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Abstract

Student neighborhoods near urban university campuses are unique neighborhood settings. Social problems resulting from thousands of college aged students living in dense enclaves in neighborhoods near university campuses are numerous. Rioting, high crime, negative neighbor relations and poor living conditions are examples of the many problems of the student neighborhood. As universities develop and implement strategies to address the challenges of the campus proximal student neighborhood, research must guide those practices.

This study examines the effects of a specific community building program sponsored by a large mid-western research university located in a large metropolitan setting on social outcomes in the densely populated student neighborhood adjacent to its campus. The community building program is designed by Student Life staff to strengthen social ties and community in the student neighborhood.

Social disorganization theory and sociological approaches to the study of neighborhoods are used to theorize important exogenous and intervening independent variables relevant to the student neighborhood context. These independent variables include demographic structures such as race, gender, age and socioeconomic status along with intervening structures such as friendship density, network associations (university versus neighborhood) and participation in university sponsored programs to build community. Dependent variables include social ties, sense of community, perceptions of
informal social control and neighborhood satisfaction. Regression analysis is used to
determine the extent to which participation in university community building programs
predicts the outcome variables.

The study concludes that participation in university sponsored programs has
effects on social ties and perception of informal social control in the student
neighborhood. Gender and race were found to negatively predict social ties formation.
The study also concludes that living in neighborhoods where community building
programs take place, regardless of the amount of an individual’s participation, predicts
sense of community. Neighborhood satisfaction is not predicted by demographic
variables or participation in the university sponsored community building program.
Results also indicate that when a student identifies as a resident of specific street, or as a
member of the community at-large, they tend to have greater sense of community. The
discussion offers propositions for higher education administrators who are tasked with
creating policy and practical interventions aimed at addressing the unique challenges with
which these neighborhoods confront the institution.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The neighborhoods surrounding the university campus are unique communities. Large urban universities attract thousands of students, faculty and staff, and with that comes a host of distinct residential neighborhood features and social dynamics that surround these institutions. Such neighborhoods have existed, in some form, dating back to the medieval universities in Bologna, Paris and Oxford. The universities of medieval Europe thrived where regions could sustain concentrated numbers of people by way of plentiful supply of food, accommodations, recreation, services and the like (Hyde, 1988). Universities or guilds were open to all who sought education, all people of all places and all classes could attend these new institutions of learning, and so growing towns proved to be the site where they prospered (Hyde, 1988). It is quite clear that universities could not have existed were it not for emergent urban scenes to support a large populace of both students and scholars. Today, university towns and university proximal neighborhoods exist in many forms around the world. Some towns exist almost entirely because of the university they host (Gumprecht, 2008). In these scenarios the university or college is the most important economic engine in the community, and community and business functions in the town organize themselves around that key function. Other universities in
larger urban settings may not be the single largest contributor to the economic and social foundation of a city, but the influence of the university within those urban settings cannot be disregarded. As a major employer and attractor of thousands of faculty, staff and students, universities have substantial impacts on these cities and more so within the neighborhood communities immediately adjacent to them. It is often within these near neighborhoods that the social and economic impacts of the university as dominant function are the greatest. These impacts are not always positive, however, particularly in the case of neighborhoods near the campus which are heavily populated with the students who attend the institution. Neighborhoods dense with student residents often present numerous challenges to colleges and universities, communities and cities.

Social disorganization in student neighborhoods that surround university campuses presents many challenges for communities and contributes greatly to the instability of these neighborhoods and their transient student residents. The nature of these neighborhoods, where students live as co-residents in that they live beside each other and other more permanent residents rather than living with each other as an interconnected neighborhood, are often marked by poor cohesion and a limited sense of community. These neighborhoods are not self-regulating, and as a consequence are dependent upon and vulnerable to external influences and need formal social controls such as the control of police intervention. Disorganized communities such as these student neighborhoods are faced with many risks that affect every day living including higher crime rates, poor property maintenance, and unenthusiastic neighbor relations. Specifically in student neighborhoods celebratory disturbances are perhaps the most
sensational eruptions of social disorganization that occur and have compelled universities to respond. Though riotous behavior has been experienced at many universities, an example from the Ohio State University is illustrative.

In the early morning hours of Sunday, November 24, 2002 the streets of the University District of Columbus, Ohio were glowing. The streets were glowing not with the pride that one would assume following the Ohio State University football team sealing a National Championship berth: defeating the University of Michigan in an exciting 14-9 close to an undefeated season. The streets were glowing with over 100 fires, set by rowdy, drunken partiers. Crowds continued to grow and moved in mob fashion form street to street flipping and burning vehicles, lighting garbage dumpsters and vandalizing property. “As many as 250 law-enforcement officers broke up crowds with tear gas, pepper spray and rubber bullets” (Dutton, 2002). The next day, Karen A. Holbrook, then president of The Ohio State University, issued a statement in response to the off-campus riots, “…allow me to apologize on behalf of The Ohio State University community for last night’s actions. I express apologies to our city, to those who suffered property damage, and to those fans and supporters who did celebrate in an appropriate manner.” She concluded “… it is sad to note that last night’s behavior is not unique to Ohio State. There were similar events at other campuses in the hours following major games yesterday afternoon. And, indeed, this is a national and ongoing problem…what the ultimate answer might be, I am not certain. But it is my view, that such behaviors must be addressed on many fronts by university presidents, parents, and by the students themselves.” (Holbrook, 2002). Jerry M. Lewis, a Kent State sociologist, in an
interview with The Columbus Dispatch said, “what happened on High Street contributes to the decline in the image of academe. I believe there is a direct connection between these riots and the fact that 49 of 50 states have lowered their higher-education budgets” (Brinkley-Rogers, 2002). Andy Topetzes, senior in political science and criminology at the time, wrote in an editorial in The Lantern, the Ohio State University school newspaper, the morning after the riots: “I make a heartfelt plea and a stern unyielding demand to the immature delinquents routinely causing violent, criminal disturbances on our campus: please stop doing this or leave our campus. The vast majority of students don’t want you here. Quite frankly, you don’t deserve to be a student at this school, enjoying the benefits of a large, urban, internationally prestigious institution” (Topetzes, 2002).

Though the Ohio State off-campus riots may be a compelling and pinnacle symbol of a disorganized student neighborhood, there are every day, more mundane examples of disorganization as well. Following are excerpts from a letter sent to University President E. Gordon Gee on July 21, 2009, by a resident of the neighborhood near the Ohio State campus. Speaking to photographs enclosed with the letter which show a vandalized magnolia tree in the front yard of a neighbor the community member writes:

“[The photographs] are evidence of a really revolting event that took place earlier this month. It is just a particularly vivid example of what we owner-occupants, who try to live in the OSU neighborhood, are up against these days… The scene is in the front yard of a family of a faculty member who lives on Frambes near
Indianola. If they solve the problem by clearing out—as so often happens—that will leave another fine home to fall into the hands of the landlords and their student renters who now rule our neighborhood.” The writer concludes, “one might sum up the matter this way: If a half century ago, the university, prospective student renters, landlords, and the City of Columbus had all sat down together and asked themselves, ‘How can we really make a thorough mess of this place?’ they couldn’t have done a better job.”

Mike Linnemann, a student at the University of Minnesota, wrote the following response in the Minnesota Daily expressing his frustration to an irate homeowner and university staff member living in or near the predominantly student inhabited neighborhoods near the University of Minnesota. The resident earlier wrote a letter to the editor titled “A Call to Halt Rowdy Behavior!” After citing examples of how students and permanent residents have worked together to solve off-campus issues, Linnemann writes:

“How about actually working with students? How about building bridges for once? Is that so hard? So, I ask you, sir, where should we live? There are thousands of us. What do you expect? You hate the noise, but I bet you love the ridiculously low cost of living adjacent to a campus, the cultural offerings and, clearly, the employment available. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. To gain one thing you have to sacrifice another. You chose to live here, knowing full well of your neighbors. If you would reach out to us on National Night Out… to
eat ice cream with us and discuss, it would be fruitful; this rant unfortunately is not.” (retrieved from mndaily.com on July, 29 2009)

What do we currently know about the social context of these neighborhoods and communities? The answer, to this question unfortunately is: very little! The research that has been done in the area of student neighborhoods tends to be descriptive and often anecdotal. It has been established in the literature that neighborhoods surrounding colleges and universities seem to have similar evolutionary trajectories, they tend to host dense enclaves of young and transient student (and non-student) residents; they are residentially segregated; housing conditions tend to be poor, (Gumprecht, 2008); crime and victimization are often higher in these neighborhoods compared to more typical neighborhoods and it can be inferred that student neighborhoods are socially disorganized. Interactions between student renters and owner occupants are not often positive. It has been shown in the literature and media that student and neighboring non-student residents often spar over students’ parties, noise, social behavior, and the manner in which these young, short-term residents steward the physical environment of the neighborhood. Permanent residents of the community often look to the university to control student behavior and intervene to discipline student residents for disruptions to the social milieu of the community. The quality of neighbor relations between universities and their neighboring communities often depend upon the extent to which student residents and permanent residents get along as well as permanent resident perceptions of the university’s interest in and intention to keep student renters “in-line.”
As illustrated in the example from Ohio State, a behavioral challenge that has
taxed the patience and resources of college administrators in the student neighborhood is
rowdy partying and rioting. This challenge pre-dates the sports culture of today's student
body. During the 1960’s, a period of time colloquially referred to by university
administrators as the “riot era,” many campus communities experienced riots in the form
of student political protests over the Vietnam war and rebellion against university “in
loco parentis” policies. Those riots and disturbances often occurred both on campus and
off campus, and focused on demonstrating against university administrators, police and
other authority figures.

Contemporary college campus rioting and disturbances more often occur off-
campus, as opposed to on, and are likely to not be political or idealistic in nature. These
violent disturbances tend to be fueled by substantial alcohol consumption and excitement
over local college sports outcomes. Students host large off-campus house parties where
alcohol freely flows and the parties grow too large and become unmanageable by the
hosts. Excitement for sports wins, typically football and basketball team victories, often
contributes to emotional outbursts by drunken students and their guests who begin
celebrating in a mob fashion. The crowds wind out of control and begin vandalizing
property, setting fires, and throwing beer bottles and other debris at police who attempt to
quell the rowdy behavior. Police are often forced to break up these uncontrollable
crowds by donning riot gear, shields and helmets, and firing tear gas, rubber bullets and
“knee knockers” into the growing crowds of drunken disorderly partiers. Typically these
disturbances end with arrests, injuries and much property damage. Needless to say, these
incidents cause enormous public relations problems for universities and hefty expenses for municipalities and local property owners. Cities, community residents and property managers expect the university to intervene to control student riots and partying and to keep student residential neighborhoods calm. Prospective students and their parents often have concerns for the type of environment they or their students will be introduced to as a student at a university where these disturbances occur. Many blame the lack of community cohesion in the highly transient student neighborhood for creating an environment where incidents so extreme could occur. Universities across the country have taken steps to intervene to control these behaviors through a host of community building strategies and many have been successful. But, since little is empirically known about the social context of student neighborhoods strategies to intervene and build community in these neighborhoods constitute a well meant “shot in the dark.”

Public relations, however, is not the only problem to confront universities as a result of students living in large numbers in adjacent neighborhoods. In addition to rioting, rowdy parties and strained student and permanent resident relations, crime has been identified by some researchers and law enforcement agencies as also being a problem in student dense neighborhoods. Some speculate that these neighborhoods are primed for criminal activity because of their structural characteristics: high transience, thin friendship networks, proximity to low income housing areas, lack of participation, absence of family influences, decreased informal social controls (Gumprecht, 2009; Hubbard, 2008; Kenyon, 1997; Nichols, 1990) and a taxed housing stock and physical environment which was not originally intended or built to support such dense residential
enclaves (Hammer, 2006). Young residents with little experience living independently, focused on socializing and attending classes, combined with housing infrastructure often converted from single family occupancy to multiple occupancy housing, and predatory criminals who take up residence not far from student neighborhoods where rent is cheap all contribute to higher rates of automobile related crimes, burglaries and thefts, assaults and robbery (Hammer, 2006). Crime in similar settings is also linked to a host of other social structures such as weak social ties, little to no community cohesion and low incidents of informal social controls.

The influence living environments have on student success is well documented in the higher education literature. Higher education researchers have illustrated this link in the campus residential setting. Though not as well documented, the impact these neighborhood factors have on student educational outcomes must be great. If we believe the residential environment impacts learning, it seems reasonable to expect that the off-campus environment also impacts the learning outcomes of students who live there. Student learning is not the only outcome the off-campus social environment impacts. Researchers such as Pace & Stern (1958), Walsh (1973), Pace & Baird (1966), and Moos (1979) have established the concept of environmental press on college campuses. Environmental press can be said to move community participants toward intended outcomes such as scholarship, community, morale, teaching, climate, and vocation sourced in the cultures produced by faculty, administrators, and students. Characteristics of social life on a college campus can create a “play-work press,” for instance, which is a cultural emphasis toward partying, drinking and rowdy behavior. Such press seems to be
spawned in these student neighborhoods which are dense with college students and relatively free of university authority and adult supervision. All too often, because of the social behaviors in university proximal neighborhood settings institutions earn the inauspicious informal label: “party school.” These labels, although informal, have clear suggestion with regard to public perceptions of institutional quality. There should be little argument that there is a need to address off-campus student communities and move toward intentional interventions to build more positive living environments in university proximal student neighborhoods.

Characteristics of student neighborhoods are of concern to university administrators who are in a position to support the success of university students, maintain a reputable image, and remain a ‘good neighbor’ to the community as well as to community leaders seeking to maintain a positive quality of life. Where should this work start? The very first strategy could be to work to build stronger, more educated, and self-regulating communities among student residents of these campus proximal neighborhoods. If this core approach to building community were successful, theory suggests other positive community outcomes may result. Kuh et al (2005) in their study of educationally effective institutions suggest that off-campus surroundings can contribute to student success when student neighborhoods were fully engaged as educational settings, made to contribute to a sense of educational “place” for students and faculty and fashioned in ways such that the institutions learning purposes are achieved. It is important to note, however, that although the primary focus as a higher education community is that of learning and success for students, the off-campus community
remains a neighborhood setting and warrants study in a specialized manner. This most appropriate approach has roots in the sociological study of neighborhoods and suggests that the facts of the neighborhood social setting must be established in order to understand it. When the social setting of a neighborhood is understood, researchers may begin to connect those social realities to intervention strategies and research to establish how that context impacts the learning outcomes of the students who live there.

**A New Kind of Neighborhood**

“Student co-resident neighborhood” is a term I coined to describe an off-campus neighborhood setting where large numbers of university students reside. They do so in a co-resident manner in that they live side-by-side each other, sharing the same neighborhood space, but they do not live in an engaged, cohesive, cooperative and interrelated manner. Other terms to describe these neighborhoods and the process whereby neighborhoods near universities become dense with student enclaves include student ghetto, studentified neighborhood, studentification, student wards, and student communities (Gumprecht, 2008; Hubbard, 2008; Kenyon, 1997; Nichols, 1990). But, studies of student neighborhoods are lacking in the higher education and sociological literature and, although geographers have been more apt to examine them, there is no distinct set of terminology to distinguish the matter. Until now, the research that addresses student neighborhoods focuses on the geography of student enclaves, policy, permanent resident reactions to “studentification” and ancillary economic or cultural effects of student populations on towns, for example, from the presence of alcohol outlets and other businesses that cater to the student populace. An in-depth investigation of the
students themselves has been largely absent from the emerging conversation about
student co-resident neighborhoods near urban university campuses. The lack of attention
paid to the student experience in these neighborhoods is related, in part, to how these
communities are labeled and to the extent that naming is related to understanding.
Perceiving these student neighborhoods as ‘co-resident’, implying relationships marked
by limited cohesion, cooperation, and community, helps to exemplify the student
experience and to set apart these neighborhoods from other transient, poor communities.

Research Questions

The goal of this research study is to investigate the effects of a community
building program which is sponsored by the university and intended to increase social
ities and support, sense of community and the self-regulatory capacity of the student
neighborhoods near The Ohio State University. The effects of these interventions will be
measured by their influence on neighborhood outcomes which are presented in the
neighborhood literature and will be discussed in further depth in the next chapter. In
order to do this adequately, we must first accept that community building activities in the
student populated neighborhood function in a contextual neighborhood environment and
not in a carefully controlled experimental setting. We must gain a better understanding
of this context and the variables of interest to neighborhood research if we are to
determine if interventions have an effect on the neighborhood.

Five research questions are proposed for this study:
Research Question 1: What are the resident structural and demographic characteristics of the student co-resident neighborhood?

Research Question 2: How can social ties and density of acquaintanceships in the co-resident environment be characterized?

Research Question 3: What are the individual amounts of participation in university sponsored community building intervention programs which are aimed at increasing social ties, social control and sense of community?

Research Question 4: What is the extent of social ties, perceived informal social control, sense of community and neighborhood satisfaction in the co-resident neighborhood?

Research Question 5: To what extent do resident characteristics and amounts of participation in university sponsored community building interventions predict social ties, and to what extent do resident and neighborhood characteristics, amounts of participation in university sponsored community building interventions and social ties predict sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, perception of informal social controls?

The first research question pertains to the structural characteristics of the student co-resident neighborhood. Researchers have implied that these neighborhoods are socially disorganized, and there is anecdotal evidence to suggest this proposition is true. Further, previous discussions of the problems of student neighborhoods have not made use of contemporary social disorganization theory, which appears to be a compelling and generative framework for understanding these problems. Therefore variables of social
disorganization theory will be utilized to create a snap-shot of a student co-resident neighborhood setting. Such variables include transience, rates of neighboring, friendship density, existing ties that result from exogenous community experiences, and demographic homogeneity that does not strengthen organization but thwarts social ties across heterogeneous demographics.

The second research question attempts to characterize social ties and density of acquaintanceships in the co-resident environment. One important goal in creating a description of the student co-resident neighborhood and determining whether intervention programs have an impact, will be to describe the extent to which neighbor acquaintanceship and social ties exist in these neighborhood settings and if interventions influence these acquaintanceships and social ties. Theory suggests that higher density of acquaintanceship will lead to positive community outcomes and many intervention strategies focus on, among other objectives, increasing neighbor acquaintanceship. Social ties go beyond acquaintanceships and describes meaningful interactions that take place between neighbors.

The third research question seeks to measure the individual amount of participation in university sponsored community building intervention programs. These community building intervention strategies are growing in popularity at universities across the country and the first step in assessing the constructive impacts they have upon sense of community within the student co-residential neighborhood will be to determine which residents participate and to what extent they do so. Next it will need to be
determined how these interventions contribute to community outcomes considering the greater collection of the variables proposed to influence neighborhood outcomes.

The fourth research question aims at assessing the amounts of perceived informal social control, sense of community, and neighborhood satisfaction in the student co-resident neighborhood. These are the outcomes which the community building interventions will be tested to influence. The measures of these community outcomes will be utilized along with the findings of the third research question to answer the fifth, and culminating research question. The culminating research question seeks to estimate the relationships between participation in university sponsored community building interventions and social ties, sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, and perception of informal social controls taking into account resident and neighborhood characteristics. The proposition is that neighborhood and community characteristics and university community building programs influence social ties, these variables all influence sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction. Therefore, social ties is considered first as an outcome variable for participation, neighborhood and resident characteristics, and subsequently as a predictor, along with participation, neighborhood and resident characteristics, for sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction.

To answer the research questions proposed, this study first focuses upon the social context of the student co-resident neighborhood in the urban university setting. Social disorganization has been linked to a variety of social ills and is manifest in higher crime
rates. Sociologists who study neighborhoods and social disorganization have established a host of constructs to be investigated when researching organization of communities and these researchers have postulated that social disorganization in neighborhoods stems from upon several exogenous sources and intervening constructs. Among the exogenous sources, social disorganization researchers point to resident mobility, heterogeneity of the population (demographics), socioeconomic status, urbanization and family disruption. Intervening constructs of social disorganization include delinquency, diminished friendship networks, lack of informal social controls and diminished social or community cohesion and trust. Social disorganization theory suggests that many of these exogenous sources, as demonstrated by Shaw & McKay in their studies of the 1920s immigrant neighborhoods of Chicago, thwart neighborhood cohesion, which then have direct effect on crime rates. More contemporary social disorganization researchers, such as Sampson and Groves (1984) have also shown that intervening structures such as density of friendships and acquaintanceships has significant inverse effects on crime. Data to be gathered will illustrate indicators classically associated with social disorganization, but will also be relevant to the student co-resident case: resident mobility, demographic homogeneity, socio-economic indicators and friendship networks.

Social ties in community settings have also been linked to positive community outcomes, particularly lessened crime rates though the development of informal social controls (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). But the influence of social ties on crime rates via informal social control is a complicated matter, and hence will be studied as a matter of the influence of social ties on perception of informal social controls this study. Social
ties are connected to informal social controls which are theorized to increase resource potential, or mutual feelings of obligation, trust and norms. Resource potential then increases social capital which in turn can have positive influences on purposive action, or, a “willingness to act” in matters of community. If a willingness to act is increased, theory suggests informal social controls will also increase. Therefore, in this study, social ties will be related to perceptions of informal social controls among the residents of this neighborhood setting.

