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| **Domain:** | Social Environments |
| **Measure:** | Neighborhood Collective Efficacy - Community Cohesion and Informal Social Control |
| **Definition:** | This measure is a questionnaire to assess the mutual trust and shared expectations among neighbors. |
| **Purpose:** | This measure can be used to determine how the neighborhood or community context modifies disease risk, prevalence, and severity. Collective efficacy includes the following: social cohesion, the relationships between neighbors and informal social control, community pressure for norms and laws, and other factors that can influence health-related behaviors or access to health care. Research has documented effects of neighborhood collective efficacy on obesity in children and adolescents (Cohen, Finch, Bower, & Sastry, 2006), sexual risk behavior among adolescents (Browning et al., 2008), and adult asthma (Cagney and Browning, 2007; Cagney et al., 2007), among others. |
| **Essential PhenX Measures:** | Current AgeGender |
| **Related PhenX Measures:** | Healthy Food EnvironmentsNeighborhood Safety |
| **Collections:** |  |
| **Keywords:** | Social Environment, collective efficacy, social cohesion, informal social control, neighborhood, community, Social Environments |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Protocol Release Date:** | October 8, 2010 |
| **PhenX Protocol Name:** | Neighborhood Collective Efficacy - Community Cohesion and Informal Social Control |
| **Protocol Name from Source:** | This section will be completed when reviewed by an Expert Review Panel. |
| **Description:** | This protocol includes 10 Likert-style, interviewer-administered questions from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). The Social Cohesion and Informal Social Control subscales include five items each. |
| **Specific Instructions:** | None |
| **Protocol:** | **Community Cohesion**Now I'm going to read some statements about things that people in your neighborhood may or may not do.For each of these statements, please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree.1. This is a close-knit neighborhood.[ ] strongly agree[ ] agree[ ] disagree[ ] strongly disagree2. People around here are willing to help their neighbors.[ ] strongly agree[ ] agree[ ] disagree[ ] strongly disagree3. People in this neighborhood generally don't get along with each other.[ ] strongly agree[ ] agree[ ] disagree[ ] strongly disagree4. People in this neighborhood do not share the same values.[ ] strongly agree[ ] agree[ ] disagree[ ] strongly disagree5. People in this neighborhood can be trusted.[ ] strongly agree[ ] agree[ ] disagree[ ] strongly disagree**Informal Social Control**For each of the following, please tell me if it is very likely, likely, unlikely or very unlikely that people in your neighborhood would act in the following manner.6. If a group of neighborhood children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, how likely is that your neighbors would do something about it?[ ] very likely[ ] likely[ ] unlikely[ ] very unlikely7. If some children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something about it?[ ] very likely[ ] likely[ ] unlikely[ ] very unlikely8. If a child was showing disrespect to an adult, how likely is it that people in your neighborhood would scold that child?[ ] very likely[ ] likely[ ] unlikely[ ] very unlikely9. If there was a fight in front of your house and someone was being beaten or threatened, how likely is it that your neighbors would break it up?[ ] very likely[ ] likely[ ] unlikely[ ] very unlikely10. Suppose that because of budget cuts the fire station closest to your home was going to be closed down by the city. How likely is it that neighborhood residents would organize to try to do something to keep the fire station open?[ ] very likely[ ] likely[ ] unlikely[ ] very unlikely |
| **Selection Rationale:** | The collective efficacy scale from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods was selected because it is a widely used, validated protocol with available recent research documenting its validity, reliability, and association with multiple health-related outcomes. Items from the collective efficacy scale have been incorporated into major studies of neighborhoods and health, including the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Survey (Cohen, Finch, Bower, & Sastry, 2006; Cohen, Inagami, & Finch, 2007) and the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (Burdette et al., 2006). |
| **Source:** | National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD), Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN). Community Survey 1994–1995. Questions 11b, 11e, 11f, 11k, 11m (questions 1-5) and 12a, 12b, 12c, 12e, 12f (questions 6-10). |
| **Life Stage:** | Adult |
| **Language of source:** | English, Spanish, Polish |
| **Participant:** | Adults, aged 18 years and older; children younger than 18 years old, by parent report. |
| **Personnel and Training Required:** | The interviewer must be trained to conduct personal interviews with individuals from the general population. The interviewer must be trained and found to be competent (i.e., tested by an expert) at the completion of personal interviews. |
| **Equipment Needs:** | Either a paper-and-pencil or computer-assisted instrument may be used. If a computer-assisted instrument is used, computer software may be necessary to develop the instrument. The interviewer will require a laptop computer/handheld computer to administer a computer-assisted questionnaire. |
| **Standards:** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **Name** | **ID** | **Source** |
| Common Data Element (CDE) | Social Environment Neighborhood Efficacy Assessment Description Text | 3139335 | [CDE Browser](https://cdebrowser.nci.nih.gov/CDEBrowser/search?elementDetails=9&FirstTimer=0&PageId=ElementDetailsGroup&publicId=3139335&version=1.0) |
| Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes (LOINC) | Neighborhood - comm cohesion proto | 63026-9 | [LOINC](http://s.details.loinc.org/LOINC/63026-9.html?sections=Web) |

 |
| **General references:** | Browning, C. R., Burrington, L. A., Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2008). Neighborhood structural inequality, collective efficacy, and sexual risk behavior among urban youth. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 49,* 269–285.Burdette, H. L., Wadden, T. A., & Whitaker, R. C. (2006.) Neighborhood safety, collective efficacy, and obesity in women with young children. *Obesity, 14,* 518–525.Cagney, K. A., & Browning, C. R. (2007). Exploring neighborhood-level variation in asthma and other respiratory diseases. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 19,* 229–236.Cagney, K. A., Browning, C. R., & Wallace, D. M. (2007). The Latino Paradox in Neighborhood Context: The Case of Asthma and Other Respiratory Conditions." American Journal of Public Health 97: 919-925.Cohen, D., Finch, B., Bower, A., & Sastry, N. (2006). Collective efficacy and obesity: The potential influence of social factors on health. *Social Science and Medicine, 62,* 769–778. Cohen, D. A., Inagami, S., & Finch, B. (2007). The built environment and collective efficacy. *Health and Place, 14,* 198–208.Raudenbush, S. W. (2003). The quantitative assessment of neighborhood social environments. In I. Kawachi & L. F. Berkman (Eds.), *Neighborhoods and health* (pp. 112–131). New York: Oxford University Press.Raudenbush, S. W., & Sampson, R. J. (1999). Ecometrics: Toward a science of assessing ecological settings, with application to the systematic social observation of neighborhoods. *Sociological Methodology, 29,* 1–41.Sampson, R. J. (2003). Neighborhood-level context and health: Lessons from sociology. In I. Kawachi and L. F. Berkman (Eds.), *Neighborhoods and health* (pp. 132–146). New York: Oxford University Press.Sampson, R. J., & Wikstrom, P.-O. H. (2008). The social order of violence in Chicago and Stockholm neighborhoods: A comparative inquiry. In I. Shapiro, S. Kalyvas, & T. Masoud (Eds.), *Order, conflict, and violence* (pp. 97–119). New York: Cambridge University Press. |
| **Mode of Administration:** | Interviewer-administered questionnaire |
| **Derived Variables:** | None |
| **Requirements:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Requirement Category** | **Required** |
| Major equipment | No |
| Specialized training | No |
| Specialized requirements for biospecimen collection | No |
| Average time of greater than 15 minutes in an unaffected individual | No |

 |
| **Process and Review:** | This section will be completed when reviewed by an Expert Review Panel. |