

Psychological Sense of Community: Measurement and Application¹

Thomas J. Glynn

National Institute on Drug Abuse

The development and testing of an instrument designed to measure "psychological sense of community" (PSC) is described. A discussion of the historical background of the PSC concept is presented and results of the use of the instrument in three U.S. and Israeli communities are described. Specific attention is given to the relationship of PSC and the variables of community satisfaction and competence as well as to applications of the PSC instrument. Since results suggest that certain manipulable variables may be associated with PSC, and that PSC itself may have the properties of a construct, suggestions for further research, and the potential importance of PSC for community development and maintenance are given.

INTRODUCTION

A community psychologist relates that in 1972 he began to keep a running tally of books reviewed in national book-review periodicals whose themes were clearly those of loneliness, alienation, rootlessness, and not belonging—all evidence of what he viewed as, and termed, a declining “psychological sense of community” (PSC) (Sarason, 1974). After three months, so much material had been accumulated that he stopped tallying because he saw no reason to confirm the obvious. Sarason’s point, of

¹A version of this paper was presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, Toronto, Canada, September, 1978. This research has benefited from the criticism and advice of Maurice Lorr, Seymour Sarason, Robert Gurney, Rita Furst Seifert, Marilyn Glynn, Dan Lettieri, and Judy Schifter Alter, and the translating ability of Issie Alter.

²Requests for reprints should be sent to Dr. Thomas J. Glynn, National Institute on Drug Abuse, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857.

course, is that the loss of a sense of community is a common theme in contemporary society.

Interest in this issue is not, however, merely a contemporary phenomenon. Social critics have been concerned with the changing nature of the community and its support systems for some time. In the latter half of the 19th century Durkheim (1964) noted a growing change in the nature of community relationships from one based upon shared interest and values to one based upon functional interests and impersonalization. Tonnies (1957) also recognized this evolution in the nature of community, expressing it in the development of his concepts of *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*. Moving into the 20th century, Cooley's (1909) notion of primary and secondary groups, McClenahan's (1929, 1945) interest in "communality," and, more recently, Warren's (1963) concept of vertical and horizontal community patterns have continued to express this concern with the changing nature of community. A common theme of all of these ideas has been the erosion of the traditional social supports in our communities and the impact of this erosion on sense of community.

Yet, as often as this theme has been discussed and elaborated upon, there has been no successful attempt to operationalize PSC or describe it on a behavioral level. The absence of a descriptive base for PSC has not come about, however, from a lack of attempts to describe it. Minar and Greer, for example, describe PSC as "vague yearnings for a commonality of desire, a communion with those around us . . ." (1969, p. 3); Brownell portrays it as ". . . the cooperative fullness of action, the sense of belonging, the face-to-face association with people well-known" (1950, p. 4) and Cowan characterizes PSC as ". . . the feeling of belonging, of being needed, of identification" (1975, p. 298). The intent of these and other descriptions seems to be clear—PSC is a desirable feeling, difficult to describe in an operational manner, but associated with the presence or development of a common bond with other people. Its loss or decline may be associated with numerous deficits, e.g., sustained feelings of anomie, alienation, isolation, and loneliness, the loss of local autonomy and personal involvement in one's community and, perhaps most importantly, a growing inability to maintain a readily available, mutually supportive network of relationships.

Since these comments imply that the presence of PSC in a society may be beneficial, and since, as noted above, PSC and the conditions that support it may be declining in our society, several questions then arise. First, is the PSC concept of sufficient importance to merit study? Second, does PSC have the properties of a construct, i.e., can it be observed, measured and systematically used (Kerlinger, 1964)? Finally, if the first two questions are answered affirmatively, a third question must be raised

concerning ways in which we can increase, or at least maintain, the psychological sense of community in our society.

This study reports on a recent investigation of these questions. The first question, concerning the importance of PSC, is briefly approached from a social-historical perspective. The second and third questions, concerning the measurability of PSC and ways in which we might promote its development and maintenance, are dealt with from the perspective of a recently completed study of PSC in several communities in the U.S. and Israel.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

PSC has generally had a rural association, both among those who have studied it and those who have experienced it. Towns and villages where barn-raisings and quilting bees took place, where the men gathered in the tavern to discuss community affairs and each other, where merchant and consumer were on a first-name basis—this is the image of the proper breeding ground for PSC. It was in these types of communities where many of the qualities associated with the concept—homogeneity, interdependence, shared responsibility, face-to-face relationships, common goals—were a necessary part of life.

Indeed a number of theorists (e.g., Goode, 1957; Nisbet, 1962) maintain that, in rural communities, the development or maintenance of PSC was not a conscious process. Instead, a sense of community was, as described by Nisbet, “. . . closely woven into the fabric of tradition and morality as to be scarcely more noticeable than the air men breathe” (1962, p. 57).

For others, including Ferdinand Tonnies and other German social theorists such as Hegel and Schiller, the ideal version of a community where PSC might develop was the Greek polis. H. D. F. Kitto emphasized the psychological content of the polis and the single-minded dedication of its citizens. He felt that a sense of community was present in the polis and was based on loyalty, commitment, and primary interactions among the people (Kitto, 1951). It was these qualities Tonnies referred to in describing his concepts of *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*.

Certainly, the polis and pre-1850 rural communities in Western society were organized on a level of interaction more likely to foster *gemeinschaft* than *gesellschaft* relationships. While recognizing the danger of conflict between individual and community interest and Warren's (1963) warning, regarding excessive nostalgia for a lost rural ethos, there are few social theorists who believe that *gesellschaft* relationships are more beneficial to human progress and development than *gemeinschaft* relationships.

THE EROSION OF PSC

The importance of maintaining *gemeinschaft* relationships, those fostering PSC, is a topic that has been the object of an increasing amount of attention over the past century. Sarason's experience, mentioned earlier, is an example of this.

Three views of the causes of PSC erosion appear to predominate: industrialization, the growth of centralized bureaucratic and governmental structures, and maintenance of an improper balance between local and centralized structures. These are, of course, interrelated. They trace the course of Western social structure over the past century and attempt to explain the erosion of a feeling that, although difficult to define, many people consider vital to our society.

The first view is espoused by a number of social theorists (e.g., Durkheim, 1964; Lawrence, 1930; Morgan, 1957; Scherer, 1972) who associate the decline of PSC with the rise of industrialism. This development, they feel, not only brought about the decline of the rural village, homogeneous social arrangements, and the opportunity to maintain a sense of personal efficacy, but also brought about the growth of a mobile society, the anonymity of city living, and functional as opposed to personal interactions.

