

---

## **Social Media Use Among North Carolina Municipalities**

*A benchmark study revealing the rate of social media adoption among North Carolina municipalities as of April 2016. This study also includes an assessment of whether the local governments best positioned to reach some of the most active populations of social media users are incorporating these communication tools into their strategies for public engagement.*

Sabrina Willard  
MPA Candidate | University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill  
August 2016

---

## Abstract

Social media is a powerful instrument not only for amplifying messaging from public leaders to citizens, but also for creating a more direct method of communication between citizens and their government. This research examines the social media presence of all 553 municipalities in North Carolina to determine the extent to which local governments across the state are incorporating tools like Facebook and Twitter into their public outreach strategies. Further, it explores whether the majority of North Carolina municipalities that are best situated to reach the most active groups of social media users, as evidenced by a 2014 Pew Research Center (PRC) study, are taking advantage of the opportunity to engage with a specific sub-population within their communities. The overall purpose of this analysis is to develop an updated benchmark of social media activity at the local government level in North Carolina so public administrators can better assess whether citizens' demands for accessible government are being met from this perspective.

To meet the purpose of this research, more than 10,500 data points were collected from a variety of sources, including the 2014 U.S. Census, the University of North Carolina Knapp-Sanders Library, the Rural Center of North Carolina and manual web search queries. The quantitative data from these sources were then compiled into a single database and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Among the preliminary findings, this research found having a relatively large population and an official government website is a strong indicator of having a presence on social media. To illustrate, 96% of the 50 largest cities in the state are on social media compared to 39% of those with populations less than 2,500. Additionally, 64% of municipalities with official websites are on social media compared to 15% of those without one. This data also revealed that a majority of suburban and youth-centric communities in NC, respectively, are tapping into the potential to reach a large, active user base through social media. In fact, 67% of suburban communities and 54% of those with median ages between 18 and 29 have an account with Facebook or Twitter, or both.

Overall, more than half of all North Carolina municipalities (55%) were found to have social media accounts, although this number is only a slight increase beyond the rate reported by Western Carolina University in a 2013 study (54%). In addition to reporting these findings, this paper proposes a possible explanation for the lag in social media adoption among North Carolina local governments over the last several years and discusses key implications for practitioners.

This is the first study in three years to report how many municipalities across the state are using social media to connect with citizen stakeholders and the first-ever North Carolina-specific study to look at the impact of factors like population size and existence of an official government website. Findings around the adoption rate for communities where there is a high likelihood of there being an active social media user base (according to the demographic characteristics discussed in the 2014 PRC study) are also first of their kind.

## Background

Ten years ago, Twitter was still in its first year of existence. A little less than ten years ago, Facebook memberships were still restricted to students at select universities. Despite its fairly recent inception into society, social media has already had a significant impact on the way the global community communicates and disseminates information. As social media has evolved and more citizens have adopted these sharing tools, public organizations have caught on to the amplification power of sites like Facebook and Twitter. Today, it is not uncommon to observe local governments investing significant time and energy crafting 140-character posts to convey messaging around various topics of local interest, ranging from elections information to public safety alerts to public meeting notices. Many public administrators from all corners of North Carolina have begun to explore the power of social networking to help achieve local initiatives that require an active and engaged citizenry. As a result of this push in the

not-too-distant past for government to adopt social media in building positive two-way relationships with the public, researchers are still in the beginning stages of piecing together a complete picture of the extent to which social media is being leveraged by local governments in North Carolina.

## Literature Review

In recent years, research has shown a clear link between the rise in consumer social media use and the adoption of these communication tools by public organizations (NASCIO, 2010). In fact, a study published in *Government Information Quarterly* in 2015 demonstrated social media use has increased as much as six times over on certain platforms among the 75 largest U.S. cities between 2009 and 2011 (Mossberger, 2015). Another study published in *Public Relations Journal* found around 70% of local governments use social media as a tactic in their public engagement strategies (Graham, 2013). The desire for more direct methods of communication between government and citizens is a two-way street, however. Research shows that local government managers with strong external influences and high demands on their organizations report a higher use of communication technologies like social media. In fact, studies have shown many local governments using communication technologies have adopted these tools in direct response to external demands from citizen stakeholders (Li, 2012). Due to this trend, public administrators across the country are being compelled to transform and improve key relationships with their public and private partners (NASCIO, 2010).

