

# Neighbourhood Collective Efficacy: A Scoping Review of Existing Research

Jessica Carrière

Research Paper 239

Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership  
July 2016

Funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada  
through the Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership

[www.neighbourhoodchange.ca](http://www.neighbourhoodchange.ca)

ISSN 0316-0068; ISBN 978-0-7727-9125-2



Social Sciences and Humanities  
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en  
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

Neighbourhood Collective Efficacy: A Scoping Review of Existing Research

by Jessica Carriere

July 2016, iv, 40 pp.

ISSN 0316-0068

ISBN 978-0-7727-9125-2

Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership

Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work

University of Toronto

248 Bloor Street West

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

M5S 1V4

E-mail: [neighbourhood.change@utoronto.ca](mailto:neighbourhood.change@utoronto.ca)

Website: <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca>

This study and its dissemination are supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada which has funded the Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership based at the University of Toronto (J. David Hulchanski, Principal Investigator).

The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the research team, the advisory board members, the university, or the funder.



## **Executive Summary**

---

This review of collective efficacy literature was part of the initial stage of the Collective Efficacy Working Group's (CEWG) three-phase research process. The group was established in 2012 as part of the larger Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership (NCRP). The review is intended to explore and build upon traditional conceptions of "collective efficacy" in order to establish a research framework through which we may begin to understand how residents and organizations work together in neighbourhoods to achieve important local improvements, and draw upon these collective achievements to effect system-wide change. The collective efficacy research frame is extended here to include community-based organizations and their impacts on neighbourhood collective efficacy, beyond those at the individual and household levels.

Findings underscore a lack of scholarship on the role of collective efficacy in neighbourhoods, as well as a lack of comparative research on the disparate effects of local state regimes and histories of immigration on neighbourhood collective efficacy. Moreover, while recent literature has examined the influence of local factors (such as laws and tax rates) and interpersonal networks on organizations, there is a gap in academic scholarship and literature about the role of organizations in shaping community outcomes. This report will address this disparity, recommending new research to explore the activities, practices, service delivery, and advocacy efforts of organizations in fostering and sustaining neighbourhood collective efficacy, and leveraging that capacity to bring about larger-scale system changes.

One of the key goals of the NCRP is to examine place-specific effects in mitigating or exacerbating processes of socio-spatial inequality. This research fits within this broad objective, exploring the role that neighbourhood-level policy and program interventions can play in reducing inequality. Community-based organizations, funders, and policy makers require a better understanding of the role of collective efficacy in neighbourhood outcomes.

## **Author**

---

Jessica Carrière is a PhD Candidate in the Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work at the University of Toronto.

## Table of Contents

---

1.	Rationale and Potential Policy Relevance.....	5
2.	Collective Efficacy and Neighbourhood: An Overview of Definitions and Concepts .....	7
2.1	Collective efficacy and neighbourhood crime .....	8
2.2	Cultural collective efficacy .....	8
2.3	Collective efficacy and local organizational behaviour.....	9
3.	Socio-Spatial Inequality and Collective Efficacy: Theoretical and Empirical Debates.....	10
3.1	Traditional approaches to the framing of collective efficacy .....	10
3.2	Challenging popular collective efficacy frameworks.....	11
4.	Factors Contributing to Neighbourhood Capacity for Collective Efficacy .....	13
4.1	Collective efficacy and place attachment.....	13
4.2	Perceived social efficacy.....	13
4.3	Political factors .....	14
5.	Empirical Indicators of Collective Efficacy and their Measurement.....	15
5.1	Individual and group perceptions of efficacy.....	15
5.2	Social organization measures .....	17
6.	Collective Efficacy and Neighbourhood Socio-Economic Status .....	19
6.1	Collective efficacy and neighbourhood SES.....	19
6.2	Mixed-income neighbourhoods and collective efficacy.....	20
6.3	Collective efficacy and the “rooted middle class” .....	20
6.4	Concentrated disadvantage and collective efficacy .....	20
7.	The Role of Local Organizations .....	22
7.1	Examining organizational capacity “in place”.....	22
7.2	Social movements-in-organizations .....	23
8.	Linking Collective Efficacy, Neighbourhood Cohesion, and Collective Action .....	24
8.1	Neighbourhood cohesion and collective efficacy .....	24
8.2	Collective efficacy and action .....	24
8.3	Containing collective action: Cities and social movements .....	25
9.	Limitations of the Neighbourhood Scale of Analysis .....	26
9.1	Rethinking “problem” neighbourhoods.....	27
9.2	Neighbouring in Toronto’s inner suburbs .....	27
10.	Conclusions and a Direction for Future Research.....	29
11.	References .....	31
12.	Appendices.....	37

---

# 1. Rationale and Potential Policy Relevance

---

Why do some neighbourhoods have more success than others in addressing the effects of social-spatial inequality and socio-economic segregation?

In an attempt to answer this very large question, researchers have pointed to the role of neighbourhood processes in shaping social, educational, health, safety, crime, and economic outcomes (Edin and Lein, 1997; Gans, 1969; Mascofsky, 1999; Patterson, 2001). Evidence suggests that one such process, “collective efficacy” (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls, 1997) – that is, the ability of neighbours to cultivate trust amongst each other, to generate shared expectations, to draw productively from social networks, and to collectively mobilize for action.

The literature offers certain plausible explanations to account for the presence or lack of collective efficacy:

- systemic barriers (e.g., concentrations of poverty and disadvantaged ethno-cultural groups);
- behavioural and attitudinal factors;
- the role of existing social networks and other forms of pre-existing social capital.

Apart from a few education-based studies (Demir, 2008; Dimopoulou, 2012; Goddard, 2001; Lin and Peng, 2010; Mawhinney, Haas, and Wood, 2005), and work on social movements by sociologists like Davis et al. (2008), Gould (2003) and McAdam and Snow (2010), there is still insufficient literature on the place of *community-based organizations* in fostering and sustaining neighbourhood collective efficacy.

The aim of a scoping review of the literature is to identify the key concepts underpinning a research area and the main sources and types of evidence available. Scoping reviews are often the first stage of a research project, informing the subsequent stages. Defining the research questions is important, influencing the nature of the literature search.

This review is animated by two key questions:

1. What are the impacts of community-based organizations (particularly those in low-income and disadvantaged neighbourhoods) on neighbourhood collective efficacy, beyond their outcomes at the individual and household levels?
2. What strategies can community-based organizations use to foster and sustain capacity for neighbourhood collective efficacy?

This scoping review systematically explores the relevant literature on the following themes:

1. **Definition:** How do researchers who use the term (or equivalents) *define* “collective efficacy”?
2. **Scholarly debates:** In general, what are the key theoretical and empirical *debates* in the literature, particularly the role of collective efficacy in mitigating the effects of societal and urban socio-spatial inequality?
3. **Factors contributing to neighbourhood capacity:** In the theoretical and conceptual literature, what *factors* are believed to contribute to neighbourhood capacity for collective efficacy?
4. **Indicators of success:** What *indicators* of collective efficacy are used in empirical research on collective efficacy and how are they measured? How does collective efficacy correlate with *neighbourhood indicators*; for instance, what evidence is there about whether neighbourhood *socio-economic status diversity* or the lack of it is positively or negatively associated with collective efficacy?
5. **Socio-economic status:** What role does the socio-economic status of a neighbourhood play in its collective efficacy?
6. **Organizational support:** How do organizations support collective efficacy at the neighbourhood scale?
7. **Linking collective efficacy, neighbourhood cohesion, and collective action:** How do organizations, community groups, and individuals mobilize to *enact* and *effect* change in social inclusion, local control over assets, civic engagement, neighbourhood improvement, and the securing of resources? What are the factors that contribute to their success?
8. **Limitations of the neighbourhood level:** What are the limitations of the neighbourhood scale in studying collective efficacy? How do researchers go beyond “neighbourhood effects”?

---

## 2. Collective Efficacy and Neighbourhood: An Overview of Definitions and Concepts

---

*How do researchers who use the term (or equivalents) define “collective efficacy”?*

Collective efficacy is a concept initially developed by Robert Sampson and Felton Earls in their study of the effect of social disorder on crime in Chicago neighbourhoods (Sampson and Earls, 1997). The concept drew upon Sampson and Groves’ (1989) earlier study on the suggested effect of social ties, social control, and neighbourhood-level disorganization, which explored the inability of “disorganized communities” to combat crime through the lens of social disorganization theory (Ramirez, 2011). Limited social ties were correlated with residents’ inability to exert informal social control on others in the neighbourhood. This finding was later described by Sampson and Earls (1997) as collective efficacy, or “the ability of the collective to intervene in order to combat neighborhood problems such as crime” (Ramirez, 2011: 7).

Writing on collective efficacy at the level of the neighbourhood, Sampson (2009: 1581) classifies collective efficacy as “informal social controls under social norms of trust,” or a “task-specific construct that highlights *shared expectations* and *mutual engagement* by residents in local social controls” (Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls, 1999: 635). This definition centres on a perceived linkage of trust and cohesion among residents of a neighbourhood with shared expectations for effective social control (Sampson, 2006).

The concept of “collective efficacy” is rooted in “self-efficacy,” the latter being the core concept in Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory. Bandura defined self-efficacy as “one’s perceptions regarding one’s capability to produce desired outcomes” (Bandura 1995: 3). The basic premise of his self-efficacy theory is that “people’s beliefs in their capabilities function to produce desired effects by their own actions” (Bandura, 1997: vii). Because individuals do not live in isolation, he extended the concept to include the group as another agency of human functioning, calling collective efficacy a “shared belief in the conjoint capabilities of a group necessary to produce desired effects” (Bandura, 1997: 447). Accordingly, collective efficacy is “not merely the sum of personal judgments regarding capabilities, but an emergent group-level phenomenon that results from interactions and the coordination of group functioning” (Bandura, 2000: 76).

