6 SOCIAL CONNECTIONS AND PROCESSES IN COMMUNITIES

This chapter provides an overview of measurement instruments that assess connections among residents and/or their connections to a neighborhood or place. Social connections in communities are the relationships and ties that demonstrate how residents are associated to their geographic place of residence (e.g., neighborhood, town, city) but also to the people, institutions, and social structures in that place. This chapter focuses on the relational aspects of community, including the quality and character of human relationships and associations that exist because of one's connection to and membership in a community. The chapter includes measures of social connections and processes among members of place-based communities, including sense of community, collective efficacy, and social capital.

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO MEASURE SOCIAL CONNECTIONS AND PROCESSES IN COMMUNITIES?

Strong social connections and sense of community among residents can lead to a range of positive outcomes, including increased civic and political participation, community engagement, trust in local government, as well as improved neighborhood and life satisfaction, well-being, psychological empowerment, social support and mental health (Hughey, Speer, & Peterson, 1999; McCarthy, Pretty, & Catano, 1990; Perkins, Florin, Rich, Wandersman, & Chavis, 1990; Peterson, Speer, & Hughey, 2006; Pretty, 1990). Neighborhood social processes, including collective efficacy and social capital, are tied to lower levels of community violence (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997) and decreased levels of major depression (Ahern & Galea, 2011). Collective efficacy and social capital are also protective against a range of physical health problems, including asthma, obesity and overweight, cardiovascular disease, cancer, and premature mortality as well as improved self-reported health and lower neighborhood death rates (Browning & Cagney, 2002; Cohen, Finch, Bower, & Sastry, 2006; Cohen, Inagami, & Finch, 2008; Lochner, Kawachi, Brennan, & Buka, 2003; Kawachi, Kennedy, Lochner, & Prothrow-Stith, 1997; Kim, Subramanian, & Kawachi, 2006; Schultz, O'Brien, & Tadesse, 2008; Subramanian, Kim, & Kawachi, 2002). Social capital has also been linked to economic development and the stable functioning of democracies (Putnam, 2000).

The social processes that occur when residents have higher levels of social cohesion, trust, and stronger connections are considered necessary for engaging in positive behaviors that promote health, collective action, civic participation, reciprocity, and a greater willingness to take action or intervene to address neighborhood problems (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000). Social capital and sense of community may also act as resources that people have with one another and that residents in a neighborhood can

draw upon to accomplish goals and engage in actions to improve their own lives as well as their communities (Coleman, 1990; Kawachi & Berkman, 2000; Putnam, 1993; Veenstra, 2001). Community researchers and practitioners are increasingly engaged in analyzing the impact of social processes and connections on a range of individual and community outcomes, and some are also developing interventions to facilitate neighborhood social processes as a strategy for improving a range of outcomes. Valid and reliable measures in this field, therefore, are critical to analyze these connections as well as the impact of potential strategies to facilitate social processes among neighborhood residents. The following sections synthesize prior research on some of the most widely used and tested measures of neighborhood social connections.

SENSE OF COMMUNITY (SOC) MEASURES

Community psychologists have conducted extensive research on sense of community in order to establish a theoretical foundation for the field's values, principles, and areas of inquiry (Chavis & Pretty, 1999). Measuring and evaluating how community interventions impact sense of community has become increasingly important for practitioners in the field, particularly understanding how sense of community can sustain the health of neighborhoods (Chavis & Pretty, 1999). Sense of community is an important concept and measure that both researchers and practitioners can use to understand and improve the social connections among residents in neighborhoods.

One of the earliest definitions of sense of community was developed by Sarason (1974), who conceptualized psychological sense of community (PSC) as an individual "perception of similarity to others, an acknowledged interdependence with others, a willingness to maintain this interdependence by giving to or doing for others what one expects from them, and the feeling that one is part of a larger dependable and stable structure" (p. 157). Glynn (1981) argued that PSC was a "desirable feeling, difficult to describe in an operational manner, but associated with the presence or development of a common bond with other people" (p. 790). Sarason and Glynn both felt that the conditions that supported PSC were declining in society and that ways should be explored for increasing or at least maintaining it. Glynn conducted an extensive research project in the United States and Israel to operationalize and measure PSC, which resulted in a measure that contained 60 items related to perceptions of the respondents' own community, while another 60 items related to an ideal sense of community (note: see Glynn [1981] for a copy of the community questionnaire and the items on the PSC scale).

After Glynn's 1981 study, further theoretical and empirical research was conducted to develop and measure sense of community. Chavis and colleagues (Chavis, Hogge, & McMillan, 1986) created a Sense of Community Profile, which consisted of a broad 46-item scale developed as part of the New York City Block Booster Action Research Project. McMillan and Chavis' (1986) theory and definition of sense of community theory has been used to develop subsequent measures of sense of community. They define sense of community as "a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together" (McMillan & Chavis, p. 9). Their SOC theoretical model had four dimensions: (a) *membership*—a sense of belonging or identification with a larger collective, interpersonal relatedness; (b) *influence*—reciprocal relationships between the individual and the community in terms of the ability to make a difference or affect change in each other and in the community; (c) *fulfillment of needs*—individuals' needs can be met through cooperative behavior within the community, reinforcing appropriate community behaviors;

and (d) *shared emotional connection*—emotional support members share from struggles and successes living in the community, including history, place, and experiences (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Several researchers have used the theory and conceptualization of sense of community developed by McMillan and Chavis (1986) to refine its measurement. This research is explained in what follows.

A theoretically based sense of community scale was developed from the responses of 1,200 adults to a Neighborhood Participation Project Questionnaire (Chavis et al., 1986). Chavis and colleagues (1986) 23-item Sense of Community Index (SCI) index was an individual construct that was conceptualized to include four subscales based on the original four dimensions of SOC developed by McMillan and Chavis (1986). This 23-item sense of community scale was then developed into a short 12-item version called the Sense of Community Index (SCI), which included a True/False response scale. The 12-item version of the SCI, which was initially used in the New York City Block Booster action research project, is described in **Table 6.1** (Perkins et al., 1990). The construct validity of the SCI measure in this study was demonstrated by the following results:

- The SCI predicted several outcome variables: Higher SCI scores were significantly associated with length or residence, higher ratings of block satisfaction, neighboring, informal social control, communitarianism, and lower ratings of fear of crime (Peterson et al., 1990, p. 110).

The 12-item SCI has been widely debated and critiqued (Peterson, Speer, & Hughey, 2006). Peterson and colleagues review and discuss some of the main criticisms of the SCI, including the lack of specificity, inconsistent level of analysis, measurement referent, conceptualization of community as a collective as well an individual experience, and issues with the psychometric properties, including factor structure and reliability. Attempts to address the criticisms of the SCI and refine its measurement properties are described next.

Chipuer and Pretty (1999) conducted a review of the SCI examining its use, factor structure, and reliability among adults and youth in neighborhoods and adults in the workplace. Their results demonstrated reliabilities ranging from .64 to .69 for the total SCI scale, but reliabilities were mostly below acceptable levels for the subscales (.16 to .72). Moreover, results from their exploratory factor analysis did not support the four dimensions of the SCI, with items loading on multiple scales, items loading on different subscales among the different samples, and item loadings deviating from the dimensions proposed by McMillan and Chavis (Peterson et al., 2006). Chipuer and Pretty suggested that the SCI be used as a unidimensional measure "until the items making up the SCI are reformulated to reflect the four underlying dimensions as conceptualized" (p. 654).

Long and Perkins (2003) conducted further research on the SCI, which resulted in the creation of a brief Sense of Community (SOC) Index. Long and Perkins reviewed prior attempts to measure sense of community, including Buckner's (1988) neighborhood cohesion index. The authors argue that Buckner's (1988) research did not support his proposed three-dimensional model of sense of community cohesion but resulted in a nonfactorial 18-item scale containing nine items originally designed to tap SOC, including five for neighboring and three for attraction to a neighborhood (Long & Perkins, 2003, p. 281). Long and Perkins (2003) further argue that Chavis et al.'s (1986) scale poses similar issues, in that "neighboring is a behavior rather than a cognitive-perceptual construction; attraction to neighborhood is more similar to place attachment and/or community satisfaction than SOC; and some of the SOC items even appear to tap constructs other than SOC" (p. 281).

Therefore, Long and Perkins (2003) attempted to empirically verify the four dimensions of the SCI proposed by Chavis and colleagues (Chavis, Hogge, McMillan, & Wandersman, 1986) by conducting a confirmatory factor analyses (CFA), which was used to test how well the variables in the measure represented the constructs proposed by the theory. Long and Perkins (2003) argued that "when theoretical or empirical evidence exists for a multidimensional construct, CFA is the appropriate analysis for (dis)confirming the fit of the theoretical construct to the empirical data" (p. 282). Their results yielded a poor model fit for the original theoretical formulation of the four dimensions as well as for a single-factor index. Therefore, they created a brief eight-item SOC index, which showed a good model fit for CFA. Moreover, they found that the new measure differentiated street level block reliability based on intragroup agreement, while maintaining the profile of a cognitive-perceptual construct. They also recommend using a 5-point Likert response agreement scale in order to increase reliability versus the "yes/no" or "true/false" response formats previously used in earlier studies. Long and Perkins (2003) **brief SOC** is summarized in **Table 6.2**. The following summarizes the results from this study:

- Results suggest the new Brief Sense of Community Index is a valid measure of the cognitive-perceptual construct popular in the field.

- There was no relationship between the items and other constructs separate but related to sense of community, including behavioral (e.g., participation, neighboring) or other cognitive-affective-perceptual constructs (e.g., community satisfaction, place attachment, collective efficacy).

- The BSCI's three-factor structure was found to have generally good fit according to rigorous confirmatory factor analysis standards, despite having marginal internal reliability (apparently due to weak response set sensitivity) (Long & Perkins, 2003, p.292).

Further research was later conducted by Peterson and colleagues (Peterson, Speer, & Hughey, 2006) examining the factor structure of the SCI using confirmatory factor analysis with two data sets. The researchers argued that a possible explanation for the psychometric problems of the SCI was the systematic error that occurred from the use of negatively worded items. The researchers demonstrated that the SCI was "best described by four factors in combination with two method factors (i.e., one factor including only positively worded items and another including only negatively worded items) . . . and that the SCI should be revised to exclude negatively worded items and new positively worded items should be developed and tested" (Peterson et al., 2006, p. 453).

