methods in American government (GLoV 2011; Hollingsworth 2011; UGLE 2011). Hence, the Masons are considered by many to be a prominent organization devoted to civic engagement that has existed from the time of Tocqueville through that of Putnam.

Early American history is filled with activity involving Masons. Numerous members of the American Revolutionary army were Masons. President George Washington was a Mason, along with 34 of his generals (The George Washington Masonic Memorial 2011; St. John's Lodge No.1 2011). The majority of the commanders

of the continental army were Masons and members of the “Army Lodge.” George Washington was sworn in to the presidency by Robert Livingston, also a Mason. The Boston Tea Party was planned at a Masonic Tavern and implemented by Masons. As many as 15 signers of the Constitution were Masons, and 13 signers of the Declaration of Independence. The laying of the Cornerstone for the U.S. Capital Building was a Masonic ceremony (GLoV 2011).

It is thought by many scholars that the Masons have been instrumental in promoting ideas and concepts of social capital and civic engagement throughout the history of America. Since the signing of the Declaration of Independence until the present, approximately 33% of the 112 Supreme Court justices have been Masons. Numerous members of state and federal congresses have been Masons (Hollingsworth 2011; Bessel 2012a). It is commonly assumed that there is a connection between the Masonic affiliation of these men and their participation in creating democracy and social capital in America.

Some may argue that the Masonic Fraternity is anti-democratic, particularly with regard to the treatment of women and minorities. The majorities of Masonic Lodges are male only, and seemingly exclude females from membership. However, Masonic Bodies and Societies do exist for women. The Eastern Star, Job’s Daughters, and the Rainbow Girls are but a few Masonic female organizations (GLoV 2012). Further, some Masons claim that due to the nature of the rituals performed, it is better to separate Masonic bodies on the basis of gender. Historically, Masonic Lodges have largely been segregated on the basis of race, specifically between black and white Lodges. Current trends, however, show an increase in racial integration among Lodges (Bessel 2012b).

Further, Freemasonry publicly espouses a belief in the equality of mankind without distinction and Masonic membership reflects virtually every race. Prominent non-white Masons include W.E.B. Dubois, Jesse Jackson, Thurgood Marshall, Sugar Ray Robinson, and W.C. Handy.

Many fraternal and civic organizations developed from the Masons. Numerous American Indian, African American, Christian, and women's civic organizations are direct offspring of the Masons (Moffrey 2001; Kaufman and Weintraub 2004). Groups such as The Boy Scouts, The Independent Order of Odd Fellows, The Grange, and The Knights of Pythas were all formed by Masons or are offshoots of the Masons (Moffrey 2001; Kaufman and Weintraub 2004; The Independent Order of Odd Fellows 2009). Thus, the Masons are unique to the study of civic engagement in America because they are indirectly responsible for the development of social capital through their involvement in the development of so many civic organizations in America.

Despite their historic influence in developing American democracy and their promotion of civic engagement, the Masons have not been exempt from societal decline in social capital and civic engagement (Putnam 2000). Masonic Lodges began to experience membership declines in the 1960s. This decline has remained consistent year after year up through the present. The Masons have attempted to combat the recent decline in membership in many ways. Chief among their efforts has been the development of two different types of lodges with two very different mechanisms aimed at increasing membership and civic engagement. On the one hand, contemporary lodges (CL) have tried to recruit members by reducing requirements. On the other hand,

traditional observance lodges (TOL) have focused on maintaining traditional practices with the hope that this will attract more civically minded recruits.

The Contemporary Lodge Movement

In general, Masons have responded to the decline in membership by making it easier for members to join the organization. They have also tried to appeal to what appears to be a faster-paced, younger generation (MRF 2010). This has resulted in lowering the requirements for progression and membership in the organization. The cost of dues and fees has been lowered overall. One day classes are offered for the conferring of Masonic degrees. The requirement for memorizing Masonic lectures has likewise been removed from many lodges. All of these changes have resulted in the development of what I refer to as “contemporary lodges” (CL). Some Masons have reacted negatively to the development of CLs, calling for a return to the original, “higher” standards of Masonic membership and progression. This is what I refer to as the “traditional observance lodge” (TOL) movement (Lodge of Nine Muses No.1776 2010; MRF 2010; East Denver Lodge No. 160 2011).

The Traditional Observance Lodge Movement

Traditional Observance Lodges (TOLs) have recently begun to emerge in America (LVX Lodge No. 848 2009; MRF 2010). A TOL is a lodge that promotes a return to a higher standard of membership selection, requirements for progression, and Masonic education for its members (MRF 2010). The argument for TOLs by Masons is that CLs’ response to decline in Masonic membership was not merited or beneficial for the organization. TOLs and their supporters argue that a focus on quantity of membership has been at the expense of quality of membership and membership

experience. TOLs typically require that a potential member be vetted much more thoroughly than in a CL (MRF 2010; East Denver Lodge No. 160 2011). Lodge membership is capped at TOLs with a typical membership ceiling of around 70 members. TOLs typically require a member to wait at least six months before progressing to the next degree of membership. Members are required to attend a certain number of meetings before progressing. Masonic research papers are often required to be compiled and presented by Masonic candidates and progressing members. Dues and fees are often higher for TOLs compared to their contemporary lodge counterparts (MRF 2010).

Hence, a dichotomy has emerged within the Masons in response to their decline in membership. In CLs there is a focus on raising membership numbers via lowering requirements. The TOLs represent a reaction against the development of CLs, stressing a renewed focus on higher standards for membership. This quantity versus quality dichotomy has possible implications for social capital and civic engagement among the Masons. Hence, this study aims to compare membership in contemporary lodges to traditional observance lodges in terms of civic engagement. The remainder of the literature review covers additional reasons why we might expect to see differences in civic engagement among lodges, namely on the basis of age, education, and group size.

Civic Engagement and Age

The development of CLs was, in part, due to an attempt to appeal to a younger, faster paced generation. Putnam (2000) claimed that the decline in American civic engagement is largely a result of a change in generational mindset concerning volunteerism (Rotolo and Wilson 2004). Putnam (2000: 132) claimed that the “long civic generation” was highly active in civic engagement. This volunteer mentality was shaped

by the Great Depression and World War II (Putnam 2000). Putnam (2000) purported that post WWII generations are less volunteer minded, less civically involved and more individualistic.

Rotolo and Wilson (2004) researched Putnam's generational hypothesis by analyzing data from the National Longevity Survey. He could only analyze the responses of women since only women were asked questions concerning volunteering during their preretirement years (Rotolo and Wilson 2004). The study showed that Putnam's (2000) assertion that current generations are less likely to volunteer is incorrect (Rotolo and Wilson 2004). To the contrary, the study found that younger participants contributed more hours of volunteering than older, retired participants (Rotolo and Wilson 2004). The study also found that the type of volunteering done by current generations is different. That is, older generations participated in 'traditional' forms of volunteer activity, such as church attendance and club memberships. Younger generations, the baby boomers of the civil rights era, were more prone toward political activism type volunteering (Rotolo and Wilson 2004). Hence, studies show that younger generations do not necessarily have less volunteer activity; rather, they have different types of volunteer activity. Hence, it is likely that age leads to differences in the amount and type of civic engagement among Masons as well. Because CL membership may be younger on average than that of TOLs (due to recent recruitment efforts targeted at younger generations), this may also contribute to differences in the type and quantity of civic engagement among members of the different lodge types.

