SAFE Study Items, Constructs & References

02/27/15

**\*New items, generated for specifically for this survey, are in bold**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Survey Section | Construct  | Reference (scoring and psychometrics included, if reported) |
| A. About You  | Demographics | N/A |
| B. Types of Residences in Your Neighborhood | NEWS | Taken from NEWS & NEWS-A:* Saelens, B.E., Sallis, J.F., Black, J., Chen, D. (2003). Neighborhood-based differences in physical activity: An environment scale evaluation. *American Journal of Public Health, 93,* 1552-1558.
* Cerin, E., Conway, T. L., Saelens, B. E., Frank, L. D., & Sallis, J. F. (2009). Cross-validation of the factorial structure of the Neighborhood Environment Walkability Scale (NEWS) and its abbreviated form (NEWS-A). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 6*(1), 32.

Specific test-retest reliability coefficients are available at: http://activelivingresearch.org/sites/default/files/NEWS\_Item\_Reliability\_0.pdf |
| C. Stores, Facilities, and Other Things in Your Neighborhood |
| D. Streets in Your Neighborhood |
| E. Places for Walking and Cycling |
| F. Neighborhood Surroundings/ Aesthetics |
| G. Traffic Hazards |
| H. Crime |
| I. Your Neighbors | **Collective Efficacy:****Informal social control (#’s 1-4)****Social cohesion & trust (#’s 5-9)** | Numbers 1-9 were taken from: * Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*(5328), 918–924.

*Note: Sampson, et al. (1997) aggregated responses to the neighborhood level, but people still use it as an individual level measure.* *Their scale (Sampson, et al., 1997) asked about the likelihood that their neighbors could be counted on to intervene: "Would you say it is very likely, likely, neither likely nor unlikely, unlikely, or very unlikely?”*  Scoring: Reverse score #8-9. Internal consistency: .80 to .91 “Responses to the five-point Likert scales were aggregated to the neighborhood level as initial measures. Social cohesion and informal social control were closely associated across neighborhoods (r = 0.80, P <0.001), which suggests that the two measures were tapping aspects of the same latent construct. Because we also expected that the willingness and intention to intervene on behalf of the neighborhood would be enhanced under conditions of mutual trust and cohesion, we combined the two scales into a summary measure labeled collective efficacy.”Changes made: * For numbers 1-4, we changed the 5-point response scale from “very likely, likely, neither likely nor unlikely, unlikely, or very unlikely” to our 4-point scale: “disagree strongly to agree strongly.”
* We omitted one item on the informal social control scale: “How likely is it that your neighbors could be counted on to intervene if the fire station closest to their home was threatened with budget cuts.”
* We made minor changes to language in number 5: “people around here” to “people in my neighborhood.”
 |
| **Neighborhood Integration (#’s 10-11) &** **Community Support (#’s 12-15)** | **Numbers 10 , 11, & 15** were adapted from: * Thornberry, T. P., Krohn, M. D., Lizotte, A. J., Smith, C. A., & Tobin, K. (2003). Gang membership and delinquency: Gangs in developmental perspective. New York: Cambridge University Press.

7-item “Neighborhood Integration” scale used in the Rochester Youth Development Study. The first three items asked “How many people who live in your neighborhood. . . (1) do you know by sight, (2) do you know by name, (3) do you talk to on a regular basis?” The response options were “4=a lot,3= some, 2=a few, and 1=none.” The next four items asked “How often do you and other people who live in your neighborhood. . . “(4) borrow things like tools or recipes from each other, (5) ask eachother to watch your children when you are not at home, (6) have a talk with each other, (7) ask eachother to drive or take your children somewhere.” The response options were “4=often,3=sometimes, 2=seldom, 1=never.” Scoring: Points were assigned as indicated above. Point values were summed and then divided by the number of items. The intended range of scores is 1-4, with higher score indicating higher level of neighborhood integration. Internal consistency: .85Changes made: * Thornberry, et al, 2003, number 1: “How many people who live in your neighborhood. . . (1) do you know by sight,” became SAFE number 10: “I know many of the people in my neighborhood by sight.” We changed the response scale from frequency ( “4=a lot,3= some, 2=a few, and 1=none.”) to agreement (“disagree strongly”=1, “agree strongly”=4)
* Thornberry, et al, 2003, number 2: “How many people who live in your neighborhood. . . (2) do you know by name,” became SAFE number 11: “I know many of the people in my neighborhood by name.” We changed the response scale from frequency ( “4=a lot,3= some, 2=a few, and 1=none”) to agreement (“disagree strongly”=1 . . . . “agree strongly”=4)
* Thornberry, et al., 2003, number 7: “How often do you and other people who live in your neighborhood. . . “ (7) ask eachother to drive or take your children somewhere” became SAFE number 15: “Sometimes I ask people in my neighborhood to drive or take me or my children somewhere.” We changed the response scale from frequency (“4=often,3=sometimes, 2=seldom, 1=never) to agreement (“disagree strongly”=1 . . . . “agree strongly”=4)