Finally, the study will examine these and other questions in the context of the comparative efficacy of an intentional intervention designed to build social ties, increase community cohesion, and establish a greater sense of community in the student co-resident setting. The Community Ambassadors program at The Ohio State University is an intentional intervention program designed to promote such self-regulation among student co-residents; it is a relatively small low budget program hastily designed in the year after the 2002 Ohio State riots but carefully shaped in the years since to build community and cohesion in the off-campus neighborhood. The basic question to be answered here is: Do intervention strategies such as this one have an influence upon this sense of community, perception of informal social control and neighborhood satisfaction? The study questions will be structured as an outcome assessment across the student co-resident neighborhood where some students participated to varying degrees in this program while others did not. If it can be shown that university interventions, such as the Community Ambassadors program, aimed at improving the social dimension of student off-campus communities have impacts on these social outcomes, then it is reasonable to
suggest that interventions such as this one should be included in the common variety of approaches universities take to improve the neighborhoods around their campuses.

This study will examine the student neighborhoods near the campus of The Ohio State University. It is intended to constitute the first of several studies which together will address the entirety of the student neighborhood milieu. Because the proportion of students and permanent residents is not a constant across all student neighborhood settings, gaining insight into neighborhoods composed of all students and other neighborhoods with differing numbers of permanent residents will be necessary. The current study focuses on the all student scenario. Future studies following the current study will sample neighborhoods with increasing numbers of permanent residents and decreasing numbers of student residents to determine the more specific effects of residential profile mix. The current study utilizes quantitative methods to explore social variables and their relationships; survey methods will be employed and regression analysis will be performed to determine the predictors of sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction and informal social controls in the student co-resident neighborhood context.

Significance

Recognizing that the field of higher education lacks the theoretical tools to properly approach the matter of urban neighborhood settings, this study will resemble a sociological study of a neighborhood or community setting. Principles of human ecology and social disorganization theory undergird the study’s rationale and methodology. This approach is joined by higher education philosophies which, once the study is completed,
will offer propositions for higher education administrators who are tasked with creating policy and practical interventions aimed at addressing the unique challenges with which these neighborhoods confront the institution. Because all communities have different types of residences, dwellers, and subcultures, sociologists who study neighborhoods have developed a continuum of neighborhood types. Along this taxonomy of neighborhoods various resident demographics, housing type, mobility patterns and organizational participation can be found. Student co-resident neighborhoods are not uncommon community phenomena in the United States and abroad. Yet, they have not found a place in the taxonomy of neighborhood types. Placing them along this taxonomy will also contribute a new perspective to the rather extensive literature on neighborhoods and communities in the sociological sciences.

The human ecological perspective and, specifically, social disorganization theory both offer a promising conceptual framework upon which a study of student co-resident neighborhoods can be based. Human ecology is concerned with the social organization of communities and considers the environmental antecedents to behavior. Concepts traditionally included in the construct of social disorganization theory are demonstrated in the university neighborhood setting: residential mobility, weak social networks, lack of informal social control and higher than average crime rates. Contemporary social disorganization researchers have suggested that the role of neighborhood culture, community cohesion, sense of community, municipal and city politics, and external policy influence should also be considered in social disorganization research. I am particularly interested in sense of community (Cantillon, Davidson & Schweitzer, 2003;
Chavis, Hogge & McMillan, 1986; McMillan & Chavis, 1986), informal social controls (Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls, 1997), neighborhood cohesion (Buckner, 1988) and social ties. Studying these constructs, as opposed to only the classic exogenous structures of social disorganization (see Sampson and Groves, 1989), I aim to provide a contemporary understanding of social organization in the student community context.

Completing a social description of a student neighborhood presents at least two benefits. First it will provide an original description of the social context of a student neighborhood. Chatterton (1999), Gumprecht (2008), Hubbard (2008), Kenyon (1997), Nichols (1990) and Smith (2008) are researchers who have produced works which add to an understanding of the student neighborhood phenomena. Those works, for the most part have been descriptive, data analyzed tends to be U.S. Census information or data collected from only the permanent residents of these neighborhoods. The literature is absent any empirical study of the social structure of the student residents themselves.

A second benefit this work will provide will be important insights into a challenge that has beleaguered university administrators for decades: how to better think about and intervene to change the social context of the transient and often unruly neighborhoods of students which surround the urban university campus. The answers to these important social questions will help university administrators develop policy and interventions to address social, and sometimes political problems presented by these dense student communities, provide better quality learning environments for students and potentially develop or design the built community in such a way that learning outcomes for off-campus students can be optimally achieved.
This study will also investigate the impacts direct social organizing strategies have on social outcomes such as perceived informal social controls, sense of community and neighborhood satisfaction in the student neighborhood. Universities have taken many approaches to working with and improving the neighborhoods that surround them. Some universities prepare and engage students as volunteers, service learners and interns to help local agencies and community service groups realize their goals. Other institutions invest in property redevelopment and urban revitalization. Faculty have partnered with communities to offer expertise and assist with studying community challenges such as parking, refuse collection, human services and education needs. I suspect that although many of these approaches are helping to strengthen university and community relationships, they are having only incidental and non-direct influences upon the social milieu of the student co-resident neighborhood. Student Affairs departments have developed strategies for directly working with student residents in the co-resident neighborhood setting. The Ohio State University, Colorado State University, University of Florida, Ohio University, University of Connecticut, University of Colorado, Texas A&M, and Michigan State University are a few institutions that have developed student Community Ambassador or Community Liaison positions. Students in these paid positions are trained as community organizers and community builders. They tend to plan events and offer resources to community members that focus around addressing many of the social ills experienced in these neighborhoods. By comparing social disorganization indicators and sense of community outcomes between student communities which both have and do not have student ambassadors or liaisons we will be
able to see if these programs are having impacts. The data may also present critical program efficacy information that can be shared with administrators who are challenged to use resources in efficient and effective ways to engage student communities off-campus.

The findings of this study promise much heuristic value. As universities develop living learning models, off-campus living learning communities can be developed to address not only the social needs of students but also the needs of the community which hosts the university. Future studies will illustrate how the findings of this study change as students move into neighborhoods with higher owner-occupied housing ratios. Those findings will have implications for university community relations.

This discussion opened with several examples of both university, student and community resident frustrations with the social circumstances of the student neighborhoods near urban university campuses. One permanent resident concluded his remarks: “If a half century ago, the university, prospective student renters, landlords, and the City of Columbus had all sat down together and asked themselves, ‘How can we really make a thorough mess of this place?’ they couldn’t have done a better job.” If indeed the student co-resident environment is a “mess,” it will be helpful to determine the nature of that mess, if our goal is to clean it up. This study offers an evaluation of a small, but potentially effective program that was designed to clean up the so-called "mess."
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Student neighborhoods can be problematic social settings and a dilemma for communities and universities. How best to address this dilemma is not completely understood, but some universities have created community building programs which are aimed at strengthening social ties in the predominantly student co-resident communities near their campuses. In order to determine if these programs are impacting the co-resident community in meaningful ways, variables which are important to describing neighborhood troubles and strengths should first be considered. Next, outcomes used to measure positive social outcomes must also be identified. In the context of these variables the student co-resident neighborhood will be examined and interventions to impact the social milieu will be tested.

The theory and research that support this study are drawn from the fields of social disorganization, neighborhood research, human ecology, and an emerging literature describing the university proximal, densely student populated neighborhood (i.e., the student co-resident neighborhood). Higher education researchers generally have not studied the student neighborhood phenomenon but geographers and social scientists have begun to look at the student neighborhood, and sociologists have developed a robust
literature on neighborhood social disorganization; therefore theories from the social sciences form the bases of the conceptual framework for this study. The dynamics and variables from these fields have been integrated into a model of student co-resident neighborhoods (Figure 2.1), which help map the key elements that are incorporated into the survey that is described in Chapter 3.

**Socially Disorganized Neighborhoods**

Human Ecology, advanced in the social sciences by McKenzie, Park and Quin and refined by Haley (1952; 1986), offers a macro-level sociological approach to the study of human organization, and provides a useful framework upon which a theory of student neighborhoods can be developed (Hawley, 1968; Hawley, 1986; Berry & Kasarda 1977). The central problem of contemporary ecological inquiry is “understanding how a population organizes itself in adapting to a constantly changing yet restricting environment” (Berry & Kasarda, 1977, p. 12). Therefore, “the question to be asked in the ecological approach is not ‘why do people do what they do?’ but rather ‘under what conditions do given actions occur?’” (Hawley, 1986, p. 6). One must study the conditions, or structural factors present in the occasion of the behavior of interest (Hawley, 1986). Social disorganization theory, an ecologically derived theory, focuses upon the structural aspects of a community and how those aspects lead to a host of behaviors which leave communities vulnerable to delinquency and crime. For this reason, the construct of social disorganization seems to be appropriate for examining the context of student residents in the university proximal neighborhood.
Several principles form the basis of human ecological theory, some of which are relevant to this neighborhood study. Taylor (1997) has taken macro-ecological principles and suggested analogs for each on the micro-ecological, or neighborhood level. For instance, environment and environmental differentiation are critical aspects of macro human ecological theory. Considered at the neighborhood level, street blocks are the neighborhood analog to environment (Taylor, 1997). “Residents are more influenced by on-block events than they are off-block events” (p. 134), and not all blocks are the same. Different street blocks have different characteristics (Taylor, 1997); hence, neighborhood environments are differentiated from one another just as environments are on the macro-level. Another principle of human ecology is interdependence. In the case of neighborhoods, life on one block will be affected by the characteristics of surrounding blocks (Taylor, 1997) and in the university proximal neighborhood, the university itself exerts much influence upon the life of the neighborhood around it creating a unique micro-ecology. It has also been found that lower socioeconomic conditions tend to exist around university proximal neighborhoods (Wechsler, et al, 2002) and these adjacent block characteristics also have impacts on crime rates in the student neighborhoods (Gumprecht, 2008; Nichols, 1990; Wechsler, et al, 2002).

“Classic” social disorganization theory is presented by Sampson & Groves (1989) as having three intervening constructs and five exogenous sources. Intervening constructs are those which occur between members of the community and are phenomena that exist within the community. Exogenous sources of social disorganization are externally caused, exist outside of the community and do not result from interactions from within
the community. Intervening constructs include local friendship networks, local participation in formal or voluntary organizations and local forms of informal social controls (Sampson & Groves 1989). Exogenous sources of social disorganization are: residential mobility, socioeconomic status, ethnic heterogeneity, family disruption, urbanization (Sampson & Groves 1989). However, contemporary social disorganization research has made substantive and methodological gains by focusing more broadly upon social processes in neighborhoods. In the 1990s neighborhood research had taken a turn away from the “more static features of sociodemographic composition” (Sampson, Morenoff & Gannon-Rowley, 2002, p. 447).

These classic and more contemporary intervening and exogenous variables are used to form the model of the student co-resident neighborhood that drives the empirical questions of the current study. The extent to which these variables function to create a model for understanding the student co-resident neighborhood is depicted in Figure 2.1. The goal of this study is to test a community building intervention strategy for efficacy. To do this, the study will first characterize the student co-resident neighborhood, attempt to validate the relationships presented in this model and provide understanding for the more proximal associations between these factors. Later research can explore the relationships of these functions to the more distal outcomes of improved neighborhood civility, improved university and community relationships and more engaged and successful college students.
Figure 2.1: Student Neighborhood Variable Relationships

- Resident Demographics (gender, age, race, SES)
- Participation (University Community Building Programs)
- Transience
  - Length of Residence
- Social Ties
  - Social Ties
  - Sense of Community
  - Informal Social Controls
  - Neighborhood Satisfaction
- Network Identification (neighborhood vs University/community associations)
- Resident Demographics (gender, age, race, SES)
- Density of Acquaintanceship
- Happier permanent residents & improved community/university relationships
- Improved neighborhood civility
- Engaged and more successful college students
I will examine the research addressing relevant social disorganization variables in order to construct a model for the social context of the student co-resident neighborhood that would influence a neighborhood intervention. It is important to keep in mind that all of these variables are tightly interwoven and discussion of one variable independent of the others is somewhat artificial. And so an attempt to unravel each variable and discuss the questions each raises is done carefully and with acknowledgement that each is part of a social system. The first set of variables which theory suggests is important in the context of a neighborhood are exogenous demographic structures: residential mobility, socioeconomic status, heterogeneity, and urbanization (Sampson & Groves 1989). Demographic heterogeneity (race/ethnicity, age and gender), socioeconomic status and resident mobility are all variables which will be examined in this study as predictors of the outcome variables.

**Demographic Heterogeneity**

Theory suggests that ethnic heterogeneity can contribute to negative community outcomes such as increased delinquency because ethnic heterogeneity thwarts neighbor’s ability to come to consensus. “Heterogeneity impedes communication and patterns of interaction” (Sampson & Groves, 1989, p. 781) and can escalate conflict. Thrasher’s gang theory suggests that ethnic heterogeneity leads to a “hangout” culture among youth of similar ethnic background (Shaw and McKay, 1969). These hangout groups begin to engage in delinquency and eventually evolve into gangs. More recent studies show that racial composition does not seem to apply independent influences on attachment and involvement within a neighborhood (Taylor, 1996). Could it be possible that the
demographic grouping behavior suggested by Thrasher combined with the communication disruptions resulting from heterogeneity could offer an intervention opportunity? In other words, if we could capitalize on student’s similarities we might be able to use their age homogeneity as a tool for quickly inducing community cohesion? Age has been shown in several studies to be positively associated with community participation and community efficacy (Sampson, et al, 1997; Woldoff, 2002; Duncan, Duncan, Okut, Styrcher & Hix-Small, 2003). Although students are young, it is possible that the relative homogeneity of the student co-resident neighborhood is one potential positive characteristic when seeking intervention strategies that might work to create closer social bonds in this community.

**Socioeconomic Status**

Social disorganization theory suggests that low-socioeconomic-status communities will suffer from a weaker organizational base than higher-status communities. Socioeconomic demographics are related to participation in that higher status residents (particularly residents with more education) tend to be more involved in formal community organizations than lower status residents (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Taylor, 1996; Woldoff, 2002). Stability (which the student co-resident neighborhood lacks) has a greater impact on response to disorder than does class, however (Taylor, 1996). But, when controlled for stability, residents who report more education seem also to report stronger attachment and more social involvement in the community (Taylor, 1996). The meaning of this is clear: although stability has a greater impact upon disorder, class has a strong impact upon attachment and involvement. A more clear
description of students’ socioeconomic status is needed; this might include socioeconomic background and current, albeit temporary, socioeconomic realities as college students live. Current information about socioeconomic status and university proximal neighborhoods is not encouraging. It has been found that income was significantly lower among residents living within a mile of a college as compared to residents living more than a mile from a college (Wechsler, Lee, Hall, Wagenaar & Lee, 2002). Lower socioeconomic neighborhoods near university proximal neighborhoods might not only generate lower involvement and attachment but could also provide plenty of perpetrators who victimize the young, naive and materially well-to-do student population of student neighborhoods (Nichols, 1990; Gumprecht, 2008).

**Resident Mobility**

Population change, resident mobility or length of residence is closely associated with friendship networks (Sampson, 1988; Sampson 1991). One of the variables most closely related to local social ties is length of residence within the community (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974). Contact theory suggests that the longer one lives in a neighborhood the more likely that individual will be to meet and get to know others who also live in that neighborhood (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). “Increasing shared length of residence in the neighborhood will increase the likelihood of neighborhood tie formation” (Hipp & Perin, 2009, p. 18). Student co-resident neighborhoods are referred to as “transient” because students move into the community and typically stay in a rental unit for no more than a year or two before graduating or moving to other temporary housing accommodations. Residential mobility disrupts a community’s network of social
relations and operates as a barrier to the development of extensive friendship networks, kinship bonds and local associational ties (Sampson & Groves, 1989). Boomtowns offer extreme glimpses of how population change can affect a community social structure. “Boomtown” is a conventional term used in the sociological literature to describe communities that undergo extremely rapid population growth over a short period of time. In the boomtown scenario population increases are expected to reduce the density of acquaintanceships because the average length of residence across the community will drop. Freudenburg’s (1986) study of a boomtown in the Rocky Mountain region showed that increases in population did not increase the density of acquaintanceship; hence more people and higher density does not lead to more friendships particularly if the population changes rapidly. This finding is of importance to the student co-resident environment because researchers and census data have suggested that student co-resident neighborhoods tend to be densely populated but extremely transient. This density is in part because opportunistic landlords in these neighborhoods have converted single family homes for multiple residential use, sometimes tearing down single family homes and replacing them with multiple unit buildings leading to extremely dense neighborhoods and sometimes overcrowding (Nichols, 1990; Gumprecht, 2008). But the research on boomtowns suggests that this increase in density does not necessarily lead to social bond formation. It raises a key question; What other mechanisms might lead to increased friendship density or neighboring and social networks and can those mechanisms be replicated via community building intervention strategies?
From a human ecological perspective, in a system there is a hierarchically ordered set of functions; the apex is the key function (Hawley, 1986). The key function is “the activity which extracts the principal sustenance supply from local resources” (Hawley, 1968, p. 332) for a given community. The key function then is the principal economic and social driver in a city or community at large. In the case of the isolated university town, the university is the key function. The university assumes the role of a major industry within that community. The university sets the rhythm of life in the community for students and faculty that live there. However, in the university proximal urban neighborhood, there are a number of functions in the metropolitan area, the most influential of which, but certainly not independent influence, is the university. Principles of human ecology also include the idea of isomorphism which assumes that units within a complex system, exposed to the same environmental conditions or conditions that are mediated through the same key unit, will evolve to a similar form of organization (Hawley, 1968). The rhythm of transience and churn set in motion by the university may well be an acceptable cycle for conducting a quarterly learning environment, but it is not a great system for regulating the social context of a neighborhood community. Constant population change is a tremendous disruption in the university student neighborhood system and social ties formation. Population turnover in the community is the most prominent, but possibly not the only, element of change the university introduces to the community around it. Hawley’s (1969) ecological conceptualization of change allows for two types of systems: open and closed. Closed systems are those where the key function is the only gateway for environmental influences to enter the system. Open
systems allow for change elements to enter at any and/or several points. “Neighborhoods are best seen as open systems [which are] connected with and subject to the influence of other systems” (Chaskin, 1997, p. 539). In the university proximal urban neighborhood, the inputs of change are most likely numerous. Where the university provides little support to manage the change introduced to the neighborhood by its presence there are likely to be influences by a host of outside players such as the city or police, who are expected to provide formal controls, property managers who are poised to capitalize on the demand for housing in the overwhelmed community, and business activities such as alcohol and entertainment outlets, fast food vendors, convenience stores, music and video stores, who tend to profit from the youthful student residents. Some research has revealed details regarding these impacts, particularly from alcohol outlets, but more research would be helpful to reveal how the student co-resident neighborhood is impacted by these industries, and other, systems influences.

Neighborhoods can be described as behavioral settings which are termed neighborhood setting programs (Taylor, 1997). A setting program involves a standing pattern of behavior within the neighborhood. These standing behavioral patterns allow residents to come to know the routines of others in the neighborhood, allow individuals to take on roles within the community, provide opportunities for neighborhoods to develop and share norms and form rhythms of activities. Neighborhoods provide a “container” of sorts for behavior (Taylor, 1997) and transience disrupts the established behavioral patterns within that container. However abruptly the student co-resident neighborhood might change, population change is of a very specific kind. I have postulated in Chapter 1
that transience in the student co-resident neighborhood is cyclical, simultaneous and pervasive.

Neighborhood changes happen on a regular cycle, mirroring the academic calendar of the university, and nearly the entire community population turns over relatively at once. This has tremendous importance for the observed lack of social bonds and behavior patterns in the neighborhood. Taylor’s (1997) study of social order and disorder in neighborhoods supports the relevance this distinction: “If the turnover of the block takes place more gradually and with a lower rate of in-migration, then deviation countering mechanisms may be effective in assimilating newer participants into the setting pattern of behavior” (p. 143) When considered through the lenses of human ecology, population turnover can be considered as a form of competition and dominance as the population of renting students, with all of their social and behavioral characteristics, “invade” the established neighborhood setting pattern. This leads to change and an eventual succession pattern where the equilibrium of the neighborhood is constantly disrupted with in-migration of new students each year. The behavior setting pattern of the neighborhood repeatedly changes with this annual in-migration and new inconsistent or unpredictable setting patterns emerge each year. These erratic patterns compete against the setting patterns of permanent residents or the few longer term student residents, and dominate the social landscape of the neighborhood.

