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ABSTRACT

Collective efficacy has long been a focus for social scientists in Western societies. When applied to community studies, this concept is closely connected with the process of informal social control and social cohesion among community residents. Although the validity of collective efficacy theory has been supported by various studies conducted in different countries, it has rarely been applied to urban communities in non-Western societies like China. Using a large urban sample generated from the Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS) 2012, this study examines the applicability of the collective efficacy measurement proposed by Sampson and colleagues to Chinese urban society. Results of binary logistic regression models suggest that this dominant measurement of collective efficacy that has been widely used in Western society has relatively weak predictive power among Chinese urbanites. Data analyses also show that although primary predictors of urbanites’ perceptions of collective efficacy vary across different community types, residents’ social ties is the most consistent of collective efficacy. The present study thus concludes that a new set of measuring tools that is more relevant to the Chinese context is needed. Future research on Chinese urban communities should pay more attention to the function of social capital in cultivating urban dwellers’ collective efficacy.

Keywords: collective efficacy, urban community, China, influence factors, social ties
COMMUNITY COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AMONG CHINESE URBANITES: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Introduction

Collective efficacy has long been a focus for social scientists in Western societies. First proposed by social psychologists, the concept has been examined under different backgrounds ranging from schools to companies, but exploring the variation in collective efficacy within urban communities has probably been the most popular area of inquiry. The sociological definition of collective efficacy regards it as the process of informal social control and social cohesion among residents (Sampson 2013). Although there are still arguments on the operating mechanism behind collective efficacy, it is widely agreed by social scientists that it is an important and positive community characteristic; a high level of perceived collective efficacy may improve individual’s well-being both physically and psychologically, while a lower level of collective efficacy is correlated to higher rates of delinquency, crime rates, and lower life quality (e.g. Sampson 2012).

Although the validity of collective efficacy theory in different cultural backgrounds has been confirmed by many Western scholars (e.g. Kirk 2010; Sampson 2012), this concept has rarely been applied to non-Western societies like China, especially in urban community studies. The reason for this lack of application is at least two fold. First, the study of communities from a sociological perspective was proposed by the Chicago School and was first practiced in the United States; it has only recently become an area of inquiry among Chinese researchers from sociology, psychology and criminology. Therefore, collective efficacy is a relatively novel concept for Chinese social scientists in urban community and neighborhood research. Second, research on community collective efficacy in China is confined by data
availability. The absence of large scale social surveys that gather information on urbanites’ community life impedes social scientists’ exploration of this theory.

Despite this paucity of research attention, it is extremely important to understand the factors related to collective efficacy in China because of the accelerated urbanization process currently occurring there. The influx of residents from rural areas to cities unavoidably affects the maintenance of social solidarity, the development of civic society, the promotion of urban residents’ well-being, and the control of delinquency and crime. Considering that many of these problems are related to conflicts between individuals and broader social context, the study of urban community – the basic organizational component in social structure – becomes necessary. Based on previous research conducted in Western cultures, it can be hypothesized that Chinese residents’ perceived collective efficacy also serves as a mediator between individuals and society, which indicates its importance in community study. Because collective efficacy has been found to be a crucial element in enhancing community stability and safety, it is important to understand the factors that affect it in China. Therefore, using a representative sample survey of Chinese adults, the purpose of this study is to explore the factors that influence perceptions of collective efficacy among urban residents in China.

**Collective Efficacy: A Literature Review**

The original idea of collective efficacy is derived from social-cognitive theory. According to Bandura (1995, 2000), social-cognitive theory distinguishes among three forms of human agency: personal, proxy, and collective. Collective efficacy in this theory concerns people’s beliefs in their joint capabilities to prioritize their common goals and shared interests and with their ability to achieve the goal successfully with
all possible resources and strategies. The stronger their belief in collective efficacy, the more actively they will engage in collective efforts.

On the basis of this original conceptualization, sociologists further developed the definition of collective efficacy, especially as it relates to community studies. For instance, Sampson and colleagues defined neighborhood collective efficacy in urban areas as the combination of social trust and cohesion among neighbors and their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001). In this articulation, Sampson and his colleagues contended that collective efficacy was both situational and stable over time (Sampson 2012), and it emphasized mutual trust and solidarity among neighbors as well as expectations for action (Sampson et al. 1997; Browning and Cagney 2002). Similarly, Gibson and colleagues considered the perceived collective efficacy within an urban neighborhood as the sense that there is social cohesion based on the trustworthiness of neighbors and their capacity to act as agents of informal social control; it is central to the effectiveness of informal mechanisms by which residents themselves achieve public order (Gibson, Zhao, Lovrich, and Gaffney 2002).

Apart from the social-cognitive origins of collective efficacy, social disorganization theory has contributed to this concept’s development as well. Disorganization theory emphasizes structural disadvantage and the prevalence of social networks at the community level (Browning and Cagney 2002). Traditionally, this theory has explained social mechanisms as the channels that connect social-structural disadvantage to crime and mediates this relationship, while collective efficacy is only one element among them (Gau 2014). Although contemporary social disorganization theory centers on informal social control (Jiang, Wang, and Lambert
the latter is closely intertwined with collective efficacy, making it an inextricable part of the theory. Valuable as it is, in the current literature, social disorganization theory plays a less important role in community collective efficacy research due to changes in urban ecology, the forms of community, and the relationship between urban neighbors (Sampson 2012). Nevertheless, the legacy of this intellectual tradition – that is, the influence factors of community disorganization – has been absorbed into collective efficacy measurement and has become a crucial part of it.

A third theory that facilitates the understanding of collective efficacy is social capital theory. Contrary to commonsense hypothesis, the social capital approach suggests that intense relationships with neighbors is not necessary for achieving social cohesion and exerting informal social control, which also extends Bandura’s definition based on human agency since the social capital perspective focuses on the activation and content of social tie in social context rather than its density (Browning, Dietz, and Feinberg 2004; Sampson 2013). It is suggested that social capital is lodged in the structure of social organization, especially in local communities (Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls 1999). Specifically, as social capital increases, characteristics such as respect and trust are embedded deeper into a community, which further leads to higher efficacy in law-maintaining (Lochner, Kawachi, and Kennedy 1999) and lower rates of crime or other social problems (Bruinsma, Pauwels, Weerman, and Bernasco 2013). Drawing on social capital theory as well as Granovetter’s “weak ties” theory on job acquiring, Sampson and his colleagues remodeled the definition of collective efficacy as “the process of activating or converting social ties among neighborhood residents in order to achieve collective goals, such as public order or the control of crime” (Kirk
collective efficacy at the community level should focus on mechanisms that facilitate social control without requiring strong ties or associations (Morenoff et al. 2001; Bruinsma et al. 2013).