Civic Engagement and Education

Traditional Observance Lodges place a heavier emphasis on the amount and type of educational experience received by Masonic members. Numerous studies indicate that there is a strong relationship between the level of one's education and their level of political or civic engagement (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; Coleman 1988; Schultz 2002). Rotolo and Wilson (2004) noted that younger generations have higher levels of education and this may be the reason why he found that younger individuals were actually not less engaged than their older counterparts.

Hillygus (2005) analyzed responses from the Baccalaureate and Beyond longitudinal survey in order to analyze the relationship between education and civic engagement. Hillygus (2005) found that both level and type of education were related to level of individual civic engagement. Those respondents who had higher scores on verbal aptitude tests and those who received civic or social related higher education, were more likely to be civically engaged (Hillygus 2005).

Therefore, education may influence differences in level of civic engagement among the Masons. Members with lower levels of education may be less civically engaged than those with higher levels of education. In addition to the level of education a person has, the field in which they receive a degree also likely influences their civic engagement. Given the emphasis on social issues within the humanities and social sciences, it might be expected that persons with degrees in these fields would be more civically engaged than people with degrees in other fields. Therefore, Masons with degrees in humanities and social sciences may be more civically engaged than Masons with degrees in physical sciences or business. Given the greater emphasis on education within TOLs, especially education specifically related to civic engagement and

knowledge, it is expected that members of TOLs will have higher levels of education and be more heavily drawn from the humanities and social science fields than members of CLs.

Civic Engagement and Group Size

Not only do TOLs place a greater emphasis on traditional sources of education, TOLs also claim that the quality of Masonic civic education (within the lodge) is higher within TOLs. One factor that affects the quality of civic education within the lodge is group size (Lodge of Nine Muses No. 1776 2010; MRF 2010). Because TOLs tend to be smaller or cap their membership at around 70 members, it is argued they are in a better position to provide quality education to their members (Lodge of Nine Muses No. 1776 2010; MRF 2010). CL lodges can be well over 300 or 400 members in size. TOLs maintain that once a lodge has reached a certain size, the individual's lodge experience and contributions are lowered.

Studies show that group size affects the level of the individual's contribution and experience in relationship to the group's goals and activities. Studies indicate that the larger the group size, the lower the level of most individuals' participation in the group. This phenomenon is known as "social loafing" (Goodman 1986; O'Leary-Kelly, Martocchio, and Frink 1994; Shepperd 1995). Shepperd (1995) noted three reasons for this negative association between group size and individual contribution, namely that individuals feel that their contributions are unnecessary, unrewarded and too costly.

Group size may also impact civic engagement through its impact on governance. Barakso (2005) studied the National Organization of Women (NOW) and its relationship to civic engagement. NOW, like the Masons, is a democratically structured membership organization. Barakso (2005) found that the democratic practices of the organization

fostered higher levels of civic engagement by its members. Both CLs and TOLs, like NOW, elect their leadership and vote on key organizational issues (GLoTx 2011; Hollingsworth 2011; UGLE 2011). However, TOLs claim that the size of group affects the ability to know and elect quality leaders. Specifically, TOLs claim that smaller groups, as opposed to the larger CLs, foster a better leadership selection process, which in turn leads to greater civic engagement. Therefore, TOLs which emphasize having a smaller, closer knit group, may have higher levels of civic engagement among their membership.

Summary

Putnam's theory of social capital, founded in the works of Tocqueville, serves as a foundation for numerous studies on civic engagement and social capital. The Masons are a civic organization that publically claims to support civic engagement and democratic concepts, concepts that are replete throughout social capital theory and civic engagement studies. The decline in membership for civic organizations over the past several decades has also impacted the Masons. Their response to these declines—the development of both CLs and TOLs—has important implications for the civic engagement of Masons.

The contrast in philosophy of these two types of lodges is also thought to be reflected in membership differences in terms of age, level and type of education, and group size. All of these factors may impact civic engagement. This study looks at each of these factors by utilizing an online survey of members of three different Masonic lodges in Colorado, one TOL and two CLs of different sizes. The foregoing review leads to the following hypotheses:

1. CL members will be less civically engaged than TOL members.
2. Age will be positively associated with civic engagement among Masons.
3. CL members will be younger on average than TOL members.
4. Younger Masons participate in different types of civic engagement than older Masons.
5. Level of education will be positively associated with civic engagement among Masons.
6. CL members will have lower levels of education than TOL members.
7. Masons with degrees in humanities and social science will be more civically engaged than those with degrees in other fields.
8. CL members will be less likely to have degrees in the humanities and social sciences than will TOL members.
9. Size of lodge will be negatively associated with civic engagement among Masons.

METHODS

Data Collection and Sampling

In this study, I explore civic engagement in America by examining factors that influence civic engagement among Masons, comparing civic engagement among CL and TOL memberships. I conducted an original internet survey using Survey Monkey Software. I surveyed members of three Masonic lodges, two CLs of different sizes and one TOL. Two CLs were surveyed in order to better analyze group size as a factor in influencing civic engagement. One CL with a membership size that is close to that of the

TOL was surveyed and one CL with a substantially higher membership was surveyed. Masonic Lodges in Colorado were surveyed in this study. Colorado is considered throughout American Freemasonry as a state that has CLs of various sizes and stellar TOLs (MRF 2010; Hollingsworth 2011) with the leadership of Masonic Lodges in Colorado who were willing to contribute to this study and participate in the survey. An attempt was made to ensure that the lodges picked came from comparable but separate urban locations (e.g., community size, demographic composition). Due to heightened interest in privacy among Masonic lodges, more specific details about these lodges cannot be provided here.

Potential respondents were contacted at least three times: 1) An initial email pre-notification of the upcoming survey was sent on February 24th, 2012; 2) an email invitation with survey link followed a few days later on February 29th, 2012; and 3) a reminder email notification with survey link was emailed approximately two weeks later on March 10th, 2012 to all respondents, thanking those who responded and reminding those who had not responded to do so. All emails were first sent to lodge leaders who then forwarded the emails to their members. The survey link was sent to all members of one TOL with a membership size of about 70, to one CL of around 70 members and to another CL with membership of about twice that size. Since responses were kept anonymous, the reminder email was sent to all potential respondents (since there was no way to determine who specifically had responded). See Appendix D for a copy of the email notifications and Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

Due to the low response rate of the survey (10%), seven follow-up, interview style questions relating to the hypotheses were sent to the leaders of all three lodges. The

answers from these questions were examined for themes relating to the study. Quotes from these answers were used to supplement the survey results. The answers to these questions will be presented in the discussion section (following the findings) when relevant.

Variables and Measurements

The primary dependent variable for this study is civic engagement. Measures based on Tufts University's Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement were used (Tufts University 2006). This measurement parallels that used by Putnam. Four types of civic engagement were measured; they are: civic activities, electronic activities, electoral activities, and civic voice activities. Civic activity includes membership in voluntary associations and religious activities. Electronic activity includes online social media activities. Electoral activity includes campaign and voting activities. Civic voice activity pertains to activities such as protests or boycotts. Table 1 includes measurement information for each type of civic engagement.

Responses to questions measuring the four types of civic engagement were combined to form an overall scale of civic engagement (range: 0-48; questions 16-21 and 23-40 on the survey). Summated scores for each subset of the overall scale (e.g., for civic activities, electronic activities, etc.) were also used to determine variation in types of civic engagement. Only 37 of the survey participants answered the civic engagement questions.

The full scale achieved a Cronbach's Alpha of .85, indicating strong internal consistency. The mean score for the full scale was 25.3, with a minimum possible score of 0, a maximum possible score of 48, and a standard deviation of 8.51. While some of

the items do not fit as well as others (e.g., problematic item correlations; lack of unidimensionality in Principal Components Analysis), given the small sample size, I have chosen to keep the scale as constructed.