Long-term, non-student residents living in and near student neighborhoods have been shown to feel aggrieved because in many parts of their community “the restructuring of housing stock had produced a tenure profile dominated by private
renting, resulting in decreasing levels of owner-occupation” (Hubbard, 2008, p. 333). Tenure refers to the distinction between owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing units. High numbers of rental units often confirms equally high residential mobility. It has been shown that “residential tenure and homeownership promote collective efforts to maintain social control. Financial investment also provides homeowners with a vested interest in supporting the commonweal of neighborhood life” (Sampson et al., 1997, p. 919).

Neighborhood responses to disorder are related to local attachments and local involvement and all are influenced by neighborhood conditions. Stability has been found to be a primary indicator of levels of response to disorder (Taylor, 1996). Therefore, community stability has been shown to have clear impacts upon community attachment and responses to disorder in a neighborhood according to Taylor’s (1996) study of 66 randomly selected Baltimore, Maryland neighborhoods. In fact, stability in a neighborhood has been found to be a key condition for neighborhood viability having been found to be more important than class, (Taylor, 1996). For instance stability more than class seems to influence how residents react to crime by way of involvement. Length of shared residence among community members has been shown to increase neighborhood ties (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Hipp & Perrin, 2009).

**Urbanization**

Many college towns exist because a college is nearby. These college towns tend not to be large metropolitan or urban areas. The current study will investigate an urban neighborhood located near a metropolitan university. This presents a unique opportunity.
Researchers have demonstrated and confirmed the link between urbanization and low levels of community attachment. Urbanized communities are what Toennies (1887) first referred to as Gesellschaft; communities characterized by industrialization, high population density, and heterogeneity of inhabitants. Relationships in the urbanized milieu move away from communal attachments and toward associational based relationships (Wirth, 1938; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974). Studies have demonstrated that urbanization is associated with lower levels of collective attachment and sense of community (Sampson, 1988; Wilson & Baldassare, 1996). This might be the case because residential mobility and sparse friendship ties are important factors in the undermining of individual integration into local community (Sampson, 1988). Although urbanization itself is not an independent variable used to predict outcomes in this study, it is the milieu in which the entire study takes place. This study is based in an area characterized as urban in the US census data. The question of interest in the context of urbanization and the student co-resident neighborhood might differ from the traditional ‘does high density and low attachment mediate community attachment or sense of community?’ Although these are fine questions, a more important question might be ‘could the creation of community building interventions counteract the effects of urbanization and better integrate students into the dense student community despite the urban milieu?’

Next intervening constructs of social disorganization will be discussed. These include local friendship networks, participation and informal social controls (Sampson & Groves 1989).
Local Friendship Networks and Density of Acquaintanceships

Terms to describe the lack of social bonds in socially disorganized neighborhoods are numerous. Researchers refer to such bonds as friendship networks (Sampson & Groves, 1989), local social bonds (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974), neighbor relations (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990), local friendship ties (Sampson, 1988), density of acquaintanceships (Freudenburg, 1986), neighboring (Greider & Krannich, 1985; Skjæveland, Gärling & Mæland, 1996), social ties (Skjæveland, Gärling & Mæland, 1996), and localism (Wilson & Baldassare, 1996). Regardless of the terms used, social disorganization researchers are in agreement that the lack of these relationships leads to a host of social problems in a neighborhood setting. From a lack of ability to agree upon and solve community issues to the inability to form community attachments, social ties seems to be one of the most compelling features in studies of community outcomes and social organization.

Kasarda & Janowitz (1974) found that number of friends living in the community was the most important relationship which influenced social support and community sentiment. It is important to note neighboring may not always lead directly to social support (Greider & Krannich, 1985) and that in the diverse, urban environment, “individuals can [also] develop social support networks on the basis of common interests rather than traditional neighborhood-bounded criteria" (Greider & Krannich, 1985). In other words communities of interest can emerge as opposed to communities of place. This point is of relevance in the student co-resident neighborhood because the potential
presence of numerous networks of interest among student residents could mitigate the negative impact of low friendship networks in this neighborhood. It is possible that students form network based associations and abandon a traditional reliance based upon neighborhood relationship networks because they are just as or perhaps more functional for them. This possibility seems reasonable because students seem to be bound by a number of non-place and non-neighborhood based relationships (e.g. university clubs, academic majors, “Facebook” groups). Most of these networks are sourced in their association with the university, and hence might well achieve for them social support, via non-place networks, rather than by way of the place bound neighborhoods and communities where they actually live with other students. If this were the case, that students are more linked by their network associations, it could prove to be problematic in the neighborhood milieu because ties as the result of neighboring have been found to be positively related to community stability (Sampson, 1988). For these reasons network associations and density of acquaintanceships are both considered as independent variables in this study.

Further exacerbating the acquaintanceship density issues is the fact that students often live among older, non-student residents. Hipp & Perrin (2009) investigated the influence of social distance (defined as differences along economic, life course, cultural values and attitudes, gender and racial/ethnic categories) on neighborhood ties. They found that social distance had significant effects on the formation of neighborhood ties; highlighting particularly robust results for age differences. This is of particular interest in the matter of student co-resident neighborhoods because student and non-student
residents (who tend to be older) have historically feuded over many perceived violations of or expectations regarding social and environmental norms in these communities (Nichols, 1990; Kenyon, 1997; Gumprecht, 2008).

Social support is not the only expected outcome of high density of friendship networks. Crime and public safety issues are of extreme concern in student co-resident neighborhoods (Hammer, 2006; Nichols, 1990; Gumprecht, 2008). Crime rates, which are linked to many neighborhood structures, seem to be inversely related to the density of friendship networks within a community (Sampson & Groves, 1989). The quality of neighbor relations has also been linked to participation in the community, be it formal or informal organization. Participation is an important variable in social disorganization and will be discussed subsequently.

**Social Ties**

“Human interaction is the foundation of all communities” (Flora & Flora, 2008, p. 117). The idea of social ties has been a basic concept of sociological community theory starting with Tonnes’s Gemeinschaft and Durkheim’s mechanical solidarity, and moving through Redfield’s folk society and Parson’s diffuse relationships (Lyons, 1989). As mentioned earlier, friendships density does not necessarily lead directly to social support. Therefore, social ties is conceptualized as both an outcome of participation and a predictor variable for sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction. Social ties is presented as a concept which goes beyond acquaintanceship density and friendships and can be thought of as the result of a process involving community related interactions within the community as a social system (Lyon,
These social ties interactions are very much dependent upon how related to the neighborhood process they are, the degree to which the community members who are interacting can be identified as members of neighborhood itself, and the degree to which those members participate in the activity (Sutton & Kolaja, 1960). This ‘activity’ is conceptualized in this study as going beyond simply ‘being friends’ and considers interactions such as greeting neighbors, borrowing items from one another, doing favors and relying upon each other.

**Participation**

Participation typically refers to the degree to which a resident is involved in community processes or community affairs by means of formal or informal community groups. Typically local groups, such as community associations, city leagues, churches and schools provide the platforms upon which local citizens can participate in the community. Formal participation tends to refer to holding political office, participating as members of councils or neighborhood organizations, school boards and other similar civic associations. Informal participation can be in the form of organized social groups, church groups, local school groups or even casual neighboring which have the result of some type of community outcome. Participation is most influenced by length of residence (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Sampson, 1988). In other words, the longer a resident has lived in a given community the more likely they are to be involved, either formally or informally, with other community members. Communities with low rates of participation have been proven to also suffer from high rates of crime and delinquency (Sampson & Groves, 1989). It has been speculated that students who reside in the
student co-resident neighborhood have little to no levels of formal or informal participation in local community organizations. There is also strong interdependence between participation and sense of community (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). A sense of community has been shown to be a mediator in social disorganization (Cantillon et al, 2003). Furthermore, researchers have established that participation, sense of community and neighbor relations are positively and highly correlated and neighborhood environment and sense of community were found to have reciprocal effects upon participation (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990; Wilson & Baldassare, 1996).

The current study tests participation in community building programs facilitated by the university in the student neighborhood. If community building intervention strategies [developed by the Ohio State University] which increase informal participation can be shown to impact sense of community it should follow that the strategy can mediate environmental effects of disorganization in the neighborhood.

**Informal Social Control**

“The presence of social networks in a neighborhood helps regulate social behavior through normative mechanisms called informal social control” (Merry, 1987; Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). “People who know one another often work out interpersonal ‘agreements’ for achieving desired goals. The agreements are usually not formalized; often they are unspoken, and sometimes they may not even be consciously acknowledged” (Frudenburg, 1986, p. 31). These agreements are dependent upon resident stability in the neighborhood. When resident mobility is high, informal agreements and mutually agreed upon social expectations in a neighborhood are difficult
to develop. Where residents are neglectful of property and disinclined to watch out for one another community members appear less likely to feel attachment to the community and to neighbors (Woldoff, 2002); these are important antecedents to the development of social ties and friendship networks. “Neighborhood deterioration is [also] associated with residents who are less willing to intervene if they see a problem, who are more concerned about their safety, and who restrict their behavior, which can have negative effects on neighboring behaviors” (Taylor, 1996, p. 66). If the logic of “broken windows” theory (Wilson & Kelling, 1982) is correct, i.e. that unattended physical disorder and delinquent behaviors lead to the breakdown of community controls, then it is no surprise that Sampson et al (1997) found that measures of informal social control were a robust predictor of rates of violence. It has yet to be determined whether interventions aimed at increasing social ties in the student neighborhood could influence perceptions of social controls.

There are three types of social controls to be found in neighborhood settings: private social control, which consists of that which emerges from relationships with close friends and family; parochial social control, consisting of social controls exerted by acquaintanceships and neighbors; and public social control, which typically involves outside controls from local organizations and public service providers (Taylor, 1997; Hunter, 1985). The degree to which types of social controls operate in the student neighborhood have yet to be identified.

As mentioned earlier it is difficult to discuss these variables individually because their effects are so intricately interwoven in the community context. Cantillion et al
(2003) point out that the markers of disparity between neighborhoods in terms of social disorganization are not to be found in each of the variables taken individually (i.e. resident mobility, socioeconomic status, etc), but rather in the combination and confluence of these variables. Kubrin & Weitzer (2003) point out that several contemporary studies of neighborhood crime indicate that cultural factors combined with structural characteristics jointly shape neighborhood crime rates. From a contemporary social disorganization standpoint, therefore, there seems to be merit in pursuing some description of processes beyond neighborhood structure and delving into the sub-cultural frame within the student co-resident neighborhood.

The studies reviewed above have established important concepts in the sociological study of social disorganization. The problem with current literature on social disorganization and student neighborhoods is that, although much of it has been completed in urban neighborhoods, study samples represent more generalized or traditionally conceived urban communities, rather than the unique student demographics to be found in university proximal urban neighborhoods. Studying these variables in these contexts has shed tremendous light upon neighborhoods; extending these concepts to the student co-resident neighborhood should help us gain insight into those communities. Investigating these social dynamics with this methodology will fill the gaps that anecdotal information has created and reveal better questions upon which future research can be based.
Neighborhoods

The thread of the current discussion suggests that student co-resident neighborhoods are unique and so a brief exploration of neighborhood types currently recognized in the sociological literature is warranted. The city can be viewed as an economic milieu which residents divide into zones of usage and neighborhoods (Park, Burgess & McKenzie, 1925; Park & Burgess, 1967; Suttles, 1972). Research perspectives about cities evolved to the recognition of various residential types composed of specific residents, participation patterns and community perception. Sociologists have developed a continuum of neighborhood types which at present includes five: defended neighborhoods, defeated neighborhoods, the community of limited liability, organizationally dependent communities, and contrived communities. Table 2.1 presents these neighborhood types and describes their various characteristics.
Table 2.1: Neighborhood Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Type</th>
<th>Resident Type</th>
<th>Boundaries</th>
<th>Community Viewed as…</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Participation to what end…</th>
<th>Density of Acquaintanceships</th>
<th>Population Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defended</td>
<td>Ethnic enclave</td>
<td>Sharply defined from within</td>
<td>Identity component</td>
<td>High levels</td>
<td>Defense of group and boundaries</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>Transient underclass</td>
<td>Defined from outside; stigmatized</td>
<td>Shameful</td>
<td>Low levels/none</td>
<td>Individual protection</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Liability</td>
<td>Suburbanite</td>
<td>Amorphous/prescribed by issues or interests</td>
<td>Collection of interests; investment; amenity</td>
<td>Moderate levels and issues driven</td>
<td>Achieving a multiplicity of goals across a broad range of groups</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Predominantly Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizationally dependent</td>
<td>Gentrifiers</td>
<td>Modestly defined from within and outside</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Moderate levels threat driven</td>
<td>Resist perceived external threats</td>
<td>Moderate dependent upon robustness of organizations</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrived</td>
<td>Lifestyle resident</td>
<td>Sharply defined but created or designed</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Moderate &amp; instrumental representation</td>
<td>To achieve specific goals</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Co-resident</td>
<td>Student Co-Residents</td>
<td>sharply defined from outside</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>To achieve specific goals</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Defended Neighborhoods**

The defended neighborhood is inhabited by ethnic enclaves where “residents recognize sharp boundaries between themselves and adjacent residential groups, and general antipathy [exists] between neighborhoods” (Suttles, 1972, p. 25). The most salient characteristic of these neighborhoods are “their boundaries and the necessity of anyone who lives within those boundaries to assume a common residential identity” (Suttles, 1972, p. 27). From an ecological perspective there is much differentiation and little interdependence between adjacent neighborhood environments in the defended neighborhood scenario. The residents of the defended neighborhood are very cohesive and residence in the community is seen a matter of identity or membership; residents defend their neighborhood against all perceived threats from outside the boundaries. Such threats by exogenous sources to the community initiate a “common fate” state of mind among the co-residents. Protest groups, committees, landowner groups and the like “spring into existence, thrive, and then decline, as the issue which brought them into existence waxes and wanes” (Suttles, 1972, p. 36). The residents of the defended neighborhood share a common subculture which is unique to that area and understood to only those who reside there (Suttles, 1972, p. 36). Sense of community is very strong in the defended neighborhood and informal social controls dominate the behavioral setting pattern in the community.

**Defeated Neighborhoods**

The defeated neighborhood is in many ways the antithesis of the defended neighborhood (Suttles, 1972) and is where the underclass or chronically impoverished
Defeated neighborhoods are neighborhoods where little social control exists because there simply is not enough social capital to create social controls. Residents of defeated neighborhoods are unable to participate in their own governance because of extreme transience, low socioeconomic demographics and complete absence of collective efficacy (Suttles, 1972). Because these communities are unable to and do not defend themselves outside interests, such as industry and business, whose aims are “antithetical to the aims of any residential group,” are able to take full advantage in these areas (Suttles, 1972, p. 240). Participation is, for the most part, nonexistent because residents engage in personal defense strategies for survival, as opposed to collective community organization. This pattern of individual defense strategies can evolve to “mere violence, often that of young predators or that of individuals looking out solely for themselves” (Suttles, 1972, p. 240); everyone is a ‘stranger,’ distrust is great (Lofland, 1973) and the public sphere is unpredictable. Residents of the defeated neighborhood withdraw from each other out of defense or shame and external, formal social controls such as police or other outside agencies are all that constitute public social controls in the community. Boundaries are sharply drawn but are likely to be imposed from outside or neighboring blocks, most likely as a containment strategy and a way to disclaim the residents of these areas (Suttles, 1972). If interdependence exists it may actually be parasitic and be cause for negative outcomes for adjacent communities by creating higher crime rates in the neighboring blocks. This idea has been put forth in the student neighborhood literature and could be demonstrated in the Ohio State neighborhood situation.
Community of Limited Liability

Communities of limited liability (Janowitz, 1952; Suttles, 1972) are inhabited by young upwardly mobile professional people with considerable latitude in choosing a place to live, sometime referred to as suburbanites. There are no distinctive boundaries to the community of limited liability as in the case of the defended neighborhood because people in the limited liability community identify with community issues, needs or interests as opposed to strict neighborhood boundaries. In other words, the members of limited liability communities do not define themselves as much by where they live, but by the needs or issues with which they identify. “The nature of residents’ membership in the community of limited liability is understood to be partial; this concept of community recognizes the multitude of associations and relationships, within and beyond the local community, that compose the social live of individuals” (Chaskin, 1997, p. 528). Hence, the boundaries of these communities may alter depending upon the issue or interest at hand. “Residents who live in the same police district do not necessarily live in the same smog-control district and those who live in the same smog-control district need not live in the same school district or Catholic parish” (Suttles, 1972, p. 60). In this community scenario residents’ investment in the community is not a function of personal identity, as in the defended neighborhood scenario, but an investment in instrumental assets. To the suburbanite a neighborhood provides a means by which they can raise a family, gain access to desirable local institutions and pleasing social advantages, but not necessarily a personality or a unique or deeply treasured culture. Should those desirable physical or social amenities that attract suburbanites to their community be threatened or
compromised by in-migration, crime or undesirable neighborhood changes, the suburbanite will, in essence, cut losses and move. Because community is a matter of interest, the limited liability resident can find these interests in other physical locations. There is a limit to the amount of responsibility these residents will take when confronting challenges to the community and interdependence relies upon the degree to which it is desired to accomplish the goals associated with the issues of interest. Informal social controls are most likely present, but balanced with a fair amount of formal controls from municipality or housing associations.

The Organizationally Dependent Community

Organizationally dependent communities (Crenshaw & St. John, 1989) are inhabited by renovators: individuals who move into aging communities, on average live fewer years in the community than life-long residents of the neighborhood but make substantial investments. This community is in a sense a melding of the community of limited liability and the defended neighborhood (Crenshaw & St. John, 1989). The social context of these communities are marked by high levels of participation in formal and informal organizations, high levels of monetary investment, but higher levels of transience, particularly in-migration. This in-migration is found because the organizationally dependent community tends to be a renewing or gentrifying community. The organizationally dependent neighborhood is mixed with long-time residents and renovators, who are new residents making investments and restoring or gentrifying housing stock. It was found that the renovators of the organizationally dependent community, because of their limited length of residence and isolation from the
established informal social network of the neighborhood, are dependent upon formal community organizations to address the fears associated with unfavorable neighborhood change (Crenshaw & St. John, 1989). Renovators are not as quick to move from the community as are suburbanites in the limited liability scenario because their monetary and idealistic investments in a community tend to anchor them. Interdependence or the relationship between the organizationally dependent community and their surrounding communities is often the very condition which triggers the organizational dependence. It is probably true that renovators are apt to rely upon formal social controls, and long-term residents rely upon informal controls as they are more tied into the social network in the neighborhood.

**The Contrived Community**

In contrived communities, ‘lifestyle residents’ choose an area of a city because it offers a lifestyle they desire or they choose a development which has been designed for a very specific type of community. Retirement communities are an example of such a contrived community. New urbanism, for instance, is a design doctrine which believes that the built community can be designed such that social community attachment will be induced via the use of specific design techniques (Talen, 1999). Participation in the contrived community might be organizationally based, but in most cases the end result is representation (Suttles, 1972), as in the case of the condo association or a residents group who intends to represent the community to the city council. Participation tends to emerge from the feeling that ‘we should organize’ not ‘we have to organize’ (Suttles, 1972). Living-learning communities are examples of how universities have taken advantage of
the contrived community concept to develop living concepts both on and off-campus.

Living-learning communities are contrived living arrangements where social and academic outcomes are achieved through the purposeful design of the living environment and academic programming experiences. The population in a contrived community is expected to be rather homogenous along some demographic distinction which the community was designed to attract.

**A New Community: Student Co-Resident Neighborhood**

Student co-resident neighborhoods might prove to be a mix of several of these scenarios, and yet, they exist on their own. Student ghettos exhibit defeated neighborhood characteristics, but, where long-term residents are found living in these neighborhoods, they can demonstrate attitudes often associated with defended, organizationally dependent and the limited liability scenario as well. However, the focus of the current study is to investigate the student neighborhood with little to no permanent residents present. If we gather various characteristics of neighborhoods previously discussed and combine those with what is currently known about student neighborhoods it would be fair to say that the student co-resident environment is akin to a market driven, contrived, but socially disorganized neighborhood of limited liability. Students choose to live in housing within these neighborhoods for a variety of reasons, some are mutually exclusive but those reasons are the conveniences the neighborhood affords them as students of the nearby university, the proximity to the institution, friends and peers and social amenities. Once the need for those amenities no longer are of importance to the student, they move to other housing. Landlords and businesses which have created the
dense population, housing market and economic environment which caters directly to the student population and all of its characteristics create the market driven nature of the neighborhood. But we might expect to see reaction to a set of interventions given the characteristics of the students themselves.

This difficulty in succinctly categorizing student neighborhoods within the current taxonomy seems to be an indicator that these communities warrant further study and could emerge as a new type of community on the taxonomy. Should the uniqueness hypothesis hold true student co-resident neighborhoods will appear to exhibit structural patterns which are in some way distinct from the previous communities described. It is anticipated that participation will be low, but the participation that does exist would be individualistic and based on very specific or narrow issues as well as directed toward formal authorities (police, property managers and the university) rather than informally vetted between residents. Residents will be “seasonal” in that they will reside in the community for the duration of the lease cycle only. The boundaries of the neighborhood should be understood through a frame of “where students live,” not the civic boundaries established by the city or municipality or a communal sense of identity, and the composition of residents should prove to be rather homogeneous within the student seasonal population, and even possibly in the non-student cohorts separately.

