

Journal of Family Strengths

Volume 16

Issue 2 *Organizational Partnerships: How
Collaboration Strengthens Families and
Communities*

Article 3

12-30-2016

Predicting Sense Of Community in a Historic Latino/Latina Neighborhood Undergoing Gentrification

Laurie A. Walker

University of Montana, Missoula, laurie.walker@umontana.edu

Jesse Littman

University of Montana, jesse.littman@umconnect.umt.edu

Amanda Riphenburg-Reese

Open Aid Alliance, amanda.riphenburg@gmail.com

Devra Ince

Open Aid Alliance, incedevra@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/jfs>

Recommended Citation

Walker, Laurie A.; Littman, Jesse; Riphenburg-Reese, Amanda; and Ince, Devra (2016) "Predicting Sense Of Community in a Historic Latino/Latina Neighborhood Undergoing Gentrification," *Journal of Family Strengths*: Vol. 16: Iss. 2, Article 3.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58464/2168-670X.1309>

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/jfs/vol16/iss2/3>

The *Journal of Family Strengths* is brought to you for free and open access by CHILDREN AT RISK at DigitalCommons@The Texas Medical Center. It has a "cc by-nc-nd" Creative Commons license" (Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives) For more information, please contact digitalcommons@exch.library.tmc.edu



Predicting Sense Of Community in a Historic Latino/Latina Neighborhood Undergoing Gentrification

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by research start up funds at Arizona State University and the University of Montana.

Introduction

Block Social Cohesion (BSC), Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, racial concentrations, and density of adults versus children are known correlates or predictors of neighborhood Sense of Community (SOC) (Chipuer & Pretty, 1999; Ohmer, Walker, & Pitner, 2014; Sampson & Graif, 2009; Sampson, Morenoff, & Earls, 1999). However, less is known about predictors of SOC in neighborhoods that are changing as a result of gentrification, where middle- and upper-class residents move into neighborhoods that were historically comprised of ethnic minorities that often have lower household incomes than the newer residents (Lees, Slater, & Wyly, 2008). Differing cultures and classes, as well as shifting dynamics, have an impact on neighborhood dynamics, social factors, and power dynamics within communities (Rivera & Erlich, 1998). Menlo Park is a neighborhood in Tucson, Arizona, that has a large concentration of Latino/Latina residents including a mix of residents with long-term Indigenous cultural ties to the neighborhood land. The neighborhood also has a tradition of several Mexican American cultural festivals—with local and immigrant influences—that are celebrated throughout the year within the neighborhood. Three waves of residents of different demographics moved into Menlo Park in the 1970s, 1990s, and the planned developments around the streetcar in the 2010s; these waves align with national gentrification trends (Lees et al., 2008). Developers marketed both the rich and stable Menlo Park neighborhood history and European-style improvements built in proximity to a new streetcar stop (Devine & McKasson, 2010). As a result, new residents were drawn to the neighborhood at least in part due to the neighborhood SOC and culture associated with a historically isolated ethnic enclave (Devine & McKasson, 2010; Lees et al., 2008). City and federal investments often promote these sorts of gentrification processes via public transportation improvements that spur development within about a half-mile area around each streetcar stop as a means of “reclaiming the city for business, the middle class, and the market” (Lees et al., 2008, p. 184). However, gentrification has been critiqued for possible psychological impacts on historic residents (such as community resentment that may impact social ties and SOC) (Chaskin & Joseph, 2014; Graves, 2010; Lees et al., 2008).

National trends focused on federal investments in neighborhoods include the interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities (PSC), which includes Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Education (PSC, 2015). The PSC formed in 2009 to work on initiatives focused on creating safe and healthy

communities that contain affordable housing and transportation options; the PSC has since expanded to include investments in educational systems within neighborhoods with large federal investments called School-Turnabout grants (Denver Public Schools, 2001; PSC, 2015). Despite the six-year history of collaborations like the PSC, the evidence-based research for collaborations, coalitions, community organizing, and community development as areas of social work practice are not as well developed as evidence-based practices for clinical work (Netting & O'Connor, 2008). Evidence-based practice is the intersection between the best available research, practitioner wisdom, and client values (Edmond, 2009). Existing empirical research reports lower SOC among Latino/Latina immigrants because "immigration and the process of adapting to the new country involve managing the loss of one's SOC nurtured in the native culture and integrating a new sense of community as adaptation and acculturation occurs" (Bathum & Baumann, 2007, p. 172). However, less is known empirically regarding the SOC trends in multicultural neighborhoods with longer-term Latino/Latina residents with market-driven changes to resident demographics in neighborhoods like Menlo Park (Townley, Kloos, Green, & Franco, 2011). This study seeks to determine whether BSC (Sampson & Graif, 2009), Involvement in Neighborhood and Voluntary Associations (Chaskin, Goerge, Skyles, & Guiltinan, 2006; Sampson & Graif, 2009), and household demographics (Latino/Latina and children present in the household) predict SOC within a historic Mexican American and Indigenous¹ neighborhood experiencing gentrification in a southwestern neighborhood (Long & Perkins, 2003; McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Perkins, Florin, Rich, Wandersman, & Chavis, 1990). Menlo Park is an example of a neighborhood with strong ties to culture that could offset gentrification trends that may have a negative impact on social factors. Therefore, this study has the potential to develop the empirical evidence for working with Latino/Latina families in maintaining their social assets within neighborhoods experiencing gentrification. Menlo Park neighborhood context is provided below in order to provide a rich description of the community as a case study.

Menlo Park Neighborhood Context

Menlo Park resident experiences of SOC are rooted in current and historic Indigenous and Mexican American identities and culture (Long &

¹ The authors capitalize Indigenous because it is a common practice among Indigenous scholarship (American Indigenous Research Association, 2016; Tuck & Yang 2012).

Perkins, 2003; McMillan & Chavis, 1986). The Menlo Park neighborhood also has a poverty rate of 31.7% and is estimated to include 61% Latino/Latina residents; the Menlo Park percentage of Latino/Latina residents is almost double the percentage for Pima County (33%) (United States Census Bureau, 2013; University of Arizona, 2009). Many of the Latino/Latina households speak Spanish, and therefore Spanish words for key concepts are included throughout this manuscript. The high poverty rate and percentage of Latino/Latina residents is the result of approximately 4,000 years of Indigenous dwelling within the land, followed by Spanish and United States (US) occupation, and ethnic enclaves created by historic policies that created racially segregated neighborhoods (Otero, 2010).

Several additional factors likely contributed to the development of a higher level of SOC in the Menlo Park neighborhood. First, Mexican American residents of the region may have developed a greater sense of community via collectively owned agricultural lots called *ejidos* (Taylor, 1972). Second, Spanish colonial missionaries influenced local customs when they established local Catholic organizations among Indigenous residents (Dobyns, 1976). Approximately one-fifth of Tucson's residents identify as Catholic, which is 52% of those who identify as religious (City-Data.com, 2010). Third, Mexican Americans, known locally as Tucsonenses, constructed a sense of belonging, solidarity, and ethnic consciousness in their neighborhoods by creating traditional Mexican events, traditions (such as festivals and processions), and organizations after US occupation of land within Tucson neighborhoods by about 1880 (Bascal, 1994; Freeman, 2006; Launius, 2013; Otero, 2010). Fourth, the Menlo Park neighborhood participated in Model City anti-poverty programming in the 1960s that resulted in activist and university collaboration to build the El Rio Community Health Center in 1970. El Rio was managed by a community board by 1974 and continues to meet local health needs, including a local community gardening program (Denogean, 2005).

Fifth, the Menlo Park neighborhood includes historic residents who raised their families in the neighborhood and are aging in place. Younger generations of residents include individuals who are both relocating to other neighborhoods and other individuals or households who are returning to the Menlo Park neighborhood, often in inherited family homes. Residents who moved away from the neighborhood often return to the community for cultural events such as the Dia de San Juan Festival (Patron Saint of Water) and San Ysidro Festival (Patron Saint of Farming). The All Souls Procession in Tucson started in 1990 as a multicultural march that ends with an urn typically in the Menlo Park neighborhood where participants burn hopes and wishes to honor those who died (All Souls Procession Weekend, 2016). The

annual fall event now engages 150,000 people in a two-mile procession. The event planners encourage participants to participate within their own culture that may include, but is not limited to, the Day of the Dead/Dia de Los Muertos. These processions and festivals may contribute to the Menlo Park neighborhood residents SOC/collectivity (*Comunidad*) and feelings (*sentimiento*) associated with the neighborhood, which is attracting newer residents to the neighborhood.

Contemporary streetcar development and demographic shifts.

A historic Mexican American Menlo Park resident is credited with influencing the decision to extend the planned streetcar into the neighborhood; the streetcar links new Menlo Park development with downtown and the University of Arizona (Devine & McKasson, 2010; Whittingslow, 2007). The Mercado District development began in 2004 and includes a mix of market-rate, senior, and affordable housing near a public market (San Agustin Mercado) built in 2010 (Devine & McKasson, 2010). While some residents support the streetcar and related development, other Tucson residents see the recent development of Menlo Park as a means to “erase and commodify cultural identity and social memories” (Launius, 2013, p. 86), which may be a repeated pattern of settlers controlling areas they perceive as the best places for capitalist development (Otero, 2010). Historic neighborhood organizations are named in local planning efforts as local assets that can redevelop a SOC and place for Tucson’s cultural heritage, which includes an Indigenous village, Spanish mission and presidio, Mexican presidio and frontier town, a Chinese ethnic enclave, and historic US settlement (Gann, 2001; Huckelberry, 2015). Theory and empirical research explaining and providing evidence of these social factors in the context of changing neighborhoods are provided below.