Others (e.g., Nisbet, 1962; Weber, 1946; Kropotkin, 1955; Plant, 1974; Stein, 1960) do not see industrialism as the cause of PSC's decline, but rather as a product of it. They consider the progressive development of large-scale bureaucracies and increasingly centralized governments as the true source of the erosion of PSC. Nisbet (1962) interprets this trend toward centralization as a logical progression taken to an extreme. The social philosophy of the nineteenth century promoted such concepts as "self-directing individualism," "change," "reason," "freedom," and, above all, "progress." The captains of industry, consolidating disparate resources for singular uses, were an ideal. As centralization of function and power has continued, the individual has gradually lost the power to do things, to be effective, and instead is acted upon, his actions coopted. One result is a loss of PSC.

A third set of views (e.g., Warren, 1963; Poplin, 1972; Hendricks, 1972; Bracey, 1964; Keyes, 1973) accepts the growth of industrialism and centralized bureaucracies and governments as evolutional elements of culture, elements that do not necessarily preclude the presence of PSC. The erosion of PSC, they feel, is not due to these elements per se, but rather to the adjustment of our society to their development. Accordingly, they theorize that we have not maintained a proper balance between local and centralized structures. Local autonomy, personal involvement, and community ties have been sacrificed for the advantages of centralized ef-

ficiency. Keyes (1973) describes this view in stronger terms—we have not lost our sense of community, he asserts, rather, we have “bought it off” for mobility, convenience, and privacy. These qualities are products that may be purchased not at the local, but at the centralized level.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PSC

Some evidence thus appears to exist which indicates that PSC, however defined, was once an integral part of Western culture and is now in a state of decline. Given this indication, we must return to the questions posed earlier, regarding the importance of a sense of community, and why there is concern over its erosion.

Sarason writes that “the absence or dilution of the psychological sense of community is the most destructive dynamic in the lives of people in our society” (1974, p. 96). Sarason’s voice is not alone. Nisbet (1967) sees the loss of PSC as “ominous” and a manifestation of certain profound dislocations in the primary associative areas of society (e.g., family, neighborhood, church). Both Fromm (1973) and Marcuse (1969) argue the view that the types of interaction that PSC typifies fulfills an objective set of human needs. Poplin believes that “the answer to many of our deepest problems is to restore the common bonds which seem no longer to typify the social life of modern communities” (1972, p. 7). Plant (1974) sees the concept of PSC as the counterpart to impersonality in modern life, and views the attainment of PSC as “salvation and redemption,” but feels it is in profound danger of being lost.

The importance of PSC to our society, expressed in the views noted above, is as diverse as the definition of PSC itself. Yet the bond among these views is clear—that the erosion of PSC may pose a serious threat to our society.

PREVIOUS STUDY

Social psychology has long dealt with such PSC-related themes as cohesion, affiliation, competition versus cooperation, and morale. More recently, environmental psychologists, such as Barker and Moos, have approached the study of communities and more specific environments in a manner which would be helpful in studying PSC.

Yet, there have been no systematic studies involving this concept. Among the reasons for this, perhaps, are the external characteristics of PSC—there is no generally accepted definition, no constellation of measurable behaviors. Additionally, the internal characteristics of the concept

suggest an association with "emotional drippiness" (Sarason, 1974), a characteristic not likely to inspire carefully defined and measured research.

However, some preliminary evidence (Goldenberg, 1971; Wilkinson & Repucci, 1973; Sarason, 1974), in the context of a residential institution for delinquent boys, suggests that PSC may be operational, that its loss may be associated with negative social psychological effects, and that its presence may counteract these effects.

Given these data and the views cited above concerning the importance of PSC, it would seem that PSC is indeed a concept worthy of study. The second and third question posed earlier, concerning operationalization and application of PSC, are addressed in the study described below.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted with four primary goals in mind: (1) to attempt to identify a range of behaviors, attitudes, and community characteristics which could be said to represent PSC; (2) to devise a reasonable method(s) to measure these behaviors, attitudes, and characteristics; (3) to attempt to address the relationship between PSC and two qualities thought to most effect the erosion of PSC, namely, competent functioning in the community (as defined by White, 1959; Cottrell, 1967; Iscoe, 1974) and satisfaction with life in the community; and (4) given a relationship between PSC, satisfaction, competency and community characteristics, to delineate ways of fostering and bolstering PSC.

Although several community oriented instruments were surveyed (e.g., Fessler, 1952; Bosworth, 1954; Roen & Burnes, 1967), none were found that seemed capable of adequately defining PSC. Therefore, an instrument was designed to carry out the first three goals. The fourth goal is aided by the inclusion in the instrument of "actual" and "ideal" items (Moos, 1974). This gives the respondent an opportunity to display the discrepancy (if any) between their perception of what is and what might be in their community. These discrepancies highlight implications for change.

The major question is whether PSC can be defined in a meaningful, operational way. If so, then several secondary questions arise: do particular characteristics influence the extent to which PSC may be present in a community, is there an association between satisfaction and competent functioning in a community and PSC, are satisfaction and competence enhanced when there is only a small discrepancy between actual and ideal PSC, and finally, what is the relationship between community satisfaction and competence?

The following, then, are the major hypotheses for this study:

(1) Actual psychological sense of community among the residents of particular communities will differ as the characteristics (e.g., geography, patterns of interaction, history, function, degree of autonomy) of those communities differ.

(2) Community residents who are satisfied with life in a community have a higher psychological sense of community than residents who are dissatisfied with life in that community.

(3) Community residents who function more competently in a community have higher psychological sense of community than those residents functioning less competently.

(4) The greater the discrepancy between actual and ideal PSC, the greater the dissatisfaction with community life.

(5) The greater the discrepancy between actual and ideal PSC, the less competence in community functioning.

(6) There is a positive relationship between satisfaction with life in a community and competent functioning in that community.

Study Phases

This investigation was carried out in three distinct and cumulative phases. A brief description of each follows below.

Phase I: Instrument Design

There were four aspects to this phase of the study.

Literature review. Philosophical, sociological, anthropological and fictional, as well as psychological, literature was surveyed. The objective was to identify behaviors and subconcepts associated with PSC. Examples of these are knowledge of the physical layout of the community, perceived safety of living in the community, presence of conflict issues, and perceived ability of the community to deal with adversity.

Sentence completion form. Based upon the PSC behaviors and subconcepts identified in the literature review, a sentence completion form was designed. The objective of this form was to provide another source for the generation of items for the PSC instrument. This form consisted of 14 stems (e.g., "My role in my community . . .") and was completed by a sample of 37 respondents across eight communities.

Item construction and establishment of content relevance. For each PSC-related behavior or subconcept identified in the literature review and

sentence completion form, an attitude or opinion item directed at community-of-residence was developed. This resulted in 178 items, each representing an aspect of the broadbased PSC concept identified in the literature and the sentence completions. Examples of items are "I have friends in this community on whom I can depend" or "This community has a number of customs or traditions that other communities do not have."