Additional methods for measuring sense of community have emerged more recently in the literature. In 2008, a newly created brief SOC Index was developed by Peterson, Speer, and McMillan (2008), and a newly developed longer version of the SOC was created by Chavis and colleagues (2008). The newly created brief SOC Index or BSCS was developed because Peterson and colleagues (2008) argued that "little theoretical justification was provided by Long and Perkins (2003) for their new dimensional structure" for the brief SOC (p. 63). Peterson and colleagues' (2008) new measure was based on the original four theoretical SOC dimensions created by McMillan and Chavis (1986). Both the first and second-order factor structure of the SOC measure was evaluated using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The validity of the BSCS was assessed by examining its relationship to a set of variables that might be differentially associated with the dimensions of SOC (i.e., community participation, empowerment, mental health, and depression). Information on the **2008 brief SOC**

(BSCS) measure is discussed in **Table 6.3**. Below is a summary of the results from this study:

- Confirmatory factor analysis: Supported both the scale's hypothesized first-order and second-order factor structure.

- Results showed that the BSCS was correlated with community participation, psychological empowerment, mental health, and depression.

- Findings "provide empirical support for the BSCS and its underlying multidimensional theory of SOC" (Peterson et al., 2008, p. 61).

Chavis, who was involved in the creation of the original SCI 12-item scale (McMillan & Chavis, 1986), went back to the drawing board in 2008 to create a newly revised sense of community measure incorporating several of the recommendations from the prior research discussed above. The SOC Index 2 (SCI-2) was presented by Chavis, Lee, and Acosta (2008) at the International Community Psychology Conference. The authors piloted their revised measure with 36 culturally distinct respondents in seven U.S. settings and then further tested the scale with a large sample of 1,800 respondents, resulting in a reliable measure overall (coefficient alpha = .94) and reliable subscales ranging from .79 to .86. Because this scale attempts to address prior issues, we include the measure of the **SCI-2** in **Table 6.4**. The two most recent scales measuring sense of community (Chavis et al., 2008; Peterson et al., 2006) use only positively worded items and a Likert scale to address issues uncovered in prior research. However, the major weakness of the new scale by Chavis and colleagues (2008) is the lack of analyses examining the scale's factor structure and research demonstrating its validity.

Finally, Prezza and colleagues (Prezza, Pacilli, Barbaranelli, & Zampatti, 2009) developed a multidimensional territorial measure for sense of community (MTSOCS) to examine different geographical communities in Italy (small towns, cities, and metropolis neighborhoods). It is included here because it focuses specifically on geographical communities and attempts to address several prior measurement issues. In order to address prior concerns, Prezza and colleagues use Chipuer and Pretty's (1990) advice to operationalize McMillan and Chavis' (1986) theory of SOC as well as Long and Perkins' (2003) advice to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis. Their research resulted in a 19-item scale with five subscales that were similar across different-sized territorial communities and demonstrated good construct validity. Please see **Table 6.5** for more information on Prezza and colleagues **MTSOCS**. The following summarizes the results from this study:

- A confirmatory factor analysis resulted in the elimination of seven items.

- Tests of factorial invariance showed that the five-factor model was basically the same across different-sized territorial communities.

- A significant relationship was found between the total scale and participation in groups/organizations, cohabitation, community identity, life satisfaction, perceived social support, interpersonal trust, and trust in local government.

- There was a higher sense of community among those cohabiting and those who participated in community groups and a lower sense of community for those who lived in small towns (Prezza et al., 2009, pp. 321–322).

Construct Validity of the SOC

While the construct validity the SOC measures is discussed where available above, we provide an overall assessment here as well. Construct validity involves relating a measurement instrument to an overall theoretical framework to determine whether the measure is correlated with all the concepts and propositions that comprise the theory (Monette, Sullivan, & DeJong, 2005). Measures are typically assessed in terms of how they relate to some criteria derived from theory. Peterson and colleagues (2006) argued that the construct validity and utility of the McMillan and Chavis (1986) SOC model is supported by prior research. Peterson and colleagues (2006) cite other studies demonstrating that SOC is positively associated with a number of outcomes including "length of residency, neighboring, satisfaction, informal social control, political participation, community involvement, perceptions of social climate and well-being" (Perkins et al., 1990; Hughey, et al., 1999; McCarthy et al., 1990; and Pretty, 1990 as cited in Peterson, et al., 2006, p. 454). The newer versions of sense of community also demonstrate construct validity. Peterson, Speer, and McMillan (2008) found that the "overall brief BSCS scale and its subscales were found to be correlated as expected with community participation, psychological empowerment, mental health, and depression" (p. 61). Prezza and colleagues (2009) found a significant relationship between the total MTSOCS scale and participation in groups/organizations, cohabitation, community identity, life satisfaction, perceived social support, interpersonal trust, and trust in local government.

SOC as an Individual- and Community-Level Construct

Buckner (1988), Perkins et al. (1990), and Long and Perkins (2003) examined SOC at both the individual and collective levels (Long & Perkins, 2003). The SOC measures can be used to assess individual residents' sense of community as well as collective or neighborhood level sense of community. Long and Perkins (2003) argued that their examination of the social climate properties of SOC showed "significant agreement among individuals within a community about the level of social cohesion, that communities vary in their degree of cohesion, and that those variables significantly relate to other variables of interest (e.g., civic participation) at the community level" (Long & Perkins, 2003, p. 281). While the majority of the measures for sense of community are used at the individual level of analysis (one's own sense of connection to their community), scholars have also measured SOC at the community level (the neighborhood's overall sense of community).

MEASURES OF NEIGHBORHOOD SOCIAL PROCESSES

The measures of neighborhood social processes that are discussed in this section of the chapter reflect community- or neighborhood-level perspectives. The majority of neighborhood social process measures have emerged from the work of researchers involved in the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods, which was a large-scale, interdisciplinary study of the impact of families, schools, and neighborhoods on child and adolescent development (PHDCN, n.d.). The project had two major components, including a study of the social, economic, organizational, political, and cultural structures and changes in Chicago's neighborhoods over time, and a series of longitudinal studies following 6,000 randomly selected children, adolescents, and young adults to examine circumstances and personal characteristics that could impact antisocial behaviors (PCDCN, n.d.). The measures in this major research study that assess neighborhood social processes include collective efficacy—including informal

social control and social cohesion—social norms, and social connections as well as social capital (which is explained in the next section of this chapter).

Neighborhoods matter because their characteristics have a strong influence on individual outcomes, particularly among youth, including reducing youth violence and increasing academic achievement (Henry, Gorman-Smith, Schoeny, & Tolan, 2014). Measures of neighborhood characteristics (e.g., poverty, inequality, etc.) are important because they can inform and help to assess the outcomes of interventions that address neighborhood problems, such as crime and youth violence. This section discusses research and measures that have been used to examine how social relationships within neighborhoods explain differences in the rate or level of community problems (Henry et al., 2014). These measures are explained next.

Collective Efficacy

Collective efficacy describes residents' perceptions regarding their ability to work with their neighbors to intervene in neighborhood issues to maintain social control and solve problems (Wandersman & Florin, 2000). Neighborhood collective efficacy is the combination of mutual trust/social connections and informal social control (Sampson et al., 1997). Mutual trust and social connections or ties among neighbors include the relationships that neighbors have with each other, including friendship networks, civic participation, or faith-based ties. When neighbors know each other and share social ties and norms, they are more likely to intervene in problems and thereby support prosocial behaviors and informal social control (Sampson et al., 1997). Informal social control refers to neighbors' willingness to intervene to address neighborhood problems. Informal social control can include indirect intervention or surveillance of the area—such as keeping an eye on a neighbor's property and actions during the course of day-to-day activities—or direct intervention, such as residents interceding to confront antisocial behaviors (Greenberg, Rohe, & Williams, 1982). It can also include direct intervention, which involves residents "questioning both strangers and residents of the neighborhood about suspicious activities. It also include chastening people for certain behavior and admonishing children" (Greenberg et al., 1982, p.10). Research conducted as part of the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods demonstrated the important connection between relationships among neighbors and their willingness to intervene. Findings from the project revealed that where collective efficacy was strong, crime and violence were low regardless of sociodemographic characteristics and the level of disorder in the neighborhood (Sampson et al., 1997).

Sampson and colleagues developed a widely used 10-item measure for **neighborhood collective efficacy** that consists of two subscales that reflect the theoretical and conceptual definition described above. The first subscale consists of five items measuring informal social control, examining residents' perceptions of the likelihood that their neighbors can be counted on to intervene in neighborhood problems. The second subscale measures social cohesion and trust by asking residents questions about their social ties to and within their community. Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) used a spatial definition of neighborhood, defined as a collection of people and institutions occupying a subsection of a larger community. They combined 847 census tracts in the city of Chicago to create 343 ecologically meaningful "neighborhood clusters" (NCs) of about 8,000 people, using geographically contiguous census tracts that were internally homogeneous on key census indicators. The researchers examined the reliability of their collective efficacy measure using a hierarchical statistical model representing item variation within persons, person variation within neighborhoods, and variation between neighborhoods (Sampson et al., 1997, p. 920). Their results demonstrated that their measure of collective efficacy was reliable at a neighborhood level. Moreover, the results demonstrated

that neighborhood collective efficacy was associated with theoretically proposed neighborhood-level outcomes, including reduced neighborhood-level crime and violence (Sampson et al., 1997). More information on this measure is described in **Table 6.6**. In summary, the study results showed:

- Together, three dimensions of neighborhood stratification, concentrated disadvantage, immigration concentration, and residential stability, explained 70% of the neighborhood variation in collective efficacy.

- Collective efficacy mediated a substantial portion of the association of residential stability and disadvantage with multiple measures of violence, which is consistent with a major theme in neighborhood theories of social organization.

- After adjustment for measurement error, individual differences in neighborhood composition, prior violence, and other potentially confounding social processes, the combined measure of informal social control and cohesion and trust remained a robust predictor of lower rates of violence (Sampson et al., 1997, p. 923).

Neighborhood Matters Measure

Henry and colleagues (2014) used a developmental-ecological perspective on risk, protection, and prevention to inform their approach to measuring neighborhood social processes that impact youth development (p. 188). Their approach is informed by Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological development model, which takes into consideration one's social setting in determining one's development. Henry and colleagues also consider the impact of the microsystem of the family on development and the impact of neighborhood social connections on parenting and control exercised by the family. The authors developed a measure they called "neighborhood matters," which consists of three broad measurement areas that can influence child development, including (a) neighborhood social norms; (b) informal social control (which is also part of collective efficacy); and (c) social support and connection (p. 189). Henry and colleagues (2014) define social norms as "shared beliefs about expected or acceptable behavior and attitudes" (p. 189). The social norms measure includes (a) "items tapping beliefs about various aspects of neighborhood life that impact child and adolescent development"; and (b) "perceived neighborhood support for such beliefs" (Henry et al., p. 190). The authors use Sampson and colleagues' (1997) definition of informal social control, particularly focusing on "neighborhood residents taking responsibility for and authority to help regulate each other's behavior collectively and informally" (Henry et al., 2014, p. 190). Norms and informal social control "refer to ways neighborhoods might regulate resident behavior, while social connection and support express the extent of neighborliness experienced in a neighborhood" (Henry et al., p. 191).