Sense of Community, Social Cohesion, and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations

Residents’ high level of BSC, neighborhood SOC, and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations may attract ongoing investment in gentrification of the neighborhood (Ahlbrandt, 1984; Ohmer, Walker, & Pitner, 2014; Wandersman, Jakubs, & Giamartino, 1981). Menlo Park is an example of a neighborhood where an historic SOC, strong BSC, and high Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations may attract outside investment and gentrification. However, the residents attracted by development and gentrification may vary from historic residents, and therefore studies measuring differences in their experiences of neighborhood SOC, BSC, and Involvement in Voluntary and

Neighborhood Associations are important because their presence in the neighborhood may change these social factors. This study includes mixed-methods Menlo Park neighborhood resident survey data. Qualitative data analysis informs quantitative data analysis in order to better understand resident descriptions of the impact of neighborhood streetcar-focused gentrification on social factors in a generational Latino/Latina neighborhood at one point in time just before the streetcar opening. Existing empirical data include the development of measurements of social factors in neighborhood contexts, case studies of these social factors in specific neighborhood contexts, and longitudinal measurement of social factors in a variety of low-income neighborhood contexts (Brisson & Walker, 2016; Chaskin & Joseph, 2014; Graves, 2010; Ohmer, Walker, & Pitner, 2014; Walker, 2015; Walker & Brisson, 2016;). Specifically, the authors of this study seek to: (a) provide a description of generational and new resident experiences with block Social Cohesion and neighborhood Sense of Community; (b) determine differences (between Latino/Latina households and those with children present and other study participants) in block Social Cohesion, neighborhood Sense of Community, and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood; and (c) determine what factors predict neighborhood Sense of Community.

Sense of Community. Theorists conceptualize four components of Sense of Community including: emotional connection, membership, fulfillment of needs, and influence (Long & Perkins, 2003; McMillan & Chavis, 1986). SOC in neighborhoods like Menlo Park must be viewed in the context of Indigenous and Mexican American culture and experiences such as those described in the neighborhood context section above (Rivera & Erlich, 1998). Mexican Americans in the city of Tucson were treated like foreigners on land they historically occupied and experienced overt racial and ethnic prejudice (Weber, 1973). Latino/Latina residents formed an SOC via churches, schools, and community groups in the US (Bathum & Baumann, 2007). Latino/Latina institutions became places to name common barriers to SOC (such as discrimination, racism, and misunderstandings from the dominant culture) and participate in developing trust and influence (Bathum & Baumann, 2007). Community practitioners know that schools are key institutions for building community social factors, engaging in community development and community organizing, as well as improving outcomes at the individual and community levels (such as health) (Gittell & Vidal, 1998; Speer & Hughey, 1995; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003).

Households with children and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations are known predictors of a neighborhood's SOC (Obst, Smith, & Zinkiewicz, 2002). Despite current resident experiences of the Menlo Park neighborhood as a place where they grew up and/or raised their families, the current demographics include only 15.8% children under 18 years old, which is lower than the US average of 24.6% (University of Arizona, 2009). The percentage under 18 years old is known to be negatively associated with BSC when above the national average in low-income neighborhoods; however, the impact of children present in households in low-income neighborhoods with a concentration of children below the national average is unknown (Walker & Brisson, 2016).

Social cohesion. Many studies on BSC were conducted in Chicago. These study measures focused on residents being close-knit, being willing to help, trusting each other, as well as not getting along and not sharing the same values (Earls, Brooks-Gunn, Raudenbush, & Sampson, 2007; Sampson & Graif, 2009). Mexican Americans may report higher social ties (the number of family and friends in the neighborhood) but generally lower BSC when living in a neighborhood with a concentration of Mexican Americans (Almeida, Kawachi, Molnar, & Subramanian, 2009). However, concentrations of Mexican American older adults are associated with higher BSC (Almeida et al., 2009). The Chicago neighborhoods studies include Mexican American neighborhoods like South Lawndale/Little Village (*Little Vilita*) (Sampson & Graif, 2009) but may not include concepts important in Mexican American neighborhoods with active streets/blocks, particularly in neighborhoods with higher concentrations of children. For example, concentrations of Latino/Latina and children/youth under 18 years old are positive predictors of BSC (Brisson & Walker, 2016). Examples of concepts specific to Mexican Americans include: (a) familism and contact among family that includes a sense of shared, common, mutual, and communal resources (*común*); (b) a group of people, society, and organizations (*gente*); (c) social support, companionship, or company (*compañía*); and (d) the ability to have power or have the capacity to work together toward what is possible (*se puede[n]*) (Landale, Oropesa, & Bradatan, 2006). Familism within Mexican American communities is a protective factor that reduces some consequences of poverty for families who are less acculturated to US norms (Landale et al., 2006). Therefore, BSC in this study focuses on study participant thoughts and neighboring behaviors that are broader than the measures used in Chicago context. including: trusting neighbors, visiting neighbors, borrowing items from neighbors, helping neighbors,

working together with neighbors, and watching a neighbor's home or children (Foster-Fishman, Cantillon, Pierce, & Van Egeren, 2007; Obst et al., 2002; Thornberry, Krohn, Lizotte, Smith, & Tobin, 2003).

Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations.

Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations is correlated with increased social factors like BSC and SOC (Ohmer, 2007; Walker, 2015). Involvement in neighborhood organizations is known to strengthen participation, address neighborhood problems, help residents advocate for their needs, build and influence policies and programs, as well as improve quality of life within the neighborhood (Johnson, 1998; Ohmer, Walker, & Pitner, 2014; Schorr, 1997; Weil, 1996). Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations focuses on membership and participation behaviors in several types of organizations, such as neighborhood associations, schools (*escuelas*), faith-based organizations (*fe/iglesia*), community gardening, multicultural festivals (*fiestas*), and processions (*procesiones*).

Resident Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations may shift with the demographics of current residents. Previous research indicates that Latinos/Latinas are less engaged in civic activities; examples of such civic activities include: signing a petition; working on a community Project; participating in sports, parent associations, neighborhood associations, senior groups, and charities; and serving as officers on committees or on local groups taking action (Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, 2000). Previous research in Chicago found that 45% of Latinos/Latinas participate in at least one community group or organization and that nearly 20% participate in two or more organizations (Ready et al., 2006). Almost half (48%) of Latinos/Latinas are members of a church congregation, 17% participate in parent teacher associations, and 14% participate in neighborhood associations within the US (Ready et al., 2006). Foreign-born Latinos/Latinas are more likely to participate in a community or civic organization (53% compared with 37%) and are less likely to participate in addressing neighborhood problems than Latinos/Latinas born within the US (52% compared to 60%) (Ready et al., 2006). Latino/Latina residents, those who do not have a bachelor's degree, and those who have lower incomes are also less likely to be involved in farmers' markets that have been found to be less accessible to lower-income shoppers (Alkon & McCullen, 2010; Zepeda, 2009). Historic and newer residents often attach different meaning to experiences and therefore may promote different solutions or interventions within neighborhoods (Freeman, 2006).

Research Questions

Determining current predictors of neighborhood SOC is important during the early stages of demographic shifts just prior to the opening of the two neighborhood streetcar stops. The specific research questions for this study are: (a) how do study participants describe their experience of neighborhood SOC?; (b) what BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, and neighborhood SOC vary based on Latino/Latina households and households with children present as demographic groups; and (c) do BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, and resident demographics (such as Latino/Latina households and households with children present) predict neighborhood SOC? The study hypotheses are: (a) resident descriptions of neighborhood SOC will include a description of the generational rootedness of Mexican American households that attract newer residents; (b) Latino/Latina households and households with children do have specific scale items that vary from other study participants; and (c) BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, and Latino/Latina households and households with children present do positively predict neighborhood SOC.

Methods

The first author of this study designed this component of the research focused on neighborhood social factors as a key component of a larger study on resident readiness for streetcar-focused redevelopment and subsequent gentrification. Previous research on neighborhood gentrification notes the social impacts of streetcar-focused development on existing BSC, neighborhood SOC and neighborhood organization dynamics, particularly in neighborhoods with a large concentration of public housing and children (Brisson & Walker, 2016; Chaskin & Joseph, 2014; Graves, 2010; Ohmer, Walker, & Pitner, 2014; Walker, 2015; Walker & Brisson, 2016). Menlo Park does contain various forms of affordable housing; however, this study provides a context for understanding how social factors (such as BSC and neighborhood SOC) vary among historic and new neighborhood populations who have a higher concentration of homeowners who raised their families in the neighborhood and aged in place. The neighborhood provides an interesting view into the dynamics of contemporary Latino/ Latina households within a neighborhood context. Menlo Park households have a high concentration of families who either have frequent visits from children and grandchildren or family members who moved back to a generational family home—often after a death in the family resulting in the inheritance of a family house, a divorce resulting in returning to the neighborhood of

their youth to reestablish roots, or a family health issue requiring someone to care for an older family member in the home. This study was a community-based research project conducted in collaboration with the existing neighborhood association (Strand et al., 2003). The study had Institutional Review Board approval from a major university in the southwestern US. The data included in this study utilize mixed methods including: (a) a 315-question pilot test with neighborhood association leaders and members in March 2014 ($n = 13$) and (b) surveys with established quantitative measures and open-ended questions regarding resident experiences living in the neighborhood, their general thoughts regarding new streetcar stops in the neighborhood, and any additional comments that were collected between May and September 2014 ($n = 195$).