In order to establish content relevance and reduce the number of items to only those most strongly associated with PSC, the following tasks were undertaken: (1) 200 names were randomly selected from the membership list of the Division of Community Psychology of the American Psychological Association (APA); (2) the 178 items were assembled in a scale allowing the behavior or attitude described in the item to be rated according to the perceived strength of its contribution to an individual's PSC. Both this rating scale and a letter describing the study were sent to each of these 200 individuals; (3) a *t* ratio was derived for each item among the scales returned ($N = 83$). Those items with the highest *t* ratios were considered to be the most content relevant and those with the lowest *t* ratios the least content relevant.

Item selection. The instrument was designed to consist of three sections and take approximately 25 minutes to complete. The first part elicits demographic data; the second part presents attitude and behavior statements to which the respondent can reply to by means of a rating scale; and the third part consists of several open-ended items tapping the respondent's community participation, awareness, and competence.

Items for Part I, demographic data, were selected on the basis of their value for cross-validation with other studies (e.g., sex, age, occupation, marital status) and for their relevance to this particular study (e.g., how many years living at present address, how many more years expected to live in present community).

Items for Part II, attitude and behavior statements, were selected from the APA judge's scale. Those items with the lowest third of the *t* ratios were discarded. Then, any remaining item which was rated as "irrelevant" (to PSC) by one-third or more of the judges was also discarded. This left 115 items. Those 60 items with the highest *t* ratios were then selected, with two exceptions. First, where two items were nearly the same, the item with the higher *t* ratio was selected; and, second, an item which could be more appropriately responded to with a number or an open-ended response was put aside for consideration in Part III. Each of the 60 selected items (time and length demanded no more than this number) was then matched by the same item with the addition of the stem "In an ideal community. . ." This was done in order that a score of discrepancy between a respondent's perceptions of his or her actual and ideal community could be obtained. A 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to

"strongly disagree" with a midpoint of "not sure" was inserted next to each item.

Items for Part III, open-ended, were selected as described above. Where the response called for a number, the raw number was recorded. For those items measuring competence, the reply was rated by independent judges.

Phase II: Data Collection

Distribution of the instrument was carried out among a quota sample of respondents in three distinct communities.

Community selection. Three communities were chosen to be studied. These communities were chosen on the basis of their *dissimilarity* on a number of characteristics which, based upon the data gathered in Phase I, were considered to be relevant to PSC. These characteristics were: geography, patterns of interaction, history, function, and degree of autonomy. A brief description of each community in terms of these characteristics is given in Table I.

Sample selection. Respondents from each community were selected by means of a quota sample based upon the distribution of sexes, ages, and occupations of the residents 18 years of age and over in each of the three communities. Prospective respondents were randomly chosen either by unsolicited personal contact or by mail; the completed instrument was, similarly, either collected personally or through the mail.

Phase III: Data Analysis

Responses to the PSC instrument were in general, analyzed separately for Greenbelt, Hyattsville, and Kfar Blum. However, in order to obtain an adequate number of respondents and to control for cultural effects, stepwise multiple regression analyses were carried out using only the combined Hyattsville and Greenbelt samples.

In order to obtain the measures of competence and satisfaction referred to earlier, subscales consisting of eight items (competence) and six items (satisfaction) were included in the instrument design. The competence items consisted of situations (e.g., how to register to vote in local elections) designed to elicit replies indicative of the respondent's ability to function competently in their community. Independent judges rated, on a 1 to 5 scale, the potential effectiveness of these responses. The mean of the eight items was the respondent's competence score. A satisfaction score was obtained by recording the mean of the six items (e.g., The atmosphere is more relaxed here, compared to other communities in the area) designed

Table I. Characteristics of Selected Communities^a

Characteristic	Community		
	Greenbelt (Pop.: 18,000)	Hyattsville (Pop.: 16,000)	Kfar Blum (Pop.: 1,100)
Geography	Suburb of Washington, D.C.; well-defined boundaries with central mall area from which residential areas radiate and are connected by a network of walkways	Suburb of Washington, D.C.; spread over large area with no readily identifiable population or business center; boundaries appear difficult to define and access to most sections must be by car or public transportation	Located in the Upper Galilee near base of the Golan Heights; boundaries are distinct and not touching those of nearby (3 miles) kibbutzim with housing and functional areas located in center and arable fields surrounding it
Patterns of interaction	Presence of interconnecting walkways and an identifiable center to the community appears to afford both planned and casual citizen interaction	Geography of the community does not encourage interaction among broad segments of the population; interaction is more likely to take place within neighborhoods, where access to other people is made easier	Many work at tasks requiring cooperative effort, take meals in a main dining hall and participate in evening and holiday group activities; centralized nature of kibbutz architecture provides many opportunities for informal interaction
History	Founded in 1936 as a planned community sponsored by the Roosevelt administration, a significant portion of community housing remains as a cooperative	Recently celebrated 100th anniversary as an incorporated city	Founded in 1940 in a relatively desolate area bordering on Syria with whom there has been sporadic violence

Function	Residential suburb, no manufacturing and little commercial activity except in central mall area and a shopping center on the periphery	Primarily a residential suburb, a number of shopping centers, a major road with a large number of businesses and fast food stores, and adjacent university bring many people to the community during the day and evening	Among its functions are reclamation and rehabilitation of arable land, production of food and other goods for itself and export, the demonstration of an alternative lifestyle, and as a potential military support post
Autonomy	Possesses a municipal government (mayor, city council, city council, city manager), but depends upon county, state, and federal sources of support	Identical to Greenbelt	Almost self-sufficient until several years ago, now shares some tasks with nearby kibbutzim; elected internal governing structure with ties to, but no undue interference from, the national government

a Based on these characteristics, and in conjunction with the hypotheses made above, the following predictions were made:

1. Residents of Kfar Blum will report the highest psychological sense of community; Greenbelt will follow and Hyattsville will follow Greenbelt (Hypothesis 1).
2. Residents of Kfar Blum will report the highest satisfaction with life in the community; Greenbelt will follow and Hyattsville will follow Greenbelt (Hypothesis 2).
3. Residents of Kfar Blum will function most competently in the community; Greenbelt will follow and Hyattsville will follow Greenbelt (Hypothesis 3).
4. Residents of Kfar Blum will report the least difference between actual and ideal psychological sense of community; Greenbelt will follow Kfar Blum and Hyattsville will follow Greenbelt (Hypothesis 4).

to measure the respondent's current level of satisfaction with life in the community.

A respondent's actual, or current, psychological sense of community was obtained by recording the mean of the 60 items in the instrument which referred to the respondent's community of residence. Ideal PSC was obtained by recording the mean of those 60 items prefaced by the phrase "In an ideal community . . .".

RESULTS

Highlights of the extensive analyses of these data are presented below; more detail will be presented in future papers.

Instrument Design

Examination of the literature and sentence completion forms resulted in the identification of 202 behaviors and subconcepts which might be associated with PSC. These were examined and those which appeared to duplicate others were eliminated, resulting in the 178 attitude and opinion statements sent to the 200 APA judges. A total of 89 of these were returned (83 within the allotted three weeks), a rate of 44.5%. The previous section describes the method by which the judges' ratings were analyzed and items selected for inclusion in the instrument. Both an English and a Hebrew form were developed and distributed; the Hebrew form excluded several items not applicable to a kibbutz (e.g., "The police in this community are friendly.") See Appendix A for a copy of the English version.