Until now, studies of student neighborhoods have been largely descriptive, focused on the permanent residents, tended to highlight the broader issues of university community relations and were biased toward case study representations. Studies were done as early at 1939 where college populations were found to clash with the local
populations (Rapport, 1939). It has been long assumed that local groups and college populations, including faculty and students, newly introduced to neighborhoods by way of a nearby university or college would never be assimilated or amalgamated because “each group is protected from being absorbed by the culture of the other, and, as a result, each will continue with its own culture” (p. 532). In his 1990 volume titled “University-Community Relations: Living Together Effectively,” David Nichols explores various dimensions of university and community struggles and partnerships. Student neighborhoods in that volume are addressed in a descriptive manner that is supported by few sources and no research methodology. Gumprecht (2008) writes a volume on college towns which focuses on the geography and demography of the town which exists because of the “gown,” but did not address the urban student neighborhood. The information presented in both volumes offers many common factors found in town-gown communities where student housing has become abundant; however, not all were empirically derived.

Another challenging aspect of the student neighborhood literature is that it is fragmented and explores a rather broad range of concepts from economic impacts in college towns (Hubbard, 2008), the effects of alcohol outlets on neighborhood outcomes (Wechsler, et al, 2002), to cultural benefits of universities near neighborhoods (Armstrong, Darrall, Grove-White, 1997), city policy and the geographic segregation of student populations (Chatterton, 1999; Smith, 2008). Researchers have yet to focus on the students in urban student neighborhoods as the primary subject.
Many researchers have surveyed and interviewed non-student residents in communities where student populations reside. Research in this area has generated some helpful insights into the social and geographic challenges of student neighborhoods. The concerns of non-student residents fall into three categories: physical concerns, social concerns and economic concerns (Kenyon, 1997; Hubbard, 2008). Non-student residents expressed a number of concerns about the perception of increased crime and deterioration (physical), the erosion in the residential population (social) and decline in reputation, lower property values and increased insurance rates (economic) when living in neighborhoods where students pervade. Reasons for student and permanent resident conflict have been discussed by many researchers: Students’ behavior and values will be different than local community members; students’ social activities will frequently create loud noise; and the consumption of alcohol will be prolific among students (Rapport, 1939; Nichols, 1990; Shanahan, 1995; Hubbard, 2008; Gumprecht, 2008). Most students drive at least one automobile, resulting in parking and traffic problems on city streets. Local residents living near student houses, apartments, and Greek housing do not often share the students’ taste in music, moral values, bedtime hours or friends (Nichols, 1990). The students who live in a particular [rental property] one year may not be there the next, but will be replaced by other students unfamiliar with any previous agreements or regulations. Off-campus dwellings occupied by college students, particularly in older houses, are often allowed to deteriorate by proprietors. The racial and cultural backgrounds of the students will sometimes differ substantially from that of local
residents. A more in-depth analysis of the social questions put forth in this chapter has yet to be completed in an urban student neighborhood.

It has been found that bars, nightclubs and alcohol outlets are more often located within one mile of colleges when compared to areas greater than one mile from colleges (Wechsler et al, 2002). Research has found that residents living within one mile of a college more often reported underage drinking, crime, vandalism, and drunk driving as well as homelessness, public drunkenness, drug use and loitering than those one or more miles from a college (Wechsler, et al, 2000). Drunkenness and underage drinking seem to be the most prominent of reported issues. “College students will drink regardless of the laws, penalties, and risks, they will get drunk and when they do they will disrupt the lives of others” (Gumprecht, 2008, p. 312). Other studies have suggested that over 60% of college students self report drinking over sensible limits (Webb et al, 1996 cited in Hubbard, 2008).

In the small, more isolated college town, where the reason for the town’s existence is the college or university, geographers have identified distinct and segregated residential features (Gumprecht, 2008): fraternity row, the student ghetto and the faculty enclave. There is a difference however, between the small college town and the urban university context, and those differences have yet to be fully explored by research. In the small college town scenario faculty who reside closer to the student ghetto can act as informal social regulators, keeping rowdy students in check by calling police, working with community leaders to deal with problem properties, hosting community gatherings for neighbors and the like. Their influence in the community provides an informal
parochial social regulation could be thought of as a proxy to similar social controls parents provide in more traditional neighborhood settings. Theory suggests that intact families provide an important social regulation which helps to counteract social disorganization in a neighborhood. In the urban university neighborhood context, given more housing options in a larger metropolitan area, faculty will often seek residence in suburbs and areas in and around the city away from the student ghettos nearer the university campus. Thus, the type of the social regulation provided by more stable faculty residents will be scant, if found at all in the urban student co-resident neighborhood. If neighborhoods are lacking these regulations, social control will likely be similar to what would be expected in a defeated neighborhood setting.

Why are students to be found in a specific location near a college or university? Studenthood momentarily frees students from family and working life and the rhythms of the university calendar allow them more fluidity to ignore distinctions between work and playtime (Chatterton, 1999). A distinct student popular culture emerges and an infrastructure for students to indulge in this culture materializes in student neighborhoods (Chatterton, 1999). Furthermore, entertainment providers develop provisions within in the neighborhood to capture this niche; “students are content with circulating within this localized infrastructure which minimizes travel and increases the opportunity to meet other students. The result is that students become a segregated, distinctive group within the larger city context (Chatterton, 1999). Community members focus on the antisocial behaviors perpetrated by students, “marking them out as an ‘other’ population whose
values and lifestyles do not accord with those ascribed to by the majority” and they oppose it (Hubbard, 2008, p. 332).

Research gaps in the study of student co-resident neighborhoods are numerous. In one sense this study takes a step back to empirically explore notions about the student neighborhood which have found anecdotal support. But overall, this study proves to provide a much more in-depth and focused account of the social context of student neighborhoods along with a study of a university intervention strategy aimed at addressing the outcomes of social disorganization of most concern to those who care about students, the university and the community.

Implications for Intervention

It has been shown that focusing on crime reduction and cleaning up disorder through law enforcement techniques may not be the keys to improving the quality of life in extreme neighborhood settings. The active ingredients in crime seem to be structural disadvantage and attenuated collective efficacy more so than disorder (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999, p. 638). If we are to attempt to intervene in ways which improve the social context of the student co-resident case, it may not be prudent to simply rely upon formal police and university disciplinary strategies, nor the often popular rebuilding of the physical environment of near campus neighborhoods. It has been pointed out that “initiatives should build neighborhood trust, cohesion, and support; factors which have an important impact on the community” (Woldoff, 2002, p. 108).

Participation, as theory suggests, is certainly one worthy goal toward greater community outcomes. But if we are to build opportunities for participation, we should
not stop there. Although important for community development, participation is not a sufficient goal by itself for community development (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990, p. 74). “Where people have little sense of belonging to a community, they may have little inclination to spend time on ‘community’ affairs” (Cornwall, 2008, p. 279). We should create interventions which are purposed around improving social capital, or the “connections and trusting contacts that people make while going about their daily business” (Kay, 2006, p. 163). The more that connections and contacts can be increased, the more social capital will be generated, and these contacts “can be used on a mutual and reciprocal basis to further the development of community” (Kay, 2006, p. 163).

Together, the elements of social capital generate a sense of community (Kay, 2006). Focusing on sense of community for purposes of community development can have many benefits for a neighborhood” from a practical and a theoretical stand point (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

Programs should be developed that foster a feeling of community membership, increased group influence, resources which meet the needs of community members, and develop shared experiences among neighbors (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990, p.74). These programs would then address the origins of disorder (Woldoff, 2002) as opposed to attempting to eliminate disorder itself. As Hipp & Perrin (2009) have pointed out, mere physical distance is not enough to bridge gaps in social distance; purposefully bringing groups together in direct contact will do more to encourage social ties formation. Sense of community, from a theoretical perspective, also seems to be a good point of departure for community building because it has been found to be a reliable and valid construct that
could be used to measure the mediating variables of social disorganization theory (Cantillon, Davidson & Schweitzer, 2003). Strategies developed by the Off-Campus Student Services office at the Ohio State University are working to create positive social contacts, directly influence sense of community, and increase informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction. Research suggests programs focused on these constructs will have impacts and the extent to which this is true is of interest to this study.

**Summary**

Very little is understood about the university proximal, densely student populated neighborhood, or as I have termed it the student co-resident neighborhood. The factors identified by social disorganization theory contribute to a better understanding of these neighborhoods, but have not been adequately studied in this context. Many authors have rested conclusions on anecdotal observations and based discussion upon assumptions with regard to the social context of student co-resident neighborhood environments. However, the structural characteristics of a student co-resident neighborhood have yet to be studied and described. The model of the student co-resident neighborhood described here suggests a complex set of ecological variables that, if better understood, could uncover mechanisms or levers of change to promote the health of these neighborhoods and their residents.

Part of assessing the structural characteristics of the student co-resident neighborhoods will be to determine the nature of the transience in these neighborhoods. The more specific impacts of pervasive synchronous turnover in this community are thought to be colossal, but are still not well understood. Research exploring the nuances
between length of residence and how these structures independently impact outcomes in this community is needed. Interventions aimed at countering the brunt of turnover can be assessed better if the nature of transience and its impact on community outcomes is better understood. To test this question, we can control for length of residence in the general community and examine sense of community, perceptions of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction among students who have lived on the same street for varying lengths of time. This result would help shed light upon the unique role of transience in the student co-resident neighborhood.

Population heterogeneity has been identified to affect social bonds in neighborhoods. The influences that demographic realities have on the social context of the student neighborhood will need to be examined. It may be that the extreme homogeneity of the neighborhoods is a key component of the efficacy of intervention strategies. These demographic indices may also be an influential component of the outcomes of interventions aimed at building stronger community structures in the student neighborhood. No researcher has yet explored perceptions of informal social controls present in student co-resident neighborhoods. Most researchers interested in this topic have included data gathered from permanent residents but not student residents. The sources of social control have yet to be revealed, or whether any social controls exist in these neighborhood environments.

Social ties in the student co-resident neighborhood scenario are of importance to understanding community outcomes such as informal controls, sense of community and neighborhood satisfaction. Very little prior research has investigated the extent to which
friendship networks exist in these communities and the sources of those acquaintanceships. Relationships within the student co-resident neighborhood are most likely influenced in large part by students associations with the university, but we do not currently know the extent to which informal neighboring plays a role in density of acquaintanceships in these communities. Social ties and friendships may be mediated by network associations with the university more so than neighboring but the nature and source of these acquaintanceships are of interest to this study particularly where the effects of community building strategies might be found to increase informal neighboring and lead to stronger social ties among residents of the student co-resident neighborhood.

Participation in the affairs of the community has been proven to have reciprocal effects on social ties and community outcomes. Little is actually known about students’ participation in the co-resident community. The fact that students do or do not participate has yet to be formally established and the nature of participation has not yet been described. Some students may participate in university sponsored groups whose objectives are to address concerns in the predominately student neighborhoods. Others may participate in service learning and volunteer opportunities which address various needs within the campus proximal neighborhoods. Students might think they are organized because they are all “students” bonded by a common college experience. Certainly community building programs which offer community oriented activities and events in which students can participate offer a platform for participation. It could be that students “participate” in ways other than attending organized community association
meetings or joining block watch programs, and the influence of these modes of participation are of interest to this study, particularly in the case of those activities planned by the university.

Social disorganization researchers have established that socioeconomic status, particularly concentrated disadvantage, is an important neighborhood structure which has an influence on social disorganization and social outcomes in neighborhoods. Researchers have not considered whether or how student’s socioeconomic status, as a neighborhood structural characteristic, plays a role in the social disorganization of the co-resident community. Students seem to be in a state of socioeconomic limbo where their family’s socioeconomic background might not match the immediate moment of being a “poor” college student. But this study might show that the socioeconomic background of the student resident may play a large role in community outcomes than does the immediate socioeconomic facts of their college lives.

Sense of community has not yet been examined in the student neighborhood among the student residents who are typically thought of as having little cohesion. Several factors may contribute to individual perception of sense of community and this study is focused on exploring the variables which are associated with and predict sense of community, chiefly the effects of participative events and resource offerings developed by the university.

Determining whether interventions could counter the negative effects of structures most associated with social disorganization such as transience, demographic profile, lack of social controls, socioeconomic indicators, neighboring, friendship, social networks and
acquaintanceship density in the student co-resident neighborhood are of interest to this study. There are likely structures within the student co-resident neighborhood experience that are pivotal, and which if positively supported or constructively altered could lead to meaningful changes which can be the impetus for creating more thriving communities and residents. Neighborhood outcomes such as sense of community, public informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction could be targets of a positive intervention, and are the outcomes of most interest to the current study. Some of these neighborhood structures are the object of program interventions by The Ohio State University, with the intent to positively affect community outcomes, and a study of these interventions will be greatly informative to discussion of how best we can serve our students and neighbors in university proximal communities.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this study is to examine the social context of the student co-resident neighborhoods near an urban university campus and to show how that context is influenced by university community building interventions. In order to do this the methodology chosen for this study is modeled after quantitative sociological studies of urban neighborhoods. It utilizes descriptive statistics to characterize the neighborhood as well as factor analysis and regression analysis to determine the strength of the relationships between structural variables within the student co-resident neighborhood setting and community outcomes including social ties, sense of community, informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction. Hierarchical regression analysis is also used to explore the strength of the relationships between individual level rates of participation in community building intervention programs and the same community outcomes. In short, the analytical strategy for this study will be to (1) characterize resident demographic structures within the neighborhood (2) characterize sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, perception of informal social controls, social ties, and perception of crime among residents in the student co-resident environment, (3) assess the levels of participation in a university sponsored community building program,
(4) through correlation and regression analysis, measure the relationship between both demographic and participation variables and sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, perception of informal social controls, social ties, and perception of crime.

**Research Design**

The purpose of this study is to provide research which examines the social context of densely populated student neighborhoods near a large urban university campus; what I have termed a ‘student co-resident neighborhood’. To do this, first an instrument had to be created to collect data related to community structural characteristics, participation levels connected with a distinctive community building program, and several community outcome measures for social ties, sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction. This study addresses the following research questions:

Research Question 1: What are the structural or demographic characteristics of the student co-resident neighborhood?

Research Question 2: How can social ties in the co-resident environment be characterized? What is the density of acquaintanceships in the student co-resident neighborhood and are students attached to the community in which they live or to their associations with university?

Research Question 3: What is the individual amount of participation by residents in university sponsored community building intervention programs (which are focused around increasing social ties, informal social control and sense of community)?
Research Question 4: To what extent is there sense of community, social ties, perceptions of informal social controls, perception of crime and neighborhood satisfaction in the co-resident neighborhood?

Research Question 5: To what extent do resident characteristics and levels of participation in university sponsored community building interventions predict sense of community, social ties, perceptions of informal social controls, and neighborhood satisfaction in the co-resident neighborhood?

**Methodology**

Given the nature of the questions and the theoretical framework proposed by this study, quantitative survey methods were utilized to answer the research questions. An adaptation of the “Perceived Neighborhood Scale” (Martinez, Black & Starr, 2002) and surveys utilized by Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls (1997) and Browning, Feinberg & Dietz (2004) were the primary data gathering tool for the study. The Perceived Neighborhood Scale survey in its original form asks questions regarding length of residence, “social embeddedness,” sense of community, satisfaction with neighborhood, and perceived crime. Adaptations were made by including additional questions from the informal social controls scale (Browning, Feinberg & Dietz, 2004) and social cohesion measures (Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls, 1997). Demographic and network ties questions created by the researcher were also added to enhance the neighborhood structures data as well as gather data relevant to research question 3: “How can we characterize the social ties in the co-resident environment?”. In addition to descriptive statistics, factor analysis, correlation, and hierarchical regression analysis were used.
Instrument Design

Because several community structures and outcome variables of interest to this study have been studied by researchers who focus upon diverse outcomes in the neighborhood context and social disorganization in community settings, the survey instrument was developed as a strategic assembly of several instruments found in the community research literature. The Perceived Neighborhood Scale is “a measure of neighborhood perceptions” (Martinez, Black & Starr, 2002, p. 23) and is primarily an instrument developed to assess sense of community, social embeddedness, and satisfaction with neighborhood in a single instrument. Although most questions appear to be rather general some are specifically written assuming the sample population is parents of children. Hence there are adaptations made, and those are discussed below. The Social Cohesion Scale (Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls, 1997) and the Informal Social Controls Scale (Browning, Feinberg & Deitz, 2004) were borrowed in large part “as is” with minor rewording of questions to better reflect the physical and social nuances found in the student co-resident neighborhood setting. Social networks and interaction questions were borrowed and intended to measure frequency of interaction and network-mediated exchange (Browning, Feinberg & Dietz, 2004; Portes, 1998). These questions were combined with social embeddedness questions from the Perceived Neighborhood Scale (Martinez, Black & Starr, 2002). See Appendix A for the final survey instrument.

Survey Adaptation

The survey includes seven sections. The first section titled “Social Ties, Network Interaction & Reciprocated Exchange” is adapted from the “Social Embeddedness”
section of the “Perceived Neighborhood Scale” (Martinez, Black & Starr, 2002) and combines those with network interaction and reciprocated exchange questions from Browning, Feinberg & Dietz (2004) and Portes (1998). The questions are focused around assessing the degree to which residents interact with neighbors, the actual ties among neighbors and the extent to which residents feel they can call upon neighbors for help. Questions from the Perceived Neighborhood Scale were altered slightly to better capture the social intentionality thought to exist in the student co-resident environment as well as to suggest scenarios which are more socially relevant to the student population. For instance, the question, “How likely is it that you could ask a neighbor to loan you a few dollars for some food?” was altered to read “How likely is it that you would ask a neighbor to borrow something?” All questions measured concepts on a five point Lickert Scale; 1 representing very likely or very often and 5 representing very unlikely or very seldom.

The second section of the survey was also adapted from the Perceived Neighborhood Scale and measures residents sense of community. Sense of community is a construct of four basic concepts: membership, integration, influence and shared experiences. The Perceived Neighborhood Scale includes questions which assess the residents feelings of belonging and membership, integration into the neighborhood and the influence of others. Questions meant to aggregate shared experiences were added.

The third section of the survey, aimed at capturing levels of informal social controls, is borrowed and adapted from the research work of Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls (1997). Questions in the first part of this section ask respondents to indicate how
likely, on a five point scale, it would be that someone in their neighborhood would intervene in various ways if a variety of social norms were being violated in the neighborhood. These social norms are a combination of those used by Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls (1997) (e.g. “teenagers from the neighborhood were skipping school and hanging out on the street corner” and “someone were spray painting graffiti on a local buildings) and several which are commonly accepted social norms violations in student neighborhoods (e.g. “a neighbor hosted a party that got out of control” and “a neighbor was not disposing of trash appropriately”). These adaptations were made to make the scenarios more likely relevant to the specific experiences of the residents who live there and to provide scenarios that could actually have been the fodder for observations of informal social controls in these neighborhoods. Questions in the second part of this section asked respondents to indicate, on the same five point likeliness scale, who would be more likely to respond to disruptions in the neighborhood. Various responders representing both formal (police, university staff, landlords, etc) and informal control (neighbors, community groups, etc) mechanisms were offered and responders rated each. Mean response for formal and informal mechanisms were calculated.

The fourth section of the survey addressed resident’s satisfaction with the neighborhood. This section was adapted from the Perceived Neighborhood Scale in that four questions from the original survey, purposed around gaining insight into parents satisfaction with neighborhood amenities which make the neighborhood more amiable to raising children, were removed. Two questions were added to better approximate the spirit of the deleted questions, for instance the question “There is a good place (e.g., playground) for children
to play in my neighborhood” was replaced with the question “There are good outdoor places to recreate in my neighborhood”. Also added to this section were a series of questions assessing the origins of residents feelings about the neighborhood. This section was intended to develop variables to be later used with the neighborhood satisfaction predictive model. The idea being that neighborhood satisfaction would be influenced by various experiences within in the neighborhood. These experiences could be police, crime, friend’s perceptions, landlords, etc.

The fifth section of the survey is intended to assess friendship networks and density of acquaintanceships borrowed from Sampson & Groves (1989) as well as social network identification created by the researcher. Questions ask residents to indicate how many friends live in the local community; within a few minute walk but not in the university residence halls. How many of those friends living close are relationships which can be characterized as friendships which resulted from neighboring was also asked. Finally residents were asked to rate, on a four point scale, the degree to which they identify as a member of their specific street, as an “off-campus student”, as an Ohio State student, or as a member of their home town. These questions are intended to gauge the degree to which students feel a connection to their specific community on one end of the continuum, the university in the middle of that continuum or a connection to some other community identity not of the neighborhood or the university.

