

# **Community Experiences and Connection Among Trans**

## **Respondents**

*Descriptive report from restored LimeSurvey dataset (2011-2019)*

Cristan Williams

January 13, 2026

## Abstract

Using a restored dataset from an online survey of trans respondents, this report provides descriptive summaries of community-related perceptions and demographic characteristics. The dataset contains 1,165 survey records collected between August 2011 and November 2019. Respondents rated the importance of community membership and answered a set of core items describing feelings of belonging, trust, needs fulfillment, and shared emotional connection using a 4-point response scale (“Not at all” to “Completely”), along with location and demographic items. Across analyzable cases (n=994 with complete core-item data), the mean core-item score was 2.37 (SD=0.57) and internal consistency was high (Cronbach's alpha=0.93), indicating moderate endorsement overall. Items reflecting anticipated long-term membership, hopefulness about the community's future, and perceptions that members care about one another were endorsed most strongly, whereas perceived influence over the community and being known by other members were endorsed less strongly. Responses were geographically distributed across the United States with higher concentrations in Texas, California, and New York, based on parsable state entries, and response volume peaked in 2013. Appendix A provides question-by-question distributions with pie charts for all survey items.

## **Introduction**

The present document summarizes a restored dataset from an online survey examining how trans respondents experienced and understood “community.” The original survey platform (LimeSurvey) was no longer accessible; however, the underlying SQL data were retained and subsequently reconstructed into an analyzable format. The present report provides a descriptive overview of response origins, response timing, and item-level patterns across the full set of survey questions.

## **Method**

The dataset includes 1,165 survey records collected between August 2011 and November 2019. Records include basic survey metadata (e.g., timestamps) and responses to community-related items and demographic questions. The survey was administered online and participation was self-selected.


Analyses in this report are descriptive. Response distributions are presented as counts and percentages. For the set of core community items using a 4-point response scale (“Not at all”, “Somewhat”, “Mostly”, and “Completely”), responses were also summarized using item means on a 1-4 scale and an overall mean score computed as the average across items for respondents with complete data. Because several items included free-text fields (e.g., location), geographic summaries were aggregated to the state level to protect privacy and to improve interpretability.

## **Results**

### **Response origins**

Location information was entered as free text and could be parsed to a U.S. state for 912 of 1,165 records (78.3%). Among parsable entries, the largest numbers of responses were

associated with Texas (n=120), California (n=105), New York (n=87), Washington (n=53), and Pennsylvania (n=35). Some entries referenced locations outside the United States or included non-standard text (e.g., privacy notes), and those records are not fully represented in the state-level map.




**Figure 1.** *Response origins by U.S. state (self-reported).*

*Note.* Map shading reflects the number of records with parsable U.S. state entries; non-U.S. or unparseable entries are not mapped.

### Response timing

Data collection was most active between 2011 and 2013, with markedly lower response volume after 2014. The highest monthly submission count occurred in February 2013 (n=174).



**Figure 2.** *Survey submissions over time (monthly counts).*

*Note.* Counts are based on the survey submit date; months with no submissions are plotted as zero.

### **Community importance and core community items**

In Question 1 (importance of being part of the community), most respondents endorsed community involvement as Important (30.1%,  $n=299$ ), Somewhat Important (28.3%,  $n=281$ ), or Very Important (28.0%,  $n=278$ ). Smaller proportions reported Not Very Important (8.1%,  $n=81$ ), Not Important at All (3.0%,  $n=30$ ), or Prefer Not to be Part of This Community (2.5%,  $n=25$ ) among those who answered ( $n=994$ ).

A set of core community items used a 4-point response scale from Not at all (1) to Completely (4). One item (Question 22) was answered by a small subset of respondents ( $n=34$ ) and appeared to be conditional; therefore, the overall score described here uses the remaining 24 core items. Among respondents with complete data on those items ( $n=994$ ), the overall mean score was 2.37 ( $SD=0.57$ ) and internal consistency was high (Cronbach's  $\alpha=0.93$ ).

The highest-scoring items reflected expectations of continued membership, hopefulness about the community's future, and perceptions that members care about one another. The lowest-

scoring items reflected limited perceived influence over the community and lower endorsement of being known by other members. Table 1 summarizes the highest and lowest items by mean score.