Data Collection

Respondents from each community were selected by means of a quota sample based upon the distribution of sexes, ages and occupations of adults 18 years of age and over in each of the three communities (Greenbelt $N = 73$; Hyattsville $N = 68$; and Kfar Blum $N = 30$). When the sex, age, and occupational distributions of the obtained samples in each community were compared to the samples that would be expected on the basis of the distribution of these variables in the population of each community, no significant differences were found between the samples obtained and the population of each of the communities. One exception to this was the distribution of female occupations in Greenbelt and Hyattsville, but regression analysis indicated that neither sex nor occupation accounted for a substantial portion of the variance in the respondent's PSC scores,

suggesting that skewed distribution of female respondent's occupation does not seriously bias the scores obtained.

In Kfar Blum, the sample was selected on age and sex only. Occupational status was not considered a reliable variable for the Kfar Blum respondents, since many kibbutz residents perform various tasks in the community and often do not have a single occupation.

Data Analysis

Analyses of the six hypotheses (and the predictions under them) and a summary of the regression analyses are presented below.

Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis tests the prediction that actual psychological sense of community among community residents will differ as the characteristics of those communities differ. This was the critical hypothesis for this study since, in testing whether residents of communities with dissimilar PSC-related characteristics will have dissimilar levels of PSC, it assesses the ability of the PSC instrument to actually measure the concept under consideration—psychological sense of community. In this sense, then, it is a measure of the PSC instrument's validity.

The hypothesis was tested by comparing, among the three communities sampled, the scores of the respondents on the Actual scale and the PSC instrument. This scale assesses the respondent's actual PSC level, using the community of residence as a referent. Since these communities were chosen for differences in those characteristics thought to be associated with PSC, this hypothesis predicted that there would be differing levels of PSC among them. In order to further assess this hypothesis, the respondents in each of the three communities were also compared according to their satisfaction and competence levels and magnitude of difference between Actual and Ideal PSC—variables predicted to be associated with PSC and, as with PSC, expected to differ as community characteristics differ. The Ideal scale of the PSC instrument, about which no prior predictions were made, was also compared among the three communities.

Table II presents the comparison, through analyses of variance, of the three communities in respect to these five variables. It can be seen that the differences among the three communities are highly significant ($p < .001$) for all four variables about which predictions were made, including the Actual scale of the instrument. This finding supports and validates the first hypothesis. No differences were found among the communities on the Ideal scale; this finding tends to further support the first hypothesis, since it suggests that the communities differ little regarding their idea of what PSC is in an ideal sense but, rather, differ in their present experience of it.

Table II. Results of Analyses of Variance Among Hyattsville (HY), Greenbelt (GR), and Kfar Blum (KB) Residents on Five Composite Variables

Variable	\bar{X}			d.f.	F	Level of significance
	HY	GR	KB			
Actual PSC level ^a	3.12	3.67	3.81	2/168	23.6	$p < .001$
Satisfaction ^a	3.04	3.83	3.96	2/168	21.5	$p < .001$
Competence ^b	14.57	19.53	16.53	2/241	13.2	$p < .001$
Actual-Ideal PSC difference	.92	.41	.56	2/168	17.0	$p < .001$
Ideal PSC level ^a	4.04	4.09	3.98	2/168	1.3	ns

^aScale: 1-5, 1 = low, 5 = high.

^bScale: 0-32, 0 = low, 32 = high.

A studentized Newman-Keuls procedure was employed to probe for significant differences between pairs of means of the three communities on the Actual scale. The magnitude of the means were in the predicted direction (Kfar Blum, Greenbelt, Hyattsville) and significant differences were found between Greenbelt and Hyattsville ($p < .05$) and Hyattsville and Kfar Blum ($p < .05$), although not between Greenbelt and Kfar Blum.

Hypothesis 2. This hypothesis tests the prediction that those community residents expressing satisfaction with life in the community will have a higher psychological sense of community than those residents expressing less community satisfaction.

When respondents scoring above the median satisfaction level were compared on the basis of their score on the Actual PSC scale to those scoring below the median satisfaction level, significant differences ($p < .001$) were found between the two groups in each community, thus supporting the hypothesis.

An identical analysis, this time on the basis of the respondent's score on the Ideal scale, revealed (as would be expected) no significant differences.

The prediction of the order of the differences among the three communities was upheld, with significant differences found between Hyattsville and both Greenbelt and Kfar Blum in satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3. This hypothesis tests the prediction that community residents who function more competently in the community will have a higher Actual PSC score than those respondents functioning less competently.

When respondents scoring above the median competence level were compared, once again on the basis of their score on the Actual PSC scale, to those scoring below the median competence level, significant differences ($p < .001$) were found between the two groups in Greenbelt and Hyattsville.

Although the Kfar Blum results were in the predicted direction, the difference was not significant. Examination of the data suggested that several of the competence items were not fully applicable to kibbutz life, thus possibly confounding the results (e.g., respondents were asked to identify as many "community leaders" as possible, but many kibbutz residents replied that "all of our members are leaders, although perhaps at different times").

When Ideal scale means were compared between high- and low-competence groups, the differences found were not significant except among Hyattsville respondents. Among that sample, the difference ($p < .005$) was the reverse of the predicted direction, i.e., the Ideal scale mean of the low competence group was significantly *higher* than that of the high competence group.

The prediction of the order of the competence score was not upheld, since Greenbelt residents' competence scores were higher than those of Kfar Blum. However, as noted above, the lack of U.S.—Israeli comparability on several of the items composing the competence variable may have confounded the results of this hypothesis and the prediction of order.

In summary, Hypothesis 3 and the prediction under it were partially satisfied.

Hypothesis 4. This hypothesis tests the prediction that community residents whose actual and ideal psychological sense of community are relatively different are less satisfied with life in the community than those residents whose actual and ideal psychological sense of community are less discrepant. It was tested by computing the difference, for each respondent, between actual and ideal scale means. Then these respondents, within each community, were separated into two groups: those whose Actual versus Ideal difference was at or above the median level of all of the computed differences (high-difference group) and those whose difference was below the median of all computed differences (low-difference group). Finally, the total mean on the community satisfaction variable for the respondents in the high and low difference groups was compared by the use of *t* tests.

The results of these analyses reveal that, for each community, the differences between satisfaction means of high and low Actual-Ideal scale difference groups are significant (Hyattsville and Greenbelt: $p < .001$; Kfar Blum $p < .01$).

The predicted order for the communities was upheld. The studentized Newman-Keuls procedure revealed significant differences between Hyattsville and both Greenbelt and Kfar Blum on this variable but a nonsignificant difference (although in the predicted direction) between Greenbelt and Kfar Blum.