The sixth section of the survey asks residents to indicate ways in which they have participated in university sponsored activities which are designed to increase sense of community. The intervention consists of three components: Activities aimed at
increasing interaction, resources designed to communicate and address community needs, and branding to create a visual symbol of community to which suggestions for community strengthening are attached. Activities include a barbeque on each intervention street near the start of the academic quarter where all residents of the street are invited, a pumpkin carving contest at Halloween time, and a holiday lights competition where residents decorate their homes and community members vote for the winners online. Resources include an Off-Campus Living Guide produced by the office of Off-Campus Student Services, a newsletter created by the Community Ambassadors, and frequent emails to residents discussing such topics as safety, crime alerts, street sweeping, and reminders to act responsibly. Branding included a “Buckeye Pride in the 43201” campaign. (The mascot of The Ohio State University is the Buckeyes, and the zip code of the neighborhood is 43201, hence the meaning behind “Buckeye Pride in the 43201” is to encourage students to carry their school pride into their neighborhood, respecting as if it too were part of campus) This campaign consisted first of distributing window placards to each resident living on intervention streets. Placards feature a specially designed “Buckeye Pride in the 43201” visual icon or logo on one side and on the back a bulleted list of suggestions for ways in which residents can “Build Community” and maintain a “Safe Community” and a “Clean Community.” Students are encouraged to display the placard in their window, with the “Pride…” logo facing outward. One home displaying the sign was randomly selected each quarter to win free Coke products and a pizza. Next, lawn signs (much like political campaign signs) were posted along the tree lawn of each intervention street displaying the same “Pride…” logo
and visual logos representing the “build community” and maintain a “safe community” and “clean community” messages. These signs were posted a few weeks after window placards were distributed. Finally, the “Pride…” logo was affixed to any other items or messages issued to the street which were themed around the three themes of building community or maintaining a clean and safe community. For instance, magnets were produced with displaying the “Pride…” logo and contact information for Community Ambassadors and Off-Campus Student Services, along with more suggests for how to implement the three themes as a resident of the neighborhood. Students were encouraged to pin any flyers Community Ambassador distributed to the neighborhood to their refrigerator with the magnet. A list of specific activities or events is listed on the survey, as well as other possible interactions such as communicating with a Community Ambassador or being a member of a university sponsored group whose goal it is to address the needs or concerns of residents of the off-campus neighborhood.

The seventh and final section of the survey includes demographic question which are intended to create much of the structural profile of the neighborhood. Length of residence, family and personal socioeconomic status, race, age, gender, and address are assessed in this section.

Respondents to the survey were asked to consider the street upon which they live and the neighbors immediately around them as the frame of reference for their responses to the questions asked. ‘Street upon which they live’ was defined as the area they live, both sides of the street, between the nearest or closest cross streets, where applicable.
Pre-Survey Evaluation

Two panel processes were employed to evaluate the survey. Items on the survey are borrowed and adapted from instrumentation found in the current literature which explores social outcomes and neighborhoods. For this reason the survey was first reviewed for accuracy, content, and clarity by panel of reviewers with methodological, theoretical and community engagement expertise. The survey was then reviewed by a panel of off-campus students for clarity feedback. The expert panel was comprised of the dissertation committee chair, a dissertation committee member with expertise in neighborhood research methods, a dissertation committee member who has methodological expertise in assessment of the impact of environments on learning, an extension educator for Ohio State University Extension who works specifically with and has expertise regarding the neighborhoods being studied, and a faculty member with expertise in community development. The student panel was comprised of 10 students who live in the neighborhoods being studied. The student panel was diverse and included an African-American male, students who grew-up in both rural and urban settings, one international student as well as several undergraduates and one graduate student.

Each panelist was presented with a letter explaining the purpose of the research, the process by which the instrument was developed, the conceptual model underlying the research and a survey review sheet. The review sheet paired questions with underlying concepts and asked the expert panelists to evaluate the survey for clarity and variable or content accuracy given the minor adjustments which were made to the questions taken from the instruments found in the literature. The student panel was asked to review the
questions for wording clarity and general understandability. The student panel provided feedback as to whether the questions were readable and clear and what specifically about confusing questions made them difficult to understand. The panel review process lead to several item revisions which enhanced the clarity of the questions. After feedback was provided and revisions made, the instrument was finalized and submitted for IRB exemption review. IRB exemption was granted on November 16, 2010 under protocol 2010E0695. See Appendix A for the final survey instrument.

Subject Population and Sampling Method

The population studied includes students at the Ohio State University who live near the university campus in the neighborhoods of the densely student populated neighborhood referred to by community leaders and university officials as the “student core”. This area is part of a larger community formally referred to as the University District of Columbus, Ohio and is also all within the postal zip code area 43201. Specifically, the study includes students living in the neighborhoods of US Census tracts 12 and 13 of Franklin County, Ohio (hereafter referred to as census tracts 12 & 13). This area effectively includes all students residing within the geographic area bound by Chittenden Avenue (southern boundary), and E. Lane Avenue (northern boundary) and High Street (west boundary) and Big Four Street (east boundary). This section of the community including all residents residing within the 100 through 400 blocks on each of streets oriented from east to west and all students residing within the 1600 through the 2100 blocks on each of the streets oriented from north to south.
US Census data indicate that in year 2000, 10,044 individuals resided in census tracts 12 & 13. Of these residents the data indicate that 4,780 are between the ages of 18 and 29. The Ohio State University Registrars office collects local address information for students, but does not require them to provide this information to the university. Registrar records indicate that 3246 students live in census tracks 12 & 13: 1238 in tract 12 and 2008 in tract 13. Two strategies were employed to address concerns that inaccuracies in the self reported local address information supplied by the University Registrar’s office might exist. First, community building strategies developed by the office of Off-Campus Student Services include collecting contact information in a door-to-door approach, from students who live in the neighborhoods. Where possible, students not included on university supplied lists are added and contact information is deleting for student who indicate, through email interactions, they do not currently live in the neighborhood. This address gathering and editing process greatly improves the accuracy of the university supplied lists, and these amended contact lists were used for survey distribution. These Community Ambassador lists included contact information for approximately 3,400 students living in the two census tracts. Second, filtering questions were asked to insure data was collected only from those who actually belong to the population.

**Data Collection**

A web based survey distributed in a population census approach was chosen over a simple random sample method for several reasons. First, one of the premises of this research is that students living in university proximal neighborhoods are difficult to
engage, and it was assumed that a request to respond to a survey would likely have been ignored by many students. Mail-back surveys used in the past by the Off-Campus Student Services Office at Ohio State yielded returns of 8%. The population approach is intended to maximize response rate. Also utilizing the web based survey system as opposed to a paper survey provided an opportunity for efficient and repeated follow up with non-responders. Follow up emails have been found to effectively increase web survey response rates (Sheehan, 2001). Finally, the web based population census approached was chosen for practicality: limited time and personnel resources which could be dedicated for personal visits to homes of non-responders of a random sample were simply not available.

The survey was administered via SNAP, a web-based survey system, which is owned by the office of Student Life Research and Assessment at The Ohio State University. To increase response rate and minimize the effects of missing and foreign elements several techniques were employed. First, and most importantly, filtering questions were asked at the start of the survey. These questions first asked respondents to indicate the zip code in which they currently live. If a respondent indicated a zip code other then 43201, their participation was automatically excluded. Second, the respondent was asked to indicate their current street and address number. Asking for specific addresses allowed the researcher to include only respondents who live within the census tracts selected for the study. The surveys were deployed during the sixth week of the ten week quarter and remained open until the end of the eighth week of the quarter. This timeframe was chosen because anecdotal information suggests that the seventh week of
the quarter presents students with “down time” after most mid-term exams have been completed, and prior to preparations for finals. Follow up emails were sent three times to non-responders; three days after deployment, at the end of the second week of deployment, and three days before the survey was closed. Each reminder yielded increase in responses. Finally incentives were used to encourage response. Respondents had the opportunity to enter a drawing for one of two fifty dollar gift cards to the university bookstore. To ensure their anonymity respondents were directed to a separate survey item to collect emails if they chose to enter the drawing.

Research Design Issues

Three types of validity are addressed: Construct validity, external validity, and internal validity.

Construct Validity

Construct validity refers to the “validity of inferences about constructs that represent sampling particulars” (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002, p. 38) or, if the operationalization of the variables being studied actually do measure the variables theory suggests they measure. Threats to construct validity “concern the match between study operations and the constructs used to describe those operations” (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002, p. 72). Construct validity was understood in this study in two ways. First, instrumentation used in the current study was selected from the research literature on neighborhoods and social disorganization. Many of the measures used in the current study are those found in the peer reviewed literature. In some instances questions were
adapted in ways to increase their conceptual relevance to college aged students. Second, a panel of experts reviewed the survey with the task of critiquing the instrument for construct concerns. This was particularly important for those questions which had been altered as well as the few questions which were developed for the instrument. Results in central analysis seem consistent with theory which supports the idea that the instrument is valid from a construct standpoint.

**External Validity**

External validity refers to the “extent to which a relationship holds over variations in persons, settings, treatments, and outcomes” (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002, p. 83). The study is not intended to suggest that the specific community building strategies being studied lead directly to specific community outcomes in all student co-resident community cases. Many universities are attempting programs to address student neighborhoods, most not on the scale of The Ohio State University. The study is intended to suggest that interventions in the particular case presented have had effects upon community outcomes in that context. The degree to which findings can be generalized to other contexts is a matter for discussion. However, the intent of the study is to suggest that a general type of approach to intervention can be shown to have effects on community outcomes relevant to the student co-resident neighborhood.

**Internal Validity**

Internal validity refers to the “inferences about whether observed co-variation between variables A and B reflects a relationship from variable A to variable B in the
form in which those variables were manipulated” (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002, p.53). In other words, can we infer that the relationship between two variables exists? Threats to internal validity include ambiguous temporal precedence, maturation, and attrition. Maturation, or naturally occurring changes over time and attrition, which is the loss of respondents in a study, were not of concern in the current study because time series data was not collected, nor were multiple treatments administered over a period of time. In the current study, the community participation intervention did in fact precede the measurement of sense of community, informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction and so temporal precedence is not of concern.

**Reliability**

Cronbach’s Alpha tests were used for each set of items created to form an index for the outcome variables. Alphas indicated that there is strong internal consistency for each of the variable scales. Table 3.1 presents Cronbach’s Alpha for each of the variables. For item scales and construction of variables see Appendix B.
Table 3.1 Cronbach’s Alpha for Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Social Control</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis Methods

This study addresses five research questions. The analysis methods for approaching each question are presented subsequently.

Research Question 1

What are the structural characteristics of the student co-resident neighborhood? (a) What is the length of residence among residents? (b) what is the demographic heterogeneity of the student community (age, race, gender)? (d) what are the socioeconomic indicators among the student residents?

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the structural characteristics data. Resident transience is measured as total number of months lived at their current address. Students with lesser number of months at the current address are considered to be more transient then those with a higher number of months lived at their current address. Socioeconomic indicators were recorded and presented as father and mother’s highest
level of education, level of family income and amount of extra spending money the students has on a weekly basis after school and living expenses. Race/ethnic background, age and gender were all presented as frequencies.

**Research Question 2**

How can social ties in the co-resident environment be characterized? (a) are students attached to the community in which they live or to the university?

**Analysis**

Measures of social ties within the neighborhood were borrowed from the Perceived Neighborhood Scale (Martinez, Black & Starr, 2002) and measured, on a 5 point scale (very likely through very unlikely): how likely is it that your neighbor would ask to borrow something? How likely is it that you would ask a neighbor to borrow something? How likely is it that you would get help from a neighbor? How likely is it that you would help a neighbor? Measures of neighbor interaction are also borrowed from the Perceived Neighborhood Scale and ask respondents to indicate how often, on a 5 point scale (very often (daily) to very seldom (less then every 3 months) residents greet their neighbors and casually visit their neighbors.

The measure of local friendship is modeled after Sampson (1988) and Sampson & Groves (1989) measure of local friendship networks and is represented by asking residents to indicate how many of their friends live in the local community, within in a few minute walk from their home and not in university housing. As when used by Sampson (1988) and Sampson & Groves (1989), the researcher placed a parameter on
“local community” that is relevant to the geographic area being studied; in the current study this parameter is within walking distance reasonable to the size of the geographic area, and because the neighborhood is located across the street from the campus, asks residents to exclude friends who live in university housing nearby. Mean level of local friendships represents the extent of local ties friendship networks (Sampson & Groves, 1989).

Network attachment is measured by asking respondents to indicate on a four point scale, from strongly identify with through do not identify with, how strongly they identify with various types of identities or attachments associated with being a university student who lives in a neighborhood setting: a resident of the street where they live; an “off-campus” student; an OSU student; a resident of their home town. The four network identifiers were designed as a continuum which begin with street membership, move through community membership, university membership and ends with no attachment to the community where they are currently residing. Mean levels of strength of identification were used to characterize each of the network identifiers.

The scale is also factor analyzed to determine subscale for each of the constructs. Averages for these subscale scores are presented in the analysis as well and later used as factors in the regression models created for research question 5.

**Research Question 3**

What is the individual amount of participation in university sponsored community building intervention programs (aimed at increasing social ties, social control and sense of community)?
**Analysis**

Respondents were asked to indicate interactions with university Community Ambassadors or involvement with university sponsored programs purposed around community building in the neighborhoods where they live. Respondents were also asked if they participate in a community group sponsored by the university, and the number of groups. Participation was calculated as the mean score of participation in the activities offered; eight in total. The specific number of community oriented groups was used as a separate independent variable.

**Research Question 4**

What are the amounts of social ties, perceived informal social control, sense of community and neighborhood satisfaction in the co-resident neighborhood?

**Analysis**

Questions from the “Sense of Community” and “Satisfaction with Neighborhood” sections of the Perceived Neighborhood Scale (PNS) (Martinez, Black & Starr, 2002) were used with minor adaptation. Residents were asked on a five point scale (from strongly agree to strongly disagree) how strongly they agree that their neighbors can be trusted, relied upon, that they feel they belong in the neighborhood that people are friendly and help each other. These questions, borrowed from the PNS were also developed based upon the sense of community work of Chavis & Wandersman (1990). Neighborhood satisfaction was measured by asking residents on a five point scale (from strongly agree to strongly disagree) how strongly they agree that their neighborhood is a
good place to live, the physical environment is pleasing, they would be interested in 
continuing to live in the neighborhood and that they are satisfied with their neighborhood.
These questions were utilized in the British Crime Survey from which Sampson (1988) 
used data to test a systemic theory of community attachment in mass society. The 
Perceived Neighborhood Scale, as used by Martinez, Black & Starr (2002), assessed 
neighborhood satisfaction in relation to parental sense of efficacy. Questions relevant to 
neighborhood and child rearing were removed or adapted for use in the current study.

Measures of informal social controls are adapted from Sampson, Raudenbush & 
Earls (1997) and was represented by a five-point Likert scale. Residents were asked how 
likely (very likely to very unlikely) is it that they can count on neighbors to intervene in 
various ways if teenagers from the neighborhood were hanging out on the corner, 
someone were spray painting graffiti, someone was shouting for help, a fight broke out in 
front of their home, neighbors were not disposing of trash properly, someone were 
playing loud music, and a neighbor’s party got out of control. Adaptations were made to 
the questions used by Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls (1997) in order to make the 
questions more relevant to the residents of the student ghetto and to better reflect what is 
currently understood about the demographic context of the neighborhood as well as social 
challenges idiosyncratic to the community. Mean level responses for items comprising 
each variable was entered into the predictive model.

**Research Question 5**

To what extent do resident characteristics and amounts of participation in 
university sponsored community building interventions predict social ties, and to what
extent does resident and neighborhood characteristics, amounts of participation in university sponsored community building interventions and social ties predict sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, perception of informal social controls.

**Analysis**

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to address research question five. The variables chosen for the regression analysis to explain the phenomena in question and the research questions proposed are those derived from the ecological and social disorganization theories upon which the research is grounded (Ethington, Thomas & Pike, 2002, p. 265). Four hierarchical regression models were used. The model developed in Chapter 2 suggests that demographic, community building program participation and neighborhood or community variables influence social ties; demographic characteristics, community building program participation, neighborhood or community variables and social ties predict sense of community, informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction. Correlation matrices for the dependent and independent variables are presented in Appendix C. Variables were entered in blocks to determine the effect of participation in community building programs and how resident and neighborhood characteristics and social ties modify those effects. First, participation in community building activities, demographic characteristics and neighborhood and community characteristics, were regressed in blocks on the social ties variable. Next, participation in community building activities, neighborhood and community characteristics, demographic characteristics, and social ties were regressed in blocks on sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, and informal social controls, Hence,
social ties was used entered as a fourth step independent variable in these three hierarchical regression models.

**Ethical Standards**

The researcher maintained standards of ethical practice in conducting this research project. The email lists were derived from lists that were created in a voluntary manner: any student whose name and email address appeared on the list volunteered their information to the university or to their Community Ambassador. Student Life Research and Assessment deployed the survey and the researcher had no access to responses or data until the survey was closed. Participation in the survey was completely voluntary. Respondents were given the option to discontinue the survey at any point while taking it, and incentives were not contingent upon participation. Survey responses were kept anonymous and if a respondent opted to be entered into a drawing for an incentive, they were directed to enter a preferred email address which was kept separate from the data to insure complete anonymity. Respondents were given contact information for the researcher and staff in the Ohio State University Office of Responsible Research Practices should they feel the need for follow-up or additional resources.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data collected as it relates to the research questions proposed in Chapters 2 and 3. The population for the study was comprised of 3,546 student residents of the University District of the City of Columbus Ohio, the neighborhood adjacent to the campus of The Ohio State University. A total of 694 responses resulted in a 20% response rate. Ten respondents who did not live in the neighborhood were removed from the sample (i.e., these respondents answered “no” to the question which screened by zip code). A total of 72 respondents indicated that they live in a Greek chapter facility or house, which included housing managed by the University, and national fraternal organizations. Analysis of these residents showed significant differences between mean responses on several critical variables, particularly participation in neighborhood community building activities and sense of community, and neighboring. Living in Greek housing seemed to be a confounding variable, and for this reason these respondents were excluded from analysis of the effects of community building strategies in the community. Thus the sample was reduced to 612 cases.

The analysis consisted of several statistical procedures. First, a descriptive statistics analysis provided a demographic structural profile of the neighborhood
addressed in research question one. Then a characterization of social ties and density of acquaintanceships for research question two was developed. Third, measures of participation in the university facilitated community building programs in research question three were examined. Fourth, the unadjusted levels of sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, and perception of informal social controls were analyzed for research question four. And for the central analysis in research question five, Social ties, sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction were identified as dependent variables in four hierarchical regression models that included the variables presented in research question 1 and density of acquaintanceships and network identifiers in research question 2 as predictors.

**Research Question 1**

The first research question was: What are the structural characteristics of the student co-resident neighborhood? This question attempts to build a structural understanding of the student co-resident neighborhood, measured in demographic terms. Specifically, the following resident characteristics were collected: Age, gender, student status, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic indicators, and length of residence in the neighborhood.

The mean age of respondents was 21 years, ranging from 19 to 34 years of age, with a modal age of 21 years old (n= 211 or 34.7%). Together 92.4% of respondents were between the ages of 19 and 23 (n= 562). Females accounted for 67.5% of the respondents (n=411), 32.2% were male (n=197), and .2% indentified as transgender (n=1). By comparison, at the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University, females
account for 48.6% of the student population and males account for 51.4% of the campus population. The majority of respondents, 81.9% identified as ‘white’ (n=499). Non-white, which included black, Hispanic, Asian, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and multi-racial (excluding 'prefer not to respond'), accounted for 15.4% of the respondents (n=94). The demographic profile of the population at the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University consists of 85.6% white students, 5.9 % black, 2.8% Hispanic and 5.3% Asian. When compared to their representation on the main campus overall, fewer minorities in comparison live in the neighborhood. Overall, the racial-ethnic breakdown is rather similar. It is important to note these results represent the survey respondents and generalization to the total population is not intended. This data appears in Table 4.1. Average number of months lived at current address was 8.23 months with a bi modal score around 5, 4 and 3 months and 15 and 16 months. These months totals match with typical lease cycles in this neighborhood. Residents’ lease terms typically begin in late August or early September (the survey was deployed late December through early January). Residents are in their first lease term and have either been tenants only a few months, (3, 4 or 5 months) or are in the second lease term at 15 to 16 months. Residents in their first lease term accounted for approximately 66.% of survey respondents, and residents in their second lease term accounted for approximately 16%. This data is summarized in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1: Sample Demographic Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian(^a)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Hawaiian/Pac. islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one race</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to not respond</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (in years)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence (in months)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* it is not known what percent of respondents indicating 'Asian' as their ethnicity are US national or international

Socioeconomic indicators include five items: amount of extra weekly spending money (after school and living expenses), financial status as dependent or independent, family annual income, and father and mother’s level of education. Respondents were first asked to indicate how much extra money they had available to spend on a weekly basis, after school and living expenses. This question was a “write-in” response. Responses ranged from $0 to $1200, Median weekly spending money is $50. The
majority of respondents, 71.0% (n=429), indicated that, from a financial perspective, they were dependent. Independent accounted for 24.8% (n=150) of respondents and 4.1% did not know (n=25). Finally annual family income, father’s education level and mother’s education level were assessed as indicators of socio-economic background. Income was measured along five scale income interval ranges: mode response for total family annual income was $75,000 to $134,000 per year. Nearly three quarters of respondents, 72.9% (n=411) fall below $135,000 in annual family income.

