Collective Efficacy in Miami Neighborhoods

Overview
- Background
- Defining collective efficacy
- Using maps in social science methodology
- Preliminary findings
- Policy considerations
Background

Two inter-related projects:

• Children’s Trust: “Mapping Research Project”
  – Determine levels of collective efficacy in 8 neighborhoods in Miami-Dade County
  – Develop recommendations for interventions and policies based on findings
Collective Efficacy

In combination, collective efficacy involves:
– Willingness to intervene
– Ability to mobilize social control
– Social cohesion and trust

How willing are residents to take responsibility for what goes on in their neighborhood?

If social control, cohesion and trust among residents is high, then crime and disorder are low.
• Neighborhoods with a great deal of collective efficacy experience fewer problems of lawlessness and disorder.

“One of the most important influences on a neighborhood’s crime rate is the willingness for neighbors to act, when needed, for another’s benefit and particularly for the benefit of another’s children.”

Felton Earls, 2004
Collective Efficacy in Miami-Dade County

- Determine levels of CE across the county
- Select neighborhoods for:
  - community surveys and
  - systematic social observations
- Examine crime data, demographics, and levels of poverty.
- Use maps to assist with the methodology
Characteristics of Four Neighborhoods

• Bunche Park in Miami Gardens
  – Residential area with park and elementary school
  – Population of 1,155
  – Mostly African American

• Liberty City/Brownsville
  – Mixed residential/commercial
  – Population of 10,731
  – Mostly African American

• East Little Havana
  – Mixed residential/commercial
  – Population of 9,149
  – Predominately Hispanic

• Seminole Wayside Park
  – Residential area with a park
  – Population of 4,293
  – Hispanic, white
Ecometric Properties of Collective Efficacy
Ecometric Properties of Collective Efficacy

• Issue
  – PHDCN collective efficacy scale is commonly used in research on collective efficacy
  – Little research has been done on the properties of this scale and whether the choice of items is optimum

• Our Research: Find New CE Items
  – Expanded the scale by adding items similar to the domains of the original scale
    • Willingness to Intervene – 12 items
    • Social Cohesion – 11 items
    • Ability to Mobilize Social Control – 6 items
Ecometric Properties of Collective Efficacy

• Preliminary Results: New Items of CE
  – Factor Structure of Scales and Subscales
    • EFA suggests single factor solution for all subscales
    • Two-factor solution for original and new CE scale
      – Social Cohesion items load on one factor
      – Willingness to Intervene and Ability to Mobilize Social Control items load on second factor
  – Reliability of Scales and Subscales
    • High internal consistency of all subscales (alpha = .879, .892, .810)
    • New scale (alpha = .917) ; Old scale (alpha = .802)
Ecometric Properties of Collective Efficacy

• Future Steps
  – Confirmatory Factor Analysis to compare single latent variable model to second order latent variable model
  – Item Response Theory models to assess the unidimensionality of collective efficacy
  – Differential item functioning analyses to determine if particular items function differently for respondents according to demographics (potential item bias)
  – Using IRT to select an optimum subset of items based on scale structure and coverage of latent construct
Does Collective Efficacy Function Similarly in Different Neighborhoods?
Does Collective Efficacy Function Similarly in Different Neighborhoods?

• Issue
  – Substantial research examines collective efficacy as a neighborhood level variable in HLM models
  – Does not consider that collective efficacy could function differently for different neighborhoods

• Our Research
  – Using the responses from the neighborhood surveys
  – Examining the relationship between Collective Efficacy, Incivilities, and Fear of Crime
  – Consider mediating effects within each of the four neighborhoods separately
Does Collective Efficacy Function Similarly in Different Neighborhoods?

- Collective Efficacy – 29 items -- intervene, social control, and social cohesion
- Incivilities – 14 items – dirty/unkempt area, vacant lots, noise, gangs, shootings
- Fear of Crime – 5 items – fear of victimization - (e.g., fear of burglary, assault, drug dealing)
Findings: Liberty City/Brownsville

• Preliminary Results --

Liberty City/Brownsville: Incivilities partially mediate the effect of collective efficacy on fear of crime
Findings: Bunche Park

Incivilities completely mediates the effect of collective efficacy on fear of crime

Note: Dashed line indicates that pathway was significant prior to Perception of Incivilities being added to the model, but not afterwards.
Findings: ELH

Collective Efficacy → Perception of Incivilities → Fear of Crime

East Little Havana: Collective efficacy never has a direct effect on fear of crime, but incivilities do have a direct effect
Findings: SWP

Seminole Wayside Park: Neither collective efficacy nor incivilities have direct effect on fear of crime
Does Collective Efficacy Function Similarly in Different Neighborhoods?