## 2.1 Collective efficacy and neighbourhood crime

Collective efficacy has typically been used to explain why criminologists, sociologists, and urban theorists consistently see the associations between high neighbourhood disorganization and high levels of crime in the United States. According to Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997), as neighbourhoods experience increasing levels of disorganization, residents find it difficult to mobilize social capital within their neighbourhoods to address neighbourhood issues such as crime. Their study, contributing to *The Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighbourhoods*, used multilevel statistical controls and qualitative interviews – concluding that high collective efficacy was correlated with reduced crime rates in poor neighbourhoods.

Recent literature on collective efficacy and crime echoes these initial findings, suggesting that neighbourhoods high in collective efficacy do experience lower violent crime rates (Block and Block, 2000; Deuchar, 2010; Meares, 2002; Maimon and Browning, 2010; Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush, 2001). However, contrary to other research in both the United States and Europe, a new study based in London, England – reporting findings from a dataset based on face-to-face interviews of 60,000 individuals living in 4,700 London neighbourhoods – did not find that collective efficacy mediated the relationship between disadvantage, residential instability, and recorded violent crime (Sutherland et al., 2013: 4). Collective efficacy was found to be weakly related to violent crime rates and to have no connection to an alternative measure of community violence. Moreover, collective efficacy “did not appear to mediate the relationship between measures of social disadvantage and crime as it does elsewhere” (Sutherland et al., 2013: 15). These findings are echoed by a small body of academic research that examines “limits of collective efficacy” as a predictor of neighbourhood crime (Cerdá et al., 2008; Villarreal and Silva, 2006).

## 2.2 Cultural collective efficacy

Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) initially defined collective efficacy as being representative of the “willingness of local residents to intervene for the common good” (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls, 1997: 919). Expanding on this criterion, Meares (2002) describes collective efficacy as the ability of residents in poor neighbourhoods to realize common goals and to engage in positive *collective action*.

Alexander (2012) builds on the collective action framework, applying it to the micro-dynamics of inner-city neighbourhoods in Chicago and developing what she calls “cultural collective efficacy” – comprising “positive social networks that inner-city residents develop through participation in musical, artistic and other neighbourhood-based cultural endeavours” (Alexander, 2012: 803). She views cultural collective efficacy as “an important type of positive social capital that exists in some low-income, segregated urban neighbourhoods” (2012: 829). Cultural efficacy can function to help inner-city residents “mitigate the negative effects of living in a poor, racially segregated and disinvested community” and to build socio-cultural networks within and between neighbourhoods that foster collective capacity and help residents to obtain more concrete benefits from urban revitalization projects (Alexander, 2012: 829).



### 2.3 Collective efficacy and local organizational behaviour

Organizations, as Sampson (2013) explains, generate a “web of routine activities and associations that lubricate collective action.” From this view, what is important is not the existence of any specific type of organization, but the overall organizational infrastructure of a community and overlapping networks among participants. These networks, as Harding et al. (2011) outline, comprise the common activity and institution building that lead to collective efficacy and social organization.

Extending Bandura’s (2000) collective efficacy model to the organization, Lin and Peng (2010) focus on local organizational behaviour, citing collective efficacy as a variable that influences individual members’ “organizational citizenship behaviours” and “team-level performance.” Collective efficacy provides a salient situation for vicarious learning in a team. Such learning, in turn, promotes efficacy and effectiveness in teams and organizations (Bandura, 1997; 2000).

Goddard et al. (2004: 175) explore the concept of efficacy and local organizational behaviour, finding that “group-referent perceptions reflect an emergent organizational property known as *perceived* collective efficacy.” Their analysis draws from fundamental principles of human agency, explained through the lens of social cognitive theory. Accordingly, human agency is extended toward the exercise of collective agency, or a combined belief in the group’s ability to work together to produce desired effects. Within an organization, perceived collective efficacy represents the beliefs of group members concerning “the performance capability of the organization as a whole” (Bandura, 1997: 469).

---

## 3. Socio-Spatial Inequality and Collective Efficacy: Theoretical and Empirical Debates

---

*In general, what are the key theoretical and empirical debates in the literature, particularly the role of collective efficacy in mitigating the effects of societal and urban socio-spatial inequality?*

### 3.1 Traditional approaches to the framing of collective efficacy

#### 3.1.1 Social disorganization theory

The social disorganization framework attaches “disorganization” to concentrated disadvantage – neighbourhoods with high rates of family poverty, unemployment, low educational attainment, immigrant population, segregation, and residential instability (Ramirez, 2011).

As proponents of social disorganization theory, Sampson and Morenoff (2006) attribute decreased rates of homicide to collective efficacy in Chicago neighbourhoods. Their research links spatial dynamics and neighbourhood inequalities in social and economic capacity to urban violence. The effect of collective efficacy on violent crime within neighbourhoods is widely acknowledged (Block and Block, 2005; Deuchar, 2010; Maimon and Browning, 2010; Meares, 2002; Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush, 2001; Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls, 1999). Social disorganization theory has traditionally linked neighbourhoods with high immigrant populations with higher crime rates (Shaw and McKay, 1942). However, recent empirical work on immigration and crime in Seattle and Brisbane suggests that neighbourhoods with more immigrants are actually less likely to experience high levels of violence (Ramirez, 2011). To date, there is a lack of research exploring the different urban contexts of cities in the United States, Australia, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and Canada, and the disparate effects that local state regimes and histories related to immigration may have on neighbourhood collective efficacy.

Though the social disorganization perspective tends to support the empirical assumption that neighbourhoods with high levels of concentrated disadvantage would be unlikely to mobilize towards collective efficacy, Weffer (2004) presents empirical evidence showing that, while increasing unemployment may reduce the likelihood of successful collective action, consistently high poverty levels actually *encourage* the likelihood of organized collective action events. His findings also suggest that a history of collective action is the most important factor in neigh-

bourhoods overcoming problems of local resident engagement, even in areas with high levels of inequality.

### 3.1.2 Collective efficacy and neighbourhood collective action

Few studies of collective efficacy focus on the relationship between collective efficacy and neighbourhood collective action, or the correlation between a collective belief in a group's ability to effect change and increased levels of *participation* in local initiatives and/or local organizational participation. In their original conception of collective efficacy, Sampson and Earls (1997) did not explicitly include the collective nature of action as part of their notional framework. Ramirez (2011: 13) argues that "neighbourhood collective action needs more theoretical and empirical exploration in the social disorganization and collective efficacy literature," pointing to a lack of theoretical and empirical exploration within social disorganization and collective efficacy literature that links the original conception of efficacy to the collective nature of "action" (that is, neighbourhood participation) in its explanation of levels of neighbourhood crime.

## 3.2 Challenging popular collective efficacy frameworks

### 3.2.1 *Co-opting the neighbourhood*

An emerging, neo-Marxist body of literature seeks both to critique and to expand the concept of collective efficacy as it is seen to operate within neighbourhoods – or as a product of "neighbourhood effects." These authors pay close attention to structural factors as well as the social and economic impacts of neoliberalism. They pose questions such as: what tools does a society provide to its members to help them develop lives that are fulfilling and adapt to the challenges of neoliberalism, as well as to self-organize and promote their own interests? Following Mayer (2003: 110), "what might appear as the fulfillment of earlier grassroots empowerment claims is actually part of a new mode of governance that has emerged in and for neglected and disadvantaged areas and communities."

Critical urban theorists frame political discourses of "collective efficacy" and "community empowerment" at the neighbourhood scale as culture-led urban regeneration, both with respect to policymaking and policy analysis (Brenner, Marcuse, and Mayer, 2012; Mayer and Kunkel, 2011; Slater, 2013; Wagenaar, 2007). Neighbourhood regeneration policies that borrow from the neighbourhood effects literature are seen to be representative of an "aggressive neoliberalizing" of urban space (Brenner and Theodore, 2002: 376).

Mayer's (2009: 365) conception of the "neoliberal imperative" of mobilizing city space as an arena for growth and market discipline becomes realized, as Peck et al. (2009) explain, through new, neighbourhood-based policies that emphasize the "empowerment" of neighbourhoods and communities (such as the Strong Neighbourhoods policies in the United Kingdom, and Priority Neighbourhoods policies in Toronto). References to "the public" and invitations to "participate" have become part of a trend Mayer (2003: 108) describes as the "dissolving of social and political perspectives into economic ones," whereby new, targeted programs for neighbourhood revitalization denote local governments' discovery of the "potential of community-based organizations for helping them solve their fiscal as well as legitimation problems" (Mayer, 2009: 364).

As Uitermark (2012: 2551) explains, in the 1980s and 1990s, urban governments in Europe co-opted a great number of moderate activists through targeted neighbourhood policies that emphasized “partnerships” and similar participatory schemes, effectively dividing radical and moderate activists while imposing government constraints on groups operating within the urban movement. Uitermark’s contributions highlight how urban institutions can “preempt or break down the types of inter-organizational and intercity alliances needed to shift the scale of mobilizations beyond particularistic and local issues.”

Shifting focus to the neighbourhood as a site for government-led intervention and the *motivations* that drive numerous national governments in the United Kingdom, European Union, Australia, the United States, and Canada to enact neighbourhood policies, Manley et al. (2013) call into question the legitimacy of the neighbourhood effects research upon which these policies are predicated (that is, the notion that living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods produces negative effects on residents’ life chances over and above the effects of structural and individual characteristics).

Whereas Sampson and his colleagues (Sampson et al., 2002) tie individuals’ life chances to the neighbourhoods that they live on the basis of neighbourhood “effects” – or neighbourhood-level variations of phenomena such as delinquency, violence and crime, mutual trust, and routine activity patterns – Manley et al. (2013: 6) assert that the “very notion of a neighbourhood effect is an instrument of accusation,” and that the neighbourhood effects literature has “failed to engage with the wider socio-economic processes that occur outside the neighbourhood.” Using the example of educational dropout rates for youth in low-income neighbourhoods, they reject the theory that the “effects” of high spatial concentrations of low-status individuals determines high incidence of drop outs; rather, structural factors such as the “necessity of working to provide financial support to the wider household” must be at the forefront of neighbourhood analyses (Manley et al., 2013).