**Measurements, Influence Factors, and Impacts**

The catalyst for most contemporary studies of collective efficacy is probably the result of Sampson and his colleagues’ research in Chicago in the 1990s (Sampson et al. 1997; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbu 2001). Their methods have probably become the most popular among community and urban scholars. According to their measurement, collective efficacy is divided into two interdependent components: social cohesion and informal social control. To measure residents’ perceptions through survey methods, an index with ten questions is proposed by the researchers with five questions for each component. Five questions related to residents’ shared expectations of social control are measured by asking respondents whether they can rely on their neighbors to take action if (1) children were skipping school and hanging out on the street, (2) children were painting graffiti on local buildings, (3) children showed disrespect to adult, (4) people fought in front of their house, and (5) neighborhood public infrastructure was threatened with budget cuts. Social trust and cohesion is measured by whether residents agree with a series of statements: (1) people in their neighborhood are willing to help with each other, (2) people in this neighborhood can be trusted, (3) this is a close-knit neighborhood, (4) people in this neighborhood generally get along with each other, and (5) people in this neighborhood share the same values (Sampson et al. 1997; Sampson 2012).
This measurement has been replicated and extended in multiple cities around the world, including studies conducted in both Western societies such as Stockholm (Sampson 2012; Sampson and Wikström 2008), Brisbane (Mazerolle, Wickes, and McBroom 2010) and the United Kingdom, as well as non-Western culture like China (Zhang, Messner, Liu, and Zhuo 2009). Although most of the collective efficacy studies have adopted quantitative methods, mixed method research does exist. For instance, by combining quantitative data and in-depth interviews conducted in three major cities in The Netherlands, Kleinhans and Bolt (2014) explored the micro-level interplay between collective efficacy, neighborhood disorder and actions. According to them, the “chicken-or-egg dilemma” between collective efficacy, its influence, and its effects has not been fully disentangled and thus require more research. While the issue of time order is problematic for the majority of quantitative research, previous studies have still found several factors that are related to collective efficacy in community context.

Residential stability is considered as one of the major sources of urban neighborhood collective efficacy (Sampson et al. 1997; Gibson et al. 2002; Duncan, Duncan, Okut, Strycker, and Hix-Small 2003; Jiang et al. 2010; Armstrong, Katz, and Schnebly 2015). A high residential mobility rate weakens the social control over collective life (Sampson et al. 1997) as it operates as a barrier to the development of friendship and kinship networks, mutual trust and local associational ties (Duncan et al. 2003). Conversely, a stable neighborhood facilitates the formation of social ties, which further stimulates public familiarity and thus increases perceived collective efficacy (Kleinhans and Bolt 2014). It can be inferred from this statement that the length of residency is critical to collective efficacy as well, which has also been found
by some research (e.g. Comstock, Miriam Dickinson, Marshall, Soobader, Turbin, Buchenau, and Litt 2010).

Residents’ perceived attachment to their community has also been found to be related to their perceived collective efficacy (Browning and Cagney 2002; Comstock et al. 2010; Jiang et al. 2010). On the other hand, racial and ethnical heterogeneity has been found to impede inter-group communication and interaction, and hence has been shown to have a negative effect on collective efficacy (Duncan et al. 2003; Jiang et al. 2010). In countries that are less racially diverse than the United States, immigration concentration is considered as an alternative factor that affects perceived collective efficacy (Sampson and Wikström 2008).

Residents’ socioeconomic status (SES) is also a well-documented indicator of collective efficacy. High levels of SES elevates levels of collective efficacy (Sampson et al. 1997), while lower income or poverty – sometimes combined with lower education – diminishes residents’ perceptions of collective efficacy (Gibson et al. 2002; Duncan et al. 2003; Comstock et al. 2010; Jiang et al. 2010). An SES-related factor that contributes to perceived collective efficacy is home ownership. Researchers point out that owning a house in certain communities is usually correlated to higher levels of collective efficacy (Sampson et al. 1997; Gibson et al. 2002; Comstock et al. 2010), as the investment to the community is followed by a sense of responsibility and an interest in supporting the commonwealth of neighborhood life (Sampson et al. 1997).

There are still other factors that influence residents’ perception of collective efficacy. For instance, existence of neighborhood organizations and voluntary associations has been found to be another contributor to perceived collective efficacy
(Sampson 2012, 2013; Browning et al. 2004), probably because of the dense social
ties and social capital such organizations generate. Similarly, urban neighborhood
activities such as gardening also serve as positive predictors of high efficacy
(Comstock et al. 2010). Other factors have shown inconsistent results predicting
collective efficacy. For example, the correlation between age and collective efficacy
have divergent results: some researchers report that older residents contribute to higher
levels of collective efficacy (e.g. Sampson et al. 1997; Duncan et al. 2003), while
others have found weak or no relationship between age and collective efficacy at all
(e.g. Gau 2014; Jiang et al. 2010). Factors like perceptions of social disorder (Gibson
et al. 2002) and faith in police (Jiang et al. 2010) are also well-studied by social
scientists; these studies contribute to collective efficacy research by connecting the
concept with residents’ trust in social institutions.

Apart from those mentioned above, other influence factors have recently been
shown to be significantly related to collective efficacy in unique urban environments.
For example, the existence of built environments such as urban parks is independently
and positively associated with collective efficacy, while the existence of alcohol
outlets is negatively associated with it in the urban context (Cohen, Inagami, and
Finch 2008).