Hypothesis 5. This hypothesis tests the prediction that community residents whose actual and ideal psychological sense of community differ

function less competently in the community than those residents whose actual and ideal psychological sense of community do not differ. This hypothesis was tested in a manner similar to that employed in testing hypothesis 4.

The results of the analyses indicate that, for Greenbelt and Hyattsville, a highly significant difference ($p < .001$) in mean competence level existed, in the predicted direction, between respondents in the high and low Actual-Ideal scale difference groups. There was little difference found between these groups when the Kfar Blum sample was examined. Again, the difficulty with U.S.-Israeli comparability on the competence scale may have been responsible.

Hypothesis 6. This hypothesis tests the prediction that a positive relationship exists between satisfaction with life in the community and competent functioning in the community.

Intercorrelation of these variables within each community suggests a positive correlation between the satisfaction and competence variables among the Hyattsville ($r = .682$) and Greenbelt ($r = .331$) residents. Essentially no relationship was found between these variables ($r = .058$) among the Kfar Blum residents.

Multiple Regression Analyses

Five stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed using the following five criterion variables: Actual sense of community, Ideal sense of community, Community Satisfaction, Community Competence, and Difference between Actual and Ideal sense of community. Eighteen independent variables, all selected from Part I of the PSC instrument, were utilized. In order to obtain a sufficient N and to reduce error due to cultural differences, each analysis considered only the Hyattsville and Greenbelt respondents combined. Table III presents the beta weights and R^2 for each of the regression analyses. With the exception, as would be expected, of the Ideal scale criterion, each of the criteria has a significant R^2 . A summary of the analysis of these results suggests that:

1. The strongest predictors of Actual PSC appear to be the number of additional years one expects to live in the community and the number of neighbors one can identify by first name (the variable "number of children living at home" appears to be acting as a suppressor).
2. The strongest predictors of community satisfaction appear to be those found to predict Actual PSC with the addition of the opinion that "a car is not necessary to get around in this community."

Table III. Beta Weights of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for Five Criterion Variables^a

Independent variables	Criterion Variables					Difference between actual & ideal sense of community
	Actual sense of community	Ideal sense of community	Community satisfaction	Community competence		
Age	—	.542	.137	-.387	-.270	
Sex	.122	-.085	.161	.090	-.158	
Marital status	-.044	-.060	-.050	-.211	.015	
Number of years married	.382	.426	.372	.423	-.154	
Own or rent home status	.160	.172	.140	.292	-.069	
Number of years at present address	-.035	-.296	-.074	.030	-.099	
Number of years in present community	.051	.404	-.037	.156	.140	
Moved within community	-.070	.291	-.069	.050	.204	
Ratio of age to years in community	.034	.213	-.053	.043	.067	
Number of more years expected in community	.475	.211	.392	.227	-.352	
Occupation	-.100	-.141	-.158	-.234	.031	
Total number of children	-.122	.083	-.120	-.062	.155	
Number of children living at home	.342	-.132	.297	-.046	.384	
Any children living at home	.085	.051	-.038	—	-.054	
Any close relatives in area :	-.043	.168	-.085	-.092	.118	
Education	—	-.145	-.022	.085	-.062	
Any need for car in community	.133	.351	.186	.238	.037	
Number of neighbors able to name	.279	.028	.208	.446	-.251	
R	.783	.028	.716	.668	.718	
R ²	.613	.272	.513	.474	.516	
P	<.001	N.S.	<.01	<.05	<.01	

^aFor the reasons noted in the text, these analyses were carried out utilizing the Greenbelt and Hyattsville samples only.

3. The strongest predictors of community competence are identical to those predicting community satisfaction.
4. The strongest predictors of a discrepancy between Actual and Ideal PSC are a small number of years expected to continue living in the community, being relatively young, ability to name few neighbors, and having changed residences within the community.

Reliability and Validity of the PSC Instrument

Initial estimates of the reliability of the measurements generated by the PSC instrument among the samples being discussed here were made by employing Kuder-Richardson (1939) estimates of reliability (KR-20); results indicated that the reliability estimate of the Actual scale was .972 and the Ideal scale estimate .924.

Since the PSC instrument was constructed from items considered by expert judges to contribute to PSC, and since the intent of the administration of the instrument was to investigate whether it could distinguish between groups of respondents hypothesized to have varying degrees of PSC, the most relevant test of its initial validity would be the results of Hypothesis 1 in this study. This hypothesis predicts that residents of communities with dissimilar characteristics will have dissimilar levels of PSC. The communities where the instrument was administered were chosen for their dissimilarity to each other and for the presence of characteristics which were predicted to either contribute to or take away from PSC; therefore, if the instrument measured what it is intended to measure—PSC—it should distinguish levels of PSC among the three communities. Table II indicates that it did so, at a significance level of $p < .001$.

In the discussion of that hypothesis it was also noted that no differences were found among the three communities on the Ideal scale of the instrument; this finding tends to lend further support to the validity of this instrument since it indicates that the differences seen are attributable to the respondent's *Actual* PSC level, not his or her projected level.

DISCUSSION

As was noted earlier, this study was conducted with four primary goals in mind: (1) to attempt to identify a range of behaviors, attitudes, and community characteristics which could be said to represent PSC; (2) to devise a reasonable method or methods to measure these behaviors, attitudes, and characteristics; (3) to attempt to address the relationship between PSC and two qualities the erosion of PSC is thought to affect

most: satisfaction with life in the community and competent functioning in the community; and (4) if a positive relationship between PSC and satisfaction and competency is found and PSC-related community characteristics are identified, to suggest realistic ways of fostering and bolstering PSC.

While the results presented above suggest that these goals have been met—i.e., that PSC has properties of a construct and that certain of these properties may be manipulable and able to increase PSC—the results must also be regarded as preliminary and subject to further research. The strength of the findings, however, suggest that such research may be fruitful.

Potential Applications of PSC

Although obviously the point of the entire investigation, it should nevertheless be noted that this study suggests that sense of community is not merely an undefined feeling but instead may be considered a group of measurable and manipulable behaviors and attitudes. Thus, if PSC comes to be considered more than an undefined feeling, a period of consciousness-raising concerning its necessity and importance may arise. As such, as the behaviors and attitudes contributing to PSC are further refined, an individual or group of individuals may have the knowledge at hand to actively, and with full awareness of what they are doing, develop and/or maintain their sense of community. This potential awareness of PSC as something that is important and manipulable is probably the broadest and most practical of this studies' findings. Several other examples of ways in which PSC and/or the PSC instrument may be utilized follow:

1. PSC may have a role in community assessment. To most community activists the question "to what extent does this community (or institution, neighborhood, etc.) have a psychological sense of community?" would be considered, at best, superfluous. Yet the results of this study suggest that such a question may be asked, answered, and the replies put to good use. Asking such a question, for example, may yield information on the community's satisfaction and competence levels and provide data on which aspects of PSC are weak or strong in that particular community. All of this information would have specific implications for program planning.
2. Neighborhood revitalization efforts are gaining strength across the country, as evidenced, for example, by Congressional establishment of a National Commission on Neighborhoods. An important fuel for these efforts is PSC and if neighborhood leaders become more aware of the specific elements of PSC and utilize them to develop/maintain it, this movement can become stronger and, perhaps, significantly affect urban policy in this country.