### 3.2.2 Reframing ‘neighbourhood effects’

In advancing the analysis of the social dynamics within a neighbourhood “beyond neighbourhood effects,” Slater (2013) argues that the problem of understanding collective action and organization (and, by extension, collective efficacy) within neighbourhoods becomes one of “understanding life chances via a theory of capital accumulation and class struggle in cities” (Slater, 2013: 367). His attention to the interplays and outcomes of capitalist accumulation lends to an understanding of the injustices inherent in state policies that allow markets to determine housing costs – giving way to the kind of spatial sorting which produces place-based concentrations of poverty. Instead, he advocates for the advancement of research that more wholly accounts for the capitalist institutional arrangements that create poverty. From this view, a new body of research must emerge that is theoretically and politically grounded in neo-Marxist approaches to neoliberal urbanization in order to show exactly “how and why spaces are coveted by those who stand to be removed from them (2013: 370).” He reframes neighbourhood effects research – and its tendency to dwell on the displacement of vulnerable groups – advocating, instead, for emplacement studies in neighbourhood research that account for the structural factors that give way to differential life chances and the social inequalities they produce.

---

## 4. Factors Contributing to Neighbourhood Capacity for Collective Efficacy

---

*In the theoretical and conceptual literature, what factors are believed to contribute to neighbourhood capacity for collective efficacy?*

### 4.1 Collective efficacy and place attachment

Numerous studies have used the collective efficacy framework to suggest a reciprocal relationship between perceptions of *neighbourhood safety* and levels of *place attachment* (Brown and Warner, 1985; Brown et al., 1992; 2004; Ferguson and Mindel, 2007; Franzini et al., 2005; Sampson, 2004; Sampson and Graif 2009; Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls, 1999; Sampson and Raudenbush, 1999; Wells et al., 2006).

Place attachment “focuses on the bonds between residents and their social and physical settings” (Brown et al., 2004: 259). This concept is similar to collective efficacy in that it highlights the role of neighbourhood cohesion in influencing residents’ perceptions of safety (Pitner et al., 2013). Yet, it also “places emphasis on residents’ feelings of pride in their home and neighbourhood appearance, and residents’ tenure in their neighbourhoods” (Brown et al., 2004: 259). Broadly, this body of literature suggests that increased place attachment can directly increase collective efficacy.

### 4.2 Perceived social efficacy

Within the field of education, a large body of research explores the link between perceived collective efficacy and differences in student achievement among schools (Bandura, 1993; Goddard, 2001; Goddard et al., 2000). Bandura (1993) has demonstrated that the effect of perceived collective efficacy on student achievement was stronger than the direct link between socio-economic status (SES) and student achievement. In a similar study, Goddard and his colleagues concluded that, even after controlling for students’ prior achievement, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, and gender, collective efficacy beliefs have stronger effects on student achievement than student race or SES (Goddard et al., 2000; Goddard et al., 2004).

Goddard et al. (2004: 8) echo Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls (2000: 657) in their study of how organized capacity for action is tapped to produce results, claiming that “the power of collective

efficacy perceptions to influence organizational life and outcomes lies in the expectations for action that are socially transmitted by collective efficacy perceptions.” This work suggests that peoples’ beliefs about the power of organized capacity to influence change may function to mitigate some of the other effects of neighbourhood-based inequality, and predict success even more strongly than factors such as race or SES.

Anti-racist social psychology literature (Fallis and Opatow 2003; Fine and Ruglis, 2009) examines the internalization of negative individual- and group-level self-efficacy beliefs among social groups facing racism, sexism, and economic marginalization. Racialized and impoverished neighbourhoods face distinct barriers to the cultivation of collective efficacy beliefs. The internalization of these beliefs is related both to representations of marginalized groups as less efficacious, and to the lived realities of those having low socioeconomic status. Drawing from interviews conducted with elementary, middle, high school, and college students in California public schools located in low-income areas in San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, and Watsonville, Fine (2004: 26) examined the effects of core psychological consequences of schooling in schools with structural problems (such as high teacher turnover, high levels of uncertified teachers, and inadequate instructional materials). She found that, given the “broad base of social inequities that confront poor and working-class youth and youth of colour,” these schools “substantially worsen already existent social inequities with psychological, academic, and ultimately economic consequence” – transforming students’ yearning for quality education into anger, pride into shame, and civic engagement into public alienation (Fine, 2004: 4).

### **4.3 Political factors**

A small body of sociological literature suggests that neighbourhood collective action is most likely to arise when local government institutions are perceived to have failed citizens in providing common goods and resources (Mesch, 1996; Rossi, 2005). As Rossi (2005) observes, in Argentina, local and neighbourhood organization was promoted by perceived weakness in the national government. Similarly, Mesch (1996) finds that the emergence of collective action and participation is a product of perceived environmental concerns, such as rapid neighbourhood changes for the worse, and political (exogenous) incentives provided to the neighbourhood. Mesch concludes that social perception of neighbourhood problems increases the likelihood of neighbourhood organization, while political incentives are less likely to promote neighbourhood organization.

---

## 5. Empirical Indicators of Collective Efficacy and their Measurement

---

*What indicators of collective efficacy are used in empirical research on collective efficacy and how are they measured?*

### 5.1 Individual and group perceptions of efficacy

There are several approaches to the empirical measurement of collective efficacy *perceptions* (Goddard, 2004). As a neighbourhood property, collective efficacy was first measured by Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) using the mean of individuals' scores on the collective efficacy scale for each of Chicago's 847 census tracts, combined into 343 "neighbourhood clusters" (N=8752). Findings showed that residential stability and concentrated poverty each had significant associations with collective efficacy in neighbourhoods that were "predominantly black" (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls, 1997: 923).

The results of this early study hypothesized and demonstrated that collective efficacy was a measurable construct (Ramirez, 2011). The Collective Efficacy Scale, developed by Sampson et al. (1997), is a 10-item Likert-type scale combining both personal-level factors (race, socio-economic status, marital status) and neighbourhood-level factors (concentrated disadvantage, immigrant concentration) to measure collective efficacy, defined as social cohesion among neighbours combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the "common good" (Sampson, 1997: 918).

The scale was created using data from Sampson and Earls' earlier study: a cross-sectional survey of Chicago residents called *The Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighbourhoods: Community Survey, 1994–1995* (Earls et al., 1995). The survey questionnaire is a multidimensional assessment of the structural conditions and organization of the neighbourhoods, and the data collected was used to create the Likert items on the Collective Efficacy Scale (1997) (see Appendix A).

To date, researchers disagree on what constitutes a neighbourhood-level mechanism like 'collective efficacy'. Critics (Small & Feldman, 2015) point to a selection bias implicit to collective efficacy scales which fail to account for selection problems and variations on how mechanisms may operate in different neighbourhood contexts.

### 5.1.1 Level of measurement

A number of different variables contribute to the measurement of individual and group perceptions of collective efficacy. The following is an overview of five empirical models of collective efficacy, adapted from Goddard et al. (2004: 7–9):

1. One approach would be to produce aggregate measures of individual (self-) efficacy beliefs, or a group mean of *self-referent* perceptions (e.g., a teacher efficacy belief survey item might read, “I have what it takes to get my students to learn.” Responses to this and other “I-” referent statements would be averaged to assess the collective sense of efficacy of the school) (Goddard et al., 2001).
2. An empirical study could also focus on aggregate measures of individuals’ perceptions of *group-referent* capability (“we” instead of “I”) (Goddard et al., 2004: 6).
3. Bandura (1997: 478) measured the extent to which *consensus* existed among group members across their individual perceptions of group-level collective efficacy, observing that “perceived collective efficacy is an emergent group-level attribute rather than simply the sum of members’ perceived personal efficacies.” This approach is vulnerable to social desirability bias, and may disguise within-group vulnerability in collective efficacy perceptions (Bandura, 1997; Goddard et al., 2004).
4. Building on Bandura’s (1997) group-level modelling, Goddard et al. (2001: 467) sought to develop a measure of collective teacher efficacy that gauged the amount of agreement among teachers in the assessment of group-level collective efficacy – or the “collective capability of a faculty to influence student achievement.” The team developed a model combining individual group members’ interdependent perspectives on group capability in order to assess perceived collective efficacy as an emergent *organizational* property. The study produced a 21-item Collective Teacher Efficacy Survey, which measured group competence (GC) and task analysis (TA) ( $r = .96$ ).<sup>1</sup> The survey evolved into a 12-item Collective Efficacy Scale, which weighted GC and TA equally ( $r = .94$ ) (Goddard 2002; see Appendix B).

Further research is needed, as Goddard et al. (2004: 10) point out, in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the influence of collective efficacy beliefs in organizations, and particularly in organizational transformation and/or and improvement in organizational culture. To date, evidence suggests that “aggregates of individual perceptions of group capability do indeed tap the perceived collective efficacy of organizations” (Goddard et al., 2004: 7). There is also a clear lack of research pertaining to the Canadian context, as the studies listed above were conducted in the United States only.

---

1 GC assesses judgments about competences that staff bring to bear upon teaching tasks, while TA measures barriers and opportunities embedded in teaching students (Goddard, 2002).



### 5.1.2 Community or group level efficacy

Carroll et al. (2005) employed Bandura's model of collective efficacy in order to study *community collective efficacy* in Portland, Oregon. The authors questioned whether individuals who believe that their community can address challenges together would connect to community networks – particularly the Internet – in support of community goals. They explored these possibilities by developing a community collective efficacy (CCE) scale, a “capacity analysis of the community by the community” (2005: 3) (refer to Appendix C).