### *Defining Characteristics of Social Media Users*

By analyzing nationwide patterns of social media use, public administrators can better anticipate and interpret public response to messages they disseminate online. For example, studies that shed light on which networking sites are the most popular and what demographic groups are

likely to be active users can help practitioners maximize opportunities that exist for reaching a specific social media user base within their municipality by telling them which platforms to hone in on and how to tailor their messaging so that it appeals to the segment of the population using that particular platform. In September 2014, Pew Research Center (PRC) found Facebook captures the largest percentage of adult internet users in the U.S. by a wide margin with 71%, while Twitter captures the second-highest with 23% (Duggan, 2015). This supports an earlier finding published in *Public Relations Journal* that Facebook and Twitter are the most commonly-used networking tools, suggesting this trend has remained consistent in recent years (Graham, 2013).

Alongside the site-use statistics, PRC also confirmed various trends have emerged across demographic groups in their analysis. The research think tank found that age and socio-economic factors like income level are linked to higher social media usage (Duggan, 2015; Perrin, 2015). In particular, young adults ages 18 to 29 are the most likely to use social media (90%), although usage among those 65 and older is on the rise (11% in 2010 to 35% in 2014). Also, those in higher-income households are more likely to use social media. For instance, 78% of those in households with incomes of at least \$75,000 use social media compared to 56% of those living in the lowest-income households. Community differences also factor into the likelihood of social media adoption. People living in rural areas are less likely than those living in suburban and urban communities to use social media, a pattern consistent over the past decade. Today, 58% of rural residents, 68% of suburban residents, and 64% of urban residents nationwide use social media. Of note, there were no observable differences between social media use in the gender or racial groups studied (Duggan, 2015; Perrin, 2015).

### *North Carolina Social Media Trends*

In a 2010 study conducted by the National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO), North Carolina was highlighted as one of the

few states that is “moving aggressively, or full-speed-ahead, with social media” (NASCIO, 2010). More recently, a 2013 survey conducted by The Public Policy Institute at Western Carolina University assessed social media use among a variety of citizen engagement techniques being adopted by local governments in the state. Out of more than 100 respondents from county and municipal governments across North Carolina, 54% reported using a social networking website, such as a government Facebook or Twitter page (Western Carolina University, 2013).

Although the 2010 NASCIO study claims North Carolina is ahead of most states in adopting social media, research thus far has not yielded consistent benchmarks from which to gauge the adoption rate of these communication tools at the local government level. Further, due to the rapid rate at which many municipalities are adopting these tools for the first time, existing research could already be considered outdated (e.g., the 2013 Western Carolina University study). There is the need for an updated benchmark study to determine whether local governments in this state are continuing to aggressively adopt social media into their public engagement strategies. From a public engagement perspective, it would also be beneficial to examine whether the municipalities best situated to reach the most active groups of social media users, as identified by the 2014 PRC study, are taking advantage of these opportunities for strategic public engagement.

### **Research Question & Hypothesis**

Research Question: Are local governments in North Carolina still adopting social media at an aggressive rate? Further, are the majority of municipalities that are best situated to reach the most active demographic groups of social media users on Facebook or Twitter using these communication tools?

Research Hypothesis: Local governments in North Carolina are adopting social media at a similar or lower rate than the 2010 NASCIO reported. Also, the majority of municipalities that possess any number of the following three characteristics have adopted Facebook and/or Twitter accounts: (1) located in a suburban county, (2) median age is between 18 and 29, and (3) median household income is at or above \$75,000.

### **Methodology**

The purpose of this study was to create an updated benchmark of social media use among all 553 local governments in North Carolina and analyze these findings to determine whether the majority of municipalities in the best positions to reach the most active segments of citizens on these sites are adopting these communication tools. To aid this research, a comprehensive database was developed to track the outcomes from each inquiry into whether an active Facebook or Twitter account existed for a particular municipality. This preliminary analysis was limited to official city or town-wide social media accounts and considered the existence of these accounts rather than degree of activity. This research also required collecting data on the following demographic categories for every municipality in the state: community type, median age, and median household income. For ease of comparison, the ranges considered within each demographic segment are consistent with the 2014 Pew Research Center study that originally identified the demographic factors leading to higher participation in social media (Duggan, 2015; Perrin, 2015). Lastly, population data and information pertaining to the existence of an official government website were recorded within the database for the purpose of identifying any trends as they relate to social media use.