The next socio-economic indicator was level of education for respondent’s father and mother. The modal educational level for fathers is a ‘bachelor’s degree’ followed by ‘high school or equivalent/GED’ and then ‘master’s degree.’ Mother’s education level was similar to father’s education level with except that, mothers earned more associate’s degrees and fewer PhDs. Modal response for mother’s education level was ‘bachelor’s degree’ followed by ‘high school or equivalent/GED’ and then ‘master’s degree’ last. The SES indicators are summarized in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Socioeconomic Summary of Sample (n=612)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finanically Dependent vs. Independent</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Family Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,999 and under</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $134,999</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135,000 to 199,999</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 and above</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Spending Money After Living Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Education Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS diploma/GED</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates degree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade school certificate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's Education Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS diploma/GED</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates degree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade school certificate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

The second research question was: How can social ties in the co-resident environment be characterized? What is the density of acquaintanceships in the student co-resident neighborhood and are students attached to the community in which they live or to their associations with university? Social ties includes the degree to which students casually interact, borrow items, greet each other and the like. Social ties is both an outcome variable and a predictor variable in the main analysis. As an outcome it is considered with participation (Research Question 3), demographics and density of acquaintanceships and network identification as predictors. Social ties is then considered as a predictor of the outcome variables discussed in Research Question 4; sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction.

Density of acquaintanceships includes how many friends a resident has in the local community. Friendships resulting from neighboring are the number of those friends in the local community that became friends because they are neighbors, not previous friends they had or friends they had made in the dormitories, classes, clubs and other associations with the University or outside of the neighborhood context. This question also considered the degree to which students identify with their ties to the university or as members of the neighborhood and community in which they live. This networks ties question was also used as an independent variable in the analysis in Research Question 5.

Students have some, close to many, friends who live in the local community (M=3.61, SD=1.06) measured on a five point Likert scale; 1 being no friends and five being all friends. Few of those friends are as a result of neighboring (M=2.14, SD=1.11) on the
same scale used to measure friends in the local community. Students also indicate that they seldom interact with their neighbors (M=2.55, SD=.91) and that it is unlikely that reciprocal exchange would take place between them and their neighbors (M=2.69, SD=.86) on a scale where 1 represents very seldom/never and 5 represents very often/daily. This data is summarized in Table 4.3. This result indicates that there is greater likelihood that friendships in this neighborhood setting are the result of networks outside of the neighborhood environment rather than neighborhood interaction. Those outside interactions likely originate with their associations at the University.

Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which they identified with various network identifiers, either university or community. This differentiated the degree to which residents see themselves as a university student or a resident of the community. Students identify most strongly as an ‘OSU student’ and next as an ‘off-campus student’. The data also indicates students are comfortable with a variety of identifiers both associated with the University and with their community. They view themselves not only as a student of the university, but also as a student of the university who lives in the specific community which surrounds the University, in this case, the University District. See Table 4.3 for a descriptive statistics summary of the variables.

**Research Question 3**

The third research question was: What is the individual amount of participation by residents in university sponsored community building intervention programs (which are focused around increasing social ties, sense of community and informal social control)? The indicator of participation is the number of activities in which residents of the student...
co-resident neighborhood participated. The Office of Student Life, Off-Campus Student
Services, sponsors a community building program called Community Ambassadors. This
program employs student who are off-campus residents to plan and execute community
building activities for residents of the neighborhood, as well as provide important living
resources for them. Respondents indicated if they had participated or had not
participated in each of 8 intervention activities sponsored in the academic quarter prior to
the deployment of the survey. Numbers of activities were summed and each respondent
was given a score between zero and eight. The average number of university sponsored
community building activities in which residents participated was approximately two of
the eight activities planned in the autumn quarter (M=1.98, SD=1.94). There were 423
students who participated in at least one community building activity sponsored by the
university (69%). Of those students who participated in at least one activity, 282 (46% of
the entire sample) participated in two or more activities. Table 4.3 in summarizes the
participation in community building variable and places participation in the context of the
other variables considered in this study. Also summarized in the table are frequencies for
participation in each of the specific activities comprising the participation variable.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question was: To what extent is there sense of community,
perception of informal social controls, and neighborhood satisfaction in the student co-
resident neighborhood? These are the dependent variables considered in the main
analysis in Research Question 5. There are moderate amounts of sense of community,
neighborhood satisfaction and perception of informal social controls. Table 4.3 lists
mean responses for sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction. For each variable, five point Likert scale answers to each set of questions were combined and averaged to form an index score. See Appendix B for variable construction. The closer each mean score is to 5 the higher that resident’s sense of community, perception of informal social control or neighborhood satisfaction. Mean response for sense of community is $M= 3.14$, $SD= 0.82$; for perception of informal social control $M=2.95$, $SD=0.57$; for neighborhood satisfaction $M= 3.32$, $SD= 0.75$. See table 4.3 for the summary for these variables.
Table 4.3: Variable Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density of Aquaintanceships</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of friends who live in the local community</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number friends met as a result of neighboring</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of interaction with neighbors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likelihood of reciprocal exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Network Identification

| An OSU student | 3.68 | 0.61 |
| An 'off-campus student' | 3.23 | 0.77 |
| A student in my major area of study | 3.20 | 0.92 |
| A resident of Columbus, Ohio | 2.88 | 0.89 |
| A resident of my specific street | 2.62 | 0.99 |
| A resident of my home town, not Columbus, Ohio | 2.58 | 1.06 |
| A member of University sponsored club(s), organization(s), honorary, etc. | 2.58 | 1.13 |
| A resident of the University District | 2.50 | 1.01 |

Participation in University Community Building Programs

| No. of activities in which respondent participated | 1.98 | 1.94 | 0 | 8 |
| No. of students participating in at least one activity |     |     | 423 |

Specific Community Building Activity Participation Frequencies

| Interact with a Community Ambassador | 153 |
| Hung a "Buckeye Pride in the 43201" sign in window | 177 |
| Received an "Off-Campus Update" newsletter | 302 |
| Attended neighborhood cookout at CA house | 167 |
| Participated in Halloween Pumpkin Carving Contest | 34 |
| Decorated home/apt for Light up the Night contest | 82 |
| Voted for homes/apartments for Light up the Night | 229 |
| Member of a university off-campus community group | 56 |

Social Ties, Sense of Community, Informal Social Control, Neighborhood Satisfaction

| Social ties | 2.57 | 0.82 |
| Sense of community | 3.14 | 0.82 |
| Perception of informal social control | 2.95 | 0.57 |
| Neighborhood satisfaction | 3.32 | 0.75 |

Note. All variables, with the exception of participation in community building activities are measured on 5 point Likert scales. The closer the mean is to 5, the greater the strength of the variable.
Research Question 5

The fifth and final research question was: To what extent do resident characteristics and levels of participation in university sponsored community building interventions predict social ties, and to what extent does resident and neighborhood social characteristics, amounts of participation in university sponsored community building interventions and social ties predict sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, and perception of informal social controls.

The central analysis included four hierarchical regressions which examined the effects of participation, endogenous network and density of acquaintanceship characteristics and exogenous demographic characteristics on the neighborhood outcomes. The regression analyses followed the conceptual model presented in Chapter 2. The Social ties variable was first regressed as a dependent variable upon participation in community building programs, endogenous type neighborhood characteristics such as network identification, length of residence (transience), and density of acquaintanceships and finally exogenous demographic characteristics such as socio-economic status indicators, race, gender, age and student/non-student status. Next, sense of community, neighborhood satisfaction, and perception of informal social control variables were each regressed upon participation in community building programs, endogenous community characteristics, exogenous demographic characteristics and social ties. Independent variables were entered into each model in blocks and the resulting models are presented in the following section.
The first regression analysis identified social ties as the dependent variable and participation in university community building programs, network identification, density of acquaintanceships, and resident demographics as independent variables. The independent variables were entered in three steps. Participation was entered into the first block, followed by network identification and density of acquaintanceship characteristics and finally exogenous resident demographic characteristics. The entry method was chosen to test the university community building program intervention.

Table 4.4 presents the results of the hierarchical regression model predicting social ties. Participation in university sponsored community building activities is a significant predictor of social ties in this neighborhood ($\beta = .116, p<.01$). In terms of the network identification and density of acquaintanceships, identifying one’s self as a street resident ($\beta = .215, p<.001$) and having friends as a result of neighboring ($\beta = .358, p<.001$) significantly predicts social ties. Both predictor coefficients are positive which indicates the greater a resident identifies as a street resident and the more friends they have made as a result of neighboring, the greater their social ties.

When these community variables are entered into the model, the predictive strength of participation in community building events is less, but remains significant. Participation in community building activities explains 5.7% of the variance, but after the addition of network identification and density of acquaintanceships in step 2 the model improves to explain 30.2% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .245, p<.001$). Resident demographics, extra spending money (an indicator of SES), gender and race are significant predictors of social ties. Gender (female) ($\beta = -.090, p<.05$) and race (non-
white) (\( \beta = -.940, p<.05 \)) are both negative predictors of social ties in this neighborhood environment. This finding indicates that social ties will be less for females and non-white students living in the student co-resident community, but more for students who have more weekly spending money after school and living expenses (\( \beta = .079, p<.05 \)).

After demographic characteristics are entered into the model in step 3, participation remains a significant predictor of social ties (\( \beta = .116, p<.01 \)). The \( R^2 \) change for step three, demographic characteristics, is modest (\( \Delta R^2 = .023, p<.001 \)) compared to for step 2 network identification and density of acquaintanceships (\( \Delta R^2 = .245, p<.001 \)).

Though both represent significant additions to the model, demographic characteristics do not dramatically diminish the effects of significant predictors of network identification and density of acquaintanceships on social ties. This suggests that participation in university sponsored community building activities and significant network identification and density of acquaintanceships variables are the stronger predictors of social ties than are demographic characteristics in this neighborhood context. For each step in the hierarchical model the \( \Delta R^2 \) value is statistically significant (\( p<.001 \) for each step) and the final model explains 32.5\% of the variance. Table 4.4 presents the hierarchical regression model for social ties.
Table 4.4: Hierarchical Regression Model for Social Ties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in comm bldg prog</td>
<td>.239 *** (.018)</td>
<td>.122 ** (.017)</td>
<td>.116 ** (.017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>-.040 (.004)</td>
<td>-.040 (.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as street resident</td>
<td>.214 *** (.035)</td>
<td>.215 *** (.034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as U. District resident</td>
<td>.016 (.033)</td>
<td>.029 (.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as 'off-campus student'</td>
<td>.055 (.044)</td>
<td>.049 (.044)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as OSU student</td>
<td>-.027 (.053)</td>
<td>-.019 (.053)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Ambassador street</td>
<td>.003 (.067)</td>
<td>.003 (.067)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in local community</td>
<td>.041 (.030)</td>
<td>.052 (.031)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends result of neighboring</td>
<td>.370 *** (.029)</td>
<td>.358 *** (.030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.040 (.004)</td>
<td>-.040 (.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as street resident</td>
<td>.214 *** (.035)</td>
<td>.215 *** (.034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as U. District resident</td>
<td>.016 (.033)</td>
<td>.029 (.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as 'off-campus student'</td>
<td>.055 (.044)</td>
<td>.049 (.044)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as OSU student</td>
<td>-.027 (.053)</td>
<td>-.019 (.053)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Ambassador street</td>
<td>.003 (.067)</td>
<td>.003 (.067)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in local community</td>
<td>.041 (.030)</td>
<td>.052 (.031)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends result of neighboring</td>
<td>.370 *** (.029)</td>
<td>.358 *** (.030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father education</td>
<td>.046 (.021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother education</td>
<td>.004 (.023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>.054 (.035)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially independent</td>
<td>-.004 (.058)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid spending money</td>
<td>.079 * (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.050 (.017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-student</td>
<td>.029 (.428)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female)</td>
<td>-.090 * (.065)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (non-white)</td>
<td>-.940 * (.086)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = \quad .057 \quad .302 \quad .325$

Adj. $R^2 = \quad .056 \quad .209 \quad .302$

$\Delta R^2 = \quad .245 \quad .023$

$F = \quad 32.725 *** \quad 25.461 *** \quad 13.936 ***$

$df = \quad 539 \quad 539 \quad 539$

---

*a reference group is living on a street not served by a university employed Community Ambassador. **reference group is dependent. **reference group is student. **reference group is male. **reference group is white. 
* $p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.$
The second model used to test the effect of the university community building program identified sense of community as a dependent variable with the same predictors as the previous model, but with social ties included also as a predictor and included as a fourth step in the hierarchical regression. Participation in university community building programs remained significant until social ties was entered into the model in step 4. Several network identification variables are significant predictors of sense of community, after social ties is entered, although not very strong. This block of variables (step 2) improves the model the most ($\Delta R^2 = .290, p<.001$) before social ties is entered at step 4.

Although participation in community building programs is not a significant predictor of sense of community, living on a street where a Community Ambassador serves (the students who are responsible for facilitating the university sponsored community building activities) is a significant predictor of sense of community ($\beta = .070, p<.05$). The result suggests that, although participation in the actual community building activities Community Ambassadors are planning is not a significant predictor of sense of community, if a student lives on a street where the community building work is taking place, their sense of community can be increased. This finding suggests that Community Ambassadors may influence their neighborhood community as well as individuals who participate directly in their events.

The greatest positive effect on sense of community among the network identification variables is whether the student identified as a street resident ($\beta = .093, p<.01$). Positive effects are also found from identifying as a member of the broader community (the University District), and as an OSU student. Interestingly, identifying
as an ‘off-campus student’ is a negative predictor of sense of community ($\beta = -0.065$, $p<.05$). Social ties is a very strong and significant predictor of sense of community ($\beta = 0.678$, $p<.001$).

When the social ties block is added (step 4) the model is most improved ($\Delta R^2 = 0.31$, $p<.001$) The model may suggest that sense of community is best among those who have good social ties and view themselves as OSU students who live in a specific neighborhood. Of the resident demographics none predict sense of community, and this block (step 3) improves the model the least ($\Delta R^2 = 0.013$). The regression model for sense of community accounts for 62.5% of the variance. Table 4.5 presents the hierarchical regression model for sense of community.
Table 4.5: Hierarchical Regression Model for Sense of Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in comm bldg prog</td>
<td>.252 *** (.018)</td>
<td>.110 *** (.017)</td>
<td>.105 ** (.017)</td>
<td>.027 (.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>-.068 (.004)</td>
<td>-.056 (.004)</td>
<td>-.029 (.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as street resident</td>
<td>.239 *** (.034)</td>
<td>.239 *** (.034)</td>
<td>.093 ** (.026)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as U. District resident</td>
<td>.072 (.032)</td>
<td>.081 * (.033)</td>
<td>.061 * (.024)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as 'off-campus student'</td>
<td>-.022 (.043)</td>
<td>-.032 (.044)</td>
<td>-.065 * (.033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as OSU student</td>
<td>.068 (.052)</td>
<td>.061 (.053)</td>
<td>.074 * (.039)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Ambassador street(^a)</td>
<td>.066 (.067)</td>
<td>.072 (.067)</td>
<td>.070 * (.049)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in local community</td>
<td>.090 * (.030)</td>
<td>.089 * (.031)</td>
<td>.053 (.023)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends result of neighboring</td>
<td>.308 *** (.029)</td>
<td>.295 *** (.03)</td>
<td>.052 (.024)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father education</td>
<td>-.011 (.021)</td>
<td>-.042 (.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother education</td>
<td>.071 (.023)</td>
<td>.014 (.017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>.011 (.035)</td>
<td>.048 (.026)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially independent(^b)</td>
<td>.020 (.058)</td>
<td>.022 (.043)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid spending money</td>
<td>.001 (.000)</td>
<td>-.052 (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.039 (.017)</td>
<td>-.038 (.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-student(^c)</td>
<td>.017 (.427)</td>
<td>-.003 (.316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female)(^d)</td>
<td>-.086 * (.065)</td>
<td>-.025 (.049)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (non-white)(^e)</td>
<td>-.070 (.085)</td>
<td>-.007 (.064)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.678 *** (.032)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = \) .064 .301 .315 .625
\( \text{Adj. } R^2 = \) .062 .290 .291 .611
\( \Delta R^2 = \) .238 .013 .310
\( F = \) 36,565 *** 25,404 *** 13,283 *** 45,624 ***
\( df = \) 539 539 539 539

\(^a\) reference group is living on a street not served by a university employed Community Ambassador. \(^b\) reference group is dependent. \(^c\) reference group is student. \(^d\) reference group is male. \(^e\) reference group is white.

*\( p < .05. ** \( p < .01. *** \( p < .001. \)
The third model used to test the effect of the university community building program identified perception of informal social controls as a dependent variable with the same predictors as the previous model. After all blocks were entered into the hierarchical regression model, only participation in university sponsored community building programs ($\beta = .135, p<.01$) and social ties ($\beta = .348, p<.001$) are significant predictors of perception of informal social controls. The network identification and density of acquaintanceship block (step 2) and social ties block (step 4) improve the model the most ($\Delta R^2 = .08, p<.001$ and $\Delta R^2 = .082, p<.001$ respectively). The greatest effect on informal social controls is social ties ($\beta = .348, p<.001$). Resident demographics (step 3) improves the model the least ($\Delta R^2 = .003, p<.001$). Resident demographics are not significant predictors of perception of informal social controls. The model for perception of informal social control explains 22.5% of the variance. Table 4.6 presents the hierarchical regression model for perception of informal social controls.
Table 4.6: Hierarchical Regression Model for Perception of Informal Social Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in comm bldg prog</td>
<td>.245 *** (.012)</td>
<td>.174 *** (.013)</td>
<td>.175 *** (.013)</td>
<td>.135 ** (.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>-.051 ( .003)</td>
<td>-.043 ( .003)</td>
<td>-.029 ( .003)</td>
<td>-.040 ( .003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as street resident</td>
<td>.129 ** (.026)</td>
<td>.127 ** (.027)</td>
<td>.126 ** (.026)</td>
<td>.127 ** (.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as U. District resident</td>
<td>.000 (.025)</td>
<td>-.001 (.025)</td>
<td>-.011 (.024)</td>
<td>-.001 (.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as 'off-campus student'</td>
<td>-.006 (.033)</td>
<td>-.010 (.034)</td>
<td>-.027 (.033)</td>
<td>-.010 (.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as OSU student</td>
<td>.000 (.040)</td>
<td>-.001 (.041)</td>
<td>.006 (.039)</td>
<td>-.001 (.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Ambassador street a</td>
<td>.026 (.051)</td>
<td>.026 (.052)</td>
<td>.025 (.049)</td>
<td>.026 (.052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in local community</td>
<td>.053 (.023)</td>
<td>.051 (.024)</td>
<td>.033 (.023)</td>
<td>.051 (.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends result of neighboring</td>
<td>.203 *** (.022)</td>
<td>.200 *** (.023)</td>
<td>.076 (.024)</td>
<td>.200 *** (.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father education</td>
<td>-.010 (.016)</td>
<td>-.026 (.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother education</td>
<td>-.048 (.017)</td>
<td>-.049 (.017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>.014 (.027)</td>
<td>.033 (.026)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially independent b</td>
<td>-.013 (.045)</td>
<td>-0.12 (.043)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid spending money</td>
<td>.002 (.000)</td>
<td>-.026 (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.022 (.013)</td>
<td>-.021 (.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-student b</td>
<td>.020 (.020)</td>
<td>.010 (.315)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female)</td>
<td>-.016 (.051)</td>
<td>.016 (.048)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (non-white)</td>
<td>-.008 (.066)</td>
<td>.024 (.063)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.348 *** (.032)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = \]
\[ \text{Adj. } R^2 = \]
\[ \Delta R^2 = \]
\[ F = \]
\[ df = \]

*α reference group is living on a street not served by a university employed Community Ambassador. β reference group is dependent. γ reference group is student. Δreference group is male. δ reference group is white.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
The fourth and final model used to test the effects of university community building programs identified neighborhood satisfaction as a dependent variable with the same predictors as the previous model. Neighborhood satisfaction is not predicted by participation in university sponsored community building programs after network identifiers and acquaintanceship density, resident demographics and social ties are entered into the model. Network identification (step 2) improves the model most ($\Delta R^2 = .098, p<.001$). Resident demographics are not significant predictors of neighborhood satisfaction, and improve the model the least of the blocks entered ($\Delta R^2 = .016, p<.001$).