**Numbers 12, 13, & 14** were adapted from:* Sheidow, A. J., Gorman‐Smith, D., Tolan, P. H., & Henry, D. B. (2001). Family and community characteristics: Risk factors for violence exposure in inner‐city youth. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *29*(3), 345-360.
* Tolan, P. H., Gorman-Smith, D., & Henry, D. B. (2001). Chicago youth development study community and neighborhood measure: Construction and reliability technical report. *Families and Communities Research Group, University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill, USA*. (unpublished)

6-item “Community Support” scale used in the Chicago Youth Development Study: “1. I visit with my neighbors in their homes. 2. If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighborhood. 3. I regularly stop and talk with people in my neighborhood. 4. I know most of the names of people on my block. 5. I would feel comfortable asking to borrow some food or a tool from people on my block. 6. I would feel comfortable asking people on my block to watch my home while I was away.”Scoring: Reverse code items 1-5. Compute a mean score from these 5 items. Ignore #6. Internal consistency: .61Changes made: * Tolan, et al., 2001, Number 3: “I regularly stop and talk with people in my neighborhood” became SAFE number 12: “I talk to many of the people in my neighborhood on a regular basis.”
* Tolan, et al., 2001, Number 5: “I would feel comfortable asking to borrow some food or a tool from people on my block” became SAFE number 13: “Sometimes I borrow things like tools or recipes from people in my neighborhood.”

Note: this item was also adapted from Thornberry, et al (2003, see above), number 4: “How often do you and other people who live in your neighborhood. . . “(4) borrow things like tools or recipes from each other.”* Tolan, et al., 2001, Number 6: “I would feel comfortable asking people on my block to watch my home while I was away” became SAFE number 14: “Sometimes I ask people in my neighborhood to watch my home or pet(s) when I’m away.”
 |
| J. Your Community | **Community Participation** | Number 1: new item.Numbers 2-3: concepts drawn from: * Lavrakas, P. J., & Herz, E. J. (1982). Citizen participation in neighborhood crime-prevention. *Criminology, 20*(3-4), 479-498

Telephone survey asked: "Have you heard or read about any of the following kinds of activities taking place in your neighborhood in the past couple of years?" Each affirmative response was followed up with an inquiry about the circumstances that prompted the effort, whether the individual had been given an opportunity to participate, and whether he/she had done so. Those who had not participated were asked why they had not; and those that did participate were asked a series of follow- up questions about the nature of their participation. The seven types of neighborhood anticrime efforts that respondents were asked about included (1) crime prevention meetings, (2) citizen patrol, (3) escort program, (4) block watch, (5) Beat Representative Program," (6) WhistleSTOP program,6 and (7) any other crime prevention program.No reliability or validity data reported. No scoring information reported.  |
| K. Transportation Physical Activity | IPAQ | Items taken from International Physical Activity Questionnaire: More details available on IPAQ website: <https://sites.google.com/site/theipaq/>* Craig, C.L., Marshall, A.L., Sjostrom, M., Bauman, A.E., Booth, M.L., Ainsworth, B.E., Pratt, M., Ekelund, U., Yngve, A., Sallis, J.F., and Oja, P (2003). International Physical Activity Questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 35(8), 1381-1395.
* Hallal, P. C. and C. G. Victora (2004). "Reliability and validity of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ)." Med Sci Sports Exerc 36: 556.
* Ainsworth, B. E., et al. (2000). "Comparison of three methods for measuring the time spent in physical activity." Med Sci Sports Exerc 32: S457-64.
 |
| L. Recreation, Sport, and Leisure-Time Walking  |
| M. Sedentary Activity | Sedentary Behaviors  | Adapted from MSPAN: * Sallis, J. F., McKenzie, T. L., Conway, T. L., Elder, J. P., Prochaska, J. J., Brown, M., ... & Alcaraz, J. E. (2003). Environmental interventions for eating and physical activity: a randomized controlled trial in middle schools. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 24*(3), 209-217.
* Marshall, S. J., Biddle, S., Sallis, J. F., McKenzie, T. L., & Conway, T. L. (2002). Clustering of sedentary behaviors and physical activity among youth: A cross-national study. Pediatric Exercise Science, 14(4), 401-417.