The sub scale “civic activity” had a fairly low Cronbach’s Alpha of .60. The mean for the civic activity sub scale was 5.5, with a minimum possible score of 0, a maximum possible score of 12, and a standard deviation of 2.42. Pearsons correlation was used to assess the consistency of the sub scale for “electronic activity” because the scale consisted of only two items. Responses to the two items (social networking, blogging) were significantly correlated ($r = .352, p < .05$). The electronic activity sub scale had a mean score of 2.0, a minimum possible score of 0, a maximum possible score of 4, and a standard deviation of 1.40. The sub scale “electoral activity” achieved a Cronbach’s Alpha of .79. The mean score for the electoral activity sub scale was 10.4, with a minimum possible score of 0, a maximum possible score of 16, and a standard deviation of 3.50. The sub scale “civic voice” was found to be highly reliable with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .81. The mean score for the civic voice sub scale was 7.5, with a minimum possible score of 0, a maximum possible score of 16, and a standard deviation of 4.27.

The independent variables for this study are lodge membership (TOL, small CL, and large CL), age, level of education, and type of education (field) (see Table 3). Additional Masonic affiliation variables were measured as potential control variables and to verify expected differences in lodge characteristics (see Table 2).

Analytic Approach

Cronbach’s Alpha was used to test the reliability of the civic engagement scale and subscales. For subscales with only two items, a Pearson’s correlation coefficient was

run for this purpose. Principal components analysis was also used to ascertain the dimensionality of the civic engagement scale. The following analyses were used for the corresponding hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: A t-test was utilized to compare the means of civic engagement for CL versus TOL members.

Hypothesis 2: Pearsons correlation was used to assess the relationship between age and civic engagement.

Hypothesis 3: A t-test was utilized to compare the mean ages for CL versus TOL members.

Hypothesis 4: To determine if age affects the types of civic engagement participated in, each sub-component of the civic engagement scale was correlated with age.

Hypothesis 5: A t-test was utilized to compare mean levels of civic engagement by educational level (< Bachelor's degree; Bachelor's degree or higher).

Hypothesis 6: A chi-square test was utilized to determine whether CL and TOL members differ significantly in terms of educational levels.

Hypothesis 7: A t-test was utilized to compare mean levels of civic engagement by different fields of study (social science and humanities versus all other fields combined).

Hypothesis 8: A chi-square test was utilized to determine whether CL and TOL members differ significantly in terms of having degrees in the social sciences and humanities.

Hypothesis 9: An F-test was used to compare civic engagement across the different size lodges.

FINDINGS

Participant Characteristics

Participants in the survey consisted of 39 Masons. Fourteen participants were from the Traditional Observance Lodge (TOL) and a combined total of 25 participants came from the Contemporary Lodges (CL). Eight respondents claimed dual membership in both a TOL and a CL and were asked to answer lodge specific questions for each type of lodge (two appropriately labeled spaces were allotted for each question). Length of membership ranged from four months to 60 years with a mean of 19.8 years. Thirty-five of the participants were Master Masons and three reported being either Fellow Craft or Entered Apprentice Masons.

Of the participants, 10 have less than a Bachelor's degree, 14 hold only a Bachelor's degree, and 11 hold a post graduate or professional degree. The highest number of respondents report that their degree or field is in business (12), nine are in physical science, six in Social Science, and eight report having a degree in an "other" field. Participants ranged in age from 24 to 93, with an average age of 54.9 years of age.

Lodge Characteristics

The primary distinction used in this thesis is between TOL and CL lodges. It is therefore important to verify that differences that are assumed to characterize these lodges are supported by the data. TOL lodges focus on putting a cap on their

membership numbers as a mechanism for ensuring a quality, rather than quantity, experience. The survey results confirm a difference in size between the TOL and CL lodges. The TOL reported membership size ranged from 20 to 224 members, with an average size of 75.1 members, which incidentally is the approximate reported size for TOL lodges throughout the country. CL membership size ranged from 40 to 250 members, with an average of 118.3 members. While my use of the TOL/CL terminology may not have been perfectly clear to respondents (causing them to occasionally misrepresent which lodge they were a part of), the means here do indicate a smaller size membership for TOL lodges.

Since TOL lodges reportedly place higher emphasis on education, it was expected that TOL members would be more likely to be expected to compile or present a paper about Masonic education or experience. Again, the data confirm this distinction. Of the TOL respondents, 50% reported that they were expected to compile or present a Masonic paper. Of the CL respondents, only one person reported an expectation to compile or present a paper on a Masonic topic.

It was further expected that it would take TOL members on average longer to advance to the next blue lodge degree compared to their CL counterparts; this was confirmed by the data. Over one-half (54%) of TOL members reported that it takes six months or longer for a member to advance to the next blue lodge degree. Of the CL members, only 14% reported that it takes six months or longer for a member to advance to the next blue lodge degree.

It was also expected that TOL membership dues would be higher than CL membership dues. Once again, the data support this distinction. The dues reported for

TOL members ranged from \$72 to \$400 per year with an average of \$270 per year. CL members reported membership dues ranging from \$10 to \$156 per year with an average membership dues amount of \$113 per year.

Based again on the notion that TOL membership has heightened expectations, it was assumed that TOL members would more likely be expected to attend meetings of their lodge before advancing to the next blue lodge degree than CL members. Indeed, 67% of TOL members responded that they were expected to attend lodge meetings before advancing to the next degree. Only 25% of CL members reported that they were expected to attend lodge meetings before advancing to the next degree.

Finally, it was anticipated that TOL lodges would be more likely to hold meetings for the sole purpose of Masonic education than CL lodges. Of the TOL members polled, 75% reported that their lodge had held a meeting for the sole purpose of education or research within the past six months. Of the CL members polled, 57% reported that their lodge had held a meeting for this purpose within the past six months. In summary, the data suggest that all of the indicators used to distinguish TOL and CL lodges in terms of their emphasis on quality of experience are accurate.

Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis 1: CL members will be less civically engaged than TOL members.

To test this hypothesis, respondents were first asked to evaluate whether they thought their Masonic affiliation had impacted their participation in civic activity. Of all of the respondents, 59% reported that their membership in Masonry helped increase their participation in civic engagement while 36% reported that their Masonic affiliation did not increase their level of civic engagement activity. Roughly equivalent proportions of

both TOL and CL members reported that Masonic affiliation had no effect on their civic engagement: 36% of TOL members and 39% of CL members.

This hypothesis was examined further through the use of the full civic engagement scale. The average score of civic engagement for CL and TOL members was roughly the same ($t = -.394, p = .696$). The average CL score for the civic engagement scale was 24.9 (std. deviation = 9.94) while the mean score for TOL members was 25.9 (std. deviation = 5.74). Thus, the data suggest that this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 2: Age will be positively associated with civic engagement among Masons.

A correlation test between age and the full civic engagement scale was used in order to test this hypothesis. The test demonstrated a slight negative association between age and civic engagement among Masons ($r = -.098, p = .579$). While insignificant (due to small sample size), this negative correlation may indicate that younger Masons are equally if not more involved civically than their older counterparts, a notion that runs counter to the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: CL members will be younger on average than TOL members.

In order to test this hypothesis the average age of CL and TOL members was compared ($t = 1.586, p = .123$). The average age of CL respondents was 58.8 years old (std. deviation = 19.25) while the average age of TOL respondents was 49.4 (std. deviation = 13.02). These exploratory data imply that this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 4: Younger Masons participate in different types of civic engagement than older Masons.