Pilot Test Process to Develop the Neighborhood Survey

The neighborhood association president sent two separate emails to all residents in the organization database inviting residents to participate in the pilot test. The pilot test included several established measures of SOC (McMillan & Chavis, 1986), BSC (Sampson & Graif, 2009), and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations (Sampson & Graif, 2009). Pilot test participants completed the survey and then either completed a feedback form on the survey questions and left the meeting or remained to have a focus group discussion regarding the survey questions and approach. Resident engagement in the pilot testing process resulted in significant changes to the quantitative scales included in the survey, the level of measurement (such as block- or neighborhood-level framing for specific measures), and the language of open-ended (qualitative) questions.

Several of the pilot study participants stated that many of the questions were not applicable to their experiences in the neighborhood either because the neighborhood does not have a large children and youth population or because they felt the existing measures framed children and youth in problematic language. As a result, pilot test participants requested that questions involving the following specific topics be removed from the survey including: (a) Collective Efficacy questions focused on children, fights, and budget cuts (Sampson & Graif, 2009; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999); Social Control (Sampson & Graif, 2009); Personal Social Control (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999); Moral Cynicism (Sampson & Graif, 2009); Police Efficacy (Sampson & Graif, 2009); Intergenerational Closeness (Sampson & Graif, 2009); Adult and Youth Neighborhood Integration (Thornberry et al., 2003); Conduct Norms (Sampson & Graif, 2009);

Working Together Against Crime (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007); and Neighborhood Housing and Social Problems (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007). Pilot study participants also requested that some measures like SOC focus on the entire neighborhood (Long & Perkins, 2003; McMillan & Chavis, 1986) and other measures like Social Cohesion focus on neighborhood blocks (Sampson & Graif, 2009). Pilot test participants also requested that none of the survey questions be framed in a manner that solicits negative opinions or consequences of neighborhood development; therefore, open-ended survey questions were framed in neutral language. The first three questions of the survey were open-ended questions. The open-ended survey questions asked of all study participants included: (a) how they describe their experience living in the neighborhood; (b) their thoughts regarding the streetcar; and (c) any additional comments.

Survey Sampling

The sampling frame included every other door that did not have a locked gate, dog in the yard, or signs of vacancy within about a half-mile of the two streetcar stops within the Menlo Park neighborhood of Tucson, Arizona, that were currently under construction during the study ($n = 347$). Research assistants left flyers on all housing units with potential research participants and then knocked on the doors at least three times at different times of the day and days of the week. The study sample resulted in 195 survey participants, which is approximately a 48% sample rate for households. The survey participants included diverse groups of participants who reflect the known diversity of the neighborhood (see Table 1). The surveys were conducted in person by bilingual (English and Spanish) interviewers who collected signed consent forms, audio recorded open-ended questions, and noted responses to quantitative questions on paper surveys. The majority of surveys were conducted in English ($n = 181$), and some were conducted in Spanish ($n = 14$). Surveys were translated in writing into Spanish and back translated into English by two professional translators. Interviewers who were fluent in English and Spanish conducted the Spanish language surveys. The open-ended question recordings lasted an average of six minutes. In-depth interviews and open-ended survey questions were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2007).

[Insert Table 1 About Here]

Quantitative Survey Measures

The study utilized existing measures with established reliability and validity.

Sense of Community/Sentido de Comunidad. Survey participants were asked their level of agreement with several SOC statements regarding their connection to the Menlo Park neighborhood. The established 15-item SOC Likert scale includes ratings (1 = strongly disagree/fuertemente en desacuerdo through 5 = strongly agree/fuertemente de acuerdo) (Long & Perkins, 2003; McMillan & Chavis, 1986). The specific English and Spanish translations are included in Table 2. The participant range of responses for the SOC scale for this survey was from 2.95 to 4.41 (sd = .628 to 1.099), and the mean item response was 3.931 (sd = .526). The alpha for the scale was .874.

[Insert Table 2 About Here]

Social Cohesion/Cohesion del Vecindario. Survey participants were asked to rate how much they agree each statement accurately portrays the current condition of their neighborhood block. The BSC scale includes 35 items from the established Neighborhood Relationships, Reciprocal Exchange, and BSC scales that have alpha scores ranging from .76 to .97 (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Obst et al., 2002; Sampson & Graif, 2009; Thornberry et al., 2003). The specific items of the BSC scale are included in Table 2. Items 20 and 25 were reverse coded due to the negatively worded questions. The participant range of responses for the BSC scale for this survey was from 2.53 to 4.21 (sd = .63 to 1.34), and the mean item response was 3.53 (sd = .54). The alpha for the scale was .944. Many studies only include 5 items to represent BSC; therefore, the descriptive information for those items only is also included for comparative purposes (m = 3.84, sd = .83, alpha = .698), which is between one to two standard deviations higher than the mean score for a national sample of US low- to moderate-income neighborhoods (Walker & Brisson, 2016). Previous research provides evidence that similar concentrations of approximately 59% of Latino/Latina residents in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods may be associated with higher BSC (Brisson & Walker, 2016).

Involvement in Neighborhood and Voluntary Associations/Escala Membrecía Asociativa Voluntaria/Participación Organizacional. Study participants were asked to rate their level of involvement in neighborhood and other voluntary groups in the last year (see Table 2). The scale includes 16 items with the following ratings: 1 = non-member (I take no part at all); 2 = new member (I am just beginning to

get involved); 3 = member only (I attend and play a passive role like occasionally talking in meetings); 4 = member and worker (I encourage others to come to meetings, relay information, do work on a committee or meeting, and/or host a meeting); 5 = member and leader (I act as an officer, committee leader, or other type of leader for the organization, which may include planning and decision-making). The scale includes both established and original items focused on local organizations and events ($\alpha = .77-.97$; Chaskin et al., 2006; Sampson & Graif, 2009). The participant range of responses for the Involvement in Neighborhood and Voluntary Associations scale for this survey was from 1.16 to 1.88 ($sd = .62$ to 1.23), and the mean item response was 1.4 ($sd = .5$). The alpha for the scale was .851. The study participant responses for open-ended items 14 to 16 included 12 additional organizations for the Mexican American study participants, such as volunteering in neighborhood schools, participating in organizations focused on beautifying the neighborhood or neighborhood planning, participating in organizations focused on a westside neighborhood association, bicycling, and belonging to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce or Presidio—The Descendants of Tucson. The white/Caucasian study participants identified 26 additional organizations focused on art, bicycles, business, food, immigration, the Mercado District Homeowners Association, neighborhood gardening, neighborhood planning and land use, pets, political campaigns, and the city senior center. Two biracial and multiracial study participants identified additional organizations focused on a food bank and the Moose Lodge.

Race/ethnicity—raza/etnia and children/hijos. The final two questions focused on demographics. The first question was categorical and focused on race/ethnicity. The survey included several race/ethnicity categories including the following category that was dummy coded as 1 for survey responses that included: Mexican American, Latino/Latina, Chicano, or Hispanic on the English surveys and México-Americano, Latino, Latina, Chicano/Chicana, or Hispano on the surveys conducted in Spanish. The race/ethnicity of survey participants were Latino/Latina (58.9%), white (30.6%), multiracial (5%), Native American/American Indian (2.8%), African American (1.7%), and other (1.1%). The final survey question was a yes/no question asking if the survey participant “has children who currently live with you” in English and “¿Tiene hijos que actualmente viven con usted?” in Spanish. Study participants with children residing in the household represented 37.4% of participants.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data Analyses

The quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently and were given equal status in the data analysis process (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2007). The qualitative themes also informed the quantitative survey measures included in the statistical analyses that highlighted statistically significant differences in scale items among households with Latino/Latina residents and/or children in home. The qualitative themes also helped identify factors predicting neighborhood SOC. The qualitative data analysis was conducted via thematic analysis that started by identifying codes in the words of survey participants, then the research team conducted an inter-rater reliability, and then themes were finalized with supporting quotes (Braun & Clark, 2006). The interrater reliability of open-ended surveys resulted in 79.5% initial agreement, 97% agreement after discussion and decision to combine codes, and 100% final agreement on 40 quotes (Koch, 1994).

The quantitative survey data was analyzed with a one-way analysis ANOVA and regression predicting SOC within the SPSS software. The one-way ANOVA analysis checked for statistically significant differences in comparison of mean and standard deviation for all quantitative survey items by group (Latino/Latina or not and currently have children in the household or not).

Results

The qualitative themes and descriptions are reported first because they highlight important research and policy implications focused on the impacts of neighborhood demographics on social factors; the qualitative themes are particularly important to understand as neighborhood demographics shift during streetcar-related development and resulting gentrification.

Qualitative Results

As the opening question of the survey, participants were asked a general question about their experience living in the neighborhood; the open-ended question resulted in half of study participants discussing concepts related to their SOC and/or BSC ($n = 97$), the Mexican American neighborhood culture ($n = 29$), and the impact of children on their experiences in the neighborhood ($n = 31$). Each of these qualitative themes are explained in depth below with additional supplemental data from survey questions regarding Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations and survey participant general comments at the end of the survey.