*Note: items also used and evaluated in Active Where?:* * Rosenberg, D., Sallis, J.F., Kerr, J., Maher, J., Norman, G.J., Durant, N., Harris, S.K., and Saelens, B.E. (2010). Brief scales to assess physical activity and sedentary equipment in the home. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 7, 10. http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/7/1/10

“Child and adolescent sedentary behavior was measured in time per typical week spent on various sedentary behaviors (watching TV, using a computer, driving in a car, playing video games, sitting and listening to music, sitting and talking on the phone, sitting to hang out with others, reading a book, doing inactive hobbies), adapted from previous measures. The questions were asked for a usual weekday and weekend day separately. Response options were: none, 15 minutes, 30 minutes, 1 hour, 2 hours, 3 hours, or 4 or more hours.”Test-retest reliability: available at http://sallis.ucsd.edu/measure\_activewhere.htmlActive Where? scoring: “Responses were recoded into duration of time spent on each sedentary behavior (e.g. 15 minutes recoded as .25 hours; 4 or more hours recoded as 4.0 hours), summed across all items, and multiplied by the appropriate days per week (5 for weekday and 2 for weekend day). The final score, sedentary composite hours per week, was the sum of weekday and weekend sedentary time. Hours/week spent watching TV was used as a separate, additional outcome.”  |
| N. Total Sitting Time |  | Taken from IPAQ: More details available on IPAQ website: https://sites.google.com/site/theipaq/* Craig, C.L., Marshall, A.L., Sjostrom, M., Bauman, A.E., Booth, M.L., Ainsworth, B.E., Pratt, M., Ekelund, U., Yngve, A., Sallis, J.F., and Oja, P (2003). International Physical Activity Questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 35(8), 1381-1395

*Note: we also used these items in NQLS, Section R, “Time Spent Sitting”* |
| O. Places for Physical Activity near Your Home | Places for Physical Activity Near Your Home  | Numbers 1-4 were adapted from Active Where? survey, Section O “Local environment”: * Rosenberg, D., Sallis, J.F., Kerr, J., Maher, J., Norman, G.J., Durant, N., Harris, S.K., and Saelens, B.E. (2010). Brief scales to assess physical activity and sedentary equipment in the home. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 7, 10. <http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/7/1/10>

 “How often are you active in the following places. . . . (1) inside my home, (2) in my yard, (3) in my driveway, (4) at a neighbor’s house, yard or driveway (5) in a local street, cul de sac (dead end street), vacant lot.” Response options: 0 = never, 1 = once a month or less, 2 = once every other week, 3 = once a week or more.Test-retest reliability: ICC (95% CI) Kappa Percent AgreementO1 Inside my home: .312 (.142, .465) 66.6%O2: In my yard: .649 (.532, .741) 53.3%O3: In my driveway: .614 (.490, .714) 49.1%O4: At a neighbor’s house, yard or driveway: .432 (.276, .567) 55.0%O4: In a local street, cul de sac (dead end street) or vacant lot: .367 (.202, .512) 45.8%Same items were also used in NIK: * Saelens, B. E., Sallis, J. F., Frank, L. D., Couch, S. C., Zhou, C., Colburn, T., ... & Glanz, K. (2012). Obesogenic neighborhood environments, child and parent obesity: the Neighborhood Impact on Kids study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 42*(5), e57-e64.

Numbers 5-8: New items. Drew concepts from NPAQ: * Giles-Corti, B., Timperio, A., Cutt, H., Pikora, T. J., Bull, F. C., Knuiman, M., ... & Shilton, T. (2006). Development of a reliable measure of walking within and outside the local neighborhood: RESIDE's Neighborhood Physical Activity Questionnaire. Preventive medicine, 42(6), 455-459.

Available online at University of Western Australia, School of Population Health, RESIDE Study: http://www.sph.uwa.edu.au/research/cbeh/projects/reside |
| P. Walking Inside Versus Outside of Your Neighborhood | NPAQ | Adapted from NPAQ: * Giles-Corti, B., Timperio, A., Cutt, H., Pikora, T. J., Bull, F. C., Knuiman, M., ... & Shilton, T. (2006). Development of a reliable measure of walking within and outside the local neighborhood: RESIDE's Neighborhood Physical Activity Questionnaire. Preventive medicine, 42(6), 455-459.

Available online at University of Western Australia, School of Population Health, RESIDE Study: http://www.sph.uwa.edu.au/research/cbeh/projects/reside |
|  Q. Fear of Crime Stories | **Anchoring Vignettes (#’s 1-2)** | Drew concepts from: * Grol-Prokopczyk, H., Freese, J., & Hauser, R. M. (2011). Using anchoring vignettes to assess group differences in general self-rated health. Journal of health and social behavior, 52(2), 246-261.
* Van Soest, A., Delaney, L., Harmon, C., Kapteyn, A., & Smith, J. P. (2011). Validating the use of anchoring vignettes for the correction of response scale differences in subjective questions. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society), 174(3), 575-595.
* León, C. J., Araña, J. E., & de León, J. (2013). Valuing the social cost of corruption using subjective well being data and the technique of vignettes. Applied Economics, 45(27), 3863-3870.
* Salomon, J. A., Tandon, A., & Murray, C. J. (2004). Comparability of self rated health: cross sectional multi-country survey using anchoring vignettes. Bmj, 328(7434), 258.
 |
| R. Your Fear of Crime | **Fear of Crime (#’s 3-13)** | **Number 1**: new item **Number 2-4**: new items. Created to match with primary outcomes: walking for transport, walking for recreation, health or fitness, and activity in park. **Numbers 5-6**: Adapted from: * Liska, A., & Baccaglini, W. (1990). Feeling Safe by Comparison: Crime in the Newspapers. Social Problems, 37(3), 360-374. (Items originally adapted from early version of National Crime Survey – before it was revised significantly in 1993)

1. "How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood at night?" 2. "How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood during the day?" Scoring: Responses were coded as very safe, safe, unsafe, or very unsafe. The fear level of each city was measured by adding the means of the two NCS items The two items correlate .91 across the 26 cities**Numbers 7-13**: Adapted from several sources: * LaGrange RL, Ferraro KF, Supancic M. (1992). Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of social and physical incivilities. J Res Crime Delinq. 29(3):311-334.