The CCE scale divides community involvement into a set of specific concerns. Going beyond task enumeration, the CCE scale also “measures residents’ beliefs about how well their community can succeed in joint endeavors [...] and their collective capacities as a community” (Carroll et al., 2005: 4). The scale includes 17 items that are intended to form a comprehensive analysis of efficacy-related goals and obstacles for the community domain. These 17 items load onto four factors in the CCE scale, derived from household survey data (N=146). The four factors are:

- Factor 1: “Managing Conflict”, dealing with the community’s capacity to manage dilemmas and tradeoffs;
- Factor 2: “Development”, relating to goals and policies on growth and the environment;
- Factor 3: “United Action”, or the community’s ability to cooperate and deal with problems collectively;
- Factor 4: “Social Services”, with respect to state support for education and access to services for seniors and people with disabilities.

Study findings reported that people higher in CCE convey “stronger feelings of belonging and are more activist in their community” (Carroll et al., 2005: 7). For instance, “people who are members of two or more community groups report higher CCE than people who are members of one or no community group.”

## 5.2 Social organization measures

Swaroop and Morenoff (2004: 3) conducted a multilevel spatial analysis of residents in 342 Chicago neighbourhoods in order to study how neighbourhood context influences participation in forms of “local social organization,” meaning collective participation in local voluntary associations. Their study drew from multilevel data taken from the 1995 Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighbourhoods Community Survey (Earls et al., 1995, see Appendix A) and the 1990 United States Census in examining neighbourhood characteristics (including residential stability, concentrated disadvantage, and physical and social disorder) in relation to local social organization.

Building on studies by Guest (2000) and Guest and Lee (1983), the authors note a lack of research activity and theoretical attention paid to differences that constitute social organization; particularly the “distinctions between expressive and instrumental motivations for community participation” (Swaroop and Morenoff, 2004: 8). “Expressive” acts are motivated by “one’s sense of identity and obligation as a neighbour,” and include behaviours such as social exchange with neighbours and participation in community groups. “Instrumental” participation is

motivated by “functional and political concerns of neighbourhood residents, such as the desire to protect personal investments and promote local businesses, and include behaviours such as neighbourhood watch programs” (Swaroop and Morenoff, 2004: 8).

The authors produced a “Typology of Local Social Organizations” (see Appendix D), sorting measures of local social organization in accordance with the motivation for community participation (expressive or instrumental), and whether the type of participation is informal (based in social ties) or formal (via civic groups). Results showed that residential stability is associated with increased participation in expressive forms of social organization, but not instrumental forms. Concentrated disadvantage and physical and social disorder were associated with increased participation in instrumental forms of social organization, but not strongly related to expressive forms (Swaroop and Morenoff, 2004: 13). These findings support the systemic model of local social organization in demonstrating that social context may influence the development of local social organization through different conduits in, but “challenge theories of urban poverty that predict lower levels of engagement in poor communities” (Swaroop and Morenoff, 2004: 13).

---

## 6. Collective Efficacy and Neighbourhood Socio-Economic Status

---

*What role does the socio-economic status of a neighbourhood play in its collective efficacy?*

This section is guided by two questions:

- What evidence is there on the extent to which neighbourhood socio-economic status (SES) diversity or the lack of it is positively or negatively associated with collective efficacy?
- Does it matter whether a neighbourhood is mainly high SES, mainly low SES, mixed SES, or bipolar (Galster and Booza, 2007)?

### 6.1 Collective efficacy and neighbourhood SES

Two opposing models link collective efficacy and SES. In accordance with Rosenbaum et al. (2002: 72), the culture of poverty model “implies that low-income individuals who acquired a low sense of efficacy will retain it, regardless of subsequent events,” while the geography of opportunity model implies that that individuals will not retain a low sense of efficacy if they “subsequently move to a place which offers more opportunities.”

The culture of poverty model draws from a traditional psychology perspective, framing ‘efficacy’ as “an aspect of an individual’s personality, an early formed, relatively stable characteristic that is unlikely to change” (Rosenbaum et al., 2002: 72). Essentially, culture is viewed as internal, and the “cycle of poverty and deprivation” is inherent to the weakness of the family structure leading to antisocial behaviours (Moynihan, 1968; Rotter, 1966). This model does not account for the structural, systemic institutional or cultural factors that carry great influence over peoples’ lives (see Section 3).

Galster and Killen (1995: 12) proposed the term “geography of opportunity” to refer to the ways in which geography influences individuals’ opportunity. They argue that “our options are limited both by the very real social and economic conditions of our existence and by the limitations we perceive regardless of the accuracy of those perceptions” (Galster and Killen, 1995: 28). Rosenbaum et al. (2002: 71) extend this idea to posit that *places* (such as neighbourhoods) may affect individuals’ sense of their own control over events in their lives.

## 6.2 Mixed-income neighbourhoods and collective efficacy

As part of their census tract data analysis for 1970–2000 in the 100 largest metropolitan areas in the United States, Galster and Booza (2007) classify neighbourhoods in terms of four degrees of income diversity (high diversity, moderate diversity, low diversity, and not diverse) and by area median income based on six income categories: very low income, low income, moderate income, high moderate, high income, and very high income. Their study finds a dramatic increase since 1970 in the number and incidence of what they call “bipolar” neighbourhoods, characterized by “extremely bimodal income distributions” (Galster and Booza, 2007: 422).<sup>2</sup>

In examining whether bipolar neighbourhoods might influence collective action and social networking, the authors question whether “increasing numbers of high-income neighbours will aid the less well-off nearby by financially supporting a stronger set of local institutions, exerting the political clout to obtain higher-quality municipal services and facilities, and creating demand for local retail establishments that will generate new job opportunities for those of modest skills” (Galster and Booza, 2007: 422). They conclude that although these arguments may be valid, they have not been empirically validated, in part because of challenges with measurement. As for networking, these types of social interactions would require certain kinds of cooperation/collective organizing among groups, and “the existing evidence suggests such interactions among highly disparate income groups are not common” (2007: 431).

## 6.3 Collective efficacy and the “rooted middle class”

Focusing on the link between middle-class families and collective efficacy in Chicago, Garnett (2010: 208) chronicles the association between high collective efficacy scores and the “rooted middle class.” She cites Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) in their finding that residential stability was one of three major factors explaining neighbourhood variation in collective efficacy. Categorized as a middle-class characteristic, homeownership is said to produce “economic incentives to organize to address neighbourhood problems” (Garnett, 2010: 209). She notes that “home ownership naturally increases social integration in a neighbourhood over time, providing opportunities to build trust relationships” (Garnett, 2010: 209).

## 6.4 Concentrated disadvantage and collective efficacy

Swaroop and Morenoff (2004: 13) find that, contrary to the image of “disadvantaged” neighbourhoods as “socially isolated places where residents withdraw from community life out of fear or apathy,” their study results indicate that neighbourhood residents in Chicago respond to challenging local conditions by taking actions intended to improve neighbourhood problems, and becoming involved in *organizations* that address the needs of the community. Residents of disadvan-

---

2 Walks (2013:15) finds Galster and Booza’s index to be highly sensitive to how the distribution layers onto the cut-off points in the income ranges and to the number of categories employed; concluding that the index is “less accurate when larger numbers of income categories are used, or when the means of different places vary, and it cannot provide comparability across contexts (metropolitan areas, etc.) containing different numbers of groups (neighbourhoods, municipalities).”

tagged neighbourhoods were also likely to have strong personal networks connecting them to friends and family members in their neighbourhoods. Moreover, signs of physical and social incivilities “appear to function as signals of community distress that motivate residents to become engaged in instrumental activities, either through formal or informal channels” (Swaroop and Morenoff, 2004: 16).

---

## 7. The Role of Local Organizations

---

*How do organizations support collective efficacy at the neighbourhood scale?*

### 7.1 Examining organizational capacity “in place”

Organizations, as McQuarrie and Marwell (2009: 257) note, are key sites of urban structuration – the locations of both systemic and social integration:

*Organizations are the medium through which systemic processes reach the street corner; they make state and market resources available, socialize individuals into a society beyond the neighborhood, and constitute social identities that have relevance beyond the neighborhood. At the same time, organizations are settings in which neighborhood social integration is produced in interaction. In churches, corner stores, coffee houses, schools, community centers, political clubs, and workplaces, neighborhood residents interact to produce shared meanings, mutually intelligible practices, and identities, all of which refer to and reproduce a shared experience of place. ... Neighborhoods are the sources of innovation, creativity, and cultural meanings that have relevance for society-wide institutions.*

The authors point to a lack of focus across urban sociological fields on the interplay of local communities and organizations. Organizations are treated as “mere reflections of local neighbourhood effects” (such as social integration), as “locations for neighbourhood interaction,” or as “vehicles in the political class struggle” (McQuarrie and Marwell, 2009: 257). Urbanists, they argue, should focus on organizations’ capacities in creating local orders and linking individuals in a community to broader society.

More recently, the influence of local communities on organizations has been examined through the work of Marquis and Battilana (2009). The authors point to the importance of factors associated with local communities – such as interpersonal networks, laws, and tax rates, among others – in understanding organizational behaviour. Rejecting popular, geography-independent organizational fields of analysis that emphasized an increasingly boundary-less global world, the authors echo more recent (Marquis and Lounsbury, 2007; Scott and Storper, 2003) scholarship and research on the community bases of organizational behaviour that focus on systemic links to community influences (Marquis and Battilana, 2009). From this view, communities provide different institutional environments that influence organizations. Scott’s (2001) typology

of institutional features is applied to the community level of analysis “in order to demonstrate organizations’ simultaneous embeddedness in both geographical communities and organizational fields” (Marquis and Battilana, 2009: 284), and to allow researchers to better understand isomorphism (that is, similarities of the processes or structure of one organization to those of another) and change dynamics within and across locales.