Henry and colleagues' (2014) study was conducted in poor urban communities in Chicago. Their purpose was to develop and validate an inventory of measures for neighborhood social organization as well as measures that assess likely correlates of social processes, such as neighborhood change, problems, and resources. Key areas addressed in their research include "how many dimensions are needed to characterize neighborhood measures, the internal consistency at the individual level, and the shared variance at the neighborhood level of analysis" (Raudenbush & Sampson, 1999, as cited in Henry et al., 2014, p. 191). They also assess the "criterion-related validity of their measures by predicting neighborhood crime contemporaneous with collection of the neighborhood social processes scales" (Henry et al., 2014, p. 191). Henry and colleagues' (2014) research resulted in valid and reliable measures of neighborhood social

processes. Their results support the internal consistency of most of their measures at the individual level and reliability as indicators of neighborhood-level phenomena as well (Henry et al., 2014). The **neighborhood matters** measures are described in **Table 6.7**. In summary, the study results showed:

- Controlling for population and poverty, neighborhood social norms about adolescent behavior correlated significantly with police reports about property crime and marginally with police reports about neighborhood violent crime.

- All of the subscales and the general informal social control scales were significantly associated with crime levels, except the subscales for the citizen responsibility and neighborhood organization, indicating the higher informal social control, the lower neighborhood violent crime.

- Neighborhood social cohesion was significantly associated with violent and drug-related crime, indicating that higher social cohesion was associated with lower levels of crime. However, cohesion was marginally positively related to violent crime, indicating that higher crime neighborhoods tended to have more resources (Henry et al., 2014, pp. 196–198).

SOCIAL CAPITAL MEASURES

Social capital, whose meaning has evolved over time, is one of the more difficult neighborhood- or community-level concepts to measure. Coleman (1988) originally conceptualized social capital by its function or form in terms of obligations and expectations, information channels, and social norms. Social capital depends on the trustworthiness of the social environment, which means that "obligations will be repaid [and the] actual extent of obligations held" (Coleman, 1988, p. S102). Another important form of social capital is the information that is part of one's social relationships and the basis for action, including social norms as well as effective sanctions for not upholding social norms. For example, an important form of social capital are norms that "one should forgo self-interest and act in the interests of the collectivity" (Coleman, 1988, p. S104). Moreover, social relations and social structures facilitate some forms of social capital: "actors establish relations purposefully and continue them when they continue to provide benefits" (Coleman, 1988, p. S105).

Putnam (1993) later argued that social capital was defined in terms of social organization, including trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions. Putnam (2000) also differentiates between bonding social capital, which is based on relationships of mutual trust found between neighbors, and bridging social capital, which is based on connections between residents and individuals and organizations external to the neighborhood. Social capital is also considered a condition for collective efficacy, but residents must take action for collective efficacy to be realized (Sampson et al., 1997). Several measures of social capital have evolved out of Putnam's work but also in connection with the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods described above. In addition, a more recent measure of social capital based on both international and national research is discussed below.

Saguaro Seminar on Civic Engagement

The Saguaro Seminar on Civic Engagement (John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University) built on Putnam's work and developed a comprehensive measure of social capital known as the **Social Capital Benchmark Survey** (see **Table 6.8** for a description of the content areas included in the survey). The effort engaged over

three-dozen local community foundations in assessing social capital in their communities, with the goal of understanding community strengths and areas for improvement in community civic behavior and creating a baseline against which future progress could be measured (Kennedy School of Government, 2000). The national survey sample included approximately 3,000 national respondents as well as 26,200 respondents from representative samples in 40 communities across 29 states. While there has been considerable reporting about the results of this survey, there has been little empirical research analyzing the validity and reliability of the social capital measures used in the study. In addition to revealing the character of civic engagement in each community, the results suggest two very large challenges and opportunities across all the communities sampled:

- The opportunity and challenge of faith-based civic engagement. From a civic perspective, the special challenge associated with faith-based civic engagement is to encourage greater tolerance for minority viewpoints and greater sensitivity to imperatives of social reform. However, the survey shows that faith-based communities have some matchless strengths as sources of civic engagement.

- The opportunity and challenge of diversity. The opportunities for social capital building in America's increasingly diverse communities are substantial, but the challenges are great, as well. The evidence suggests that community activists in settings of unusual diversity need to redouble their efforts to build trust (and not just across racial lines), to reduce social isolation, to expand political participation, and to bridge class barriers (JFK School of Government, 2000, pp. 2–4).

We included in this chapter a few studies that examined data from the survey to assess the association between social capital and self-rated health. Two of those studies used the national data from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey, while the third used data from a specific geographic community that participated in the Benchmark Survey. The social capital measures that were examined in these studies are explained below.

The first two studies used national data from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey. Subramanian, Kim, and Kawachi's (2002) measure of **social capital** (see **Table 6.9**) included individual trust, defined as general interpersonal trust and degrees of trustworthiness of neighbors, and coworkers; and community-level social trust, which was aggregated from individual responses to questions on the interpersonal trust scale. Community-level measures were developed using these variables and then a contextual social trust variable was aggregated from individual responses to questions on interpersonal trust. Below is a summary of this study's results:

- Higher levels of community social trust were associated with a lower probability of reporting poor health.

- Individual demographic and socioeconomic predictors did not explain the association of community social trust with self-rated health.

- Controlling for individual trust perception, however, rendered the main effect of community social trust statistically insignificant.

- A complex interaction effect was observed, such that the health-promoting effect of community social trust was significantly greater for high-trust individuals. For low-trust individuals, the effect of community social trust on self-rated health was the opposite (Subramanian et al., 2002, pp. S31–S32).

Kim, Subramanian, and Kawachi's (2006) measure of **social capital** (see **Table 6.10**) examined bonding versus bridging social capital, including formal group/associational involvement, diversity of friendships, and level of trust in one's race/ethnicity. Community-level measures of bonding and bridging social capital were created by aggregating individual responses to these subscales. It is important to note that the results from both studies demonstrated that community-level social capital was associated with a lower probability of reporting poor health. The second study showed that:

- Adjusting for individual-level factors (except for social capital) and community level covariables, community bonding social capital and community bridging social capital were associated with 14% and 5% lower odds of self-reported fair/poor health, respectively.

- The two forms of community social capital did not interact with one another or with community level SES, and the main effects did not differ significantly by individual sex or income.

- The validity of the study's results was strengthened by controlling for a number of compositional characteristics, community-level SES and age.

- The survey sampling from multiple, diverse U.S. communities favors the generalizability of the findings to other U.S. communities (Kim et al., 2006, pp. 119–120).

Schultz, O'Brien, and Tadesse (2008) (see **Table 6.11**) used data from the SCBS in Duluth, Minnesota, and Superior, Wisconsin, and examined **bonding social capital** (informal socializing/interactions), **bridging social capital** (formal group/associational involvement and organizational group interaction), as well as the related social capital constructs of social trust, social support, and volunteer activity. The researchers address the endogenous nature of social capital by estimating it as a function of both individual and household characteristics and then estimating self-reported health as a function of the individual and social capital as well as individual and household characteristics (Schultz et al., 2008, p. 610). The researchers also included explanatory measures that acted as proxies for the ability of individuals to produce social capital, including length of residency and religiosity. The results of this study demonstrated that:

- Individuals with higher social trust, greater associational involvement and participation in organized interactions, and more informal socializing or volunteering reported stronger health than those with lower levels of these social capital indices.

- The production and demand for social capital, through social engagement, are related to individual characteristics, including income and education

- While religiosity had a positive impact on social capital, it did not predict self-reported health status.

- The research suggests that individuals with higher levels of social trust, associational involvement, more participation in organized interactions and informal socializing, and those who volunteer perceive themselves to be healthier compared to those with lower levels of these individual social capital measures.

- Summing all social capital measures results in approximately a 10% increase in the probability of being healthy when each index increases by 1% (Schultz et al., 2008, pp. 613–616).

The major weakness of above studies examining social capital and self-reported health is that none of them assessed the reliability of the social capital measures they used, nor did they conduct any type of factor analysis to examine the dimensions of their measures. These studies, however, demonstrate empirical validity through the association of social capital with other potentially related constructs, such as self-rated health.

Social Capital Measure From the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods

This section discusses two studies that empirically examined measures of social capital from the PHDCN. The first study by Chaskin, Goerge, Skyles, and Guiltinan (2006) used a convenience sample in two Chicago communities and includes the following **social capital** constructs: voluntary association/organizational involvement, collective efficacy, and neighborhood activism (see **Table 6.12**). The researchers argue that these three concepts were selected because they reflect different dimensions of civic engagement, including informal and formal, theory supporting their interaction with community well-being, and their relationship to personal efficacy and Putnam's notion of democratic activism (Chaskin et al., 2006, p. 492). The researchers tested practical options for community-based organizations to measure social capital. They found that the community partners in their study had a basic understanding of and interest in social capital in their communities, including the interactions between residents and community stakeholders and how neighborhood organizations and the environment impacted those interactions, the social fabric, and quality of life. The strength of their study was that they examined the reliability of their social capital constructs and tested empirical validity by examining differences between the results from their sample and the PHDCN sample. Below is a summary of the study results:

- A regression model of social capital examined whether it was possible to measure aspects of social capital in partnership with CBOs.

- Some social capital measures translated better than others to methods more generally accessible to CBOs.

- There was no statistically significant difference between how individuals in the current study's sample responded to items measuring collective efficacy as compared to those in the PHDCN study.

- Measures of neighborhood activism and voluntary association were overestimated in the CBO community survey, possibly due to a systematic sampling bias in favor of more active and engaged residents.

- Some public venues like supermarkets were more promising for strategic convenience sampling because they offered a cross-section of the local population and an efficient mechanism for collecting relatively high numbers of completed surveys (Chaskin et al., 2006, pp. 510–511).

The second study by Sampson and Graif (2009) examined the following **neighborhood social capital** and related constructs: neighborhood collective efficacy, neighborhood activism, conduct norms; moral legal cynicism, intergenerational closure, reciprocal exchange, density of local friend/kinship ties, organizational involvement, tolerance of deviance, and police efficacy (see **Table 6.13**). Sampson and Graif (2009) examine the structural dimensions and predictors of social capital and thus significantly contribute to the literature on measuring social capital at the neighborhood level. Sampson and Graif (2009) examine the reliability of their constructs and their dimensionality, and

they assess empirical validity by examining potential predictors of social capital. The results demonstrated a reliable measure of social capital at the residential level that consisted of four major factors that were extracted using a principal components factor analysis: collective efficacy, local networks, organizational involvement, and conduct norms. A measure of leadership-based social capital was also developed using a survey of positional leaders in Chicago (see Sampson & Graif, 2009, for more details on this measure). The authors used the results to develop a conceptual typology of communities that can inform future studies of social capital. Sampson and Graif (2009) "caution future research against the notion that there is one or even a small number of indices of neighborhood-level social capital that can coherently reflect all of its relevant and yet simultaneously distinct facets" (p. 1601). Below is a summary of the study results:

- Principal component factor analyses were conducted with a varimax rotation.