"At one time or another, most of us have experienced fear about becoming the victim of crime. Some crimes probably frighten you more than others. We are interested in how afraid people are in everyday life of being a victim of different kinds of crimes. Please rate your fear on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means you are NOT AFRAID AT ALL and 10 means you are VERY AFRAID. HOW AFRAID ARE YOU OF . . . 1. Being approached on the street by a beggar or panhandler? 2. Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money? 3. Having someone break into your home while you are away? 4. Having someone break into your home while you are there? 5. Being raped or sexually assaulted? 6. Being murdered? 7. Being attacked by someone with a weapon? 8. Having your car stolen? 9. Being robbed or mugged on the street? 10. Having your property damaged by vandals? Scoring and reliability: All 10 items summed for the general fear index (alpha =.90); Items 4,5, 6, and 7 summed for fear of personal crime index (alpha =.90); Items 2, 3,8, 9, and 10 summed for the fear of property crime index (alpha =.82).* Chadee, D., Austen, L., & Ditton, J. (January 2007). The relationship between likelihood and fear of criminal victimization. British Journal of Criminology, 4(4), 359-376.

Fear: "How much would you say you fear ... 1. Being approached on the street by a beggar? 2. Being cheated, conned, or swindled out of some money? 3. Have someone attempt to break into your home while you are away? 4. Have someone break into your home while you are there? 5. Being raped or sexually assaulted? 6. Being murdered? 7. Being attacked by someone with a weapon? 8. Have your car stolen? 9. Being robbed or mugged on the street? 10. Property damaged by vandals? 11. Being kidnapped? 12. Being a victim of crime in your workplace? 13. Being a victim of crime when you are out liming? 14. Being a victim of crime in the near future? [responses: very afraid, afraid, unafraid, very unafraid]Validity/Reliability not reported. Scoring: They used factor analysis to create Personal crime index (items 4, 5, 6 &7) Property crime index (items 2, 3, 9, & 10) and All Crime index (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10). The partial indices are 0-12-point scales, and the total indices are 0-27-point scales.* Rader NE, May DC, Goodrum S. (2007). An empirical assessment of the "threat of victimization:" Considering fear of crime, perceived risk, avoidance, and defensive behaviors. Sociological Spectrum: Mid-South Sociological Association, 27(5):475-505.

Fear of crime index: (6 items)"I am afraid someone will break into my house while I am away.""I am afraid of being raped or sexually assaulted.""I am afraid of being attacked by someone with a weapon.""I am afraid to go out at night because I might become a victim of crime.""I am afraid of being murdered.""I am afraid of having my money=possessions taken from me."Scoring and reliability: Responses were scored using a four-point Likert-type format (strongly agree = 4, somewhat agree = 3, somewhat disagree= 2, and strongly disagree = 1). Scores on the index thus ranged from 6 (least fearful) to 24 (most fearful). High internal reliability w/ Cronbach’s alpha of .863.* Jackson, J. (2011). Revisiting risk sensitivity in the fear of crime. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 48(4), 513-537.

 “How often (if at all) have you worried that you will fall victim of each of the following crimes during the next twelve months while in your neighborhood? [Response alternatives were ‘‘not once in the last month;’’ ‘‘once or twice in the past month;’’ ‘‘once or twice in the past week;’’ and ‘‘every day.’’]1. Burglary while out of the home?2. Burglary while in the home?3. Acts of vandalism/ graffiti/ damage to property?4. Being pick pocketed and other nonviolent theft?5. Being physically attacked in the street by a stranger?6. Being harassed, being threatened or verbally abused in the street?7. Being mugged and robbed?" Scoring: All variables were weighted factor scores that were rescaled to range from 0 to 10.Construct validity: "No structural paths were constrained so the fit statistics relate to the test of the measurement models. This indicates the scales have adequate reliability and the structure of the measurement model had some validity. The factor loadings (validity coefficients) of the worry indicators were all statistically significant and of considerable magnitude (pickpocket, λ=.78; physical attack, λ=.90; harassment, λ=.86; and street robbery, λ=.93)” |
| **Estimated Effect of Crime on Activity (#’s 14-16)** | New items. Concepts drawn from: * Sallis, J. F., Conway, T. L., Dillon, L. I., Frank, L. D., Adams, M. A., Cain, K. L., & Saelens, B. E. (2013). Environmental and demographic correlates of bicycling. *Preventive medicine*, *57*(5), 456-460.
 |
| S. Problems in Your Neighborhood | **Values (#’s 1-17)** | Numbers 1-17: Adapted from several sources: * Covington J, Taylor RB. (1991). Fear of crime in urban residential neighborhoods: Implications of between- and within-neighborhood sources for current models. Sociological Quarterly,32(2):231-249.

