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ABSTRACT

This study examined the attitudes and behavior of 119 youth living in a small community located adjacent to a major midwestern university which began a community revitalization project in 1995. Survey data were collected in 1999. A model of prosocial community behavior was created based on research literature from sociology, psychology, and social work on community change, as well as literature on adult and adolescent community attitudes and behavior. The analysis examined a model of four latent variables (residential stability, community attitudes, social integration, and neighboring activities). Residential stability was hypothesized to have a direct negative effect on community attitudes and a direct positive effect social integration. Community attitudes and social integration were hypothesized to directly affect neighboring activities and mediate the effect of residential stability on neighboring activities.

A specified model with adequate fit indices resulted from structural equation model analyses. The latent constructs "community attitudes" and "neighboring activities" were supported. Paths between length of time in the community and community attitudes, length of time and social network, community attitudes and neighboring activities, and social network and neighboring activities were significant ($p \leq 0.05$). Those who resided in the community for longer periods had less favorable community attitudes and a more extensive social network that included university affiliates. Persons with more
favorable attitudes about the community and a social network that included more university affiliates participated more often in neighboring activities. The model created by these paths resulted in adequate goodness of fit indices but explained only 17% (R square standardized solution) of the variance in neighboring activities indicating that the model could benefit from further development, specifically in regard to a possible feedback loop between attitudes and neighboring activities. Further research is also needed to test the model with gender, minority status, and socioeconomic status. These analyses were not possible due to the small sample size.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

By 1998, all thirty of the nation’s largest cities had established community revitalization projects to improve the quality of life for urban residents. Yet central city problems, such as unemployment, poverty, lack of affordable housing, violence, and underperforming school systems, persist (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1999a, 2000c). These ongoing problems have prompted scholars to call for a shift in focus away from interventions that target individual level problems and seem only to mitigate the effect of living in disadvantaged or declining communities to those that promote individual, family, and community health and well-being (Chalk & Phillips, 1996; Morrison, Alcorn, & Nelums, 1997). Such recommendations have been made by policy analysts, community practitioners, and social work scholars with the hope that a change in focus will encourage research that expands our understanding of the synergy between community and individual/familial well-being. Of particular interest is the influence of community contexts (decline to revitalization) on adolescent behavior.

While cross-disciplinary research literature has extensively documented adolescent involvement in urban decline through antisocial or delinquent behavior, there is little documentation of adolescent prosocial community activities either through formal
involvement as in urban renewal projects, or informal involvement, as in neighboring activities. This study extends the knowledge base by examining the ways in which urban youth are involved in prosocial community activities. It also addresses community context by focusing on a community experiencing urban renewal and modeling the relationship between community-related factors (residential stability, community attitudes, and social integration). Study findings provide information to assist social workers, other helping professionals, and community developers in better understanding youth who live in revitalizing urban centers.

Overview of the Study

This study aims to describe the characteristics of youth who live in one revitalizing community, the University Area District (UAD), with regard to age, gender, racial/ethnocultural identity, and the community-related factors. The primary purpose of this study was to determine if community-related factors (residential stability, community attitudes, and social integration) influence urban youth involvement in prosocial community activities; thus, model analyses are the focus of discussion. This chapter provides an overview of the theoretical framework and a discussion of the problem addressed by this study.

Youth and Community

Youth have an impact on the health and well-being of their community and the community has an impact on the health and well-being of its youth. Supporting such a broad claim is a vast interdisciplinary body of research examining the influence of
community on individual and familial health and well-being and a growing subset of literature on community context and youth development. The most developed theoretical frameworks and research on this topic have examined how the conditions of a declining community stimulate adolescent antisocial community behavior and how the antisocial behavior of the adolescent in turn increases the community's rate of decline (Bursik, 1986, 1988; Sampson, 2000). The synergistic relationship between antisocial youth behavior and community disorder is a critical component of social disorganization theory.

To better illustrate this dynamic, consider an example of delinquency and community disorder. The litter, trash and deteriorating buildings in a community can signal youth that community members do not care about the appearance of the neighborhood, thus giving youth a "green light" to further deface buildings with graffiti. The presence of new graffiti signals to the neighborhood and greater community that youth are participating in delinquent, perhaps even gang-related, activities. This perception of increasing disorder fosters mistrust among residents (Ross, Mirowsky, & Pribesh, 2001), heightens fear of crime (Bursik, 1986, 1988; Finestone, 1976; Sampson, 1993; Shaw & McKay, 1942; Simcha-Fagan & Schwartz, 1986), and creates reluctance among community members to involve themselves in community prosocial activities (Perkins, Florin, Richard, Wandersman, & Chavis, 1990; Sampson, 1988; Skogan, 1986; Taylor, Shumaker, & Gottfredson, 1985).

When fear grows, the social fabric of the community is damaged: for example, residents stop attending community meetings, do not socialize with neighbors in public spaces, and keep their children inside their homes. The weakening of social ties among community members in this manner provides an opportunity for more disorder to occur.
Because responsible adults spend less time outside, youth are able to paint more graffiti or cause other damage to community buildings without being caught and suffering the consequences of their actions. A lack of informal social control leads to further criminal behavior. As the crime rate increases, businesses leave the community, creating an economic void. Thus, increases in physical disorder (i.e., litter, trash, and graffiti) combined with increases in social disorder (i.e., delinquent youth and increased social isolation among neighbors) and shifts in the economic base of the neighborhood accelerate the rate of overall community decline (Skogan, 1990; Taylor & Covington, 1988). Decline has been described as a downward spiral of deviance and decay (Skogan, 1990). If the decline goes unchecked, the community will reach a state where the damage cannot be repaired (Ahlbrandt & Brophy, 1975).

Theory and Research on Community Processes

Social disorganization theory was developed by urban sociologists in the early 1900s (see Burgess & Park, 1925; Bursik, 1988; Hannerz, 1980; Thomas & Znaiecki, 1918-1920; Thrasher, 1927) to describe community change that appeared to be related to the rapid in-migration and urbanization of cities (Hannerz, 1980). Since then, a focus on the progressive nature of physical and social disorder in urban areas, as highlighted by the previous example, has dominated community research (see Bursik, 1986, 1988; McDonald, 1986; Shaw and McKay, 1942; Taylor, 1997). Building on social disorganization research findings, a more complex understanding of community change has evolved over the past twenty-five years or so (Ahlbrandt & Brophy, 1975; Birch.

the community can improve over time (Miller, 2001; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997).

Regarding behavior, researchers have studied social integration (Baron & Tindall, 1993; Elliot et al., 1996; Freudenburg, 1986; Tietjen, 1989; Unger & Powell, 1980), as well as social involvement in both formal community organizations (Carr, Dixon, & Ogles, 1976; Florin & Wandersman, 1984; Innes & Boocher, 2000; Wandersman, 1977; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988) and informal engagement with neighbors (Collins & Pancoast, 1976; Maton, 1990; Silverman, 1986; Unger & Wandersman, 1983). Research on formal settings has focused on the extent of resident involvement in activities and organizations (Chinman & Wandersman, 1999; Florin & Wandersman, 1984) and the role(s) played in organizations, i.e., who assumes leadership and why (Kieffer, 1984; Prestby, Wandersman, Florin, Rich, & Chavis, 1990). Studies on informal involvement have generally examined what types of support are offered to those who live in close proximity to one another (Unger & Wandersman, 1985; Warren, 1981) and variations in neighboring styles (Silverman, 1986).

Community Context

A growing number of studies combines many or all of the previously described concepts, using individual-level data (demographics, attitudes, and behavior) and community-level data (aggregated statistics on crime rates, race/ethnicity, income, number of families, etc.) to model individual and community well-being (Aneshensel & Sucoff, 1996; Elliot et al., 1996; Stiffman et al., 1999). Thus, the trend in community research over the past 20 years has been toward understanding how the attitudes and
behaviors of residents predict wellness within varying "community contexts" (Connerly & Marans, 1988; Coulton et al., 1996; Elliot et al., 1996; Furstenburg, 1993; Schwirian, 1983).

Community context refers to the state of organization or order within the community at any given time. Community organization is conceptualized as a continuum from extremely declined or disorganized to organized and vital (Ahlbrandt & Brophy, 1975; Allen, 1984; Arias, 1996; Birch, 1971; Connerly & Marans, 1988; Medoff & Sklar, 1994; Palen & London, 1984; Palen & Nachmias, 1984). The contemporary focus on community context shifts research in this area from a limited examination of a declining or disadvantaged community to a broader examination of 1) how communities change over time, 2) which factors influence a community's state of well-being, and 3) how a community's well-being influences individual and familial well-being.

Researchers are also beginning to reconsider how adolescent community behavior is studied, recognizing that both prosocial and antisocial behavior can occur in declining communities (Elliot et al., 1996; Heath & McLaughlin, 1993; Medoff & Sklar, 1994) and that adolescents can avoid participation in antisocial community behavior, such as delinquency, even when residing in a declining community. Studies in this area have been organized around the idea of risk and protective factors.

Risk and protective factors have been identified within individual, family, and community domains (Safyer, Griffin, Colan, Alexander-Brydie, & Rome, 1998). Certain aspects of any community are believed to be risk factors because their presence deprives youth of important developmental experiences, relationships, and opportunities, making them vulnerable to participation in antisocial activities or ill health (Bowen & Chapman.
1996: Safyer et al., 1998). Other factors are considered protective in that they encourage healthy development and/or mediate the direct effects of the declined community or dysfunctional family system on adolescent health and well-being (Safyer et al., 1998). Adults can decrease the likelihood of adolescents participating in antisocial behavior by increasing the adolescents' exposure to protective factors (Stiffman et al., 1999).

Protective factors may have a cumulative effect, or "pile-up . . . as the number of developmental assets increase, risk behavior patterns decrease and thriving behaviors (e.g., school success, affirmation of diversity, prosocial behavior) increase."

(Public/Private Venture, 2000b, p. 133)

Community risk and protective factors include both real and perceived aspects of community. Researchers have found that the actual state of order (i.e., the number of abandoned buildings, the amount of drug dealing, etc.), the resident's perceived state of order (i.e., the degree to which the individual is aware of empty buildings, drug dealers, etc., and sees these types of behavior and quality of the environment as a community problem-Aneshensel & Sucoff, 1985: Stiffman et al., 1999), and the rate of community change (Cortese, 1982), as well as overall resident satisfaction with the community (Freudenburg, 1984), have an influence on youth mental health status and on access to services. Other community risk factors are residential mobility (Buerkle, 1997; Hendershot, 1989; Scanlon & Devine, 2001; South, Crowder, & Trent, 1998), exposure to danger and violence (Bowen & Chapman, 1996; Garbarino, 1992; Garbarino, Burston, Raber, Russell, & Crouter, 1978; Garbarino, Kostelny, & Dubrow, 1991), and the protracted stress associated with low socioeconomic class backgrounds and minority group membership (Safyer et al., 1998; Sandler, 1980).
Youth who reside in dangerous, violent, stressful communities are considered at-risk because of their greater potential for poor developmental outcomes. These youth need not participate in violent activities for violence to have an impact on their lives. Watching others participate in or being victimized by community violence, as well as simply knowing that violence is occurring within the community have been known to effect the development of health and behavioral problems of adolescents who live in dangerous environments (Bowen & Chapman, 1996; Garbarino, 1999; Garbarino et al., 1991; Richter & Martinez, 1993).

Discussion of Study Problem

Community-related factors used in this study emerged from examination of the sociological research on community processes and the psychological/social work research on risk and protective factors. As highlighted previously, residential stability, community attitudes, and social integration are repeatedly addressed in research on community involvement and studies that examine the influence of community context on youth well-being. The following section provides an introduction to research in this area. More detailed discussion of this topic is provided in chapter two.

Literature on residential stability clusters around the concepts of residential mobility, migration, and displacement. Most of this research supports the idea that living in a place for an extended period of time results in a sense of attachment or rootedness to the community (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; St. John, Austin & Baba, 1986) and social integration into the network of community relationships (Hendershott, 1989; Pittman & Bowen, 1994; Vernberg, 1990) that is supportive of healthy social and emotional
development (Cohen, Johnson, Struening, & Brook, 1989). Families who reside in changing communities, such as revitalizing ones, tend to have less residential stability, which limits their ability to establish and maintain social networks of support (Northwood, 1975; Vernberg, 1990).

Building on Brofenbrenner's (1979) foundational work on ecological systems, researchers often focus on the caring relationships within the youths social network as a protective factor. The provision of social support by such relationships is viewed as instrumental in assisting youth to overcome environmental adversities (Bowen & Chapman, 1996; Stiffman et al., 1999). The three main types of community support available for at-risk youth are family support (Garmezy, 1991; Tietjen, 1989), informal support (Cauce, Felner, & Primavera, 1982; Tietjen, 1989), and formal support (Cauce et al., 1982; Tietjen, 1989). Family support is provided by parents, siblings, and relatives, while informal support is provided by peers and neighbors. Formal support is obtained from persons who play distinct, nonkinship roles in the youth's life such as counselors, clergy, teachers (Cauce et al., 1982), or community leaders (Safyer et al., 1998) and are associated with a community institution, such as a social service agency, church, or school/university.

Some people play multiple roles in the youth's life, providing varied layers of social support. The social support provided by a network is one aspect of a community's social capital (Coleman, 1990). A strong social network has been known to mediate the experience of living in declined communities for at-risk youth (Bryant, 1985; Sampson & Groves, 1989; Tietjen, 1989).
Other factors can offer protection for at-risk youth: these include the youth’s opinion of the neighborhood environment as a positive place to live—also referred to as community pride (Safyer et al., 1998; Stiffman et al., 1999), a psychological sense of community (Brodsky et al., 1999), knowledge of and access to community resources (Safyer et al., 1998), and community involvement (Safyer et al., 1998).

Positive feelings about one’s community and involvement in community processes are protective factors for at-risk youth. Specifically, an important relationship has been established between resident involvement in community processes betterment and resident self-determination, skills or competencies, and feelings of empowerment (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Florin & Wandersman, 1984, 1990; Breton, 1994; Freire, 1970; Kieffer, 1984; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988).

Involvement can occur through formal or informal mechanisms (Public Private Venture, 2000b). Formal involvement most often refers to participation in community organizations that focus on community betterment activities (community service and volunteering) and participation in local political processes, while informal mechanisms refer to reciprocal social support between neighbors, also referred to as neighboring activities.

Community research on adults has provided some insight, although it is inconclusive, regarding the factors influencing whether an individual initiates and sustains active involvement and in what manner of involvement s/he engages (Carr et al., 1976; Chan & Elder, 2001; Chinman & Wandersman, 1999; Day, 1997; Prestby et al., 1990; Sue & Zane, 1980). Chinman and Wandersman (1999) argue that participation is related to perceived benefits (incentives) and costs. Similarly, Prestby et al. (1990)
focused on explaining why adults do or do not participate in voluntary organizations through a cost/benefits lens and argue that purposive benefits "such as working toward the improvement of the neighborhood or community", "desiring to make a contribution" and to a lesser extent, "friendship and socialization", "enjoyment of leadership and organizing" and "ego gratification" (p. 120) are motivations of the most active participants in voluntary organizations. These motivations were noted as the "most important of initiating participation" (p. 121). Carr et al. (1976) also found that attitudes toward the place of residence, perception of neighbors as active and potent yet stable, and view of the future as promising and secure determined attitudes toward and participation in a community voluntary organization. Adding a different perspective, Sue and Zane (1980) argue that perceived control and influence in decision making as a key factor in participation.

The literature on adolescent involvement in organized efforts to improve communities has, for the most part, remained theoretical or descriptive in nature and been limited to case studies (Barton, Watkins, & Jarajoura, 1997: Checkoway, Finn, & Pothukuchi, 1995: Finn & Checkoway, 1998: Heath & McLaughlin, 1993: Medoff & Sklar, 1994: Public/Private Venture, 2000b). Articles on theories of moral and political development suggest that involvement in community processes during adolescence assists youth in discovering "who they are within a social and historical framework" (Yates & Youniss, 1998, p. 495) and helps them incorporate civic involvement into their forming identity (Hart, Atkins, & Ford, 1998: Youniss, McLellan, & Yates, 1997).

The developmental process related to citizenry is significant in that it provides a conceptual bridge between youth and adult community involvement and justifies the
application of adult involvement models to youth. From the descriptive and case study research on this topic, we know that youth can demonstrate their competence in ways that help themselves and their communities (Barton, Watkins, & Jarajoura, 1997; Finn & Checkoway, 1998; Medoff & Sklar, 1994; Public/Private Venture, 2000b). Also, mentoring relationships between adults and youth or between older and younger youth assist with youth leadership development (Checkoway, Finn, & Pothukuchi, 1995; Finn & Checkoway, 1998). Organizations can be effective vehicles for youth leadership development (Checkoway, Finn, & Pothukuchi, 1995; Finn & Checkoway, 1998).

Experiences in groups or with mentors provide political socialization through which youth reflect on personal interests and connect them to broader political and cultural issues (Finn & Checkoway, 1998; Yates, 1999). We have learned that the most effective youth programs/organizations are those that youth want to be members of, choose their friends from, and spend free time in, and they are not necessarily affiliated with or defined by schools (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993).

Research studies in community services, service learning, and volunteerism seek to explain the impact that service has on youth outcomes, such as inverse relationships between service and antisocial behavior (Uggen & Janikula, 1999) and between service learning projects and school failure (Zoerink, Magafas, Pawelko, 1997). Such research also examines the relationship between service and caring/helping attitudes (Brunelle, 2001) and the influence of service on moral and identity development (Yates & Youniss, 1999a). For example, Brunelle (2001) found that youth who participated in community service activities for a period of six months had increased empathy, concern for society, and willingness to take action to help others and their communities. The impact of service
learning projects on identity formation may differ based on the type of experience and the method of processing the experience (Leming, 2001). Service learning projects may also help youth learn new information and incorporate new behaviors as a result of teaching others about specific issues, such as preventive health care and sexual health practices (O’Donnell et al., 1999; Schondel, Boehm, Rose, & Marlowe, 1995).

Assisting youth in completing development tasks is a positive effect of involvement often discussed in volunteering, community service, and service learning literature (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993; Pugh, 1999; Yates & Youniss, 1998). Involvement in formal community organizations helps youth practice basic roles and rules needed for participation in democratic processes, thus developing their political sense of self (Rosenthal, Feiring, & Lewis, 1998; Youniss et al., 1997). Such experiences also help youth learn to work in teams or cooperative groups (Youniss et al., 1997). Others have argued that such activities build moral character (Hart et al., 1998; Yates & Youniss, 1999a). Volunteering may be a “developmental consequential experience” as youth are able to demonstrate the new skills acquired through normal development via the volunteering experience (Johnson, Beebe, Mortimer, & Snyder, 1998, p. 310).

Kieffer (1984) provides some insight into how participation changes for individuals across the life cycle. He describes empowerment as a long-term transformative process of adult learning and development that goes hand in hand with participation in the sociopolitical environment. Participants come to realize that “something is wrong.” (p. 25) an internal contradiction or dissonance between what is and what should be, and then they act to change community problems. During this process, individuals move from a state of powerlessness or helplessness to empowerment.
and they acquire a "participatory competence," which Kieffer defines as "the combination of attitudes, understandings, and abilities required to play a conscious and assertive role in the ongoing social construction of one's political environment." (p. 31) and "a dynamic of long-term development from socio-political illiteracy or infancy to socio-political adulthood." (p. 18)

Drawing from Kieffer's qualitative descriptions of participatory competency phases, one would expect the following to act as contributors to future citizen leadership: a tangible and direct threat to individual or familial self-interest as motivator to begin activity; the assistance of an "external enabler" (p. 20) who acts as model, mentor, ally, instructor, and friend; a sufficient length of time to learn and grow in the new role; the opportunity to practice new skills; and the experience of having endured and overcome obstacles related to the motivating issue.

Besides formal involvement in community organizations and volunteerism, one may be informally involved in geographic communities through neighboring, an exchange of tangible, emotional, and/or informational support among persons who live in close proximity (Unger & Wandersman, 1985), which can include, but does not assume, friendship (Silverman, 1986). Instead neighbors can be characterized as "relationships of distanced care." (Silverman, 1986, p. 325) Networks of assistance and caring can enhance individual well-being, as well as a neighborhood's quality of life (Unger & Wandersman, 1985).

Neighboring is important. It exists in all residential settings and exists either by action or inaction. A sophisticated, interdisciplinary approach to neighboring will increase our understanding of individual problem solving and resources, and of
neighborhood organizational and neighborhood viability, and it will lead to a
better understanding of the relationship between the individual and the

Some of the many ways in which neighboring occurs include borrowing tools
from one another, mowing the lawns of elderly neighbors, watching other’s property
when they are away on vacation, listening to parents who are struggling with their child’s
bad behaviors, and/or sharing information about where to purchase the best produce, how
to handle sewer problems, or who is the preferred dentist in town. All are examples of
how persons who live in a tightly woven community could provide support to one
another from an adult perspective. Little is empirically known about the ways in which
youth engage in neighboring activities.

Together, these studies on adult and youth involvement in community processes
(formal and informal), community service, service learning, and volunteerism tell us that
some factors may predict who will be involved. Important variables to consider when
predicting involvement are age, gender, race/ethnicity, residential stability, social
network strength and perception of the community, and how involvement and
volunteerism is beneficial to youth. In addition, this broad body of literature begins to
describe the developmental process by which individuals acquire the motivation and
skills needed to assume leadership in community processes.

Many questions require further examination to expand our understanding of
community involvement. Who should be involved, to what degree and in what manner
should involvement occur in order to maintain individual, familial, and community
health? How do the processes by which individuals become and sustain active
involvement in their community differ by subgroup (e.g., subgroups as defined by variability in age, and physical or economic health)? And perhaps most important, what community-related factors predict adolescent involvement?

Because the definition of "involvement in community organizations" is so broad, it is difficult to definitively identify the influences to formal citizen participation (Kweit & Kweit, 1999). These factors need further exploration. Since there has been little empirical research on formal youth involvement, and there is no available research on youth neighboring activities, it is also difficult to estimate how the experiences of adults transfer to those at a younger developmental stage.

The few existing studies and literature on this topic use very broad definitions of formal involvement and include many different types of organizations, which imposes significant problems regarding the definition and measurement of youth community involvement for this study. Thus, the definition of adolescent prosocial involvement and the relationships between involvement and other model variables in this study are built primarily upon research on adult's community involvement and processes. Both formal (specific program attendance and volunteering) and informal types of involvement (neighboring) are included in order to capture data related to this concept as broadly as possible.

This overview of literature on community processes and youth provides the foundation for the study problem. The following section introduces the study model. The relationships between model variables (demographics, residential stability, community attitudes, social integration, and involvement) are further explored in chapter two.
**Underlying Assumptions of Study**

This study seeks to understand how youth participate in community processes and what factors influence their participation: therefore, the main assumptions are that youth who live in revitalizing areas participate in their communities in a variety of ways that are prosocial and that their involvement can be measured and modeled. A secondary yet fundamental assumption is that both individual and community factors affect youth involvement in community processes. The last assumption is related to the relevance of this study. Community involvement enhances adolescent well-being and improves the community; therefore, it is an important area of inquiry and has relevance for social work practice and research.