- Based on the main conceptual commonalities of the indices bearing the highest loadings on each, the community survey yielded four major factors:

  ○ Collective efficacy (Eigenvalue = 7.821): social cohesion, social control, moral/legal cynicism, neighborhood dissatisfaction, and police efficacy

  ○ Local networks (Eigenvalue = 2.210): friends and kin density, reciprocal exchange, intergenerational closure, anonymity, unlikely to move out

  ○ Organizational involvement (Eigenvalue = 1.554): organizational participation, neighborhood activism, involvement in neighborhood organization

  ○ Conduct norms (Eigenvalue = .923): conduct norms for both 13-year-olds and 19-year-olds

- The above dimensions "cluster differently across Chicago communities and are differently influenced by structural disadvantage, residential instability, and diversity of population."

- Communities with high scores on collective efficacy had low scores on residents' networks in the neighborhood, conduct norms, and leadership involvement in traditional religious or school organizations.

- For local networks and conduct norms, disadvantage was not a significant predictor net of other structural indices (Sampson & Graif, pp. 1600–1601).

More Recent Social Capital Measures

Two other unrelated studies on social capital also may be worth exploring, including Whitman (2012), who developed and examined the following social capital constructs to asses community success: civic network density—interorganizational connectedness via residents' overlapping organizational affiliations (note: this is similar to associational/organizational involvement in other studies)—and gathering place density—extent to which residents socialize/co-frequent local gathering places (this is similar to informal social interactions in other studies).

Alaimo, Reischl, and Allen (2010) examined the relationship between community gardening and social capital. Their social capital measures included (a) bonding social capital—trust/reciprocity, know neighbors, get along, intergenerational relationships, (b) social support, linking social capital—connections, get to know police, neighborhood organizations, and (c) norms/values—feel responsible, involvement, informal social control,

collective efficacy, neighborhood influence, and satisfaction. Moreover, there are numerous international measures of social capital that can be explored when conducting global research, such as those developed by international agencies (e.g., the World Bank), including the integrated questionnaire for the measurement of social capital, the social capital inventory, and the social capital assessment tool (Grootaert, Narayan, Nyhan-Jones, & Woodcock, 2004; Grootaert & Van Bastelaer, 2001; Narayan & Cassidy, 2001). However, an analysis of these extensive international measures is beyond the primary scope of this book.

The final measure of social capital in this chapter draws on lessons learned about social capital measurement at the international and domestic levels discussed in a recent article by Enfield and Nathaniel (2013) on social capital constructs and survey development. The authors argue that, while measuring social capital can be difficult, researchers from around the globe and in the United States have demonstrated the beneficial presence, utility, and impact of social capital in communities. Enfield and Nathaniel (2013) provide a thorough review of the national and international literature on social capital measurement and introduce a measure that was developed by researchers at the University of Minnesota (Chazdon, Allen, Horntvedt, & Scheffert, 2013).

Chazdon, Allen, Horntvedt, and Scheffert's (2013) measure of **social capital** was developed and tested using a participatory and community-engaged approach (**Table 6.14**). The measure includes behavioral and cognitive traits associated with three kinds of social capital, bonding (strong internal ties among individuals with similar backgrounds), bridging (weak ties with external resources and support), and linking (vertical networks) (Chazdon et al., 2013). Similar to bridging social capital, linking social capital includes networks with external players or institutions, but these networks are not among individuals who are alike or share power or status (Chazdon et al., 2013, p. 2). The researchers created a conceptual model of overall social capital that contains six related subconstructs, including bonding engagement, bonding trust, bridging engagement, bridging trust, linking engagement, and linking trust. They also add a seventh dimension called efficacy, which is an individual measure that lacks the shared definition of collective efficacy. Their conceptualization of efficacy aggregates individual-level data from their survey to measure the "ability to make a difference in social contexts" (Chazdon et al., 2013, p. 4).

Chazdon and colleagues (2013) tested their measure of social capital in three rural communities (because of their long standing work there) as well as one community located close to a major metropolitan area. Their conceptual model of social capital (illustrated in Chazdon et al., 2013) was derived by conducting both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses of the seven dimensions discussed above. The results demonstrated that their measure of social capital was valid and reliable and the "overall model held together as a conceptual framework for measuring social capital," with "efficacy at the center of the model, reflecting its importance as the energy needed to animate community social capital" (Chazdon et al., 2013, p. 10). Their findings are similar to prior research discussed earlier in this chapter demonstrating that efficacy is needed to activate social networks, ties, and cohesion:

- A model generating CFA was used to test the conceptual model of social capital by identifying the model based on theory and statistical analyses in order to derive the best fit and most efficient model.

- The results showed that the seven conceptual domains were valid and reliable as measurement scales. The overall conceptual model held together as framework for measuring social capital (Chazdon et al., 2013, p. 10).

Chazdon and colleagues (2013) note that their measure needs further testing among low-income people, youth, less-educated residents, and residents of inner-city and urban areas. Enfield and Nathaniel (2013) are piloting a revised version of the Chazdon et al. survey among youth in the 4-H program, with the goal of making the survey youth friendly and meaningful to youth from various geographical and cultural backgrounds.

CONCLUSION

The social fabric of communities, including the social connections and networks residents share, has been recognized as a powerful and important characteristic of communities for generations (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Glynn, 1981; McMillan & Chavis, 1986). As early as 1979, social fabric was described as "the fragile, sacred, essential, and complex ingredient that holds neighborhoods together" (Baroni, 1979, p. vii). Measurement in this area has advanced over the last 50 years, resulting in measures with increased validity and reliability. While there is still work to be done, the measures in this chapter provide researchers and practitioners with tangible methods to quantify and examine the complex social processes that make up a neighborhood's social fabric and that impact a range of individual and community-level outcomes.

LIST OF MEASURES AND TABLE NUMBERS

Chapter 6 ● Social Connections and Processes in Communities

TABLE 6.1 ■ Sense of Community Index	
Primary Reference	Perkins, D. D., Florin, P., Rich, R. C., Wandersman, A., & Chavis, D. M. (1990). Participation and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *18*(1), 83–115.
Purpose	• Measures sense of community, defined as a feeling that members have of belonging and being important to each other and a shared faith that members' needs will be met by their commitment to be together. (McMillian & Chavis, 1986) • The short SCI was part of a larger survey designed to understand the relationship between participation in block associations and a wide range of block-level variables (demographics, the built environment, crime, and the transient social and physical environment).
Description	The Sense of Community Index (SCI) is a 12-item self-report scale with four subscales based on the original four dimensions developed by McMillan and Chavis (1986). Responses are True or False. Please see the article for all of the items. **Reinforcement of needs (3 items)** • I think my [block] is a good place for me to live. • People on this [block] do not share the same values. **Membership (3 items)** • I can recognize most of the people who live on my [block]. • Very few of my [neighbors] know me. **Influence (3 items)** • I care about what my [neighbors] think of my actions. • If there is a problem on this [block] people who live here can get it solved. **Shared emotional connection (3 items)** • It is very important to me to live on this particular [block]. • People on this [block] generally don't get along with each other.
Sample	• Forty-eight blocks in three New York City neighborhoods were selected to participate in the study. • A telephone survey was conducted over five weeks in the spring of 1985 with randomly selected block residents from 48 New York City blocks using the criss-cross directory. Selected sample characteristics • 58% response rate • Mean age: 42 years old • Median estimated annual family income: $19,000 • Median length of residence: 9 1/2 years (Perkins et al., 1990, pp. 95–96)
Scoring	To get a total score for the SCI, Q2, Q6, Q8, & Q11 need to be reversed before scoring. Then you add scores to get the total score for all 12 questions.
Assessment	The total scale was shown to have an internal reliability coefficient of .80 (Perkins et al., 1990, p. 110). However, there is no report of internal reliabilities of subscales in this study.
Related Reference	The SCI was also used in several other place-based studies; however, only a few use the 12-item T/F SCI discussed here. One example is Kingston, S., Mitchell, R., Florin, P., & Stevenson, J. (1999). Sense of community in neighborhoods: A multilevel construct. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*(6), 681–694.

(*Continued*)

Copyright ©2019 by SAGE Publications, Inc.
This work may not be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means without express written permission of the publisher.

TABLE 6.1 ■ (Continued)	
Language	English
Contact	Douglas D. Perkins Department of Human and Organizational Development, Box 90 Peabody College, Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN 37203 Email: douglas.d.perkins@vanderbilt.edu
Other Comments	Further development and assessment of this instrument is discussed in this chapter.

TABLE 6.2 ■	Brief Sense of Community Index (2003)
Primary Reference	Long, D. A., & Perkins, D. D. (2003). Confirmatory factor analysis of the sense of community index and development of a brief SCI. *Journal of Community Psychology, 31*(3), 279–296.
Purpose	• Confirmatory factor analysis of the 12-item SCI Index developed by McMillan and Chavis (1986) and used in Perkins et al. (1990). • Study used findings to create the brief SCI.
Description	This scale consists of eight items divided into three subscales. The items from the SCI that were retained in the brief SCI (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) are indicated in parentheses. This scale also uses a True or False response format, except for the open-ended questions listed below. Please see the article for all of the items. **Social connections (membership subscale in the SCI): (3 items) All three items from the original SCI were retained in this subscale, including** • I can recognize most of the people who live on my block. • I have almost no influence over what this block is like. **Mutual concerns (reinforcement of needs and influence subscales in the SCI): (2 of the 3 items were retained and a 3rd added):** • My neighbors and I want the same things from the block (from original SCI). • If there is a problem on this block, people who live here can get it solved (from original SCI). • In general, would you say that people on your block help out when they can, or do they pretty much go their own way? **Community values (new items):** • Would you say that it is very important, somewhat important, or not important to you to feel a sense of community with the people on your block? • Would you say that you feel a strong sense of community with others on your block, very little sense of community, or something in between?
Sample	• The original SCI and other resident survey data from the 1985–1986 Block Booster Project are used to develop this measure (Perkins et al., 1990). • Clustered, resident survey data from 47 street blocks in five neighborhoods in Brooklyn and Queens, New York, were collected at two points in time and through a household panel: ○ T1 *N* = 1,081 ○ T2 *N* = 638 • This study uses both waves of data, not just the first wave; however, respondent panel verification was limited. • Thus, the analyses are of two semi-independent, cross-sectional data sets.
Scoring	Similar to the SCI, the negatively phrased items (Questions 2 and 3) need to be reversed scored. Then the scores from all of the items are added together to create a total Brief SCI score.