**Table 1**

*Highest and lowest scoring core community items (1-4 scale).*

Rank	Item (Q#)	Item text	Mean	Mostly/Completely (%)
Highest	Q23	I expect to be a part of this community for a long time.	2.91	64.9
Highest	Q25	I feel hopeful about the future of this community.	2.87	64.4
Highest	Q26	Members of this community care about each other.	2.72	59.6
Highest	Q5	Being a member of this community makes me feel good.	2.71	59.5
Highest	Q20	It is very important to me to be a part of this community.	2.58	51.3
Lowest	Q17	I have influence over what this community is like.	1.72	13.7
Lowest	Q10	Most community members know me.	2.00	27.4
Lowest	Q11	This community has symbols and expressions of membership such as clothes, signs, art, architecture, logos, landmarks, and flags that people can recognize.	2.10	28.4
Lowest	Q21	I am with other community members a lot and enjoy being with them.	2.12	30.1
Lowest	Q4	This community has been successful in getting the needs of its members met.	2.14	25.4

### Demographic overview

Age was reported by 1,147 respondents (median=35 years; M=37.9, SD=14.7; range=14-110). The most common age group was 25-34 years (26.9%), followed by 18-24 years (19.4%) and 45-54 years (17.2%) among those who reported age.

Racial/ethnic identification was provided by 1,164 respondents. The most frequently selected category was European American/White - Non-Hispanic (72.3%), followed by Other

(10.2%) and European American/White - Hispanic (6.4%). Additional categories accounted for less than 5% of responses each.

For the multi-select identity item, 1,164 respondents selected at least one label. The most commonly selected labels (respondent counts) included Transgender (n=693), Female (n=634), Trans (n=529), Male-to-Female (MTF) (n=510), and Transsexual (n=478). Because multiple selections were allowed, these categories are not mutually exclusive.

Among records with usable start and submit timestamps (n=994), the median time between survey start and submission was approximately 3.4 minutes (interquartile range: 2.5 to 4.6 minutes). Longer durations likely reflect interruptions or leaving the survey open.

### **Discussion**

Overall, respondents tended to describe their relationship to “community” in moderately positive terms, with the strongest endorsement for items reflecting future belonging and perceptions of mutual care. In contrast, perceived influence and recognition by other members were less strongly endorsed. These patterns are consistent with a picture in which community is valued and emotionally meaningful for many respondents, while structural participation and collective efficacy may be experienced as more limited.

### **Limitations**

Interpretation of these findings should be tempered by several limitations. The survey relied on a self-selected, online sample, and participation occurred across an extended period (2011-2019) during which social and political contexts affecting trans communities have changed substantially. Several items had missing data, and one item (Question 22) appeared to be conditional and was answered by a small subset of respondents. Location data were provided

as free text and were aggregated (e.g., to state level or ZIP-region level) to reduce identifiability; consequently, fine-grained geographic analyses are not presented here.

### **Conclusion**

Restoring the archived LimeSurvey database yielded a complete, analyzable dataset spanning 2011–2019, allowing both respondent-level metadata reconstruction and comprehensive item-level descriptive summaries. Overall, respondents tended to place meaningful value on “community,” although this endorsement was not universal. Across the core community scale, response patterns indicate a moderately positive sense of connection that is internally coherent across items. At the item level, the strongest endorsements emphasize future-oriented belonging, hopefulness about the community’s trajectory, and perceptions of mutual care, whereas the weakest endorsements cluster around personal influence, being recognized/known within the community, and confidence that the community effectively meets members’ needs. This profile suggests an important distinction between emotional attachment and perceived structural efficacy within community life.

## Appendix A


### *Question-by-question response distributions*

#### Question 1

*How important is it to you to feel a sense of community with other community members?*

Answered responses totaled n=994 (missing n=171). The most frequent categories were Important (30.1%, n=299), Somewhat Important (28.3%, n=281), Very Important (28.0%, n=278).

Q1. Response distribution



Answered: n=994; Missing: n=171


**Figure 3.** *Distribution of responses for Question 1.*

#### Question 2

*I get important needs of mine met because I am part of this community.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (42.4%, n=422), Mostly (25.1%, n=250), Not at All (20.7%, n=206).

## Q2. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 4.** *Distribution of responses for Question 2.*

**Question 3**

*Community members and I value the same things.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (53.5%, n=532), Mostly (36.7%, n=365), Not at All (6.5%, n=65).

## Q3. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170

**Figure 5.** *Distribution of responses for Question 3.*


**Question 4**

*This community has been successful in getting the needs of its members met.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were

Somewhat (59.5%, n=592), Mostly (22.2%, n=221), Not at All (15.1%, n=150).

## Q4. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 6.** *Distribution of responses for Question 4.*

**Question 5**

*Being a member of this community makes me feel good.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Mostly (34.5%, n=343), Somewhat (26.5%, n=264), Completely (25.0%, n=249).