3. An important finding of this study is the potentially negative effect of a significant discrepancy between one's Actual and Ideal sense of community. Identification of specific, manipulable areas of discrepancy between what actually goes on in a community and what is hoped would go on could provide us with both primary and secondary preventive planning information. Additionally, it could provide policy planners with important information concerning areas in which expectations have outstripped current possibilities and allow them to make adjustments.
4. An important contributor to PSC identified by this study concerns the number of years one expects to live in a community. If a community mental health center is aware of who in the community cannot expect to live in the community for a long period of time or who is uncertain of how long they will be there (e.g., executives of large corporations or military personnel), these people can be identified as a population at risk and special services offered to them in an attempt to prevent the difficulties discussed earlier which may be associated with a loss or lack of PSC.
5. There are few communities which are planned in such a way that their residents will have little or no need for a car to get around in their community. The results of this study suggest, however, that where such a condition exists the residents may be more likely to have higher PSC, satisfaction, and competence levels than in communities where a car is felt to be a necessity.

The PSC instrument will yield data which indicates to what extent the residents of a particular community perceive the need for a car in their community and what the relationship of this need is to PSC, satisfaction, and competence. If the data suggest, as in this study, that the perceived need for a car is predictive of low PSC, satisfaction, and competence, then the community psychologist could initiate action such as the strong encouragement of increased within-community public transportation (such as Reston, Virginia's minibus system), bicycle paths, and public walkways which bypass streets (such as in Greenbelt in this study). Once again, these would be considered preventive measures.

These few examples are given to illustrate the potential utility of PSC. Whether they or similar measures are used depends, first, on the reaction to Sarason's challenge to rearrange the priorities of our interventions from an individual to a systems level and to make fostering and preservation of PSC the "overarching criterion" of any community development or change efforts; and second, upon the quality and creativity of future research concerning PSC.

Implications for Future Research

The results of this study point to numerous areas where further research is necessary in order to make the psychological sense of community a useful scientific construct. Several directions which this research might take are listed below, in the form of specific research questions.

1. Can further evidence be gathered concerning the validity of the PSC instrument? One approach to this question is suggested by Chamberlain (1965) and Cronbach (1971). This involves the collection of what Campbell and Fiske (1959) term "discriminant evidence," that is, evidence suggesting the measure is not unduly related to indicators of other distinct constructs. Such evidence may be gathered by directing "attention from the outset to vulnerabilities in the theory by formulating counterhypotheses, or plausible alternative interpretations of the observed consistencies. If repeated challenges from a variety of plausible rival hypotheses can be systematically discounted, then the original interpretation becomes more firmly grounded" (Messick, 1975, p. 956). Approaching the question of PSC validity in this way would be an efficient approach to answering such questions as what the relationship is between PSC and satisfaction.
2. Does the size of a community affect PSC? This study intentionally involved one small community and two larger communities of approximately equal size. Greater PSC differences were found between the two larger communities in the *same* culture than between one of those larger communities and the small community of a *different* culture. This suggests that size may not be important to PSC, although the evidence of one preliminary study cannot offer an answer. Certainly, a prevailing opinion is that smaller systems are more amenable to the presence of PSC (e.g., Nisbet, 1962; Schumacher, 1973). This question has important potential implications for community planners and should be systematically investigated.
3. If PSC can be increased in a community, what changes, either positive or negative, occur? This question requires, first, the further isolation of specific, manipulable aspects of PSC (e.g., need for a car, knowledge of neighbors' names) and, second, the systematic introduction of these PSC aspects into a community through a number of carefully controlled studies.
4. What characteristics of a community have an effect on PSC? This study investigated five community characteristics which appear to have an effect on PSC. Investigations should be carried out to de-

termine if others, (e.g., closeness to large cities, rural versus urban character, climate) affect the PSC of the residents.

5. Are there higher levels of PSC among the residents of a readily identifiable neighborhood? The results of this study suggest that considering one's neighborhood as a component of the whole community may be associated with higher levels of PSC. This question could be dealt with by identifying several areas defined by the residents of a city as "neighborhood" and comparing these by areas which do not have a neighborhood identification. Implications could be drawn, for example, for policy analyses of urban neighborhood preservation programs by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In sum, this study suggests that sense of community is more than a philosophical abstraction. Instead, it may be: (1) an identifiable group of attitudes and behaviors associated with community satisfaction and competence; (2) a rather sweeping set of attitudes and behaviors whose presence in an actual sense may be predicted by the characteristics of a neighborhood or community, but whose ideal transcends communities and cultures; and (3) a useful tool in community development and maintenance efforts.

APPENDIX A
Community Questionnaire

This questionnaire is about communities. It asks your opinions about two types of communities—your own community (_____) and your idea of the ideal community. There are three parts to the questionnaire. You will find the instructions on the following page.

Instructions

Part I: Answer all questions on this page.

Part II: There are statements in this part that you may agree or disagree with. Some statements refer to whatever you think an ideal community would be. Those statements all begin with "In an ideal community . . ." An ideal community is whatever you think would be the best type of community, even if you think such a community is not possible. All the other statements refer to your own community. So if a statement was "Life is nice here," "here" would refer _____. If you strongly agree with the statement, circle SA; if you agree, but not strongly agree, circle A; if you are not sure about whether you agree or disagree, circle NS; if you disagree, circle D; and if you strongly disagree circle SD. Please record the first impression that occurs to you and try to answer every statement.

Part III: Answer all questions in this part.

- (9) Your occupation: _____
 (10) Spouse's occupation: _____
 (11) How many children do you have: Boys: _____ Girls: _____
 (12) How many children living at home: Boys: _____ Girls: _____
 (13) Any close relatives in this community or a nearby one: yes
 no
 (14) Who lives with you: no one spouse children
 parent(s) other relatives other (specify) _____
 (15) Your highest educational level: less than 8th grade
 9th to 11th 12th some college
 college some graduate study
 graduate degree
 (16) Do you need a car to get around in your community: yes
 no

Part II

SA = Strongly Agree
 A = Agree
 NS = Not Sure
 D = Disagree
 SD = Strongly Disagree

circle
 appropriate
 abbreviations

- Part I*
- (1) Age: _____ (2) Sex: _____ (3) Marital Status: _____
 (4) Years Married: _____ (5) Living Place: own rent _____
 (6) Years living at present address: _____
 (7) Years living in present community: _____
 (8) Expect to live in present community: 0-1 more years
 1-5 more years 5-10 more years 10 or more years
- Part II*
- | | SA | A | NS | D | SD |
|---|----|---|----|---|----|
| 1. I feel useful in this community. | SA | A | NS | D | SD |
| 2. No one here takes any interest in what you are doing. | SA | A | NS | D | SD |
| 3. In an ideal community people can depend on each other. | SA | A | NS | D | SD |