Respondents were asked if the following conditions were a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem in their neighborhoods: vandalism, vacant housing, litter, vacant lots, loiterers harassing passersby, groups of teenagers hanging out, noise levels, and people fighting and arguing.Scoring and reliability: Answers for each condition were standardized and combined; the mean across scale items calculated (Cronbach's alpha = .87)* LaGrange RL, Ferraro KF, Supancic M. (1992). Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of social and physical incivilities. J Res Crime Delinq. 29(3):311-334.

"Now I will mention a few things that people sometimes consider to be problems in their local neighborhood. After I read each item, please tell me HOW SERIOUS a problems it is in YOUR neighborhood by indicating whether it's not a problem, somewhat of a problem, or a very serious problem. HOW GREAT A PROBLEM IS. . . 1. Trash and litter lying around your neighborhood? 2. Neighborhood dogs running loose?3. Inconsiderate or disruptive neighbors?4. Graffiti on sidewalks and walls? 5. Vacant houses and unkempt lots? 6. Unsupervised youth? 7. Too much noise? 8. People drunk or high on drugs in public? 9. Abandoned cars or car parts lying around?Scoring and reliability: Eight items (#4 excluded) are summed for the general incivility index (alpha =.77); Items 3,6,7, and 8 summed for the social incivility index (alpha =.72). Items 1,2,5, and 9 summed for the physical incivility index (alpha =.63).* Mason, P., Kearns, A., Livingston, M. (2013). “Safe Going”: The influence of crime rates and perceived crime and safety on walking in deprived neighbourhoods. Social Science & Medicine, 91, 15–24.

"Respondents were asked how serious they considered each of eleven problems to be in their neighbourhood (serious problem vs. slight problem or not a problem): vandalism, graffiti, deliberate damage to property/vehicles; violence (assaults and muggings); people being insulted, pestered or intimidated in the street; people being attacked/harassed because of their skin colour/ethnicity; people using or dealing drugs; people being drunk or rowdy in public places; gang activity; teenagers hanging around on the street; nuisance neighbours or problem families; rubbish or litter lying around; house break-ins/burglary."Scoring and reliability: Results were dichotomized (serious vs. slight or no problem). Simultaneously considering all eleven neighbourhood problems (Cronbach's α = 0.884) |
| T. Avoiding Crime in Your Neighborhood | **Avoidant Behaviors (#’s 1-6)** | Numbers 1-6: Adapted from several sources: * Lavrakas, P. J., & Herz, E. J. (1982). Citizen participation in neighborhood crime-prevention. Criminology, 20(3-4), 479-498

This scale was composed of three items which measured the frequency with which respondents reportedly restricted their behavior in their own neighborhoods by: (1) not carrying a lot of cash; (2) not walking near certain types of strangers; and (3) not going out alone at night. Responses: always, most of the time, sometimes, or never.Reliability: The internal consistency of this scale, as measured by coefficient alpha, is .73.* Skogan, Wesley G. and Michael G. Maxfield. 1981. Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighborhood Reactions. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

“When you go out at night, how often do you do the following because of crime? 1) going out by car rather than walking (50 most of the time%)2) going out with someone else (25%)3) avoiding certain places in the neighborhood (25%)4) taking something with you like a dog, whistle, knife or gun (20%)"(No reliability or validity data presented)* Rader NE, May DC, Goodrum S. (2007). An empirical assessment of the "threat of victimization:" Considering fear of crime, perceived risk, avoidance, and defensive behaviors. Sociological Spectrum: Mid-South Sociological Association, 27(5):475-505.

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: ‘‘In the past twelve months, fear of crime has prevented me from doing things I would like to do.’’ Responses were coded so that those who agreed (either ‘‘strongly’’ or ‘‘somewhat’’) were coded (1) while those who disagreed with the statement (either ‘‘strongly’’ or ‘‘somewhat’’) were coded (0).Those respondents that agreed that fear had prevented them from doing things they liked to do were then asked to ‘‘state any activities that fear of crime has prevented you from doing in the past 12 months.’’ The open-ended responses were then categorized into 19 ‘‘avoidance behaviors.’’No reliability or validity data presented.  |
|  | **Positive Avoidant Behaviors (#’s 7-14)** | New items. Drew concepts from studies assessing avoidant behaviors (see above). These new items focus on avoidant behaviors that result in increased PA (thus, they are “positive” avoidant behaviors).  |
| U. Protecting Yourself from Crime | **Protective Behaviors****(#’s 1-13)** | These items were generated primarily in focus groups, interviews, and by expert discussion. We drew some concepts from: * Lavrakas, P. J., Normoyle, J., Skogan, W. G., Herz, E. J., Salem, G., & Lewis, D. A. (1981). Factors related to citizen involvement in personal, household, and neighborhood anti-crime measures: An executive summary. National Institute of Justice.