In order to test this hypothesis a correlation test was used with age and each civic engagement sub scale. Age was not significantly correlated with the civic activity sub scale ($r = -.024, p = .893$), the electoral activity sub scale ($r = .039, p = .829$) and the civic voice sub scale ($r = -.043, p = .811$). There was a statistically significant negative association between age and the electronic activity sub scale ($r = -.552, p < .01$). This indicates that younger Masons appear more likely to engage in electronic civic activity than older Masons. Thus, the limited exploratory data suggest that this hypothesis may be supported.

Hypothesis 5: Level of education will be positively associated with civic engagement among Masons.

In order to gauge if level of education was positively associated with civic engagement the mean levels of civic engagement for those with at least a Bachelor's (four year) degree were compared to the mean levels for those with less than a Bachelor's degree ($t = -.525, p = .603$). Masons with less than a Bachelor's degree scored an average of 24.5 (std. deviation = 6.69) on the civic engagement scale while those with a Bachelor's degree or higher scored an average of 26.2 (std. deviation = 9.29). This indicates a possible positive association with level of education and civic engagement among Masons. Therefore, the data suggest that this hypothesis may be supported (the limited sample size precludes adequate significance testing).

Hypothesis 6: CL members will have lower levels of education than TOL members.

In order to test this hypothesis the level of education was compared between CL and TOL respondents (chi-square = .244, $p = .970$). The comparisons indicated that 43% of CL members had earned a four year degree and an additional 29% of CL members earned a graduate/professional degree. Among TOL members, 36% reported having a four year degree with an additional 36% reporting a graduate/professional degree. Therefore, this hypothesis appears to be supported, (again, limited sample size precludes adequate significance testing).

Hypothesis 7: Masons with degrees in humanities and social sciences will be more civically engaged than those with degrees in other fields.

To test this hypothesis, the average civic engagement scale score was compared for Masons whose degree or field is in the social sciences/humanities versus Masons whose degree or field is not within the social sciences/humanities ($t = -.088$, $p = .930$). Masons reporting having a degree or being in a non-social science/humanities field scored an average of 25.7 (std. deviation = 8.72) on the civic engagement scale while those within social science/humanities scored an average of 26.0 (std. deviation = 8.53). Given the very small differences in these means, this hypothesis does not appear to be supported.

Hypothesis 8: CL members will be less likely to have degrees in the humanities and social sciences than will TOL members.

To test this hypothesis the type of degree (social science/humanities versus other) obtained by participants was compared between CL and TOL members (chi-square =

2.146, $p = .143$). The findings indicated that 29% of TOL members reported having a degree or being in the field of social science/humanities compared to 10% of CL members. Thus, the data suggest that this hypothesis may be supported (as before, limited sample size disallows adequate significance testing).

Hypothesis 9: Size of Lodge will be negatively associated with civic engagement among Masons.

To test this hypothesis the mean of civic engagement was compared for each lodge polled, the TOL lodge, a small CL lodge, and a large CL lodge ($F = .770$, $p = .471$). The mean for the TOL was 25.9 (std. deviation = 5.74) and the mean for the small CL was 26.5 (std. deviation = 10.80). The much larger size CL lodge had a mean of 22.0 (std. deviation = 7.89). This indicates a possible trend that as size of lodge increases the level of civic engagement among lodge members decreases. Thus, the hypothesis appears to be supported (although limited sample size precludes adequate significance testing).

DISCUSSION

This exploratory study aimed to examine civic engagement in America. This was done by using an exploratory analysis of the response by the Masons, a unique civic organization, to a decline in its membership in America. Specifically, this study explored possible differences in two approaches taken by contemporary Masonic organizations, namely the CL approach and the TOL approach. In addition to expectations with regard to differences in age, education and group size, a key hypothesis of this study was that

each of these approaches would result in different levels of civic engagement among members.

Survey data from three lodges in Colorado were used to address the study's expectations. Since the survey data were limited by low response, leaders from each lodge were asked, via e-mail, follow up, interview-style questions that paralleled the study's hypotheses. Where relevant, their responses are incorporated in the following discussion to either counter or support results from the survey.

The first hypothesis addresses the core issues of this study, stating "CL members will be less civically engaged than TOL members." The data suggest that this hypothesis was not supported. It was expected that a TOL environment and focus on education would foster more civically minded and engaged members. The results demonstrated that the vast majority of respondents (nearly 60%) felt that their membership in Masonry increased their level of civic engagement. As one young Worshipful Master of his lodge put it, "I definitely think being a Mason increase(s) our awareness of community volunteerism. I think that the idea that many of us have led a selfish life for most of our lives due to societal pressures." This statement indicates that Masonry overall may influence its members to be civically minded and active. It is noteworthy that Putnam (2000) argued that younger generations in America are developing an atomistic, individualistic mindset and behaviors which he considers dangerous to American democracy. The statement; "the idea that many of us (younger members) have led a selfish life for most of our lives due to societal pressures", seems to directly support this claim by Putnam (2000) that American culture may be, in some ways, influencing

younger generations, and in this case younger Masons, to perceive that they have a more individualistic mindset than older Masons.

While the average level of civic engagement for TOL members was slightly higher than CL members, there was not a statistically significant or substantively meaningful difference in overall civic engagement between CL and TOL members. In addition to having a limited number of survey responses (which increases the difficulty of finding statistically significant differences), a possible reason for this may be because Masonry, in general, tends to attract people who are already civically engaged. That is, of those polled, 95% reported volunteering for civic groups at some point in the past, with 79% having volunteered with civic groups (other than the Masons) within the past year. See Table 4 for a list of groups/organizations specifically mentioned by respondents.

Hypothesis 1 tested overall level of civic engagement between CLs and TOLs but did not account for the quality or type of civic engagement. It can be speculated that there is a difference in the specific types and/or quality of civic engagement between CL and TOL members. While the survey data cannot provide information about the quality (or extent of) civic engagement, it appears that there may be important differences in the types of civic engagement for CLs and TOLs. Although not statistically significant, CL members scored higher, on average, in terms of the civic activity subscale (CL mean = 5.9, standard deviation = 2.20; TOL mean = 4.9, standard deviation = 2.71). TOL members, on the other hand, scored higher on each of the remaining subscales. For electronic activity, TOL members had a mean of 2.3 (standard deviation = 1.14) and CL members had a mean of 1.8 (standard deviation = 1.54). For electoral activity, TOL

members scored a mean of 10.4 (standard deviation = 2.50) and CL members scored a mean of 10.3 (standard deviation = 4.04). For civic voice activity, TOL members scored an average of 8.4 (standard deviation = 3.34) and CL members scored 7.0 (standard deviation = 4.73). Further study would be needed in order to see if type of lodge impacts the type, and especially, the quality of civic engagement.

The second hypothesis stated that older Masons would be more civically engaged than their younger Masonic counterparts. The results suggest that this hypothesis is not supported and in fact implied a slight trend opposing it. That is, there was a slight negative correlation between age and civic engagement. This runs counter to Putnam's broader societal claim that younger generations are less civically engaged than older generations in America. The findings for the second hypothesis are further corroborated by statements made by lodge leadership in their responses to follow-up questions.

For example, one lodge leader states; "Being in the younger category I think that a lot of what the older members are in lodge for is very different than the younger group. The younger members tend to seek more networking opportunities where the older members are uninterested in this." The key phrase in this quote is "networking opportunities." This language suggests that younger Masons are in fact seeking to connect with other individual and groups. This is supported by another lodge leader who stated: "I like (that) several of our younger members have received help along the way through life via foster homes and the like and would like to give back in some way while building relationships along the way." This supports the claim that civic engagement increases social capital, which in turn cultivates more civic engagement, and that younger members are seeking to be civically engaged.