(*Continued*)

TABLE 6.2 ■ (Continued)	
Assessment	• Brief Sense of Community overall reliability α = .65 (Time 1; N = 713), α = .73 (Time 2; N = 422). Subscale Reliabilities • Mutual concerns: α = .50 (Time 1; N = 820), α =. 64 (Time 2; N = 485) • Social connections: α = .55 (Time 1; N = 917), α = .50 (Time 2; N = 544) • Community values: α = .51 (Time 1; N = 1040), α = .61 (Time 2; N = 621)
Language	English
Contact	Douglas D. Perkins Department of Human and Organizational Development Box 90 Peabody College, Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN 37203 Email: douglas.d.perkins@vanderbilt.edu

TABLE 6.3 ■	Brief Sense of Community Scale (BSCS)
Primary Reference	Peterson, N. A., Speer, P. W., & McMillan, D. W. (2008). Validation of a brief sense of community scale: Confirmation of the principal theory of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(1), 61–73.
Purpose	This study examined a brief measure for SOC that included completely new items designed to be consistent with the McMillan and Chavis (1986) model of the four SOC dimensions.
Description	The BSCS followed recommendations in the SOC literature (Peterson, Speer, & Hughey, 2006), including using only positively worded items. In addition, all BSCS items were designed to reference the respondents' neighborhood and used a 5-point, Likert-type response option format ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Sample items are provided below. Please see the article for a complete list of the items. **Needs Fulfillment: (2 items)** • I can get what I need in this neighborhood. **Membership: (2 items)** • I feel like a member of this neighborhood. **Influence: (2 items)** • People in this neighborhood are good at influencing each another. **Emotional Connection: (2 items)** • I have a good bond with others in this neighborhood.
Sample	• Part of a larger study evaluating a community health promotion initiative in the mid-western United States. Sample: • 308 randomly selected residents participated in the study. • 293 who completed all BSCS items and were included in the present study. • The majority were non-Hispanic White females.
Scoring	A total score is created by adding the responses to all of the items.
Assessment	Cronbach's alpha for the overall BSCS was .92 Subscale reliabilities • α = .86 for needs fulfillment • α = .94 for group membership • α = .77 for influence • α = .87 for emotional connection
Language	English
Contact	N. Andrew Peterson School of Social Work Rutgers University 536 George Street, 303A New Brunswick, NJ 08901. Email: andrew.peterson@ssw.rutgers.edu

TABLE 6.4 ■ Sense of Community Index-2	
Primary Reference	Chavis, D. M., Lee, K. S., & Acosta, J. (2008). *The sense of community (SCI) revised: The reliability and validity of the SCI-2.* Paper presented at the 2nd International Community Psychology Conference, Lisboa, Portugal.
Purpose	Designed to expand and improve the original Sense of Community Index (SCI) based on McMillian and Chavis (1986) theory of sense of community.
Description	The Sense of Community Index-2 is a 24-item scale divided into four subscales. Respondents rate each item, which measures how they feel on a 4-point Likert-like scale (*not at all* = 0, *somewhat* = 1, *mostly* = 2, and *completely* = 3). The full report on this article is publicly available at the website listed below.

Reinforcement of needs

- I get important needs of mine met because I am part of this community.
- Community members and I value the same things.
- This community has been successful in getting the needs of its members met.
- Being a member of this community makes me feel good.
- When I have a problem, I can talk about it with members of this community.
- People in this community have similar needs, priorities, and goals.

Membership

- I can trust people in this community.
- I can recognize most of the members of this community.
- Most community members know me.
- This community has symbols and expressions of membership, such as clothes, signs, art, architecture, logos, landmarks, and flags that people can recognize.
- I put a lot of time and effort into being part of this community.
- Being a member of this community is a part of my identity.

Influence

- Fitting into this community is important to me.
- This community can influence other communities.
- I care about what other community members think of me.
- I have influence over what this community is like.
- If there is a problem in this community, members can get it solved.
- This community has good leaders.

Shared emotional connection

- It is very important to me to be a part of this community.
- I am with other community members a lot and enjoy being with them.
- I expect to be a part of this community for a long time.
- Members of this community have shared important events together, such as holidays, celebrations, or disasters.
- I feel hopeful about the future of this community.
- Members of this community care about each other.

Sample	• The original draft was piloted with 36 culturally diverse persons in seven different settings from Maryland to Hawaii.
	• Strong reliability was found, but there were several suggestions for improvement that were incorporated (i.e., rewording of the statement to increase clarity).
	• The SCI-2 was revised and tested with a larger survey of 1,800 people.
Scoring	A total score is created by adding the responses to all of the items.
Assessment	The analysis of the SCI-2 showed that it is a very reliable measure (coefficient alpha = .94). The subscales also proved to be reliable with coefficient alpha scores of .79 to .86.
Language	English
Contact	David Chavis, PhD Community Science 438 N. Frederick Ave, Suite 315 Gaithersburg, MD 20877 301-519-0722 (office) or 301-519-0724 (fax) Email: dchavis@communityscience.com
Website	This article is available at http://www.communityscience.com/pdfs/Sense%20of%20Community%20Index-2%28SCI-2%29.pdf

TABLE 6.5 ■	Multidimensional Territorial Sense of Community Scale (MTSOCS)
Primary Reference	Prezza, M., Pacilli, M. G., Barbaranelli, C., & Zampatti, E. (2009). The MTSOCS: A multidimensional sense of community scale for local communities. *Journal of Community Psychology, 37*(3), 305–326.
Purpose	Designed to measure the sense of community across different geographical communities (small towns, cities, and metropolis neighborhoods). Sense of community is based on McMillan and Chavis' (1986) definition of sense of community.
Description	This measure consists of 19 items divided into five subscales. Respondents rate each item on a 4-point scale, with 4 meaning *strongly agree* and 1 meaning *strongly disagree*. Sample items are provided for each subscale. For a list of all of the items, see Prezza and colleagues (2009). **Membership (4 items)** • I feel like I belong here. • This town is a part of me. **Shared influence (3 items)** • If the people here get organized, they can achieve their goals. • If there is a serious problem in this town, the people who live here can get it solved. **Help in case of need (4 items)** • Many people in this town are available to give help if somebody needs it. • If I had a problem, few people in this town would try to help me. **Social climate and bonds (4 items)** • I have good friends in this town. • I feel at ease with the people in my town. **Needs fulfillment (4 items)** • This town provides opportunities for me to do a lot of different things. • In this town I have few opportunities to satisfy my needs.
Scoring	The scores are added for all items to create a total score.

Sample	• 781 participants were divided into three groups:
	  ○ 316 participants from four small Italian towns
	  ○ 227 participants from two Italian cities
	  ○ 238 participants from neighborhoods in Rome

Assessment	• Overall reliability of the 19 item MTSCOS scale: $\alpha = .88$ Reliability for the subscales • Membership: $\alpha = .80$ • Shared influence: $\alpha = .61$ • Help in case of need: $\alpha = .69$ • Social climate and bonds: $\alpha = .75$ • Needs fulfillment: $\alpha = .71$
Languages	English and Italian
Contact	Miretta Prezza Department of Psychology "Sapienza" University of Rome Via dei Marsi 78 00185 Rome, Italy Email: miretta.prezza@uniroma1.it

TABLE 6.6 ■ Neighborhood Collective Efficacy	
Primary Reference	Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*, 918–924.
Purpose	Designed to measure neighborhood collective efficacy, which is the combination of informal social control and social cohesion/trust. It is designed to measure a neighborhood- or community-level construct.
Description	Neighborhood collective efficacy is a 10-item self-report scale, consisting of two subscales: informal social control and social cohesion/trust (Sampson et al., 1997). This measure and the complete community survey are available on the PHDCN (Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods) website (see below). The **social cohesion/trust** subscale contained five conceptually related items that asks residents how strongly they agree (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, and 5 = *strongly agree*) with several statements including the following: • People around here are willing to help their neighbors. • This is a close-knit neighborhood. • People in this neighborhood can be trusted. The 5-item **informal social control** subscale asks residents about the likelihood (1 = *very unlikely*, 2 = *likely*, 3 = *neither likely nor unlikely*, 4 = *likely*, and 5 = *very likely*) that their neighbors can be counted on to intervene in various ways if, including the following: • Children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner. • A fight broke out in front of their house. • The fire station closest to their home was threatened with budget cuts.
Sample	• The sample consisted of 8,782 Chicago residents representing 343 neighborhood clusters (NC), who were interviewed in their homes as part of the community survey (CS). • The CS was designed to yield a representative sample of households within each NC, with sample sizes large enough to create reliable NC measures (Sampson et al., 1997, p. 919). • The sample neighborhoods were categorized into low, medium, and high socioeconomic status (SES). There were no low-SES White neighborhoods and no high-SES Latino neighborhoods. There were Black neighborhoods in all three categories of SES and many heterogeneous neighborhoods that varied in SES (Sampson et al., 1997, p. 919).
Scoring	• A mean score is calculated after the last two items in the social cohesion scale are reverse coded. • Responses were aggregated to the neighborhood level as initial measures. Social cohesion and informal social control were closely associated across neighborhoods ($r = 0.80$, $p < 0.001$), which suggested that the two measures were tapping aspects of the same latent construct. • The two scales were combined into a summary measure labeled collective efficacy (Sampson et al., 1997, p. 920).
Assessment	The reliability with which neighborhoods could be distinguished on collective efficacy ranged between 0.80 for neighborhoods with a sample size of 20 raters to 0.91 for neighborhoods with a sample size of 50 raters.

(*Continued*)

TABLE 6.6 ■ (Continued)	
Related Reference	Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1999). Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology, 105*(3), 603–651.
Language	English
Contact	Robert J. Sampson, PhD Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology Harvard University William James Hall 33 Kirkland St. Cambridge, MA 02138 Email: rsampson@wjh.harvard.edu
Website	For more information on neighborhood collective efficacy, related measures, and this research, see the study website: Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods: http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/PHDCN/instruments.jsp.