It is also important to notice the proliferation of research that has documented
the positive effects of collective efficacy, both in communities and at the individual
level. Urbanites’ perceptions of collective efficacy have been shown to influence their
utilization of resources, their collective capacity to translate social resources into
specific outcomes, and their vulnerability (Carroll, Rosson, and Zhou 2005; Browning
and Cagney 2002). Through the process of building up and strengthening collective
efficacy, informal social control becomes possible even without strong or established community ties in urban neighborhoods (Mazerolle et al. 2010) as indicated by social capital theory. Highly efficacious urban neighborhoods are better able to control teenage behaviors, which set the context for group-related delinquency. These neighborhoods are also typically more successful in uniting to ensure that services and resources are not diminished in times of budget cuts (Duncan et al. 2003). Within families, collective efficacy is negatively related to partner violence by regulating violent behaviors between partners and increasing the possibility for women to disclose their experience to neighbors (Browning 2002) and can also moderate the association between child maltreatment and aggressive behavior (Yonas, Lewis, Hussey, Thompson, Newton, English, and Dubowitz 2010). Correspondingly, urbanites who perceive a high level of collective efficacy in their neighborhood are less likely to be fearful of crime (Liu, Messner, Zhang, and Zhuo 2009).

In addition to this research on delinquency and crime, the concept of collective efficacy has been successfully applied to issues beyond community crime control. Recent studies have found that collective efficacy conditions the effects of disadvantageous socioeconomic characteristics on individuals’ health. Generally speaking, residents from neighborhoods high in collective efficacy report better overall health (Browning and Cagney 2002). Collective efficacy is a significant predictor of adolescent obesity measured by body mass index; this correlation could potentially be explained by metabolic pathway and neighborhood difference in terms of physical and social environments (Cohen, Finch, Bower, and Sastry 2006). Higher levels of neighborhood efficacy are also associated with lower prevalence of major depression among populations, especially elder adults (Ahern and Galea 2011).
Despite these positive findings, it is important to note that high levels of perceived collective efficacy have not always been beneficial when put in different contexts. Browning and colleagues (2004), for instance, argued that although social networks do contribute to neighborhood collective efficacy, social ties may also provide rich social capital to offenders who are also embedded in the community and, as a consequence, prevent them from intense social control (Browning et al. 2004). Research on urban youth also shows that unstructured socializing among adolescents – a powerful predictor of neighborhood violence – is supported by neighborhood collective efficacy (Maimon and Browning 2010). For example, in a study on rumor and the perceived crime rate after Katrina, Thomas found that the influx of evacuators from New Orleans to the Baton Rouge area aroused stronger fear of crime among local residents, which was largely attributed to rumors among local residents with high collective efficacy (Thomas 2007). In this way, the neighborhoods that were ranked higher in collective efficacy experienced the negative outcome of being more able to perpetuate rumors that propagated fear among residents.

In sum, the collective efficacy index proposed by Sampson and colleagues has been fully or partly replicated under different cultural and socioeconomic contexts and has generally been found to be related to positive outcomes, which provides support for its validity as a community construct. Perceived collective efficacy is influenced by both demographic and ecological characteristics while exerting impact on residents’ general well-being. Based on this literature, it is reasonable to conclude that perceived collective efficacy functions as a “mediator” in urban communities. It organizes and amplifies individuals’ power to achieve community goals. It also appears to buffer structural disadvantages and protects residents from direct harm.
Therefore, it would appear especially important to examine whether collective efficacy similarly affects individuals in countries where civil society is still emerging. Clearly, this important research question deserves more attention. To reiterate, the goal of this research is to examine the factors related to collective efficacy in China. The next section will review the few studies that have been conducted in China.

**Related Research in the Chinese Context**

With the accelerated urbanization process occurring in China, the decline of “the system of (working) unit,” and the “community construction” movement led by the government, the role of the urban community has become a focus of the government, the public, and scholars alike. Some social scientists do not consider the community as the “idyllic urban village” of traditional urban sociologists (Sampson 2012) but a “field” that provides a “micro-level perspective to look into macro-level problems” (Xiao 2011). What is more, the rise of China’s “new middle class” (Shi 2009) as well as civil society enables the urban community to be a “public space between family and nation-state” (Xiao 2011). As a result, studies on urban communities and residents are of great importance for both policy makers and social scientists.

Although the booming development of urban communities provides sociologists with rich data from which to explore research questions, it is also complicates research examining communities as units of analysis. The rapid urbanization process in contemporary China, accompanied by modification in housing policies and an influx of migrants from rural China has resulted in huge changes in urban community forms. Traditional communities divided by working-unit (residents of a certain community are usually colleagues from the same working place and thus
know each other well) are gradually being replaced by commercial housing communities with higher inner-community heterogeneity (Li, Huang, and Feng 2007). The co-existence of different community forms thus lead to higher inter-community heterogeneity, which makes it harder for cross-community comparative studies. Increased heterogeneity may also weaken residents’ trust in strangers including researchers, which results in a lower willingness to respond to social surveys about their own lives. As a result, large scale survey data obtained from probability samples of communities are rarely collected.

Despite the disadvantageous environment and the inadequate empirical knowledge on community collective efficacy, urban community studies in China are very important. According to Luo (2007), for instance, collective efficacy is a form of neighborhood effect that understands community in a holistic way. Luo argued that the study of neighborhoods, similar to the collective efficacy studies that had been conducted in the Western context, could provide theoretical support for policy change in terms of social mobility in China (Luo 2007). The proliferation of research in social capital has also generated rich results about individual in relation with neighborhoods or communities. Generally speaking, due to its characteristics such as reciprocity, trust and network, social capital can facilitate social collaboration and social cohesion (Xiao 2011; Luo 2007). The higher the social capital in certain communities, the more likely it is that residents will participate in solving public problems (Gui and Huang 2008). Moreover, some research about community participation suggests that a few “active members” coexist with the apathetic majority; many of these active members are retired females who are leaders of residents’ groups (Xiao 2011).
Successful as they are, the mechanisms behind the transformation from residents’ demographic and social characteristics (e.g. education, social capital, etc.) to social behavior remain relatively unexamined in China. We still have limited understanding towards the medium and catalyst between residents’ characteristics and their purposeful actions. Under what conditions will residents unify themselves to the greatest extent to achieve their shared goals? One study conducted by Zhang and colleagues’ in Tianjin took Guanxi (social network) into account when measuring perceived collective efficacy and fear of crime (Zhang et al. 2009). However, this measurement was largely influenced by Sampson’s research and was primarily interested in crime control rather than daily life in urban communities. Shi recognized the disadvantage of Sampson’s method in relation to the urban context in China and modified the survey questions to measure informal social control (Shi 2009), but Shi’s research still failed to examine the factors related to perceptions of collective efficacy.