## Q5. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 7.** *Distribution of responses for Question 5.*

### Question 6

*When I have a problem, I can talk about it with members of this community.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (32.9%, n=327), Mostly (31.3%, n=311), Completely (20.1%, n=200).

## Q6. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 8.** *Distribution of responses for Question 6.*

**Question 7**

*People in this community have similar needs, priorities, and goals.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (47.2%, n=470), Mostly (33.3%, n=331), Not at All (12.6%, n=125).

## Q7. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 9.** *Distribution of responses for Question 7.*

**Question 8**

*I can trust people in this community.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (42.2%, n=420), Mostly (41.0%, n=408), Not at All (9.3%, n=93).

## Q8. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 10.** *Distribution of responses for Question 8.*

**Question 9**

*I can recognize most of the members of this community.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (41.8%, n=416), Mostly (34.8%, n=346), Not at All (18.1%, n=180).

## Q9. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 11.** *Distribution of responses for Question 9.*

**Question 10**

*Most community members know me.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (41.6%, n=414), Not at All (31.0%, n=308), Mostly (23.7%, n=236).

Q10. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 12.** *Distribution of responses for Question 10.*

### Question 11

*This community has symbols and expressions of membership such as clothes, signs, art, architecture, logos, landmarks, and flags that people can recognize.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (44.8%, n=446), Not at All (26.7%, n=266), Mostly (19.9%, n=198).

## Q11. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 13.** *Distribution of responses for Question 11.*

**Question 12**

*I put a lot of time and effort into being part of this community.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (39.8%, n=396), Mostly (24.0%, n=239), Not at All (22.2%, n=221).

## Q12. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 14.** *Distribution of responses for Question 12.*

**Question 13**

*Being a member of this community is a part of my identity.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (34.8%, n=346), Not at All (24.2%, n=241), Mostly (21.9%, n=218).

## Q13. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 15.** *Distribution of responses for Question 13.*

**Question 14**

*Fitting into this community is important to me.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (39.5%, n=393), Not at All (27.1%, n=270), Mostly (22.6%, n=225).

Q14. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 16.** *Distribution of responses for Question 14.*

### Question 15

*This community can influence other communities.*

Answered responses totaled n=994 (missing n=171). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (43.3%, n=430), Mostly (25.8%, n=256), Completely (20.7%, n=206).

## Q15. Response distribution



Answered: n=994; Missing: n=171

**Figure 17.** *Distribution of responses for Question 15.*


**Question 16**

*I care about what other community members think of me.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were

Somewhat (46.0%, n=458), Mostly (24.8%, n=247), Not at All (21.1%, n=210).

## Q16. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 18.** *Distribution of responses for Question 16.*

**Question 17**

*I have influence over what this community is like.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Not at All (45.1%, n=449), Somewhat (41.2%, n=410), Mostly (10.2%, n=101).

Q17. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


Figure 19. Distribution of responses for Question 17.

**Question 18**

*If there is a problem in this community, members can get it solved*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (52.4%, n=521), Mostly (25.4%, n=253), Not at All (16.8%, n=167).

## Q18. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 20.** *Distribution of responses for Question 18.*

### Question 19

*This community has good leaders.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (38.5%, n=383), Mostly (32.7%, n=325), Not at All (17.6%, n=175).

## Q19. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 21.** *Distribution of responses for Question 19.*

**Question 20**

*It is very important to me to be a part of this community.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (31.7%, n=315), Mostly (27.2%, n=271), Completely (24.0%, n=239).

## Q20. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 22.** *Distribution of responses for Question 20.*

**Question 21**

*I am with other community members a lot and enjoy being with them.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (42.1%, n=419), Not at All (27.8%, n=277), Mostly (20.3%, n=202).

## Q21. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 23.** *Distribution of responses for Question 21.*

### Question 22

*I am with other community members a lot and enjoy being with them.*

This item had a low response rate. Answered responses totaled n=34 (missing n=1131). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (44.1%, n=15), Mostly (23.5%, n=8), Not at All (17.6%, n=6).

## Q22. Response distribution



Answered: n=34; Missing: n=1131


**Figure 24.** *Distribution of responses for Question 22.*

**Question 23**

*I expect to be a part of this community for a long time.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Completely (40.1%, n=399), Mostly (24.8%, n=247), Somewhat (20.8%, n=207).

## Q23. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 25.** *Distribution of responses for Question 23.*

**Question 24**

*Members of this community have shared important events together, such as holidays, celebrations, or disasters.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Somewhat (42.1%, n=419), Mostly (25.7%, n=256), Completely (17.0%, n=169).