**Relevance of Study to Theory and Social Work Practice**

The shift in perspective offered by this study, along with its findings, provides a framework from which a model explaining and predicting youth prosocial community activity in a changing community can be further developed. Such a model could assist community leaders, including social workers, in utilizing youth as an untapped but much needed source of social capital in communities attempting revitalization.

**Conclusion**

The following chapters will further explain the basis and results of this study. Chapter two extends the review of literature on the relationship between key factors of the study: residential stability, community attitudes, social integration, and neighboring activities. It also discusses how these factors are affected by age, gender, and
racial/ethnocultural identity. Chapter three explains the study methods and provides a
description of the community studied. Chapter four presents the results of this study that
resulted in a specified model of neighboring activities. Chapter five discusses those
results, examines their implications, and offers recommendations.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Chapter one presented an overview of the research problem and introduced key constructs of the study’s conceptual framework. Building on the prior discussion, this chapter reports and summarizes cross-disciplinary research literature from sociology, community psychology, and social work on community-related factors (residential stability, community attitudes, social integration) that influence youth engagement in prosocial community activities (neighboring, volunteering, and community program participation). Research questions and model hypotheses conclude the chapter.

Residential Stability

Residential stability typically refers to a continuum of housing experiences from homelessness to permanent stable housing (Breakey & Fischer, 1995; Appleby & Desai, 1987). A family experiences residential stability when they own their home because they tend to move less frequently and live for longer periods in one community. Adults who experience residential stability tend to have more favorable community attitudes and to be more integrated into the social fabric of their communities (Chavis, Hogge, McMillan, & Wandersman, 1986; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974). This may be true for youth as well.
Research shows that age, socioeconomic status, and minority status affect how youth will experience residential stability. 

During adolescence the effects of resident relocation seem to be most pronounced (Myers, 1999; Pettit, 2000; Riesch, Jacobson, & Tosi, 1994). It can have a positive or negative impact on youth well-being depending on the quality of the new neighborhood and the context of the move (Buerkle, 1997), particularly if the family had choices in the moving process (South, Crowder & Trent, 1997).

Older youth tend to have more stable residences. Findings from national child and youth well-being data support the relationship between youth age and mobility. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services reports that between 1990 and 2001, young children were consistently the most mobile age group and that the percentage of mobile youth decreases as age increases:

25 percent of children between the ages of 1 and 4 had changed residences in the previous year, compared with 18 percent among children ages 5 through 9, 15 percent for ages 10 through 14, and 13 percent for youth ages 15 through 17 (USDOHHS, 1998, p. 46).

While the interaction between family life cycle and residential stability is complicated (McHugh, 1985; McHugh, Hogan, & Happel, 1995), increased stability typically appears at midlife points where the household head is younger than 45 and has young children or teenagers (Clark & Onaka, 1983). Adults tend to become more established in their residences as they age; they voluntarily move less, own homes at a greater rate, and have longer periods of residence in their communities (McAuley & Nutty, 1982; Lee, Oropesa, & Kanan, 1994; Long, 1988). Families who voluntarily move
during this period are more likely to do so for adjustment and change in household characteristics, i.e., divorce (South, Crowder, & Trent, 1998), accessibility to parent's work, or increased need for space and neighborhood quality (Clark & Onaka, 1983). These types of moves typically occur with families who have greater economic resources (Clark & Onaka, 1983; McAuley & Nutty, 1982; McHugh, 1985).

There is also variability in residential factors based on race/ethnicity, but, in general, youth from minority families tend to experience less residential stability. For example, there is a well-documented disparity between African Americans and Euro-Americans with regard to homeownership and home equity (Flippen, 2001). African Americans tend to live more often in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Massey, Condran, & Denton, 1987; St. John et al., 1995) and have fewer resources. They are more likely to move (USDOC, 2000a) and to move locally (USDOC, 2000a) but have less opportunity to move voluntarily from a poor to nonpoor neighborhood (Crowder, 2001; Massey, Condran, & Denton, 1987; St. John, Edwards, & Wenk, 1995). There is also a significant difference in youth mobility by race. Between 1990 and 2001, Caucasian/White/Euro-American children under the age of 18 years were the least mobile of all groups (16 percent moved in the year 1998), when compared with African American/Black children under the age of 18 years (23 percent moved in the year 1998) and Hispanic children under the age of 18 years (19 percent moved in the year 1998). Thus, African American youth are more likely than Euro-American youth to live in homes not owned by their families, move short distances and remain in their homes for shorter periods, but stay in disadvantaged neighborhoods for longer periods of time.
Residential stability is often measured as an aggregated statistic of community residents’ moving patterns, e.g., the proportion of residents who have resided in their homes for five years or more (Aneshensel & Sucoff, 1996; Cubbin. LeClere, & Smith, 2000; Kowaleski-Jones, 2000) and/or the percentage of owner-occupied housing units within a given geographic area (Simcha-Fagan & Schwartz. 1986). Conversely, measures of residential mobility include the proportion of families that moved in the past 5 years (Elliot et al., 1996) and/or the proportion of occupied rental housing units within a given geographic area (Cubbin et al., 2000; Stiffman et al., 1999).

Residential stability can also refer to individual and familial patterns of moving and is measured by examination of whether the respondent owns his or her home (Fredrickson, Heaton, Fuguitt, & Zuiches, 1980; Sommer & Rowell, 1992; South & Crowder, 1998), the length of time lived in the home and/or community (Fredrickson, Heaton, Fuguitt, & Zuiches, 1980; Sommer & Rowell, 1992), the number of moves during a designated time span (Coleman, 1988; Humke & Schaefer, 1995; McHugh et al., 1995: Family Housing Fund, 1998) and attitudes about the turnover of neighborhood residents (Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1996). Homeownership and number of moves are related measures of stability, i.e., census data reports that renters move more frequently than homeowners. 33.2 percent, versus 8.3 percent (USDOC, 2000b). Some research has demonstrated that residential stability can have a similar effect on community attitudes and social integration whether it is measured at the individual or community levels.
Community Attitudes

As previously noted, residential stability is related to community attitudes. Homeownership and length of residence have been noted as key factors influencing community behavior and attitudes among adults, particularly the psychological sense of community (Chavis et al., 1986; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974), and commitment or attachment (Guest and Lee, 1983; Goudy, 1977, 1982; Hunter, 1974; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Ladewig and McCann, 1980; St. John, Austin, & Baba, 1986; Wasserman, 1982). Families that experience residential stability tend to have more favorable community attitudes. Although there is less research on adolescents in this area, Pretty, Andrewes, and Collett (1994) found that length of residency within the neighborhood was significant in its relationship to a sense of community.

For adults, intended length of residence also seems to affect community attitudes (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) and may have a greater effect on attitudes about community than actual length of residence (Glynn, 1981). There were no studies found that examined intended length of residence with adolescents. Since adults typically have more power and influence over housing decisions than do youth, it would make sense that youth might not know how long their family intends to live in the community. Therefore intended length of residence may not be a salient construct for youth.

In the general community literature there appears to be some relationship between age, race, residential stability, and community attitudes, although what this relationship means needs clarification. It appears that community attitudes improve as a person ages. Owning the home in which one lives, living for a long time in the community, and/or intending to stay in the community also influence community attitudes. Campbell et al.,
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(1976) found that age was significantly related to community satisfaction. Sampson (1988) found that the strongest predictor of community attachment was age, and Brodsky et al. (1999) documented a relationship between age and psychological sense of community. These findings may be due to the consistent result that "older adults, regardless of length of residency, appear to have stronger feelings of commitment to their neighborhood." (Brodsky et al., 1999, p. 673) Austin & Baba (1990) found that race, age, and homeownership directly affected community attachment. Other studies support a correlation between age, sense of community, and a number of other variables, including length of residence and race (Hill, 1996). The relationships between these variables may be related to whether the individual has voluntarily remained in the community (Skjaeveland, Garling, & Maeland, 1996). Those who grow older in communities not of their choice tend to have less positive feelings about the communities (Brodsky et al., 1999).

African Americans are more likely to express dissatisfaction with particular aspects of their neighborhoods (Austin & Baba, 1990), i.e., local orientation of a neighborhood, neighborhood characteristics that include child-oriented activities, friends, shopping, and churches (St. John & Clark, 1984) but are less likely to convert neighborhood dissatisfaction into a move because of structural constraints on mobility (South & Deane, 1993). From these limited findings, age and race appear to influence residential stability and indirectly affect community attitudes.

It is not clear how and if the relationship between age and other community attitudes translates to adolescents. Pretty et al. (1994), the first to study the psychological sense of community among adolescents, found that reliability scores from the sense of
community index were comparable with those from adult samples and that there were some commonalities inherent in adult and adolescent responses but more needs to be understood in this area. "The use of other social climate measures, which include concepts other than social support, may prove fruitful in delineating the other components of adolescents' sense of community." (p. 355) Pretty et al. (1994) argue that the applicability of findings from adult research on the psychological sense of community for adolescents was highly probable.

Social Integration

As previously noted, residential stability is related to how integrated community residents are into the social fabric of the community: living in the same place for an extended period of time results in development of a social network (Hendershott, 1989; Pittman & Bowen, 1994; Vernberg, 1990) that is supportive of healthy social and emotional development (Cohen et al., 1989).

In terms of negative consequences, moving has been shown to damage social networks by disrupting social bonds between parents, children, teachers, and other community adults (Coleman, 1990; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; South et al., 1998). Moving disrupts social networks and therefore impacts the adolescent's ability to make new friends (Hendershott, 1989; Pittman & Bowen, 1994; Vernberg, 1990), as well as know about and utilize neighbors as resources, e.g. emotional support, information and educational resources (Kowaleski-Jones, 2000). For youth, social network impairment can lead to feelings of isolation and alienation, putting the youth at risk to develop problem behaviors. Maintaining contact with old friends and neighbors may mediate the
effects of moving on youth and family stability because it maintains a reliable source for support when needed.

One would expect, therefore, that younger teens and those who move often or who move outside of their networks of support would have the greatest difficulty re-establishing social ties. African American families tend to experience less residential stability and, thus, have frequent disruptions to their network of support; therefore, it is reasonable to hypothesize that younger African American youth may have less-developed social networks.

A strong social network has been known to mediate the experience of living in declined communities for at-risk youth (Bryant, 1985: Sampson & Groves, 1989: Tietjen, 1989). As mentioned in chapter one, formal support (addressed in this study) is a type of caring relationship within the youth's social network that acts as a protective factor. It is obtained from persons who play distinct, nonkinship roles in the youth's life and who are associated with community institutions.

As youth's social networks expand, there are more adults available to guide the youth during their maturation process. In socially disorganized communities, the lack of strong horizontal ties such as these are believed to be a critical factor in the development of delinquency because it decreases the community's ability to socially control youth members. Following the example from chapter one, if adults catch a youth spray painting graffiti on a building and report the behavior to the youth's parents, the youth will less likely to engage in this type of behavior again. In addition to being agents of social control, community members who offer formal support to youth can act as role models.
Prosocial Community Activities

As previously noted, there is little research on adolescent involvement in community programs, adolescent neighboring behaviors and adolescent volunteers, especially volunteer activities by at risk youth (Johnson, Beebe, Mortimer, & Snyder, 1998). Available literature indicates that females may be more likely to participate in prosocial community activities.

Findings on the relationship between gender and involvement are mixed. Some research has found a variation in rate or type of community involvement by gender (Bourke & Luloff, 1998), but this was limited to respondents from rural settings. Bourke & Luloff (1998) found that women are as involved in their communities. Available literature on gender and community involvement tends to focus on how participation influenced personal change, such as expression of gender roles (Abrahams, 1996) or women's participation in local political processes. One additional study found that gender, among other variables such as involvement in recreational community groups, was shown to predict involvement in community service years after the initial service experience (Hart et al., 1998; Rosenthal et al., 1998).

Some research on service activity/volunteerism supports the idea that girls benefit more from longer involvement, but there were also some conflicting results. Stukas et al. (1999) found differences in service learning by gender in that girls felt more positively about the programs and were more likely than boys to intend to help in the future. Hamilton and Fenzel (1988) found that girls gained slightly more than boys in social responsibility as a result of service activities and self-reported gains in knowledge, skills, and willingness to make decisions as a result of volunteer experiences. In contrast.
Johnson, Beebe, Mortimer and Snyder (1998) found that gender was not related to adolescent volunteering.

There is some indication that neighboring differs by gender, with females participating in neighboring more often than males (Campbell & Lee, 1990). The authors argue that this difference is a result of gender roles that define women as bearers of emotional and social responsibilities. Research on the provision of social support validates these findings. For example, regarding sources of social support, Griffith (1985) found that respondents depended more often on women than on men and on persons of similar age and racial background. No research could be found that differentiates gender roles based on type of neighboring activity (i.e., emotional versus tangible support). Despite the inconsistent findings on gender and involvement, this model hypothesizes that gender will be significant in the model.

Research on formal and informal involvement varies regarding which community attitudes are studied and how they are measured. When included in the analysis, community attitudes generally tend to have an effect on involvement. For example, Unger and Wandersman (1985) modeled the relationship between perception of the physical/social environment, neighboring, and organizational participation and found that the physical and social environment has an effect on neighboring activity. Carr et al. (1976) found that attitudes toward the place of residence, perception of neighbors as active and potent yet stable, and a view of the future as promising and secure determined attitudes toward and participation in a community organization. Also, Perkins et al. (1990) found that satisfaction with their block predicted participation in voluntary block associations.
Silverman (1986) found the following factors influenced neighboring: attachment to the neighborhood, homeownership, which was explained as a greater commitment to the neighborhood and, by extension, to the neighbors; housing density, which was explained with regard to boundary control; perceptions of others as similar to oneself; and trust of neighbors.

Based on their research findings, Unger and Wandersman (1985) suggest future research on the relationship of neighborhood physical and social characteristics to the different components of neighboring. No research could be found that examined a relationship between attitudes related to a geographic community and volunteerism. It is unclear how the relationships between community attitudes and participation translate to youth. Pretty et al. (1994) hypothesized a link between a lack of youth participation in community programs and youth perception that programs are “demanding, inflexible, and unsupportive: that is, lacking in sense of community.” (p. 377)

Research on social networks tends to focus on those individuals who spend the most time with subjects, such as nonkin friends and neighbors. A moderate level of social solidarity or cohesion among community residents increases participation in organized community activities among residents (Oropesa, 1992; Perkins, Florin, Richard, Wandersman, & Chavis, 1990; Hyman & Wright, 1971), while either a weak or strong set of social ties within a community can have a negative effect on formal and informal involvement (Freudenburg, 1986; Wilson & Musick, 1998). For example, increased network density among low-income persons leads to less formal volunteering (Wilson & Musick, 1998). This may occur for a number of reasons. For instance, an individual might think that others are participating in the community change process and therefore
s/he is not needed (Chinman & Wandersman, 1999; Olson, 1965). Also, a lack of information regarding the community's needs could hinder participation (Oropesa, 1992; Oliver, 1984). Another possible explanation is that strong social ties fulfill affiliative needs, thereby decreasing the motivation to participate in formal activities (Wilson & Musick, 1998).

Despite the emphasis within social disorganization theory on the role of nonkin adults in the daily life of urban youth, only one study was found that specifically addressed institutional members of youth social networks. Garbarino, Burston, Raber et al. (1978) found that there were significantly more adult institutional representatives in urban youth networks than were in suburban or rural youth networks. The article did not discuss who these institutional representatives were or the possible reasons for their involvement in urban youth social networks.

**Summary of Literature on Model Factors**

A review of the literature on these community-related variables found that older youth are more likely to have stable residences, i.e., their parents will own their homes, and families will have lived in their communities for longer periods and have moved less often than younger respondents. Persons of minority status tend to experience less residential stability, i.e., they tend to rent their homes and move frequently within the same communities. Those who experience residential stability tend to have more favorable community attitudes and be socially integrated into their communities. Persons who view their communities more favorably and who are well integrated into their communities tend to participate more often in community programs, volunteering, and
neighboring activities. The study research questions and hypotheses are built upon these research findings.

Introduction of the Conceptual Framework

The study model was based on the previous research findings. Attention to community context was addressed in this study by limiting subjects to those who reside within the boundaries of a publicly recognized revitalizing community (Campus Partners, 1996) and the inclusion of community-related variables such as residential mobility, community attitudes, and social integration.

The majority of prior community context studies limited their dependent variable to antisocial behavior/delinquency (Simcha-Fagan & Schwartz, 1986) or health/mental health problems, including depression (Aneshensel & Sucoff, 1996; Stiffman et al., 1999), anxiety, oppositional defiant disorder, conduct disorder (Aneshensel & Sucoff, 1996) suicidality and posttraumatic stress symptoms (Stiffman et al., 1999). The Neighborhood Contextual Model from Elliot et al.'s 1996 study was, at the time of data collection, the sole known model that sought to explain antisocial behaviors and prosocial behaviors. Although a few qualitative studies exist, including case studies of adolescent involvement in community organizations working to revitalize their communities (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993; Medoff & Sklar, 1994), this author knows of no prior published quantitative study that attempted to model adolescent behavior/activities in the context of a revitalizing community. Therefore, this study extends the research on community context and youth outcomes by studying youth who
reside in a revitalizing community and by modeling prosocial community behavior (formal involvement, neighboring, and volunteerism).

These factors are examined through structural equation model analysis. Models containing latent variables are preferred over single variable path analysis because they "reduce the overall effect of measurement error of any individual observed variable." (Kline. 1998. p. 189) This is accomplished by using more than one indicator of each construct that is represented in the model. The present study uses several measured variables to represent each construct. Model paths are designated based on prior research findings.

Figure one provides a visual depiction of the conceptual framework of this study and delineates relationships between study variables. Age and racial/ethnocultural identity are hypothesized to have an indirect effect on community attitudes (perception of community quality) and institutional social networks (with OSU) through residential variables. Gender, community attitudes (perception of community quality), and institutional social networks (with OSU) are hypothesized to have a direct effect on prosocial community activities. Residential variables have a direct effect on community attitude and social integration variables. Indicators are grouped together in the hypothesized three-factor model of neighboring activities. circles represent latent variables, and rectangles represent measured variables. Shaded variables represent dependent variables.
Figure 1. Conceptual Framework. PCA=Prosocial Community Activities; Note: The lack of designated paths between the variables is predicted to be zero.
Research Questions

The specific aims of this study as presented visually in the study model address two important areas of investigation: description of the sample and empirical testing of model relationships.

A. Descriptive Questions

1. What are the sample characteristics of youth living in this community (age, gender, and racial/ethnocultural identity)?

2. To what extent do the youth living in this community have a stable residence with regard to homeownership, frequency of moves, and length of time in the community?

3. To what extent do University Area District (UAD) youth have a favorable view of their community?

4. To what extent do UAD youth view their community as disordered (physically and socially)?

5. To what extent do UAD youth view The Ohio State University and Campus Partners as good community members?

6. To what extent do UAD youth visit the campus area (OSU and/or the campus business area)?

7. To what extent does the social network of UAD youth include persons who are affiliated with The Ohio State University?

8. To what extent do youth participate in neighboring behaviors?

9. To what extent do youth participate in community programs?

10. To what extent do youth volunteer?
B. Testing Model Relationships

1. Do homeownership, length of time in the community, and number of moves represent the same construct (residential stability)?

2. Do social disorder, physical disorder, and community opinion represent the same construct (community attitudes)?

3. Do OSU attitudes, social network, visits to campus, and High Street represent the same construct (social integration)?

4. Does the group of activities (improve community, help elderly neighbors, clean the community, and babysit) represent the same construct (neighboring)?

5. Does residential stability directly affect community attitudes and social integration?

6. Do community attitudes directly affect neighboring activities?

7. Does social integration directly affect neighboring activities?

8. Do community attitudes and social integration mediate the effect of residential stability on neighboring activities?

9. How does the model fit the data?

Model Hypotheses

1. Residential stability directly affects community attitudes and social integration. UAD youth who live in stable homes (ownership, fewer moves, and longer time living in community) will view their community more favorably and perceive less disorder (social and physical) present in the community. OSU will be more
extensively integrated into the lives of UAD youth who live in stable homes (ownership, fewer moves, and longer time living in community).

2. Community attitudes directly affect prosocial community behavior. Youth who view their community more favorably and perceive less disorder (physical and social) present in the community will engage more often in prosocial community behaviors.

3. Social integration directly affects prosocial community behavior. UAD youth who have integrated OSU into their social lives will engage more often in prosocial community behaviors.

4. Residential stability indirectly affects prosocial community behavior through community attitudes and social integration. The extent to which UAD youth who live in stable homes (ownership, fewer moves, and longer time living in community) engage in prosocial community behaviors will be affected by their attitudes toward the community and the extent to which OSU is integrated into their social lives.

Conclusion

The study of adolescent prosocial community behaviors in a revitalizing community is a complex undertaking. As researchers begin to converge on models for understanding the influences of community context on adolescent behavior and well-being, it becomes increasingly clear that past research has been one-sided in focusing on adolescent problem behavior and community decline. Theoretical frameworks have neglected adolescent prosocial community activities and revitalizing communities.
Research examining community processes should also examine the factors that influence adolescent prosocial activity. This study attempts to address these gaps in the literature by examining the relationship among model variables, specifically the influence of age, gender, and race/ethnocultural identity, residential mobility, community attitudes, and social integration as modifiers of adolescent prosocial community activities. The methods used to examine this model are described in chapter three.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This nonexperimental research examined adolescent involvement in prosocial community activities using a model of community-related variables known to influence adolescent and adult community behavior. Data for this study were collected via self-administered, written surveys. This is a cross-sectional study: data for all model variables were collected at the same time, and no variable manipulation was attempted.

Because this study sought to document characteristics of a sample of youth from a specific geographic community and analyze the relationships between community-related variables and youth activities, a survey instrument was developed. Surveys are particularly appropriate for descriptive and explanatory research of a large population. Also, a secondary data set was not available. There is very little aggregated data on University Area District (UAD) adolescent residents.

A nonprobability sample was used because the population was small; therefore, it was not possible to obtain a large enough sample of randomly selected subjects from a list of those who provided consent and assent to participate. Parental consent was solicited using the most complete listing of UAD adolescents available.
Public Schools student database. The student named in each returned consent form was pursued for participation, but not every person completed the survey. In an effort to obtain a high response rate, the Dillman (1978) Total Design Method of mail survey solicitation was adapted and used for consent. When the response was less than expected, additional solicitation methods were implemented. The solicitation process and participation rates will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Between August 1, 1999 and November 1, 1999, 119 self-administered surveys were collected from adolescents (13 to 18 years of age) who resided in the UAD. Consent and assent to participate were pursued through mail and through backpack delivery from schools. Surveys were completed at either a community social service agency or at the adolescents' homes. The researcher was available to answer questions about the survey as needed.