To help fill this void in the literature, the current study contributes to the collective efficacy literature in several ways. First, research on Chinese urbanites’ perceptions of collective efficacy can not only provide Chinese scholars a new perspective of understanding community, but also enrich the “comparative knowledge base” of this theory in general (Sampson 2012). The use of nationwide survey data, which is examined here, also compensates for the lack of generalizability of the small-scale existing case studies. Most importantly, the results of this study offers a new perspective in understanding the role of community in the development of civil society in China.
Method

The present study focuses on exploring the factors that influence collective efficacy among urban residents in China. The general measurement is instructed by the logic of Sampson and colleagues’ research (Sampson et al. 1997), but adjustments are made in order to fit into the specific cultural and social background of China.

Dataset and Sample

The empirical analysis is based on the Chinese General Social Survey (CGSS) 2012 data. Started in 2003, the CGSS is a nationwide, continuous survey designed to provide the most up-to-date, comprehensive, and authoritative information on Chinese residents’ opinions and behaviors ranging from the economy to education and general social welfare.

To obtain the survey data, a rigid probability sampling strategy was employed. The 2012 survey drew part of the sample from 31 provinces in mainland China, including 480 urban community/rural village residents’ committees from 100 city districts and county towns. In addition, five major cities—Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Shenzhen, and Tianjin—were selected and sampled according to their level of economic development, education, and openness. To ensure representativeness, the sampling process combined stratified-systematic sampling with multi-stage sampling. A total of 11,765 questionnaires were completed through face-to-face interviews.

This research focuses exclusively on urban residents, which is defined here by interviewer’s record on the respondent’s community type. The options include “old city that is not transformed (neighborhood community),” “single or mixed working unit community,” “indemnificatory housing community,” “normal commercial housing community,” “villa or high-level community,” “urban community that is
recently transformed from rural community,” “rural,” and “others”; residents who lived in each of these communities, except for the last two (“rural” and “others”), are considered as urban residents. Because Chinese urban residents’ perceptions about collective efficacy might vary according to the type of community they live in, separate community-specific-regression-models will be run to determine whether the independent variables differentially affect collective efficacy across community type. This resulted in a sample size of 3,333 urban residents for the present study (See Table 1 in Appendix A for descriptive statistics for variables).

**Dependent Variables**

Sampson and colleagues’ classic two-component model of collective efficacy was employed in the current study with a slight modification that takes into account the social context in China. Social cohesion was measured by a combination of three questions. Two of them asked about respondent’s level of agreement to two statements: (1) People in this community always care about each other, and (2) When I need help, my neighbors are always glad to help. Response categories for both questions were measured by Likert scales ranging from 1 (“Strongly agree”) to 7 (“Strongly disagree”). The third question asked about resident’s level of trust towards their neighbors; a Likert scale ranging from 1 (“Trust very much”) to 4 (“Not trust at all”) was employed in the answer. Cronbach’s alpha value of these three variables was 0.70, indicating that there was good reliability for treating them as one indicator. However, answers to all three questions were skewed: a total of 71.5% of the respondents agreed (48.5%) or strongly agreed (23.0%) that neighbors cared about each other; 62.1% of the respondents agreed (44.5%) or strongly agreed (17.6%) that their neighbors were willing to give a hand when they needed help; 81.9% of all
respondents trusted (68.1%) their neighbors or trusted them very much (13.8%). Therefore, the three variables were aggregated and recoded as a dummy variable with 1 indicating a high level of perceived social cohesion while 0 indicating a low level. In the recoded binary indicator, 53.2% of all respondents were ranked as “high” in perceived social cohesion, while 46.8% had relatively low perceptions of social cohesion.

Informal social control was measured by a single question asking to what extent respondents believed “if disaster happens, members in your community can be unified to resist the crisis together.” A seven-level Likert scale was used for answers with 1 indicating “Strongly agree” and 7 indicating “Strongly disagree.” Compared with questions in previous research that focus more on delinquency intervention and crime control, this single question transfers its focus to a more general “emergency” in urbanites’ daily life while still retaining the key elements of the original questions – individual’s expectation for other people to unify and help under a negative emergent situation. It has been pointed out that both social cohesion and informal social control could be measured in multiple ways according to the context (Sampson 2012); previous studies interested in residents’ general sense of informal social control have also replaced Sampson’s original questions with other measurements such as life quality for teenagers and senior citizens (e.g. Shi 2009). Therefore, in terms of face validity, it could be concluded that this single question reflects residents’ willingness to fight for common goods and their expectation for action – an indicator of informal social control (Sampson et al. 1997; Sampson 2013). Similar to items measuring social cohesion, this variable was also skewed: 65.2% of all respondents agreed (38.8%) or strongly agreed (26.4%) to the statement that their neighbors could be unified to resist
the disaster. Another dummy variable was thus created with 1 referring to a high level of perceived informal social control (those who agreed or strongly agreed to the statement) compared to 0 for those who perceived low levels social control. Among all respondents, 65.3% had a high level of perceived informal social control, while 34.7% perceived low level of informal social control in daily life. Due to the nature of dependent variables, binary logistic regression models were adopted in the analyses.

**Independent Variables**

Several demographic variables have been found to be significant predictors of social control and collective efficacy in Western culture (e.g. Sampson 2012; Sampson and Wikström 2008; Shi 2009), and will be included in the multivariate models for this research. Gender is a dummy variable coded “1” for females, and age is an interval level variable measured in years, ranging from 17 to 93. The sample had a mean age of 47.4, and 51% were female. Although individual’s perceived social status has been found to be a better indicator than objective socioeconomic status in some empirical studies (e.g. Singh-Manoux, Adler, and Marmot 2003; Goldman, Cornman, and Chang 2006), preliminary analyses with these data found that it was not significantly correlated to the dependent variables in this study. Therefore, only educational level will be used as an independent variable and was recoded into a five-level scale with 1 to 5 representing illiteracy, primary school, middle school, high school, and college and above respectively. The mean level for this ordinal scale was 3.5. Both marriage status and house ownership were recoded into dummy variables, with those who were married and those who themselves or their spouse owned their own house were coded as 1. The majority of the sample was married (77%) and 45% own their own house.
In addition, household registration status – also known as *hukou* status in Chinese – was also included in this study. The household registration (*hukou*) system assigns agricultural or non-agricultural status to each individual at birth based on the mother’s status, and accordingly registers each individual in a local community (Treiman and Zhang 2011). Under specific conditions, individuals are allowed to change their status, but the policy varies among regions and it is usually harder for non-urbanites to transfer to urban status. Generally speaking, urban household registration status is usually linked to accessibility to a series of social welfare programs such as public housing, medical welfare, children education and so on; these are all societal-level factors that strongly influence individual’s general well-being and life quality. Therefore, it is reasonable to hypothesize that residents with urban *hukou* status are more likely to perceive higher level of collective efficacy as they enjoy more benefits from being “local residents,” and thus, may develop deeper social bonds to their community. In this analysis, urban household registration was coded as 1 (58%) while all other non-urban statuses were coded as 0.