After resident demographics (step 3) and social ties (step 4) are entered into the model “identify as a resident of a specific street” remains significant. Final significant predictors of neighborhood satisfaction in this model are “identify as a resident of a specific street” ($\beta = .205, p<.001$) and social ties ($\beta = .191, p<.001$). But, overall, the model only explains 15.1% of the variance. Neighborhood satisfaction in this neighborhood environment is a more complicated matter than community building programs, as they are currently designed, are able to influence. Table 4.7 presents the hierarchical regression for neighborhood satisfaction.
Table 4.7: Hierarchical Regression Model for Neighborhood Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
<th>( \beta ) (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in comm bldg prog</td>
<td>.109 * (.017)</td>
<td>.035 (.017)</td>
<td>.032 (.018)</td>
<td>.010 (.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence</td>
<td>-.093 * (.004)</td>
<td>-.084 (.004)</td>
<td>-.077 (.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as street resident</td>
<td>.250 *** (.035)</td>
<td>.246 *** (.036)</td>
<td>.205 *** (.036)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as U. District resident</td>
<td>-.006 (.033)</td>
<td>-.013 (.034)</td>
<td>-.019 (.033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as ‘off-campus student’</td>
<td>-.007 (.045)</td>
<td>-.013 (.046)</td>
<td>-.022 (.045)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify as OSU student</td>
<td>.049 (.054)</td>
<td>.055 (.055)</td>
<td>.059 (.054)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Ambassador street(^a)</td>
<td>.073 (.069)</td>
<td>.075 (.069)</td>
<td>.075 (.068)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in local community</td>
<td>.029 (.031)</td>
<td>.026 (.032)</td>
<td>.016 (.032)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends result of neighboring</td>
<td>.096 * (.030)</td>
<td>.079 (.031)</td>
<td>.011 (.033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father education</td>
<td>.038 (.022)</td>
<td>.029 (.022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother education</td>
<td>-.078 (.023)</td>
<td>-.079 (.023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>.058 (.037)</td>
<td>.068 (.036)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially independent(^b)</td>
<td>-.004 (.060)</td>
<td>-.003 (.060)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid spending money</td>
<td>-.011 (.000)</td>
<td>-.026 (.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.047 (.018)</td>
<td>-.046 (.018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-student(^c)</td>
<td>-.058 (.443)</td>
<td>-.063 (.437)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female)(^d)</td>
<td>-.071 (.068)</td>
<td>-.054 (.067)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (non-white)(^e)</td>
<td>.055 (.089)</td>
<td>.073 (.088)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ties</td>
<td>.191 *** (.045)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = \) \( .012 \) \( .110 \) \( .126 \) \( .151 \)

\( \text{Adj. } R^2 = \) \( .010 \) \( .095 \) \( .096 \) \( .119 \)

\( \Delta R^2 = \) \( .098 \) \( .016 \) \( .025 \)

\( F = \) \( 6.461 * \) \( 7.271 *** \) \( 4.166 *** \) \( 4.850 *** \)

\( df = \) \( 539 \) \( 539 \) \( 539 \) \( 539 \)

\( ^a\) reference group is living on a street not served by a university employed Community Ambassador. \( ^b\) reference group is dependent. \( ^c\) reference group is student. \( ^d\) reference group is male. \( ^e\) reference group is white.

\(* p<.05. \ ** p<.01. \ *** p<.001.\)
Participation in university facilitated community building programs was found to significantly predict social ties and perceptions of informal social controls. Although sense of community is not predicted by university sponsored community building program participation, living in a community where a Community Ambassador serves does predict this outcome. In addition to participation in university facilitated community building programs, social ties, when entered into the regression model as an independent variable, most significantly and strongly predicted all three of the outcome variables. Identifying as a resident of a specific street was a significant predictor of social ties and sense of community. Demographic characteristics predicted social ties modestly, but did not significantly predict any of the other outcome variables. It is also important to note that in each of the four hierarchical regression models, the $\Delta R^2$ hypothesis test for the addition of each step was significant at the .001 level. These results are consistent with theory and also offer several interesting suggestions as to what is important in terms of predicting social outcomes in student co-resident neighborhoods. These results and their implications will be discussed in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This dissertation study investigated the effect of a university sponsored community building program upon the social context of the student co-resident neighborhood adjacent to an urban university campus. The study assessed demographic structures and sources of social disorganization both theorized in the neighborhood literature and considered by the researcher. The study also considered the predictive relationship of those demographic structures and disorganization variables, considered along with the university community building interventions, upon specific social outcomes important to the conceptualization of neighborhoods and community. Social ties, sense of community, perception of informal social controls and neighborhood satisfaction were among these outcome variables. This chapter presents a discussion of the findings which were reported in Chapter 4.

Participation in University Community Building Programs

Participation in university community building programs does seem to be associated with significant impacts on certain neighborhood outcomes in the student co-resident neighborhood. Those outcomes include the formation of social ties and perception of informal social controls. Also, living in a community where the community
building program is taking place seems to significantly predict sense of community. Sixty-nine percent (423 students of the 612 sample) participated in one or more activities. On average students participated in two of eight community building activities during the quarter which preceded the deployment of the survey. The program is intended to provide opportunities for student neighbors to meet each other and begin the process of casual neighboring. And the results suggest that this participation by residents in community building programs significantly predicts social ties in the student co-resident neighborhood. Social ties goes beyond the simple act of meeting neighbors, and the programs the university is facilitating in these neighborhoods seems to be having positive effects on that social ties development.

Participation in community building programs significantly predicts perception of informal social controls as well. Informal social controls are an important aspect of the self-regulatory capacity of a neighborhood. If residents perceive that others are taking a role in addressing neighborhood issues the literature suggests that neighboring behavior could be increased (Taylor, 1996). Although it cannot be directly inferred that the perception of informal social controls equate to actual increased social controls, participation in community building programs is related to an increase in the likelihood that residents will think others are participating in addressing neighborhood issues. Neighborhoods are behavioral settings (Taylor, 1997), and any positive step toward improvement to that behavioral setting pattern could be a critically important one for improving the quality of life for those who live in that neighborhood.
Although participation in community building programs does not significantly predict sense of community, living on a street where a Community Ambassador serves is a significant predictor of sense of community. The sense of community regression model presented in Chapter 4 does suggest, however, that participation is a significant predictor prior to the social ties variable being entered and social ties is, itself, predicted by participation in university community building activities. Given this connection between social ties and participation and the finding that living on a Community Ambassador street is a significant predictor of sense of community, it seems likely that there is a relationship, although not direct, between sense of community and participation in community building activities.

**Demographic Structures and Network Association**

The data suggest that the student co-resident neighborhood is a rather homogeneous environment. Respondents were 82% white. These findings are also consistent with 2010 US census data which indicates that 88% of residents in the community, who are over the age of 18, are white. Race (non-white) is included in the final social ties regression model as significant negative predictor suggesting that non-white students are less likely to form bonds with their neighbors in this neighborhood setting. Theory predicts that racial and ethnic heterogeneity negatively impacts social bonds in neighborhoods by impeding communication and interaction (Sampson & Groves, 1989), and this theoretical claim is supported by the current study.

Females accounted for 67% of respondents and males 32%. At the time of this analysis, 2010 Census data for gender was not available for comparison, however 2000
census data indicate that 57% of residents in the two US census tracts selected were male. This could suggest a potential limitation of the results, and this limitation will be discussed subsequently. Despite this potential bias, results suggest that females have lower levels of social ties in the neighborhoods. This could be because females have in increased sense of safety issues, might be more fearful than are males, and this fear could curtail their engagement in casual neighboring in the co-resident neighborhood. Fisher, Sloan & Wilkins (1995) in their study of fear of crime and perception of risk of victimization in a campus setting suggest that gender (being female) is a factor in perception of physical vulnerability or susceptibility to attack, powerlessness to resist attack, and exposure to significant physical and emotional consequences if attacked. Fisher et al. in their study of perceived risk on a university campus found that gender (being female) was significantly associated with perceived risk as well as fear at night. This fear of vulnerability might cause female residents of these neighborhoods to be more cautious of, and less likely to interact with unknown neighbors, particularly if those neighbors are males.

Respondents were predominantly between the ages of 19 and 24 years (95%). Age did not prove to be a significant predictor of any of the outcome variables examined in this study. The sample, and likely the population, represents a restricted range in reference to age. Although age was not statistically significant, its regression coefficients were negative in each of the outcome variable’s regression models. Despite the uncertainty of the age variable to predict outcomes there are developmental implications suggested by the age demographic. Chickering and Reisser (1983) suggest that students
at this age are faced with several developmental tasks which they refer to as ‘vectors’. One of these developmental vectors which seems most applicable to the neighborhood living scenario is developing competence. There is a social or interpersonal component to developing competence, and the questions considered as part of the social ties piece in this study seem to be connected to and affected by the challenge of developing interpersonally in this social context. There appear to be countervailing dynamics at play: The neighborhood setting might hinder movement toward the formation of developmentally appropriate social ties but the community building program encourages it. Also, the data suggest that there might be a developmental trajectory nuance not quite fully captured by the current study.

Socioeconomic indicators suggest that students who live in the student co-resident neighborhood are financially dependent upon their parents, do not necessarily come from wealth, and do not have large amounts of extra spending money. The literature theorizes that socioeconomic status is a predictor of social disorganization and that higher SES status is associated with greater organization (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Taylor, 1996; Woldoff, 2002). Some indicators of socioeconomic status predict community outcomes in this study, but not all.

This study shows that socioeconomic status has some positive effects on social ties. Amount of extra spending money, after living and school expenses, was a predictor of social ties. Spending money was one of several socioeconomic status indicators, the others were not significant predictors of social ties in the student co-resident neighborhood. This result suggests that there are aspects of socioeconomic status which
predict social ties in this neighborhood context. The reasons for this is unknown, but might relate to the same theoretical notions which suggest that socio-economic status, particularly poverty, is related to social disorganization in the community (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974). I speculated in Chapter 2 that there might well be a difference between a student resident’s familial SES background and their current SES characteristics and realities as a college student. Given that the other background indicators of socio-economic status, father’s and mother’s education, and annual family income, are not significant predictors of social ties, this speculation regarding current SES situation might be true. The reason the variable relates specifically to social ties is unclear. It could be that students with more spending money spend that money on socializing; hosting house parties, ‘going out’ with friends, and other activities that might create opportunities for increased social ties. An additional line of inquiry might examine why students have extra spending money. This could be linked to a host of variables such as employment, financial aid, and possibly SES background in that their parents support them financially. More research is needed to better understand the intricacies of SES and social ties in the student co-resident community. Such further research would be needed to further illuminate and nuance the effect of SES in the student co-resident neighborhood, and the practical implications for this information would need to be considered as well.

**Transience**

This is a transient neighborhood, and pervasive turnover seems to be the mode by which the neighborhood population fluctuates. With ‘turnover’ residents move in and out of rental units relatively at the same time, in this case corresponding with the beginning
of the lease season and university academic calendar. Churn, or steady in and out movement throughout the year, does not seem to happen. This is evidenced by the length of residence modality around 4 and 5 months and at 15 and 16 months. For the most part the student residents have not lived in the community for more than two years or two full lease cycles; most respondents are in the midst of their first lease cycle and have lived in the neighborhood for less than a year. Length of residence does not predict any of the outcomes studied, but in the neighborhood satisfaction regression analysis length of residence is significant prior to adding in personal demographics and social ties. It is to be noted that it is a negative predictor. This finding suggests that although resident stability is theorized to have positive effects in neighborhoods, this is not the case in the co-resident environment. It might be that once a resident has lived in the community for more than a year they begin to form more negative opinions of the community, begin to develop goals beyond their time as students and as they mature, they begin to become less interested in the college student neighborhood. As students look to develop and establish a sense of identity they begin to understand better what experiences resonate with them (Chickering & Reisser, 1983, p. 49). The longer students live in the community, the more they may learn they prefer to have other amenities in a living environment, and the enticement of the carefree ‘youth ghetto’ wears to a resentment of the social-contextual trade-offs made when residing in these types of neighborhoods.

**Density of Acquaintanceships**

There are two types of acquaintanceships examined in this study. The first are those friendships which students bring with them to the neighborhood from their
associations with the University. Dorm friends, classmates, friends from clubs and organizations are all examples of this type of acquaintanceship. The second are acquaintanceships which are the result of neighboring in the community. These would be friends students acquired as a result of neighboring with other students in the neighborhood community where they live. There is a moderately high density of acquaintanceship in the community; students indicate that they have many friends who live in local community. The data indicate that acquaintanceship density in this neighborhood seems to be more a result of University associations and less the result of neighboring. Data also suggests that students seldom interact with their neighbors.

Theory suggests that number of friends in the community is a predictor of neighborhood outcomes such as social support and community sentiment (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974). But number of friends in the community alone is not a strong a predictor of neighborhood outcomes in this neighborhood environment. Friendships which are a result of neighboring, however, are an important predictor of neighborhood outcomes. Greider & Krannich (1985) suggested that communities of interest can provide additional social support in the urban environment. It remains unclear the full extent of “communities of interest” to be found in this neighborhood setting but the current study suggests that, in this type of residential environment where students have deep network associations with the University, neighboring (networks of place) remains a more important influence on community outcomes. In other words, although students are members of the broader university community and bring with them a friendship density from their university experience, it is still critically important for them to make friends and acquaintances of
their neighbors. It is not enough to simply know others across the community if positive community outcomes are to be realized.

**Network Identification**

Network identification, or whether students more strongly associate with their ties to the university or to the neighborhood community, was considered as a predictor of the outcome variables. These networks include “communities of place” within the neighborhood, or non-community based networks which include associations with the university. Students most strongly identify themselves as Ohio State students. But, they also identify as ‘off-campus’ students and several other community identifiers such as a resident of the specific street upon which they live. This suggests that although students are strongly associated with their ties to the university, they also identify as community members and are not exclusively aligned with their identity as a university student. Moreover, identifying as a ‘resident of a specific street’ is an important variable in predicting social ties, sense of community and neighborhood satisfaction. This study suggests that encouraging a sense of specific street or neighborhood identity would be a productive goal of intervention strategies where the goal is to encourage social ties and sense of community. Overall, students identify themselves with a mix of university and community memberships. And a collection of these network identity variables predict sense of community: Identify as a University District resident, identify as an off-campus student, and identify as an OSU student. This finding supports the theoretical proposition that membership is an important component to sense of community.
One interesting finding in terms of network identification was that identifying as an ‘off-campus student’ was a modest negative predictor of sense of community where ‘identify as a street resident’ and ‘identify as a University District resident’ were both positive predictors. One possible explanation for ‘off-campus’ as a negative predictor is that the term ‘off-campus student’ is a generic label used by the university to identify students who live in the neighborhoods within walking distance of the campus. There might be unenthusiastic associations with this term as it has no didactic connection to the actual neighborhood in which students feel they are residents. The vague nature of the term ‘off-campus’ does not offer any direction for a resident to associate themselves with membership in a clear group of people, such as a specific street community or a specific community with definable boundaries and population. Finally, the term might simply be viewed as negative. The media refers to “off-campus crime,” the university dealt with “off-campus riots,” “off-campus landlords” are difficult to deal with, etc.; The term might serve to rebuke and distance those to whom it is applied as opposed to draw residents together into a definable community of which they might want to be a member. This is particularly troublesome as it is the second most highly rated way which students indicate they identify themselves.

Living on a Community Ambassador street was a significant predictor of sense of community, but participating in the community building programs was not a significant predictor. This might seem as if it is a contradictory finding, but I believe that this is not the case. Community Ambassadors do more than facilitate community building activities on their street and in the broad University District community. Not tested in this study
are the numerous supportive resources which Community Ambassadors provide to their neighbors. These resources do not constitute participatory events or activities, but are more passive informational materials which are distributed in various ways (signs, flyers and emails) to residents reminding them of things such as street sweeping tow dates, safety tips, good citizen behavioral suggestions and the like. It is possible that these more passive aspects of the community building program might be contributing to positive influences on sense of community.

Figure 5.1 presents the variable relationships model suggested in Chapter 2 modified to represent suggested relationships found in this study. It incorporates the proposition that several of the independent variables have direct effects upon the outcome variables sense of community and perception of informal social controls. The figure also addresses the more specific predictors found to influence the outcomes and moves neighborhood satisfaction to the level of the more distal variables, which will be addressed subsequently in terms of limitations to the current study.
Figure 5.1. Amended Student Neighborhood Variable Relationships
Limitations

Although the study was able shed light on the central question of university community building programs, and contribute to a structural understanding of the community, there are some limitations to the study and several ways in which it could be improved. For instance, it is unknown if individuals who identify as Asian are domestic Asian-American students or international students. Some of the influence of the race variable on the outcomes could in part be the result of language barriers or more substantive cultural differences. Future research could investigate this nuance by better articulating the demographic variables in this respect. This would allow for better determination of the more specific nature and influence of race or cultural differences in the co-resident neighborhood environment.

Another potential limitation of the data is the difference between response rates for females and males. The survey may over represent female experiences in the neighborhood. As mentioned earlier 2000 US census data indicates that over half of the residents in the neighborhood studied are male but only 32% of the respondents to the survey were male. Given the relationship discussed in the literature between females and perceptions of crime and safety, it is possible the results are biased in this regard.

The survey respondents did not include many non-student residents. The two census tracts were purposefully chosen because they include the streets with the highest concentration of students. Therefore, the current study does not represent the
perspectives of the homeowners and the non-student population. As proposed in Chapter 1 this study was meant to be the first in progressive group of research steps which will include neighborhoods with increasing numbers of permanent residents or homeowners in the population. Much of the current literature focuses around home owners and not on students. This study was meant to begin the investigation into the student co-resident population. Given that there were some significant results with regard to age and non-student status, the proposal to develop research in neighborhoods more populated with homeowners and non-student residents seems to be a sound and promising one.

Neighborhood satisfaction seems to be a more complicated variable and is not predicted in any particularly insightful way by many of variables in this study. Identifying as a street resident and social ties are the only variables which predict neighborhood satisfaction. Participation in University community building programs does not, and the resulting model predicts a small portion of the variance. Literature suggests that neighborhood satisfaction is affected by many variables such as type of neighborhood, scale of the metropolitan area, housing stock (Lee & Guest, 1983) and other variables not explored in this study.

Theoretical Implications

Several theoretical constructs were suggested as useful frameworks for this study. Human ecology was one of them. The question addressed by human ecological theory is ‘under what conditions do given actions occur?’ (Hawley, 1986, p.6). This study shows that intervention to change or create conditions does have a relationship with social outcomes in student co-resident neighborhood settings. It also points out other conditions
such as strong neighborhood identity and social ties as the result of neighboring, which are important for positive neighborhood outcomes. University sponsored community building programs might influence these important community dimensions. Social disorganization theory was also proposed as a relevant theoretical framework for this study of student co-resident neighborhoods. Intervening constructs of social disorganization (friendship networks, participation, and informal social controls) were assessed along with exogenous sources of social disorganization (resident mobility, socioeconomic status, and other demographic structures such as race/ethnicity and age) (Sampson & Groves 1989). These intervening constructs and exogenous sources of social disorganization also proved in some cases to be relevant variables in the prediction of social outcomes in these neighborhoods.

Density of acquaintanceships and friendship networks was identified in the literature as a compelling aspect to community outcomes and social disorganization theory (Freudenburg, 1986; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Sampson, 1988). Networks of interest and networks based on location or “place” were also explored as potential effects to community outcomes in this context. This study examined the difference between identifying with a network such as a “identity as a university student” or “identity as a member of a club or organization” and networks of place represented by items such as “identify as a street resident” and “identify as a University District resident.” And the results show that first, students in this neighborhood environment view themselves as university students, but as ‘off-campus’ students second. The results show, however, that community or ‘network of place’ associations more predict sense of community and
social ties than does university network identification. It also seems that place identifiers which are clearly associated with a demonstrable community are positive predictors of sense of community. This not only supports theory but it also suggests a promising outcomes platform upon which interventions can be designed.

Programs focused on countering the effects of social disorganization in the community might be successful at producing socially desirable outcomes in the transient student co-resident environment. This study shows that not all problems can be solved by intervention, but the fact remains that the program tested in this study was designed for specific outcomes, and those outcomes, though modest, were realized in the analysis. Interventions planned in these or other neighborhoods should be carefully designed to address the specific outcomes most needed for that environmental context.

The suggestion was made in Chapters 1 and 2 that student co-resident neighborhoods are unique among neighborhood types. Several neighborhoods types were described; limited liability, contrived neighborhoods, defended neighborhoods organizationally dependent and defeated neighborhoods (Suttles, 1972). The student co-resident neighborhood does seem to be unique in that it could be thought of as ‘function specific’ neighborhood. Co-residents live in the function specific neighborhood because of an ecological “key function” (Hawley, 1986) with which the co-residents are all associated, in this case, the University. Aspects of community are different in the function specific student co-resident neighborhood. Participation is not high, but can be intervened upon, possibly most successfully by the function which brought the co-residents to the neighborhood. Few co-residents stay past their association with the key
function, but while they do live in the neighborhood they exhibit a certain level of community solidarity and identify both with the neighborhood and the function at the same time.