This chapter proceeds with a discussion of the community in which the study took place and is followed by a description of the sample, further discussion of the recruitment process, instrument development, and an explanation of how descriptive variables and construct indicators are measured. The discussion of instrument development details the findings of each scale used in the model, including the number of responses used, scale mean, median, range, and the reliability analysis of the scale using coefficient alpha. Where applicable, the methods and reasons for reducing the number of scale items are also discussed. The last section of the chapter addresses the analysis strategy, ethical issues, and limitations of the study.
**Description of the Study Community**

Boudon and Bourricaud (1989) list three elements of a community that are widely recognized as crucial: 1) a social network that is both resilient and flexible; 2) some symbolic ties to an object of identification; and 3) the identified group must be part of a larger society. What defines the symbolic ties varies based on the group's members but could include ethnocultural identity, geographic location, residents' type of work, affiliation with a community institution (such as a school or a religious institution), the presence of a natural entity (such as a park or a lake), or the residents' socioeconomic status, etc. A community defined by geographic location may comprise all several different neighborhoods or parts thereof. While the level at which individual members use the community's name and subscribe to the symbolic ties varies, the included areas are generally perceived by most members of the larger urban setting (residents and nonresidents) to share one or more elements.

This research studies a community that fit Boudon and Bourricaud's criteria. It is defined by geographic location of residences and businesses. The residents of the University Area District form a community because they have an established social network, share a symbolic tie with The Ohio State University, and fit within the larger community of Columbus, Ohio, in the United States of America. While the extent of social ties between residents and The Ohio State University are unknown, the adoption of the name "University Area District" (UAD) which describes the area located adjacent to the university recognizes a connection. Also, evidence of a community-based social network is found in the organizations serving this district, such as the University Area
Commission and the Weinland Park Collaborative, which were both organized to address community change in the UAD (Campus Partners. 1998).

Information obtained from UAD revitalization plans provides a description of this community (Campus Partners. 1996, 1998). The University Area District (UAD) is a 2.38 square mile geographic area in Columbus, Ohio (Campus Partners. 1998). that is bounded on the north by Arcadia Street (more specifically the Glen Echo Ravine), on the south by Fifth Avenue, on the east by the Conrail tracks and an interstate highway, and on the west by Olentangy River Road. As seen on the Campus Partners Housing Incentive Program Map (Campus Partners. n.d.-c), it includes the central area of The Ohio State University campus, a business district located on High Street, and a residential area where students and community families reside (Campus Partners. 1998).

Since one model variable, social integration, examines the extent to which OSU affiliates are connected to UAD youth's social lives, it is important to know how many OSU affiliates live in the UAD. According to the 1990 census and information from OSU's urban community revitalization corporation (Campus Partners. 1998), 44,000 people live in the UAD, including 10,000 students who live in campus dormitories, fraternities, sororities and off-campus rental units. Student housing is clustered near High Street close to the University. Most OSU affiliated persons—students (60%), and faculty and staff (96%)—live outside of the University Area District (Campus Partners. 1998). Community families are found in increasing numbers east of High Street, closest to the parallel corridors of Summit and Fourth Street, in two neighborhoods that comprise the remainder of the UAD, North Campus, and Weinland Park (Campus Partners. 1998).
Revitalization Organizations and Programs

Two university-sponsored groups work in tandem to revitalize the UAD: Campus Partners and the Campus Collaborative (Campus Partners. n.d.-b; Campus Collaborative, 1999). Campus Partners is a nonprofit community urban redevelopment corporation created in 1995 by The Ohio State University to develop and implement a comprehensive revitalization plan for the University Area District. Campus Partners' primary focus is to develop the business district on High Street, specifically the area near Eleventh and High Streets designated the "University Gateway." The area is considered "priority one" in the revitalization plan (Campus Partners, 1998, p.45). Other Campus Partners' initiatives include a UAD homeownership incentive plan for faculty and staff (Campus Partners, n.d.-e).

While Campus Partners focuses on the physical revitalization of the UAD, the Campus Collaborative has been directed to coordinate programs of social revitalization, particularly education (Campus Collaborative, 1999). Between 1996 and 2001, university faculty voluntarily worked through this organizational structure to implement service learning projects in the UAD with the involvement of OSU students who received $5,000 seed grant awards to support projects conducted in the neighborhoods around the OSU campus. Funding for the Campus Collaborative came from a number of sources including the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) which provided a $400,000 Community Outreach Partnerships Centers (COPC22) grant (Campus Partners, n.d.-a).

After consultation23 with Campus Collaborative staff and faculty coordinators regarding the nature of the programs offered,24 eight programs were selected from a
Campus Collaborative list of twenty-nine (Campus Collaborative, 1999). These programs were chosen because they were the only Campus Collaborative programs that UAD adolescents (13 to 18 years of age) were believed to have participated in before or during the study. Program descriptions supplied to respondents in the survey were adapted from those provided by Campus Collaborative (1999) and from faculty/staff coordinators. The language was changed to be more youth friendly and descriptive of program activities that youth might readily recall. Suggestions from the program coordinators were used to adapt program descriptions. The eight programs included in the study are:


Study Population and Sample

The population examined in this study consists of adolescents (13 to 18 years of age) who resided within the geographic boundaries of the University Area District in Columbus, Ohio, and who attended Columbus Public Schools during the period of data collection. The proposal for this study indicated a probability sampling method to obtain 200 participants. Prior to obtaining approval from Columbus Public Schools (CPS) to access their student database, the number of adolescents estimated to live in the UAD was unknown. After approval from CPS and the data set was obtained, it became evident that the population was too small to secure an adequate probability sample, especially
from a group (low-income, minority adolescents) that can be difficult to engage in research (McLoyd, 1998). Due to the small population size, all eligible adolescents were solicited to participate.

Recruitment Process

This study used a modified Dillman (1978) Total Design Method of survey solicitation to solicit parental consent. Modifications were made to minimize the burden on parent(s) or guardian(s). The original plan involved three separate mailings over a four-week period and one month of data collection but the solicitation/data collection process was extended to six-months to increase sample size and solicit all eligible subjects. In addition, a subgroup of students received a fourth solicitation packet at school.

For each set of parents solicited, the first and third mailings consisted of a full packet, including a cover letter, two copies of a consent form, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope (see Appendices A and B). The cover letter noted that a monetary gift of $5.00 was offered to adolescents who, along with their parents, assented/consented to complete the survey and scheduled a time to do so. One copy of the consent form was provided for the parents to keep. Parents were asked to return the other copy to the researcher by mail. If the parent and youth consented to participate, a signed consent form was to be returned. If the parent and child did not consent to participate, a blank consent form was to be returned. Receipt of a blank consent form by the researcher was a signal to stop additional mailings of solicitation packets to the family. Parents who did not respond at all were sent a series of three mailings. The second mailing was a
"reminder postcard." as is recommended in the Dillman method (see Appendix C). The postcard asked parent(s) or guardian(s) to review the packet of information and return the consent form or notify the researcher that the packet had not been received. For several reasons, a decision was made not to send a fourth mailing by certified mail.28

Because the study's response rate was much lower than expected, solicitation efforts were revised and expanded. Backpack delivery of solicitation packets seemed to be the best available alternative.29 After obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Board for this data-collection change, the fourth set of packets was distributed to a subset of nonrespondents at four Columbus Public schools. Only the cover letter was changed to reflect the change in solicitation process (see Appendices E).

Packets30 were distributed to the specified adolescents (solicitation nonrespondents) during a nonacademic period of the school day by a teacher who read an Institutional Review Board Human Subjects Committee-approved script. The youth then carried the packets home and presumably delivered them to their parents or guardians.

Of the 586 subjects originally identified, 92 were considered "not able to solicit" or "ineligible" because repeated attempts to locate their families were unsuccessful or the students no longer met the study criteria. This reduced the number of eligible subjects to 494 adolescents. Following this second round of solicitation and the distribution of packets at schools, 68 additional affirmative consent forms and 20 negative consent forms were received.
Response Rate and Participation Rate

Of the 494 solicitation packets distributed, 119 adolescents completed the survey resulting in a 26.31% response rate. The response rate for this study is low when compared with research on similar populations. Given the extensive efforts employed to increase subject participation, the reasons for the low response rate are not known but may be related to subjects living in a low-income community that has been frequently solicited for participation in research and social programs by nearby universities. Other possible reasons for low participation include the time of the year when the survey was solicited, the relevance of the study in the lives of those who were solicited, and the way in which participation was solicited. The mailings, phone conversations, and survey completion may have required too many interactions with the researcher. Also, parents must have been able to read to know about the project and sign the consent form.

Survey Completion

After consent was obtained, the researcher contacted each youth’s parent(s) by phone to arrange a time to complete the survey. Some of the youth met in a group at a community location, such as the Godman Guild, to complete the survey. Others requested that the researcher come to their homes so that they could complete the surveys there. A small number of youth requested that the surveys be mailed to their homes. All requests were honored. Youth who met at community locations completed the survey in the group setting. In both the community setting and the home visits the researcher was available to answer questions as needed. The researcher often sat in a different room and chatted with parents or did her work while waiting for the youth to complete the survey. Upon
receiving the survey and the monetary gift, subjects were reminded that their participation was voluntary and they could cease involvement at any time without suffering consequences.

*Instrument Development*

A survey instrument was created that organized items into four sections: “Your Ideas about Your Community,” “Your Involvement in Community Programs,” “Your Ideas about The Ohio State University,” and “About You.” (See Appendix D) Effort was made to create a youth-friendly instrument. This was accomplished in a number of ways, including making the survey readable, understandable, interesting, and engaging, as well as having assistance available.

First, the survey used language at a fourth-grade reading level, established using guidelines by Laubach and Koschnick (1977). This was lower than the grade level of the group surveyed and was used to accommodate youth with less developed reading skills. In addition, an adult stayed nearby while the youth took the survey so that any questions about directions or word meaning would be answered in a timely manner. Also, the first item of the survey asked respondents to draw the area (streets, buildings, etc.) where they live and label places on the map, then circle the places that were most important to them. This task was used to engage the youth in the survey activity and assist them in concretizing how they conceptualize their geographic “community” prior to answering specific recall questions about it.

Last, youth and those with knowledge and experience working with UAD youth reviewed the survey and offered suggestions about how to improve it. A prestudy focus
group with 13 adolescents of similar characteristics (socioeconomic and race/ethnocultural identities) who resided in a different Columbus community completed the survey and then met with the researcher in a focus group to discuss their thoughts and suggestions regarding the survey directions and how questions were worded. The youth made suggestions about language and provided ideas about how they participate in neighboring activities. These suggestions were incorporated into the final survey. For example, these youth reported that they sometimes clean up their neighborhood, including abandoned houses (item d27), and organize other community kids to play sports (item d25). The time ranged from 30 to 55 minutes for this group to complete the 185-item survey.

The survey was also reviewed by a group of nine adults who work with UAD youth at the Godman Guild. These youth development specialists gave feedback about the language of the survey and discussed what concepts or tasks would be confusing to the youth. For example, the staff offered that UAD youth might not know what a "bus stop" was but would more easily recognize the term "bus shelter." As a result, item a11, "There are enough bus shelters in my community" was added to the survey in addition to item a10, "There are enough bus stops in my community." Also, Godman Guild staff suggested that UAD youth would know the term "courtyard," not "townhouse or condominium" as a type of housing listed in item d12.

**Descriptive Variables**

Respondents were asked if they were "male" or "female" and to provide their birth dates. For the model analysis, age was calculated as number of years alive at the
time at data collection. Respondents were also provided with a list of categories from which to choose their racial/ethnocultural category of identification. These categories were “Asian or Asian American,” “African American or Black,” “Caucasian or White,” “Hispanic or Latino/a,” “Native American,” and “Other: ____.” Due to low representation of several racial/ethnocultural categories, all minorities were combined for analysis. minority/nonminority (0= nonminority. 1= minority). 12

Socioeconomic data was not collected from the youth for two reasons. It was questionable whether the youth respondents would be able to accurately report family socioeconomic information. Also, it was believed that the pursuit of such personal family information might decrease response rates from a population in which it can be difficult to achieve a high participation rate.

Residential Stability

Residential stability is measured by a set of variables: length of time in community (in years), number of moves within community, and if the family rented, owned, or lived with another family that rented or owned their residence (0= no. 1= yes). As discussed in chapter two, these are typical measures of residential stability.

Community Attitudes

The set of variables labeled “community attitudes” was measured by four scales (Community Opinion, Physical Disorder, Social Disorder, and Community Change) that reflect the adolescent’s general opinion of the community as a whole and the extent to which the adolescent recalls indicators of community disorganization or urban decline.
(physical and social) within the community. Subjects were asked to respond to a set of items, estimating how true each statement was about their community and how often the physical and social indicators occurred in their community.

**Community Opinion Scale**

No scale was found that measured the general community opinion of adolescents so Coulton, Korin, and Su's (1996) Neighborhood Quality Scale was adapted for use in this study. The Neighborhood Quality Scale was created and used in Coulton, Korin, and Su's (1996) study on the effects of neighborhood context on young children living in urban areas. The Neighborhood Quality Scale consisted of eleven items and had high reliability in Coulton, Korin, and Su's study with adult caregivers (Cronbach alpha=.81). This scale, however, has not been used to measure youth perception of community quality. As stated by the authors, the scale measures "judgements on the positive and negative aspects of their neighborhood and whether or not they would like to continue living in their neighborhood." (p. 16)

With regard to scale adaptation, some words were changed and references shifted to better reflect the experience and concern of youth living in urban areas (see Appendix F for a comparison of scale items). For example, the term "community" was used instead of a "neighborhood" because the UAD consists of more than one neighborhood. Using "community" also maintains consistency in survey language. This term is used repeatedly throughout the instrument. Respondents were asked to estimate how true a set of eighteen statements (nine adapted from the Neighborhood Quality Scale and nine new items) was about the community in which they live. Subjects rated their response on a
five-item scale: 1) not at all true; 2) a little true; 3) somewhat true; 4) very true; and 5) extremely true. A high score on the community opinion scale indicates the youth's overall satisfaction with their home community.

A reliability analysis was calculated using Cronbach alpha coefficients to test the community opinion scale for internal consistency. The resulting reliability of the eighteen items used in this study to measure community opinion was very low (coefficient alpha = .4116): therefore, a principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization) of the community opinion items was conducted to extract the items that have higher internal consistency and together best represent the construct.

Six components were extracted with eigen values >1.0. Together the six components accounted for 66% of the variance in the scale data. The first component, consisting of six items, explained 29.98% of the variance with a 5.396 eigen value. Examination of the scree test illuminated a sharp drop after factor one and leveling of the curve after factor three, suggesting that factors 4 through 6 resulted from random error variance. Items from factor one consisted of general statements about the state of the community, so they were used for the final community opinion scale. These included "My community is a good place to live." "My community is a good place to grow up." "I would like to move out of my community." (reverse scored) "There is too much crime in my community." (reverse scored) "My community has become a better place to live in the last year." and "I feel safe in my community." A reliability analysis of these items yielded an acceptable Cronbach alpha of .8659.

A community opinion score was also calculated. Mean replacement was used for missing data of two items with one case. The scale had a mean of 2.75 (SD = .985) and a
median of 2.57. The range of scores for community opinion was 1.00 to 4.83. A three on the Likert-type scale was described as "somewhat true." The mean score indicates that, as a whole, respondents have a moderate or average opinion of their community, neither highly favorable nor unfavorable. Generally, UAD youth view their community as a satisfactory place to live.

Physical and Social Disorder Scales

The indicators of disorder were taken directly from Skogan's (1990) neighborhood crime studies. In Skogan's book, the results of five different studies are presented. These studies have a combined total sample size of slightly under 13,000 urban residents of 40 residential neighborhoods (mostly inner-city but considered neither declining or renewing). Residents were interviewed on a number of topics including their victimization experiences, the extent of various forms of disorder in the neighborhood, neighborhood satisfaction, intent to move, fear of crime, and "other questions directly related to theories about neighborhood stability and change." (p. 19) From these studies, Skogan presents a list of community disorder problems (physical and social) that are most frequently mentioned across neighborhoods.

The social indicators of disorder noted most frequently are public drinking (ranked highest), corner gangs or loitering groups of youth, street harassment, the sale and use of drugs, noisy neighbors, and commercial sex. The physical indicators of disorder noted most frequently are vandalism, dilapidation and abandonment, and rubbish. While he did not include two other types of social problems in this list, Skogan (1990) writes about persons who are homeless and mentally ill as a "new form" of social
disorder (pp. 33-34). These findings provided the foundation for three scales used in this study: the physical disorder scale, the social disorder scale, and the community change scale.

Skogan's indicators were rewritten for this study to reflect people-first language and to separate the inappropriate behavior of adolescents from that of children and adults. In addition, new items and the definitions of certain terms (e.g., vandalism) were added at the suggestion of Godman Guild staff. As previously noted, words were adapted to increase readability. Following these minor adaptations, six indicators of physical disorders and twelve indicators of social disorder, based on Skogan's work, were used in this study.

Physical indicators used in this study for the physical disorder and community change scales were: “Litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets.” “Graffiti on buildings and walls.” “Abandoned cars.” “Empty buildings where no one lives or works.” “Vandalism (buildings, cars or other property in the community that have been destroyed or damaged, except graffiti).” “Houses and yards that are not kept up.” The social indicators of disorder used in this study for the social disorder and community change scales were: “Community people dealing drugs.” “Community people using illegal drugs (like marijuana, weed or blunts, crank, crack, or any other non-prescription drugs).” “Community people drinking alcohol.” “Gang activity.” “Community adults without jobs hanging around the community.” “Loud noises.” “Community people who seem mentally ill.” “Community people who seem homeless.” “Community people who seem to be selling sex (prostitution).” “Groups of young children misbehaving (younger than teenagers).” “Groups of teenagers misbehaving.” “Groups of adults misbehaving.”
The same Likert-type scale (1 to 5 response categories) was used for physical and social disorder scales. In responding to items from the physical and social disorder scales, participants were asked to consider “How often do these things happen in your community?” and were given a choice of five Likert-type responses: 1) never; 2) a little of the time; 3) some of the time; 4) most of the time; and 5) all of the time. High scores on these scales indicate greater perceived disorder (physical or social) in the community. High scores on these scales indicate a greater presence of perceived disorder (physical or social) in the community. The individual respondent’s score for both the social and physical disorder scales is the mean score of all items for that scale; therefore, the possible range of scores is from one to five. All 119 cases responded to each scale item; thus, mean replacement was not necessary.

The physical scale had a mean of 2.90 (SD=.8990) and a median of 2.83. The minimum score was 1.17, and the maximum was 5.00. This scoring suggests that the sample perceives moderate physical disorder within the UAD. A reliability analysis of these six items yielded an acceptable Cronbach alpha of .8517.

The social disorder scale had a mean of 2.87 (SD=.1025), a median of 2.75. The range of scores for social was 1.17 to 4.92. Similar to the physical disorder scale, these results suggest that overall the sample perceives moderate social disorder within the UAD: the various indicators of physical and social disorder are present “some of the time.” A reliability analysis of these twelve items produced an acceptable Cronbach alpha of .9319.
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Community Change Scale

Subjects were then asked to consider how these same indicators of physical and social disorder had changed in the past year. For example, respondents could reply that “litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets” is “less of a problem,” “about the same,” or “more of a problem.” The responses were coded as: -1, 0, +1, respectively. The original analysis plan included the community change measured variable as a representative of community attitudes. As will be discussed in chapter 4, the subjects across the sample reported little to no change in any indicator during the past year. Because there was no variability in response to this indicator, it was not included in the model analysis.

The community change scale consisted of the same 18 indicators of community disorder used in the physical and social disorder scales. Subjects were asked if the indicator was more, less, or about the same as in the previous year. Respondents reported very little change in the community regarding each of the indicators during the past twelve months: 14 of the 18 indicators of disorder were viewed as staying the same. Due to the lack of variability in response to this item, the scale was not computed for use in further study analysis.

Social Integration

The measures selected to represent the social integration construct include attitudinal scales regarding OSU and Campus Partners as community members, the frequency of the adolescent’s interaction with the OSU area (campus and High Street), and a composite score reflecting the extent to which the adolescent’s social network includes links to The Ohio State University affiliates, either students or employees.
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OSU and Campus Partners Scales

In response to the OSU and Campus Partners scales, subjects were asked to consider "how true each of these statements is" and were given a choice of five Likert-type responses: 1) not true at all: 2) a little true: 3) somewhat true: 4) very true: and 5) extremely true.

The OSU scale measures the extent of a relationship between the youth respondent and the university (The Ohio State University) that is leading urban revitalization in the UAD. There were seven items about OSU with Likert-type responses to the following statements: "OSU is part of my community." "I feel uncomfortable being on the OSU campus." (reverse scored) "I would like to attend college." "I would like to attend college at OSU". "OSU helps improve my community." "OSU students are not members of my community." (reverse scored) and "When I'm around the OSU campus, I hang out mostly on High Street." (reverse scored)

Five items were retained for the OSU scale using guidance from the Cronbach alpha reliability test regarding which items to drop in order to increase the alpha. The five items ("OSU is part of my community." "I feel uncomfortable being on the OSU campus." (reverse scored) "I would like to attend college." "I would like to attend college at OSU". and "OSU helps improve my community") increased the reliability level of the scale from a very low .3573 coefficient alpha to a modest .5069. Responses to the five items were summed. Mean replacement was used for missing data: three items from two cases were replaced with the mean score. All 119 cases were used with a mean of 3.72 (SD = .6533) and a median of 3.80 with a range of responses from 2.20 to 5.00.
No person answered “not at all true” to the scale items. This reflects a generally favorable opinion among respondents of OSU as a community member.

The reliability level for the OSU scale is quite low but adequate in social science research (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). It does call into question the usefulness of the data for measuring the desired construct—i.e., youth resident attitudes about OSU. Recognizing these limitations, the scale was kept in the model analyses since the variable was viewed as an important measure of the latent variable, social integration.

For the Campus Partners scale, respondents were first asked, “Have you ever heard of “Campus Partners?” If a subject responded “no,” s/he skipped to the next set of items. If a subject responded “yes,” s/he was directed to the following three items: “Campus Partners is an organization that is helping to improve the community,” “Campus Partners is cleaning up the community.” and “Because of Campus Partners, people will be forced to move out of my community.” Few respondents answered the Campus Partners questions because they were not familiar with the organization; therefore, the Campus Partners data was not included in the model analysis.

Social Network

Item c1 asked the respondent, “Do you know anyone who works for OSU and lives in your community?” A similar question, item c4, followed inquiring about knowledge of OSU students who live and work in the community. If the respondent answered “yes” to these questions, s/he was asked to report what relationship the person(s) had to him/her. The list of response choices were parents, family members, neighbors, friends, and friends’ parents, and “other”. Respondents were permitted to
circle more than one answer. No consideration was given for multiple persons known by
the respondent in any one category.

