Universität Zürich
Pädagogisches Institut

University of Cambridge
Institute of Criminology

z-proso *Zürcher Projekt zur sozialen Entwicklung von Kindern*

Technical Report

Parent Wave 1

Neighbourhood Characteristics Scale

Source/Developer	Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW & Earls F (1997), "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy", Science, 277(5328), 918 - 924.
Adaptations	z-proso uses the adapted version from the Peterborough study directed by P.O. Wikström. The "Social Network" subscale has been added by D. Oberwittler.
Description	The purpose of this scale is to measure neighbourhood characteristics believed to be associated with low cohesion among residents and low social capital.
Measured Concepts/ Subdimensions	Four subscales: 1. *Collective efficacy* Measures to what extent neighbours would intervene in case of problems 2. *Social cohesion* Measures to what extent people in a neighbourhood have a feeling of belonging together 3. *Intergenerational closure* Measures to what extent parents in the neighbourhood are believed to be looking after each others' children 4. *Social networks subscale* Measures the level of everyday interaction among neighbours
Number of Items	19
Response Categories	• *Collective efficacy, social cohesion & intergenerational closure scales:* 5-point Likert scale (from "very unlikely/very much disagree" to "very likely/very much agree") • *Social networks scale:* 4-point Likert scale (from "never" to "often")
Item Examples	• "If some children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building, how likely is it that your neighbours would do something about it?" (Collective efficacy) • "Parents in this neighbourhood generally know each other." (Intergenerational closure) • "People in this neighbourhood can be trusted." (Social cohesion) • "(Have you …) talked to neighbours about personal things." (Social networks)
Administration History	Wave 1

Neighbourhood Characteristics Scale – Subscale "Collective Efficacy"

Variable Values
- 5-point Likert scale
  1- very unlikely
  2- unlikely
  3- neither likely nor unlikely
  4- likely
  5- very likely

  7- Does not apply *(MISSING)*
  8- Don't know/ Can't remember *(MISSING)*
  9- No answer/ Answer refused *(MISSING)*

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
V3010	Collective Efficacy 1	If a group of neighbourhood children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, how likely is it that your neighbours would do something about it?	73 (5.9%)
V3020	Collective Efficacy 2	If some children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building, how likely is it that your neighbours would do something about it?	42 (3.4%)
V3030	Collective Efficacy 3	If there was a fight in front of your house and someone was being beaten or threatened, how likely is it that your neighbours would break it up?	69 (5.6%)
V3040	Collective Efficacy 4	If a child was showing disrespect to an adult, how likely is it that people in your neighbourhood would tell off or scold that child?	61 (4.9%)
V3050	Collective Efficacy 5	Suppose that because of budget cuts the post office closest to your home was going to be closed down by the post authorities. How likely is it that neighbourhood residents would organize to try to do something to keep the post office open?	122 (9.9%)

Total N = 1237

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed (α = .632)
V3010	Collective Efficacy 1	3.47	1.40	1	5	-.561	-1.08	.466	.535
V3020	Collective Efficacy 2	4.09	1.10	1	5	-1.37	1.17	.457	.549
V3030	Collective Efficacy 3	3.99	1.16	1	5	-1.22	.630	.433	.557
V3040	Collective Efficacy 4	3.74	1.08	1	5	-.867	.067	.432	.560
V3050	Collective Efficacy 5	3.12	1.37	1	5	-.069	-1.35	.193	.681

Comments: The variable V3050 has been excluded from the scale due to the low item-scale correlation.