**Further Analysis and Future Research**

This study was intended to begin the conversation about the social context of student neighborhoods and explore how intervention strategies influence that context. The intention was to spark a robust conversation regarding strategies to better understand the communities where our students live and how to best support them. The current study raises many exciting questions for future research.

Further data analysis could be performed on the current data set to address questions that go beyond the questions asked in this study. The data collected and analyzed thus far lead to additional interesting questions. For instance, potential covariance could be examined to determine better if race, gender and participation interact to effect social ties. Analysis of mediating effects of social ties can be examined between the demographic, participation, network identification and density of acquaintanceships variables and the outcomes variables. Particularly of interest would the potential mediating effect social ties formation has on the relationship between participation in community building activities and sense of community.

The questions related to neighborhood outcomes that were addressed in this study lend themselves to the use of hierarchical linear models. Such methods allow for the dependent variables to vary on multiple levels. This means that individual outcomes could be nested into neighborhood outcomes, which could be nested into community
outcomes. The current study was not designed as a multilevel analysis, but future research could address outcome in this manner. Social disorganization researchers have also proposed that multilevel analysis is an appropriate future methodological direction for social disorganization research (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Path analysis could also be used to further explore the data presented in the current study. Because causal relationships were not meant to be implied in the current analysis, path analysis was not considered, but further analysis could utilize path analysis to explore causal relationships between the variables examined in this study.

College students are in a unique developmental moment in their lives. They are attempting to develop social competence, autonomy and interdependence (Chi  

ckering & Reisser, 1993). The fact that length of residence is a negative predictor (albeit not significant) of community outcomes creates an important suggestion for the expansion of future research into questions of development. Research can be designed to better incorporate the developmental context and tasks of this population and demonstrate how that developmental process factors into both the social context of the neighborhood and success of interventions. The community building program studied is, in one way, developmentally sensitive in that while attempting to build community it addresses the needs of college students to socialize, make friends and develop in a context of autonomy. It is not developmentally sensitive in that it does not address the developmental growth trajectory of student as they move through their experience in the neighborhood and prepare to transition out; an ‘intra-individual’ approach to the developmental needs of students. The university creates a host of opportunities for
students to engage, learn and develop which are sensitive to the developmental tasks of
the college aged person and it seems reasonable that the same could be done here. Future
research could do a better job investigating the developmental trajectory and needs of
students who live in the co-resident environment and how those intersect with the quality
of the neighborhood and community outcomes. And if development relates to the person
interacting with his or her environment, the unique affects of the neighborhood
environment on the development process of students should also be investigated more
closely. The suggestion then is that future research be designed to investigate potential
reciprocal effects of student development and neighborhood outcomes. There might be a
need for longitudinal data examining the changes students undergo over time, as they
increasingly interact with programming, and intervening neighborhood variables, to best
address developmental questions.

Future research should attempt to form a better understanding of the influences of
demographic structures such as socioeconomic status, background versus more
immediate spending money, as well as race and gender upon social ties in these
neighborhoods. Race as a variable can be further developed, articulated and investigated.
It is not known how much of the effects of race on the outcome variables are a matter of
majority/minority dynamics or differences in culture, say, between international students
and domestic students. Better understanding of the reasons female students experience
less social ties in the co-resident community should also be sought. Answers to both
questions provide implications for practice. Qualitative approaches could provide
excellent insight into the experiences of women and minority students who live in this type of community.

Because non-whites seem to have less social ties in the co-resident community, future research could address the effects of neighborhood culture. Culture can be said to describe both the “content and distribution of shared values in a community” and whether those values are linked to the social structure itself (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003, p. 379). Models of diverse and competing subcultures model, first theorized by Shaw & Mckay (1969) suggests that multiple cultures exist in one community and the presence of these various subcultures “undermines the community’s ability to find consensus” (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003, p. 380). Small (2002) asserts that culture acts as a filter through which cohorts come to frame and understand their neighborhood, the aspects of it they will consequently highlight or ignore, and that this filtering will, in turn, affect the way the cohorts act toward the neighborhood. If we can better understand the frames with which different racial cohorts come to understand the neighborhood, it might well explain the contrast between social ties among white and non-white students, and also explain the seeming lack of cohesion among and across both populations: it is possible that each group literally “sees” a different neighborhood.

Research can also be designed to go deeper into the question of community and cohesion. Collective efficacy is a concept that might be worthwhile to study in the student co-resident community. Collective efficacy is defined as “a sense of collective competence shared among individuals when allocating, coordinating, and integrating their resources in a successful concerted response to specific situational demands.”
Collective efficacy as a community outcome has been found to be strongly associated with several variables and individual structures of interest to this study, such as residential socioeconomic status and age (Sampson, et al, 1997) as well as neighborhood level structures such as concentrated disadvantage and resident stability. For this reason collective efficacy has been identified as an important construct to be examined in the context of social disorganization research (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003) and might prove to be a concept worth investigating in the student neighborhood.

Collective Efficacy and neighborhood culture are complicated and deep constructs to assess. They were beyond the scope of the current study, but could be potentially important concepts which might be considered in the context of the student co-resident neighborhood. Subsequent research can consider the nature and role of collective efficacy and neighborhood culture in this neighborhood milieu and do so utilizing qualitative methods, particularly interviews, focus groups for instance, to produce a much more rich description of these variables.

**Implications for Practice**

Many of the implications of the current study lead to suggestions for practitioners. The university community building programs studied in this research project seem to achieve the goals for which they were developed. These include encouraging social ties, increasing social controls and contributing to sense of community. Because networks of place more significantly predict community outcomes, university administrators would be wise to use this as a platform for intervention. The demographic characteristics students
bring with them to the neighborhood are not extremely strong or significant predictors of outcomes, but are in some cases detractors from community outcomes. By contrast, attempting to encourage students to identify as street residents and specific community members may have positive effects on sense of community. Administrators may also consider using a term different from “off-campus” to identify students who live in the student neighborhoods and the resources which are made available to them. Well-designed branding and thorough marketing techniques may be a key co-component of those efforts.

This study suggests that both participation in activities and the presence of a student who facilitates these activities are key to positive outcomes in these communities. Administrators would do well to increase the number of streets which are served by these students and continue to encourage not only the development of participatory activities, but also continue to focus on providing resources and messaging to students in the community. In other words create a diversity of activities and materials and deliver them in different ways to residents. Given the data which suggest students who identify as street residents and who identify as larger community residents might have more a sense of community it is suggested that a mix of activities that both promote identifying with specific street communities and promote a larger sense of broad community be developed. For instance, the Community Ambassador program at Ohio State facilitates cookouts on each street twice per academic year. The program also sponsors an annual holiday lights competition. Light up the Night, which engages students community wide. Students clearly need to be able to associate with a specific, smaller neighborhood group,
but they need also to be able to connect to a larger idea. The Light up the Night event may allow residents to feel part of a larger effort, and to see the more immediate results of them and so many others participating in something that is beneficial to the larger community. This is a key component of the theoretical notion of sense of community: shared experiences (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990).

Administrators should begin to consider developmental issues when designing programs to build neighborhood community. Addressing the developmental needs of student who remain the community for more than one year might have positive impacts upon community outcomes. In addition to considering the needs of continuing student residents, taking more intentional steps to engage female and minority students will also be important in these neighborhood settings. Crime reduction strategies combined with training on personal safety practices to increase sense of security could help female residents engage in more behaviors that lead to strong social ties and sense of community.

Conclusion

It is extremely important that universities continue the work of addressing the student neighborhoods which surround their campuses. Ensuring that students live in environments where their safety and success is assured is critically important to the mission of higher education. Community relations also hinge greatly on the extent to which students and community members experience each other in positive ways. For the sake of our students, our communities and our universities, we cannot afford to let these neighborhoods fail! In Chapter 1 several examples of disruptions common to these
neighborhoods were offered, one was an apology in 2002 by the then Ohio State University president Dr. Karen Holbrook, following off-campus riots. She said: “it is sad to note that … this is a national and ongoing problem…what the ultimate answer might be, I am not certain. But it is my view, that such behaviors must be addressed on many fronts”. As universities look to address the social context of the neighborhood environments proximal to the campus, one avenue clearly should involve direct intervention to address social outcomes in the student co-resident community. Effective strategies for doing so will need to be carefully designed, purposefully implemented, and thoroughly studied. This study sheds some light on the effectiveness of one such strategy designed at The Ohio State University. And now the work begins to develop the interventions that will achieve even greater outcomes for the students and neighbors who live in our communities.
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Appendix A: Survey Instrument Materials

Survey Cover Letter for surveys and Follow up to non-responders

Launch: December 7, 2010; follow up emails on December 14 and 21, 2010
Subject line: Win $50: Tell us about the Off-Campus experience at Ohio State!

Dear (name):

Hello! My name is Sean McLaughlin (follow up email insert: I am following up with you regarding an email I sent to you several days ago inviting you to participate in a survey I am conducting ) and I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program in the College of Education and Human Ecology working with Dr. Ada Demb, Associate Professor of Educational Policy & Leadership, to conduct my dissertation research. I am also the assistant director of Off-Campus Student Services in the Office of Student Life at The Ohio State University.

As a doctoral student I am interested in studying the off-campus student neighborhoods because not much is really known about these unique neighborhood environments! I am wondering if you would help me learn more about the off-campus area by filling out my survey. The survey examines the social context of the student neighborhood near the Ohio State University.

You are being invited to fill out the survey because you have been identified as an OSU student who lives in the off-campus neighborhood. I would really love it if you would take the survey as a high response rate will really give us great results!

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary! Your decision about whether to take this survey will have no impact on your school work. Your responses will be completely anonymous. All responses will be stripped of any identifying information and results will be pooled and reported collectively.

Please respond to each item of the survey as honestly as possible. For the purpose of all the questions, the “neighborhood in which you live” is meant to be the off-campus street
upon which you live between the nearest cross streets, and your “neighbors” are those individuals who live around you, in the immediate area near your home. Please answer the questions based upon the current place where you live off-campus.

Taking the survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete and once you begin the survey, if you decide you no longer wish to participate, you may discontinue.

All responders to the survey are offered an opportunity to enter a drawing for a chance to win one of two $50 gift cards to the Ohio State University Bookstore. If you choose to enter this drawing, your contact information will be collected by a separate system and will not be connected in any way to your responses. The contact information you provide will not be shared with us. You are not required to finish the survey to enter the drawing.

If you have any questions about the survey, please feel free to contact Sean McLaughlin at mclaughlin.129@osu.edu. For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Most appreciatively,

Sean McLaughlin
Doctoral Candidate, College of Human Ecology, Higher Education and Student Affairs

Ada Demb
Associate Professor, College of Human Ecology, Higher Education and Student Affairs
Final Survey Instrument

I have read the instructions and agree to proceed with the survey: yes/no

1. Do you live in the 43201 zip code area: yes/no (no= branch to #94)

2. Please indicate the street upon which you live:
   (insert list of all streets within the census tracts being studied) Chittenden, E. 12th Avenue, E. 13th Avenue, E. 14th Avenue, E. 15th Avenue, E. 16th Avenue, E. 17th Avenue, E. 18th Avenue, Iuka Avenue, Indianola Avenue, Summit, E. 19th Avenue, Woodruff, Frambes, E. Lane Avenue, Tuller, Waldeck, other (if “other” branch to #94)

Social Ties, Network Interaction & Reciprocated Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How likely is it that you would ask a neighbor to borrow something like a cornhole set (if they had one)?

4. How likely is it that you would ask a neighbor to borrow something like money?

5. How likely is it that a neighbor would ask you to borrow something, like a cornhole set (if you had one)?

6. How likely is it that a neighbor would ask you to borrow something, like a money?

7. How likely is it that you would get help from a neighbor? (e.g., watch your place if you’re away, feed a pet, take in mail)?

8. How likely is it that you would help a neighbor (e.g., watching their place if they’re away)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Seldom/never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(once every 3 months)</td>
<td>(once per month)</td>
<td>(once per week)</td>
<td>(daily)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How often do you greet your neighbors when you see them?

10. How often do you casually visit with neighbors, either going over to their place or their coming over to yours?

11. How often do you participate in neighborhood activities (e.g., cookouts, parties, Light up the Night)?

12. How often do you talk to neighbors who are students?

13. How often do you talk to neighbors who are non-students?

14. How often do the people in this neighborhood do favors for each other?
### Sense of Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>There are people I can rely on among my neighbors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>People trust each other in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel I belong in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I care about what my neighbors think of my actions (e.g., if I take care of my property, how I act, etc)?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I feel close to some of my neighbors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>People in my neighborhood are usually warm and friendly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>We look out for one another in this neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Satisfaction with Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My neighborhood is a good place to live</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My neighborhood has been getting worse recently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The building and yards in my neighborhood are really run down</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I would move out of my neighborhood if I could</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I would rent here again</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>There are good outdoor places to recreate in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Overall I am satisfied with my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>My feelings about this neighborhood are influenced by my perception or relationship with the police</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My feelings about this neighborhood are influenced by my experience with a landlord(s)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>My feelings about this neighborhood are influenced by my perceptions of crime in this neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>My feelings about this neighborhood are influenced by my own observations and experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>My feelings about this neighborhood are influenced by friends or neighbors observations and experiences in this neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>My feelings about this neighborhood are influenced by the non-student residents living near me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My feelings about this neighborhood are influenced by my perception of the relationship between this neighborhood and the University</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Perceived Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>There are troublemakers hanging around in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>There is public drinking in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>There is open drug abuse/dealing in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>It’s safe to walk alone in my neighborhood at night</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>It is safe to walk home after leaving class, work, recreational activities, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Some friends and relatives don’t visit me at home because they don’t feel safe</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>People are scared of being robbed in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>People are scared of being raped in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>People are scared of being mugged in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>People are scared of being murdered in my neighborhood</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Informal Social Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>…young kids from the surrounding neighborhood were skipping school and hanging out on the street corner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>…someone was spray painting graffiti on a local building</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>…a fight broke out in front of your neighbor’s house</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>…a fight broke out in front of your house</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>…a neighbor was not disposing of trash appropriately</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>…someone was shouting for help</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>…someone was playing loud music at an inappropriate hour</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>…a neighbor hosted a party that got out of control</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Who would be likely to respond to disruptive issues experienced in your neighborhood?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Your neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Homeowners or Non-student residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>A Community Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>University staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>The City Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>A community group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. How many community oriented groups that deal with off-campus concerns do you belong to that are university based? (numerical write in/choice)

63. How many community oriented groups that deal with off-campus concerns do you belong to that are based in the community? (numerical write in/choice)

64. How many of your friends live in the local community (within a few minute walk from your home and not in university housing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. Consider just those friends who live in the local community: How many would you say are people you met while living in this community (not friends from a residence hall, classes, clubs, organizations, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Network Identification**

When you think about your current living situation in the neighborhood where you live, rate the degree to which you feel a connection to, or identify with and of the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Identify as</td>
<td>identify as</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>do not tend to identify as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. A resident of my specific street

67. An ‘off-campus student’

68. An OSU student

69. A resident of my home town, not Columbus Ohio

70. A student in my major area of study

71. A member of university sponsored club(s), organization(s), Honorary, etc.

72. A resident of the University District

73. A resident of Columbus, Ohio
Please mark any of the interactions you have had or activities in which you have participated

74. Interacted with a Community Ambassador (a student who works with Off-Campus Student Services) who lives on my street  yes no
75. Hung a “Buckeye Pride in the 43201” sign in my window  yes no
76. Received a newsletter from a Community Ambassador  yes no
77. Attended a neighborhood cookout planned by your Community Ambassador  yes no
78. Attended the off-campus Pumpkin Carving Contest  yes no
79. Decorating my home or apartment for Light up the Night  yes no
80. Voting for houses and apartments in the Light up the Night contest  yes no
81. I am a member of a university sponsored club or organization which addresses the needs and interests of the residents of the off-campus (University District) community.  yes no

Demographics

82. How long have you lived at your current address in total number of months? ______ months (1 year = 12 months)
83. What is your father’s highest level of education? (less than high school, GED or high school diploma, associate’s degree, trade school certificate, bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, PhD)
84. What is your mother’s highest level of education? (less than high school, GED or high school diploma, associate’s degree, trade school certificate, bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, PhD)
85. What is your family’s total annual income (interval choices) 11,999 and under  12,000 to 74,999  75,000 to 134,999  135,000 to 199,999  200,000 and above
86. From a financial perspective are you considered a dependent or independent?
87. After school and living expenses (rent, utilities, meals), on average, how much extra money do you have to spend weekly?

Please indicate your
88. race/ethnic background (ethnicity choices)
89. age (write in)
90. gender (male, female, transgendered, intersex)

91. Are you a… student, non-student
92. Are you a member of a Greek organization? Yes, No
93. Do you live in a Greek chapter house? Yes, No
94. Do you wish to enter the drawing for a chance to win one of two $50 gift cards to the OSU Bookstore? Yes/no (… if yes branch to email collection interface… )
Appendix B: Construction of Variables
### Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Ties</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would ask a neighbor to borrow something like a cornhole set (if they had one). (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5= very likely)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would ask a neighbor to borrow something like money.(1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5= very likely)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A neighbor would ask you to borrow something, like a cornhole set (if you had one).(1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5= very likely)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A neighbor would ask you to borrow something, like money.(1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5= very likely)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would get help from a neighbor (e.g., watch your place if you're away, feed pet, take in mail).(1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5= very likely)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You would help a neighbor (e.g., watch their place if they were away).(1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5= very likely)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You greet your neighbors when you see them.(1 to 5 scale; 1=very seldom/never to 5= very often)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You casually visit with neighbors, either going over to their place or their coming over to yours. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very seldom/never to 5= very often)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You participate in neighborhood activities (cookouts, parties, Light up the Night). (1 to 5 scale; 1=very seldom/never to 5= very often)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You talk to neighbors who are students.(1 to 5 scale; 1=very seldom/never to 5= very often)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You talk to neighbors who are non-students.(1 to 5 scale; 1=very seldom/never to 5= very often)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people in this neighborhood do favors for each other. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very seldom/never to 5= very often)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's \( \alpha = 0.912 \), constructed as the mean of the items
**Sense of Community**

There are people I can rely on among my neighbors. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)

People trust each other in my neighborhood (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)

I feel I belong in my neighborhood (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)

I care about what my neighbors think of my actions (e.g., if I take care of my property, how I act, etc.) (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)

I feel close to some of my neighbors (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)

People in my neighborhood are usually warm and friendly. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)

We look out for one another in this neighborhood. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)

Cronbach’s α=.871. Constructed as the mean of the items.

**Perception of Informal Social Control**

How likely is it that you can count on your neighbors to intervene in various ways if…

…young kids from the surrounding neighborhood were skipping school and hanging out on the street corner. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)

…someone was spray painting graffiti on a local building. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)

…a fight broke out in front of your neighbors house. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)

…a fight broke out in front your house. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)

…a neighbor was not disposing of trash appropriately. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)

…someone was shouting for help. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)

…someone was playing loud music at an inappropriate hour. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)

…a neighbor hosted a party that got out of control. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)
Who would be likely to respond to disruptive issues experienced in your neighborhood?

You. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)  
1 5 3.38 1.07

Your neighbors. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)  
1 5 3.1 0.89

Homeowners or other non-student residents. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)  
1 5 3.15 1.01

A Community Ambassador. (1 to 5 scale; 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely)  
1 5 3.11 0.99

Cronbach's α=.788. Constructed as the mean of the items.

Neighborhood Satisfaction

1.14 5 3.3 0.75

My neighborhood is a good place to live. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)  
1 5 3.61 0.96

My neighborhood is getting worse lately. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) (rev)  
1 5 2.66 0.91

The buildings and yards in my neighborhood are really run down. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) (rev)  
1 5 2.85 1.08

I would move out of my neighborhood if I could. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) (rev)  
1 5 2.65 1.12

I would rent here again. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)  
1 5 3.54 1.1

There are good outdoor places to recreate in my neighborhood. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)  
1 5 2.63 1.11

Overall, I am very satisfied with my neighborhood. (1 to 5 scale; 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree)  
1 5 3.64 0.91

Cronbach's α=.85 Constructed as the mean of the items.
### Appendix C: Data Correlation Matrices

#### Correlation Matrix of Statistically Significant Demographic Structures and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sense of Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neighborhood Satisfaction</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Ties</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perception of Informal Social Control</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Family total annual income</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Father's level of education</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Weekly spending money</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Length of residence</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Female (reference=male)</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Age</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Comm Groups/University based</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Friends as a result of neighboring</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Density of acquaintanceships</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Live on a Community Ambassador street</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, 2-tailed.