Each network item was weighted according to the importance of that person’s role
within the adolescent’s social networks (Felner. Aber. Primavera. & Cauce. 1985). Those
viewed as potentially having the closest relationships and more intense interaction with
the youth received greater weight. What role each person had with the university (student
or employee) was considered irrelevant. If the respondent reported that a parent was
either an OSU student or employee, the parental weight was added to that respondent’s
social network score. The weighting was applied as follows: “My parent(s). stepparent(s).
or guardian(s)” received the greatest weight, a score of “6,” followed by “My family
member [other than your parent(s). stepparent(s). or guardian(s)].” which received a score
of “5,” and then “My friend(s).” which received a score of “4.” Friends’ parents received
a score of “3,” and neighbors a “2.” Because persons within the “other” category fall
outside of all other categories distinguished in social support literature as having a
significant impact on adolescent behavior and because those listed in the other category
are not likely to be persons with whom the adolescent has daily contact, they were
assigned the least weight, a score of “1.” The weights were then totaled. Total network
scores ranged from 0 to 21 This total score represented the extent to which each
respondent’s social network was linked to OSU affiliates.

The social network composite score had a mean of 3.83 (SD=4.06) and a median
of 3.00. The range of scores for social network was 0 to 18. As was also discussed in the
descriptive section on this topic, results of such a low mean demonstrate that the social
network of UAD youth is not substantially embedded with OSU affiliates.
Visits to OSU and High Street (Campus Business District)

Respondents were first shown a simple map of the OSU campus boundaries and then asked how often they had visited campus in the past twelve months and for what reasons they had been there. Response categories were 0 times (scored as 0); 1-3 times (scored as 1); 4-6 times (scored as 2); 7-9 times (scored as 3); 10-12 times (scored as 4); more than 12 times (scored as 5). A similar set of questions explored the respondents' visits to the High Street area within the same period.

Prosocial Community Activities

Involvement in prosocial community change activities is measured as participation in formal activities designed to improve the quality of life in the University Area District (UAD) and participation in informal activities believed by the adolescent to improve the UAD. Formal activities were those that were developed by the Campus Collaborative and volunteering activities. Each adolescent was asked a series of questions about the eight Campus Collaborative programs for which adolescent participation was solicited. Students were asked how often they participated in each program, why they had or had not participated, and how likely they would be to participate the next time. Formal involvement was to be measured by the total amount of Campus Collaborative program participation, sum total of the number of times the respondent participated in each program. As will be described in chapter four, few subjects reported participation in these programs.

In addition, adolescents were asked whether they volunteered and how often. The original analysis plan for this study called for the frequency of volunteering to be a part
of the composite involvement score. Again, few respondents reported that they had participated in volunteering activities.

A score of total involvement was to be created from the sum of the respondent’s participation in Campus Collaborative Programs, volunteering, and neighboring activities. Since so few respondents recorded any participation in Campus Collaborative programs and few had volunteered, the analysis plan was altered. Instead of modeling for total involvement, the data were analyzed with participation in neighboring activities (informal prosocial community activities) as the sole dependent variable.

**Neighboring Activities Scale**

To measure involvement in neighboring activities, adolescents were asked how often they participated in tangible support types of neighboring activities such as assisting an elderly neighbor, helping organize a community yard sale, or cleaning trash from community streets. In responding to items from the neighboring scale, respondents were asked to consider “How often do you do these things?” and were given a choice of five Likert-type responses: 1) never; 2) once; 3) a few times; 4) often; and 5) all of the time. High scores on these scales indicate greater participation in neighboring activities. The individual respondent’s score for the neighboring scale was the mean score of all items for that scale: therefore the possible range of scores is from one to five. All 119 cases responded to each scale item thus mean replacement was not necessary.

The neighboring activities scale resulted in a mean of 2.18 (SD=.5920) and a median of 2.22. The range of scores was 1.11 to 3.56. These results suggest that the UAD
youth, as a whole, participate moderately in neighboring activities: they have contributed something to their community.

A reliability analysis of these eight items yielded a low Cronbach alpha of .6775. Again, such a low reliability score is a signal that there are problems with how the scale measured the construct (inconsistent variance in response to scale items); therefore, the results must be interpreted with caution. Future research should develop and test additional items for the youth neighboring scale to improve reliability and represent other forms of social support provided via neighboring interactions.

In this study, neighboring activities were the only form of involvement measured that had sufficient responses and variability. As noted in the descriptive section of the analysis, few youth had participated in the Campus Collaborative programs, and few had reported participation in volunteering activities. Recognizing the limitations of the data, a principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization) of the neighboring activities was conducted to extract the best fit among the seven neighboring activities items.

Since all items in the scale represented one type of neighboring, tangible support, the items that are most highly correlated and together best represent the construct were used as the measured variables for neighboring activities. Upon rotation, the four receiving the highest scores in the first component were selected. These were “doing things that help improve the community”, “helping out an elderly neighbor”, “helping clean up the community”, and “babysitting for community parents”. These four neighboring items were retained for use in the model as measured variables of the latent construct “neighboring.”
**Analysis Strategy**

The original analysis strategy for this study was to model for prosocial community activities, a standardized composite score of total involvement as measured by Campus Collaborative program participation, volunteering activities, and neighboring activities by UAD youth. As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, and is discussed in detail during chapter four, few respondents attended Campus Collaborative programs and/or participated in volunteering activities. Because of this non-participation, a standardized score of total involvement in prosocial community activities was not meaningful. Thus the dependent variable for the model was limited to the only measure of informal prosocial community activities with variability, neighboring. Scale items were used as measured variables of the neighboring construct. The revised analysis plan employed structural equation modeling to test the relationship between variables using neighboring activities as the dependent variable (see Figure 2).
Figure 2. Modified Conceptual Framework. Note: The lack of designated paths between the variables figure is predicted to be zero.
Kline (1998) describes model fitness as "multifaceted," emphasizing that no one determinant indicates whether a model has a "good fit." Instead, model fitness can be understood as increasing with each satisfied criteria. The minimal requirements for a "good fit" are, according to Kline, "favorable values of numerous fit indexes and absolute values of correlation residuals less than .10." (p. 139) Kline suggests using the terms "adequate, satisfactory and acceptable" to describe fit. In addition to a measure of overall fit, Bollen and Long (1993) stress the need to evaluate components of the model such as the R squares of equations, the magnitude of coefficient estimates and their signs, and other improper or unusual results. They also recommend testing several alternative models over a single model and the use of prior studies of the same or similar models to judge model adequacy.

Model fitness is typically reported with a set of indices: chi square statistic, its degrees of freedom and significance level, an index of overall proportion of explained variance (NFI), an index that adjusts the proportioned of explained variance of model complexity (NNFI) and an index based on the standardized residuals. Kline also suggests using the standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR); however, the average absolute standardized residual is an acceptable substitute. Like the chi square statistic, both the SRMR and the average absolute standardized residuals are a measure of the difference between the predicted and observed data.

Chi square provides a measure of difference between the observed and the expected frequencies: the larger the chi-square, the larger the difference between expected and observed frequencies. A statistically significant chi square means that the data do not fit the model; therefore low and nonsignificant values of chi square are
desired. In other words, chi square for just identified models equals zero with no degrees of freedom because the model perfectly fits the data. In contrast, an overidentified model has both a positive number of degrees of freedom and chi square statistic. However, the size of chi square is difficult to interpret. There are no guidelines regarding the meaning of the chi square statistic because it has no upper bound (Kline, 1998). In addition, chi square is sensitive to large sample sizes. To reduce this sensitivity, some researchers divide the chi square value by the degrees of freedom, using 0 to 3 as the acceptable ratio (Kline, 1998).

The Bentler-Bonett Normed Fit Index (NFI), another fit index, indicates the proportion in the improvement of the researcher’s model overall fit relative to a null model.

\[ \text{NFI} = \frac{\chi^2_{null} - \chi^2_{alternative}}{\chi^2_{null}} \]

Similar to the NFI, another incremental fit index, the Comparative Fit Indices (CFI) may be less affected by sample size (Kline, 1998), therefore, it is best to use the CFI with small samples. Perfect model fitness using both the NFI and the CFI is a score of 1. The Bentler-Bonett Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) includes a correction for model complexity and typically has much lower values than other indices due to sensitivity to sample size. It is normed to approximate the 0-1 interval (Tanaka, 1993) but can fall outside that range (Kline, 1998).

\[ \text{NNFI} = \frac{(\chi^2_{null}/df_{null}) - (\chi^2_{alternative}/df_{alternative})}{(\chi^2_{null}/df_{null} - 1)} \]

The Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR) is a standardized summary of the average covariance residuals. This statistic summarizes the standardized
differences between the observed and predicted matrices. The SRMR should be zero when reflecting a perfect fit because what we observe should replicate what the model implied (Kline, 1998, p. 129); however, “a favorable value of the SRMR, which is based on the standardized covariance residuals, is less than .10.” (Kline, 1998, p. 131) In summary, a model with good fit would have an insignificant chi square or a chi square ratio between 0-3, a NFI, CFI and the NNFI are close to 1, and a SRMR or an average absolute standardized residual less than or equal to .10.

Recursive models with latent variables (such as the one hypothesized in this study) are empirically tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) before structural analysis. The CFA tests the theoretically conceptualized relationships by examining the correlation of measured variables. The neighboring activities model indicators were hypothesized to be unidimensional: their error terms are independent and measured variables load on only one factor as hypothesized. Alternatives to unidimensionality are that the indicators do not load, they load with measured variables that are not hypothesized to represent the construct, and/or they load on multiple factors. Such findings would indicate conceptual error—i.e., regarding what indicators were used to represent the model constructs—and/or measurement error—such as, how variables were measured.

A CFA was conducted to test the hypotheses B1-4 (see pages 36-37) regarding whether the indicators collectively represent a construct. Following the CFA, theory and empirical findings guided how the model was modified. When all indicators for the construct did not load together, one measured variable per construct was retained as a proxy of that indicator so that the specified model would be theoretically sound and
mirror the relationships from the conceptual model. A structural analysis with latent and measured variables was conducted. The resultant goodness of fit indices were examined as the basis for answering the research question regarding overall model fitness. No additional model analysis was conducted using the two remaining exogenous variables, gender and minority status (dummy variables), because there were not enough cases to test model fitness for different groups.

Ethical Issues

The Behavioral and Social Science Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University reviewed this study and approved the human subjects procedures in July 1999. Subjects were informed that their survey responses would be confidential. To maintain confidentiality, each survey was assigned a unique identification number. A list matching identification numbers with student members' names was kept in a locked office. The list was used to determine which subjects had not responded so that follow-up mailings could be sent. Completed surveys were filed by identification numbers and secured in a locked office.

Subjects were informed that their participation in the study was voluntary. The researchers' phone number and contact information for the OSU Institutional Review Board were provided in all of the solicitation materials so that parents and their children could ask questions prior to consenting (or refusing). Subjects were instructed to return a blank consent form in the postage-paid envelope if they did not wish to participate so that they would not receive any follow-up mailings. Additional mailings were not sent to respondents whose blank or completed consent forms were received or to respondents...
who indicated orally (by phone) that they were not interested in participating in the study. Replacement solicitation packets were mailed to subjects who reported that they had not received or had misplaced their packets and requested new packets.

A monetary gift ($5.00) was offered to compensate subjects for their time as suggested in literature about increasing response rates with young research subjects of low socioeconomic and minority status (Cauce, Ryan, & Grove, 1998). Upon meeting with the researcher to complete the survey, the youth received the monetary gift along with the survey instrument, and the subject was reminded verbally of his/her right to stop participation at any time or to ask questions of the adult regarding language or directions if needed. In addition, the front cover of the survey instrument contained the following reminder in the introductory message: “... And if you decide not answer these questions, just put the papers back in the envelope and hand them in. It’s your decision.” The subject kept the monetary gift whether or not any items on the survey were actually completed. Thus the youth could stop participating in the research study at any point of time without suffering consequences or penalties.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of residential factors, community attitudes, and social integration on youth prosocial community activities. The presentation of the study's data analysis is organized into two sections: descriptive data and multivariate analyses. The first provides a descriptive overview of the sample with regard to age, gender, race/ethnocultural identity, attitudes about the community of residence, the extent to which OSU is integrated into respondents' social lives, and the extent to which respondents engage in prosocial community activities. In the second section, structural equation model analyses (confirmatory factor analysis and structural analysis) are described and results of the specified model are presented.
I. Descriptive Data

Sample Characteristics: Age, Gender and Race Ethnocultural Identity

Research Question 1:

What are the sample characteristics of youth living in this community?

Respondents ranged in age from 13 to 19 years with a mean age of 15.41 years (SD = 1.5 years). The majority of the sample was female (58%) and Caucasian/White (43.7%). The next largest ethnic/racial identity was African American and/or Black (35.3%). Other racial/ethnic minorities comprised 15.9% of the sample, including mixed racial/ethnic categories (3.4%), and Somalians (0.8%). Due to low representation of several racial/ethnocultural categories, racial/ethnocultural minorities were combined into one category for analysis. This resulted in a sample of 65 persons of minority status (54.6%), 52 nonminorities (43.7%), and 2 respondents with missing data (1.7%) (see Table 1), indicating that the sample may be biased with regard to race/ethnicity.

Since the only estimate of gender distribution and age among UAD youth includes college students, the representativeness of the sample by these two variables is unknown. To evaluate representativeness, racial/ethnocultural characteristics were compared with census data aggregated to tracts (2000)\textsuperscript{34}.

Those who identify themselves as Caucasian/White and Asian/Asian American are underrepresented when comparing percentages of these categories from the sample with percentages from the 2000 census data of tracts that comprise the UAD (see Table 1). The discrepancies for Native Americans and Asian Americans are most likely due to the small sample size. With only 119 respondents, assignment of any minority status to a
participant greatly shifts overall category proportions within the sample. Those respondents who identified themselves as African American/Black and Native American are clearly overrepresented in this sample.

The sample is not representative of the general UAD population with regard to racial/ethnocultural identity: therefore, the results cannot be generalized beyond this study. Results of this study may be more reflective of the attitude, behavior, and relationships of minority youth who reside in the UAD and chose to participate in this study than of all UAD youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/ Ethnocultural Identity</th>
<th>Sample n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>2000 Census Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>5345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian or White</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>33,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1811(^{16})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>43,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sample Characteristics-Racial/Ethnocultural Identity Compared with 2000 Data of UAD Census Tracts 6, 10, 11, 10, 11.20, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18.10 & 18.20
Residential Stability

Research Question 2:

To what extent do the youth who live in this community have a stable residence with regard to homeownership, frequency of moves, and length of time in the community? The following residential stability results are mixed: stability and instability are both demonstrated in the findings. Almost all respondents reside with “family members” (n = 116, 97.5%), which includes any person from their extended family network, such as birth parent(s), stepparent(s), adopted parent(s) and/or grandparents, aunts, or uncles. Eight youth reported that their families were “doubled up,” that is, their families stay with others (usually extended family members) who rent (n= 7.6%) or own (n= 1.0.8%) their places of residence. A majority of the subject’s parent(s) or guardian(s) did not own their place of residence (n= 80, 67.8%). The length of time that respondents have lived in the UAD ranges from 4 months to 18 years (n = 113). The mean length was 7.4 years (SD= 6.0 years, median = 5.0 years). Most youth either resided at the same address (57.9%) or moved only once (19.3%). Thus, the findings on residential stability indicators are mixed. Most youth live in rented housing, an indicator of instability. Yet, there are signs of stability within the group. Families tend to stay in one home and the length of time they have lived in the community is considerably varied. Some youth reported living in the UAD for their entire childhood.
Community Attitudes

Research Question 3:

To what extent do UAD youth hold a favorable view of their community? As described in chapter three, there were eighteen community opinion items in the survey. Respondents were asked to estimate how true each statement was about the community in which they live. Subjects rated their response on a Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 to 5). A high score on the community opinion scale indicates the youth's overall satisfaction with the home community. Subject responses varied. All of the eighteen items received scores ranging from 1 to 5. Item means fell between 2.32 and 3.65 (see Table 2). There were large standard deviations in most scale items, indicating that another factor may be contributing to variance within the scores. In general, however, youth had a moderate opinion of their community. They did not think it is a particularly good or bad place to live.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Opinion</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>My community is a good place to live.</strong></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My community is a good place to grow up.</strong></td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people moving into my community in the past year or so are good for this community.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to move out of my community.*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are some kids in my community that I don't want to spend time with.*</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People move in and out of my community a lot.*</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the most part, the police help people in my community.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much car traffic in my community.*</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are enough bus stops in my community.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are enough bus shelters in my community.</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had to move out of my community, I would be sorry to leave.</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much crime in my community.*</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My community has become a better place to live in the past year.</strong></td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the most part, adults in my community are concerned about kids.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a part of my community.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in my community.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the most part, people who move into the community are similar to my family.</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are some kids in my community that I wouldn't want my brother(s) or sister(s) to spend time with.*</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sample Characteristics-Community Opinion. Likert response categories: 1=not at all true, 5= extremely true
* denotes items that were reverse scored. reverse score mean presented: bolded items were retained for scale
Research Question 4:

To what extent do UAD youth view their community as disordered (physically and socially)? As described in chapter three, six indicators of physical disorder and twelve indicators of social disorder were used in this study. High scores on the Likert-type scales (ranging from 1 to 5) indicate a greater presence of perceived disorder (physical or social) in the community. There was variability across the scale in subject response. Item means fell between 2.34 and 3.75 (see Table 3). Again, standard deviations are large for a five-point scale.

The community problems that youth notice most often were “Litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets” (X =3.66, n = 119, SD=1.18), a form of physical disorder, and “community people drinking alcohol” (X=3.75, n = 118, SD=1.18), a form of social disorder. The problem youth noticed least often was “community people who seem to be selling sex” (X=1.87, n = 118, SD=1.28). Standard deviations were once again high for a five-point scale. Of note are the standard deviations for “gang activity,” “community people using illegal drugs,” and “community people dealing drugs,” which all fall around 1.5, indicating some extreme differences in response to the item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Problem</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graffiti on buildings and walls</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abandoned cars</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empty buildings where no one lives or works</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalism (buildings, cars or other property in the community that have been destroyed or damaged, except graffiti)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houses and yards that are not kept up</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Community people dealing drugs</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community people using illegal drugs (like marijuana, weed or blunts, crack, or any other non-prescription drugs)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community people drinking alcohol</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gang activity</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community adults without jobs hanging around the community</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loud noises</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community people who seem mentally ill</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community people who seem homeless</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community people who seem to be selling sex (prostitution)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups of young children misbehaving (younger than teenagers)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups of teenagers misbehaving</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups of adults misbehaving</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Sample Characteristics-Physical and Social Disorder: Likert response categories: 1=never, 5=all of the time
Social Integration

Research Questions 5:

To what extent do UAD youth view The Ohio State University and Campus Partners as good community members? Given the proximity of OSU to the neighborhood, a separate scale was created to evaluate youth attitudes about the university. Respondents were asked to answer seven Likert-type items (ranging from 1 to 5) that indicated their views about the university. Most of the items had a mean response at the middle to high end of the scale, demonstrating a favorable attitude toward OSU as a community member (see Table 4). Those items with moderately to highly favorable responses included two items that were reverse scored: “I feel uncomfortable being on the OSU campus” (X=4.47, n=118, SD= .89) and “Ohio State students are not members of my community” (X=3.92, n=117, SD=1.28). These two items demonstrate that youth generally feel comfortable visiting the campus area and view students as members of their community. The other measures of social integration further address these two issues. physical interactions with campus and social network with OSU affiliates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State is part of my community.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable being on the OSU campus.*</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to attend college.</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to attend college at OSU.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU helps improve my community.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU students are not members of my community.*</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I'm around OSU, I hang out mostly on High Street.*</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Sample Characteristics-Ohio State Attitude. Likert response categories: 1=not at all true. 5=extremely true
* denotes items that were reverse scored, reverse score mean presented

Research Question 6:

To what extent do UAD youth visit the campus area (OSU and the campus business area)? This study also assessed the extent to which youth visited the OSU campus and High Street, the campus business area located adjacent to the east university entrance. The majority of respondents (n = 61, 51.3%) report visiting OSU ten or more times during the year prior to data collection. Over half the respondents stated they had visited OSU one to three times during the past year to "go for a walk" (63.9%) or "hang out" (53.8%). The next most popular reasons to visit campus were "to visit someone I know." (39.5%) "to visit the hospital." (37%) and "to use the library." (35.3%) The least popular reasons to visit campus were to attend summer camp (5%) and to visit OSU with a parent who is employed there (7.6%) or who is a student there (3.4%). Only sixteen
subjects reported not visiting OSU campus at all in the past year. In this group, the two most popular reasons were "I don't know anyone there" (n = 10, 8.4%), and "I don't have a reason to go campus." (n = 9, 7.6%) (see Table 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Visit OSU</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To attend an educational program</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend an OSU sports activity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To visit someone I know</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see an art exhibit</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a concert</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a theater performance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a festival</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use the library</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To go to a party</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take a walk</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To hang out</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To go to the hospital</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a summer camp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be with a parent at work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be with a parent who is going to school at OSU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a school field trip</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Sample Characteristics-Visits to OSU Campus: Percentage is based on those youth who reported visiting OSU in past year for some type of activity (n=103)
The majority of respondents reported visiting High Street businesses 1 to 3 times in the 12 months prior to data collection to “eat at a restaurant.” (79.8%) “shop.” (75.6%) “hang out.” (61.3%) or “take a walk.” (59.7%) The least popular reason to visit High Street was to attend a concert (18.5%). Thirteen respondents had not visited High Street in the past year. The reason most frequently given was “I have no reason to go to High Street.” (see Table 6)

The majority of UAD youth visited the OSU campus during the year prior to the study period, although their visits were infrequent and they spent little time on High Street. Youth visit OSU and High Street for a variety of reasons: some visits involved planned productive activity, and some were more leisure-oriented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Visit High Street (Campus Business District)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To visit someone I know</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a concert</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To go to a party</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take a walk</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To hang out</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To shop</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To eat at a restaurant</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Sample Characteristics-Visits to High Street Businesses: Percentage is based on those youth who reported visiting OSU in past year for some type of activity (n=106)
Research Question 7:

To what extent does the social network of UAD youth include persons who are affiliated with OSU? The majority of respondents know OSU students who live in their community (n = 68, 57.1%) but do not know OSU employees (n = 69, 58%). Of those who do know an OSU employee, the employee is the respondent’s friend, neighbor, or friend’s parent. Twenty-one respondents stated they had friends who were OSU employees: twenty reported their neighbors were OSU employees: and eighteen reported that OSU employed a friend’s parent(s). Similarly, respondents’ friends and neighbors were more likely to be students than were parents and family members. The majority of individuals did not know persons who were employees or students. Also, forty-one individuals did not know anyone who was an employee or student of OSU. These findings indicate that some of the youths’ social networks included OSU affiliates, particularly students, and these individuals tended to have more distant, less influential positions (nonfamilial) in the network.