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Collective Efficacy Subscale (P1_colef)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	df	F	p
Full sample	1184	2.83	.849	.000	4.00	-.968	.950			
Gender								1	.915	.339
Girls	570	2.80	.852	.000	4.00	-.918	.972			
Boys	614	2.85	.846	.000	4.00	-1.02	.959			
Treatment								3	1.99	.114
Control	318	2.85	.885	.000	4.00	-1.09	1.12			
Triple P	285	2.87	.825	.000	4.00	-.724	.411			
PATHS	329	2.86	.783	.000	4.00	-1.01	1.27			
Combination	252	2.71	.904	.000	4.00	-.950	.767			
Language								8	3.82	.000
German	790	2.88	.795	.000	4.00	-.873	.597			
Albanian	67	2.49	1.39	.000	4.00	-.778	-.678			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	84	2.81	.863	.000	4.00	-.687	.479			
English	25	2.36	.889	1.00	4.00	.031	-.995			
Italian	17	2.72	1.06	.250	4.00	-.872	.141			
Portuguese	69	2.96	.695	.500	4.00	-.945	1.60			
Spanish	46	2.88	.662	1.25	4.00	-.258	-.367			
Tamil	48	2.53	.814	.250	3.80	-.784	.455			
Turkish	38	2.78	.761	.250	4.00	-1.14	1.98			

Comments:

1) The variable V3050 has been excluded from the scale. The scale has been constructed by taking the average of the remaining variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 1. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the language groups ($F(8,1175) =3.82$, $p<.001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for both the gender groups ($F(1,1182) =.915$, $p>.05$) and the treatment groups ($F(3,1180) =1.99$, $p>.05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Collective Efficacy Subscale (P1_colef)

Variable	r	Full Sample p[1]	N	r	Girls p[1]	N	r	Boys p[1]	N
Subscales									
Social Cohesion	.416	***	1138	.398	***	547	.434	***	591
Intergenerational Closure	.422	***	1166	.392	***	561	.453	***	605
Social Networks	.327	***	1180	.332	***	568	.324	***	612
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	.056	ns	1177	.066	ns	565	.043	ns	612
Prosociality	.069	*	1166	.082	ns	561	.069	ns	605
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	-.029	ns	1147	.013	ns	555	-070	ns	592
Prosociality	.006	ns	1126	.055	ns	544	-.019	ns	582
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.038	ns	1163	.071	ns	563	.004	ns	600
Prosociality	.034	ns	1163	.005	ns	563	.067	ns	600

[1] *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, ns p>.05

Comments: The collective efficacy subscale is positively and significantly correlated with the three other positive subscales, both in the full sample and in each of the gender groups separetely. But the moderate correlations cast some doubt on the divergent validity of the subscale. The subscale yields very low predictive validity since the correlations between the collective efficacy subscale and the levels of child aggression and prosociality derived from parent, teacher and child assessments are very low and generally not significant. The direction of the correlation between the level of collective efficacy and that of child aggression is positive when the source is the parent or the child him/herself, pointing to the low predictive validity.

Neighbourhood Characteristics Scale – Subscale "Social Cohesion"

Variable Values

- 5-point Likert scale
  1- very much disagree
  2- somewhat disagree
  3- neither agree nor disagree
  4- somewhat agree
  5- very much agree

  7- Does not apply *(MISSING)*
  8- Don't know/ Can't remember *(MISSING)*
  9- No answer/ Answer refused *(MISSING)*

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
V3110	Social Cohesion 1	People around here are willing to help their neighbours	37 (3.0%)
V3120	Social Cohesion 2	This is a close knit neighbourhood	41 (3.3%)
V3130	Social Cohesion 3	People in this neighbourhood can be trusted	65 (5.3%)
V3140	Social Cohesion 4	People in this neighbourhood generally don't get along with each other	44 (3.6%)
V3150	Social Cohesion 5	People in this neighbourhood share the same values	108 (8.7%)

Total N = 1237

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed (α = .761)
V3110	Social Cohesion 1	3.98	1.13	1	5	-1.24	.790	.620	.686
V3120	Social Cohesion 2	3.46	1.23	1	5	-.556	-.714	.600	.691
V3130	Social Cohesion 3	3.85	1.13	1	5	-1.01	.353	.633	.680
V3140_r	Social Cohesion 4	3.96	1.05	1	5	-1.02	.465	.419	.753
V3150	Social Cohesion 5	3.03	1.20	1	5	-.223	-1.05	.392	.768

Comments: The variable V3140 has been reverse-scored.