TABLE 6.7 ■	Neighborhood Matters Measure of Neighborhood Social Processes
Primary Reference	Henry, D., Gorman-Smith, D., Schoeny, M., & Tolan, P. (2014). "Neighborhood matters": Assessment of neighborhood social processes. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 54,* 187–204.
Purpose	Designed to measure neighborhood social processes that impact youth development and outcomes and evaluate their reliability at the individual level, their shared variance at the neighborhood level, and criterion-related validity.
Description	The following measures for three neighborhood social processes were developed and assessed in this study. **Neighborhood social norms** The original scale had 45 items; 12 items were eliminated based on the confirmatory factor analysis. Each item contained the stem: "People in this neighborhood believe that . . . " followed by the specific item content. Responses were on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. The subscales are described below, along with sample items: • **Child welfare (6 items):** "Adults should know who the neighborhood children and teenagers are." "Adults should do something if they see a child in danger or hurt or being mistreated." • **Child management (10 items):** "Children and teenagers should be expected to respect adults." "If adults see a child doing something wrong, they should tell that child's parent(s)." • **Adolescent behavior (4 items):** "It is always wrong for teenagers to drink alcohol." "It is always wrong for teenagers to smoke cigarettes." • **Crime (5 items):** "People should call the police if they see a crime being committed." "People should do something if a neighbor's house is being vandalized." • **Neighborhood management (4 items):** "People should be considerate of their neighbors." "People should keep their neighborhood looking nice." **Informal social control** The original scale had 62 items; 15 items were eliminated based on the confirmatory factor analysis. For each item, respondents were asked: "What would people in your neighborhood do if . . . " followed by the specific content for each item. Responses were on a 4-point Likert scale, from 1 = *do nothing*, 2 = *complain to or discuss with other neighbors*, 3 = *talk to someone who can do something about it* (e.g., police, etc.), or 4 = *do something directly* (e.g., stepping in and talking directly to the persons involved). The subscales are described below, along with sample items: • **Child welfare (8 items):** "A child falls or hurts him/herself is crying?" "A child is left at home alone during the evening?" • **Child management (11 items):** "Some children are spray-painting graffiti (tagging)?" "A child (or children) is/are bullying or hassling another child?" • **Adolescent behavior (6 items):** "A teenager is recruiting for a gang?" "Someone is trying to sell drugs to a teenager in plain sight?" • **Crime (10 items):** "They hear about planned gang retaliation?" "A neighbor is physically abusing (beating) their partner?" • **Neighborhood management (5 items):** "Someone who lives in the neighborhood rarely or never shovels snow?" "A neighbor is blasting music out of their home or apartment?" • **Neighborhood organization (7 items):** "They want more resources or recreation programs for youth?" "There is violence or shootings?"

(*Continued*)

TABLE 6.7 ■ (Continued)		
	Social support and connection The original scale had 45 items, 32 of which tapped social cohesion (e.g., none were eliminated) and the remaining assessing existence and use of neighborhood resources that might promote social connection (one was eliminated). **Neighborhood social cohesion (32 items):** Responses were on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. Twenty-five items included the stem: "In general, people in this neighborhood . . . ," for example, "look out for one another," "introduce themselves when someone new moves into the neighborhood." Seven items had no stem—for example, "This neighborhood is a good neighborhood for families." **Neighborhood social resources (5 items):** Responses were "yes" or "no" followed by a 3-point Likert scale indicating whether none, some, or most community residents made use of a resource if the answer was "yes." Sample items include the following: "Does this neighborhood have a neighborhood newsletter?" "Does this neighborhood have organized activities for children?"	
Sample	- Neighborhoods were selected through a stratified random sample from pools of eligible census tracks in Chicago, including minority population, size, poverty, and crime level. - To form the sample of neighborhood informants, 20 participants within each of the 30 census tracks were recruited. A stratified sample was used to ensure an even number of male/female, youth/adults. - Data were collected via an in-person interview; 86.2% of households with an eligible resident participated.	
Scoring	Mean scores are calculated to determine the scores for each subscale and for the overall scale.	
Assessment	**Neighborhood social norms** - Internal consistency reliabilities were all above .70. - At the neighborhood level, three of the five subscales had significant shared variance at the neighborhood level: child management, crime, and neighborhood management. **Informal social control** - Internal consistency reliabilities were above .80 with one exception, neighborhood organization, which was at .74. - Shared variance at the neighborhood level was significant for all subscales except for citizen responsibility and the general informal social control factor. **Social cohesion** - Internal consistency reliability was .92. - At the neighborhood level, the shared variance was significant.	
Language	English	
Contact	David Henry, PhD Institute for Health Research and Policy University of Illinois at Chicago (MC 275) 512 Westside Research Office Bldg. 1747 West Roosevelt Road Chicago, IL 60608 Email: dhenry@uic.edu	
Website	The online version of the article contains supplementary material, including the complete survey with the final items, available to authorized users.	

TABLE 6.8 ■ Social Capital Benchmark Survey	
Primary Reference	J. F. Kennedy School of Government: Harvard University. (2000). *Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey: Executive summary*. The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America Project. Retrieved from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/results.html
Purpose	Designed to measure social capital in communities
Description	The instrument is a 25-minute phone survey with 66 questions that measure social capital in 11 dimensions **Social trust** measures whether or not people trust each other. **Inter-racial trust** measures the extent to which different racial groups trust one another and is a proxy for health of inter-racial relations in the community. **Conventional politics participation** measures how many people in the community are involved politically because political involvement is a key measure of community engagement. **Protest politics participation** measures participation in political protest forms like marches, demonstrations, boycotts, and so forth. The data in the benchmark survey indicates communities with low conventional political participation exhibit high levels of protest politics participation. **Civic leadership** measures how frequently respondents were engaged in community and civic groups and whether respondents took a leadership role in these groups. **Associational involvement** measures associational involvement across 18 categories of groups including senior groups, ethnic groups, musical, service and fraternal, and so forth. **Informal socializing**: While civil leadership and associational involvement measure "formal" social ties, this measure looks at informal socializing, like socializing with neighbors, coworkers, and "hanging out" in public spaces. **Diversity of friendships** measures how diverse a person's social network is (and by extension diversity in the community's network). This measure of diversity is important in producing community solidarity and forming larger consensus of how communities should work together. **Giving and volunteering** measures how often community residents volunteer and how generous their giving is. **Faith-based engagement** measures attendance, participation, and affiliation with religion and religious activities because religion is a big part of social capital. **Equality of civic engagement across the community** measures how skewed civic participation is across socioeconomic status within a community. Communities with more egalitarian civic participation score higher.
Sample	- Sample: 30,000 Americans, with 27,000 respondents surveyed across 40 communities and 3,000 nationally representative respondents using random digit dialing. - Average response rates: 28.9% for the community samples and 28.7% for the national sample.

(*Continued*)

TABLE 6.8 ■ (Continued)	
Scoring	• The Roper Center at the University of Connecticut offers a codebook to assist with the actual scoring of the survey. The Social Capital Benchmark survey used "community quotients" as a measure to compare results across the communities surveyed since they were so varied. • Along every dimension of social capital, a community quotient (CQ) score shows a community's performance on this dimension relative to what was predicted given its urbanicity, ethnicity, levels of education, and age distribution. • A score *above* 100 indicates that a community shows more of this community connectedness than its demographics would predict; conversely, a score below 100 indicates that a community shows *less* of this type of social capital than its demographics would suggest.
Assessment	No information on reliability is provided.
Related References	The Social Capital Benchmark Survey Website has a listing of papers published using the survey: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/pdfs/SCCBSpapers0108.pdf. Three research studies using the survey are also reported on in this chapter.
Language	English
Contact	The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research University of Connecticut Homer Babbidge Library 369 Fairfield Way, Unit 1164 Storrs, CT 06269-1164 Telephone: 860.486.4440 Fax: 860.486.6308
Website	Social Capital Benchmark Survey Website http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/index.html Roper Center at University of Connecticut (*Survey Codebook*, methodology) http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/misc/USMISC2006-SOCCAP/usmisc2006-soccap.pdf For a copy of the executive summary of the results, please see http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/docs/exec_summ.pdf Study Results: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/results5.html

TABLE 6.9 ■	Social Capital Benchmark Survey: Social Trust and Self-Rated Health
Primary Reference	Subramanian, S. V., Kim, D. J., & Kawachi, I. (2002). Social trust and self-rated health in U.S. communities: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 79*(4), S21–S34.
Purpose	This study examined social trust and self-rated health using data from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey (SCBS) from all 40 communities participating in the survey. A multilevel analysis was conducted with 21,456 individuals nested within the 40 communities.

Description	The instrument was a 25-minute phone survey with 66 questions that measure social capital in 11 dimensions. This study used the following variables from the SCBS:
	
	• **Perceptions of individual trust:** derived by summing individual responses to questions on
	
	    ○ General interpersonal trust (whether most people can be trusted) with potential responses being "people can be trusted," "you can't be too careful," and "depends"
	
	    ○ Degree of trustworthiness (how much you can trust people) of neighbors, coworkers, fellow congregants, store employees where the individual shops, and local police, with potential responses being "trust them a lot," "trust them some," and "trust them not at all." Individual scores on this scale were dichotomized as low and high, using the average as the cut point.
	
	• **Self-rated health** was also measured to determine the association between social capital and health. Respondents were asked: "How would you describe your overall health these days? Would you say it is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?" The five responses were collapsed into dichotomous variables: 0 for excellent, very good and good, and 1 for fair or poor.

Sample	Social Capital Benchmark Survey Sample (see Table 6.8)
Scoring	**Community-level measures** were then developed using the above measures. • A contextual social trust variable was aggregated from individual response to questions on interpersonal trust. • Values were calculated as the average of the standardized responses to the questions using the U.S. average of the response to each question for standardization. • Aggregate community-level measures of social trust were calculated by taking the arithmetic average of the weighted individual level measures.
Assessment	No information on reliability is provided.
Related Reference	Kim, D., Subramanian, S. V., & Kawachi, I. (2006). Bonding versus bridging social capital and their association with self-rated health: A multilevel analysis of 40 U.S. communities. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 60*(2), 116–122. (see Table 6.10)
Language	English
Contact	Dr. S. V. Subramanian Department of Health and Social Behavior Harvard School of Public Health 677 Huntington Avenue, 7th Floor Boston, MA 02115 svsubram@hsph.harvard.edu