Another reason that the findings indicate that younger Masons polled are not less (and possibly more) civically engaged than older Masons could be related to the findings of hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 4 states; “younger Masons participate in different types of civic engagement than older Masons.” The data seemed to indicate that younger Masons were more likely to be involved in social media networking, like Facebook or blogging than older Masons. Therefore, it is possible that younger Masons are not less civically engaged than older Masons but rather participating in different types of civic activity. This was also demonstrated by Rotolo and Wilson (2004).

Hypothesis 3 stated that CL members would be younger on average than TOL members. It was thought that CL members would be younger than TOL members because CLs have generally lowered requirements for membership in order to make it easier for younger potential candidates to join. The findings suggest that this hypothesis is not supported. In fact, the findings indicate a possible trend that TOL members are considerably younger than CL members. Statements provided by lodge leadership may provide insight as to why this is.

The TOL leader stated: “younger Masons are looking for an experience rather than just a social club . . . older Masons tend to like the social aspect.” CL leaders stated that younger Masons were seeking networking and relationship building opportunities as quoted above. Thus, based on these statements, it can be speculated that certain aspects of TOLs may attract younger members because their unique environment and focus on education are more in line with the expectations that younger potential members have concerning Masonic membership. Further study would be required to explore this possibility.

It appears that level of education is positively associated with civic engagement among Masons, as stated in hypothesis 5. This finding parallels other studies that find that the higher one's education, the more civically engaged they are likely to be (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; Coleman 1988; Schultz 2002). Yet, all of the lodge leaders stated that they "did not think education background affected one's involvement in Masonry." However, the TOL leader stated that: "the educational background may affect a Mason's ability to learn the deeply esoteric aspects of Freemasonry. This is not to say that backgrounds other than liberal arts are not able to understand the mysteries of Freemasonry."

What is interesting here is that all three lodge leaders agree that any members, despite their education background, can be active in their lodge and civically engaged. However, the TOL leader notes that education background, specifically, level and type may be positively associated with one's ability to grasp deeper aspects of Masonic experience and education. This may lend credibility to the idea that type of education may impact type of civic engagement and not necessarily overall level of civic engagement. Again, further study is required to better understand this possible dynamic.

It was expected, according to hypothesis 6 that "CL members will have lower levels of education than TOL members." Further, it was expected in hypothesis 8 that "CL members will be less likely to have degrees in the humanities and social sciences than will TOL members." The findings tend to support both of these expectations. However, it was expected that those with degrees in humanities and social sciences would be more civically engaged (hypothesis 7). The findings suggest that this is not the case.

It is interesting that TOLs have a higher rate of members with graduate degrees and seem to attract more individuals with degrees in humanities and social sciences. This would seem to indicate that TOL members would be more civically engaged than the CL members surveyed, which, as previously stated, is not supported by the findings. This may indicate that Masonry has some type of nullifying effect for its members in relation to their level/type of education and level of civic engagement. In other words, despite one's educational background, simply being a Mason may impact civic engagement. It may also indicate that, as already noted, Masonry may tend to attract those who are already civically engaged. It may also be, as noted previously, that educational background impacts the quality or type of civic engagement rather than the overall level of civic engagement. Further study is required to substantiate these speculations.

Hypothesis 9 states that, "size of lodge will be negatively associated with civic engagement" and appears to be supported by the data and statements provided by lodge leadership. One CL leader stated: "I do feel that size of lodge impacts the participation in lodge events; however it is not simply the number of members, but number of active members." A leader from the other CL stated: "It is my personal opinion that Lodge size does matter greatly with a Lodge of say fifty members . . . it's easier to stay in touch with the members, keep track of them and each member feels a greater need for everyone to contribute for the better good." The TOL leader stated: "This small number allows members to get to know each other better. Since all members are relatively close, participation in Lodge events is greater." The statistical data along with these quotes support social loafing theory as discussed earlier, with members of larger lodges being

less active on average than members of smaller lodges. This further suggests that a small lodge tends to foster or attract more civically engaged Masons.

CONCLUSION

Social capital and more specifically civic engagement are considered crucial for the existence and perpetuation of democracy in America. Tocqueville (1838) and more recently Putnam (2000) have conducted major studies on civic engagement. Putnam's (2000) highly cited and studied works demonstrate a strong, positive relationship between civic engagement and democracy in America. The Masons are an organization that has existed in America since prerevolutionary times. It is commonly thought that historical actions by Masons were instrumental in the development of democratic practices in America. The Masons are unique in American history and in relation to American civic engagement because they have existed from the colonial era through the present and teach their members to be civically minded and active. Further, they have influenced the development of other civic groups in America. This study explored civic engagement in America by examining the reaction by the Masons to a decline in its membership, an issue that has afflicted numerous civic groups and activities in American society. The reaction to decline in membership among the Masons has led to the development of two types of Masonic lodges in America, CLs and TOLs. This study compared these lodges in relation to their member's civic engagement activities and background characteristics.

It is interesting that TOLs have smaller sized lodges, have younger members, and have more members with degrees in humanities and social sciences. All of these factors,

with the exception of age, would indicate that TOLs have a higher level of social capital and therefore produce more civically minded and civically engaged members. That, however, was not supported by this study. TOL members were slightly more civically engaged than CL members in this study, but the limited survey response precludes any definitive statement in this regard.

It can be stated that Masons, at least the ones polled in this study, are very civically engaged. For example, nearly 90% of respondents reported having voted in local, state, and federal elections within the past four years, well above national averages. Nearly all respondents are members of other civic groups outside of Masonry. The question then becomes, does Masonry produce civic engagement or does Masonry attract people who are already civically engaged? It would be interesting to further explore the degree to which TOL members are engaged in different types of civic engagement than CL members, and what implications those differences may have for Masonry and American culture in general, if they do in fact exist. However, due to the limitations of this study, further study is needed to explore this possibility.

A chief limitation of this study is the low survey response rate (~10%). This low response rate may seem to conflict with the emphasis Masons place on voluntary activity and the importance of scientific research. However, it should be noted that while Masons stress the importance of civic engagement, we also place a high value on the privacy of Masonic lodge information. It could be that guarding privacy outweighed participating in the survey for most potential participants. Another explanation may be that only the most active members participated in the survey. By active members, I mean those who attend lodge meetings on a regular basis and stay highly informed on lodge functions. The

results here would then further support the idea that smaller lodges have a higher level of participation among members. That is, approximately 30% of TOL members participated in the survey and around 10% of the lodge membership participated from the CL lodges. In any case, future research, as is the case for other secretive organizations of interest to Sociologists, will need to take this high value of privacy into account before we can make more definitive conclusions.

REFERENCES

- Barakso, Maryann. 2005. "Civic Engagement and Voluntary Associations: Reconsidering the Role of the Governance Structure of Advocacy Groups." *Polity* 37 (3): 315-334.
- Bessel, Paul M. 2012a. "Freemasons and the U.S. Declaration of Independence." Freemasons. Retrieved August 6, 2011. (<http://bessel.org/declmas.htm>)
- Bessel, Paul M. 2012b. "Prince Hall Masonry Recognition." Freemasons. Retrieved June 19, 2012. (<http://bessel.org/masrec/phamap.htm>).
- Boggs, Carl. 2002. "Social Capital as Political Fantasy." Pp. 183-202 in *Social Capital*, edited by Scott L. McLean, David A. Schultz, and Manfred B. Steger. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Coleman, James S. 1988. "Free Riders and Zealots: The Role of Social Networks." *Sociological Theory* 6 (1): 52-57.
- East Denver Lodge No. 160. 2011. "Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Colorado: Traditional Observance." Retrieved August 26, 2011. (<http://www.eastdenver160.com/>).
- Fried, Amy. 2002. "The Strange Disappearance of Alexis de Tocqueville in Putnam's Analysis of Social Capital." Pp. 21-49 in *Social Capital*, edited by Scott L. McLean, David A. Schultz, and Manfred B. Steger. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- George Washington Masonic Memorial, The. 2011. "George Washington, the Mason." Retrieved August 7, 2011. (<http://gwmemorial.org/washingtonTheMason.php>).