Items: 1. imposing behavior restrictions to avoid exposure to criminal victimization;
2. installing burglar alarms, window bars, and/or special locks at home;
3. installing outdoor lights at home;
4. owning a hand gun for protection;
5. using an indoor timer;
6. asking neighbors to watch an unoccupied home;
7. engraving valuables;
8. purchasing theft/vandalism insurance;
9. reporting suspicious/criminal activities to police;
10. attending neighborhood crime prevention meetings;
11. taking part in organized neighborhood patrol;
12. participating in neighborhood escort program;
13. participating in local b10ckwatch or similar type crime prevention program; and
14. taking part in "Whist1eSTOP"
* Tewksbury, R. & Mustaine, E. (2003). College Students’ Lifestyles and Self-Protective Behaviors: Further Considerations of the Guardianship Concept in Routine Activity Theory.” Criminal Justice and Behavior 30, 302-327."

"Do you currently use, or anytime in the previous six months have used any of the following for the purposes of self-protection: Gun, mace, club, body alarm, knife.” The variable was dichotomous. |
| V. Crime in Your Daily Life | **No Behavioral Response** | New items. Created to identify individuals who do not change behavior in response to crime. These items were generated primarily in focus groups, interviews, and by expert discussion. |
| W. Your Neighborhood Characteristics | **CPTED – Crime Prevention through Environmental Design** * **Surveillance (#’s 1-5)**
* **Maintenance (#’s 6-8)**
* **Access Control (#’s 9-10)**
* **Territorial Reinforcement (#’s 11- 12)**
 | New items. These items are innovative because they ask residents their perceptions about CPTED issues (as opposed to having a third party conduct an environmental assessment). These items were generated primarily in focus groups, interviews, and by expert discussion. Concepts were drawn from: * Marzbali, M., Abdullah, A., Razak, N., Tilaki, M. (2012). The influence of crime prevention through environmental design on victimisation and fear of crime Journal of Environmental Psychology, 32 (2), 79–88.
* Mair, J. & Mair, M. (2003). Violence prevention and control through environmental modifications. Annu. Rev. Public Health, 24, 209–25
* Minnery, J. & Lim, B. (2005). Measuring crime prevention through environmental design. Journal of Architectural and Planning Research, 22(4), 330-341.
 |
| X. Your Crime Risk | **Evaluation of Risk** | New items. These items were generated primarily in focus groups, interviews, and by expert discussion. Note: Numbers 1-3 werecreated to match with primary outcomes: walking for transport, walking for recreation, health or fitness, and activity in park. Items were also adapted from several sources: * Callanan, V. (2005). Feeding the Fear of Crime : Crime-related media and support for three strikes. LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC., NY, NY.

"Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not likely and ten equals very likely, please tell me the likelihood that crime will happen your neighborhood. . . .1. How likely is it that a home in your neighborhood will be broken into while the occupants are away?2. How likely is it that a home in your neighborhood will be broken into while the occupants are at home? 3. How likely is it that someone in your neighborhood will be attacked by someone with a weapon? 4. How likely is it that someone in your neighborhood will be raped or sexually assaulted? 5. How likely is it that someone in your neighborhood will have their car stolen? 6. How likely is it that someone in your neighborhood will be robbed or mugged? 7. How likely is it that property in your neighborhood will be vandalized? Scoring and reliability: Individual item scores were totaled and divided through by the number of questions. The scale ranged from 0 (does not perceive any crime risk in their neighborhood) to 10 (perceives the likelihood of crime in the neighborhood as extremely high). Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient = .93; with no differences across race/ethnic subsamples* Jackson, J. (2011). Revisiting risk sensitivity in the fear of crime. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 48(4), 513-537.

"How likely do you think it is that you will fall victim of each of the following during the next twelve months?"" [1 = definitely not going to happen and 7= certain to happen]1. Burglary while out of the home?2. Burglary while in the home?3. Acts of vandalism/ graffiti/ damage to property?4. Being pick pocketed and other nonviolent theft?5. Being physically attacked in the street by a stranger?6. Being harassed, being threatened or verbally abused in the street?7. Being mugged and robbed?Scoring and reliability: "the factor loadings of the perceived likelihood indicators (pickpocket, λ=.77; physical attack, λ=.92; harassment, λ=.85; and street robbery, λ=.89), t* LaGrange RL, Ferraro KF, Supancic M. (1992). Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of social and physical incivilities. J Res Crime Delinq. 29(3):311-334.