Sense of Community. Resident conceptualizations of SOC were closely aligned with the study quantitative measures such as: (a) they describe the neighborhood as a great place to live, say that they love the neighborhood, or say that it is the best neighborhood they have ever lived in ($n = 11$, 6%); (b) they recognize others and are known by other residents; (c) they are comfortable ($n = 34$, 17%), which they define as feeling content and feeling safe in working-class, predominantly long-term, and Mexican residents where children have pleasant childhoods and can live at ease/without fear; and (d) they work together to address issues. Survey participants also describe active streets ($n = 57$, 29%) where lots of residents take a walk, jog, walk a dog, ride bicycles to work/school, walk to the farmers' market, and see children safely playing on the block. One survey participant said,

It's an awesome neighborhood. People walk around here, they ride their bikes, they jog, and they walk their dogs. And it doesn't matter who is walking by, like right there. It's always "buenos noches" ("good evening"), "how are you doing?" It's always a "hi" and a "bye." People do not pass by without addressing somebody.

Many survey participants noted how walkable the neighborhood is ($n = 10$, 5%), which may contribute to the active streets as they are able to walk to shopping, the farmers' market, and downtown or to hiking, parks, pools, the community garden, the community center, or library. One resident noted that Menlo Park is a

walking neighborhood with a limited amount of excellent shopping close by with a world-class Mexican bakery, several restaurants, a cheese shop, a bicycle shop, you walk over to get the mail, you walk over to get tacos at the taqueria, you walk over to stop by for a pastry in the morning or a coffee at the wonderful little espresso place inside the Mercado.

Resident involvement in events like the Farmer's Market and Mercado restaurants varied by race and class, as newer, higher-income, and white residents described participating in these activities. A large percentage of survey participants also noted the importance of bicycling ($n = 31$, 16%) contributing to the SOC as they ride in bike lanes on the street and downtown, commute to work/school, on the Santa Cruz River path, and with a bicycling group.

The long-term residents described the impact of having all the same people still living in the neighborhood where family names of current residents are on street signs and in park names. They describe stability in their lifetime investment as they hope to live in the neighborhood for the rest of their lives (such as stating they choose to stay and do not plan on selling their houses). The long-term residency includes adults who moved back to a family home after a divorce or when a parent needed help. Newer residents are also often older adults (retired), are drawn to the multicultural interactions yet may be new to having the time to socialize with neighbors, and are energized by the neighborhood change.

Social Cohesion. The survey participants also describe BSC in a manner that closely aligns with quantitative measures as they describe the following social interactions: (a) a very close, tight-knit, and bound community; (b) where people know each other; (c) are family oriented; (d) have a community-oriented way of life; (e) sentimentality and neighborhood-based memories for multigenerational families; (f) newer residents who choose to live in closer proximity, live among friends, and care for each other's homes (care for yard/garden and bring in mail when their neighbors travel); (g) historic residents who borrow from one another and who look out for and help each other; and (h) where they fit in and get along in a manner that feels authentic. The family orientation includes residents having several family members who live within the neighborhood (such as parents, aunts, uncles, sisters, brothers, and in-laws). The community orientation is rooted in friendly neighbor interactions (n = 45, 23%) where even acquaintances are polite, nice, generous, outgoing, and open-minded; greet one another (say good morning/afternoon/evening, wave, or greet you with a hug); are inviting, like to visit, and are talkative; compliment each other; are helpful (such as they would let you know if your dog got out of your yard) and are inclusive of those with disabilities; give each other plants or food; and notice when neighbors travel. Survey participants note that the friendly interactions among neighbors often extend five generations as they live in homes their parents and grandparents built in the 1920s through the 1940s. Many survey participants grew up and went to school in the neighborhood, raised their children in the neighborhood, and have aged in place. Survey participants also named several gathering spaces within the neighborhood that build ties among neighbor; these include the pool (such as birthday parties with large families), the river, the community center, fountains and benches within blocks, the Mercado, and the new streetcar connections. For example, one study participant described the gatherings that happen after the Dia De San

Juan festivals when the monsoon rains begin. Another resident said, “When the river starts running, everybody comes out. Big families, big picnics all the time here, kids are always around here with their parents. It’s really nice.”

Latino/Latina: Sense of Community, Social Cohesion, and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations. Fifteen percent of survey participants (n = 29) named cultural components of resident SOC and BSC. Survey participants identify with the: (a) rich history as the birthplace of Tucson; (b) the historically designated neighborhood status; (c) a smaller and charming place that is not new or modern; and (d) the vision of the residents to maintain their language, culture, religion, and traditions. Many Mexican American survey participants named the importance of speaking to each other in Spanish when they said, “it’s nice to lean over the fence and speak to your neighbor in Spanish” and “we all speak Spanish. It’s like a big family. Most of us are Mexicans.” Survey participants describe long-term friendships that feel like or are becoming like family, including church members in the neighborhood who may participate in community get-togethers and traditions like Las Posadas, Fourth of July BBQs, and community parties within neighborhood blocks. Many survey participants noted that they enjoy the culture within the neighborhood and that everything needed by those with Latino/Latina descent is available nearby, including festivals like Dia de San Juan. Mexican American resident participation in community events and organizations increases their SOC, as well as their being known by and their recognition of neighbors.

Survey participants noted that any future development and business improvements should preserve and build on the existing neighborhood culture, character, and charm (such as Mexican food and bakeries). Survey participants also note that new housing should be affordable for current residents and their descendants. Many survey participants noted the direct contrast of their preservation goals with the previous nearby redevelopments that residents term “urban removal” rather than “urban renewal” because residents of Latino/Latina heritage were relocated and their SOC was destroyed. As an example of how gathering spaces within the development have attracted newer community events like the All Souls Procession that is attended less by Mexican American residents and does not reflect Dia De Los Muertos/Day of the Dead traditions, one participant said,

They built the Mercado, and then they've had the festivals—like the Dia de San Juan—and all that, but they also ended up—like All Souls Day Procession ended up being there. But it ended up starting with mainly Anglos instead of the Hispanics that live in the neighborhood, which is supposed to be a tradition, but they ended up making it nothing like what we were accustomed to growing up.

Eleven percent of survey participants (n = 21) discussed the different types of people including renters, new homeowners at the Mercado, and gentrifiers throughout the neighborhood who have moved into the neighborhood within the last 25 years and noted that they are not Mexican Americans, have different values, and are changing the neighborhood. Survey participants noted that resident “values are divided by people’s race,” income, and political affiliations. For example, one resident who lives in a portion of the neighborhood they term Fiesta Grande said,

It’s like our own little community over here. And it feels like it’s changing there, like a lot of people that are moving in. The one guy that just moved out, one of the old people that I used to talk to, he moved in and made his house into a prison immediately. He put a ten-foot high wall and completely isolated the whole neighborhood. And his house, her house is beautiful. He ruined it, but I don’t know how he has it inside. I mean, people that are moving in aren’t like the rest of the neighborhood. They’re die-hard Republicans, they’re like, “We don’t take kindly to their kind.” That’s not what this neighborhood is about. It’s a very open neighborhood.

Survey participants noted the social impacts of the differences in resident characteristics and values, with one participant saying, “it has lost its charm as people move in and out and you no longer know your neighbors.” For example, a newer resident said, “As a newcomer (lived here = 5.5 years), I don’t find that my neighbors have been particularly welcoming or even interested in my living here. I suspect this is due to my being in a neighborhood of long-time residents.”

Generational residents and their descendants describe class-based causes, as they cannot afford to purchase homes in the Mercado or eat at the restaurants along the streetcar route downtown. One study participant said,

There’s really no houses here, and when there is a rental it just gets scooped away fast, but that would have been nice to get more

affordable housing so that more Mexican American, Latinos, and Chicanos could move into the neighborhood they grew up in because there is no place for them to live that they've had to move out. I think that would have brought more culture into the neighborhood. It was a waste of money to build those half a million dollar homes they built there. I don't think there's anybody that's Chicano, Mexicano, or Latinos living in those homes.

Another study participant said, "All the new restaurants downtown are for the 'rich bitch.' The only ones we can afford are the fast food restaurants." Study participants stated that they fear the neighborhood may become accessible to only higher-income and smaller households. One study participant said,

And a few affluent Mexicans and Natives and other people like that will be able to stay here, but for the most part it will be like upper-middle-class white kids, you know? Maybe 3 people living in each house that used to house 16 people, like that house.

Another generational resident stated,

I think they could have used the money a lot more like building low-income housing instead of building those half a million dollar homes that they built behind the Mercado. It did not bring any more Hispanic people to the neighborhood. It brought a lot of (pause) white populations. We have not seen much growth for our Hispanic people here. We do have the El Rio house, and the health center is being expanded, and I think it's going to benefit a lot of the people in the neighborhood, but basically we see the Mercado has not done anything for the people or the streetcar is going to do anything for us.

Generational residents also noted the expected but unknown increased costs for transportation as the historic free bus circulator is expected to be replaced with a more expensive streetcar. The new housing and business realities of the streetcar-related development in Menlo Park are in stark contrast with generational Mexican American residents' expectation to live in the neighborhood and influence the future of the neighborhood. Generational residents feel a strong sense of fellowship and commonality with the neighborhood's past and express concern about whether or not the new neighborhood investments and residents fit in with their way of life and sense of what is important in life. For example, 25% of survey participants

(n = 49) named valuing the quiet, peaceful, tranquil, and calm working-class nature of the neighborhood, which may change with streetcar- focused development.

Children: Sense of Community, Block Social Cohesion, and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations.

Generational and new residents describe a long-term pattern of active neighborhood streets where children play together on the block, ride bikes to school or around the neighborhood, play at the pool, walk dogs, and visit their grandparents. Residents describe watching each other's children when playing outside and children walking their neighbors' dogs, which results in adults interacting with each other more.