- GLoTx. 2011. "The Grand Lodge of Texas: Freemasonry and the American Revolution."
Retrieved August 6, 2011.
(<http://www.grandlodgeoftexas.org/search/node/U.S.%20declaration%20of%20independence>).
- GLoV. 2011. "The Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Virginia. History of the Grand Lodge of Virginia." Retrieved November 17, 2010.
(<http://www.grandlodgeofvirginia.org/history/index.htm>).
- GLoV. 2012. "The Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Virginia: Appendant Bodies of Freemasonry." Retrieved June 19, 2012.
(http://www.grandlodgeofvirginia.org/appendant_bodies/index.htm).
- Goodman, Paul. 1986. *Designing Effective Work Groups*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hillygus, D. Sunshine. 2005. "The Missing Link: Exploring the Relationship Between Higher Education and Political Engagement." *Political Behavior* 27 (1): 25-47.
- Hollingsworth George. 2011. "Masonic Tourist: Living History, Freemasonry in Williamsburg, VA." Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite. Retrieved July 21, 2011
(<http://scottishrite.org/journal/july-august-2011/living-history/>).
- Independent Order of Odd Fellows, The. 2009. "History of Odd Fellows: Why the Name Odd Fellows?". Retrieved August 16, 2011.
(http://www.ioof.org/history/history_california.html).
- Kaufman, Jason and David Weintraub. 2004. "Social Capital Formation and American Fraternal Association: New Empirical Evidence." *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 35 (1): 1-36.

- Lichterman, Paul. 2006. "Social Capital or Group Style? Rescuing Tocqueville's Insights on Civic Engagement." *Theory and Society* 35 (5/6): 529-563.
- Lodge of Nine Muses No. 1776. 2010. "Free and Accepted Masons of The District of Columbia: Members." Retrieved August 26, 2011. (<http://www.lo9m1776.org/Membership.html>).
- LVX Lodge No. 848. 2009. "Free and Accepted Masons of California: About: who we are." Retrieved August 22, 2011. (<http://www.calodges.org/no846/about.html>).
- Moffrey, Robert W. 2001. "The Rise and Progress of the Manchester Unity Independent Order of Odd Fellows." The Isle of Man.org. Retrieved August 7, 2011. (http://www.isle-of-man.com/manxnotebook/history/socs/odf_mdly.htm).
- MRF. 2010. "The Masonic Restoration Foundation: The Foundation." Retrieved August 20, 2011. (<http://traditionalobservance.com/>)
- O'Leary-Kelly, Anne M., Joseph J. Martocchio, and Dwight D. Frink. 1994. "A Review of the Influence of Group Goals on Group Performance." *The Academy of Management Journal* 37 (5): 1285-1301.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Rotolo, Thomas and John Wilson 2004. "What Happened to the 'Long Civic Generation'? Explaining Cohort Differences in Volunteerism." *Social Forces* 82 (3): 1091-1121.

- Schultz, David A. 2002. "The Phenomenology of Democracy: Putnam, Pluralism, and Voluntary Associations." Pp.74-98 in *Social Capital*, edited by Scott L. McLean, David A. Schultz, and Manfred B. Steger. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Shepperd, James A. 1995. "Remedying Motivation and Productivity Loss in Collective Settings." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 4 (5): 131-134.
- St. John's Lodge No. 1. 2011. "Ancient York Masons: History of Freemasons." Retrieved August 4, 2011. (<http://www.stjohns1.org/portal/>).
- Tocqueville, Alexis De. 1838. *Democracy in America*. London, England: Saunders and Otley.
- Tufts University. 2006. "Civic Engagement Quiz." Retrieved December 21, 2010. (http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/Final_Civic_Inds_Quiz_2006.pdf)
- UGLE. 2011. "The United Grand Lodge of England: History of Freemasonry." Retrieved November 17, 2010. (<http://www.ugle.org.uk/>).
- Wolfinger, Raymond. E., and Steven J. Rosenstone. 1980. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Masonic Civic Engagement

The following survey is completely anonymous. This survey is part of a research project being conducted by James M. Kinslow and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Middle Tennessee University. Feel free to stop this survey at any time. Your privacy will be protected at all times. Please answer the following survey questions. If you are not sure about a particular question, you may skip that question. Thank you for your participation.

***1. Are you a member of a Traditional Observance Lodge? (Please check one). (A Traditional Observance Lodge is one that meets certain Masonic criteria. If you are not sure if your lodge is a Traditional Observance lodge, please consult your Grand Lodge or Lodge leadership.)**

- Yes
 No

***2. Are you a member of a Masonic Lodge that is not a Traditional Observance Lodge? (Please check one)**

- Yes
 No

***3. Do you hold dual membership with a Traditional Observance Lodge and with a non-Traditional Observance Lodge? (Please check one)**

- Yes
 No

Please skip question 4 if you answered NO to question 3.

4. In which Lodge do you attend meetings more frequently? (Please check one)

- Traditional Observance Lodge
 Non-Traditional Observance Lodge
 About the same

Masonic Civic Engagement

5. Approximately how many members belong to your Lodge? If you hold dual membership with a Traditional Observance Lodge and a non-Traditional Observance Lodge please answer for both types of lodges. (Please type in the approximate membership number in the correct box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:

Non-Traditional Observance Lodge:

6. How long have you been a Mason? (Please type length in years and months in the box).

7. What is your current Blue Lodge Degree? (Please check one)

- Entered Apprentice
- Fellow Craft
- Master Mason

Masonic Civic Engagement

If you hold dual membership with a Traditional Observance Lodge and a non-Traditional Observance Lodge please answer for both types of lodges for questions 8-14. If you hold membership in only one type of lodge please answer for that lodge. Only answer for lodges in which you have actual membership status.

8. Approximately how many meetings does your Blue Lodge have a month? (Please select the best answer form the appropriate drop-down box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>
Non- Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>

9. Approximately how many Lodge meetings are you able to attend per month? (Please select the best answer from the appropriate drop-down box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>
Non-Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>

10. Are you expected to compile or present a paper for your Lodge? (Please select the best answer from the appropriate drop-down box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>
Non-Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>

11. Approximately how long does it take an active Member to advance to the next degree in your Blue lodge? (Please select the best answer from the appropriate drop-down box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>
Non-Traditional Observance Lodge:	<input type="text"/>

Masonic Civic Engagement

12. How much are the yearly dues for your Blue lodge? (Please type in the dollar amount in the appropriate box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:

Non-Traditional Observance Lodge:

13. Does your Lodge REQUIRE that you attend meetings before being advanced to the next Blue Lodge Degree? (Please select the best answer from the appropriate drop-down box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:

Non-Traditional Observance Lodge:

14. Has your Lodge held a Masonic meeting in the past 6 months for the sole purpose of an educational or research focus? Please exclude degree conferral only and business meetings from your answer. (Please select the correct answer from the appropriate drop-down box).