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Social Cohesion Subscale (P1_socoh)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	df	F	p
Full sample	1167	2.67	.823	.000	4.00	-.718	.303			
Gender								1	.180	.671
Girls	562	2.68	.835	.000	4.00	-.747	.400			
Boys	605	2.66	.812	.000	4.00	-.691	.217			
Treatment								3	3.04	.028
Control	310	2.74	.799	.200	4.00	-.591	-.141			
Triple P	284	2.59	.787	.000	4.00	-.432	.148			
PATHS	326	2.73	.834	.000	4.00	-.837	.414			
Combination	247	2.59	.865	.000	4.00	-.980	.721			
Language								8	8.36	.000
German	780	2.76	.750	.000	4.00	-.797	.592			
Albanian	70	2.75	1.00	.400	4.00	-.588	-.694			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	84	2.62	.864	.000	4.00	-.749	.641			
English	25	2.53	1.01	.250	4.00	-.654	.024			
Italian	13	1.92	.894	.000	3.00	-.772	.164			
Portuguese	70	2.14	.940	.200	4.00	-.064	-.504			
Spanish	41	2.25	.965	.200	4.00	-.436	-.350			
Tamil	47	2.60	.457	1.40	3.40	-.637	.414			
Turkish	37	2.53	.986	.000	4.00	-.199	-.579			

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Social Cohesion Subscale (P1_socoh)

Variable	Full Sample			Girls			Boys		
	r	p[1]	N	r	p[1]	N	r	p[1]	N
Subscales									
Collective Efficacy	.416	***	1138	.398	***	547	.434	***	591
Intergenerational Closure	.592	***	1155	.594	***	557	.590	***	598
Social Networks	.476	***	1162	.443	***	561	.509	***	601
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	.032	ns	1161	.002	ns	558	.060	ns	603
Prosociality	.111	***	1153	.149	***	556	.077	ns	597
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	-.153	***	1128	-.082	ns	547	-.208	***	581
Prosociality	.027	ns	1107	.048	ns	536	.003	ns	571
Child SBQ									
Aggression	-.002	ns	1143	.011	ns	553	-.012	ns	590
Prosociality	.026	ns	1143	.020	ns	553	.027	ns	590

[1] *** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$, ns $p>.05$

Comments: The social cohesion subscale is positively and significantly correlated with all the three subscales, both in the full sample and in each of the gender groups separetely. The Pearson correlation coefficient ranges from moderate to substantial, ponting to the low divergent validity. The correlation between the level of social cohesion and that of child aggression is significant only when the informant is the teacher and only for the boys and the full sample. The Pearson correlation coefficient ranges from low (for the full sample) to moderate (for the boys sample) with the expected negative sign. The correlation between social cohesion and child prosociality is low and significant only when the informant is the parent and only in the full and girls sample. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

Neighbourhood Characteristics Scale – Subscale "Intergenerational Closure"

Variable Values	• 5-point Likert scale 1- very much disagree 2- somewhat disagree 3- neither agree nor disagree 4- somewhat agree 5- very much agree 7- Does not apply *(MISSING)* 8- Don't know/ Can't remember *(MISSING)* 9- No answer/ Answer refused *(MISSING)*

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
V3210	Intergenerational Closure 1	Parents in this neighbourhood generally know each other	36 (2.9%)
V3220	Intergenerational Closure 2	There are adults in this neighbourhood that the children can look up to	87 (7.0%)
V3230	Intergenerational Closure 3	You can count on adults in this neighbourhood to watch out that children are safe and don't get into trouble	44 (3.6%)
V3240	Intergenerational Closure 4	Adults in this neighbourhood know who the local children are	22 (1.8%)

Total N = 1237

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed (α = .669)
V3210	Intergenerational Closure 1	4.15	1.03	1	5	-1.41	1.46	.479	.584
V3220	Intergenerational Closure 2	3.67	1.19	1	5	-.989	.104	.417	.631
V3230	Intergenerational Closure 3	3.75	1.19	1	5	-.926	-.061	.505	.564
V3240	Intergenerational Closure 4	4.42	.827	1	5	-1.83	3.76	.435	.623