APPENDIX A
Community Questionnaire

SA	A	NS	D	SD	4.	Most of my friends in this community are here to stay.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	35.	I have friends in this community who know they can depend on me.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	5.	In an ideal community most of your phone calls would be to people or places within the community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	36.	In an ideal community there would be a feeling that people should not get too friendly with each other.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	6.	The community government here gets very little done.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	37.	When something needs to be done here the whole community gets behind it.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	7.	I can find my way anywhere in this community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	38.	In an ideal community I would not feel safe.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	8.	In an ideal community you would get something out of being a member of the community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	39.	In an ideal community I would try to keep up with the community news in the newspaper.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	9.	In an ideal community if something needed to be done, the whole community would get behind it.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	40.	The community government works with the well-being of this community in mind.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	10.	What is good for this community is good for me.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	41.	In an ideal community most of your friends would be there to stay.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	11.	In an ideal community there would be people, other than your family, who you really care about.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	42.	In an ideal community there would be community leaders whom you could trust.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	12.	People here have no say about what actions this community takes.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	43.	There is not enough to do in this community.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	13.	In an ideal community your best friends would not be living there.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	44.	There are people in this community, other than my family, who I really care about.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	14.	If I called a community agency here with a complaint, I would get quick service.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	45.	In an ideal community the type of people I am most similar to would not live there.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	15.	In an ideal community a small group of people would run everything.	SA	N	NS	D	SD	46.	In an ideal community being a member of that community would be like being a member of a group of friends.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	16.	In an ideal community there would not be enough to do.							
SA	A	NS	D	SD	17.	My own goals are very similar to the goals of the rest of the people here.							

SA	A	NS	D	SD	18.	In an ideal community you could buy most things you need right in the community.	SA	N	NS	D	SD	47.	In an ideal community I would have a part in solving at least one community problem.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	19.	If I tried, I could help change some things here.	SA	N	NS	D	SD	48.	I do not get much out of being a member of this community.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	20.	In an ideal community, if you did not look out for yourself, others would.	SA	N	NS	D	SD	49.	In an ideal community my own goals would be very similar to the goals the rest of the community has.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	21.	People can depend on each other in this community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	50.	The people in this community do not have very much in common.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	22.	In an ideal community you can be yourself.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	51.	My best friends live outside this community.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	23.	It is hard to make good friends here.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	52.	In an ideal community there would be people to turn to if I was upset about something personal.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	24.	In an ideal community I would be quite similar to most people who lived there.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	53.	If you do not look out for yourself in this community no one else will.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	25.	This is not a very good community to bring children up in.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	54.	In an ideal community if I called a community agency with a complaint, I would get quick service.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	26.	There is less crime here compared to other communities in the area.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	55.	I feel that I belong here.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	27.	In an ideal community living there would give me a secure feeling.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	56.	In an ideal community I could help change some things if I were to try.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	28.	Most of my phone calls are to people or places within this community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	57.	In an ideal community people would have no say about what actions the community takes.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	29.	In an ideal community no one would care about the appearance of the community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	58.	This community satisfies what I want in relationships with other people.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	30.	In an ideal community "every man for himself" is a good description of how people would act.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	59.	I am quite similar to most people who live here.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	31.	In an ideal community I would seldom feel lonely.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	60.	In an ideal community I would feel useful.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	32.	In an ideal community the police would be effective.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	61.	I can buy most things I need right here in the community.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	33.	My role in this community is to be active and involved.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	62.	In an ideal community most changes that would occur would be well thought out.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	34.	In an ideal community you would choose to move in for a particular reason.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	63.	I seldom feel lonely here.

APPENDIX A
Community Questionnaire

SA	A	NS	D	SD	64.	In an ideal community no one would take any interest in what you are doing.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	93.	This community has no goals for itself.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	65.	In an ideal community the community government would get very little done.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	94.	I try to keep up with the community news in the newspaper.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	66.	I do not like living in this community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	95.	In an ideal community I would have friends on whom I could depend.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	67.	In an ideal community my friends would be a part of my everyday activities.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	96.	In an ideal community it would not be a very good place to bring children up in.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	68.	A small group of people run everything here.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	97.	People here know they can get help from the community if they are in trouble.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	69.	You can be yourself in this community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	98.	In an ideal community the community government would work with the well-being of the community in mind.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	70.	If I just feel like talking, I can generally find someone in this community to talk to right away.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	99.	In an ideal community, people I do not know would be willing to help me if I had an emergency.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	71.	In an ideal community I could find my way anywhere.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	100.	My friends in this community are a part of my everyday activities.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	72.	In an ideal community I would have friends who would know they could depend on me.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	101.	In an ideal community there would be less crime compared to other communities.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	73.	It is important to me that this community do well.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	102.	Most changes that occur in this community are well thought out.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	74.	There is a feeling in this community that people should not get too friendly with each other.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	103.	In an ideal community I would feel that I belonged there.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	75.	In an ideal community what would be good for the community would be good for me.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	104.	I do not feel safe in this community.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	76.	No one seems to care about the appearance of this community.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	105.	We have community leaders here that you can trust.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	77.	This community is divided into small, snobbish groups.	SA	A	NS	D	SD	106.	In an ideal community it would be important to me that the community do well.
SA	A	NS	D	SD	78.	In an ideal community my role would be to be active and involved.							

- SA A NS D SD 79. I chose to move into this community for a particular reason.
- SA A NS D SD 80. In an ideal community it would be hard to make good friends.
- SA A NS D SD 81. I think that "every man for himself" is a good description of how people act in this community.
- SA A NS D SD 82. The police in this community are generally friendly.
- SA A NS D SD 83. In an ideal community if there were a serious community problem the people could get together and solve it.
- SA A NS D SD 84. There has been at least one problem in this community that I have had a part in solving.
- SA A NS D SD 85. In an ideal community if someone I did not know had an emergency, I would be willing to help.
- SA A NS D SD 86. The police in this community are effective.
- SA A NS D SD 87. In an ideal community if someone did something good for the community that would make me feel good.
- SA A NS D SD 88. Living in this community gives me a secure feeling.
- SA A NS D SD 89. Being a member of this community is like being a member of a group of friends.
- SA A NS D SD 90. In a ideal community the people would not have very much in common.
- SA A NS D SD 91. In an ideal community there would be people, other than my family, who would really care about me.
- SA A NS D SD 92. The type of people I am most similar to do not live in this community.
- SA A NS D SD 107. In an ideal community the community would satisfy what I want in relationships with other people.
- SA A NS D SD 108. In an ideal community, if I just felt like talking I would be able to find someone to talk to right away.
- SA A NS D SD 109. If I am upset about something personal there are people in this community to whom I can turn.
- SA A NS D SD 110. In an ideal community the community would be divided into small, snobbish groups.
- SA A NS D SD 111. In an ideal community I would not enjoy living there.
- SA A NS D SD 112. If someone I did not know in this community had an emergency I would be willing to help.
- SA A NS D SD 113. There are people in this community, other than my family, who really care about me.
- SA A NS D SD 114. In an ideal community the police would be generally friendly.
- SA A NS D SD 115. I have friends in this community on whom I can depend.
- SA A NS D SD 116. If there were a serious problem in this community, the people here could get together and solve it.
- SA A NS D SD 117. If someone does something good for this community, that makes me feel good.
- SA A NS D SD 118. In an ideal community the community would have no goals for itself.
- SA A NS D SD 119. In an ideal community people would know they could get help from the community if they were in trouble.
- SA A NS D SD 120. If I had an emergency, even people I do not know in this community would be willing to help.