In 2013 a special volume of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* was dedicated to the theme of “Reconsidering the urban disadvantaged: The role of systems, institutions, and organizations” (Small and Allard, 2013). The authors of the introduction argue that, today, understanding the conditions of disadvantaged urban populations requires a focus on not only *individuals* and their *neighbourhoods* (as we see in “neighbourhood effects” literature) but also on the *organizations* that structure their lives, the *systems* in which those organizations are embedded, and the *institutions* that regulate both.

## 7.2 Social movements-in-organizations

Social movements and formal organizations share a number of characteristics – including goal orientation, activity systems, and boundary maintenance (Aldrich and Ruif, 2006). As Davis et al. (2008: 389) explain, “organizations are the targets of, actors in, and sites for social movement activities. Social movements are often represented by formal organizations, while organizations resemble episodic ‘movements’ rather than bounded actors.”

In the field of sociology, recent engagement (from the early 2000s on) between organizational and social movement scholars has produced a body of work on the intersections of social movements and formal organizations. Social movement scholars look to neo-institutional theory as a way to extend their analysis beyond “movements” toward institutional fields and the role of institutions in producing and/or effecting change (Zald, 2005; 2008). Emergent research themes were compiled by Davis et al. (2008: 390–394), and include:

- *organizations as targets of social movements*: describing how movements seek to change the actions of organizations and what factors lead to success (King and Soule, 2007);
- *organizations as collaborators with movements* (O’Mahony and Bechky, 2008);
- *organizations as sites and carriers of social movements*: describing how the actions that organizations take in response to movements can set standards that spread more broadly through society (Briscoe and Safford, 2010);
- *organizations as manifestations of movements*: describing how social movement organizations mirror the essential dynamics of public sentiment, and their spread can indicate the progress of social change (King and Haveman, 2008).

While the engagement between social movement theory and organization theory and research is becoming increasingly well-established in sociological fields (Zald, 2008: 573), there is a notable lack of scholarship dealing with the practical efficacy of organizations in cultivating change at the neighbourhood scale. More research is needed in order to understand how organizations may combine community mobilizing and organizing efforts to transform residents’ motivations and capacities for involvement – particularly in the Canadian context.

---

## 8. Linking Collective Efficacy, Neighbourhood Cohesion, and Collective Action

---

*How do organizations, community groups, and individuals mobilize to enact and effect change in social inclusion, local control over assets, civic engagement, neighbourhood improvement, and the securing of resources, and what factors contribute to their success?*

### 8.1 Neighbourhood cohesion and collective efficacy

In its 2008 report on social housing facilities in Toronto, the Wellesley Institute documented the collective efforts of tenants and supportive and housing agency workers in their efforts to foster neighbourhood cohesion and collective efficacy and contribute to the neighbourhood's capacity to make change (Wellesley Institute, 2008).

The report defines *neighbourhood cohesion* as the result of “regular interactions between neighbours and tenants that reflect good will and support” (Wellesley Institute, 2008: 18). *Collective efficacy* is described as “the result of informal and formal actions that go beyond casual friendliness and have contributed to the nature of their immediate neighbourhood” (Wellesley Institute, 2008: 20).

Factors that were found to contribute to the fostering of collective efficacy in the supportive housing units studied included: the presence of tenant gardens, organized community-tenant action related to the management of garbage disposal disputes and issues of safety, positive relations between tenants and neighbourhood business owners, small “cluster” relationships amongst neighbours, and regular meetings facilitated by an agency staff member who worked with tenants to organize internal community-building activities. The study's findings highlight the various ways that tenant-neighbour interactions resulted in increased cohesion, which in turn contributed to the collective efficacy of the neighbourhood – resulting in organized, collective action around noise, tidiness, and crime.

### 8.2 Collective efficacy and action

In *Cities and Social Movements: Theorizing Beyond the Right to the City*, Uitermark, Nicholls, and Loopmans (2012: 2551), commenting on the nurturing of urban social movements, take the position that “radical change occurs when movement participants forge ties between different



sectors, scales, and places.” The authors argue that cities “breed contention” because they “produce a wide variety of grievances among their inhabitants and offer opportunities for developing ties between local activists” (Uitermark, Nicholls, and Loopmans, 2012: 2550). The task of analysts of urban social movements is then to understand how, where, and when contention arising from the urban grassroots is channelled at the local scale and connected to broader social and organizational networks.

Nicholls (2008: 8) describes how location in a common urban system creates “bridging opportunities” as actors learn about the resources and organizations in their areas, establish connections with “brokers” who connect them with different groups, and transfer resources from one group to the other. From his view, the role of the city for generating collective action is in its “function as a relational incubator, facilitating complex relational exchanges that generate a diversity of useful resources for campaigns operating at a variety of spatial scales” (Nicholls, 2008: 8). These new connections between diverse individuals make it possible to “step outside of conventional boxes, draw on diverse resources and ideas, and establish trust.” As “interdependencies and mutual obligations” grow between these specialized groups, actors “not only begin to perceive their particular issues in complementary ways but they also feel obliged (strategically, ideologically and emotionally) to mobilize on behalf of their allies” (Nicholls, 2008: 8).

Miller and Nicholls (2013) expand on Nicholls’ (2008) early urban social movement framework, outlining that, in some instances, “connections created through urban-based campaigns can evolve into strong, complex, and rich ties which can then serve to drive local, national, and transnational movements” (Miller and Nicholls, 2013: 8). We see the collective efficacy construct emerge here, contained within the processes that contribute to the strengthening of social ties and foster collective community capacities across local networks.

### **8.3 Containing collective action: Cities and social movements**

Just as cities are spaces that support innovations in politics, they also become sites for the innovation of techniques to monitor subjects and maintain social order. The local state can “absorb contention by channelling diffuse discontent into local institutions” (Uitermark, Nicholls and Loopmans, 2012: 2550). For instance, interorganizational competition for small municipal funding pots requires organizations to “differentiate themselves and produce specific outcomes, thereby reducing overlap and motivation to work together in common campaigns” (Miller and Nicholls, 2013: 462). Increasing competition for resources can also weaken trust among organizations, and constrain or inhibit alliance-building and the fostering of collective efficacy (Miller and Nicholls, 2013: 462).

---

## 9. Limitations of the Neighbourhood Scale of Analysis

---

*What are the limitations of the neighbourhood scale in studying collective efficacy? How do researchers look beyond “neighbourhood effects”?*

Two papers published (Wikström, 2010; Wikström et al., 2012) in London, England, highlight that a focus on geographical units has its limitations in the study of collective efficacy. Wikström et al. (2012) argue that to understand the relationship between places and behaviours, researchers must attempt to gain a better understanding of which people go where, when, and with whom (kinds of people in kinds of places). They constructed a space-time-budget methodology that captures individuals’ daily routines, life circumstances, and their own conceptions of neighbourhoods. The inclusion of these contextual factors was intended to counter the popular assertion that greater ethnic diversity equates to better social mixing, without accounting for specific community-level dynamics such as the needs and capacities of residents.

Similarly, as outlined in Sutherland, Brunton-Smith, and Jackson (2013: 3), Cerda et al. (2008) “question the generalizability of collective efficacy studies conducted in the United States to cities with very different macro-level conditions.” Contrasting political and economic contexts in the study of neighbourhood violence in Chicago (drawing from Sampson’s work) and Medellín, Colombia, the authors “report limitations in a focus on the neighbourhood scale, as members of more affluent classes tend to have social links that cut across geographic boundaries and are less restricted to the neighbourhood than members of less affluent classes” (Sutherland Brunton-Smith, and Jackson, 2013: 3). However, they find that the lack of available data on this issue precludes researchers from making any conclusive statements about this phenomenon.

Comparable results were reported in Villarreal and Silva’s (2006) study of the effects of social cohesion and neighbourhood disorder on crime using data from a survey of neighbourhoods in Brazil. Findings from the study indicate higher levels of social cohesion in lower-income neighbourhoods – refuting findings of the Chicago-based studies of Sampson and his colleagues. The authors find that greater cohesion among neighbourhood residents is not significantly associated with lower levels of crime, but is significantly associated with a higher perceived risk of victimization. This finding points to the “limits of collective efficacy” (Villarreal and Silva, 2006). In order to explain these discrepancies, they suggest that further analysis extend beyond the neighbourhood scale to include meso- and macro-level indicators. Their critique also points to

the local, regional, and cultural specificity of the dynamics of collective efficacy, and the difficulties encountered by researchers attempting to apply U.S. models to non-U.S. cities.

Finally, in their study on Chicago, Swaroop and Morenoff (2004) found that neighbourhood boundaries were more permeable than the statistically defined neighbourhood boundaries commonly used in research on neighbourhood effects (such as Sampson's Chicago-based research). As they argue, "the contextual factors that predict community participation in one place simply spill over these boundaries" (2004: 4). Many "neighbourhood" organizations provide services for areas beyond the neighbourhood in which they are located, serving residents and members from surrounding areas.

### **9.1 Rethinking "problem" neighbourhoods**

Countering the recurrent framing of ethnoracially diverse neighbourhoods in Western European cities as "deprived" or "socially dysfunctional," van Eijk (2012: 3009) puts forward the notion that "perceptions of diversity or disorder do not matter much when neighbour relations evolve around chance encounters and norms of good neighbouring." She points to the persistent idea that people living in "problem" neighbourhoods fail to form relationships with their fellow residents, and are therefore in need of more "social cohesion" (Amin, 2002; Fortier, 2007). Instead, she argues, researchers should make an effort to refine these claims, and consider that, perhaps, more distant neighbourly relations do not constitute a lack of social cohesion, or a "fragmentation" of the neighbourhood. Rather, scholarly focus on "narratives of dissociation" (van Eijk, 2012: 3009) risks overlooking that people in "deprived" neighbourhoods are actually maintaining "good" neighbourly relationships (respecting a neighbour's privacy should not be interpreted as an effect of social dysfunction).