Multiple methods were employed to collect the quantitative data required for this research. The website for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Knapp-Sanders Library was the main source for obtaining the names of

all 553 North Carolina municipalities referred to in this study.<sup>1</sup> The Rural Center’s Map of Rural Counties in North Carolina assisted with the categorizations of each municipality by community type.<sup>2</sup> The U.S. Census Bureau’s 2014 American Community Survey provided demographic data for most municipalities.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, manual Internet searches on Facebook, Twitter, and official government websites helped determine whether these types of platforms existed for each municipality. Each dataset was imported into the larger database and analyzed using descriptive statistics.

### Research Findings

From a state-wide perspective, the data shows more than half (55%) of all North Carolina municipalities have social media accounts. Out of this

Figure 1—Social media adoption rate by community type

Community Type → Social Media Account? ↓	Urban Counties	Regional City/Suburban Counties	Rural Counties
Yes	87.5%	66.6%	50%
No	12.5%	33.3%	50%

number, 96% of the 50 largest cities by population have a presence on Facebook or Twitter or both. Conversely, the smallest municipalities in the state (populations of less than 2,500) have a much lower adoption rate at 39%. In considering the presence of an official government website, 64% of municipalities with official websites are on social media compared to 15% of those without official websites.

From a community perspective, 87.5% of municipalities located in urban counties, 66.6% of municipalities located in suburban counties, and 50% of municipalities located in rural counties are active on social media. Out of all three community types, urban counties were found to have the highest adoption rate despite the PRC study finding that suburban communities tend to have the highest adoption rates.

By a wide margin, municipalities with a median population between the ages of 50 and 64 have the highest adoption rate out of all age groups studied in this survey at 68%. A little over half (54%) of those with a median age between 18 and 29, the age group that the PRC study found to have the highest nationwide adoption rate, are on Facebook or Twitter or both.

<sup>1</sup> Cities in North Carolina. Knapp Library, 2016.  
<https://www.sog.unc.edu/resources/microsites/knapp-library/cities-north-carolina>

<sup>2</sup> Rural Counties in North Carolina. The Rural Center, 2015.  
[http://www.ncruralcenter.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=75&Itemid=126](http://www.ncruralcenter.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=75&Itemid=126)

<sup>3</sup> 2014 American Community Survey, Community Facts. U.S. Census Bureau.  
[http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml?src=bkmk#](http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml?src=bkmk#)

Figure 2—Social media adoption rate by median age

Median Age → Social Media Account? ↓	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+
Yes	54%	53%	68%	50%
No	46%	49%	32%	50%

Additionally, municipalities with a median household income between \$50,000 and \$74,999 have the highest social media adoption rate out of all income levels studied in this survey at 68%. The \$75,000+ category, the highest median income category, had the lowest adoption rate out of all groups despite the PRC study finding that higher income households tend to have the highest adoption rates.

Figure 3—Social media adoption rate by median household income

Median Household Income → Social Media Account? ↓	LT \$30,000	\$30-49,999	\$50-74,999	\$75,000+
Yes	54%	53%	68%	50%
No	46%	49%	32%	50%

Not a single municipality in North Carolina satisfied all three demographic characteristics outlined in the research hypothesis—located in a suburban county (1) with a median age between 18 and 29 (2) and average household income of \$75,000 or above (3). However, it is worth noting that six municipalities in the state fit the first two qualifications related to community type and median age. In terms of social media presence, Greenville, Montreat, Spring Lake, and Wingate have a Facebook and Twitter account; Elon only has a Facebook account; and Spencer Mountain has neither.

Other notable discoveries include the finding that municipalities with official government websites are significantly more likely to adopt social media than those without this type of online presence (64% and 15%, respectively). This research also suggests a positive correlation between the size of a municipality and its likelihood of having a social media presence. Nearly all of the 50 largest cities in the state have social media accounts compared to less than half of those with populations less than 2,500 (96% and 39%, respectively).

### Implications for Practitioners

The main hypothesis that launched this benchmark study was proved to be true based on the research findings. When compared to the 2013 Western Carolina University study, it is clear that local governments across the state are no longer adopting social media at as aggressive of a rate as the 2010 NASCIO study claimed. In 2013, a little over half of municipalities (54%) reported having a social media presence and, at 55%, this latest research shows the adoption rate still hovers around the same number. One explanation for the sluggish adoption rate in North Carolina in recent years may be that a significant portion of municipalities were either early

adopters or early majority adopters to the social media scene.<sup>4,5</sup> Out of the municipalities that currently have Twitter accounts, 44% issued their first tweets between 2008 and 2010, 45% between 2011 and 2013, and 11% between 2014 and the present. This trend suggests that if a city or town has not yet engaged in social media they may never do so unless prodded to during this late adoption phase by a determined local government practitioner.