TABLE 6.10 ■ Social Capital Benchmark Survey: Bonding/Bridging Social Capital and Self-Rated Health	
Primary Reference	Kim, D., Subramanian, S. V., & Kawachi, I. (2006). Bonding versus bridging social capital and their association with self-rated health: A multilevel analysis of 40 U.S. communities. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 60*(2), 116–122.
Purpose	This study examined bonding versus bridging social capital and self-rated health using data from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey (SCBS) from all 40 communities participating in the survey. A multilevel analysis was conducted with 21,456 individuals nested within the 40 communities.
Description	The instrument is a 25-minute phone survey with 66 questions that measure social capital in 11 dimensions. This is the same measure used above, but this study used the following variables from the SCBS for their measure of social capital. • **Formal group involvement (called associational involvement in SCBS):** This includes participation in 19 different types of formal groups, including neighborhood associations, senior groups, labor unions, and religious organizations. They also measured the respondent's stated most important formal group and how its composition was characterized in terms of race/ethnicity, sex, and education. • **Diversity of friendships (same name as SCBS)**: This was a count of the number of different kinds of personal friends, including having a friend who owns their own business, has been on welfare, is White, Hispanic, Asian, or African American, or has a different religion. • Level of trust in one's race/ethnicity (part of the measure of **social trust**) • The number of times one had invited or been invited to the home of a person of a different race/ethnicity over the previous year The same self-rated health measure was used as in the study in Table 6.9.
Sample	Social Capital Benchmark Survey Sample (same as Table 6.8)
Scoring	**Community level measures** were then developed using the preceding **measures**: • **Community bonding social capital:** calculated as the mean of the (1) standardized proportion of individuals in the community sample that was both at or above the national median on the number of formal group involvements and for whom most of the respondents stated most important formal group was similar to the respondent on race/ethnicity, sex, and education; and (2) the standardized mean level of trust in members of one's racial/ethnic group. • **Community bridging social capital**: calculated as the mean of (1) standardized proportion of individuals in the community sample that was both at or above the national median on the number of formal group involvements and for whom most of the respondents stated most important formal group was dissimilar to the respondent on race/ethnicity, sex, and education; and (2) the standardized mean of the number of times one had invited or been invited to the home of a person of a different race/ethnicity; and (3) the standardized community-level mean for diversity of friendships. • To generate community level proportions, individual level measures were weighted according to previously assigned survey weights.
Assessment	No information on reliability is provided.
Related Reference	See study by Subramanian et al., in Table 6.9.
Language	English

Contact	D. Kim Department of Society, Human Development, and Health Harvard School of Public Health 677 Huntington Avenue Boston, MA 02446 dkim@hsph.harvard.edu

TABLE 6.11 ■ Social Capital Benchmark Survey: Social Capital and Self-Rated Health	
Primary Reference	Schultz, J., O'Brien, M. A., & Tadesse, B. (2008). Social capital and self-rated health: Results from the US 2006 social capital survey of one community. *Social Science and Medicine, 67*(4), 606–617.
Purpose	This study examined individual social capital and self-rated health, after controlling for individual and economic characteristics, using data from the Social Capital Benchmark Survey (SCBS) in Duluth, Minnesota, and Superior, Wisconsin. The researchers address issues of social capital as an endogenous determinant of self-reported health using instrumental variables probit estimation.
Description	The instrument was a 25-minute phone survey with 66 questions that measure social capital in 11 dimensions. This study used the following variables from the SCBS: • **Social trust** (same scale used in Subramanian et al., 2002): Five questions were used to construct the social trust index, one question on general trust and four others on degrees of trustworthiness with specific types of people (see Table 6.9 for details). • **Associational involvement:** counts the number of groups the respondent has been involved with in the past 12 months prior to the interview. The index consists of 17 questions that cover the following types of groups: religious, sports, neighborhood association, ethnic group, political groups, hobby, garden, singing group, and so forth. • **Organized group interaction:** constructed from three questions: the number of times in the past 12 months the respondent (1) attended any public meeting in which town or school affairs were discussed, (2) attended a club meeting, and (3) attended a celebration, parade, or local sports or art event. • **Information social interaction:** based on the answers to five questions about socializing over the past 12 months. Respondents were asked how many times they had done things such as "had friends over to their home," "socialized with coworkers outside of work," and "hung out with friends at park, shopping mall or public place." • **Social support:** based on answers to four questions, including how often they communicate with immediate neighbors, how many close friends they have, and number of times they have been in the home of a neighbor. • **Volunteer activity:** continuous variable, asked respondents how many times they volunteered in the past 12 months prior to the survey. This study used the same self-rated health measure as the studies in Tables 6.9 and 6.10.
Sample	• Data were analyzed from the 2006 Social Capital Community Survey of Duluth, Minnesota, and Superior, Wisconsin. • A random telephone survey was conducted with 500 households in mid-April 2006. The response rate was 24.5%, which was higher than the national rate of the SCCS.
Scoring	See description of measures above for scoring (where applicable and available).
Assessment	No information was provided on reliability.
Language	English
Contact	Jennifer Schultz Department of Economics University of Minnesota 165 SBE, 412 Library Drive Duluth, MN 55812 (218) 726-6695 Email: jschultz@d.umn.edu

TABLE 6.12 ■ Social Capital Measure From the PHDCN	
Primary Reference	Chaskin, R. J., Goerge, R. M., Skyles, A., & Guiltinan, S. (2006). Measuring social capital: An exploration in community–research partnership. *Journal of Community Psychology, 34*(4), 489–514. doi:10.1002/jcop.20111
Purpose	The study tests practical options for community-based organizations to measure aspects of social capital at the neighborhood level. The study used findings from PHDCN to provide comparison measures to test strategic nonrandom approaches to neighborhood survey administration.
Description	• The community survey was developed in consultation with community partners, building from items contained in the PHDCN community survey. • The survey combined the following three scales of social capital from the PHDCN, available on the PHDCN website (see below): **Collective efficacy:** This measure includes two subscales: **social cohesion and trust** and **informal social control,** described in **Table 6.6** in this chapter. (Sampson et al., 1997) **Neighborhood activism (5 items):** Respondents were asked the following: "Sometimes people in a neighborhood do things to take care of a local problem or to make the neighborhood a better place to live. Please tell me if you have been involved in the following activities in your neighborhood in the past year. Have you (or any member of your household) . . . " (Sample items include:) • Talked to a person or group causing a problem in the neighborhood • Attended a meeting of a neighborhood group about a problem • Gotten together with neighbors to do something about a problem in the neighborhood **Voluntary association (6 items):** asking the respondent whether he or she or a member of his or her household belongs to local organizations, such as • A church or other religious organization • A neighborhood watch program • A business or civic group • A local political organization
Sample	• Strategic convenience sampling of two communities, North Lawndale and Southwest Side in Chicago, was used to deliberately select sites based on local knowledge of community characteristics and dynamics. • Sample size: 355 people in North Lawndale and 248 in Southwest Side. • The researchers used the PNDCN definition of Chicago neighborhoods and information on neighborhood definitions from the community organizations they worked with on the study. • Researchers compared characteristics of respondents with data from the U.S Census and also the findings of the PHDCN Survey.
Scoring	No information is provided on scoring.
Assessment	• Collective efficacy ◦ Social cohesion: $\alpha = .72$ ◦ Informal social control: $\alpha = .80$ • Neighborhood activism: $\alpha = .77$ • Voluntary association: $\alpha = .43$

(*Continued*)

TABLE 6.12 ■ (Continued)	
Language	English
Contact	Robert J. Chaskin University of Chicago 1313 East Sixtieth Street Chicago, IL 60637 Email: rjc3@uchicago.org
Website	For more information see: Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods: http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/PHDCN/instruments.jsp.

TABLE 6.13 ■ Extended Social Capital Measure From the PHDCN	
Primary Reference	Sampson, R., & Graif, C. (2009). Neighborhood social capital as differential social organization: Resident and leadership dimensions. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *52*, 1579–1605.
Purpose	The study treats social capital as a multidimensional phenomenon along which neighborhoods are differentially organized. The authors use data from the PHDCN to examine the dimensionality and structural predictors of neighborhood social organization.
Description	This measure includes the following dimensions using data from the PHDCN, which is available online (see website below): • **Neighborhood collective efficacy** (same as Table 6.6 in this chapter) • **Neighborhood activism** (same as Table 6.12) • **Moral/legal cynicism (5 items):** based on responses to five statements, on a scale from 1 to 4, with a high value signifying greater cynicism: ○ Laws were made to be broken. ○ Fighting between friends or within families is nobody else's business. • **Intergenerational closure (5 items):** Respondents were asked about their level of agreement (on a scale from 1, *disagree strongly*, to 4, *agree strongly*) to five statements such as the following: ○ There are adults in this neighborhood that children can look up to. ○ Parents in this neighborhood know their children's friends. • **Reciprocal exchange (5 items):** based on responses to five statements (on a scale from 1, *never*, to 4, *often*), such as ○ When a neighbor is not at home or on vacation, how often do you and other neighbors watch over their property? ○ How often do you and other people in this neighborhood visit in each other's homes or on the street? • **Density of local friend/kinship ties:** based on responses to two questions (on a scale from 1, *none*, to 5, *ten or more*): ○ Not counting those who live with you, how many of your relatives or in-laws live in your neighborhood? ○ How many friends do you have who live in your neighborhood? • **Organizational participation:** (same as voluntary association in Table 6.12) • **Tolerance of deviance (4 items):** asks respondents four questions on a scale from *not at all wrong* to *very wrong*, including ○ How wrong is it for teenagers around 13 years of age to smoke cigarettes? ○ How about getting into fistfights? (The same four questions are repeated for "teenagers around 19 years of age.") • **Police efficacy (5 items):** asks respondents about their level of agreement to five statements, such as ○ The police in this neighborhood are responsive to local issues. ○ The police are not doing a good job in preventing crime in this neighborhood.

(*Continued*)

TABLE 6.13 ■ (Continued)	
	○ Three single item measures were also included the following: Anonymity: how easy is it to spot strangers in the neighborhood; Attachment to neighborhood: how much respondents like living in the neighborhood: Intentions to move: how likely respondents will move in the next five years.
	Please see the article and the PHDCN website for all of the items for each of the above measures.
Sample	• The study uses data from the PHDCN. In 1995 the community survey was conducted; 8,782 Chicago residents representing all Chicago community areas were interviewed in their homes. • The survey consisted of three stages. At Stage 1, city blocks were sampled within each neighborhood cluster; Stage 2, dwelling units were sampled within blocks; Stage 3, one adult resident (18 or older) was sampled within each selected dwelling unit. • The final response rate was 75%. • A key informant (KI) survey was also conducted.
Scoring	Information on scoring is provided in the preceding section where available.
Assessment	• Collective efficacy: α = .85 and intraclass correlation of .20 ○ Social cohesion: community-area reliability of .92 ○ Social control: community-area reliability of .87 • Neighborhood activism: aggregate reliability was .66 • Moral/legal cynicism: community-level reliability was .73 • Intergenerational closure: community-level reliability was .87 • Reciprocal exchange: community-level reliability was .82 • Density of local friend/kinship ties: α = .79 • Tolerance of deviance: between community level reliabilities were .67 for questions asked about 13-year-olds and .78 for questions about 19-year-olds • Police efficacy: α = .92.
Language	English
Contact	Robert J. Sampson, PhD Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology Harvard University William James Hall 33 Kirkland St. Cambridge, MA 02138 Email: rsampson@wjh.harvard.edu
Website	For more information see the study website: Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods. http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/PHDCN/instruments.jsp.