Survey participants also described a sense of loss regarding both a decrease in the number of children living in the neighborhood and the loss experienced by the neighborhood with the closure of Menlo Park Elementary School in 2013. Two quotes describing the past experience of children in the neighborhood include, "the kids went to school together, they fought together, they played ball. There was an empty lot over there, and they used to play ball in there together. But now all the kids are gone" and "at one time we had—oh, over 30 children playing in the street in front of us. And we don't have any children anymore." Children growing up in the Menlo Park neighborhood today have different experiences such as a seven-year-old not having any friends from the neighborhood, experiencing pool closures, and not learning about Mexican American history in neighborhood schools. Residents reminisced about their experiences growing up in the neighborhood, raising their children, watching their grandchildren grow up in the neighborhood, attending graduation celebrations for students who walked to the neighborhood school, and volunteering in the neighborhood schools they used to attend. Residents stated that their great-grandchildren were not able to attend these same schools. One participant said, "I had my great-granddaughter going to school over here at Menlo, and she really liked that school. Too bad they closed it." Survey participants described the school closure as causing extreme sadness, pain, and suffering, like it took the neighborhood soul because they have familial history with the Menlo Park school that extends back to the 1920s. One survey participant said there is "nothing like kicking a neighborhood in the stomach like closing down a school."

Some residents described losses to the adults who became accustomed to children walking to school within the neighborhood as an aspect of their daily routine. Some adults reported their personal involvement with the school such as: (a) investing in a new playground

soccer fields, basketball courts, and school walls and (b) parents walking to the school to take classes on crochet, knitting, English, and cooking, classes which resulted in a close-knit parents' group.

Several study participants described a desire to fight to reopen the school. The closed school became an empty place where neighborhood children catch a bus to another school and gangs fight over turf via tagging wars on the school walls and threats of violence. Moreover, the close school has "become a crisis training site for law enforcement with screaming children, like some sort of crisis is happening." Study participants described a desire for community-based groups to rent the school and re-create a place that engages the residents via local organizations, community classes, or a library. The neighborhood school, until just a year before this study, was a socially active place in the neighborhood for both children and adults.

Study participants described continuing to volunteer in area schools; however, their energy is dispersed to other schools and organizations. Examples of places Menlo Park survey participants volunteer are the Davis Bilingual Elementary School, Roskrige Magnet Bilingual Elementary and Middle School, Presidio Schools (which includes evidence-based programs and college supports like Upward Bound and dual enrollment in high school and community college), and Nosotros Academy Charter School (elementary through high school). The closure of the school may result in a decrease of resident ability to recognize each other, bond, or rely on a neighbor for support because they are not engaged in the same schools even if they are engaged in classes for parents or parent/teacher organizations at their children's schools. The differences among Latino/Latina residents and newer residents, as well as those with and without children present in their household, informed the approach to the quantitative analysis.

Quantitative

Differences in scale items among Latino/Latina or children in home. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to check for differences between households with Latino/Latina residents and children present in the household because both demographics are hypothesized to contribute to higher levels of social factors like BSC and neighborhood SOC. Study participants with children currently in the household had higher and statistically significant responses on one SOC scale item and one BSC item, as well as lower responses on one BSC item and one Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations scale item (see Table 3). Study participants with children reported being better able to recognize people

who live in the neighborhood, having neighbors they can contact if they need a little company, and being more involved in school or parent organizations. Study participants who are parents with children in the home reported lower difficulty forming bonds with others in the neighborhood.

The Latino/Latina study participants had higher and statistically significant responses on five SOC scale items, seven BSC scale items, and one Involvement in Neighborhood Other Voluntary Associations scale item (see Table 3). The Latino/Latina population was lower on two Involvement in Neighborhood Other Voluntary Associations scale items including the All Souls Procession and the San Agustin Farmers' Market. Latino/Latina study participants reported higher experiences with having an SOC with people in the neighborhood, recognizing and feeling fellowship with neighbors, fitting in within the neighborhood, being known by neighbors and being able to contact them for company, feeling similar and having a lot in common with neighbors, agreeing with neighbors about what is important, having an influence over the neighborhood, having things in the neighborhood remind them of their past, and expecting to live in the neighborhood a long time. Five Latino/Latina individuals wrote in specific schools where they regularly volunteer. The schools where Latino/Latina study participants volunteer focus on holistic student engagement, have a bilingual focus, or emphasize college preparation.

[Insert Table 3 About Here]

Predicting Sense of Community. The results of a multivariate regression analysis of survey data indicate that BSC ($p < .001$), Involvement in Neighborhood and Voluntary Associations ($p < .01$), survey participants being Latino/Latina ($p < .05$), and survey participants who currently have children within their household ($p < .05$) explain 68.5% of the variance in their neighborhood's SOC. The survey participants included a majority of those who are Latino/Latina (59%) and fewer households that had children present (37%). When the BSC sum increases by 1 standard deviation, the SOC sum increases by .587 standard deviations. When Involvement in Neighborhood and Voluntary Associations increases by 1 standard deviation, SOC increases by .322 standard deviations. Being Latino/Latina increases SOC by .291 standard deviations. Having children currently in the household increases SOC by .241 standard deviations.

Discussion

BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, and Latino/Latina households, and households with children present predict

neighborhood SOC in the Menlo Park neighborhood. Racial concentrations, density of adults versus children, BSC, and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations are known predictors of SOC; therefore, this study aligns with previous research (Chipuer & Pretty, 1999; Ohmer, Walker, & Pitner, 2014; Sampson & Graif, 2009; Sampson, Morenoff, & Earls, 1999). Several BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, and neighborhood SOC items vary based on Latino/Latina households and households with children present as demographic groups. Study participants described an historic and current sense of active and cohesive streets where people visit, eat, play, walk, bike, and run. Latino/Latina residents were higher on seven BSC items (a lot in common, agree on what is important, similar to neighbors, fit in, company from neighbors, fellowship, do not have trouble bonding with neighbors, and reminders of past in neighborhood). The higher BSC may in part be representative of the older Mexican American population that has aged in place and is known to have higher BSC rates (Almeida et al., 2009). The study sample has higher than average BSC (between 1 to 2 standard deviations above a national sample of low-income neighborhoods) (Walker & Brisson, 2016).

The Menlo Park neighborhood is comprised of: (a) approximately double the percentage of Latino/Latina residents in the city of Tucson; (b) a high concentration of poverty (31.7%); and (c) an historically ethnically segregated neighborhood where residents developed a strong ethnic identity and SOC via churches, schools, and community groups (Bathum & Baumann, 2007; Otero, 2010; United States Census Bureau, 2013; University of Arizona, 2009). Generational Mexican American residents, called Tucsonenses, created a strong sense of belonging and ethnic consciousness via: (a) daily interactions and companionship where they recognize and are known by other residents with whom they feel comfortable and raised their families in a working-class, predominantly Mexican American neighborhood; (b) a tradition of shared, common, and communal resources (*común*, a family-oriented community (familism) that contributed to a greater SOC, and later, fences around individual properties where they lean over and speak Spanish and watch each other's children playing on the street; (c) places of gathering groups of people (*gente*) for celebrations and family gathering at events attended by residents and their descendants who have relocated (festivals, processions like Los Posadas, block parties, birthday parties at neighborhood recreational facilities); (d) involvement in schools that were able to promote (*se pueden*) an ethnic consciousness and teach Mexican American history; and (e) the El Rio Community Health Center and local gardening at their own homes or in

community programs (Bascal, 1994; Bathum & Baumann, 2007; Denogean, 2005; Launius, 2013; Landale et al., 2006; Otero, 2010; Sampson & Graif, 2009; Taylor, 1972). Familism within Mexican American communities is a protective factor that reduces some consequences of poverty for families who are less acculturated to US norms (Landale et al., 2006).

Involvement in Neighborhood and Voluntary Associations increases SOC. Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations is known to strengthen participation, address neighborhood problems, help residents advocate for their needs, build and influence policies and programs, as well as improve quality of life within the neighborhood (Johnson, 1998; Ohmer, Walker, & Pitner, 2014). Many Menlo Park residents are engaged in organizations and events, although their participation differs by group. White residents participate in All Souls Procession and the farmers' market at higher rates (All Souls Procession Weekend, 2016).

Latino/Latina residents expressed concern regarding the similarity of the All Souls Procession to Dia De Los Muertos, which ends in the Menlo Park neighborhood, draws the dominant culture, and overlaps with yet is not rooted in Mexican American traditions (All Souls Procession Weekend, 2016). One resident expressed concern that the All Souls Procession occurring in the neighborhood but not incorporating Mexican American traditions may be a sign of erasing their culture. Latino/Latina residents are known to be less likely to be involved in farmers' markets; therefore, these results align with existing research (Alkon & McCullen, 2010; Zepeda, 2009). Latino/Latina study participants are more involved with religious/faith organizations where they tend to be members, volunteer workers, or leaders. Latino/Latina study participants are also more involved in schools where they tend to be new members, established members, volunteer workers, or leaders.