The second part of the hypothesis was proved to be partially true based on the research findings. The majority of North Carolina municipalities located in suburban counties and those with median ages between 18 and 29 are indeed adopting Facebook and Twitter accounts. These results suggest local governments in suburban and young adult-centric areas, respectively, are tapping into the potential to reach a large, active social media user base with their external messaging. However, contrary to my hypothesis, the data did not demonstrate that a majority of municipalities with median household incomes at or above \$75,000 have a presence on social media. This discovery suggests that North Carolina municipalities at the higher end of the median household income spectrum have untapped potential for reaching a segment of the population that is actively engaging in social media. The potential for outreach is even greater considering that wealthier communities tend to have older residents. Based on the findings in this study, the municipalities with median ages between 50 and 64 were found to have the highest social media adoption rate out of all age groups (68%), demonstrating that North Carolina residents within this age group are responding favorably to this form of communication.

In sum, more local government practitioners in North Carolina should consider incorporating social media into their public engagement strategies, especially those in areas that have the potential to reach the most active subsets of social media users. Boone is an example of a

municipality with untapped potential to reach a significant number of its more than 18,000 residents, a majority of which are between the ages of 18 and 29 and likely on social media. While the Boone police department maintains an active Facebook account, the town might consider creating a general government account on Facebook or Twitter, or both, for the purpose of disseminating information to residents from all departments via a centralized platform.

### **Research Limitations**

Data on the median household incomes and median ages for two out of the 533 municipalities were not available according to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2014 American Community Survey (North Topsail Beach and Robbins). Considering that these towns account for < 1% of the total population, the absence of this information from the database is not expected to have a significant effect on the research results.

According to the 2014 PRC study, people with at least some college experience have been consistently more likely than those with a high school degree or less to use social media over the past decade (Perrin, 2015). Due to time constraints, this study was unable to prove or disprove the hypothesis that a majority of municipalities in North Carolina with higher average education levels have social media accounts.

Lastly, the research leading to the aforementioned conclusions around the early adoption and early majority adoption rates in North Carolina is based solely on Twitter account creation dates due to the difficulties associated with identifying these milestones on Facebook. A common way of collecting information on the creation date of a Facebook account is to visit an organization's page and scroll down to the bottom, which can take

---

<sup>4</sup> Classifications based on the Diffusion of Innovation (DOI) Theory developed by E.M. Rogers in 1962. (Source: Boston University School of Public Health, 2016. <http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/MPH-Modules/SB/SB721-Models/SB721-Models4.html>.)

<sup>5</sup> A timeline of Twitter milestones, from 2006 to the present, can be found here: <https://about.twitter.com/company/press/milestones>.

considerable time depending on the amount of content the organization has issued.<sup>6</sup>

### **Areas for Further Research**

The next phase of this research should look more in-depth at the social media activity of North Carolina municipalities by asking questions such as how frequently each local government is posting to Facebook and Twitter, how long they have been active social media users, and what type of content is being posted. Doing so would offer a more complete snapshot of the extent to which local governments are leveraging social media in their strategies for public engagement and help reveal more of the trends that exist around the use of this tool by practitioners across the state. This type of study could help researchers advance beyond the basic question of whether practitioners are taking advantage of social media to reveal whether local governments are leveraging it in such a way that the time and effort spent cultivating their online presence is in fact improving their relationships with key stakeholders.

As mentioned in the research limitations section, time constraints prevented the collection of additional data that could help explain why and how local governments are adopting these tools into their public engagement strategies. A more comprehensive benchmark study might also look at how the average educational attainment within each municipality affects the adoption rate, as well as whether each local government has staff available to manage their social media accounts (e.g., public information officer or community relations coordinator). Additionally, to keep up with the rapid pace that social media has changed, and is still changing, how local governments share information, the recommended frequency for future benchmark studies that monitor this phenomenon is every two years. By committing to establishing regular benchmarks, local government practitioners will have access to up-to-date research on this subject and at any point be able to gauge whether the current trends around social media use at the provincial level are appropriate for addressing the level of accessibility that citizens desire from their government, and vice versa.