From this view, local relationships in poor neighbourhoods are subject to an evaluative double standard. Sayer (2005: 205) echoes this claim, contending that neighbourhood analyses that focus on social dysfunction in poor neighbourhoods "demonstrates a lack of recognition, which is in turn closely linked to a socioeconomically weak position." Framing a city's most ethnoracially diverse neighbourhoods in this way can produce a stigmatizing affect that residents of deprived areas must work to overcome (van Eijk, 2012).

### **9.2 Neighbouring in Toronto's inner suburbs**

To explore, as Ghosh (2014: 2010) does, the ways that recent immigrants to Toronto make the "ageing high rises of the inner suburbs their home," it is necessary to account for the various intersections between economic deprivation, ethnoracial diversity and housing in the city. Her analysis explores the social practices, and "neighbouring" practices, of recent Bangladeshi immigrants in Toronto – a group that makes up one of most impoverished and residentially segregated new immigrants groups in the city (Ghosh, 2014: 2013). Qualitative interviews were conducted with 30 Bangladeshi households residing in high-rise apartments in Crescent Town and Scarborough Village neighbourhoods. In order to expand their social connections, residents often had to work around their buildings' strict regulations. These individuals "routinely ignored, as well as transformed, regulations" by "playing the 'game' of and with the authorities" (Ghosh, 2014: 2016). For instance, an increasing demand for specific cultural services led them to open

their own private apartments as spaces for informal economic activities (such as at-home beauty parlours and daycares). Residents successfully achieved their objectives “not through friction, but through tact and by improvising on the same rules that restricted them” (Ghosh, 2014: 2016). This research highlights some distinctive processes of power, social connectivity, and resistance that can occur within the “deprived” neighbourhoods of Toronto’s inner suburbs, which have emerged as sites where “race and deprivation coincide with housing” (Jacobs, 2006).

Ghosh’s work supports van Eijik’s (2012) assertion that neighbouring should be judged based on the criteria given and used by an actual community, rather than criteria imposed by social researchers seeking to ‘model’ social networks in neighbourhoods.

---

## 10. Conclusions and a Direction for Future Research

---

This scoping review of collective efficacy literature was undertaken to explore and, ultimately, build upon traditional conceptions of efficacy in order to establish a research framework through which we may, in subsequent phases of the research, begin to understand how residents work together in neighbourhoods to achieve important local improvements, and continue to draw upon these collective achievements to effect system-wide change. The collective efficacy research frame was extended to include community-based organizations and their impacts on neighbourhood collective efficacy, beyond their outcomes at the individual and household levels. The goal was to compile, through the literature, a number of frameworks and strategies that community-based organizations might use to foster and sustain capacity for neighbourhood collective efficacy.

The review has underscored a clear lack of scholarship pertaining to the role of community-based organizations, and what these organizations actually do to support residents to develop their own capacities for collective action. Throughout the collective efficacy, neighbourhood effects, sociological, and critical urban social movement literature reviewed, organizations were treated as sites for community interaction, as reflections of local neighbourhood effects, and as vehicles in political class struggle (McQuarrie and Marwell, 2009).

While recent literature has examined the influence of local community factors (e.g. laws and tax rates) and interpersonal networks on organizations (Marquis and Battilana, 2009; Marquis and Lounsbury, 2007; Scott and Storper, 2003), there is a gap in academic scholarship and literature with regards to the activities, practices, service-delivery and advocacy efforts that organizations engage in to foster and sustain capacity for neighbourhood collective efficacy, and to leverage that capacity toward larger-scale system changes. Small and Allard's (2013) call for research that looks beyond individuals and their neighbourhoods to include the organizations that structure their lives, the systems in which those organizations are embedded, and the institutions that regulate both bears repeating. This review has also highlighted a scarcity of Canadian scholarship examining the role of collective efficacy in neighbourhoods, as well as a lack of comparative research that explores the disparate effects that local state regimes and histories vis-à-vis immigration may have on neighbourhood collective efficacy.

In establishing a direction for future research, Slater's (2013) critique of the "new cottage industry" of neighbourhood effects research can be echoed here. Perhaps it is time to shift focus beyond the neighbourhood itself, and begin to examine its outward links in order to develop a more strategic spatial approach to deprivation which acknowledges the city, or region-wide economy (Matthews, 2012).

Collective efficacy research will also benefit from a new direction that brings focus to the autonomous experiences of individuals in a post-Fordist climate of austerity and the widespread roll-back of state financing for social infrastructures and social services across the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and Australia, alongside the downloading of financial and administrative responsibilities for these services to local organizations. Moving away from a more traditional collective efficacy approach to understanding the capacities of neighbours to remain resilient under place-specific "effects," research must attend to the goals, strengths, assets and intentions that underscore collaboration in and across neighbourhoods; examining the processes and outcomes of collaboration and collective action while at the same time honouring individual experiences, wisdoms, and perspectives in order to create strategies that are tailored to the residents who lead, participate in, and contribute to the work of community-based organizations, and, more broadly, to neighbourhood change.

---

## 11. References

---

- Aldrich, H. (1999). *Organizations Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Aldrich, H. and Ruif, M. (2006). *Organizations Evolving: Second Edition*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Alexander, L. (2012). Hip-Hop and Housing: Revisiting Culture, Urban Space, Power, and Law, *Hastings Law Journal*, 63, 803–825.
- Allard, Scott W. and Small, M. (2013). *Reconsidering the Urban Disadvantaged: The Role of Systems, Institutions, and Organizations*. Chicago: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Amin, A. (2002) Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity. *Environment and Planning A*, 34(6), 959–980.
- Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology*, 4, 359–373.
- Bandura, A. (ed.). (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Personal efficacy in psychobiologic functioning. In G. V. Caprara (ed.), *Bandura: A Leader in Psychology* (pp. 43–66). Milan, Italy: Franco Angeli.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 75-78.
- Block, R., and C. Block (2000). The Bronx and Chicago: Street robbery in the environs of rapid transit stations. In V. Goldsmith, P. McGuire, J. Mollenkopf, and T. Ross (eds.), *Analyzing Crime Patterns: Frontiers of Practice*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage.
- Brenner, N., Marcuse, P., and Mayer, M. (2012). Cities for people, not for profit: an introduction. In N. Brenner, P. Marcuse, and M. Mayer (eds.), *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City* (pp. 1–10). London: Routledge.
- Brenner, N. and Theodore, N., (eds.) (2002), *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Briscoe, F. and Safford, S. (2010). Employee affinity groups: Their evolution from social movement vehicles to employer strategies. *Perspectives on Work*, 14(1), 42–73.
- Brown, B., Perkins, D., and Brown, G. (2004). Incivilities, place attachments and crime: Block and individual effects. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24, 359–371.
- Brown, B., Perkins, D., and Douglas, D. (1992). Disruptions in place attachments. *Human Behavior & Environment: Advances in theory & research*, 12, 279–304.
- Brown, S., and J. Warner (1985). Using daily stock returns: The case of event studies. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 14, 3–31.

- Carroll, J., Rosson, M., Zhou, J. (2005). *Collective Efficacy as a Measure of Community*. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. New York: ACM.
- Cerda, M., Morenoff, J., Duque, L. F. and Buka, S. L. (2008). The limits of collective efficacy: Investigating the influence of neighborhood context on levels of violence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Sheraton Boston and the Boston Marriott Copley Place, Boston, MA.
- Davis, G., McAdam, D., Richard, W., Mayer, S. and Zald, N. (eds.). (2005). *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, G., Morril, C., Rao, H, Soule, S. (2008). Introduction: Social movements in organizations and markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 141–173.
- Demir, K. (2008). Transformational leadership and collective efficacy: the moderating roles of collaborative culture and teachers' self-efficacy. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 9–112.
- Deuchar, R. (2010) Prevention through formal and informal education, in: M. Herzog-Evans (ed.) *Transnational Criminology Manual*. Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- Dimopoulou, E. (2012). Self efficacy and collective efficacy beliefs of teachers for children with autism. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal*, 3, 509-520.
- Earls, F.J., Brooks-Gunn, J., Raudenbush, S.W., and Sampson, R.J. (1997). Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods: Community Survey, 1994- 1995. Boston, MA: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR).
- Edin, K., and Lein, L. (1997). *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Fallis, K., and Opatow, W. (2003). Are students failing school or are schools failing students? Class cutting in high school, *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(1), 103–119.
- Ferguson, K., and Mindel, C. (2007). Modeling fear of crime in Dallas neighborhoods: A test of social capital theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53, 322–349.
- Fine, M., Burns, A., Payne, Y. A., and Torre, M. E. (2004). Civics lessons: The color and class of betrayal. *Teachers College Record*, 106, 2193–2223.
- Fine, M., and Ruglis, J. (2009). Circuits of dispossession: The racialized and classed realignment of the public sphere for youth in the U.S. *Transforming Anthropology*, 17(1), 20–33.
- Fortier, A.M. (2007). Too close for comfort: Loving thy neighbour and the management of multicultural intimacies, *Environment and Planning D*, 25(1), 104–119.
- Franzini, L., Caughy, M., Spears, W., and Esquer, M. (2005). Neighborhood economic conditions, social processes, and self-rated health in low-income neighborhoods in Texas: A multilevel latent variable model. *Social Science and Medicine*, 61, 1135–1150.
- Galster, G. and Killen, S. (1995). The geography of metropolitan opportunity: A reconnaissance and conceptual framework, *Housing Policy Debate*, 6, 7–43.
- Gans, H. (1969). Culture and class in the study of poverty. In D.P Moynihan (ed.), *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences* (pp. 201–228). New York: Basic Books.
- Garnett, N.S. (2010). Affordable Private Education and the Middle Class City. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 77(1), 201–222.
- Ghosh, S. (2014). Everyday lives in vertical neighbourhoods: Exploring Bangladeshi residential spaces in Toronto's inner suburbs. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(6), 2008–2024.
- Goddard, R.D. (2001). Collective efficacy: A neglected construct in the study of schools and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(3), 467–476.