Adolescent Prosocial Behavior

Research Question 8:

To what extent do youth participate in neighboring behaviors? Neighboring behaviors represent efforts made by the adolescent to do things s/he believes improves his or her community outside of organized programs. As discussed in chapter one, neighboring can take different forms, such as tangible, socioemotional, or informational support. The scale used in this study uses measures of tangible support. To measure this concept, a nine-item Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 to 5) was created to measure how
often the adolescent engages in acts of tangible support for nonfamily members who reside in the community (see Table 7).

One hundred fourteen respondents (95%) reported having at least once helped an elderly neighbor, helped clean up the community, organized community kids to play sports, babysat for community parents, cleaned abandoned houses, planted a garden, mowed a neighbor's lawn, or done something else to help improve the community. Seventy-six subjects (63.9%) chose four or higher on the scale, meaning that the majority of the sample has done things to help improve their community at least "a few times." Helping an elderly neighbor was the most popular activity while cleaning abandoned buildings was the least (see Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping an elderly neighbor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning up the community</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing community kids to play sports</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitting for community parents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting a garden</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing the neighbors lawn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning abandoned houses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Sample Characteristics-Neighboring Activities: Likert response categories: 1=never, 5=all the time; Note: This is a subset of respondents-those who responded 4=often, or 5=all the time (n=119)
Respondents listed other community improvement activities. The responses ranged from the very general—e.g., “Help families in need”—to the specific -e.g., “Tell speeders in the street to slow down.” A content analysis of the items listed by respondents found that items fit into all three areas of social support that relate to neighboring as described in chapter two: tangible, informational, and emotional support. These types of support focused on assisting both individuals and the community at large (see Table 8). A fourth type, spiritual support, emerged from the data. It included frequent comments about attending church, bible study, and church potlucks, as well as praying or “talking to God to see what I can accomplish.” UAD youth tend to be active in helping neighbors in a variety of activities that provide different types of support to individuals in the community and the community as a whole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support to Individuals</th>
<th>Tangible Support</th>
<th>Informational Support</th>
<th>Emotional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Fix things”</td>
<td>“Help teens or kids with homework”</td>
<td>“Be friendly”; “Be nice to others”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Rake leaves”</td>
<td>“Talk with kids I know about drugs and stuff”</td>
<td>“Focus on positive things”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Shovel snow”</td>
<td>“Play with my family”</td>
<td>“Stay out of trouble”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Help tow away cars”</td>
<td>“Collect and recycle cans”</td>
<td>“No violence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Tell speeders in the street to slow down”</td>
<td>“Try to build a tree house”; “Try to build a playhouse”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Help people get food”; “Help people go to the store”; “Take children out to eat”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Make blankets for the homeless”</td>
<td>“Help people carry stuff”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Watch kids crossing the street”</td>
<td>“Do neighborhood kids’ hair”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 continued on top of next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support to Community</th>
<th>Tangible Support</th>
<th>Informational Support</th>
<th>Emotional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Get educated about things in the community so I can help fix them”</td>
<td>“Get educated about things in the community so I can help fix them”</td>
<td>“Keep peace in the neighborhood”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Take care of my house and what’s around my house”</td>
<td>“Set examples for appropriate housing”</td>
<td>Participate at the local recreation center and library, attend community events, and go to the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Take up one parking spot on the street”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Report vandalism, drug and gang activity to police”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Walk rather than drive”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Sample Characteristics—Things Done to Improve the Community. Note: Each quote represents one respondent

Research Question 9:

To what extent do youth participate in community programs? In contrast to the level of neighboring activities, involvement in Campus Collaborative-sponsored programs was very low. Only 29 (24.4%) of the respondents reported having participated in any one of the eight Campus Collaborative-sponsored programs that had occurred prior to this study’s data collection period, July 1999-December 1999 (see Table 9). Twenty-five others responded that they had participated in other community programs.
believed to improve the community. Only five subjects participated in both Campus Collaborative and other community programs. The majority of respondents (n = 66, 55%) did not participate in either.

Responses confirmed that when individuals attended Campus Collaborative programs, they did so by their own choice rather than by adults instructing them to do so. Respondents who did not attend Campus Collaborative programs overwhelmingly reported that their nonattendance was due to not knowing about the programs. The second largest response to reasons for nonattendance was that the adolescent was not a student of Indianola Middle School, where half the programs took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Collaborative Program</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Program at Indianola Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity at Practice: Introducing Somatic Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors at Indianola</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laying the Groundwork for Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance: The Columbus Symphony Orchestra and BalletMet as Partners in Campus Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School to Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Law in the Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Bridges that Link Schools, Families, and Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Sample Characteristics-Formal Program Participation
Respondents were also asked to provide information about participation in other activities that they believe improves the community. Although it specifically asked the youth to list those things that they do “without being in an organized program,” this question produced a mixed list of forty informal and formal efforts to improve the community from twenty-four youth respondents. Other activities listed were educational, recreational, and service-oriented (social, environmental, and political). Educational activities included tutoring community youth, while recreational activities included art camp and martial arts classes. Church activities listed were after school programs and feeding the homeless. Service activities included participating in community clean-up activities, block watch programs, and neighborhood forums, as well as working on political campaigns. Because the youth provided very little description of their activities, it is difficult to know if they were done independently or with an organized group.

UAD youth participate in a variety of community programs but do not participate in those sponsored by OSU as part of the revitalization project. As noted previously, participation in community programs was originally a dependent measured variable of the construct prosocial community activities. There was little variation in subject response to inquiry about participation in Campus Collaborative or other community programs. Few had participated. For this reason, participation in community programs was not retained for model analysis.

**Research Question 10:**

To what extent do youth volunteer? Some respondents do not volunteer (89.1%). The number of volunteer hours that respondents log ranges from one to twenty-four per
week. The average number of hours for those who do volunteer is 8.4 hours (SD = 8.73).
These thirteen UAD adolescents volunteer at a variety of places, including a hospital, a
historical society, a settlement house, a library, the Red Cross, a food pantry, an art
museum, and a fire station. As noted previously, volunteering was originally another
dependent measured variable of the construct prosocial community activities.

In general, few UAD youth participate in volunteering activities. Because there
was so little variation in subject response to inquiry about participation in volunteer
activities, volunteering was also not retained for model analysis.

Summary of Descriptive Data

The first section presented a description of the sample. The 119 subjects
predominately consisted of females, younger adolescents, and those of minority status
(mostly African Americans) who live with family members in rented property. There was
considerable variability in how long families have resided in the UAD; however, they
seldom move. Overall, they have a moderate opinion of their community and perceive
moderate levels of physical and social disorder but are not aware of any change in the
past year. Nor are they aware of programs to stimulate community
change/revitalization. They have a generally favorable attitude toward OSU and they
have OSU affiliates in their social network, but infrequently visit the campus and
business area of OSU. While the youth do participate frequently in various neighboring
activities, they are not very active in community programs and tend not to volunteer.
Descriptive findings are discussed in more depth in chapter five.
II. Model Analysis

*Measurement Model*

In chapter two, the constructs residential stability, community attitudes, and social integration were operationally defined and the literature supporting the relationship among indicators was presented. Literature on neighboring activities was also discussed. Chapter three summarized how measured variables were selected to represent the neighboring construct: doing things that help improve the community; helping out an elderly neighbor; helping clean up the community; and babysitting for community parents. The following section discusses a confirmatory factor analysis of the measured variables in the model and examines data relevant to the following research questions:

B1. Do homeownership, length of time in the community, and number of moves represent the same construct (residential stability)?

B2. Do social disorder, physical disorder, and community opinion represent the same construct (community attitudes)?

B3. Do OSU attitudes, social network, and visits to campus, and High Street represent the same construct (social integration)?

B4. Does the group of activities (improve community, help elderly neighbors, clean the community, and babysit) represent the same construct (neighboring activities)?

Before model analyses, missing data was replaced with the mean for age (three cases) and length of time living in the community (six cases). A logistical model to predict homeownership was created based on the number of moves and length of time
living in the community. This model provided the missing values for homeownership.

Data for two cases were replaced in this manner. Three cases were deleted from the database because they were noted consistently as large contributors to normalized multivariate kurtosis on preliminary runs with EQS, a statistical software program. This reduced the cases to 116.

Following these modifications to the data, two Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) were performed with EQS to test how the data fit the hypothesized relationships between study variables. Maximum likelihood estimation was employed for all models. In the first analysis with all measured variables, the chi square and standardized root mean residual (SRMR) were high: $\chi^2 (91, n=119) = 552.628, p<.01, \text{SRMR}=0.138$. Additional fit indices were lower than expected: NFI = .642, CFI = .738. Length of time in the community and homeownership loaded together for residential stability ($p<.05$); however, the factor explained only a small proportion of the variance in homeownership (28%). Since three measured variables are required for a CFA and only two loaded on the factor, it was necessary to estimate which variable better represented the construct. The coefficient standard error (Z-test, values $>1.96 = .05$) for homeownership was 6.19 and was 15.10 for length of time. While both were significant, the higher value for length of time lived in the community indicates greater significance. For these reasons, length best represented residential stability in the CFA.

The measured variables for social integration loaded together but only very small proportions of variance were explained by the social integration factor: OSU scale (6%), visits to OSU (7%), and visits to High Street/Campus Business District (9%). In contrast 64% of the variance in social network was explained by the factor indicating that social
network was the best measured variable to represent the construct. The measured variables for community attitudes and neighboring activities loaded together (p<.05); therefore, they were considered representative of the construct designated in the model.

Together the findings regarding residential stability and social integration pointed to a possible conceptual or measurement error. The model was not performing as had been hypothesized, therefore, a three-factor confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to test factor loading with the absence of measured variables hypothesized to represent residential stability.

Results of the second CFA provided improved goodness: $X^2 (55, n=119) = 400.217, p<.01. NFI = .797, CFI = .880$. Community attitudes and neighboring activities performed similarly in the second CFA to the way they had in the first. The third factor, social integration, loaded only one variable—social network (p<.05). The factor explained 57% of the variance of social network. The second CFA confirmed that social integration was not adequately represented by the set of measured variables hypothesized in the model.

Post hoc model modifications were performed in an attempt to develop a better fitting and more parsimonious model that reflected the relationships hypothesized in the conceptual model. Age, a continuous exogenous variable, was included in the model as a measured variable. Because of their level of significance and large portion of the variance explained by the factor, length of time living in the community was selected as the only measured variable to remain in the trimmed model as a proxy for residential stability and social network remained as a proxy for social integration. The community attitude and
neighboring constructs were retained in the model using all measured variables of those constructs noted in Figure 2.

A model analysis following these modification found social disorder to best represent the community attitude construct. Factor two, community attitudes, accounted for 92% of the variance in social disorder, 73% of the variance in physical disorder, and 42% of the variance in community opinion. Factor four, neighboring activities, explained the largest proportion of variance in the two measured variables, which measure tangible assistance to the community. 38% of the variance in “help improve the community,” and 62% of the variance in “helping clean up the community,” and less of the variance in items which measure tangible support to individuals. Only 15% of the variance in “helping an elderly neighbor” and 16% of the variance in “babysitting for community parents” (both tangible support to individuals) were explained by the factor. Although all indicators of the neighboring construct were significant, these findings demonstrate that further research is needed on this topic to increase the number of neighboring items that is salient for youth and that best represents the construct. In this regard, other forms of neighboring could be explored (as was discussed previously in this chapter and in chapter two).

No additional model analysis was conducted using the remaining two exogenous variables, gender and minority status, because there were not enough cases to test model fitness for different groups. The following section reviews the results of the structural analysis.
Structural Model

The following discussion examines how the data fit the relationships designated by the hypothesized model. In this section the following research questions are addressed:

B5. Does residential stability directly affect community attitudes and social integration?

B6. Do community attitudes directly affect neighboring activities?

B7. Does social integration directly affect neighboring activities?

B8. Do community attitudes and social integration mediate the effect of residential stability on neighboring activities?

B9. How does the model fit the data?

The model converged during the sixth iteration. Increased support was found for the trimmed model. The chi square was reduced, and the Bentler-Bonett Normed Fit Index and Comparative Fit Index increased to acceptable levels: $X^2 (31, n=116) = 55.206, p<.01. NFI = .842, CFI = .926$. Although the chi square remains significant, a ratio of chi square to the degrees of freedom is below the recommended 2.5 times ratio (77.5). The average absolute standardized residual for the study model is .081, an acceptable level. Since few models result in a nonsignificant chi square, especially those with a small sample, the indices calculations can be interpreted to mean that the model has satisfactory goodness of fit. All model paths are significant except the path between age and length of time in the community. Figure 2 depicts the standardized effects of the model using significant paths, factor loadings, error terms and disturbances. All effects
(significant and nonsignificant) for measured and latent variables are also summarized in Table 10.

Concurrent with conceptual model hypotheses, persons with more favorable attitudes about the community and a social network that included more OSU affiliates participated more in neighboring activities. Inconsistent with the conceptual model was the relationship between length of time and community attitudes. The longer a youth lives in the community, the less favorable is her/his opinion of it. The relationship between length of time in the community and social integration reflected hypothesized model paths. The longer a youth lives in the community, the more integrated is her/his network with OSU affiliates. Also contrary to conceptual model hypotheses, none of the indirect effects were significant in the model: neither community attitudes nor social network mediated the effect of length of time living in the community on neighboring activities. Last, length of time did not mediate the effect of age on community attitudes, social network, and neighboring activities.

The specified model did include statistically significant relationships between the endogenous constructs as they were hypothesized in the conceptual model although the measured variables did not adequately represent the construct. To what extent the exogenous variables explained variance in length of time lived in the community (proxy for residential stability) or neighboring activities is unknown. Due to the small sample size, these analyses could not be conducted. The model analysis findings are discussed in more detail in chapter five, where an interpretation of the relationships between measured variables and latent constructs is addressed.
Figure 3: Specified Neighboring Activities Model of Measured and Latent Variables with Significant Standardized Effects; *p < .10; ** p < .05; n = 116; $X^2$ (df = 31) = 55.206, p < .01; NFI = .842; CFI = .926; absolute standardized residual = .08
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Table 10 continued on top of next page.
Table 10 (cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Variables</th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V7</th>
<th>V8</th>
<th>V9</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>V11</th>
<th>V14</th>
<th>V15</th>
<th>V16</th>
<th>V17</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V11 Soc.Net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14 Improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15 Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16 Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17 Babysit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Decomposition of Standardized Effects for the Specified Neighboring Activities Model; *p<.10; ** p<.05
Summary of Model Analysis Findings

Confirmatory factor analysis of latent variables in the study model determined inadequate goodness of fit. Measured variables for community attitude and neighboring activities adequately represented the construct, but residential stability and social integration were not well represented by their measures. To achieve better fit and model parsimony, a trimmed model was analyzed, resulting in adequate fit indices. All trimmed model paths, except age to length of time in the community, were significant. The specified model explained 17% of the variance in sample data. Notwithstanding limitations, the results show promise for the development and use of community attitude scales and the future study of youth neighboring behavior because they have both theoretical and empirical support. Further discussion of descriptive and model analyses is presented in chapter five.
Despite years of research, intervention, and treatment, American communities continue to struggle with the persistent problems associated with decline and the related problems of youth who reside in disadvantaged communities, such as gang involvement, graffiti, school drop-out rates and substance abuse (Barton, Watkins & Jarjoura, 1997). The persistent nature of such problems has forced social work researchers and youth development specialists to step back, reconsider problem definition, and shift the manner in which new knowledge is pursued with regard to youth and their communities.

We advocate that the pursuit of knowledge about the more complex arenas of system and community change are as important, if not more so, than is knowledge about programs. Efforts that work to broaden the purpose of youth programs and organizations to include community change and development certainly move us in the right direction. Some now argue that in the long run understanding and effecting system and community change will do more developmental good for more youth than will a focus on the proliferation of programs (Public/Private Venture, 2000b, p. 134).
Among contemporary youth development specialists there has been a call to address: 1) how youth perceive assets and deficits within social settings, particularly with regard to social reference groups and community institutions; and 2) the need to integrate research on youth development, community development, and community organization (Chalk & Phillips, 1996). By resisting a simplistic and dichotomistic perspective of youth as either antisocial problems or innocent victims who require protection from unhealthy environments, this proposed focus expands investigation of adolescents to include an examination of the entire youth as an individual who both influences and is influenced by community. Focusing on the interactive process reframes youth as agents of community change (Public/Private Venture, 1999, 2000b).

Similarly, social work scholars have called for the profession to reexamine how social problems involving youth are conceptualized and to expand our understanding of youth as community builders (Finn & Checkoway, 1998; Morrison et al., 1997; Van Soest & Bryant, 1995). Van Soest and Bryant have argued for an expanded examination of youth issues to include experiences of alienation and omission of the individual within a community. Additionally, Finn and Checkoway have argued that social workers need to move away from “an infatuation with mental health solutions to the social problems affecting young people” to a view of “youth as resources,” focusing on youth as “competent citizens with a right to participate in the decisions that affect their lives and a responsibility to serve their communities.” (p. 336) This reconceptualization moves the focus toward examining how community institutions and processes influence youth involvement in shaping the health and well-being of their communities (Barton et al., 1997; Hart et al., 1998; Morrison et al., 1997; Van Soest & Bryant, 1995).
This fifth and final chapter discusses and interprets study findings in relationship to community change theory and community research. While this study only begins to examine the prosocial community behavior of urban youth, and the generalizability of the findings are limited, the results provide a basis for an increased understanding of the relationship between community-related factors and youth behavior. For social workers in community practice, these findings may illuminate some of the ways youth can contribute to the social capital of communities that are attempting revitalization. The study also contributes to knowledge on which community factors influence youth prosocial activities. The following sections summarize and discuss the descriptive findings, scale results, and model analyses, provide comments about how study findings relate to community practice, describe the limitations of the study, and recommend directions for future research on this topic.

Descriptive Findings

Descriptive data provided background about the study population, which predominately consisted of females, younger adolescents, and those of minority (versus nonminority) status who live with family members. Within the minority category, African American respondents were the largest group. Youth tended to reside in rented property. There was considerable variability in how long families had resided in the UAD; however, they did not tend to move often.

In general, UAD youth have a moderate opinion of their community. It is neither a particularly good nor a bad place to live. They report moderate levels of social and physical disorder and saw little change in indicators of this disorder during the year prior
to data collection. Youth tended to notice both types of disorder. While the youth recognized physical and social problems within their environment, they were, for the most part, unaware of any changes within the larger community with regard to the physical and social problems named in this study.

There were mixed results about how well integrated OSU was in the lives of UAD youth respondents. The majority of UAD youth only infrequently visited the OSU campus during the year prior to the study most visited about once per month but spent little time on High Street during the same period. When youth did visit OSU and High Street it was for a variety of reasons, some of which involved planned productive activity (such as work, visiting the library, or shopping) and some of which was more leisure-oriented (such as “hanging out”). Most youth do not know OSU employees but do know OSU students. OSU affiliates who are a part of the UAD youths’ social networks tend to be neighbors and friends, not part of their families/extended families. Youth may be unaware of the university’s efforts to revitalize the district since most were not familiar with Campus Partners and rated OSU’s role in community clean-up lower than other OSU scale items. Few youth have participated in Campus Collaborative programs. They report lack of knowledge about the programs or lack of access to them as their reasons for nonparticipation. In general, UAD youth view OSU favorably and see the institution as part of their community but have limited knowledge of OSU’s role in community change efforts via Campus Partners. They have limited interaction with the campus and its affiliates; therefore, it appears that, with regard to the social integration indicators used in this study, OSU is not well integrated into their daily lives.
Youth respondents are an active, prosocial group. Few youth volunteer at formal agencies, but many youth participate in some kind of informal activities that they feel benefit individual community members and their community as a whole. They participate in many community programs and act as good neighbors through a variety of activities, which can be categorized as examples of tangible, informational, and emotional social support. In addition, youth viewed engaging in spiritual activities as a way to improve their community. Of all activities, helping elderly neighbors was the most popular.

Scale Results

For the most part, UAD youth do not see their community as changing during the past year with regard to the community problems noted in this study. This is an interesting finding given the extensive efforts by the revitalization project to address criminal activity in the first stages of the project. Perhaps some improvement is under way but these youth were not aware of it at the time of the study. Since the presence of disorder is believed to cause more disorder, e.g., delinquency, it would seem important that any improvements in community problems be widely publicized so that youth members become aware of these changes.

Since very little variance was found in the community change variable, it was dropped from the model. The remaining three community attitude scales were found to have high internal reliability (physical disorder, .852; social disorder, .932; and community opinion, .866). In the model analysis, the three scales loaded together and as a group had a significant effect on neighboring activities. Scale reliability and validity, as well as the relationship between community attitudes and neighboring activities should
be further explored in research on similar populations with larger youth samples to test if the relationship between these variables are consistent across communities.

The OSU scale had low reliability (.507) and performed poorly in model analysis. Problems with the scale could have resulted from how the scale was constructed. It is also possible that responses could have been biased because an OSU student conducted the research. Due to this possible bias and measurement error, the relative importance of university attitudes versus community attitudes is not clear. The scale was created specifically for this study due to the focus on the UAD revitalization program. Thus, it is not likely to be used in future research.

Since the measures chosen to represent the social integration construct did not clearly represent the social integration construct, much more information is needed to assess how residents perceive the role of OSU as an institutional community member, specifically, how youth perceive OSU's role in initiating community change. Qualitative research that studies the social maps of UAD youth would assist us in better understanding where the boundaries of communities lie for various UAD youth subgroups and where OSU fits or does not fit within these boundaries. In addition, qualitative research could assist us in knowing which of the university's efforts to connect with community residents are viewed as helpful to youth and their families and which enhance the community residents' view of the university as an institutional community member.

The neighboring activities scale also had low reliability (.678), although four of the indicators performed well in the model analysis. The poor reliability may be due to the mixing of items that reflected two different types of tangible support: support...
provided to individuals and that provided to the community. These subcategories of support were found via a content analysis of “other” neighboring behaviors listed by respondents. In future research with this scale, the creation of neighboring subscales should be considered, i.e., tangible, emotional, and informational social support to individuals within the community and activities done to improve the community at large. Since the literature on neighboring activities is not well developed, these items should be expanded via qualitative research of youth from communities in various stages of their life cycle followed by a larger survey of youth for scale refinement. Responses to the last question in the survey from this study could also inform further study of the concept: “What are the other things that you do to improve your community by yourself or with family and friends without being in an organized program?”

Model Analysis Results

Measurement Model Results

The study model as a whole did not fit the data. Initial confirmatory factor analysis of the model found not all measured variables represented the residential stability and social integration factors. The model was trimmed, leaving one measured variable to serve as a proxy for each of those constructs. Length of time in the community was retained as the proxy for residential stability and social network was retained as the proxy for social integration. There is no clear reason why the number of moves in the community did not load as a residential stability variable. Nor is it clear why OSU attitudes and visits to campus and High Street did not load as social integration variables.
These results could be due to measurement errors or problems with the conceptual framework, i.e., the operational definition of these factors.