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Intergenerational Closure Subscale (P1_intclo)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skew-ness	Kurtosis	df	F	p
Full sample	1204	3.01	.763	.000	4.00	-.943	.769			
Gender								1	.031	.859
Girls	581	3.00	.783	.000	4.00	-.952	.615			
Boys	623	3.01	.745	.000	4.00	-.933	.939			
Treatment								3	1.07	.361
Control	319	3.00	.791	.000	4.00	-.916	.584			
Triple P	296	2.95	.750	.670	4.00	-.676	.070			
PATHS	336	3.06	.754	.000	4.00	-1.34	2.13			
Combination	253	3.01	.755	.500	4.00	-.789	.384			
Language								8	6.13	.000
German	793	3.07	.708	.000	4.00	-1.00	1.08			
Albanian	74	2.87	.820	.750	4.00	-.477	-.319			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	89	3.17	.718	.750	4.00	-1.10	1.05			
English	24	2.75	.950	.330	4.00	-.799	.184			
Italian	18	2.61	1.10	.500	4.00	-.623	-.809			
Portuguese	72	2.99	.804	.750	4.00	-.748	.022			
Spanish	46	2.48	1.08	.000	4.00	-.603	-.530			
Tamil	48	2.77	.672	1.25	4.00	-.266	-.080			
Turkish	40	2.87	.735	1.33	4.00	-.145	-.974			

Comments:

1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of the four variables. The maximum number of missing values allowed was 1. For

the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.

2) The results of the ANOVA are highly significant for the language groups ($F(8,1195)$ =6.13, $p<.001$). ANOVA yielded no significant results for both the gender groups ($F(1,1202)$ =.031, $p>.05$) and the treatment groups ($F(3,1200)$ =1.07, $p>.05$).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Intergenerational Closure Subscale (P1_intclo)

Variable	Full Sample r	p[1]	N	Girls r	p[1]	N	Boys r	p[1]	N
Subscales									
Collective Efficacy	.422	***	1166	.392	***	561	.453	***	605
Social Cohesion	.592	***	1155	.594	***	557	.590	***	598
Social Networks	.444	***	1201	.457	***	580	.432	***	621
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	.022	ns	1199	.015	ns	577	.028	ns	622
Prosociality	.110	***	1187	.162	***	573	.068	ns	614
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	-.056	ns	1163	-.068	ns	565	-.053	ns	598
Prosociality	.018	ns	1141	.066	ns	553	-.024	ns	588
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.053	ns	1180	.036	ns	572	.068	ns	608
Prosociality	.040	ns	1180	.043	ns	572	.041	ns	608

[1] *** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$, ns $p>.05$

Comments: The intergenerational closure subscale is positively and significantly correlated with all the three subscales, both in the full sample and in each of the gender groups separetely. The Pearson correlation coefficient ranges from moderate to substantial, pointing to the low divergent validity. The correlation between the level of intergenerational closure and that of child aggression is very low and insignificant, irrespective of the type of the informant and the sample. Further, the direction of the correlation is unexpectedly positive when the informant is the parent or the child. The correlation between the intergenerational closure and the child prosociality is low and only significant when the informant is the parent and only in the full and girls sample. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.

Neighbourhood Characteristics Scale – Subscale "Social Networks"

- 4-point Likert scale
  1. never
  2. rarely
  3. sometimes
  4. often

  7. Does not apply *(MISSING)*
  8. Don't know/ Can't remember *(MISSING)*
  9. No answer/ Answer refused *(MISSING)*

Variable Wording & Case Summary

Variable Name	Label	Wording	Missings (%)
V3310	Social Networks 1	Helped a neighbour with a minor problem (e.g. repair something, help out with some food, etc.)	14 (1.1%)
V3320	Social Networks 2	Watched your neighbour's property when they are out of town	16 (1.3%)
V3330	Social Networks 3	Had lunch or dinner with a neighbour	9 (0.7%)
V3340	Social Networks 4	Talked to neighbours about personal things	10 (0.8%)
V3350	Social Networks 5	Taken care of neighbours' children while the neighbours were away from home	34 (2.8%)