"You have already rated your fear of different kinds of crimes, now I want you to rate THE CHANCE THAT A SPECIFIC THING WILL HAPPEN TO YOU DURING THE COMING YEAR. On a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 means it's not at all likely and 10 means it's very likely, HOW LIKELY DO YOU THINK IT IS THAT YOU WILL..1. Be approached on the street by a beggar or panhandler? 2. Be cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money? 3. Have someone break into your home while you are away? 4. Have someone break into your home while you are there? 5. Be raped or sexually assaulted? 6. Be murdered? 7. Be attacked by someone with a weapon? 8. Have your car stolen? 9. Be robbed or mugged on the street? 10. Have your property damaged by vandals? " Scoring and reliability: All 10 items summed for the general risk index (alpha =.87); Items 4,5, 6, and 7 summed for personal risk index (alpha =.87); Items 2, 3,8, 9, and 10 summed for the property risk index (alpha =.77).  |
| Y. Your Confidence about Staying Safe | **Street Efficacy** | New items. These items were generated primarily from stakeholder interviews, focus groups, and discussions with experts. Concepts were also drawn from: * Sharkey, P. T. (2006). Navigating dangerous streets: The sources and consequences of street efficacy. American Sociological Review, 71(5), 826-846.

The measure of street efficacy represents the mean value over five survey items measuring adolescents’ perceptions of their ability to avoid violent confrontations or to find ways to be safe in their neighborhoods. The individual items comprising the scale of street efficacy are the following:1) “Some kids feel they can figure out ways to be in their neighborhood safely,” and “Other kids feel no matter what they do, they can not be in the neighborhood safely”;2) “Some kids feel they can not avoid gangs in their neighborhood even if they try,” and “Other kids feel, even if it may not be easy, they can avoid gangs if they try”;3) “Some kids feel if they work at it, they can go places within a few blocks of their home safely,” and “Other kids feel they can not be sure about getting places within a few blocks of their home safely”;4) “Some kids feel they have trouble avoiding fights in their neighborhood even when they try,” and “Other kids feel they can figure out ways to avoid getting into fights in their neighborhood”;5) “Some kids feel no matter what they do, they aren’t safe when they are alone in their neighborhood,” and “Other kids feel safe when they are alone in their neighborhood because they know how to take care of themselves.”The items were selected based on their adherence to the theoretical concept of street efficacy. Factor analysis was used to examine whether the items tap into a uni-dimensional or multi-dimensional construct, and all items were found to load on a single factor. To give an example of the coding scheme, if the adolescent responded to the fifth item by indicating that he was more like the latter kids (i.e., he feels safe when alone in the neighborhood…), and that this statement is “very true” for him, he would be given a value of ‘4’ on the scale for the particular item. If he felt similar to the latter group, but the statement was only “sort of true”, he would be given a value of ‘3.’ If he was more like the former group, but the statement was “sort of true,” he would be given a value of ‘2,’ and if he was more like the former group and the statement was “very true,” he would be given a value of ‘1.’ |
| Z. How You Hear about Crime | **Crime information sources (#’s 1-10)****Crime and the news (#’s 11-13)** | New items. These items were generated primarily in focus groups, interviews, and by expert discussion. For numbers 1-10, concepts were drawn from: Sirotnik, B. (2014). Hemet Community Survey Final Report. California State University San Bernadino: Institute of Applied Research and Policy Analysis. Submitted to Hemet Police Department on March 10, 2014. Accessed in February 2015: [http://iar.csusb.edu/documents/HemetSurveyReportFINAL.pdf](https://mail.ucsd.edu/owa/redir.aspx?SURL=N3vWT_cF4_JQcy4zT71Zl8Eq2sYglX5nOgLpQ3v-KHhztlEc3SDSCGgAdAB0AHAAOgAvAC8AaQBhAHIALgBjAHMAdQBzAGIALgBlAGQAdQAvAGQAbwBjAHUAbQBlAG4AdABzAC8ASABlAG0AZQB0AFMAdQByAHYAZQB5AFIAZQBwAG8AcgB0AEYASQBOAEEATAAuAHAAZABmAA..&URL=http%3a%2f%2fiar.csusb.edu%2fdocuments%2fHemetSurveyReportFINAL.pdf) |
| AA. Your Activities | **Exposure to Crime** | Items adapted from: * Giblin, M. (2008). Examining Personal Security and Avoidance Measures in a 12-City Sample. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 45, 359-379.

Tested exposure to victimization risk in routine activities: (3 items)how often the respondent goes shopping, spends evenings away from home, and rides public transportation. Response options: almost every day (or more often) or at leastonce a week (or less often).No reliability, validity or scoring information. |
| BB. Your Experience with Crime | **Victimization** | New items. These items were generated primarily from stakeholder interviews, focus groups, and discussions with experts. Concepts were also drawn from: * Rader NE, May DC, Goodrum S. (2007). An empirical assessment of the "threat of victimization:" Considering fear of crime, perceived risk, avoidance, and defensive behaviors. Sociological Spectrum: Mid-South Sociological Association, 27(5):475-505.