The findings that Latino/Latina households are more involved in schools is in contrast with previous research that found that Latino/Latina households are less involved in parent associations (Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, 2000); however, the findings are in line with previous research noting faith- and parent-teacher-focused organizations as the most common organizations for Latino/Latina families to be involved in (Ready et al., 2006). The Menlo Park Elementary School was a place of both sentimental memories of their own childhoods where they formed a strong ethnic identity rooted in Mexican American history and as a gathering place for neighborhood residents who took classes and developed a close-knit parents' group. Historic residents described the importance of children in creating an SOC through their play within the neighborhood, attendance at school, and participation in volunteering and sporting events. The

festivals located in the neighborhood maintain a sense of culture (Bascal, 1994; Launius, 2013; Otero, 2010). New outdoor gathering spaces foster social ties and community building where residents can visit with neighbors and participate in community events; however, the neighborhood had many gathering spaces before building the Mercado. These spaces included the pool, the river, the community center, fountains, and benches within blocks (Almeida et al., 2009).

Menlo Park Mexican American residents comprised 59% of the study sample and lived in the neighborhood for over 40 years on average. Mexican American interviews in this study tended to be longer; this is an indicator of their generational roots and connection to the neighborhood. Being Latino/Latina increases SOC as Latino/Latina study participants reported higher SOC, ability to recognize other residents and be known, and an expectation of living in the neighborhood a long time and having an influence. The Latino/Latina residents described a sense of sentimentality and companionship within the neighborhood; this may be the result of participating in and developing an SOC via generational involvement in churches, schools, and community groups (Bathum & Baumann, 2007).

The Menlo Park neighborhood has a strong history of children as a source of strengthening BSC and neighborhood SOC; however, the neighborhood currently has fewer children than were present in the past and less than the national population of children (University of Arizona, 2009). The school closure one year before the survey data collection resulted in the school as a prominent theme within qualitative results where study participants described a familial history with the Menlo Park school that extends back to the 1920s. They described an extreme sadness and a painful suffering process with the school closure, which felt like taking the neighborhood soul. The presence of children in study households (37% of the sample) quantitatively increased SOC and was qualitatively discussed as contributing to household social connections and involvement in the local school and organizations. Study participants with children reported being better able to recognize people who live in the neighborhood, having neighbors they can contact if they need a little company, and being more involved in school or parent organizations. Study participants who are parents with children in the home reported lower difficulty forming bonds with others in the neighborhood. The percentage of those under 18 years old in a neighborhood is a known negative predictor of BSC (Brisson & Walker, 2016), but the presence of children in a household is a positive predictor of SOC in this study. The children and cultural emphasis on family, social support, and communal

attitudes may result in increased SOC for the Latino/Latina population (Landale et al., 2006).

Limitations

This research is a case study of one neighborhood experiencing gentrification in a Southwestern city comprised of a large population of Latino/Latina residents. The study has a 47% sample rate with demographics that closely align with the known neighborhood Latino/Latina residents and male/female demographics. However, the study sample may represent a higher proportion of homeowners and those who are retired and a lower portion of those with less than a high school education than is representative of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is comprised of a lower percentage (15.8%) of children under 18 years old, which is lower than the US average (24.6%) (University of Arizona, 2009). Therefore, the study is representative of the Menlo Park neighborhood race and gender demographics; however, the study results should not be generalized to neighborhoods with higher percentages of children present. The study utilized some of the Social Cohesion measures created by Sampson & Graif (2009); however, the community-based research process resulted in eliminating several of their scales that residents found did not apply to their neighborhood given the lower-than-average percentage of children under 18 years old. The social ties, BSC, and SOC concepts blurred together in survey participants' open-ended descriptions of the neighborhood. Mexican American populations are known to have higher social ties (the number of friends and family in the neighborhood) and lower BSC (Almeida et al., 2009); however, this study did not measure the number of social ties in the neighborhood. The BSC measure of this study included several items that measure characteristics of social ties, and therefore there was a distinction between the social ties and BSC among study participants.

Research, Practice, and Policy Implications

This research was a collaborative community-based research process with multicultural leaders of a neighborhood association; this process resulted in an emphasis on neighborhood historic and present assets. The strengths-based approach to selecting quantitative measures and questions for the qualitative interview guides resulted in identifying specific factors that the Latino/Latina participants and households with children present reported as unique to their experiences of BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, and neighborhood SOC. The study included Spanish translation of BSC, Involvement in Neighborhood and Voluntary Association, and SOC

measures that are reliable and valid measures. The Menlo Park neighborhood is an example of a community that drew together investment and the gentrification process of residents with a commitment to maintaining the SOC and character. The blend of historic and new residents working together to maintain BSC and neighborhood SOC stands in stark contrast to nearby developments in Tucson, which were critiqued for relocating the Mexican American and Indigenous communities and in effect erasing social memories in favor of commodifying the place (Launius, 2013). However, the blend of generational and newer residents is not without consequences for the historic residents.

The three waves of residents of different demographics moving into Menlo Park over the past 25 years included the recent planned developments around the streetcar; these three waves align with national gentrification trends (Lees et al., 2008). City and federal investments promote “reclaiming the city for business, the middle class, and the market” (Lees et al., 2008, p. 184). Developers marketed the rich and stable neighborhood history with European-style improvements, and then new residents were drawn to the neighborhood and began consuming the neighborhood culture. The marketing of the new development led to a mismatch with the neighborhood that had been a somewhat isolated ethnic enclave (Lees et al., 2008). The patterns of new residents moving in match other populations experiencing gentrification as a form of urban renaissance. As Lees et al. (2008) state, “the cohort investing in, or buying and living in these new gentrified properties shares its identity with the new upper classes colonizing the elite districts in major world cities—they are business executives, business elites, and media elites” (p. 168). The new development and resident demographics come with common strengths (increased neighborhood investment, improved business investments, improved transportation and pedestrian amenities, and increased social mixing) and consequences to the neighborhood (decreased housing affordability, increased displacement of residents and nearby businesses, increased costs for transportation as the historic free bus is replaced with a more expensive streetcar, impacts to neighborhood social ties and SOC, psychological costs to historic residents, and community resentment) (Lees et al., 2008).

The strong emphasis on social ties among the historic residents may have ethnic- and class-based components as they connect with and celebrate the maintenance of their culture and also rely on one another to cope and meet household needs (Freeman, 2006). In contrast, the higher-income and white residents are often accustomed to weaker social ties and buying/consuming goods and services rather than relying on social ties to

meet needs (Freeman, 2006). Newer residents reported making adjustments to their lifestyles to spending more time with neighbors and relying more on neighbors to care for their houses, yards, and mail while they travel. The new residents now live near historic residents but may attach different meaning to: (a) specific places and events (such as the All Souls Procession and Farmers' Market); (b) engagement in different social activities (such as planning a family gathering on the block or neighborhood pool versus patronizing a business at the Mercado); (c) different solutions to neighborhood problems (such as calling the police to address a vague sense of crime and safety concerns rather than talking with the landlord about those they are renting to who may be contributing to block-specific neighborhood problems); (d) the police, developers, and city planners (such as a public servant, neighbor, or someone creating welcome and positive change for the community versus an unwanted occupying army that once did not invest in or protect the community and now has a sudden interest in creating change for new residents); and (e) changes to neighborhood services, such as closing the elementary school (the role of their closed neighborhood school in maintaining an SOC versus a necessary action due to the low performance of the school) (Freeman, 2006). As a result, the neighborhood SOC, social ties, and involvement in and expectations of neighborhood organizations will commonly have continued: (a) strong ties between generational families; (b) an increased sense of ties among those living in blocks with large concentrations of new housing; (c) a higher likelihood of a sense of social isolation for newer residents living within blocks with high percentages of historic residents; and (d) weak ties among groups despite their living in close geographic proximity (Freeman, 2006).

The most recent wave of gentrification in the Menlo Park neighborhood has resulted in positive experiences for new residents who reported their social needs being met within a neighborhood that provides a good quality of life. In contrast, historic residents reported resenting the higher cost of Mercado District housing, which they believed would be affordable to historic residents and their descendants within the neighborhood to which they have strong attachments. Therefore, newer residents, particularly those in leadership roles within neighborhood organizations, might focus on developing and maintaining an awareness of the differences in experiences and meaning attached to neighborhood place, events, services, and interventions. Social interactions within neighborhood daily interactions, community meetings, and neighborhood events likely have race/ethnicity, class, and/or historic/new resident components underlying interactions. An awareness of these nuanced interactions and a focus on ensuring residents with different perspectives

are able to voice their experiences, describe the meaning they attach to a topic, and offer their proposed solutions will likely lead to improved social ties among historic and new residents and an ability to maintain the endearing neighborhood SOC to which historic and newer residents are committed.

Urban transit-oriented development planners can utilize the Menlo Park neighborhood as an example of policy and practice implications including: (a) identifying neighborhood assets; (b) maintaining neighborhood values; and (c) institutionalizing commitments to neighborhood assets and values within planning, requests for proposals, and development processes. The city commitments to identifying and maintaining neighborhood assets and values may need to extend to additional domains such as city school district decisions regarding closing a neighborhood school and the use of a school building attached to generational residents' BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, and neighborhood SOC.

National trends focused on federal investments in neighborhoods include interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities that coordinate investments in transportation and education systems (PSC, n.d.). Neighborhood cultural festivals and events that occur in and around the neighborhood schools provide a means of emotional connection, membership, fulfillment of needs, and influence, which are all key components of a neighborhood Sense of Community rooted in current and historic Indigenous and Mexican American experiences (Long & Perkins, 2003; McMillan & Chavis, 1986). The closure of the Menlo Park Elementary School is a clear example of how the approach of the PSC could make local and state decisions regarding schools within the context of national best practices, given the federal investment in the neighborhood streetcar stops. The decision of the Tucson United School District to close the Menlo Park Elementary School should be made within the context of federal investment in the neighborhood, as a reason to maintain the neighborhood school, invest School-Turnaround funds to focus on improving school performance and enrollment in neighborhoods with other federal investments, or perhaps close and reopen the school with a different evidence-based approach (Asmar, 2016; Denver Public Schools, 2011).