## Q24. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 26.** *Distribution of responses for Question 24.*

**Question 25**

*I feel hopeful about the future of this community.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Mostly (33.5%, n=333), Completely (31.0%, n=308), Somewhat (27.0%, n=269).

## Q25. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 27.** *Distribution of responses for Question 25.*

**Question 26**

*Members of this community care about each other.*

Answered responses totaled n=995 (missing n=170). The most frequent categories were Mostly (41.8%, n=416), Somewhat (35.3%, n=351), Completely (17.8%, n=177).

## Q26. Response distribution



Answered: n=995; Missing: n=170


**Figure 28.** *Distribution of responses for Question 26.*

### Question 27

*What state and city did you initially encounter the trans community?*

State was parsable for 912 respondents (with 253 entries missing or not parseable). Among parsable entries (n=912), the most frequent locations were Other (49.1%, n=448), Texas (13.2%, n=120), California (11.5%, n=105).

## Q27. Initial encounter location (state-level)



Answered (state parsed): n=912; Missing/Unparsed: n=253


**Figure 29.** *Distribution of responses for Question 27.*

### Question 28

*What is your current zip code?*

ZIP codes were parsable for 1032 respondents (with 133 missing or not parseable). For privacy, ZIP codes were summarized by the first digit (USPS region). The most frequent regions were 9 (West) (19.1%, n=197), 7 (South Central) (16.7%, n=172), 1 (NY/PA/DE) (13.0%, n=134).

## Q28. Current ZIP code region (first digit)



ZIP parsed: n=1032; Missing/Unparsed: n=133. Labels are USPS first-digit regions.


**Figure 30.** *Distribution of responses for Question 28.*

### Question 29

*Please select which (if any) of the following you identify with:*

This item allowed multiple selections. 1164 respondents provided at least one selection (total selections=4217). Among selections (n=4217), the most common categories were Other (21.0%, n=884), Transgender (16.4%, n=693), Female (15.0%, n=634).

Q29. Identity selections (distribution of selections)



Respondents with any selection: n=1164; Total selections: 4217


**Figure 31.** *Distribution of responses for Question 29.*

**Question 30**

*How old are you?*

Age was reported by 1147 respondents (with 18 missing or invalid values). Median age was 35 years ( $M=37.9$ ,  $SD=14.7$ ). The most frequent age groups were 25–34 (26.9%,  $n=308$ ), 18–24 (19.4%,  $n=222$ ), 45–54 (17.2%,  $n=197$ ).

Q30. Age group



Answered: n=1147; Missing/Invalid: n=18


**Figure 32.** *Distribution of responses for Question 30.*

### Question 31

*How do you identify:*

Answered responses totaled n=1164 (missing n=1). The most frequent categories were European American/White - Non-Hispanic (72.3%, n=841), Other (10.2%, n=119), European American/White - Hispanic (6.4%, n=75).

## Q31. Response distribution



Answered: n=1164; Missing: n=1

**Figure 33.** *Distribution of responses for Question 31.*

## Appendix B

### *Standard Deviations (SD) and Cronbach's Alpha Restored LimeSurvey dataset: Trans community survey*

**Purpose.** This supplement provides the intermediate quantities and formula substitutions used to compute every standard deviation (SD) and Cronbach's alpha value reported in the accompanying APA-style report. All SD values are sample SDs (denominator  $n-1$ ).

#### Conventions and data handling

Sample standard deviation:  $s = \sqrt{s^2}$ , where  $s^2 = [\Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2/n] / (n-1)$ .

Age (Question 30): responses were parsed as numbers; non-numeric entries were treated as missing (18 cases).

Completion time: minutes between startdate and submitdate from the metadata table; records with missing timestamps were excluded (171 cases).

Core community scale: 4-point items coded Not at All=1, Somewhat=2, Mostly=3, Completely=4.

Cronbach's alpha was computed on the 24 items with near-complete data (Questions 2-21 and 23-26) using listwise complete cases ( $n=994$ ). Question 22 had substantial planned/skip missingness and was excluded.