---

<sup>6</sup> Menga, Rich. How To Find Out How Old Your Online Accounts Are, 2011. PC Mech. <http://www.pcmec.com/article/online-accounts-age/>

**Appendix — Database Capturing Population Size, Social Media and Website Presence, Twitter Creation Dates, and Select Demographic Data for North Carolina Municipalities**

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Aberdeen	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ahoskie	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Alamance ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Albemarle	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Alliance	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Andrews	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Angier	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ansonville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Apex ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Arapahoe	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Archdale	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Archr Ldge ('15)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Asheboro	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Asheville ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Askewville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Atkinson	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Atlantic Bch	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Aulander	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Aurora	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Autryville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Ayden ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Badin	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Bailey	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bakersville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Bald Head Island	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Banner Elk	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Bath	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Bayboro	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bear Grass	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Beaufort ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Beech Mtn ('11)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Belhaven	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Belmont ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Belville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Belwood	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Benson ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Brmda Run ('13)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bessmr Cty ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bethania	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Bethel	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Beulaville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Biltmore Forest	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Biscoe	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Black Creek	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Black Mtn	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Bladenboro	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Blowing Rock	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Boardman	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bogue	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Boiling Spring Lakes	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Boiling Springs	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Bolivia	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bolton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Boone	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Boonville ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bostic	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Brevard	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bridgeton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Broadway ('11)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Brookford	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Brunswick	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Bryson City	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bunn	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Burgaw ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Burlington ('08)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Burnsville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Butner	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cajah's Mtn	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Calabash	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Calypso	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cameron	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Candor	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Canton ('14)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cape Carteret	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Crlina Bch ('14)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Carolina Shores	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Carrboro ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Carthage	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cary ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Casar ('16)	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Castalia	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Caswell Bch	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Catawba	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cedar Point	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cedar Rock	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Centerville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cerro Gordo	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Chadbourn	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Chapel Hill ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Charlotte ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cherryville	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Chmny Rck Vllge	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
China Grove	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Chocowinity	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Claremont ('13)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Clarkton	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Clayton ('12)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Clemmons	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cleveland	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Clinton	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Clyde	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Coats ('15)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cofield	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Colerain	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Columbia	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Columbus ('11)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Como	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Concord ('14)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Conetoe	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Connelly Springs	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Conover	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Conway	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cooleemee	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cornelius ('12)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cove City	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Cramerton ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Creedmoor	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Creswell	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Crossnore	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Dallas	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Danbury	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Davidson ('11)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Denton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Dillsboro ('09)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Dobbins Heights	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Dobson ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Dortches	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dover	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Drexel ('14)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Dublin	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Duck 09	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Dunn	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Durham ('12)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Earl	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
East Arcadia	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
East Bend	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
East Laurinburg	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
East Spncr ('14)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Eastover	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Eden	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Edenton ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Elizabeth City	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Elizabethtown	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Elk Park	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Elkin	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ellenboro	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ellerbe	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Elm City ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Elon	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Emrld Isle ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Enfield	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Erwin ('15)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Eureka	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Everetts	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Fair Bluff	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Fairmont ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Fairview	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Faison	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
('08-15) = Twitter creation date, if acct exists																	
Faith	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Falcon	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Falkland	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Fallston	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Farmville	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Fayetteville ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Flat Rock ('14)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Fletcher	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Forest City	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Forest Hills	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Fountain	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Four Oaks	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Foxfire Village	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Franklin	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Franklinton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Franklinville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Fremont	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Fquy-Vrina ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Gamewell	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Garland	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Garner ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Garysburg	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Gaston	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Gastonia ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Gatesville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Gibson	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Gibsonville	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Glen Alpine	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Godwin	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Goldsboro	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Goldston	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Graham	0	0	1	0	1	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Gfather Village	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Grnte Falls ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Granite Quarry	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grantsboro	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Green Level	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Greenevers	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Grnsboro ('08)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Greenville ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grifton ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grimesland	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Grover ('11)	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Halifax	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hamilton	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Hamlet	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Harmony	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Harrells	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Harrellsville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Harrisburg ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hassell	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Havelock	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Haw River	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hayesville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Hemby Bridge	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Henderson	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hendersonville	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hertford	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hickory ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
High Point ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
High Shoals	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Highlands	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Hildebran ('13)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hillsbrogh ('14)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hobgood	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Hoffman	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Holden Bch ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Holly Ridge	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hlly Springs ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hookerton	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hope Mills	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hot Springs	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Hudson	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Huntersville ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Indian Bch	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Indian Trail ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Jackson	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Jacksnville ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Jamestown	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Jamesville	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Jefferson	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Jonesville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kannapolis ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kelford	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kenansville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kenly	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kernersville ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kill Devil Hills	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
King	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kings Mtn ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kingstown	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kinston	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kittrell	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kitty Hawk	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Knightdale ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kure Bch ('09)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