The finding that variance in homeownership was not explained by the underlying construct residential stability is an interesting one as homeownership is used so often as a proxy for this construct. Given the relationship between homeownership and income, this variable may have been a better proxy for socioeconomic status. Socioeconomic status was not considered as a variable in this study because it was believed that it would be difficult to obtain reliable information about a family's socioeconomic status from the youth and that asking questions about such a private family matter might decrease participation. Since subjects reported no difficulty in indicating whether or not their parents owned their home, future research should consider examining the role of homeownership and other socioeconomic indicators in relation to community attitudes, social integration, and neighboring activities.

Specified Model Results

The trimmed model resulted in adequate fit indices with significant paths. All constructs from the conceptual model were represented in the specified model with sets of measured variables or a proxy variable. The hypothesized relationships of the trimmed model reflected the conceptual model hypotheses. Almost all paths were significant. Age is the one exception. This may be due to the limited age range of subjects in this study. Community attitudes and social networks were found to be significant predictors of neighboring activities. Length of time living in the UAD was a significant predictor of community attitudes and social network. The effect of length of time on neighboring was
not mediated by community attitudes or social network. Length of time had a small negative effect on community attitudes and a medium positive effect on social networks. The relationship between length of time in the community and community attitudes was opposite to that originally hypothesized. Those who had lived for longer periods of time in the UAD had less favorable community attitudes, and social networks that included more OSU affiliates.

More favorable community opinions resulted in increased participation in neighboring activities. The relationship between social network and neighboring activities also supported the model hypothesis: more extensive social networks resulted in increased neighboring activities. Despite the good fit indices, the specified model only explained 17% (R square of standardized solution) of the variance in neighboring activities, indicating that the larger portion of the variance was left unexplained. Since there were not enough cases to split the database and compare the model by gender and minority status, the relative contribution of these variables to explaining the variance of neighboring activities in the specified model is not known. There may be other explanations for the small variance such as non-designated feedback loops among model variables, a poor choice of measured variables for the constructs studied, or the absence of variables in the model that would better explain neighboring activities. In regard to possible feedback loops, some researchers have suggested that participation in community activities has an effect on attitudes which in turn affects further participation. For example Day (1997) noted:

Not only is the process educative in and of itself, but the more one participates, the more one develops the attitudes appropriate to a citizen. These attitudes
include largeness of mind and an appreciation that the interests of the community are one's own. The examples set by the initial participators will draw ever-widening groups of individuals into the political arena, therefore increasing the likelihood that policies will be representative (p. 423).

Also in regard to a negative feedback loop. Sue and Zane (1980) cited research that suggesting that perceptions and expectations of the inability to influence outcomes in a community will result in a loss in the psychological sense of relatedness and community. Such a loop between involvement and attitudes could explain why the variance explained was minimal.

The relationship of length of time to community attitudes suggests that those who reside in the community longer have less favorable community opinions and a more extensive social network. These findings are interesting because the relationship between length of time and social networks is consistent with community research but the relationship between length of time and attitudes is contrary. Residential stability/mobility research report that more time is needed to form local social ties with supportive individuals in communities experiencing change (Freudenburg, 1984, 1986). Community studies has shown that residents become more attached to their communities over time (Pretty et al., 1994; St. John, Austin, & Baba, 1986; Wasserman, 1982). The relationship between time and attitudes may indicate that there is an intervening variable affecting this model path.

The relationship between social network and neighboring activities was significant in the model. In social disorganization theory and literature on social support and mentoring, those with more extensive and supportive social networks would be
expected to participate less in delinquent behavior and more often in prosocial behavior because they have a group of adults that provides guidance and boundaries regarding what behavior is acceptable. The findings of this study support the relationship between connections with adults and prosocial behavior. This study does not examine the quality of the relationship with these adults or the extent to which the adults promoted prosocial behavior among the youth respondents. The adults are in some way associated with a community institution that is improving the community. These findings (the more extensive the network with OSU affiliates, the greater the participation in neighboring activities) support the relationship between youth social network and prosocial activities.

While social disorganization theory does not discuss prosocial behavior, it implies that declining communities breed bad behavior, not good behavior. Respondents in this study reported a moderate amount of social and physical disorder in their community. In addition, they reported active participation in neighboring behaviors. The findings of this study suggest that prosocial behavior exists despite disorder. This is an area in need of further inquiry.

Limitations of Study

The present study has several limitations that primarily stem from three characteristics of the study. The first is that the nonprobability sampling method of youth from one community limits the generalizability of the findings beyond the sample being studied. The names of youth solicited to participate in this study were taken from a school system database. Youth who attend school are more conforming and subjects who self-selected to participate may have been more prosocial than those who did not participate.
Thus, there may be response bias due to the method of subject solicitation. Females and minority youth were overrepresented in the sample; therefore, the findings may be more representative of their experiences than of the entire UAD youth population. Also, this study does not compare youth activities across communities, thus, the influence of a renewing environment may be overestimated in the study.

Second, the cross-sectional design of the study does not allow direct examination of causality and must rely on the subject's self-report of past activities instead of direct observation of youth being neighborly, volunteering, or attending programs. Self-report data are particularly vulnerable to measurement errors (Rubin & Babbie, 1997). Many factors can influence whether a subject accurately reports such activity, such as difficulty in accurately remembering what occurred and social desirability. Youth may want to appear to be more prosocial than they actually are, therefore, they may have provided elevated rates participation in neighboring activities. In addition, subjects may want to please the researcher by reporting more or less disorder, depending on their perception of what answers the researcher is seeking.

Perhaps the most significant consequence of relying on self-report data in this study is the potential underreporting of involvement in Campus Collaborative programs. If youth did not recognize the name or description of the program, they could report nonattendance when they actually had attended and there is no way to validate their report. Also, subjects may have forgotten what indicators of disorder they witnessed since they were unaware that they would be called upon to report their observations. For these reasons, the findings of this study should not be considered as an evaluation of Campus Collaborative programming. The lack of attendance of UAD youth respondents
in these particular programs should not be considered representative of all Campus Collaborative programs.

Third, there are potential issues with measurement of the study variables. Since the scales used in this study were either adapted from other scales or were constructed for use in this study and have not been normed, there is some likelihood that systematic error occurred. The measures may not translate well to all youth and may not accurately capture what they intend to measure.

There are additional limitations regarding the use of these model analyses with study data. CFA assumes that measured variables are normally distributed, but those used in these analyses were not. Log transformations of the measured variables did not improve kurtosis. Because this is a small sample (n=119), the recommended criteria of at least 10 cases per parameter (if measured variables are normally distributed) or a sample of at least 200 cases, as documented by Ullman (2001, p. 659), is not met. The small number of available cases results in less stable covariance. The inability to draw more than one sample from the database means that exogenous variables cannot be included in the model, and it is not possible to test the specified model against different samples of the population. Because of these limitations, specification results should be interpreted with caution. Further model testing is necessary to establish a causal relationship between variables and to test differences in model results by gender and minority status.

Despite these limitations, this study provided the opportunity to test scales with a youth population. Also, the analysis identified relationships between study variables that can be examined in later studies using better methods of data collection, such as direct observation of youth involvement in prosocial community activities or creative data
collection methods (i.e., photography) and more developed community-related measures, such as an expanded neighboring activities scale. Although many obscure community related behaviors have been studied through participant observation (e.g., corner gang activity, tagging, gang activity, etc.), it would be difficult to observe neighboring behavior in this manner. Participant observation could be used for formal programs. Structured interviews of youth could expose some additional ways in which they engage in neighboring activities. Interviews with those designated as part of their social network could verify their activities.

Implications for Community Practice and Research with Youth

Research has provided very little knowledge about the process through which a community becomes physically, socially, and economically healthy and even less about how a revitalizing community shapes the behavior and outcomes of its adolescent residents. Little is known about the role of youth as competent community members and participants in the change process (Elliot et al., 1996; Finn & Checkoway, 1998; Van Soest & Bryant, 1995). Youth have long been targeted in urban revitalization projects as a "community problem" not a community asset. By focusing more often on dramatic antisocial acts of minority youth living in urban communities (i.e., graffiti and/or gang activity), informal ways of improving the community through acts of neighborly kindness by youth have been ignored. We have noticed the graffiti in the alley but not the youth who is cutting a neighbor's lawn.

In addition, there is a bias that community improvement activities can only be found in formal settings. We may be aware of an organized community clean-up by a
youth group but do not know about the girl who picks up trash on his walk home from school. This study demonstrated that youth who live in one declining community have acted as good neighbors in both informal ways and through participation in community groups but tend not to participate in formal efforts to revitalize the community. Those who have more favorable opinions of their community report greater frequency in helping neighbors. Such findings have significance for those who facilitate community services for youth. Community practitioners could use the community attitude scales from this study to assess which youth are most satisfied with their community and target them as potential leaders of youth-oriented community projects.

This study found that few community youth participated in formal programs because many of them did not know about the programs. This is a surprising finding. Future efforts in this vein should not assume that a program provided at Indianola Middle School draws only those living in the UAD and that youth who attend the school know about special programming that is held there. Many youth expressed interest in the programs but the youth must first know that programs exist so that they can chose whether to participate in them. Diligent efforts should be made to reach the targeted youth. This could be accomplished through advertisements at other community organizations, such as social services agencies, churches, and neighborhood stores. Such programs might ultimately be more successful if they are moved out of the school and into the community. They could be held at places where youth tend to gather, making them more accessible and attractive for families. Partnerships with local organizations that have an established relationship with area youth and serves only UAD youth (like the Godman Guild) could be built or strengthened.
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Although this study did not address how Campus Collaborative programs sought to engage youth participants, the literature provides direction in this area that may further assist program leaders. For example, community organizations must serve the needs of youth if youth are to be active participants. Heath and McLaughlin (1993) define an effective youth organization using the standards of community youth: 1) want to be members of the group. 2) choose their friends from members: and 3) identify their free time away from schools and households with those organizations.

Currently, those leaders and organizations judged most effective by young people do not define themselves with reference to schools. Most exist with relatively little recognition from schools: most of the young who come to these organizations, in fact, regard school as a place that has rejected and labeled them by what they are not rather than by what they are. (p. 4)

To excite youth and convince them to participate in community programs, the programs should be youth-oriented and focused on building youth capacities and strengths. Those organizations that utilize this approach have been successful in eliciting and maintaining youth involvement. Allowing youth to own their organizations helps them to practice skills needed for adult citizenship roles.

Reframing our understanding of youth and communities with a strengths-based perspective permits social workers to address not only the person-in-environment, but also the person and the environment. This perspective complements efforts by youth mental health workers to reframe services with regard to risk and protective factors, but it pushes those efforts one step further by challenging those in the helping professions to think of youth as positive contributors to the community.
The task of increasing citizen involvement by all types of residents (not just established community leaders) is an important one. The contributions of youth to the social capital of their community should be recognized and supported/strengthened through community services to assist youth in developing skills and competencies in the area of citizenship and to assist the community in its development. But before we consider new ways to increase involvement through formal services, it is first necessary to understand what efforts are already taking place by various constituents, how they define involvement, and what types of activities are most meaningful to them. Community practitioners must expand their ideas about community involvement and community change to include the perspectives of youth. This process begins by speaking with the youth and asking them to define their ideas about a community’s strengths and needs, inquiring about what would make it easier for them to be leaders in their own community, and taking away the barriers to their participation as citizens in the change process.

Concluding Remarks

This study examined the self-reported behavior, attitudes, and social relationships of 119 youth who reside in a revitalizing urban community. The youth surveyed in the study routinely participate in neighboring activities and are active in various community groups but do not participate in activities sponsored as part of the community revitalization plan. A specified model with adequate fit indices resulted from a model analyses (confirmatory factor analysis of the model and structural model analysis) to predict neighboring activities, a form of prosocial community behavior. The latent
construct "community attitudes" and "neighboring activities" was supported. Paths between length of time in the community and community attitudes, length of time and social network, community attitudes and neighboring activities, and social network and neighboring activities were significant. The model created by these paths resulted in adequate goodness of fit indices but explained only 17% (R square standardized solution) of the variance in neighboring activities indicating that the model could benefit from further development, specifically in regard to a possible feedback loop between attitudes and neighboring activities. Further research is also needed to test the model with gender, minority status, and socioeconomic status. These analyses were not possible due to the small sample size.

In order to create effective prevention and early intervention-type programs for youth who reside in disadvantaged and changing communities, it is important to understand all the ways in which changing communities influence youth behavior. Additional research is needed to describe and explain how, when, and why youth participate in prosocial community behavior. The author hopes that these study findings will provoke interest among community practitioners and researchers about the ways in which youth who live in disadvantaged and changing communities can and do act as competent citizens.
ENDNOTES

1 There is disagreement among those who study youth development regarding the use of the terms “risk” and “protective factors” (Medoff & Skylar, 1994) and prevention (Morrison et al., 1997) in that some scholars believe the use of the terms implies that the youth is completely malleable by her/his environment and minimizes youth capacities to effect change. Thus, these terms perpetuate the idea of youth as victims, not competent citizens (Finn & Checkoway, 1998). In addition, the association of the term “at risk” with persons who are of minority status and disenfranchised creates a new label for old stigmas. “In many ways, the wholesale labeling of children of single mothers and inner city children generally, as ‘at risk’ has become a stigmatizing code word for ‘illegitimate’—which also means contrary to law, rules and logic.” (Medoff & Skylar, 1994, p. 206) Strength-based terminology, such as healthy or positive youth development, competency, capacity, etc., is preferred. The terms “risk factors” and “protective factors” are used here to describe a body of research that has contributed significantly to the conceptual framework of this study although the author recognizes certain limitations regarding the use of these terms.

2 Private/Public Ventures (2000a) describes how the definition of risk factors has changed over time: “At first, the term ‘at risk’ was applied to young people who lived in proximity to older youth and adults who had already demonstrated social problems. The logic here was that if you were in the presence of trouble you were more likely to create it. Actually causing trouble also qualified you as at risk. Eventually however, at risk came to encompass a broader set of indicators—indicators that are not based on your behavior or relationship to others but rather on your membership in a demographic category with which trouble has been associated.” (p. 167)

3 The term “minority” is problematic as it can imply “less than” or “less important” and, when used in reference to racial/ethnocultural minorities, it may imply that “all persons of color are more similar than different”. In this study, the use of this term is not meant to imply such a disregard for diversity among persons of color nor does it mean to imply that these individuals play a less important role in their community than do other community members. In discussion of the conceptual framework, it is used in this study to highlight similarities in sociopolitical status among persons of color who experience oppression because they live in a racist society. In statistical analysis, the need to collapse categories arose from a low sample size and again should in no way imply a disregard for diversity between and among racial/ethnocultural groups.

4 These terms all refer to the experience of moving, including how people move and why/how decisions to move are made.

5 Moving during teenage years has been known to be a precursor to family conflict
(Sluzki, 1992). academic disruption (Buerkle, 1997; Jordan, Lara, & McPartland, 1996), and mental health problems (Humke & Schaefer, 1995; Scanlon & Devine, 2001), including suicidality (Beautrais, Joyce, & Mulder, 1996), situational depression (Brown, Ahmed, Gary, & Milburn, 1995; Hendershott, 1989) and a feeling of a loss of control or mastery over their environment by the youth (Hendershott, 1989). In the Beautrais et al. (1996) study, individuals who made serious suicide attempts had elevated odds of a change of residence within the previous 6 months.

6 Forced moving may result from community revitalization or may be related to significant changes in family structure, i.e., divorce, community, or family disaster, such as a residential fire or a job change/type of job (Greenberg, 1994; Lyons, 1996; Mongeau, 1986; Northwood, 1975; Rossi, 1955; South et al., 1998).

7 According to the U.S. Census Bureau (USDOC, 2000b), “moving rates decrease steadily with age: 32.4 percent for people 20-29 year old 22.8 percent for those 30-34, 14.1 percent for 35-44, 9.5 percent for 45-54, 6.7 percent for 55-64 and 4.5 percent for those 65 and older” (p. 1).

8 African Americans move at an 18.9 percent rate, while White, non-Hispanics move at a 14.5 percent rate.

9 13.1 percent of African Americans moved within county versus 8.7 percent of White, non-Hispanics.

10 In general, families with lower incomes tend to move less often for satisfaction and quality reasons. When poor families move they tend to relocate short distances from their previous homes and remain in or close to disadvantaged neighborhoods (Lyons, 1996; USDOC, 2001).

11 For example, in his study of British communities, Sampson (1991) found that both individual length of residence and community residential stability increased an individual’s friendship and acquaintanceship ties and community attachment. Sampson concluded that residential stability directly and indirectly promoted social integration at both the individual and community levels.

12 In this study, African Americans were more likely to show a higher level of neighborhood attachment.

13 Studies on youth volunteerism often include mandated volunteering by schools (Johnson et al., 1998). Some advocate that mandated service lessens the positive effects of the volunteer experience (Morris, 1992), while others suggest that required participation can be meaningful if it reflects the institution’s mission (Yates, 1999).
According to Johnson et al. (1998), youth who volunteer tend to have higher educational plans, educational aspirations, grade-point averages, and intrinsic motivation toward school. Girls who volunteer tend to have a higher levels of self-esteem. For youth who volunteer by choice, the motivation to volunteer may be related to college/career plans, or they may have more opportunity and willingness to volunteer due to prior successes. Thus, the data on youth volunteerism may better describe a subgroup of advantaged, not disadvantaged, youth.

Women are as interested in political participation as men (Schlozman, Burns, & Verba, 1994), but certain factors may act as barriers to their active involvement and leadership. These include a lack of political resources (Schlozman et al., 1994), a tendency toward group orientation and organizational work, and an affinity for relying on nongovernmental institutions to find solutions to problems (Fuller, 2000).

Persons in single-family detached housing will have fewer problems because space between residents is greater (Silverman, 1986).

Neighboring activities tend to decrease as the proportion of strangers to familiar residents in a community increases (Freudenburg, 1986).

This is also referred to as the “free-rider problem”, which argues that there is no motivation for involvement and it is in an individual’s economic self-interest not to participate when s/he can benefit from others’ involvement and “reap collective goods” (Chinman & Wandersman, 1999, p. 47). The solution to nonparticipation from this perspective is to offer incentives.

Latent variables are also referred to as constructs, factors, or unobserved variables (Ullman, 2001).

Indicators are also referred to as measured, observed, or manifest variables (Ullman, 2001).

It is important to establish early that the conceptual model does not mean to imply that community decline is due to the racial/ethnocultural identity of community residents. Instead, the relationship between these two variables results from the systemic inequities experienced by persons with racial/ethnocultural minority status with regard to housing and neighborhood choices. It speaks to the intersection of race and class in American society. Because persons of minority status are more likely to live in disadvantaged communities and have less stability in their housing, they are more likely to notice social and physical problems in their communities and have less favorable opinions of their communities.

COPC programs were discussed in chapter two in the section on university-led urban renewal.
24 According to Steve Harsh, Campus Collaborative, attendance records for individual programs at the time of the study did not isolate participants with regard to where they lived within the greater Columbus community nor did they note names of attendees, only the number of youth participants. Program participants included youth who resided outside the UAD because the programs were offered at Columbus schools (Personal communication, March 12, 1999). School assignment in Columbus is not community or neighborhood based. Thus, the only way to estimate how many UAD youth participated in the programs was to ask the youth themselves if they had participated.

25 The Dillman (1978) was chosen for this project as a method to solicitation consent for two reasons. First, it was necessary to obtain parental/guardian consent through the mail. The most efficient way to solicit adolescent research subjects is through school, however, data collection for this project was planned to occur in the summer when adolescents were not attending school. Secondly, the Dillman method is widely regarded as the standard for assuring high response rates (Cote, Grinnell, & Tompkins, 1986; Diaz de Rada, 2001; James & Bolstein, 1990).

26 The original Dillman (1978) method was developed to increase response rates to phone and mail surveys using repeated mailings. The focus of Dillman’s method is to demonstrate the researcher’s personal commitment to the study and the need for the participation by mailing repeated requests to participate. Each mailing having a more persistent focus. In addition, Dillman recommends adding personal touches to the mailings to show the recipient that s/he is not regarded as simply another number. These personal touches include signing letters and postcards and hand addressing envelopes. Four mailings are recommended. The first contains a letter explaining the research project, the survey, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The second mailing is a postcard with a message reminding the recipient to review the information in the first mailing and please respond as soon as possible. The postcard is mailed one week after the first packet. After two additional weeks, a third mailing is sent to those who have not yet responded. The third mailing is identical to the first: however, the letter that explains the project has a more urgent tone. The last attempt to solicit participation occurs after two additional weeks have passed when the fourth packet is sent by certified mail to all nonrespondents.

27 Solicitation occurred in two distinct periods, although it was not the original intent of this study to extend data collection in this manner. This change in methodology occurred due to an error in the creation of this study’s original student database by Columbus.
Public Schools. Because of the error, a second round of solicitation was necessary in order to solicit all eligible adolescents. The first round of solicitation for parental consent of 329 students occurred from August 1, 1999, to September 15, 1999. The second round of solicitation for parental consent of 266 students occurred from October 1 to November 1, 1999.

Certified mail requires a signature. If the recipient is not at home when the postal worker attempts delivery, the recipient must go to the post office to collect the packet. If a fourth mailing had been sent following Dillman's guidelines, it would have been mailed at the beginning of the 1999 school year. The beginning of a school-year is a particularly busy time for families as they move from a summer schedule to a new school year routine. Additionally, it was uncertain at that point how much the issue of family mobility was influencing the response rate. It became evident that some families had moved since registering their children at the beginning of the 1998-99 school year, as repeated mailings sent to the families at the address provided by Columbus Public Schools were returned marked undeliverable. Columbus Public Schools tried but failed to locate new addresses for these families. Forty-seven solicitation packets from the first round were returned as "undeliverable, addressee unknown." Another 194 did not respond at all. If, as suspected, many families were not responding because they were not receiving their mail, the use of certified mail would be costly, ineffective, and burdensome to some families and would provide only potentially minimal gain in participation. For these reasons certified mail was not used in the solicitation process.

In the study of minority youth, creative methods of solicitation are recommended such as using gifts (monetary and other types), getting endorsements from those the participants respect, adding personal touches to the solicitation document, and trying several different methods of solicitation (Cauce, Ryan, & Grove, 1998, pp.157-160). The backpack method developed for this study provided several advantages in that it added a personal touch, provided an endorsement from the school system, and ensured that if the youth actually delivered the packet to the parent(s) or guardian(s), it would arrive at the correct address. Thus, this form of delivery service circumvented some of the original methodological problems encountered through data collection, i.e., incorrect home addresses and use of certified mail. It also increased the likelihood that the study information would be read so that parent(s) or guardian(s) could make an active and informed decision about study participation. Since the period of data collection needed to be extended beyond the summer months, the use of school in this manner became a viable option.