#### Standard deviation (SD) calculations

##### Age (Question 30)

Quantity	Value
n (valid cases)	1,147
$\Sigma x$	43,513
$\Sigma x^2$	1,898,415
Mean ( $\bar{x} = \Sigma x/n$ )	37.936356
Sample variance ( $s^2$ )	216.134689
Sample SD ( $s = \sqrt{s^2}$ )	14.701520
Units	Years

Expanded computation:

$$\bar{x} = \Sigma x/n = 43,513.000000 / 1,147 = 37.936356$$

$$s^2 = [\Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2/n] / (n-1)$$

$$= [1,898,415.000000 - (43,513.000000)^2 / 1,147] / 1,146$$

$$= 216.134689$$

$$s = \sqrt{s^2} = \sqrt{216.134689} = 14.701520$$

**Survey completion time**

Quantity	Value
n (valid cases)	994
$\Sigma x$	5,713.066667
$\Sigma x^2$	752,357.130556
Mean ( $\bar{x} = \Sigma x/n$ )	5.747552
Sample variance ( $s^2$ )	724.593135
Sample SD ( $s = \sqrt{s^2}$ )	26.918268
Units	Minutes (submitdate - startdate)

Expanded computation:

$$\bar{x} = \Sigma x/n = 5,713.066667 / 994 = 5.747552$$

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 &= [\Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2/n] / (n-1) \\ &= [752,357.130556 - (5,713.066667)^2 / 994] / 993 \\ &= 724.593135 \end{aligned}$$

$$s = \sqrt{s^2} = \sqrt{724.593135} = 26.918268$$

**Core community scale score (mean of 24 items; Questions 2–21 and 23–26)**

Quantity	Value
n (valid cases)	994
$\Sigma x$	2,350.833333
$\Sigma x^2$	5,877.576389
Mean ( $\bar{x} = \Sigma x/n$ )	2.365023
Sample variance ( $s^2$ )	0.320041
Sample SD ( $s = \sqrt{s^2}$ )	0.565721
Units	1–4 scale (higher = stronger endorsement)

Expanded computation:

$$\bar{x} = \Sigma x/n = 2,350.833333 / 994 = 2.365023$$

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 &= [\Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2/n] / (n-1) \\ &= [5,877.576389 - (2,350.833333)^2 / 994] / 993 \\ &= 0.320041 \end{aligned}$$

$$s = \sqrt{s^2} = \sqrt{0.320041} = 0.565721$$

### Cronbach's alpha calculation: Core community scale

Cronbach's alpha was computed for the 24-item core community scale using the variance-based formula:

$$\alpha = (k/(k-1)) \times [1 - (\sum s_i^2 / s_t^2)]$$

Component	Value
k (number of items)	24
n (listwise complete cases)	994
$\sum s_i^2$ (sum of item variances)	19.211579649093
$s_t^2$ (variance of total/summed score)	184.343418010581

Item-level variances ( $s_i^2$ ) used in  $\sum s_i^2$ :

Item	Prompt (abbrev.)	Mean	Variance ( $s_i^2$ )
Q2	I get important needs of mine met because I am part of this community.	2.278672	0.851770
Q3	Community members and I value the same things.	2.368209	0.430247
Q4	This community has been successful in getting the needs of its members met.	2.135815	0.484053
Q5	Being a member of this community makes me feel good.	2.705231	0.989560
Q6	When I have a problem, I can talk about it with members of this community.	2.556338	0.966108
Q7	People in this community have similar needs, priorities, and goals.	2.346076	0.617271
Q8	I can trust people in this community.	2.464789	0.585365
Q9	I can recognize most of the members of this community.	2.273642	0.668247
Q10	Most community members know me.	2.002012	0.696874
Q11	This community has symbols and expressions of membership such as clothes, signs, art, arch...	2.102616	0.799127
Q12	I put a lot of time and effort into being part of this community.	2.296781	0.933988
Q13	Being a member of this community is a part of my identity.	2.357143	1.095885
Q14	Fitting into this community is important to me.	2.170020	0.900571
Q15	This community can influence other communities.	2.569416	0.865771
Q16	I care about what other community members think of me.	2.198189	0.743159
Q17	I have influence over what this community is like.	1.721328	0.616121
Q18	If there is a problem in this community, members can get it solved	2.195171	0.602353
Q19	This community has good leaders.	2.376258	0.812970
Q20	It is very important to me to be a part of this community.	2.580483	1.065520
Q21	I am with other community members a lot and enjoy being with them.	2.120724	0.857516
Q23	I expect to be a part of this community for a long time.	2.906439	1.172506
Q24	Members of this community have shared important events together, such as holidays, celebra...	2.445674	0.891809

Q25	I feel hopeful about the future of this community.	2.867203	0.904804
Q26	Members of this community care about each other.	2.722334	0.659984

Expanded computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha &= (k/(k-1)) \times [1 - (\Sigma s_i^2 / s_t^2)] \\
 &= (24/23) \times [1 - (19.211579649093 / 184.343418010581)] \\
 &= 0.934730870064
 \end{aligned}$$

Optional cross-check: the implied average inter-item correlation is  $\bar{r} = \alpha / [k - \alpha(k-1)] = 0.373714$ .