- Goddard, R.D. (2002). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the measurement of collective efficacy: The development of a short form, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62(1), 97–110.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact of student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 479–507.
- Goddard, R.D., Hoy, W.K, Hoy, A.W. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical development, empirical evidence, and future directions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 479–507
- Gould, R. (2003). Why do movements matter? Rationalist and structuralist interpretations. In M. Diani and D. McAdam (eds.), *Social Movements and Networks* (pp. 233–257). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guest, A. M. (2000). The mediate community: The nature of local and extralocal ties within the metropolis, *Urban Affairs Review*, 35: 603–627.
- Guest, A.M., and Lee, B.A. (1983). The social organization of local areas. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 19, 217–240.
- Harding, D., Wyse, J., Dobson, C., and Morenoff, J. (2011). *Making Ends Meet after Prison: How Former Prisoners Use Employment, Social Support, Public Benefits, and Crime to Meet their Basic Material Needs*. Population Studies Center (PSC) Research Report No. 11-748. <http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/pubs/pdf/rr11-748.pdf>
- Haynes, R., Daras, K., Reading, R., and Jones, A. (2007). Modifiable neighbourhood units, zone design and residents' perceptions. *Health & Place*, 13: 812–25.
- Jacobs, J. (2006), A geography of big things. *Cultural Geography*, 13, 1–27.
- King, B.G., and Soule, S.A. (2007). Social movements as extrainstitutional entrepreneurs: The effect of protests on stock price returns, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52, 413–442.
- King, M., and Haveman, H. (2008). Antislavery in America: The press, the pulpit, and the rise of anti-slavery societies, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 492–528.
- Leitner, H., Peck, J. and Sheppard, E. (2006). *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers*, New York: Guilford Press.
- Lin, C., and Peng, T. 2010. From organizational citizenship behaviour to team performance: The mediation of group cohesion and collective efficacy, *Management and Organization Review*, 6(1), 55-75.
- Maimon, D., and Browning, C. (2010). Unstructured socializing, collective efficacy and violent behavior among urban youth. *Criminology*, 48(2), 443–474.
- Manley, D., van Ham, M, Bailey, M., and Maclennan, D. (2013). *Neighbourhood Effects or Neighbourhood-Based Problems? A Policy Context*, New York: Springer Publishing.
- Marquis, C., and Battilana, J. (2009). Acting globally but thinking locally? The enduring influence of local communities on organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 283–302.
- Marquis, C., Glynn, M. A., and Davis, G. F. (2007). Community isomorphism and corporate social action. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 925–945.
- Marquis, C. and Lounsbury, M. (2007). Vive la resistance: Consolidation and community-level professional counter-mobilization in U.S. banking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 799–820.
- Mascovsky, J. (1999). *Fighting for Our Lives: Poverty and AIDS Activism in Neoliberal Philadelphia*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Dissertation Services.
- Matthews, P. (2012). From area-based initiatives to strategic partnerships: have we lost the meaning of regeneration? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 30(1), 147-161.
- Mawhinney, H., Haas, J., and Wood, C. (2005). Teachers' collective efficacy beliefs in professional learning communities. *Leading and Management*, 11(2), 12-45.

- Mayer, M. (2000). Social movements in European cities: Transitions from the 1970s to the 1990s. In A. Bagnasco and P. Le Galès (eds.) *Cities in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 131–152). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, M. (2003). The onward sweep of social capital: Causes and consequences for understanding cities, communities and urban movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(1), 110–132.
- Mayer, M. (2006). Manuel Castells' *The City and the Grassroots*, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30 (1): 202–206.
- Mayer, M. (2009). The 'right to the city' in the context of shifting mottos of urban social movements. *City*, 13 (2-3), 362–374.
- Mayer, M. (2012). The "right to the city" in urban social movements. In N. Brenner, P. Marcuse, and M. Mayer (eds.), *Cities for People, Not for Profit* (pp. 63–85). London: Routledge.
- Mayer, M. (2013). First World urban activism: Beyond austerity urbanism and creative city politics. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, 17(1), 5–19.
- Mayer, M., and Künkel, J. (2011). Introduction: Neoliberal urbanism and its contestations – crossing theoretical boundaries. In J. Künkel and M. Mayer (eds.), *Neoliberal Urbanism and Its Contestations – Crossing Theoretical Boundaries* (pp. 3–26). London: Palgrave Publications.
- McAdam, D., and Snow, D. (eds.). (2010). *Readings on Social Movements: Origins, Dynamics and Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McQuarrie, M., and Marwell, N. (2009). The missing organizational dimension in urban sociology. *City and Community*, 8(3), 247–268.
- Meares, T. (2002). Praying for community policing, *California Law Review*, 90(5), 1593–1605.
- Mesch, Gustavo S. 1996. The Effect of Environmental Concerns and Governmental Incentives on Organized Action in Local Areas. *Urban Affairs Review*, 1, 346–366.
- Miller, B. and Nicholls, W. (2013). Social Movements in Urban Society: The City as a Space of Politicization. *Urban Geography*, 34(4), 452–473.
- Morenoff, J.D., Sampson, R.J., and Raudenbush, S. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology*, 39, 517–560.
- Moynihan, D. (1968). *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives for the Social Sciences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Nicholls, A. (Ed). (2008). *Social entrepreneurship: new models of sustainable social change*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Mahony, S. and Bechky, B.A. (2008). Boundary organizations: Enabling collaboration among unexpected allies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 422–459
- Patterson, J. (2001). *America's Struggle Against Poverty in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Peck, J., Theodore, N., and Brenner, N. (2009). Postneoliberalism and its malcontents. *Antipode*, 41(1), 94–116.
- Pitner, R., Yu, M. and Brown, E. (2013). Which factor has more impact? An examination of the effects of income level, perceived neighborhood disorder, and crime on community care and vigilance among low-income African American residents. *Race and Social Problems*, 5, 57-64.
- Ramirez, S. (2011). *Immigration, Collective Efficacy and Neighbourhood Participation: Exploring the Limits of Social Control in Seattle and Brisbane*. (Doctor in Philosophy). The University of Washington, Seattle.

- Rosenbaum, J.E., Reynolds, L., and Deluca, S. (2002). How do places matter? The geography of opportunity, self-efficacy, and a look inside the black box of residential mobility. *Housing Studies*, 17 (1), 71–82.
- Rossi, F. (2005). Emergence, rise and fall of a social movement: the popular neighborhood assemblies and Buenos Aires, 2001-2003. *European Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 78, 67–88.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1–28.
- Sampson, R.J. (2002). Transcending tradition: New directions in community research, Chicago style. *Criminology*, 40, 213–230.
- Sampson, R.J. (2004). Neighborhood and community: Collective efficacy and community safety. *New Economy*, 11, 106–113.
- Sampson, R.J. (2006). How does community context matter? Social mechanisms and the explanation of crime. In P-O. Wikström and R.J. Sampson (eds.), *The Explanation of Crime: Context, Mechanisms, and Development* (pp. 31–60). New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sampson, R.J. (2008). Moving to inequality: Neighborhood effects and experiments meet social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(1), 189–231.
- Sampson, R. J. (2009). Disparity and diversity in the contemporary city: Social (dis) order revisited. *British Journal of Sociology*, 60, 1-31.
- Sampson, R.J. (2012). *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sampson, R.J. (2013). When disaster strikes, it's survival of the sociable. *New Scientist*, May 2013. [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/sampson/files/when\\_disaster\\_strikes.pdf](http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/sampson/files/when_disaster_strikes.pdf)
- Sampson, R.J. and Earls, F.J. (1997). Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918–924.
- Sampson, R.J., and Groves, B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(4), 774–802.
- Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D., and Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: Spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 633–660.
- Sampson, R., and Raudenbush, S. (1999). Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 603–651.
- Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S., and Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy, *Science*, 27, 918–924.
- Sayer, A. (2005) *The Moral Significance of Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, A. (2000). *The Cultural Economy of Cities*. London: Sage.
- Scott, W. Richard. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Scott, A., and Storper, M. (2003). Regions, globalization, development. *Regional Studies*, 37 (6/7), 579–593.
- Small, M., and Allard, S. (2013). *Reconsidering the Urban Disadvantaged: The Role of Systems, Institutions, and Organizations*. Chicago: Sage Publications.
- Small, M.L. and J. Feldman. (2015). Ethnographic Evidence, Heterogeneity, and Neighbourhood Effects after Moving to Opportunity. In van Ham M., Manley D., Bailey N., Simpson L. & Maclennan D. (eds). *Neighbourhood Effects Research: New Perspectives*. Springer: Dordrecht.