According to Columbus Public School records, UAD adolescents have chosen to attend 24 different Columbus Public Middle or High Schools located across the city. Due to financial and time constraints, it was not possible to distribute sets of a fourth packet to all 24 schools: therefore, the distribution of eligible students at each school, the age of respondents and the racial mix of the school's student body was considered when deciding which schools to approach for assistance. Based on information obtained from
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the student database. Five Columbus Public Schools educate 83.94% of the high school students who live in the UAD. The five schools are: Whetstone High School, Centennial High School, Fort Hayes High School, Columbus Alternative High School, and Linden McKinley High School. These schools have an unequal racial mix of students. Whetstone has a higher percentage of Caucasian students while Centennial and Linden McKinley have a higher percentage of African American students. To avoid a sample bias based on race, all five schools were asked to assist with the final distribution of solicitation packets. Three of the five schools solicited to participate (Whetstone, Centennial, and Linden McKinley) agreed to do so. To address the issue of sample bias based on age, the only middle school located within the UAD boundaries, Indianola Middle School, was asked to distribute a packet of information to all 7th and 8th grade students following the same procedures as the high schools.

Cauce, Ryan, and Grove (1998) note that aspects of the subject’s environment may have an influence on their participation in research, such as living in urban settings with high poverty. Declining participation in surveys is thought to be related to the general public being more withdrawn and isolated, more fearful of strangers, and having a negative attitude toward research (Neuman, 2000; Sudman & Bradburn, 1983).

The need to collapse categories arose from a low sample size and should in no way imply a disregard for diversity between and among race/ethnocultural groups.

In their discussion of reliability standards, Pedhazur & Schmelkin note: “it is for the user to determine what amount of error he or she is willing to tolerate, given the specific circumstances of the study (e.g., what the scores are to be used for, cost of the study)” (p. 110). They reference Nunally (1967), who established a standard of .50-.60 reliability as sufficient for early stages of research. Also referenced is Nunally (1978) who reset the standard at .7 or higher.

Because census 2000 block group data was not available at the time this document was published, the 1998 estimates calculated by the UAC are the best comparison for gender among the UAD population. Census 2000 census tract data were the best comparison for racial categories because a comparison 2000 data and 1998 estimates showed discrepancies with regard to migration patterns. Estimates from 1998 showed a decreasing majority Caucasian/White population (6.8% estimated decrease by 2003) with a slightly growing minority population. African Americans (estimated 3.4% increase by 2003) and Asian Americans (estimated 3% increase by 2003) accounted for 6.4% of the 6.8% estimated shift in population. Census 2000 data, however, showed an overall decrease in the population of census tracts that include all or portions of the UAD. Since this data used a different set of ethnocultural categories and allowed for respondents to choose one or more races, it is not clear to what degree the reductions in population within specific racial categories between 1990 and 2000 are due to out-migration. They could also be the result of individuals choosing a different race/ethnocultural category than they did in the 1990 census. Yet, it is likely that the 1998 African American...
population for the UAD was overestimated given the differences in the estimated 1998 figures and census 2000. Thus, the more current census data is a better choice for comparison, even though it includes a broader geographic area.

Block data for 2000 is not yet available. Tracts are aggregated blocks that do not fit perfectly with UAD boundaries; therefore, these numbers also include persons who reside outside the UAD.

This statistic includes the categories “some other race,” “two or more races,” and “native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander.”

“Kurtosis” is a term used to describe nonnormal data that results from cases with cases that fall outside the normal curve in relationship to other cases in the sample. As stated by Kline (1998, p. 81), it is “a relative excess of cases in the tails of distribution relative to a normal curve” for a specific variable. Multivariate kurtosis refers to nonnormal data across several variables. Most model analysis programs calculate scores of multivariate kurtosis. Mardia’s coefficient and normalized estimate, and note which cases have the largest contribution to normalized multivariate kurtosis in the sample. Multivariate kurtosis can be addressed by deleting cases or modifying the outlying scores. Case deletion was used in this study.
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1. **Community** - For the purposes of this study, the term refers to a geographic community, instead of a social, relational, school or workplace community.

2. **Community processes** refers to any effort by residents to improve their community through both informal and formal venues.

3. **Declining communities** - the destabilization of communities or neighborhoods in physical, social, and economic terms (Skogan, 1990).

4. **Displacement** refers to being forced to move which is often the result of gentrification and community revitalization efforts (Hartman, 1979; Lyons, 1996).

5. **Migration** is long-distance or interregional moves (Rossi, 1955; USDOC, 2001). The voluntary nature of the move is implied in both of these terms.

6. **Psychological sense of community** - “a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group and a shared faith that members’ needs will be met through their commitment to be together.” (McMillan & Chavis, 1986)

7. **Residential mobility** refers to short-distance moves that tend to be intraregional (Rossi, 1955; USDOC, 2001). Some literature and housing programs use this term to describe efforts to help individuals and families move up from lower to higher quality neighborhoods, however the term typically does not imply an interregional moving experience (see USDOHUD, 2001; Johnson, Ladd, & Ludwig, 2002; South & Crowder, 1997).

8. **Revitalizing communities** are those that are engaged in formal efforts to improve and stabilize their physical, social, and economic conditions (Skogan, 1990).
9. **Social disorganization** - the inability of a community to realize common resident values and maintain effective social controls (Kornhauser, 1978; Bursik, 1988).

10. **Social fabric** - "a complex system of friendship and kinship networks and formal and informal associational ties rooted in family life and on-going socialization processes" but does not include ties to the community occupational system (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974, p. 329). The strength of these bonds is typically determined by the quantity and quality of connections.

11. **Social integration** - the extent of the individual’s social network and/or the extent to which an individual is embedded in his/her community (Barrera, 1986).

12. **Social network** or **social support network** consists of the linkages between individuals, groups, and institutions within the community that allow individuals to become embedded into the community (Barrera, 1986). "the sum of all relationships that an individual perceives as personally relevant, or that contribute to the individual’s sense of identity, well-being, competence, and agency." (Sluzki, 1992, p. 360) Social networks are typically measured in terms of network size, and density, multiplexity, and reciprocity of social ties (Barrera, 2000). These linkages create a feeling of connectedness that is important to an individual’s psychological sense of community. Connections to other community members serve as a resource and buffer to the direct effects of the declining community on resident health and well-being. The opposite of social embeddedness is isolation and alienation (Barrera, 1986).

13. **Social support** - the ways in which individuals provide assistance to one another or "behavioral transactions provided by natural support systems." (Barrera, 1986, p.140)
14. **Youth development** refers to a field of study and practice that encourages social policies, programs and community initiatives supporting and building competence to prepare youth for adulthood (Barton, Watkins, & Jarjoura, 1997). Critical areas of youth development include: "safety and structure", "belonging and membership", "self worth and an ability to contribute", "independence and control over one's life", "closeness and several good relationships", and "competence and mastery" (Barton, Watkins & Jarjoura, 1997, p. 487; Public/Private Venture, 2000a). Competency areas include: "mental health", "physical health", "intellectual", "employment", "civic and social" and "cultural". From this perspective, community involvement is viewed as an important experience for youth, especially those who reside in resource-poor communities (Barton, Watkins & Jarjoura, 1997; Public/Private Venture, 2000a, 2000c).
APPENDIX A

Comparison of Neighboring Quality and Youth Community Opinion Scales
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Quality (Coulton, Korbin &amp; Su, 1996, p.29)</th>
<th>Youth Community Opinion</th>
<th>What about the item was changed and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is a good place to live.</td>
<td>My community is a good place to live.</td>
<td>• Changed neighborhood to community because the UAD consists of several neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| My neighborhood is a good place to raise children      | My community is a good place to grow up. | • “Neighborhood” to “community”  
• “To raise children” is adult focused,  
“to grow up” is youth focused |
| The people moving into my neighborhood in the past year or so are good for the neighborhood. | The people moving into my community in the past year or so are good for this community. | • “Neighborhood” to “community” |
| I would like to move out of this neighborhood.         | I would like to move out of my community. | • “Neighborhood” to “community”  
• Changed “this” to “my” so as to imply that it is referencing their own definition of community |
| There are some children in the neighborhood that I don’t want my children to play with. | There are some kids in my community that I don’t want to spend time with. | • “I don’t want my children to play with” is adult focused, “I don’t want to spend time with” is youth focused |
| The people moving into my neighborhood in the past year or so are bad for the neighborhood. | --- | • Deleted due to number of scale items |

Appendix A continued on top of next page.
For the most part, the police come within a reasonable amount of time when they are called.

For the most part, the police help people in my community.

- Changed "come within a reasonable amount of time when they are called" to "the police help people in my community". It's not reasonable to have youth estimate the response time of police. They are more concerned with how police treat them and if the community is safe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is too much traffic in my neighborhood.</th>
<th>There is too much car traffic in my community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Neighborhood&quot; to &quot;community&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add &quot;car&quot; for clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are enough bus stops in my neighborhood.</th>
<th>There are enough bus stops in my community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Neighborhood&quot; to &quot;community&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My neighborhood is conveniently located in the city.</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deleted - This item seemed to be work related and therefore irrelevant to youth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If I had to move out of my neighborhood, I would be sorry to leave.</th>
<th>If I had to move out of my community, I would be sorry to leave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Neighborhood&quot; to &quot;community&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| People move in and out of my community a lot. | Added - to address issues of residential mobility |

Appendix A continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are enough bus shelters in my community.</td>
<td>Added at suggestion of Godman Guild staff who felt UAD youth would be more familiar with the term “bus shelters”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much crime in my community.</td>
<td>Added to focus scale more on the potential concerns of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My community has become a better place to live in the past year.</td>
<td>Added to focus scale more on the potential concerns of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the most part, adults in my community are concerned about kids.</td>
<td>Added to focus scale more on the potential concerns of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel apart of my community.</td>
<td>Added to focus scale more on the potential concerns of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in my community.</td>
<td>Added to focus scale more on the potential concerns of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the most part, people who move into the community are similar to my family.</td>
<td>Added to focus scale more on the potential concerns of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are some kids in my community that I wouldn’t want my brother(s) or sister(s) to spend time with.</td>
<td>Added to focus scale more on the potential concerns of youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix A: Comparison of Neighborhood Quality and Youth Community Opinion Scales**
APPENDIX B

Solicitation Letter
August 1, 1999

Dear __________________________:

My name is Carol Snively. I am a social worker and a doctoral student at Ohio State University. I am currently working with Dr. Denise Bronson, Associate Professor on my dissertation project about teens and their communities. As a social worker, I have loved working with teens for the past 14 years. Lately, I am concerned because we only hear about the bad, violent things that teens do. Yet, those of us who believe in kids know that there are many positive ways they contribute to their communities. I am very interested in learning about this. So, I have created a project to discover what teens think about their community and how they help to improve it.

I am asking permission from you to allow your child __________________________ to answer a questionnaire. It would only take about 45-60 minutes to finish. The questionnaire asks your child’s opinion about living in your community, changes in your community, and participation in programs meant to improve your community. In addition, they are asked some basic information about themselves, such as age, gender and length of residency in your community. Your child’s comments will be kept confidential. That means that your child’s information will be used in research papers and your child may be quoted but her/his name will not be used and there will be no way to identify any specific teen. Your child can answer the questionnaire with a group of teens at a nearby social service agency (like the Godman Guild) or at their own home. For their time and effort, each teen will receive $5.00. What I learn from this project will be shared with organizations in your community so that the teen’s opinions can be considered when community decisions are made. By signing the consent form, you are giving me permission for me to ask your child if he/she will participate in the project. Your daughter/son can refuse to fill out the questionnaire, if they don’t want to participate.

If you agree, to allow your child to participate, please do the following:
1. sign the consent form,
2. fill out the address & phone number section,
3. ask you child if he/she is willing to participate and if so, ask him/her to sign the consent form &
4. mail one of the completed consent forms back to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please keep the other consent form for your own records.

Sometime it is difficult to read people’s signatures so, please print everyone’s names on the form in the spaces provided. It is very important that you fill out the bottom of the consent form completely so that I can contact you and your child to complete the survey. Please make sure that you include your address and a phone number where you can be reached. When I receive your consent form, I will call to schedule a time for your child to complete the survey at a nearby social service agency or in your own home.

If you do not agree to allow your child to participate, please mail the blank consent form to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. By doing that, I will know you do not want me to contact you again.
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If you have any questions, please call me, Carol Snively at (614)299-1973. You can leave a message and a number where you can be reached and I will return your call as soon as possible. I hope you agree with us about the importance of this project and will take a few minutes right now to complete the enclosed form and send it back.

Thanks very much for your time!

Signed: ________________________________
Denise Bronson, Ph.D. Associate Professor
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Principal Investigator)

Signed: ________________________________
Carol A. Snively, PhD. Candidate
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Co-Principal Investigator)
APPENDIX C

Consent and Assent to Participate Form
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent (agree) to participate in research entitled: Adolescents & Urban Renewal: Community Attitudes, Efficacy & Involvement. Denise Bronson, Ph.D. or her authorized representative, Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate has explained the purpose of this study, what information will be collected, how the survey will be completed, and the amount of time needed for my child to participate.

I have been able to ask questions and get more information about the study and questionnaire. All of my questions have been fully answered. I understand that my child is free to withdraw consent at any time and to stop participation in the study without any consequences or prejudice to me or my child.

I agree that I have read and fully understand this consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ____________________________ Signed: ____________________________________________
(Adolescent Participant)

Printed name: ______________________________________

(Adolescent Participant)

Signed:
Denise Bronson, Ph.D. Associate Professor
College of Social Work
Ohio State University
(Principal Investigator)

Signed:
Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate
College of Social Work
Ohio State University
(Co-Principal Investigator)

Signed:

Your Phone Number: __________________________
Your Address: ____________________________________
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APPENDIX D

Follow-up Postcard
August 14, 1999

Dear Parent:

Last week a letter seeking your child’s participation in a study about your community was mailed to you. Every parent if a Columbus Public School middle or high school student who lives in the area around Ohio State University received this request along with a consent form and a self-addressed stamped envelope.

If you have already completed and returned the consent form to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do return the form today. If you agree to allow your child to participate, please sign the consent form, fill out the address & phone number section, ask your child to sign the consent form & then mail one of the completed consent forms back to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. If you do not agree, please send the blank form back to us. What I learn from this project will be shared with organizations in your community so that the teens’ opinions can be considered when community decision are made. It is very important that you child’s opinions are represented.

If by some chance you did not receive the letter and consent form, or it got misplaced, please call me right no 299-1973 and I will get another in the mail to you today.

Thanks so much for your time,

Carol A. Snively  
Ph.D. Candidate, College of Social Work  
Ohio State University
Dear Parent(s) or Guardian(s) of a ________ School student:

My name is Carol Snively. I am a social worker and a doctoral student at Ohio State University. I am currently working with Dr. Denise Bronson, Associate Professor on my dissertation project about teens and their communities. As a social worker, I have loved working with teens for the past 14 years. Lately, I am concerned because we only hear about the bad, violent things that teens do. Yet, those of us who believe in kids know that there are many positive ways they contribute to their communities. I am very interested in learning about this. So, I have created a project to discover what teens think about their community and how they help to improve it.

I am asking permission from you to allow your child to answer a questionnaire. It would only take about 45-60 minutes to finish. The questionnaire asks your child's opinion about living in your community, changes in your community, and participation in programs meant to improve your community. In addition, they are asked some basic information about themselves, such as age, gender and length of residency in your community. Your child's comments will be kept confidential. That means that your child's information will be used in research papers and your child may be quoted but her/his name will not be used and there will be no way to identify any specific teen. Your child can answer the questionnaire with a group of teens at a nearby social service agency (like the Godman Guild) or at their own home. For their time and effort, each teen will receive $5.00. What I learn from this project will be shared with organizations in your community so that the teen's opinions can be considered when community decisions are made. By signing the consent form, you are giving me permission for me to ask your child if he/she will participate in the project. Your daughter/son can refuse to fill out the questionnaire, if they don't want to participate. Your child is eligible to participate if you live in the University Area District and s/he is between the ages of 13-18 years.

If you agree, to allow your child to participate, please do the following:
1. sign the consent form,
2. fill out the address & phone number section,
3. ask you child if he/she is willing to participate and if so, ask him/her to sign the consent form &
4. mail one of the completed consent forms back to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please keep the other consent form for your own records.

Sometime it is difficult to read people's signatures so, please print everyone's names on the form in the spaces provided. It is very important that you fill out the bottom of the consent form completely so that I can contact you and your child to complete the survey. Please make sure that you include your address and a phone number where you can be reached. When I receive your consent form, I will call to schedule a time for your child to complete the survey at a nearby social service agency or in your own home.

If you do not agree to allow your child to participate, please mail the blank consent form to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. By doing that, I will know you do not want me to contact you again.
If you have any questions, please call me, Carol Snively at (614) 299-1973. You can leave a message and a number where you can be reached and I will return your call as soon as possible. I hope you agree with us about the importance of this project and will take a few minutes right now to complete the enclosed form and send it back.

Thanks very much for your time!

Signed: ________________________________  Signed: ________________________________

Denise Bronson, Ph.D. Associate Professor  Carol A. Snively, PhD. Candidate
College of Social Work, Ohio State University  College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Principal Investigator)  (Co-Principal Investigator)
APPENDIX F

Survey Instrument
Section A
Your Ideas About Your Community

a1. **Using a black pen**, draw the area (streets, buildings, etc) where you live and label the different places on your map.

Now show on your map the places that are most important to you (where you do things—the places where you spend the most of your time).

Circle these areas with **a different color of marker**.
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How true are each of these statements about your community?
Circle ONE number for each.

a2. My community is a good place to live.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a3. My community is a good place to grow up.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a4. The people moving into my community in the past year or so are good for this community.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a5. I would like to move out of my community.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a6. There are some kids in my community that I don’t want to spend time with.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a7. People move in and out of my community a lot.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true
How true are each of these statements about your community?
Circle ONE number for each.

a8. For the most part, the police help people in my community.

1  2  3  4  5  
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a9. There is too much car traffic in my community.

1  2  3  4  5  
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a10. There are enough bus stops in my community.

1  2  3  4  5  
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a11. There are enough bus shelters in my community.

1  2  3  4  5  
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a12. If I had to move out of my community, I would be sorry to leave.

1  2  3  4  5  
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a13. There is too much crime in my community.

1  2  3  4  5  
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true
How true are each of these statements about your community?
Circle ONE number for each.

a14. My community has become a better place to live in the past year.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a15. For the most part, adults in my community are concerned about kids.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a16. I feel apart of my community.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a17. I feel safe in my community.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a18. For the most part, people who move into the community are similar to my family.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

a19. There are some kids in my community that I wouldn’t want my brother(s) or sister(s) to spend time with.

1 2 3 4 5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true
How often do these things happen in your community?
Circle ONE for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a20. Litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a little of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>all of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a21. Graffiti on buildings and walls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a little of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>all of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a22. Abandoned cars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a little of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>all of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a23. Empty buildings where no one lives or works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a little of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>all of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a24. Community people dealing drugs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a little of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>all of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a25. Community people using illegal drugs (like marijuana, weed or blunts, crank, crack, or any other non-prescription drugs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a little of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>all of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**How often do these things happen in your community?**

**Circle ONE for each.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a26. Community people drinking alcohol</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. never 2. a little of 3. some of 4. most of 5. all of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a27. Gang activity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. never 2. a little of 3. some of 4. most of 5. all of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a28. Community adults without jobs hanging around the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. never 2. a little of 3. some of 4. most of 5. all of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a29. Loud noises</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. never 2. a little of 3. some of 4. most of 5. all of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a30. Community people who seem mentally ill</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. never 2. a little of 3. some of 4. most of 5. all of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a31. Community people who seem homeless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. never 2. a little of 3. some of 4. most of 5. all of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do these things happen in your community?
Circle ONE for each.

a32. Community people who seem to be selling sex (prostitution).

1  never  2  a little of  3  some of  4  most of  5  all of
the time  the time  the time  the time  the time

a33. Vandalism (buildings, cars or other property in the community that have been
destroyed or damaged, except graffiti)

1  never  2  a little of  3  some of  4  most of  5  all of
the time  the time  the time  the time  the time

a34. Houses and yards that are not kept up

1  never  2  a little of  3  some of  4  most of  5  all of
the time  the time  the time  the time  the time

a35. Groups of young children misbehaving (younger than teenagers)

1  never  2  a little of  3  some of  4  most of  5  all of
the time  the time  the time  the time  the time

a36. Groups of teenagers misbehaving

1  never  2  a little of  3  some of  4  most of  5  all of
the time  the time  the time  the time  the time

a37. Groups of adults misbehaving

1  never  2  a little of  3  some of  4  most of  5  all of
the time  the time  the time  the time  the time
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Tell us how your community changed in the past year. In your opinion, is it about the same, more of a problem or less of a problem than last year? Circle ONE number for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Less of a Problem</th>
<th>About the Same-no change</th>
<th>More of a Problem</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a39 Graffiti on buildings and walls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a40 Abandoned cars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a41 Empty buildings where no one lives or works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a42 Community people dealing drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a43 Community people using illegal drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a44 Community people drinking alcohol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a45 Gang activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a46 Community adults without jobs hanging around the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a47 Loud noise(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a48 Community people who seem mentally ill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a49 Community people who seem homeless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a50 Community people who seem to be selling sex (prostitution)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a51 Vandalism-buildings, cars or other property in the community that have been destroyed or damaged, except graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a52 Houses and yards that are not kept up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a53 Groups of young children misbehaving (younger than teenagers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a54 Groups of teenagers misbehaving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a55 Groups of adults misbehaving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which do you think are the **three worst problems** for your community today? Please circle these. (a56, a57, a58)

Litter or trash on the sidewalks and streets

Graffiti on buildings and walls

Abandoned cars

Empty buildings where no one lives or works

Community people dealing drugs

Community people using illegal drugs

Community people drinking alcohol

Gang activity

Community adults without jobs hanging around the community

Loud noise(s)

Community people who seem mentally ill

Community people who seem homeless

Community people who seem to be selling sex (prostitution)

Vandalism (buildings, cars or other property in the community that have been destroyed or damaged, except graffiti)

Houses and yards that are not kept up

Groups of young children misbehaving (younger than teenagers)

Groups of teenagers misbehaving

Groups of adults misbehaving

Other: ______________________________________________________________

Of those you circled, which is the **#1 worst problem** for your community today?

a59. ________________
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Section B
Your Involvement in Community Programs

The next section of questions is about the following programs. Please read over the following descriptions.

Computer Program at Indianola Middle School
A computer training program at Indianola Middle School.

Cultural Diversity: A Practice: Introducing Somatic Education
Students and teachers at Indianola Middle School learned about different world cultures by studying movement and dances with an international student from Ohio State University.

Honors at Indianola
A tutoring program with Ohio State University honors students at Indianola Middle School.

Laying the Groundwork for Service
Service projects with students and faculty from the College of Education at Ohio State University.

Music and Dance: The CSO and Balletmet as Partners in Campus Harmony
Students worked on a music project with professional musicians and dancers from the Columbus Symphony Orchestra and Ohio State University professors & students.