TABLE 6.14 ■ Measure of Social Capital in Rural Communities	
Primary Reference	Chazdon, S., Allen, R. P., Horntvedt, J., & Scheffert, D. R. (2013). *Developing and validating University of Minnesota extension's social capital model and survey.* Regents of the University of Minnesota: University of Minnesota Extension.
Purpose	The goal of this study was to develop and validate a conceptual framework for measuring social capital by pilot testing the measure using a participatory approach in rural communities.
Description	The scale includes 34 items, broken down into seven subscales measuring the conceptualized dimensions of social capital. Sample items are provided below (please see primary and secondary sources for all items and additional information). **Bonding trust (4 items)** • I trust my family members who live nearby. • I trust the people on my block who live nearby. **Bonding engagement (4 items)** • When my family or I need extra help with daily tasks (like shopping, childcare, meals, rides to school or appointments), there are people who live nearby whom we can count on for support. • In the area where I live, I help people out with daily tasks (like helping with chores or homework, giving rides, or other small acts of kindness), and I can count on them to help me. **Bridging trust (4 items)** • I trust people new to the area. • I trust people who don't share my cultural, racial, or ethnic background. **Bridging engagement (6 items)** • In the past month, how often have you spent at least fifteen minutes interacting directly with people of a different racial or ethnic background from you? • In the past month, how often have you spent at least fifteen minutes interacting directly with people whose first language is different from yours? **Linking trust (5 items)** • I trust the people who own and work at the places where I shop. • I trust people in local law enforcement. • I trust the hospitals and health clinics in my community. **Linking Engagement (7 items).** Asks respondents the number times they: • Attended any public meeting in which there was discussion of school or other local affairs? • Hosted or visited the home of a nonfamily member you consider to be a community leader? • Tried to get your local government to pay attention to something that concerned you? **Efficacy (4 items):** • I believe I can make a difference by helping out my circle of closest friends. • I believe I can make a difference helping newcomers get involved in groups or organizations.

(*Continued*)

TABLE 6.14 ■ (Continued)	
Sample	• The survey was administered in four communities, three of which were rural and one that was located close to a major urban area. A project team of volunteers was organized to conduct the survey in each community. • The sample was a nonrandom convenience sample in order to capture a representative cross section of the community, including civic and community organizations, private businesses, schools, food shelves, churches, community service agencies, libraries, and coffee shops. • Total sample: 1,293 adults; ranging from 168 to 465 in each community. • Sample characteristics: Compared to the populations in each community, the samples were disproportionately female, well educated, and wealthy.
Scoring	See primary and secondary references
Assessment	Subscale reliabilities • Bonding trust: α = 0.669 • Bonding engagement: α = 0.764 • Bridging trust: α = 0.808 • Bridging engagement: α = 0.800 • Linking trust: α = 0.786 • Linking engagement: α = 0.788 • Efficacy: α = 0.835
Related References	• Chazdon, S., Allen, R. P., Horntvedt, J., & Scheffert, D. R. (2013). *Methodological appendix: Steps before confirmatory factor analysis.* Regents of the University of Minnesota: University of Minnesota Extension. • Enfield, R. P., & Nathaniel, K. C. (2013). Social capital: Its constructs and survey development. *New Directions for Youth Development, 138,* 15–30.
Language	English
Contact	Scott Chazdon, Evaluation & Research Specialist, Community Vitality University of Minnesota Extension 454 Coffey Hall, 1420 Eckles Avenue Saint Paul, MN 55108 Email: schazdon@umn.edu Phone: 612-624-0982 Cell Phone: 612-251-2178 Fax: 612-625-1955
Website	For the full report on this measure please see http://www.extension.umn.edu/community/research/reports/docs/Validating-Social-Capital-Report.pdf For the methodological appendix listed above, please see http://www.extension.umn.edu/community/research/reports/docs/Validating-Social-Capital-Appendix.pdf

REFERENCES

Ahern, J., & Galea, S. (2011). Collective efficacy and major depression in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 173*(12), 1453–1462.

Ahlbrandt, R. S. (1984). *Neighborhoods, people and communities.* New York: Plenum.

Alaimo, K., Reischl, T.M., & Allen, J. O. (2010). Community gardening, neighborhood meetings, and social capital. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(4), 497–514.

Baroni, G. (1979). Forward. In R. S. Ahlbrandt & J. V. Cunningham, *A new public policy for neighborhood preservation* (pp. vii–ix). New York: Praeger.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments in nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Browning, C. R., & Cagney, K. A. (2002). Neighborhood structural disadvantage, collective efficacy, and self-rated physical health in an urban setting. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 43*(4), 383–399.

Buckner, J. C. (1988). The development of an instrument to measure neighborhood cohesion. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 16,* 771–791.

Chaskin, R. J., Goerge, R. M., Skyles, A., & Guiltinan, S. (2006). Measuring social capital: An exploration in community–research partnership. *Journal of Community Psychology, 34*(4), 489–514.

Chavis, D. M., Hogge, J. H., McMillan, D. W., & Wandersman, A. (1986). Sense of community through Brunswick's lens: A first look. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 24–40.

Chavis, D. M., Lee, K. S., & Acosta, J. (2008). *The sense of community (SCI) revised: The reliability and validity of the SCI-2.* Paper presented at the 2nd International Community Psychology Conference, Lisboa, Portugal.

Chavis, D. M., & Pretty, G. M. H. (1999). Sense of community: Advances in measurement and application. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27,* 635–642.

Chazdon, S., Allen, R. P., Horntvedt, J., & Scheffert, D. R. (2013). *Developing and validating University of Minnesota Extension's Social Capital Model and Survey*: Regents of the University of Minnesota: University of Minnesota Extension. Retrieved from http://www.extension.umn.edu/community/research/reports/docs/Validating-Social-Capital-Report.pdf

Chipuer, H. M., & Pretty, G. M. H. (1999). A Review of the Sense of Community Index: Current uses, factor structure, reliability, and further development. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*(6), 643–658.

Cohen, D. A., Finch, B. K., Bower, A., & Sastry, N. (2006). Collective efficacy and obesity: The potential influence of social factors on health. *Social Science & Medicine, 62*(3), 769–778.

Cohen, D. A., Inagami, S., & Finch, B. (2008). The built environment and collective efficacy. *Health and Place, 14*(2), 198–208.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94,* S95–S120.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Enfield, R. P., & Nathaniel, K. C. (2013). Social capital: Its constructs and survey development. *New Directions for Youth Development, 138,* 15–30.

Glynn, T. J. (1981). Psychological sense of community: Measurement and application. *Human Relations, 34,* 780–818.

Greenberg, S. W., Rohe, W. M., & Williams, J. R. (1982). *Safe and secure neighborhoods: Physical characteristics and informal territorial control in high and low crime neighborhoods.* Washington, DC: Community Crime Prevention Division, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

Grootaert, C., & Van Bastelaer, T. (2001). *Understanding and measuring social capital: A synthesis of findings from the social capital initiative.* Social capital initiative working paper

Number 24. Washington, DC: Social Development Department, World Bank.

Grootaert, C, Narayan, D, Nyhan-Jones, V., & Woodcock, M. (2004). *Measuring social capital: An integrated questionnaire* (No. 18). Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/15033/281100PAPER0Measuring0social0capital.pdf? sequence=1

Henry, D., Gorman-Smith, D., Schoeny, M., & Tolan, P. (2014). "Neighborhood Matters": Assessment of neighborhood social processes. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 54,* 187–204.

Hughey, J., Speer, P. W., & Peterson, N. A. (1999). Sense of community in community organizations: Structure and evidence of validity. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 97–113.

John F. Kennedy School of Government: Harvard University. (2000). *Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey: Executive summary.* The Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America Project. Retrieved from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/results.html

Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. (2000). Social cohesion, social capital, and health. In L. F. Berkman & I. Kawachi (Eds.), *Social epidemiology.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kawachi, I., Kennedy, B. P., Lochner, K., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (1997). Social capital, income inequality and mortality. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*, 1491–1498.

Kim, D., Subramanian, S. V., & Kawachi, I. (2006). Bonding versus bridging social capital and their association with self-rated health: A multilevel analysis of 40 U.S. communities. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 60*(2), 116–122.

Lochner, K. A., Kawachi, I., Brennan, R. T., & Buka, S. L. (2003). Social capital and neighborhood mortality rates in Chicago. *Social Science & Medicine, 56,* 1797–1805.

Long, D. A., & Perkins, D. D. (2003). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Sense of Community Index and development of a Brief SCI. *Journal of Community Psychology, 31*, 279–296.

McCarthy, M. E., Pretty, G. M., & Catano, V. (1990). Psychological sense of community and student burnout. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*(3), 211–216.

McMillan, D., & Chavis, D. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 14*, 6–23.

Monette, D. R., Sullivan, R. J., DeJong, C. R. (2005). *Applied social research: A tool for the human services* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Narayan, D., & Cassidy, M.F. (2001). A dimensional approach to measuring social capital: Development and validation of a social capital inventory. *Current Sociology, 49*(2), 59–102.

Perkins, D. D., Florin, P., Rich, R. C., Wandersman, A., & Chavis, D. M. (1990). Participation and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*(1), 83–115.

Peterson, N. A., Speer, P. W., & Hughey, J. (2006). Measuring sense of community: A methodological interpretation of the factor structure debate. *Journal of Community Psychology, 34*(4), 453–469.

Peterson, N. A., Speer, P. W., & McMillan, D. W. (2008). Validation of A brief sense of community scale: Confirmation of the principal theory of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(1), 61–73.

Pretty, G. M. (1990). Relating psychological sense of community to social climate characteristics. *Journal of Community Psychology, 18*(1), 60–65.

Prezza, M., Pacilli, M. G., Barbaranelli, C., & Zampatti, E. (2009). The MTSOCS: A multidimensional sense of community scale for local communities. *Journal of Community Psychology, 37*(3), 305–326.

Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (n.d.). *About.* Retrieved from http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/PHDCN/about.jsp

Putnam, R. D. (1993). What makes democracy work? *National Civic Review, 82*(2), 101–107.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sampson, R. J., & Graif, C. (2009). Neighborhood social capital as differential social orga-

nization: Resident and leadership dimensions. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *52*(11), 1579–1605.

Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S.W. (1999). Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology, 105*(3), 603–651.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277,* 918–924.

Sarason, S. B. (1974). *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schultz, J., O'Brien, M. A., & Tadesse, B. (2008). Social capital and self-rated health: Results from the US 2006 social capital survey of one community. *Social Science and Medicine, 67*(4)*,* 606–617.

Subramanian, S. V., Kim, D. J., & Kawachi, I. (2002). Social trust and self-rated health in US communities: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 79*(4), S21–S34).

Veenstra, G. (2001). Social capital and health. *ISUMA: Canadian Journal of Policy Research, 2,* 72–81.

Wandersman, A., & Florin, P. (2000). Citizen participation and community organizations. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Whitman, M. M. (2012). Community connections: Social capital and community success. *Sociological Forum, 27*(2), 441–457.