Another important contributor – residential stability/mobility – was not presented in the questionnaire. However, since it is easier for individuals to develop more and denser social ties in a relatively stable neighborhood, social ties can be used as an indicator of residential stability. Considering the arguments on the density of social ties, this analysis created an index to measure social ties in the community by combining the answers to three questions: (1) the number of neighbors the residents would say “hi” to during normal days, (2) residents’ frequency of having entertainment activities with neighbors, and (3) the number of neighbors that the residents would seek help to for tasks such as taking care of garden or pets. The
question about frequency of neighborhood entertainment was originally measured by a seven-level scale and was recoded into five-level scale according to the contents of the options (“Once or twice a week” and “Several times a month” were combined together, “About once a month” and “several times a year” were combined together) and then aggregated with other questions (all measured by five-level scales). This resulted in a social tie index ranging from 3 to 15 with the lowest score (a score of 3) indicating the weakest social ties in community while highest score (a score of 15) suggesting very strong social ties in community. The mean number of social ties in the sample was 9.15 with a standard deviation of 3.17.

**Results**

**Models for all urbanites**

The analysis process is divided into two parts. For the first part, two binary logistic regression models are run separately for the two dependent variables using all 3,333 cases from urbanites (See Appendix B for summaries of each set of model). Table 2 presents the results predicting urban residents’ social cohesion and indicates that holding other variables constant, the only significant predictor of social cohesion is their social ties. For every 1 unit increase in respondent’s social ties, respondent’s odds of having a strong sense of social cohesion increase by 28% (Exp(B)=1.28).

Urban residents’ perceptions of informal social control are also predicted in the Model 1. Again, demographic variables such as gender, age and education level are not significant in this model. In addition, home ownership and whether the respondent has urban *hukou* are also insignificant in this model. However, marital status and social ties are significant predictors of urbanites’ perceived informal social control.
Being married – compared with separated, widowed and not married – increases the odds of having a higher level of perceived informal social control by 25% (Exp(B)=1.25). Social ties are also positive predictor of informal social control: each unit increase in social ties leads to a 12% (Exp(B)=1.12) increase in residents’ perceiving stronger informal social control.

In general, both models fail to explain the variance in urbanites’ collective efficacy very well. Social ties is significantly and positively correlated with urbanites’ collective efficacy; having stronger social ties in the community results in higher level of perceived social cohesion and informal social control. Residents in marriage are more likely to perceive higher level of informal social control compared with those who are not in a normal marriage, but the marital status variable is not significant in predicting social cohesion. Gender, age, education level, household registration status, and house ownership are not good predictors of Chinese urbanites’ perceptions of social cohesion and informal social control.

**Community-specific models**

As noted previously, one of this study’s assumptions is that different community types in urban areas might lead to different living conditions and therefore different perceptions of collective efficacy. Hence, in the second part of data analysis, two binary regression models are run for each type of community (measured by the question “the type of community respondent lives in” in the survey) to determine whether the independent variables differently predict social cohesion and informal social control across different community contexts. Two community types are excluded due to their small sample sizes (“indemnificatory housing community” with 33 cases, “villa or high-level community” with 54 cases); analysis results for the other
four community types (“old city that is not transformed (neighborhood community),” “single or mixed working unit community,” “normal commercial housing community,” and “urban community that is recently transformed from rural community”) are presented below.

*Neighborhood community*

A total of 931 residents reported to live in this type of community. Results of the models predicting social cohesion and informal social control are presented in Table 3. As shown in the first column, the only significant predictor of social cohesion is social ties. With each unit of increase in social ties, respondents are 29% (Exp(B)=1.29) more likely to perceive high social cohesion. On the other hand, house ownership, marital status and social ties all significantly contribute to respondents’ perception of informal social control in neighborhood communities. Compared with people who are not in marriage or do not own their own house, those who are married and living in their own house are 42% (Exp(B)=1.42) more likely to have high perception of informal social control; similarly, a one level in one’s social ties increases the perceived informal social control by 19% (Exp(B)=1.19).

In sum, neighborhood community residents’ perceived social cohesion is not well-measured by the current model, only the variable social ties is proved to be an enhancer of social cohesion. However, residents’ perceptions of informal social control are better predicted by the model; home ownership, being married, and having strong social ties in the neighborhood significantly promote neighborhood community residents’ perceived social cohesion.

*Working unit community*
A total of 506 residents reported to live in single or mixed working unit communities. Results of the models predicting social cohesion and informal social control are presented in Table 4. Unlike earlier models, in addition to social ties, in working unit communities, gender and age are also significantly correlated with residents’ perceived social cohesion, after controlling for all other independent variables. Being female rather than male increases the odds of perceiving high social cohesion by 48% (Exp(B)=1.48). For every one year increase in respondent’s age, there is a 2% (Exp(B)=1.02) increase in having a strong sense of social cohesion. Finally, for each level increase in respondent’s social ties, they are 22% (Exp(B)=1.22) more likely to perceive high social cohesion. In contrast, none of the independent variables significantly predicted respondents’ perceptions of informal social control.

Therefore, in the context of working unit communities, females, old residents and people with strong social ties are more likely to perceive higher social cohesion, while the variance in social control cannot be explained by the current variables.