The narrative of the neighborhood regarding the importance of the school in maintaining their Block Social Cohesion, SOC, and engagement within the community is evident within the qualitative data of this study, which provides new empirical data describing resident values and needs (Edmond, 2009). Qualitative data from the study describes best practices for repurposing closed schools for community-building initiatives, which is

an ongoing trend of the Tucson United School District to support neighborhoods developing locally led, lease-to-own closed schools as a means of reclaiming places for community building (Pittenger, 2016). The sociopolitical climate in the state of Arizona which has led to banning ethnic studies within schools does not take into account the clear outcomes of improved standardized testing scores and graduation rates for Latino/Latina students in schools that have non-Eurocentric curricula that engage students in content that is relevant to their cultural identities and experiences in a manner that “deliberately [brings] issues of race, difference, and power into central focus” (Cabrera, Milem, Jaquette, & Marx, 2014, p. 1092). This study provides additional evidence that schools are also important places for parents and grandparents to maintain and pass on cultural knowledge, as well as remain cohesive and connected themselves as a broader component of their neighborhood SOC. Family advocates, whether residents or professionals, working in neighborhoods like Menlo Park may want to support residents, teachers, and those with decision-making authority over neighborhood schools to see themselves as responsible not only for the education of neighborhood students but also for the maintenance of neighborhood assets such as Latino/Latina culture and the resulting neighborhood SOC (Cabrera et al., 2014).

Conclusion

This study contributes to asset focused neighborhood research within a historic Mexican American and Indigenous neighborhood experiencing changing demographics related to streetcar-related development. BSC, Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations, Latina/Latino households, and households with children present do positively predict SOC within an historic Mexican American neighborhood in a Southwestern city experiencing gentrification. Latina/Latino households and households with children present do have different (most frequently higher) BSC, neighborhood SOC, and Involvement in Voluntary and Neighborhood Associations scale items due to their strong maintenance of a strong ethnic identity, generational neighborhood-based social ties, and ongoing involvement in neighborhood schools and religious traditions (such as Las Posadas). While some residents support the streetcar and related development, other Tucson residents see the recent development of Menlo Park as a means to “erase and commodify cultural identity and social memories” (Launius, 2013, p. 86), which may be a repeated pattern of settlers controlling areas they perceive as the best places for capitalist development (Lees et al., 2008; Otero, 2010). However, generational Menlo Park residents strongly identify with the neighborhood, have strong

commitments to stay in the neighborhood, have maintained a high concentration of generational residents, and have the support of new residents and developers to maintain the neighborhood assets (e.g., character, SOC, and identity as Tucson's Origins). Therefore, despite the likely weak social ties between generational and newer residents, the value attributed to the historic residents, their culture, and ongoing neighborhood cultural events may result in maintaining the strong neighborhood SOC despite national trends that displace populations that occupied the land prior to several waves of gentrification.

Menlo Park is an example of a neighborhood with strong ties to culture that could offset the negative impact of gentrification on social factors like BSC and neighborhood SOC. Future research on the impacts of gentrification could focus on existing neighborhood assets and strengths of the current neighborhood that draw new residents to the community, but these assets need to be understood in context. For example, a naturally occurring place for social connections to form is within neighborhood blocks, and a sense of place may not need to be manufactured; rather, residents gather for celebrations at the neighborhood pool, celebrate seasonal rains at the river, and connect at their neighborhood school. Rich qualitative descriptions from existing neighborhood residents identify how important policy decisions like closing a neighborhood school based on enrollment numbers need to be reconsidered. Decision-making structures regarding school closures need to take into account the social functions of a neighborhood school for multigenerational families, functions that include programing for parents and engagement of grandparents as cultural elders and volunteers in school contexts. Schools in Tucson, Arizona, have served as places where culture is maintained and passed on across generations; therefore, schools are very important neighborhood institutions to maintain as assets and key contributors to healthy families and communities.

References

- Ahlbrandt, R. S. (1984). *Neighborhoods, people, and community*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Alkon, H. A., & McCullen, C. G. (2010). Whiteness and farmers markets: Performances, perpetuations...contestations? *Antipode*, 43(4), 937-959.
- All Souls Procession Weekend. (2016). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <http://allsoulsprocession.org/faq/>
- Almeida, J., Kawachi, I., Molnar B. E., & Subramanian, S. V. (2009). A multilevel analysis of social ties and social cohesion among Latinos and their neighborhoods: Results from Chicago. *Journal of Urban Health*, 86(5), 745-759.
- American Indigenous Research Association. (2016). Indigenous research methodologies. Retrieved from <http://americanindigenousresearchassociation.org/>.
- Asmar, M. (2016, December 9). Denver Public Schools reveals schools recommended for closure under new policy. *Denver Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.denverpost.com/2016/12/09/dps-schools-recommended-for-closure/>
- Bascal, A. (1994). *Types of ethnic responses to ethnic discrimination: An experiential approach to Mexican American identity*. Gothenburg, Sweden: The University of Gothenburg.
- Bathum, M. E., & Baumann, L. C. (2007). A sense of community among immigrant Latinas. *Family and Community Health*, 30(3), 167-177.
- Braun, V., & Clark, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brisson, Daniel & Walker, Laurie A. (2016). A description of social cohesion in low to moderate-income neighborhoods. Manuscript submitted for publication
- Cabrera, N. L., Milem, J. F., Jaquette, O., & Marx, R. W. (2014). Missing the (student achievement) forest for all the (political) trees: Empiricism and the Mexican American Studies controversy in Tucson. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(6), 1084-1118.
- Chaskin, R. J., Goerge, R. M., Skyles, A., & Guiltinan, S. (2006). Measuring social capital: An exploration in community-research partnership. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(4), 489-514.
- Chaskin, R. J., & Joseph, M. J. (2014). Contested space: Design principles and regulatory regimes in mixed-income communities replacing public housing complexes in Chicago. *Kreisman Working Papers Series in Housing Law and Policy*, 16, 1-40.

- Chipuer, H. M., & Pretty, G. M. H. (1999). A review of the Sense of Community Index: Current uses, factor structure, reliability, and further development. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 27(6), 643-658.
- City-Data.com. (2012). *Pima County, Arizona (AZ) religion statistics profile*. Retrieved from <http://www.city-data.com/county/religion/Pima-County-AZ.html>
- Denogean, A. T. (2005, November 15). El Rio health center's founder a true local hero. *Tucson Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://tucsoncitizen.com/morgue2/2005/11/15/219710-el-rio-health-center-s-founder-a-true-local-hero/>
- Denver Public Schools. (2011). Announcements: DPS Receives \$14.4 million in School-Turnaround Grants. Retrieved on April 19, 2011 from <http://communications.dpsk12.org/announcements/dps-receives-14-4-million-in-school-turnaround-grants>
- Devine, D. & McKasson, M. (2010, September 2010). A streetcar named development: What attracts more people and business: transit tracks or government subsidies. *Tucson Weekly*. Retrieved from <http://www.tucsonweekly.com/tucson/a-streetcar-named-development/Content?oid=2205897>.
- Dobyns, H. F. (1976). *Spanish Colonial Tucson: A Demographic History*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Earls, F. J., Brooks-Gunn, J. Raudenbush, S.W. and Sampson, R. J. (2007). Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods: Community Survey, 1994-1995. ICPSR02766-v3. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2007-10-29.
- Edmond, T. (2009, November). Training MSW students to be evidence based practitioners: The Brown School model. Presentation at the Conference on Advances and Challenges in Evidence-Based Practice and Social Work Education, Denver, CO.
- Foster-Fishman, P. G., Cantillon, D., Pierce, S. J., & Van Egeren, L. A. (2007). Building an active citizenry: The role of neighborhood problems, readiness, and capacity for change. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(1-2), 91-106.
- Freeman, L. (2006). *There goes the 'hood: Views of gentrification from the ground up*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gann, D. (2001, October). Can a shared virtual heritage help rebuild a sense of place: A case study in virtual heritage and urban renewal in Tucson, AZ. Paper presented at the Seventh International

- Conference on Virtual Systems and Multimedia, Berkeley, CA. Retrieved from <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/969660/>.
- Gittell, R., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Graves, E. M. (2010). The structuring of urban life in a mixed-income housing "community." *City & Community*, 9(1), 109-131.
- Huckelberry, C. H. (2015, December 14). Summary of Pima County bond election results [memorandum]. Retrieved from http://webcms.pima.gov/UserFiles/Servers/Server_6/File/Government/Bonds/2015%20Bond%20Election/Post%20Election%20Results/bd-bond.election.results.summary.pdf
- Johnson, A. K. (1998) The Revitalization of Community Practice: Characteristics, Competencies, and Curricula for Community-Based Services. *Journal of Community Practice*, 5(3), 37-62.
- Koch, T. (1994). Establishing rigour in qualitative research: The decision trail. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19(5), 976-986.
- Landale, N. S., Oropesa, R. S., & Bradatan, C. (2006). Hispanic families in the United States: Family structure and process in an era of family change. In M. Tienda & F. Mitchell (Eds.), *Hispanics and the future of America* (pp. 138-178). Washington, DC: National Academis Press.
- Launius, S. A., (2013). *Contesting the city: How divergent imaginaries produce Tucson* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Proquest. (1537192).
- Lees, L., Slater, T., & Wyly, E. (2008). *Gentrification*. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Long, D. A., & Perkins, D. D. (2003). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Sense of Community Index and the development of a brief SCI. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(3), 279-296.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1), 6-23.
- Netting, F., & O'Connor, M. (2008). Recognizing the need for evidence based macro practices in organizational and community settings. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 5(3-4), 473-496.
- Obst, P., Smith, S. G., & Zinkiewicz, L. (2002). An exploration of sense of community, part 3: Dimensions and predictors of psychological sense of community in geographical communities. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(1), 119-133.
- Ohmer, M. L. (2007). Citizen participation in neighborhood organizations and its relationship to volunteers' self- and collective efficacy and sense of community. *Social Work Research*, 31(2), 109-120.