A. Have you had any of the following (nonsexual violent) experiences ‘‘during the past 12 months:’’ "Did anyone take or attempt to take something directly from you by using force or threat of force, such as a stick-up or mugging?"""Did anyone attack you with a knife, gun, club, or another weapon other than hands, fists, or feet?"""Did anyone hit, attack, or beat you by using their hands, fists, or feet or other bodily attack? (not including attacks with weapons)."B. Have you had any of the following (property victimization) experiences ‘‘during the past 12 months:’’ "Did anyone steal or attempt to steal a motor vehicle belonging to you such as a car, truck, motorcycle, or snowmobile?""Did anyone break into, or try to break into, your house or some other building on your property intending to commit a crime?""Was anything else stolen from you (other than the incidentsalready mentioned)?""Did anyone intentionally damage or destroy property owned by you or someone else in your household?"C. Respondents were asked if any of the following (sexual victimization) experiences had ever happened to them:"Has anyone made or tried to make you have sex by using force or threatening to harm you or someone close to you?""Did anyone force you or attempt to force you into any unwanted sexual activity such as touching, grabbing, kissing, fondling, etc.?"Scoring and reliability: Three subscores calculated (nonsexual violent, property, and sexual). Validity and reliability not reported. |
| CC. About Your Health | Fruits and Vegetables (#’s 1-2)  | Numbers 1-2 taken from Active Where?, Section T, “Food”: * Rosenberg, D., Sallis, J.F., Kerr, J., Maher, J., Norman, G.J., Durant, N., Harris, S.K., and Saelens, B.E. (2010). Brief scales to assess physical activity and sedentary equipment in the home. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 7, 10. <http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/7/1/10>

Test-retest reliability: available at <http://sallis.ucsd.edu/measure_activewhere.html> |
| Sugar-sweetened beverages (#3) | New item |
| Smoking (#4-5) | Number 4: taken from: Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System 2013 Questionnaire, number 9.2.Number 5: new item |
| Alcohol Use (#6-7) | Numbers 6-7: adapted from Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System 2013 Questionnaire, numbers 10.1-10.2. |
| Stress (#8-11) | Items taken from the 4-item Perceived Stress Scale: * Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24, 385-396.
* Cohen, S., & Williamson, G. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. In S. Spacapam & S. Oskamp (Eds.), The social psychology of health: Claremont Symposium on applied social psychology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Scoring: PSS-4 scores are obtained by reverse coding the positive items, e.g., 0=4, 1=3, 2=2, etc. and then summing across all 4 items. Items 2 and 3 are the positively stated items. |
| Quality of Life (#12-13) | Number 12: taken from Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System 2013 Questionnaire, number 1.1.Number 13: taken from 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey, number 12: * Ware JE, Kosinski M, and Keller SD (1996). A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: Construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. Medical Care, 34(3), 220-233.
* Ware, J.E. Jr., Kosinski, M., Turner-Bowker, D.M., & Gandek, B. How to Score Version 2 of the SF-12® Health Survey (With a Supplement Documenting Version 1). Lincoln, RI: QualityMetric Incorporated, 2002.

*Note: we also used this item in NQLS, section A, “Quality of Life.”** Sallis, J.F., Saelens, B.E., Frank, L.D., Conway, T.L., Slymen, D.J., Cain, K.L., Chapman, J.E., and Kerr, J. (2009). Neighborhood built environment and income: Examining multiple health outcomes. Social Science and Medicine, 68, 1285-1293. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.01.017
 |
| Mental Health (#14) | Item taken from the 8-item Burnam Depression Screener: * Burnam MA, Wells KB, Leake B, Landsverk J. Development of a brief screening instrument for detecting depressive disorders. Medical Care. 1988;26(8):775–89.
 |
| DD. Just a Few more Questions | Reasons for Moving to Current N’hood (#’s 1-6) | Numbers 1-6 were taken from NQLS, section M “Reasons for moving here.”Originally adapted from: * Frank, Lawrence, Leerssen, Christopher, Chapman James, Contrino, Heather (2001). Strategies for Metropolitan Atlanta's Regional Transportation and Air Quality (SMARTRAQ). Georgia Institute of Technology.
 |
|  | Local Park address (#7) | New item |
|  | Driving & Access to a car (#’s 8 & 8a) | New items |
|  | **Obligatory Behaviors** **(#’s 9-11)** | New items. These items were generated primarily in focus groups, interviews, and by expert discussion. |
|  | Driveable vehicles (#12) | Taken from NQLS |
|  | Dog ownership (#13) | * Bauman, A., Russell, S.J., Furber, S.E, and Dobson A.J. (2001). The epidemiology of dog walking: an unmet need for human and canine health. *Medical Journal of Australia, 175*, 632-634.

Note: also used in NQLS, Section S “Activity Checklist,” numbers 8-9 |
| EE. Demographics | Height/weight, marital status, employment, income, household composition | Most items taken from NQLS and SNQLS |