*Normal commercial housing community*

A total 1,313 urbanites reported to live in commercial housing communities and the results of the logistic regression models predicting the dependent variables are presented in Table 5. Holding all other independent variables constant, education level and social ties are significant in predicting social cohesion. As education increased by one level, the odds of respondents perceiving high social cohesion are reduced by 13% (Exp(B)=0.87), while each level of increase in social ties increased the odds by 31% (Exp(B)=1.31). When predicting informal social control, gender, education and social ties all contribute to respondents’ perceptions. Compared to males, being female
increases the odds of perceiving strong informal social control by 30% (Exp(B)=1.30).
Every level increase in social ties also increased the odds of respondents perceiving
strong social control by 12% (Exp(B)=1.12). However, education has the opposite
effect; a one level increase in education leads to a 13% (Exp(B)=0.87) decrease in the
odds of perceiving strong informal social control.

This set of models suggest that in normal commercial housing communities,
residents who are more educated are less likely to have strong perceptions of either
social cohesion or informal social control, yet residents with stronger social ties tend
to have stronger perception of both variables. Women are more likely than men to
have a stronger sense of informal social control, but there is no significant difference
between males and females in perceptions of social cohesion.

**Newly-transformed community**

Table 6 presents the results of the logistic regression models predicting social
cohesion and informal social control for the 496 residents living in urban communities
recently transformed from rural communities. As shown in the first column, only
social ties appear to be a significant predictor of both social cohesion and informal
social control after controlling for other independent variables. Every one unit increase
in social ties leads to a 22% (Exp(B)=1.22) increase in the probability of having strong
sense of social cohesion. Similarly, for every one level increase in social ties, there is a
12% (Exp(B)=1.12) increase in the odds of respondents perceiving a strong sense of
informal social control. In other words, the social cohesion and informal social control
among residents of newly-transformed communities are only affected by their social
ties, with stronger social ties in the community leading to perceptions of stronger
cohesion and social control.
Discussion

This research has examined the factors related to collective efficacy, as measured by perception of social cohesion and informal social control, in a sample of urban Chinese residents. When combining all types of urban communities into one model, results indicate that residents’ social ties positively contribute to their perceptions of both social cohesion and informal social control. Being married also promotes one’s perception of strong informal social control in the neighborhood, but it has no influence on perceived social cohesion. In other words, urbanites’ social ties could be considered as a good predictor of their collective efficacy, while their marital status can only be used to predict part of their collective efficacy.

Although the explanatory power of community-specific models was not very strong, results did illuminate that while residents’ social ties was still the only factor that consistently predicting collective efficacy, other variables differentially affected collective efficacy across the community types. This indicates that further research interested in explaining collective efficacy should do so within more homogeneous types of communities.

For neighborhood community residents, stronger social ties contribute to stronger social cohesion, while stronger social ties together with being in marriage and homeownership promote perceptions of strong informal social control. Neighborhood communities are usually old-city areas that have not yet transformed into commercial housing communities; residents there are more likely to be urbanites who themselves or their family have been living in the community for a long time and cannot afford more expensive commercial housing – people who generally have lower incomes but may be emotionally tied to their communities. Having their own house or family (marriage) in the community might enhance residents’ sense of attachment as well as
responsibility to the neighborhood (Sampson et al. 1997; Fang and Xia 2014) and make them believe that community members can be united to fight for common goals, thereby increasing their perceptions of informal social control.

Residents of working unit communities are usually co-workers who are working for (or used to work for) the same employer (working unit). Houses in this type of community are usually allocated to residents by employers as part of their welfare. In these communities, residents can live in their houses as long as they want but they usually do not possess house ownership, which is part of the reason why house ownership does not contribute to collective efficacy in these communities. On the other hand, since most of the residents share a similar working experience, those who work and live together for long – namely the elder residents – are more likely to develop a stronger sense of social cohesion. It has been pointed out by researchers that females are more active in participating community activities (e.g. Xiao 2011), which is proved in this model as females perceive stronger social cohesion than males in these communities – feelings derived from shared experience and familiarity.

Residents of normal commercial housing communities come from various social backgrounds. With all differences taken into account, residents’ education level and social ties are two variables that significantly contribute to perceived collective efficacy. Unlike previous studies conducted in Western countries (e.g. Subramanian, Lochner, and Kawachi 2003; Marschall and Stolle 2004; Stolle, Soroka, and Johnston 2008), residents with higher education level in these Chinese urban communities are less likely to perceive high collective efficacy. Liu and colleagues’ (2009) study in a Chinese city provides a feasible explanation to this finding. According to them, more educated residents exhibit a higher level of fear of crime mainly because they are
highly exposed to new media – particularly to the Internet – which is filled with negative reports about deviance and crimes. Their less educated counterparts, on the contrary, rely more heavily on traditional media such as TV programs and newspapers that are under the control of government and inclined to exhibit the harmonious aspects of society. Hence, educated urbanites might suffer more from the impact of negative reports and thus underestimate the friendliness of their neighborhood (Liu et al. 2009; Zhang et al. 2009). Results also indicate that compared to males, female residents of commercial housing communities are more likely to have strong perceptions of informal social control. This is more difficult to explain as residents in commercial housing communities are expected to share fewer similarities than residents of other community types, which usually leads to fewer interactions between neighbors and thus lower level of perceived control among both males and females.

The last community type, newly-transformed community, includes communities lately transformed from rural or semi-urban communities to urban communities. These communities are usually located on the outskirts of urban area and are inhabited by residents from different social statuses. The complex composition of residents is reflected on the low exploratory power of the models, in which the social ties variable was the only significant predictor of residents’ perceived collective efficacy. Studies in Western societies suggest that communities with high levels of resident diversity tend to have lower collective efficacy (Duncan et al. 2003; Jiang et al. 2010; Sampson and Wikström 2008), while Chinese scholars believe that distinct life experiences and values between residents impede their communication and thus hinder the formation of a sense of community (Li et al. 2007). Both explanations are supported by the current models.
The results of these community specific models underscore the importance of context. Collective efficacy researchers in Western societies focus mainly on city or national level comparisons; some scholars consider racial/ethnic composition as an indicator of community context (e.g. Marschall and Stolle 2004), yet seldom have they examined the possibility that the form of community could also influence residents’ perceptions of collective efficacy. This is probably due to the fact that community forms in Western countries are less diverse than those in other countries like China; however, the easy assumption that residents in gated apartment blocks in downtown areas might have very different perceptions of collective efficacy compared to those who live in either poor urban communities, or those who reside in suburban cottages with gardens and fences seems to be ignored by many scholars.