School to Work
This is a program which provides internships to high school students and job shadowing to middle school students. Students spend time at Ohio State University with professors and workers learning about educational and employment possibilities.

Street Law in the Public Schools
Students from the Ohio State Law School visited many different classrooms to add information about law to the teacher's lessons.

Strengthening Bridges that Link Schools, Families and Communities
Students at Indianola Middle School were interviewed by Ohio State University students about going into high school. They asked what you thought about leaving Middle School and entering high School. Also, Indianola students were taught about using the internet and shown a website for 9th graders.

Now, please tell us about your involvement in these community programs
b1. Did you participate in the “Computer Program at Indianola Middle School” program in the past school year?

1. YES 2. NO (GO TO b4)

b2. If YES to #b1, how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 more than 10

b3. If YES to #b1, why did you participate? (SKIP TO =b5)

1. I wanted to participate.
2. I was told to participate by an adult (either parent or teacher).

b4. If NO to #b1, why didn’t you participate in this program? Circle ALL that apply.

b. The time of the program.
c. The day of the program.
d. I participated in it and didn’t like the program.
e. I don’t know anyone there.
f. I didn’t know about the program.
g. I wasn’t interested in the program.
h. I’m too busy with other activities to participate in this program.
i. I was already participating in a similar program.
j. I don’t attend Indianola Middle School.
k. Other: ________________________________

b5. If you had the opportunity to participate in “Computer Program at Indianola Middle School” program in the upcoming school year, how likely would you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. absolutely not</td>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>I’d give it a try</td>
<td>Yes, I’d definitely participate as often as I could</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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b6. Did you participate in the “Cultural Diversity A Practice: Introducing Somatic Education” program in the past school year?

1. YES 2. NO (GO TO b9)

b7. If YES to #b6, how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 more than 10

b8. If YES to #b6, why did you participate? (SKIP TO #b10)

1. I wanted to participate.
2. I was told to participate by an adult (either parent or teacher).

b9. If NO to #b6, why didn’t you participate in this program? Circle ALL that apply.

b. The time of the program.
c. The day of the program.
d. I participated in it and didn’t like the program.
f. I didn’t know about the program.
g. I wasn’t interested in the program.
i. I was already participating in a similar program.
j. I don’t attend Indianola Middle School.
k. Other: ________________________________

b10. If you had the opportunity to participate in “Cultural Diversity A Practice: Introducing Somatic Education” program in the upcoming school year, how likely would you?

1. No. Absolutely not
2. Probably not
3. Not sure
4. I’d give it a try
5. Yes, I’d definitely participate as often as I could
b11. Did you participate in the “Honors at Indianola” program in the past school year?

1. YES  2. NO (GO TO b14)

b12. If YES to #b11, how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2  3-4  5-6  7-8  9-10  more than 10

b13. If YES to #b11, why did you participate? (SKIP TO #b15)

1. I wanted to participate.

2. I was told to participate by an adult (either parent or teacher).

b14. If NO to #b11, why didn’t you participate in this program? Circle ALL that apply.

a. I didn’t have transportation.

b. The time of the program.

c. The day of the program.

d. I participated in it and didn’t like the program.

e. I don’t know anyone there.

f. I didn’t know about the program.

g. I wasn’t interested in the program.

h. I’m too busy with other activities to participate in this program.

i. I was already participating in a similar program.

j. I don’t attend Indianola Middle School.

k. Other: ________________________________________________________________

b15. If you had the opportunity to participate in “Honors at Indianola” program in the upcoming school year, how likely would you?

1  2  3  4  5
No. Absolutely Not  I’d give it Yes, I’d
not  probably not  not  sure  a try  definitely
absolutely not  not  not  sure  a try  definitely
not  not  sure  often as I could
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b16. Did you participate in the “Laying the Groundwork for Service” program in the past school year?

1. YES 2. NO (GO TO b19)

b17. If YES to #b16. how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 more than 10

b18. If YES to #b16. why did you participate? (SKIP TO b20)

1. I wanted to participate.
2. I was told to participate by an adult (either parent or teacher).

b19. If NO to #b16. why didn’t you participate in this program? Circle ALL that apply.

a. I didn’t have transportation.

b. The time of the program.

b. The day of the program.

d. I participated in it and didn’t like the program.

e. I don’t know anyone there.

f. I didn’t know about the program.

g. I wasn’t interested in the program.

h. I’m too busy with other activities to participate in this program.

i. I was already participating in a similar program.

k. Other: __________________________________________________________________

b20. If you had the opportunity to participate in “Laying the Groundwork for Service” program in the upcoming school year. how likely would you?

1 2 3 4 5

No. Probably Not I’d give it Yes. I’d
absolutely not sure a try definitely participate as
not not sure
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b21. Did you participate in the “Music and Dance: The CSO and BalletMet as Partners in Campus Harmony” program in the past school year?

1. YES  2. NO (GO TO b24)

b22. If YES to b21, how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2  3-4  5-6  7-8  9-10  more than 10

b23. If YES to b21, why did you participate? (SKIP TO b25)

1. I wanted to participate.
2. I was told to participate by an adult (either parent or teacher).

b24. If NO to b21, why didn’t you participate in this program? Circle ALL that apply.

a. I didn’t have transportation.
b. The time of the program.
c. The day of the program.
d. I participated in it and didn’t like the program.
e. I don’t know anyone there.
f. I didn’t know about the program.
g. I wasn’t interested in the program.
h. I’m too busy with other activities to participate in this program.
i. I was already participating in a similar program.
j. Other: ____________________________________________

b25. If you had the opportunity to participate in “Music and Dance: The CSO and BalletMet as Partners in Campus Harmony” in the upcoming school year, how likely would you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Absolutely not</td>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>I’d give it a try</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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b26. Did you participate in the "School to Work" program in the past school year?

1. YES 2. NO (GO TO b29)

b27. If YES to #b26, how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 more than 10

b28. If YES to #b26, why did you participate? (SKIP TO #b30)

1. I wanted to participate.
2. I was told to participate by an adult (either parent or teacher).

b29. If NO to #b26, why didn’t you participate in this program? Circle ALL that apply.

a. I didn’t have transportation.
b. The time of the program.
c. The day of the program.
d. I participated in it and didn’t like the program.
e. I don’t know anyone there.
f. I didn’t know about the program.
g. I wasn’t interested in the program.
h. I’m too busy with other activities to participate in this program.
i. I was already participating in a similar program.
j. Other: ________________________________________________

b30. If you had the opportunity to participate in "School to Work" program in the upcoming school year, how likely would you?

1 2 3 4 5
No. Probably Not I’d give it absolutely definitely
Not sure a try not participate as
not often as I could
b31. Did you participate in the “Strengthening Bridges that Link Schools, Families and Communities” program in the past school year?

1. YES  
2. NO (GO TO b34)

b32. If YES to #b31, how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2  3-4  5-6  7-8  9-10  more than 10

b33. If YES to #b31, why did you participate? (SKIP TO #b35)

1. I wanted to participate.
2. I was told to participate by an adult (either parent or teacher).

b34. If NO to #b31, why didn’t you participate in this program? Circle ALL that apply.

b. The time of the program.

c. The day of the program.

d. I participated in it and didn’t like the program.

f. I didn’t know about the program.

g. I wasn’t interested in the program.

h. I’m too busy with other activities to participate in this program.

i. I was already participating in a similar program.

j. I don’t attend Indianola Middle School.

k. Other: ___________________________________________________________________

b35. If you had the opportunity to participate in “Strengthening Bridges that Link Schools, Families and Communities” program in the upcoming school year, how likely would you?

<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>No.</td>
<td>Absolutely not</td>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>I’d give it a try</td>
<td>Yes, I’d definitely participate as often as I could</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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b36. Did you participate in the “Street Law in the Public Schools” program in the past school year?

1. YES 2. NO (GO TO b14)

b37. If YES to #b36, how many times did you participate in this program?

1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 more than 10

b38. If you had the opportunity to participate in “Street Law in the Public Schools” program in the upcoming school year, how likely would you?

1 No. Absolutely not
2 Probably not
3 Not sure
4 I’d give it a try
5 Yes, I’d definitely participate as often as I could

b39. Do you participate in programs that you believe improve your community?

1. YES 2. NO

b40. If YES to #b39, what are the names of these programs?

a. ______________________________________________________

b. ______________________________________________________

c. ______________________________________________________

d. ______________________________________________________

e. ______________________________________________________
Section C

Your Ideas About The Ohio State University (O.S.U.)

c1. Do you know anyone who works for O.S.U. and lives in your community?
1. YES  2. NO (SKIP to =c3)

c2. If YES to #c1. what relationship are they to you?
Circle ALL that apply

a. My parent(s), stepparent(s) or guardian(s)
b. My family member [other than your parent(s), stepparent(s) or guardian(s)]
c. My neighbor(s)
d. My friend(s)
e. My friend’s parent(s), stepparent(s) or guardian(s)
f. Other: ________________________________

c3. How many people do you know who work for O.S.U. and live in the community?
_____ people

c4. Do you know anyone who is a student at O.S.U. and lives in your community?
1. YES  2. NO (SKIP to =c6)

c5. If YES to #c4. what relationship are they to you?
Circle ALL that apply

a. My parent(s), stepparent(s) or guardian(s)
b. My family member [other than your parent(s), stepparent(s) or guardian(s)]
c. My neighbor(s)
d. My friend(s)
e. My friend’s parent(s), stepparent(s) or guardian(s)
f. Other: ________________________________

c6. How many people do you know who work for O.S.U. and live in the community?
_____ people

180
Now think about The Ohio State University—the campus itself. The campus includes the buildings where college classes are held, the library and the sports facilities but not the businesses on High Street. Use this map as a guide to the general area that we are asking you to think about.

Lane Avenue

Olentangy River

Ohio State University

High Street

11th Avenue

c7. How often have you been to the O.S.U. campus in the past 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 times</th>
<th>1-3 times</th>
<th>4-6 times</th>
<th>7-9 times</th>
<th>10-12 times</th>
<th>more than 12 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c8. If you answered “0 TIMES to #7”, why haven’t you been on the O.S.U. campus? Circle ALL that apply.

a. I don’t know anyone there.

b. I don’t have transportation to the O.S.U. campus.

c. My parent told me not to go to campus.

d. I don’t have any reason to go to campus.

e. I’m busy doing other things.

f. Other: ____________________________________________
In the past 12 months, how often have you visited the O.S.U. campus for the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>0 Times</th>
<th>1-3 times</th>
<th>4-6 times</th>
<th>7-9 times</th>
<th>10-12 times</th>
<th>more than 12 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To attend an educational program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend an O.S.U. sports activity (football, basketball...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To visit someone I know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see an art exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a concert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a theater performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use the library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To go to a party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take a walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To hang out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To go to the hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attend a summer camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be with a parent at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be with a parent who is going to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a school field trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now think about the business area around Ohio State University on and near High Street (coffee shops, record stores, restaurants, book stores...)

c28. During the past 12 months, how often have you visited the businesses on High Street?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 times</th>
<th>1-3 times</th>
<th>4-6 times</th>
<th>7-9 times</th>
<th>10-12 times</th>
<th>more than 12 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c29. If you answered “0 TIMES” to #C28, why haven’t you visited the businesses on High Street? Circle ALL that apply.

a. I don’t know anyone there.

b. I don’t have transportation to the High Street area.

c. My parent told me not to go the High Street area.

d. I don’t have any reason to go to the High Street area.

e. I’m busy doing things.

f. Other: ____________________________________________

In the past 12 months, how often have you visited the businesses on High Street for the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 Times</th>
<th>1-3 times</th>
<th>4-6 times</th>
<th>7-9 times</th>
<th>10-12 times</th>
<th>more than 12 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c30. To visit someone I know

c31. To attend a concert

c32. To go to a party

c33. To take a walk

c34. To hang out

c35. To shop

c36. To eat at a restaurant

c37. Other: ____________________________________________

c38. Other: ____________________________________________

c39. Other: ____________________________________________
c40. Have you ever heard of "Campus Partners"?

1. YES  2. NO (SKIP to #c44)

If YES to #c40, please tell us how true each of these statements are. Circle ONE number for each.

c41. Campus Partners is an organization that is helping to improve the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little true</td>
<td>somewhat true</td>
<td>very true</td>
<td>extremely true</td>
<td>don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c42. Campus Partners is cleaning up the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little true</td>
<td>somewhat true</td>
<td>very true</td>
<td>extremely true</td>
<td>don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c43. Because of Campus Partners, people will be forced to move out of my community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little true</td>
<td>somewhat true</td>
<td>very true</td>
<td>extremely true</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How true are each of these statements about Ohio State University (O.S.U.)?
Circle ONE number for each.

c44. O.S.U. is part of my community.
   1  2  3  4  5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

c45. I feel uncomfortable being on the O.S.U. campus.
   1  2  3  4  5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

c46. I would like to attend college.
   1  2  3  4  5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

c47. I would like to attend college at O.S.U.
   1  2  3  4  5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

c48. O.S.U. helps improve my community.
   1  2  3  4  5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

c49. O.S.U. students are not members of my community.
   1  2  3  4  5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true

c50. When I'm around O.S.U.'s campus, I hang out mostly on High Street.
   1  2  3  4  5
not at all true a little true somewhat true very true extremely true
Section D
About You

d1. What is your birthdate? 

   / / 

   Month Day Year

d2. Are you male or female?
   1. Male  2. Female

d3. With which of the following racial or ethnic backgrounds do you most strongly identify? Circle only ONE.
   1. Asian or Asian American
   2. African American or Black
   3. Caucasian or White
   4. Hispanic or Latino/a
   5. Native American
   6. Other: ________________________________

d4. What is your home zip-code? 432___

d5. What is the name of the street where you live? ________________________________

d6. What is the name of the school you attend? ________________________________

d7. Do you have a name for your community?
   1. YES  2. NO

   d8. If YES to #d7. what is your community’s name?

   ____________________________________________
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d9. How long have you lived in this community?

___ years AND ___ months

d10. Who do you live with? Circle ONE number

1. my family (birth parent(s), stepparent(s), adopted parent(s) and/or other family members who aren't parents like grandparents, aunt, uncle) GO TO d11

2. my foster family (SKIP to #d12)

3. group home staff and residents (SKIP to #d12)

4. I live by myself. (GO TO d11)

5. Other: ______________________________________________________

d11. Does you family or do you.... Circle ONE number

1. Rent the place where you live.

2. Own the place where you live.

3. Live with another family who rents the place where you live.

4. Live with another family who own the place where you live.

5. Other: ______________________________________________________

d12. Where do you live? Circle ONE number

1. In an apartment (GO to d13)

2. In a duplex or half of a double house (SKIP to #d14)

3. In a courtyard, townhouse or condominium (GO to d13)

4. In a house (SKIP to #d14)

5. Other: _______________________________________________________________________

d13. If you live in an apartment, courtyard, townhouse or condominium, how many total units are in the same building?

___ units
d14. How many times have you moved during the time you have lived in this community?

1. I have lived at the same address since moving into this community. (SKIP to #d21)
2. I have moved once.
3. I have moved twice.
4. I have moved three times.
5. I have moved more than three times.

d15. Did you move...

1. By myself (GO TO #d16)
2. With my family (SKIP TO #d17)

d16. If you answered "BY MYSELF" to #d15, why did you move?

1. I moved to live with a different parent or family member (GO TO d20)
2. I moved to a foster home. (GO TO d20)
3. I moved to a group home. (GO TO d20)
4. I moved into my own place. (GO TO d20)
5. Other: ____________________________ (GO TO d20)

d17. Did your family have a choice about whether or not to move?

1. YES (GO TO #d18)
2. NO (SKIP TO #d19)
3. I DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO #d20)
d18. If YES to #d17. why did you family move? 
   Check ALL that apply.
   a. to move to a bigger home
   b. we bought a house
   c. to move to a safer neighborhood
   d. we could afford a more expensive home
   e. to move to a less expensive home
   f. to move to closer to family
   g. for better schools
   h. Other: _____________________________

d19. If NO to # d17. why did you move? 
   Check ALL that apply.
   a. the house was being renovated or fixed-up
   b. the rent became more expensive and we couldn’t afford it
   c. we were having trouble paying our bills
   d. Other: _____________________________

d20. How long have you lived in your current home? 
   _____ years AND _____ months

d21. How many friends do you have who live within a 15 minute walk from you home? 
   _____ friends
These questions ask you about the things you do to improve your community—those things you do by yourself or with family and friends without being in an organized program.
How often do you do these things? Circle ONE number for each.

d22. Do things that help improve your community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>a few times</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d23. Help out an elderly neighbor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>a few times</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d24. Help clean up the community (pick up trash, clean graffiti off of buildings…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>a few times</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d25. Organize community kids to play sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>a few times</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d26. Babysit for community parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>a few times</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d27. Clean abandoned houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>a few times</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d28. Plant a garden

1 2 3 4 5  
never once a few times often all the time

d29. Mow the neighbor’s lawn

1 2 3 4 5  
never once a few times often all the time

d30. Do you volunteer at a community agency?

1. YES 2. NO

d31. If you answered YES to #d30, at which agency do you volunteer?

______________________________

d32. If you answered YES to #d30, how many hours each week do you volunteer?

_______ hours

d33. Do you work?

1. YES 2. NO (go to B7)

d34. If you answered YES to #d33, how many hours each week do you work?

_______ hours
d35. What are the other things that you do to improve your community by yourself or with family and friends without being in an organized program? Please list all of these.

a. ________________________________
b. ________________________________
c. ________________________________
d. ________________________________
e. ________________________________

d36. Please describe your community. What is important to you about this community?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you VERY MUCH for your time and effort!
Appendix G

Letters of Support
July 30, 1999

Don Cramer  
The Ohio State University  
Room 012 Ramseyer Hall  
29 W. Woodruff  
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Mr. Cramer:

I write to inform you that the Research Proposal Review Committee has evaluated the proposal of Carol Snively and has recommended approval of this research proposal.

I am enclosing the necessary letter of introduction. The letter should be forwarded to the researcher so it may be offered to administrators when soliciting participation/subjects for the study.

Sincerely,

Maurice D. Blake, Director  
Department of Pupil Services

MDB/hlm  
Enclosure
October 5, 1999

Dear Dr. Dell:

I write to inform you that Centennial High School has agreed to provide assistance to Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate in Social Work at the Ohio State University in the following manner. Centennial High School staff or Carol Snively will distribute solicitation packets during study hall sessions or other non-academic times of the school day to Centennial High School students. The packets will contain the information approved by the Ohio State University IRB (Protocol #99B0063) including: a solicitation letter, two consent forms and a returned self addressed stamped envelope. If staff distribute the packets, the attached oral script will be used. If you have any questions, please contact me at 365-5491.

Sincerely,

Sherry Badger
Principal
Centennial High School

The Columbus Public Schools system will not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, sex, or handicap in the admission, access to, treatment, or employment in its programs and activities. This notice is available in all languages. 195
September 27, 1999

Behavioral and Social Sciences
Human Subjects Review Committee
The Ohio State University
Office of Research Risks
Room 300, Research Foundation Building
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221

Dear Dr. Dell:

I write to inform you that Linden McKinley High School has agreed to provide assistance to Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate in Social Work at the Ohio State University in the following manner. Linden McKinley High School staff or Carol Snively will distribute solicitation packets during study hall sessions or non-academic times of the school day to Linden McKinley High School students. The packets will contain the information approved by the Ohio State University IRB (Protocol #99B0083) including: a solicitation letter, two consent forms and a returned self addressed stamped envelope. If staff distribute the packets, the attached oral script will be used. If you have any questions, please contact me at 385-5583.

Sincerely,

Suzie Retterer Heifrich
Assistant Principal, Linden McKinley High School

The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap with
Dear Dr. Dell:

I write to inform you that Whetstone High School has agreed to provide assistance to Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate in Social Work at the Ohio State University in the following manner. Whetstone High School staff or Carol Snively will distribute solicitation packets during study hall sessions or other non-academic times of the school day to Whetstone High School students. The packets will contain the information approved by the Ohio State University IRB (Protocol #99B0063) including: a solicitation letter, two consent forms and a returned self addressed stamped envelope. If staff distribute the packets, the attached oral script will be used. If you have any questions, please contact me at 365-8080.

Sincerely,

 Skip Thomas
 Principal
 Whetstone High School
September 27, 1999

Behavioral and Social Sciences
Human Subjects Review Committee
The Ohio State University
Office of Research Risks
Room 300, Research Foundation Building
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221

Dear Dr. Dell:

I write to inform you that Indianola Middle School has agreed to provide assistance to Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate in Social Work at the Ohio State University in the following manner. Indianola Middle School staff will distribute solicitation packets to 7th and 8th grade Indianola Middle School students. The packets will contain the information approved by the Ohio State University IRB (Protocol #99B0083) including: a solicitation letter, two consent forms and a returned self addressed stamped envelope. Staff who pass out the packets will follow the attached oral script. If you have any questions, please contact me at 365-5574.

Sincerely,

Sharon Prentice
Principal, Indianola Middle School

The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap with regard to admission, access, treatment, or employment. This policy is applicable in all district programs and activities.
August 2, 1999

Behavioral and Social Sciences
Human Subjects Review Committee
The Ohio State University
Office of Research Risks
Room 300, Research Foundation Building
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221

To the Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee:

This letter is to provide evidence that Gladden Community House has decided to support the research proposal entitled, "Adolescents & Urban Renewal: Community Attitudes, Efficacy & Involvement" by Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate in Social Work at the Ohio State University (Research Protocol 9980083). The Gladden Community House has agreed to assist Ms. Snively in the solicitation of adolescents for a pilot study of the survey instrument and to provide a meeting place for the adolescents to complete survey. If you have any questions, please contact me at 227-1600.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Larry D. Danduran
President/CEO

183 Hawkes Avenue
P.O. Box 23030
Columbus, Ohio 43221
614-227-1600
Fax: 614-227-1048

Larry D. Danduran
President/CEO
A United Way Agency
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August 5, 1999

Behavioral and Social Sciences
Human Subjects Review Committee
The Ohio State University
Office of Research Risks
Room 300, Research Foundation Building
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221

To the Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee:

This letter is to provide evidence that Godman Guild has decided to support the research proposal entitled, "Adolescents & Urban Renewal: Community Attitudes, Efficacy & Involvement" by Carol A. Snively, Ph.D. Candidate in Social Work at the Ohio State University (Research Protocol 998003). Godman Guild has agreed to provide a panel of Godman Guild staff to review the survey instrument and provide feedback to Ms. Snively regarding any potential issues that could arise as neighborhood adolescents complete the survey. In addition, Godman Guild has agreed to provide a meeting place for the adolescents to complete survey. If you have any questions, please contact me at 294-6227.

Sincerely,

Betty Newland
Community Organization Team

303 East Sixth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201-2888
Phone: 614-294-6227 FAX: 614-299-4080

© A United Way Agency 200