APPENDIX A
Community Questionnaire

Part III

Use the back of this page for any answer that there is not enough room for. If your answer to any question is “don’t know” or “none,” please write that in.

- (1) What community events have you attended or participated in during the past year? _____
- (2) What community issues are important in your community right now? _____
- (3) Who are the community leaders in your community? _____
- (4) If I suspected the appearance or increase of rats in my neighborhood, this is how I would get action on this: _____
- (5) I belong to the following community groups, churches, organizations, or clubs (underline the ones you are active in): _____
- (6) If I thought a new service, such as a health clinic, would be a good thing for this community, this is how I would get things started: _____
- (7) Give the first names of as many of your adult neighbors as you can: _____
- (8) These are the people or places I could go to in this community if I needed to talk with someone about a personal problem: _____
- (9) If I felt a particular elected community official favored actions which were bad both for myself and other community members, this is what I could do about it: _____
- (10) This is how to register to vote in local elections: _____
- (11) Give the first names of as many people who run a business or a store in this community as you can: _____
- (12) If you had to leave your car for repairs outside this community, give the first names of any people in this community you feel you could ask to follow you and bring you back: _____
- (13) If someone were to ask you “what is your community?” which of the following (check one or more) would you reply?
 family friends work neighborhood town or city
 where I live group or club I belong to church I belong to none other (specify) _____

REFERENCES

- BARKER, R. G. *Ecological psychology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- BOSWORTH, C. A. *Development of a community attitude scale*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954.
- BRACEY, H. E. *Neighbours: Subdivision life in England and the United States*. Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1964.
- BROWNELL, B. *The Human community: Its philosophy and practice for a time of crisis*. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.
- CAMPBELL, D. T., & FISKE, D. W. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multi-trait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1959, 56, 81-105.
- CHAMBERLAIN, T. C. The method of multiple working hypotheses. *Science*, 1965, 148, 754-759.
- COOLEY, C. H. *Social organization*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- COTTRELL, L. S. The Competent Community. In B. H. Kaplan, Wilson, R. N., and Leighton, A. H. (Eds.), *Further explorations in social psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.
- COWAN, P. A. Community psychology: The emperor without clothes. *Contemporary Psychology*, 1975, 20, 297-299.
- CRONBACH, L. J. Test validation. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), *Educational Measurement* (2nd Ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- DURKHEIM, E. *The division of labor in society*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- FESSLER, D. R. *The development of a scale for measuring community solidarity*. *Rural Sociology*, 1952, 17, 144-152.
- FROMM, E. *Sane society*, New York: Fawcett, 1973.
- GOLDENBERG, I. I. *Build me a mountain: Youth, poverty, and the creation of new settings*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1971.
- GOODE, W. J. Community within a community—the professions. *American Sociological Review*, 1957, 22, 194-200.
- HENDRICKS, G. Community development in western Europe. *Community Development Journal*, 1972, 7, 141-151.
- HILLERY, G. A. Definitions of community: Areas of agreement. *Rural Sociology*, 1966, 20, 111-122.
- ISCOE, I. Community psychology and the competent community. *American Psychologist*, 1974, 29, 607-613.
- KERLINGER, F. N. *Foundations of behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- KEYES, R. *We the lonely people: Search for community*. New York: Harper-Row, 1973.
- KITTO, H. D. F. *The Greeks*. New York: Penguin, 1951.
- KROPOTKIN, P. *Mutual aid*. Boston: Extending Horizon Books, 1955.
- KUDER, G. G., & RICHARDSON, M. W. The calculation of test reliability coefficients based upon the method of rational equivalence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1939, 30, 681-687.
- LAWRENCE, D. H. *Lady Chatterly's lover*. London: Nesor Publishing Co., 1930.
- MARCUSE, H. *Eros and civilization*. London: Sphere, 1969.
- McCLENAHAN, B. A. *The changing urban neighborhood*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1929.
- McCLENAHAN, B. A. Communalism: The urban substitute for the traditional community. *Sociology and Social Research*, 1945, 30, 264-274.
- MESSICK, S. The standard problem: Meaning and values in measurement and evaluation. *American Psychologist*, 1975, 30, 955-966.
- MINAR, D. W., & GREER, S. *The concept of community*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.
- MOOS, R. *Evaluating treatment environments: A social ecological approach*. New York: Wiley, 1974.
- MORGAN, A. E. *The community of the future and the future of community*. Ann Arbor: Braun-Burmfeld, 1957.
- NISBET, R. *Community and power*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

- NISBET, R. *The sociological tradition*. London: Heinemann, 1967.
- PLANT, R. *Community and ideology: An essay in applied social philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.
- POPLIN, D. E. *Communities: A survey of theories and methods of research*. New York: Macmillan, 1972.
- ROEN, S. R., & BURNES, A. J. Social roles and adaptation of the community. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 1967, 3, 153-158.
- SARASON, S. B. *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- SCHERER, J. *Contemporary community: Sociological illusion or reality?* London: Tavistock Publications, 1972.
- SCHUMACHER, E. F. *Small is beautiful: A study of economics as if people mattered*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- STEIN, M. R. *The eclipse of community*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- TONNIES, F. *Community and society (gemeinschaft and gesellschaft)*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957.
- WARREN, R. *The community in America*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- WEBER, M. *Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- WHITE, R. W. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, 1959, 66, 297-333.
- WILKINSON, L., & REPUCCI, N. D. Perceptions of social climate among participants in token economy and non-token economy cottages in a juvenile correction institution. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 1973, 1, 36-43.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

THOMAS J. GLYNN received an MS in Communications Research from the Boston University School of Public Communication in 1973 and MA and PhD degrees in Psychology from Catholic University in Washington, D.C. in 1977. He has been a research psychologist with the Psychosocial Branch, Division of Research of the National Institute on Drug Abuse since 1978. His current research interests include the role of social ecological factors on drug use, the effect of family influences on adolescent drug use and methodology in drug-policy research.