Some recent community studies in China have noticed the distinct impacts exerted by different types of community on their residents and have tried to take this factor into account. Urban researchers point out that the transformation of dominant urban community types from working unit communities to common commercial housing communities enhances the heterogeneity among residents of the same community, which results in larger social distance between neighbors and thus lowers their mutual trust and reliance (Li et al. 2007; Luo 2012; Dong 2014). Empirical studies in Chinese cities also reveal a significant difference between these two community types in terms of residents’ interaction and mutual trust (Fang and Xia 2014; Dong 2014). One might argue that the selection of community is a reflection of general socio-economic status and thus could be compensated by taking SES into account; this argument has been tested and partly supported by researchers using statistic methods (Subramanian et al. 2003). However, researchers also emphasize that
other characteristics of communities, including available public spaces, social distance, infrastructures, and so on – cannot be simply measured by residents’ income level and social status but should be considered as part of the unique community context (Subramanian et al. 2003).

Although the community-specific models presented in this research represent an important step in controlling the context, the low explanatory power of the models is still unexpected as all the variables were selected carefully according to previous research, and the data come from a large, representative sample. There are three possible explanations for the lack of significance found in the models presented here. First, the low explanatory power could be a consequence of imperfect model design. To be more specific, the models may be missing some variables that play a crucial role in building up urbanites’ collective efficacy. For instance, length of residency is believed to be a key contributor to perceived collective efficacy (Duncan et al. 2003; Comstock et al. 2010; Dong 2014); the longer residents live in their community, the more familiar they are with their neighbors, and the higher their perceived collective efficacy will be. Also, communities constituted by long-time residents have high levels of residential stability, which also weakens vigilance between residents and enhances social cohesion as well as informal social control (Jiang et al. 2010; Armstrong et al. 2015). Although CGSS2012 does include a question asking respondent’s length of residence in the local area (which refers to district or county), the variable itself is part of a series of questions about migration and needs to be imputed in combination with changes in household registration. After the imputation, more than 400 missing values are generated due to unexplainable reasons. Because the
sample sizes for the community-specific models were already somewhat small, this variable was not included in the analysis.

This possibility is closely related to the second explanation, which is also to the dataset used for the current study. As mentioned before, CGSS2012 provides a large sample size which is representative on national level. However, since the survey itself was not designed for measuring collective efficacy, the questions used as indicators of this construct may not validly capture residents’ perceptions of collective efficacy. Despite the questions used for this research having a high reliability coefficient, indicating that they are measuring the same construct, it is still possible that the questions employed in this study only capture a limited aspect of urbanites’ perceived collective efficacy. The questions selected for this study to measure urbanites’ perceptions of social cohesion and informal social control are theoretically representative in the sense that they capture the core components of collective efficacy. However, it is undeniable that they also fail to cover every specific aspect of the concept and this may have resulted in the lack of significance in the regression models.

The third explanation to the models’ low explanatory power may be that the factors used in this study are not good predictors of urbanites’ collective efficacy in China. Collective efficacy – a combination of perceived social cohesion and informal social control in the neighborhood – is a theory of great importance in both Western and Eastern societies. Nevertheless, when it comes to the factors that contribute to high levels of perceived collective efficacy, obvious distinctions exist between Western countries and Eastern countries like China. The coherence of collective efficacy theory and its corresponding measurement index has been examined by
researchers from multiple countries (e.g. Sampson and Wikström 2008; Mazerolle et al. 2010), but the differences in terms of context such as culture and people’s life experience are less profound among Western countries than between Western and Eastern countries. Although contemporary urban life in China is increasingly becoming similar to that in Western nations, people’s values, norms and worldviews are still largely instructed by their accumulated life experience in this specific context. Chinese urbanites can – just like their Western counterparts – perceive high levels of social cohesion and informal social control, but their perceptions may be determined by a different set of factors. For instance, highly educated Westerners are more likely to have higher levels of collective efficacy, but the opposite thing appears to be happening in China; highly educated Chinese urbanites tend to have lower collective efficacy. This is exactly due to the different meanings and life styles attached to “high education level” in different cultural backgrounds.

While previous research using the original index developed by Sampson and colleagues (Sampson et al. 1997; Sampson 2012) within Chinese society has obtained statistically significant results (e.g. Zhang et al. 2009; Liu et al. 2009), collective efficacy in these studies is usually used as predictor or mediator itself, the possibility that the same index is actually measuring some other traits instead of collective efficacy among Chinese urbanites still exists. In short, despite the importance of this theory, the Western measurement of collective efficacy cannot be applied indiscriminately to community studies in China. Future research should examine a set of predictors or an index that more validly measures collective efficacy within the Chinese context.
While the significance of other variables fluctuated across community-specific models, residents’ social ties were a consistent predictor of their perceived collective efficacy. In other words, familiarity with the local community contributes to residents’ sense of cohesion and informal control. This finding resonates with previous research conducted in Western societies, which suggest that the density of local networks and the level of participation into community institutions are contributors to residents’ collective efficacy (e.g. Browning and Cagney, 2002). Scholars believe that not only strong social ties such as kinship and friendship, but also relatively weak social ties like acquaintanceship can enhance residents’ perceptions of social cohesion and informal social control (Browning and Cagney 2002; Morenoff et al. 2001). Social ties as a variable is measured in slightly different ways in different studies, but a consensus among researchers is that communication is crucial for building familiarity among neighbors and, therefore, a cornerstone of collective efficacy (Gau 2014).

Residents’ social ties in the current research were measured by a combination of urbanites’ familiarity with their neighbors, their frequency of interaction with neighbors, and their trust in their neighbors. Although social ties as a variable is operationalized differently by different scholars, its role in Chinese urban dwellers’ community life is confirmed by researchers. Both Song (2010) and Luo (2012) attribute the decline of community in contemporary China – community’s incapability of providing neighborhood-based basic social welfare and social support – to the loss of community social networks that has resulted largely from the development of market economy. The retreat of government and working units from communities leads to the disorganization of social institutions within communities and thus contributes to urban residents’ detachment from both their neighbors and the
community public sphere. Dong (2014) points out that compared with commercial housing communities, residents of traditional neighborhood communities have a stronger sense of belonging to their neighborhood primarily due to their dense and active social ties in local community. In addition, social ties and social networks have proven to be strong predictors of residents’ sense of community as well as their perceived “neighborhood effect” (e.g. Fang and Xia 2014; Xin and Ling 2015). Since sense of community and neighborhood effect are concepts that highly overlap with the idea of collective efficacy (Perkins and Long 2002; Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley 2002), it could be argued that the positive relationship between urbanites’ social ties and perceptions of collective efficacy is supported both empirically and theoretically in Chinese society.