Traditional Observance Lodge:

Non-Traditional Observance Lodge:

15. Has your membership in Masonry helped increase your participation in voluntary community activities such as youth programs, religious activity, or voting? Please do not include your Masonic activity when answering. (Please check one)

Yes, a little

Yes, some

Yes, a lot

No

Masonic Civic Engagement

16. Besides the Masons, have you ever worked together with someone or some group to solve a problem in the community where you live? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

17. Besides the Masons, have you volunteered or done any voluntary community service for no pay? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

18. Have you volunteered with a religious group? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

19. Have you volunteered with an environmental organization? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

20. Have you volunteered with a civic or community organization involved in health or social services? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

Masonic Civic Engagement

21. Have you volunteered with an organization for youth, children, or education? (Please answer for organizations that do NOT require Masonic Affiliation.) (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
- Yes, but not in the last year
- No, Never

22. Do you belong or donate money to any other groups, either locally or nationally, such as a youth group like 4-H, Girl Scouts, or a Poetry Slam chapter, a charity, a PTSA or other association, a labor union, a political or social group, a sport team or any other kind of group? Please list.

23. Besides email, have you communicated with others through a media social network, such as Facebook, Myspace, Twitter, Skype, etc? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
- Yes, but not in the last year
- No, Never

24. Have you participated in writing a blog? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
- Yes, but not in the last year
- No, Never

Masonic Civic Engagement

25. Are you registered to vote? (Please check one)

- Yes
 No
 Not Sure

26. Have you voted in a local public election in the last 4 years? (Please check one)

- Yes
 No

27. Have you voted in a state-level public election in the last 4 years? (Please check one)

- Yes
 No

28. Have you voted in a national public election in the last 4 years? (Please check one)

- Yes
 No

Masonic Civic Engagement

29. Have you volunteered for a political organization or candidate running for office? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the past 4 years
- Yes, but not within the past 4 years
- No, never

30. When there is an election taking place, do you try to convince people to vote for or against one of the parties or candidates, or not? (Please check one)

- Yes, always
- Yes, sometimes
- No, never

31. When there is an election taking place, do you wear a campaign button, put a sticker on your car, or place a sign in front of your house? (Please check one)

- Yes, always
- Yes, sometimes
- No, never

32. In the past 4 years have you given money to a political candidate, political party, or organization that supported candidates? (Please check one)

- Yes
- No

Masonic Civic Engagement

33. Have you contacted or visited a public official at any level of government to express your opinion? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

34. Have you contacted a newspaper or magazine to express your opinion on an issue? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

35. Have you contacted a radio station or talk show to express your opinion on an issue? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

36. Have you taken part in a protest, march, or demonstration? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

Masonic Civic Engagement

37. Have you signed an e-mail petition about a social or political issue? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

38. Have you signed a written petition about a social or political issue? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

39. Have you NOT bought something from a certain company because you disagree with the social or political values of the company that produces it? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

40. Have you bought something because you like the social or political values of the company that produces or provides it? (Please check one)

- Yes, within the last year
 Yes, but not in the last year
 No, Never

Masonic Civic Engagement

In order for us to analyze your responses to the previous questions, we need to know a little more about your background. Please remember that your answers are anonymous—we have no way to connect your responses to who you are.

41. Please give your age in years. (Please type your age in the box).

42. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Please check one)

- Less than high school graduate
- High school graduate or GED
- Vocational or Trade School
- Some College
- Associate's Degree (2 year degree)
- College Graduate (Bachelor's or 4 year degree)
- Graduate or Professional Degree

43. Which category best describes the field in which you hold your highest degree? (Please check one)

- Physical Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Humanities
- Business
- Other

Masonic Civic Engagement

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Any information regarding the survey and/or study can and will be provided to you. You may contact me at KinslowLLL@yahoo.com if you have any questions regarding the survey and/or study. I will answer any question that I can, in as timely a fashion as possible. Again, the privacy of all participants will be protected. Thank you for your time and energy.

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR LODGE LEADERS

Follow-up Questions for survey:

Please type in a brief, yet thorough (1-2 paragraphs) answer under each of the following questions. You, of course, can choose to skip any question. You, your Lodge, and your location will not be revealed. Thank you for your openness, honesty, and willingness to take the time to answer these supportive questions.

1. In your opinion, how does the size of your Lodge impact individual participation in Lodge events? (Please state approximately how many members your Lodge has).
2. In your opinion, what, if any, do younger Masons (18-50) expect from Masonry that perhaps older Masons (over 50) may not?
3. In your opinion, do you think that more of a liberal education enhances one's involvement and satisfaction in Freemasonry? If so, how?
4. In your opinion, do you think that being a Mason increases one's awareness of and participation in community volunteerism? If so, Why?
5. In your opinion, what are the top three things new members are looking for in joining Freemasonry?
6. In your opinion, how do you think your lodge is meeting these desires of new members?
7. In your opinion, what three things can your lodge and Masonry in general do to enhance the quality of experience by incoming and current members?

APPENDIX C

TABLES

Table 1. Measurement of Civic Engagement

Question Number	Type of Civic Engagement/ Question Wording	Scale Coding	Responses
<i>Civic Activity</i>			
Q16	Besides the Masons, have you ever worked together with someone or some group to solve a problem in the community where you live?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q17	Besides the Masons, have you volunteered or done any voluntary community service for no pay?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q18	Have you volunteered with a religious group?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q19	Have you volunteered with an environmental organization?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q20	Have you volunteered with a civic or community organization involved in health or social services?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q21	Have you volunteered with an organization for youth, children, or education?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never

Table 1. Measurement of Civic Engagement (cont.)

Question Number	Type of Civic Engagement/ Question Wording	Scale Coding	Responses
<i>Electronic Activity</i>			
Q23	Besides email, have you communicated with others through a media social network, such as Facebook, Myspace, Twitter, Skype, etc?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q24	Have you participated in writing a blog?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
<i>Electoral Activity</i>			
Q25	Are you registered to vote?	2	Yes
		0	No
		0	Not sure
Q26	Have you voted in a local public election in the last 4 years?	2	Yes
		0	No
Q27	Have you voted in a state-level public election in the last 4 years?	2	Yes
		0	No
Q28	Have you voted in a national public election in the last 4 years?	2	Yes
		0	No
Q29	Have you volunteered for a political organization or candidate running for office?	2	Yes, within the past 4 years
		1	Yes, but not within the past 4 years
		0	No, never

Table 1. Measurement of Civic Engagement (cont.)

Question Number	Type of Civic Engagement/ Question Wording	Scale Coding	Responses
Q30	When there is an election taking place, do you try to convince people to vote for or against one of the parties or candidates, or not?	2	Yes, always
		1	Yes, sometimes
		0	No, never
Q31	When there is an election taking place, do you wear a campaign button, put a sticker on your car, or place a sign in front of your house?	2	Yes, always
		1	Yes, sometimes
		0	No, never
Q32	In the past 4 years have you given money to a political candidate, political party, or organization that supported candidates?	2	Yes
		0	No
<i>Civic Voice Activity</i>			
Q33	Have you contacted or visited a public official at any level of government to express your opinion?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q34	Have you contacted a newspaper or magazine to express your opinion on an issue?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q35	Have you contacted a radio station or talk show to express your opinion on an issue?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never

Table 1. Measurement of Civic Engagement (cont.)