• Future Steps
  – Further refinement of models to incorporate a measurement model for latent constructs
  – Test the model in additional neighborhoods to help identify the variable involved in the interaction
  – Extend the model to consider the relationship between collective efficacy, incivilities, fear of crime, and crime
Does Collective Efficacy Vary *Within* Neighborhoods?
Does Collective Efficacy Vary Within Neighborhoods?

• Issue
  – Research on CE presumes that the neighborhood is the most important level of analysis
  – Little research focused on within neighborhood heterogeneity of collective efficacy and its influence on crime

• Our Research: Kriging
  – We have geo-coded locations of the respondents to the neighborhood surveys
  – We are treating these surveys as if they represent measurements from an underlying smooth spatial surface
  – Kriging is a method for spatial interpolation that allows for the estimation of this surface – similar to rainfall collection
  – For initial examples, we used the Spatial Analyst package in ArcGIS
Intensive Study Area:
Bunche Park
Does CE Vary Within Neighborhoods?

Kriged Estimate of Collective Efficacy Factor Scores in Bunche Park
Kriged Estimate of CE Factor Scores with Homicides (2004-2010) in Bunche Park
Intensive Study Area:
Liberty City/ Brownsville
Does CE Vary within Neighborhoods?
Kriged Estimate of CE Factor Scores with Homicides (2004-2010) in Liberty City/ Brownsville
Intensive Study Area:
East Little Havana

Legend
- Intensive Study Areas

Scale: 0 0.04 0.08 0.16 Miles
Does CE Vary Within Neighborhoods?
Kriged Estimate of CE Factor Scores with Homicides (2004-2010) in East Little Havana
Intensive Study Area:
Seminole Wayside Park

Legend
- Intensive Study Areas
Does CE Vary Within Neighborhoods?
Kriged Estimate of CE Factor Scores
with Homicides (2004-2010)
in Seminole Wayside Park
Does Collective Efficacy Vary Within Neighborhoods?

• Future Steps
  – More work on Kriging capabilities for improved interpolation.
  – Understand what causes local variation in collective efficacy and what impact that this local variation has on crime
  – Use Hierarchical Bayesian Spatial Kriging
What are the Consequences of Different Strategies for Measuring Incivilities?

• Issue:
  – Incivilities are important components of neighborhood-level research

• Our Research:
  – We use three separate measures of incivilities:
    • Perceptions of incivilities measured on the community survey
    • Systematic Social Observations of a sample of face blocks within each neighborhood
    • Video taped walkthroughs of a subsample of these face blocks within some neighborhoods
  – Because we sampled the face blocks based on the original sample of survey respondents, we can link these together
What are the Consequences of Different Strategies for Measuring Incivilities?

• Future Research
  – Validate perceptual measure of incivilities
  – Compare perceptual incivilities to the SSOs of face blocks
  – Compare SSO methods (video, walk-throughs)
Important Considerations

1. Research expanded the Collective Efficacy scale
2. Incorporated GIS and geo-coded data to move away from traditional social science methodology
3. Used the Kriging method to visualize findings about collective efficacy
4. Will build upon these methods to find more answers
5. Develop into policy recommendations
• The Mapping Research Project is funded by The Children’s Trust & the U. S. Department of Justice

• Contact us with questions/ comments:
  – Dr. Craig Uchida, cduchida@jssinc.org
  – Shellie Solomon, sesolomon@jssinc.org
  – Corry Putt, cputt@jssinc.org
  – Christine Connor, cconnor@jssinc.org
  – Jonathan Mash, jmash@jssinc.org
  – Marc Swatt, mszwatt@mail.unomaha.edu
  – Sean Varano, seanvarano@gmail.com