Total N = 1237

Descriptive Statistics

Variable Name	Label	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Item-Scale Correlation	α If Item Removed (α = .820)
V3310	Social Networks1	3.01	.959	1	4	-.794	-.260	.588	.792
V3320	Social Networks 2	2.48	1.19	1	4	-.094	-1.51	.609	.787
V3330	Social Networks 3	2.36	1.07	1	4	-.006	-1.31	.669	.767
V3340	Social Networks 4	2.62	1.00	1	4	-.326	-.963	.601	.788
V3350	Social Networks 5	2.74	1.12	1	4	-.431	-1.17	.603	.787

Sum Index Descriptive Statistics

Social Networks Subscale (P1_socnet)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Kurtosis	ANOVA df	F	p
Full sample	1224	1.64	.815	.000	3.00	-.240	-.889			
Gender								1	.004	.953
Girls	590	1.64	.814	.000	3.00	-.200	-.918			
Boys	634	1.64	.817	.000	3.00	-.278	-.859			
Treatment								3	4.78	.003
Control	324	1.70	.807	.000	3.00	-.336	-.797			
Triple P	299	1.61	.802	.000	3.00	-.116	-.917			
PATHS	340	1.72	.828	.000	3.00	-.377	-.808			
Combination	261	1.49	.806	.000	3.00	-.112	-.938			
Language								8	23.04	.000
German	801	1.85	.749	.000	3.00	-.479	-.515			
Albanian	75	1.20	.906	.000	3.00	.234	-1.22			
Bos./Cro./ Serb.	89	1.41	.717	.000	3.00	.199	-.941			
English	24	1.47	.876	.200	3.00	.175	-.954			
Italian	18	1.26	.769	.000	2.40	-.134	-1.43			
Portuguese	77	1.09	.767	.000	3.00	.341	-.571			
Spanish	50	1.15	.843	.000	3.00	.555	-.472			
Tamil	48	1.24	.625	.000	2.80	.242	-.332			
Turkish	42	1.24	.788	.000	2.80	.282	-.878			

Comments:

1) The scale has been constructed by taking the average of the five variables. The maximum number of missing values was 1. For the purpose of rescaling, 1 has been subtracted from the total scale.

2) The results of the ANOVA are significant for the treatment groups (*F*(3,1220) =4.78, *p*<.01) and for the language groups (*F*(8,1215)

=23.04, *p*<.001). ANOVA yielded no significant results for the gender groups (*F*(1,1222) =.004, *p*>.05).

Correlations with Subscales & DVs

Social Networks Subscale (P1_socnet)

Variable	Full Sample r	p^1	N	Girls r	p^1	N	Boys r	p^1	N
Subscales									
Collective Efficacy	.327	***	1180	.332	***	568	.324	***	612
Social Cohesion	.476	***	1162	.443	***	561	.509	***	601
Intergenerational Closure	.444	***	1201	.457	***	580	.432	***	621
Parent SBQ									
Aggression	155	***	1218	.161	***	585	.155	***	633
Prosociality	.105	***	1204	.119	**	581	.097	*	623
Teacher SBQ									
Aggression	-.103	***	1182	-.092	*	573	-.114	**	609
Prosociality	.057	ns	1161	.096	*	561	.028	ns	600
Child SBQ									
Aggression	.093	**	1199	.109	**	580	.080	*	619
Prosociality	.071	*	1199	.102	*	580	.047	ns	619

[1] *** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, ns p>.05

Comments: The social networks subscale is positively and significantly correlated with all the other three subscales, both in the full sample and in each of the gender groups separetely. The Pearson correlation coefficient ranges from moderate to substantial, pointing to the low divergent validity. The correlation between the level of social networks and that of child aggression is low and significant, irrespective of the type of the informant and the sample. Further, the direction of the correlation is unexpectedly positive when the informant is the parent or the child. The correlation between the social networks and the child prosociality is generally low and significant (only when the informant is the parent or the child) and has the expected positive sign. Overall, the subscale yields low predictive validity.