The significance of social ties in models also points to a new direction for future research, namely the function of social capital in the development of urban communities. As illustrated in the literature review, the relationship between community collective efficacy and factors like social capital is almost a “chicken-or-egg dilemma” (Kleinhans and Bolt 2014), yet social networks and social ties are undoubtedly important components of both social capital and collective efficacy. For instance, Perkins and Long (2002) provide a socio-psychological four-dimension definition of social capital, in which they include both neighborhood social ties and efficacy of collective action. Sampson and colleagues, on the other hand, highlight the importance of neighborhood ties, mutual trust, and routine activity patterns – the measurement of “social ties” in the current study – in cultivating “neighborhood effects” (Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley 2002). Therefore, it is feasible for researchers to bridge social capital and collective efficacy in Chinese urban
communities through residents’ social ties and contribute to a better measurement of collective efficacy in China.

Many scholars have been attracted by the “bridging” function of social ties and social networks in Chinese society. Lin (2000) defines social capital as resources embedded in an actor’s social relations, which emphasizes the role of social networks and their contribution to community cohesion as well as participatory democracy. Based on this theoretical framework, Bian and his colleagues (2005) point out that urbanites’ social ties, even on a community level, are closely related to their social class in terms of both occupational position and economic achievement. Despite these macro-level analyses, contemporary researchers place more attention on the connection between social ties, community life and social capital in neighborhoods. Some researchers describe the contemporary Chinese urban society as experiencing a shortage of community social capital (e.g. Luo 2012; Song 2010), while others believe that social capital among Chinese urban dwellers is actually abundant (Chen and Lu 2007) and can be successfully mobilized through appropriate methods (Zhang and Xia 2014). For example, various ways of (re)constructing community social capital have been proposed by scholars, ranging from self-organized community organizations (Zhang and Xia 2014) and grassroots self-government in urban areas (Chen and Lu) to the strategic intervention of state (Liu 2007). The importance of geo-spatial factors in understanding social capital has been rediscovered by social scientists (Fang and Xia 2014; Gu 2010). In fact, their argument about revitalizing public spaces in urban communities echoes Sampson’s idea of “spatial network” in modern cities, which focuses on the dynamic interaction between residents and community space and thus enhances neighborhood social ties (Sampson 2004). Although scholars articulate the
network-capital issue in distinct ways, a latent argument they share is that in the Chinese context, a robust social network in neighborhoods does contribute to the prosperity of community social capital, which further benefit perceptions of social cohesion, informal social control, and a sense of community – characterized as collective efficacy in the current research – among community members.

**Conclusion**

Based on an examination of collective efficacy research in Western societies, the current study explored the applicability of Sampson and colleague’s measurement of collective efficacy in urban China. An analysis of over three thousands urban survey respondents generated from CGSS 2012 suggested that although the idea of collective efficacy is theoretically supported in Chinese urban community research, a new set of measuring tools that is more relevant to the Chinese context is need. Data analysis showed that although the exploratory power of models is relatively low, there were significant differences between community types in terms of the primary predictors of residents’ perceptions of collective efficacy. The most consistent predictor of collective efficacy was residents’ social ties in both general models and community-specific models, suggesting that social networks in Chinese urban communities should be considered as a major impact source of residents’ sense of community. Considering the fact that social ties and social capital are closely interrelated, this finding also points to a new research direction for scholars interested in collective efficacy in urban China, namely the function of social capital in cultivating urban dwellers’ collective efficacy and its contribution to the prosperity of civic society in China.
As with all research, this research also has its limitations. Measurement issues related to the data utilized, including the sample size within specific communities types, the inability to fully measure Sampson’s original index of collective efficacy, and the absence of a measure of residential stability are all limitations of this study. Future research should focus on articulating a conceptual definition of collective efficacy within Chinese context as well as determining the most valid ways to operationalize this concept.

Despite these limitations inherent in the current research, the theoretical contribution of this study cannot be ignored. The cultural gap between Western and Eastern societies does not mean the concept of collective efficacy will lose its power in China, but this gap indicates that the same concept might consist of different dimensions across these different contexts. Therefore, the contextual understanding of urbanites’ collective efficacy is required for studies conducted across different social and cultural backgrounds. Policy makers should pay more attention to the power of social ties in urbanites’ community life; robust social network can not only enhance residents’ sense of collective efficacy but also, through the accumulation of community social capital, contribute to the prosperity of civic society and public sphere at the community level. Possible methods of bridging social capital and collective efficacy through social network include community organizations, self-government, and revitalization of community public spaces.
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Appendix A

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND RESULTS OF BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

Table A 1: Descriptive Statistics for All Variables, N=3,333

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Social Control</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female=1)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>47.44</td>
<td>16.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Ownership (Self=1)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Household Registration</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married=1)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Binary Logistic Regression models Predicting Chinese Urbanites’ Collective Efficacy

Table A 2: Results of Logistic Regression for All Residents, N=3,333

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Informal Social Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female=1)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Ownership (Self=1)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Household Registration</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married=1)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td>1.28**</td>
<td>1.12**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01

Table A 3: Results of Logistic Regression for Neighborhood Community, N=931

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Informal Social Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female=1)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Ownership (Self=1)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.42*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Household Registration</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married=1)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.42*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td>1.29**</td>
<td>1.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
### Table A 4: Results of Logistic Regression for Working Unit Community, N=506

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Cohesion</th>
<th>Informal Social Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female=1)</td>
<td>1.48*</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.02**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Ownership (Self=1)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Household Registration</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married=1)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td>1.22**</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01

### Table A 5: Results of Logistic Regression for Commercial Housing Community, N=1,313

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Cohesion</th>
<th>Informal Social Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female=1)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Ownership (Self=1)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Household Registration</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married=1)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td>.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td>1.31**</td>
<td>1.12**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Table A 6: Results of Logistic Regression for Newly-transformed Community, N=496

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>Social Cohesion</th>
<th>Informal Social Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female=1)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Ownership (Self=1)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Household Registration</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married=1)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td>1.22**</td>
<td>1.12**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01