

**Feelings About Neighborhood**  
Grade 11/Year 12  
Fast Track Project Technical Report  
Jennifer Godwin and John Klaric  
August 17, 2006

**Table of Contents**

- I. Scale Description
- II. Report Sample
- III. Scaling
- IV. Between Group Differences
- V. Recommendations for Use
- VI. Item Means and Standard Deviations

**Appendix**

SAS scoring program

**Citation**

*Instrument*

Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, & Earls F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-924.

*Report*

Godwin, J. and Klaric, J. (2006). Feelings About Neighborhood (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org/>

**Data Sources**

Raw: C12AZ

Scored: FAN12

**I. Scale Description**

*Feelings About Neighborhood* is a questionnaire developed for Fast Track that was modified from one described by Sampson et al. (1997) to measure “informal social control” and “social cohesion and trust.” These two dimensions were later collapsed into a single latent construct (“Collective Efficacy”). In the Sampson et al. (1997) paper, five items measured “informal social control” by obtaining ratings of the likelihood of neighbor intervention under specific circumstances; items were rated on a 5-point scale. In the Fast Track study, “informal social control” was measured by three of these items rated on a 4-point scale (Very Unlikely, Unlikely, Likely, Very Likely). Scenarios included estimates of neighbor intervention when youth in the neighborhood skipped school, spray-painted graffiti on local buildings, or showed disrespect to others. “Social cohesion and trust” in the Sampson et al. (1997) paper was again measured by five items on a 5-point scale; in the Fast Track study, items were reworded and a 5-point scale was used (Strong Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree). Two items were also added (“People in your neighborhood watch out for one another” and “Given the opportunity, you would like to move out of this neighborhood”).

**II. Report Sample**

The analyses in this report were conducted with the control sample (n=155) and the normative sample (n=387, N=463 with overlap) from the first cohort during the eleventh year of the study. Overall, 120 records were missing the whole measure. Forty-four respondents were missing from the control sample (6 from Durham, 17 from Nashville, 9 from Pennsylvania, and 12 from Washington) and 106 respondents

were missing from the normative sample (15 from Durham, 39 from Nashville, 23 from Pennsylvania, and 29 from Washington).

### III. Scaling

A total scale score was developed after reverse-scoring item 10 (“Given the opportunity, you would like to move out of this neighborhood”). Since items measuring “informal social control” and “social cohesion and trust” were rated utilizing different scales, ratings were standardized ( $M=0.0$ ,  $SD=1.0$ ). Item z-scores were averaged to yield a score reflecting Collective Efficacy.

The internal consistency of the Collective Efficacy scale score was measured with Cronbach’s coefficient alpha.

Cronbach's Alpha for Scales			
Variable	Label	Normative	High Risk Control
FAN12CEF	Collective Efficacy-FAN-Year 12	0.80	0.84

The Collective Efficacy scale from the *Feelings About Neighborhood* measure shows adequate internal consistency across both control and normative samples.

### IV. Between Group Differences

As shown in the table below, the Collective Efficacy scores do not differ significantly between the normative and control samples.

Comparison of Means for Normative and Control for Continuous Scales and Items								
Variable	Label	Normative		Control		DF	t Value	Pr >  t
		Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
FAN12CEF	Collective Efficacy-FAN-Year 12	0.07	0.55	0.01	0.66	187	-0.86	0.3921

### V. Recommendations for Use

Although there is a slight negative skew in the normative and control samples, the Collective Efficacy scale is fairly normally distributed.

## VI. Item Means and Standard Deviations

Descriptive Statistics - Normative Sample						
Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
C12AZ5	You have a sense of belonging to your neighborhood.	280	3.51	0.93	1.00	5.00
C12AZ6	You feel loyal to the people in your neighborhood.	280	3.45	0.88	1.00	5.00
C12AZ7	You would be willing to work together with others on something to improve your neighborhood.	280	3.85	0.86	1.00	5.00
C12AZ8	You like to think of yourself as similar to the people who live in this neighborhood.	280	3.31	0.96	1.00	5.00
C12AZ9	Overall, you are happy living in this neighborhood.	280	3.80	0.94	1.00	5.00
C12AZ10	Given the opportunity, you would like to move out of this neighborhood.	280	3.13	1.20	1.00	5.00
C12AZ11	People in your neighborhood look out for each other.	280	3.57	0.97	1.00	5.00
C12AZ12	If a group of kids in your neighborhood were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something about it?	280	2.36	0.97	1.00	4.00
C12AZ13	If some kids were spray-painting graffiti on a local house or building, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something about it?	280	3.24	0.89	1.00	4.00
C12AZ14	If a kid was showing disrespect to an adult, how likely is it that people in your neighborhood would scold or reprimand him or her?	280	2.66	0.90	1.00	4.00
FAN12CEF	Collective Efficacy-FAN-Year 12	280	0.07	0.56	-1.72	1.48

Descriptive Statistics - High Risk Control Sample						
Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
C12AZ5	You have a sense of belonging to your neighborhood.	111	3.43	1.07	1.00	5.00
C12AZ6	You feel loyal to the people in your neighborhood.	111	3.38	0.96	1.00	5.00
C12AZ7	You would be willing to work together with others on something to improve your neighborhood.	111	3.78	0.97	1.00	5.00
C12AZ8	You like to think of yourself as similar to the people who live in this neighborhood.	111	3.17	1.02	1.00	5.00
C12AZ9	Overall, you are happy living in this neighborhood.	111	3.74	1.00	1.00	5.00
C12AZ10	Given the opportunity, you would like to move out of this neighborhood.	111	3.29	1.34	1.00	5.00
C12AZ11	People in your neighborhood look out for each other.	111	3.57	1.12	1.00	5.00

Descriptive Statistics - High Risk Control Sample						
Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
C12AZ12	If a group of kids in your neighborhood were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something about it?	111	2.23	0.94	1.00	4.00
C12AZ13	If some kids were spray-painting graffiti on a local house or building, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something about it?	111	3.20	0.98	1.00	4.00
C12AZ14	If a kid was showing disrespect to an adult, how likely is it that people in your neighborhood would scold or reprimand him or her?	111	2.77	1.00	1.00	4.00
FAN12CEF	Collective Efficacy-FAN-Year 12	111	0.01	0.66	-1.89	1.16