Question Number	Type of Civic Engagement/ Question Wording	Scale Coding	Responses
Q36	Have you taken part in a protest, march, or demonstration?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q37	Have you signed an <u>e-mail petition</u> about a social or political issue?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q38	Have you signed a <u>written petition</u> about a social or political issue?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q39	Have you NOT bought something from a certain company because you disagree with the social or political values of the company that produces it?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never
Q40	Have you bought something because you like the social or political values of the company that produces or provides it?	2	Yes, within the last year
		1	Yes, but not in the last year
		0	No, never

Source: Modified from Tufts University Civic Engagement Quiz

(http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/Final_Civic_Inds_Quiz_2006.pdf)

Table 2. Measurement of Masonic Affiliation

Question Number	Question Wording	Responses
Q1	Are you a member of a Traditional Observance Lodge?	Yes No
Q2	Are you a member of a Masonic Lodge that is not a Traditional Observance Lodge?	Yes No
Q3	Do you hold dual membership with a Traditional Observance Lodge and with a non-Traditional Observance Lodge?	Yes No
Q4	In which Lodge do you attend meetings more frequently?	Traditional Observance Non-Traditional Observance About the same
Q5	Approximately how many members belong to your Lodge?	# of members
Q6	How long have you been a Mason?	Length in years and months
Q7	What is your current Blue Lodge Degree?	Entered Apprentice Fellow Craft Master Mason
Q8	Approximately how many meetings does your Blue Lodge have a month?	1, 2, 3, 4, more than 4
Q9	Approximately how many Lodge meetings are you able to attend per month?	1, 2, 3, 4, more than 4

Table 2. Measurement of Masonic Affiliation (cont.)

Question Number	Question Wording	Responses
Q10	Are you expected to compile or present a paper for your Lodge?	Yes
		No
		Not sure
Q11	Approximately how long does it take an active Member to advance to the next degree in your Blue lodge?	Less than 1 month
		1-2 months
		Between 2 and 6 months
		More than 6 months
Q12	How much are the yearly dues for your Blue lodge?	Dollar amount
Q13	Does your Lodge REQUIRE that you attend meetings before being advanced to the next Blue Lodge Degree?	Yes
		No
		Not sure
Q14	Has your Lodge held a Masonic meeting in the past 6 months for the sole purpose of an educational or research focus?	Yes
		No
		Not sure
Q15	Has your membership in Masonry helped increase your participation in voluntary community activities such as youth programs, religious activities, or voting? (Please do not include your Masonic activity when answering.)	Yes, a little
		Yes, some
		Yes, a lot
		No

Table 3. Measurement of Independent Variables

Question Number	Question Wording	Responses
Q41	Please give your age in years.	Age in years
	<i>Age</i>	
Q42	What is the highest level of education that you have completed?	Less than high school graduate
	<i>Education</i>	High school graduate or GED
		Vocational or Trade School
		Some College
		Associate's Degree (2 year degree)
		College Graduate (Bachelor's or 4 year degree)
		Graduate or Professional Degree
Q43	Which category best describes the field in which you hold your highest degree?	Physical Sciences
	<i>Field</i>	Social Sciences
		Humanities
		Business
		Other

Table 4: Additional Organizations Mentioned by Respondents*

Organization mentioned	# of mentions
Amateur Radio clubs	1
American Contract Bridge League	1
Boy Scouts	5
CCFA	1
Children's Miracle Network	1
Church	1
Colorado Springs Rescue Mission	1
County Sheriff	1
DeMolay	1
EWI	1
Gates Camp of Boy & Girls Club of Denver	1
Girl Scouts	4
Goodwill	1
GOP	1
heartsapart.org	1
Humane Society	2
Jobs	1
Kiwanis	1
Lions	1
Local animal shelter	1
Memorial Health System Foundation	1
Miss America Organization	1
National religious organization	1
National Rifle Association	2
NRA-PVA	1
nowilaymedowntosleep.org	1
Red Cross	3
Salvation Army	1
U. S. Olympic Committee	1
United Way	1
University	1
YMCA	1

*Do you belong or donate money to any other groups, either locally or nationally, such as a youth group like 4-H, Girl Scouts, or a Poetry Slam chapter, a charity, a PTSA or other association, a labor union, a political or social group, a sport team or any other kind of group? Please list.

APPENDIX D

EMAILS TO SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Pre-Notice Email:

February 24, 2012

Brethren,

Within a few business days you will receive a request via email to fill out a brief online questionnaire for an important thesis research project being conducted by James Kinslow under the supervision of faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Middle Tennessee State University.

The purpose of this study is to better understand participation in social activities among voluntary charitable organizations within America, namely, the (Ancient) Free and Accepted Masons.

We are writing in advance because we understand that many people like to know ahead of time that they will be contacted. This is a very important study that will help us understand the important role of Masons in American culture.

Your Lodge membership's timely response to the survey is strongly desired to ensure the maximum effectiveness and efficiency of the study.

If you have any questions about this project now or after you receive your questionnaire, feel free to call us at 1.931.619.9930.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It is only with the generous help of people like you that our research can be successful.

Sincerely,

James M. Kinslow S.D., L.E.O.

Cover email:

February 29, 2012

I am writing to ask for your help in a study of social activity among Masons being conducted as a thesis project by James Kinslow in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Middle Tennessee State University. We are contacting members of Masonic Lodges within Colorado due to Colorado's central role in Masonic activity in America.

The survey can be accessed at the following link: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Your answers are completely anonymous. We are not selling or promoting anything. Your name or email address will never be associated with your responses in any way. You can be assured that your privacy will be completely respected. While your response to this survey and any of the questions is completely voluntary, you can help us by taking a few minutes to share your answers.

The survey can be accessed at the following link: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. You can contact me via phone at 1.111.111.111 or by email at kinslowlll@yahoo.com.

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

James M. Kinslow S.D., L.E.O.

Follow up email:

March 10, 2012

Recently you were emailed a link to a questionnaire asking about your social activity and Masonic affiliation. If you have already completed the survey, please accept our sincere thanks! If not, please do so today.

The survey can be accessed at the following link: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

We are especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking individuals like you that we can better understand the connection between Masonic membership and social activity in America.

If you have any questions about this study, please call us toll free at 1.111.111.111 or email us at kinslowlll@yahoo.com.

Again, the survey can be accessed at the following link: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Sincerely,

James M. Kinslow S.D., L.E.O.

IRB APPROVAL



February 16, 2012

James Kinslow, Dr. Angela Mertig
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
jmk3s@mtmail.mtsu.edu, amertig@mtsu.edu

Protocol Title: "Social Capital, Civic Engagement, and the Masons"

Protocol Number: 12-219

Dear Investigator(s),

I found your study to be exempt from Institutional Review Board (IRB) continued review. The exemption is pursuant to 45 CFR 46.101(b) (2). This is because your study involves the use of survey materials and the information was recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

You will need to submit an end-of-project report to the Office of Compliance upon completion of your research. Complete research means that you have finished collecting data and you are ready to submit your thesis and/or publish your findings. Should you not finish your research within the three (3) year period, you must submit a Progress Report and request a continuation prior to the expiration date. Please allow time for review and requested revisions. Your study expires on **February 16, 2015**.

Any change to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB before implementing this change. According to MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who works with data or has contact with participants. Anyone meeting this definition needs to be listed on the protocol and needs to provide a certificate of training to the Office of Compliance. **If you add researchers to an approved project, please forward an updated list of researchers and their certificates of training to the Office of Compliance before they begin to work on the project.** **Once your research is completed, please send us a copy of the final report questionnaire to the Office of Compliance.** This form can be located at www.mtsu.edu/irb on the forms page.

Also, all research materials must be retained by the PI or **faculty advisor (if the PI is a student)** for at least three (3) years after study completion. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Tyler Hubbard
Graduate Assistant to:
Emily Born
Compliance Officer
615-494-8918
eborn@mtsu.edu