La Grange	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Lake Lure	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Lake Park	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Lake Santeetlah	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Lake Waccamaw	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Landis	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lansing	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lasker	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Lattimore	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Laurel Park	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Laurinburg	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Lawndale	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Leggett	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Leland ('14)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Lenoir	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lewstn Wdvll	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lewisville ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Lexington ('12)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Liberty	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lilesville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lillington ('15)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Lincolnton	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Linden	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Littleton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Locust ('13)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Long View	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Louisburg	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Love Valley	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lowell	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lucama	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lumber Bridge	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Lumberton	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Macclesfield	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Macon	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Madison	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Maggie Valley	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Magnolia	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Maiden ('11)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Manteo	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Marietta	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Marion	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mars Hill	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Marshall	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Marshville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Marvin ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Matthews ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Maxton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mayodan	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Maysville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
McAdenville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
McDonald	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
McFarlan	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mebane	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mesic	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Micro	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Middleburg	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Middlesex	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Midland ('13)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Midway ('14)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mills River	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Milton ('09)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Mineral Springs	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Minnesott Bch	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Mint Hill ('15)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Misenheimer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Mocksville	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Momeyer	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Monroe ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Montreat ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mooresboro	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mresville ('08)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mrehd Cty ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Morganton ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Morrisville ('08)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Morven	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mnt Airy	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mnt Gilead	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mnt Holly	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mnt Olive	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mnt Plsant ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Murfrsboro ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Murphy	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Nags Head ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Nashville ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Navassa	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
New Bern ('11)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
New London	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Newland	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Newport ('16)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Newton ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Newton Grove	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Norlina	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Norman	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
N Topsail Bch ('14)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1								
N Wilkesboro	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Northwest	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Norwood	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Oak City	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Oak Island	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Oak Ridge ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Oakboro	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Ocn Isl Bch ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Old Fort	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Oriental ('12)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Orrum	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ossipee	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Oxford	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pantego	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Parkton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Parmele	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pattersn Springs	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Peachland	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Peletier	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pembroke	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pikeville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pilot Mtn ('13)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pine Knll Shores	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Pine Level	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Pinebluff	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pinehurst ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pinetops ('11)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pineville	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pink Hill	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pittsboro ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pleasant Garden	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Plymouth	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Polkton	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Polkville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pollocksville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Powellsville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Princeton ('15)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Princeville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Proctorville	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Raeform	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Raleigh ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Ramseur	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Randleman	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ranlo	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Raynham	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Red Cross	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Red Oak	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Red Springs	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Reidsville	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rennert	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rhodhiss	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Rich Square	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Richfield	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Richlands	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
River Bend	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Roanoke Rapids	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Robbins	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1								
Robbinsville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Robersonville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Rockingham	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rockwell	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rocky Mnt ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rolesville ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ronda	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Roper	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Rose Hill	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Roseboro	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rosman	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Rowland	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Roxboro	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Roxobel	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Rural Hall	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ruth	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rthfd Clge ('15)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Rthfrdton ('15)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Saint Helena	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Saint James	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Saint Pauls	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Salemburg	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Salisbury ('12)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Saluda	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Sandy Creek	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sandyfield	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sanford ('10)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Saratoga	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sawmills	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Scotland Neck	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Seaboard	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Seagrove	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sedalia	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Selma	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Seven Devils	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Seven Springs	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Severn	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Shallotte ('13)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sharpsburg	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Shelby	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Siler City	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Simpson	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sims	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Smithfield ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Snow Hill	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Southern Pines	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Southern Shores	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Southport	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
( '08-15) = Twitter creation date, if acct exists																	
Sparta	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Speed	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Spencer	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Spencer Mtn	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Spindale	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Spring Hope	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Spring Lake ('13)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Spruce Pine	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Staley	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Stallings ('14)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Stanfield	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Stanley ('13)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Stantonsburg	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Star	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Statesville	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Stedman	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Stem	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Stokesdale	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Stoneville ('15)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Stonewall	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Stovall	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Sugar Mtn	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Summerfld ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sunset Bch ('11)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Surf City ('09)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Swansboro	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Swepsonville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Sylva	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tabor City	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Tar Heel	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Tarboro	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Taylorsville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Taylortown	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Teachey	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Thomasville	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tobaccoville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Topsail Bch	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Trent Woods	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Trenton	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Trinity ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Troutman	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Troy ('15)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Tryon	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Turkey	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Unionville	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Valdese ('12)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Vanceboro	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Vandemere	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Varnamtown	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Vass	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Waco	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Wade	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wadesboro	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Wagram	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Wake Frst ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Walkertown	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wallace	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wallburg	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Walnut Cve ('09)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Walnut Creek	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Walstonburg	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Warrenton	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Warsaw	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Washington Pk	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Watha	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Waxhaw ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Waynesville ('10)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Weaverville	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Webster	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Weddington	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Weldon	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Wendell ('11)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wentworth	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wesley Chapel	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
West Jefferson	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Whisp Pines	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Whitakers	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
White Lake	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Whiteville	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Whitsett	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0