- Slater, Tom. (2013). Your life chances affect where you live: A critique of the “cottage industry” of neighbourhood effects research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), 367–387.
- Sutherland, A., Brunton-Smith, I., and Jackson, J. (2013). Collective efficacy and violence in London', *British Journal of Criminology*, 53: 1050–74.
- Swaroop, S., and Morenoff, J. (2004). Building community: The neighborhood context of social organization. *Social Forces*, 84(3), 1665–1695.
- Uitermark, J., Nicholls, W., and Loopmans, M. (2012). Cities and social movements: theorizing beyond the right to the city. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(11), 2546–2554.
- van Eijk, G. (2012). Good neighbours in bad neighbourhoods: Narratives of dissociation and practices of neighbouring in problem places. *Urban Studies*, 49(14), 3009–3026.
- Villarreal, A., and Silva, B.F. (2006). Social cohesion, criminal victimization and perceived risk of crime in Brazilian neighborhoods. *Social Forces*, 84(3): 1725–1753.
- Walks, A. (2013). Income Inequality and Polarization in Canada's Cities: An Examination and New Form of Measurement. University of Toronto Cities Centre: Research Paper No. 227.
- Wagenaar, H. (2007). Governance, complexity, and democratic participation: How citizens and public officials harness the complexities of neighborhood decline. *American Review of Public Administration*, 37(1), 17–50.
- Wellesley Institute. (2008). *We Are Neighbours: The Impact of Supportive Housing on Community, Social, Economic, and Attitude Changes*. <http://www.peelregion.ca/housing/peelbuilds/pdf/weareneighbours.pdf>
- Wells, W., Schafer, J., Varano, S., and Bynum, T. (2006). Neighborhood residents' production of order: The effects of collective efficacy on responses to neighborhood problems. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(4), 523–550.
- Wikström, P.O. (2010). Explaining crime as a moral action. In S. Hitlin and S. Vaysey (eds.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Morality*. New York: Springer.
- Wikström, P.O., Oberwittler, D., Treiber, K., and Hardie, B. (2012). *Breaking Rules: The Social and Situational Dynamics of Young People's Urban Crime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zald, M. (2005). The strange career of an idea and its resurrection: Social movements in organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 157–166.
- Zald, M. (2008). Epilogue: Social movements and political sociology in the analysis of organizations and markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53, 568–574.

---

## 12. Appendices

---

### Appendix A

#### Community Survey Questionnaire Items

**Description:** The Community Survey measured the structural conditions and organization of Chicago's neighbourhoods with respect to the structural make-up of the local community, the neighbourhood organizational and political structures, information and formal social control, cultural values, and social cohesion (Sampson et al., 1997). The Community Survey was conducted in 1994-1995 and consisted of household interviews with 8,782 adult Chicago residents from 343 neighborhood clusters. The data collected was used to create the Likert-type items on the Collective Efficacy Scale (Sampson et al., 1997). Variables include measures of characteristics of their neighbourhood (including types of social service agencies available), the best and worst aspects of living in Chicago, how long residents had lived in a particular neighbourhood, and if they would consider moving to a different neighbourhood and why. Other community variables measure the relationships among neighbours, including how many neighbours a respondent would recognize, how often neighbours socialized, and how often neighbours participated in other activities together.

#### Items

For each of these statements, please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

- a. If there is a problem around here, the neighbors get together to deal with it.
- b. This is a close-knit neighborhood.
- c. When you get right down to it, no one in this neighborhood cares much about what happens to me.
- d. There are adults in this neighborhood that children can look up to.
- e. People around here are willing to help their neighbors.

- f. People in this neighborhood generally don't get along with each other.
- g. You can count on adults in this neighborhood to watch out that children are safe and don't get in trouble.
- h. If I had to borrow \$30 in an emergency, I could borrow it from a neighbor.
- i. When I am away from home, I know that my neighbors will keep their eyes open for possible trouble to my place.
- j. In this neighbourhood people mostly go their own way.
- k. People in this neighborhood do not share the same values.
- l. If I were sick I could count on my neighbors to shop for groceries for me.
- m. People in this neighborhood can be trusted.
- n. Parents in this neighborhood know their children's friends.
- o. Children around here have no place to play but the street.
- p. Adults in this neighborhood know who the local children are.
- q. The equipment and buildings in the park or playground that is closest to where I live are well kept.
- r. The park or playground closest to where I live is safe during the day.
- s. The park or playground closest to where I live is safe at night.
- t. Parents in this neighborhood generally know each other.

Adapted from Earls, F.J, Brooks-Gunn, J, Raudenbush, S.W. and Sampson, R.J. *Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighbourhoods: Community Survey, 1994-1995*. ICPSR 2766. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2007-10-29. <http://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02766.v3>.

## Appendix B

### Collective Efficacy Scale

**Description:** The 12-item Collective Efficacy Scale evolved from a 21-item survey developed by Goddard et al. (2001). The two variables are task analysis (TA), which measures the constraints and opportunities embedded in teaching students, and group competence (GC), which assesses judgements about the capabilities that a school staff bring to bear upon teaching tasks (Goddard, 2002). Cronbach's alpha reliability was calculated for each scale (TA = 0.84; GC = 0.75).

**Items:**

- Teachers in this school are able to get through to difficult students (GC).
- Teachers here are confident they will be able to motivate their students (GC).
- Teachers in this school really believe every child can learn (GC).
- If a child doesn't want to learn, teachers here give up (GC).
- Teachers here don't have the skills needed to produce meaningful student learning (GC).
- Students at this school come to school ready to learn (TA).
- Home life provides so many advantages the students here are bound to learn (TA).
- Students here just aren't motivated to learn (TA).
- The opportunities in this community help ensure that students will learn (TA).
- Learning is more difficult at this school because students are worried about their safety (TA).
- Drug and alcohol abuse in the community make learning difficult for students here (TA).
- Teachers in this school do not have the skills to deal with student disciplinary problems (GC).

Adapted from Goddard, R.D. (2002), A theoretical and empirical analysis of the measurement of collective efficacy: The development of a short form, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62, Copyright 2002 by Sage Publications.

## Appendix C

### Community Collective Efficacy Scale

**Description:** Listed below are the factor loadings for 17 collective efficacy items that are intended to form a comprehensive analysis of efficacy-related goals and obstacles for the community domain. These 17 items load onto four factors in the CCE scale, derived from household survey data (N=146). The four factors are:

- Factor 1: “Managing Conflict”, dealing with the community’s capacity to manage “dilemmas and tradeoffs”);
- Factor 2: “Development”, relating to goals and policies on growth and the environment ;
- Factor 3: “United Action”, or the community’s ability to cooperate and deal with problems collectively;
- Factor 4: “Social Services”, with respect to state support for education and access to services for seniors and people with disabilities (Carroll et al., 2005).

The 17 factor loadings are: (1) assist economically disadvantaged, (2) increase tourism, (3) improve roads, (4) improve quality of life, (5) improve quality of education, (6) preserve parklands, (7) handle mistakes and setbacks, (8) improve quality of community facilities, (9) present united community vision, (10) quality and access to services by disabled people, (11) commit to common community goals, (12) clean air and water, (13) work together, (14) resolve crises, (15) enact fair laws, (16) create resources for new jobs, and (17) improve services for senior citizens.

The obstacles are: (1) problems with the economy, (2) maintenance of unique character, (3) opposition from adjacent counties and states, (4) limited resources, (5 and 6) population growth, (7) discouragement, (8) difficulties, (9) inadequate help from the federal government, (10) work and family obligations, (11) commercial development, (12) a great deal of effort, (13) negative after-effects, (14) conflicts in the larger society, and (15) changes in the economy.

#### Items:

1. Our community can enact fair laws, despite conflicts in the larger society.
2. I am confident that our community can create adequate resources to develop new jobs despite changes in the economy.
3. Our community can present itself in ways that increase tourism while maintaining its unique character.
4. Despite occasional problems with the economy, we can assist economically disadvantaged members of our community.
5. We can resolve crises in the community without any negative aftereffects.



6. I am convinced that we can improve the quality of life in the community, even when resources are scarce.
7. We can greatly improve the roads in Blacksburg County, even when there is strong opposition from adjacent countries and states.
8. Despite a growing population, our community can preserve parklands in Blacksburg County.
9. We can ensure that the air and water in our community remain clean despite commercial development.
10. Our community can cooperate in the face of difficulties to improve the quality of community facilities.
11. Despite work and family obligations, we can commit ourselves to common community goals.
12. As a community, we can handle mistakes and setbacks without getting discouraged.
13. I am confident that we can be united in the community vision we present to outsiders.
14. The people of our community can continue to work together, even if it requires a great deal of effort.
15. Our community can improve the quality of education in Blacksburg County without the help of the Commonwealth of Virginia.
16. Our community can improve quality and access to services for people with disabilities without help from the federal government.
17. Our community can greatly improve services for senior citizens in Blacksburg County without the help of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Adapted from Carroll, J., Rosson, M., Zhou, J. (2005). *Collective Efficacy as a Measure of Community*. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. New York: ACM.

## Appendix D

### Typology of Local Social Organization

**Description:** The typology above describes Swaroop and Morenoff's (2004: 10) measures of local social organization based on whether the motivation for community participation is expressive or instrumental, and whether the type of participation is informal or formal. Descriptive statistics for each of the four outcome measures were drawn from the PHDCN Community Survey (1994–1995, see Appendix A).

Informal expressive participation is measured by a two-item scale of local social ties, which is the “combined average of two measures capturing the number of friends and relatives that respondents reported living in the neighbourhood” (Swaroop and Morenoff, 2004: 10). The authors classify social ties as expressive because “they are the product of sociability and neighbourliness rather than purposeful decisions to protect neighbourhood interests and personal investment” (Swaroop and Morenoff, 2004: 10). The measure of formal expressive participation is a sum of the number of expressive organizations to which the respondent, or any member of the respondent's household, belongs.

#### Items:

<b>Motivation</b>	<i>Formal</i>	<i>Informal</i>
<i>Instrumental</i>	<b>Instrumental Organizations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community council</li> <li>- block group or tenant association</li> <li>- local political organization</li> <li>- neighbourhood watch</li> </ul>	<b>Problem-Solving Actions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- talking with politician</li> <li>- talking with minister</li> <li>- attending action-oriented meetings</li> <li>- getting together with neighbours to take action</li> </ul>
<i>Expressive</i>	<b>Expressive Organizations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- religious group/ organization</li> <li>- civic group</li> <li>- ethnic assoc</li> </ul>	<b>Informal Neighbouring</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- doing favours for neighbours (reciprocal rshps)</li> <li>- inviting neighbours to social gatherings</li> </ul>

Adapted from Swaroop, S., and Morenoff, J. (2004). Building community: The neighborhood context of social organization. *Social Forces* 84(3), 1665–1695.