Name of City	Population		Twitter and/or Facebook		Official Gov't Website		Community Type (county level)			Median Age				Median Income			
	LT 2.5K	GT 17.5K	Yes	No	Yes	No	Urban	Suburban	Rural	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	LT \$30k	\$30k-49,999	\$50k-74,999	\$75k+
Wilkesboro	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Williamston	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wilmngton ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wilson ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wlsn's Mills ('15)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Windsor	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Winfall	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wingate ('11)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wnstn-Slm ('09)	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Winterville	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Winton	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Woodfin	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Woodland ('09)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Wrghs Bch ('09)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Yadkinville	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Yanceyville	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Youngsville	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Zebulon	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Total Number:</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Total Percentage:</b>	<b>59.13</b>	<b>9.04</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>7.96</b>	<b>17.54</b>	<b>74.32</b>	<b>6.33</b>	<b>78.84</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>22.78</b>	<b>52.62</b>	<b>18.63</b>	<b>5.43</b>

## References

1. Friends, Followers, and Feeds: A National Survey of Social Media Use in State Government. National Association of State Chief Information Officers. 2010. Accessed November 13, 2015. <http://www.nascio.org/Portals/0/Publications/Documents/NASCIO-SocialMedia.pdf>
2. Mossberger, K., Wu, Y., and Crawford J. "Connecting Citizens and Local Governments? Social Media and Interactivity in Major U.S. Cities." *Government Information Quarterly*. 2013. 351-58. Accessed September 4, 2015. [http://www.union.wisc.edu/pmra2013/PaperSubmissions/New/Connecting Citizens and Local Governments Social Media and Interactivity in Major US Cities.pdf](http://www.union.wisc.edu/pmra2013/PaperSubmissions/New/Connecting%20Citizens%20and%20Local%20Governments%20Social%20Media%20and%20Interactivity%20in%20Major%20US%20Cities.pdf).
3. Graham, M. and Avery, E. J. "Government Public Relations and Social Media: An Analysis of the Perceptions and Trends of Social Media Use at the Local Government Level." *Public Relations Journal*. 2013. Vol. 7, No. 4. Accessed September 4, 2015. <http://www.prsa.org/intelligence/prjournal/documents/2013grahamavery.pdf>.
4. Li, M.-H. and Feeney, M. K. "Adoption of Electronic Technologies in Local U.S. Governments: Distinguishing Between E-Services and Communication Technologies." *The American Review of Public Administration*. 2012, 75-91. Accessed September 4, 2015. <http://arp.sagepub.com/content/44/1/75.full.pdf.html>.
5. Duggan, M., et. al. "Social Media Update 2014." Pew Research Center. January 9, 2015. Accessed October 14, 2015. [http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/01/PI\\_SocialMediaUpdate20144.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/01/PI_SocialMediaUpdate20144.pdf)
6. Perrin, Andrew. Social Media Usage: 2005-2015. Pew Research Center, 2015. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/10/08/social-networking-usage-2005-2015/>
7. Citizen-Government Communications at the Local Level in North Carolina. The Public Policy Institute at Western Carolina University. 2013. Accessed October 14, 2015. <http://www.wcu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/PPI-2013-LoGoS-Summary.pdf>