- Ohmer, M., Walker, L. & Pitner, R. (2014). Measures for community engagement and collective efficacy in community-based research: Opportunities and challenges. *Society for Social Work Research Conference*.
- Otero, L. R. (2010). *La Calle: Spatial conflicts and urban renewal in a Southwest city*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Partnership for Sustainable Communities. (n.d.). <http://www.sustainablecommunities.gov/>
- Perkins, D. D., Florin, P., Rich, R. C., Wandersman, A., & Chavis, D. M. (1990). Participation and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18(1), 83-115.
- Perkins, D. D., & Long, D. A. (2002). Neighborhood sense of community and social capital: A multi-level analysis. In A. Fisher, C. Sonn, & B. Bishop (Eds.), *Psychological sense of community: Research, applications, and implications* (pp. 291-318). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Pittenger, A. (2016). Urban farm and community space coming to deserted southside school. *This Is Tucson*. http://tucson.com/thisistucson/schools/urban-farm-and-community-space-coming-to-deserted-southside-school/article_b64623de-c21f-11e6-be80-df90fe47fdd8.html
- Plano Clark, V. L., & Creswell, J. W. (2008). *The mixed methods reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ready, T., Knight, R., & Chun, S.-C. (2006). Latino civic and community involvement: Findings from the Chicago-area survey. *Latino Research @ Notre Dame*, 3(4), 1-8.
- Rivera, F. G., & Erlich, J. L. (1998). *Community organizing in a diverse society* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sampson, R., & Graif, C. (2009). Neighborhood social capital as differential social organization: Resident and leadership dimensions. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(11), 1579-1605.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: Spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 633-660.
- Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1999). Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), 603-651.
- Schorr, L. (1997). *Common Purpose: Strengthening Families and Neighborhoods to Rebuild America*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

- Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey. (2000). Retrieved from <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/docs/margins.pdf>
- Speer, P. W., & Hughey, J. (1995). Community organizing: An ecological route to empowerment and power. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23(5), 729-748.
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. 2003. Principles of best practice for community-based research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(3): 5-15.
- Taylor, P. S. (1972). *An American-Mexican frontier*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. (Original work published 1934)
- Thornberry, T. P., Krohn, M. D., Lizotte, A. J., Smith, C.A., & Tobin, K. (2003). *Gangs and delinquency in developmental perspective*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Townley, G., Kloos, B., Green, E. P., & Franco, M. M. (2011). Reconcilable differences? Human diversity, cultural relativity, and sense of community. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 47(1-2), 69-85.
- Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- United States Census Bureau. (2016). *Quick facts*. <http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00>
- University of Arizona. (2012). Menlo Park community profile. Retrieved from <http://azprc.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/MenloParkProfileFinal.pdf>
- Walker, Laurie A. (2015). Community level engagement in public housing redevelopment. *Urban Affairs Review*. DOI: 10.1177/1078087414564604.
- Walker, Laurie A. & Brisson, Daniel. (2016). The impact of concentrations of African Americans and Latinos/Latinas on neighborhood social cohesion in high and extreme poverty United States neighborhoods. Manuscript submitted for publication
- Wandersman, A., Jakubs, J. F., & Giamartino, C. A. (1981). Participation in block organizations. *Journal of Community Action*, 1, 40-48.
- Weber, D. J. (Ed.). (1973). *Foreigners in their native land: Historical roots of the Mexican Americans*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Weil, M. O. (1996). Community building: Building community practice. *Social Work*, 41(5), 481-499.
- Whittingslow, T. (2007). Streetcar alignment decided: Department of Transportation ready to move modern streetcar plan to Feds.

Retrieved from
<http://www.tucsonartisanbuilders.com/docs/press/trolley.pdf>.
Zepeda, L. (2009). Which little piggy goes to market? Characteristics of
US farmers' market shoppers. *International Journal of Consumer
Studies*, 33(3), 250-257.

Table 1

Comparison of Survey Participant and Neighborhood Demographics

Demographic Variable	Study Participants	Neighborhood Demographics
Housing type	Homeowners (51.6%) Renters (38.9%) Subsidized housing (6.8%) Other unknown housing types (2.6%)	Owner occupied (34%) Renter occupied (67%)
Gender	Female (51.1%) Male (47.8%) Transgender (1.1%)	Female (43.2%) Male (46.2%)
Education	Less than high school (11.9%) High school or General Equivalency Degree (18.4%) Professional certificate (7.6%) Some college (21.6%) Associate's degree (9.2%) Bachelor's degree (14.6%) Master's degree (13.5%) Doctoral degree (3.2%)	Less than a high school education (19.2%) Some college (29.5%) Associate's degree (9.3%) Bachelor's degree (24.3%) Graduate degree (17.7%)
Employment	Employed (44.6%) Retired (30.5%) No (24.9%)	Employed (64.4%)
Income	Less than \$12,500 per year (23%) \$12,501-\$25,000 (26.1%) \$25,001-\$50,000 (27.3%) \$50,001 or more (27.7%)	Median income \$49,952 19% increase in income since 2000
Length of time living in the neighborhood	Less than 5 years (32%) Between 6 and 40 years (42.2%) More than 40 years (25.8%)	—
Experience living in the neighborhood	Really like (69.1%) Like (25.7%) Neutral (3.1%) Do not like or really do not like (2.1%)	—

Likelihood of moving from the neighborhood in the next 5 years	Very unlikely (42.5%) Not likely (28.2%) Neutral (9.4%) Likely (13.3%) Really likely (6.6%)	—
--	---	---

Note: University of Arizona (2009) is the source of data in the Neighborhood Demographic column, which is provided as a comparison for the study participants.

Table 2
Study Measures

Sense of Community Scale Items English	Spanish
1) My neighborhood is a good place to live.	Mi vecindario es un buen lugar para vivir.
2) People in this neighborhood share the same values.	Las personas en este vecindario comparten los mismos valores.
3) My neighbors and I want the same thing from this neighborhood.	Mis vecinos y yo queremos las mismas cosas de nuestro barrio local.
4) I can recognize most of the people who live in this neighborhood.	Puedo reconocer la mayoría de las personas que viven en este vecindario.
5) Most of my neighbors know me.	La mayoría de mis vecinos me conoce.
6) I feel at home in this neighborhood.	Me siento en casa en este vecindario.
7) I care about what my neighbors think of my actions.	A mí me importa lo que piensan mis vecinos de mis acciones.
8) I have a lot of influence over what this neighborhood is like.	Tengo mucho influencia en lo que es este vecindario.
9) If there is a problem in this neighborhood, people who live here get it solved.	Si hay un problema en el vecindario, los mismo habitantes lo resuelven.
10) It is very important to me to live in this neighborhood.	Es muy importante para mí vivir en este vecindario.
11) People in this neighborhood generally get along with each other.	Las personas en este vecindario generalmente se llevan bien?

12) I expect to live in this neighborhood a long time.	Espero vivir en este vecindario por largo tiempo.
13) People in this neighborhood watch after each other.	Las personas en este vecindario se cuidan unas a otras.
14) It is important for me to feel a SOC with the people in my neighborhood.	Es importante para mi sentir la sensación de comunidad con las personas de mi vecindario.
15) I feel a strong SOC with the people in my neighborhood.	Siento un fuerte sentimiento de comunidad con las personas de mi vecindario.
Social Cohesion Scale Items English	Spanish
1) I feel a strong sense of ties with the other people who live in my local neighborhood.	Yo percibo un fuerte sentimiento de lazos con otra gente que vive en mi barrio local.
2) If I need a little company, I can contact a neighbor I know.	Si necesito un poco de compañía, puedo llamar a un vecino que conozco.
3) A feeling of fellowship runs deep between me and other people in my neighborhood.	El sentimiento de hermandad es profundo entre otra gente de mi barrio y yo.
4) If I need advice about something I could ask someone from my local neighborhood.	Si necesito consejo sobre algo le podría preguntar a alguien de mi barrio local.
5) People in this neighborhood are willing to help their neighbors.	Las personas en este vecindario tienen voluntad de ayudar a sus vecinos.
6) I often help my neighbors with small things or they help me.	Con frecuencia ayudo a mis vecinos con pequeñas cosas o me ayudan ellos a mí.
7) I have a lot in common with other people who live in my local neighborhood.	Yo tengo mucho en común con otra gente que vive en mi barrio local.
8) If the people who live in my local area were planning something, I'd think of it as something we're doing rather than something they're doing.	Si la gente que vive en mi área local estuviese planeando algo, yo pensaría en eso como algo que nosotros estamos haciendo, más que como algo que ellos están haciendo.

9) The friendships and associations I have with other people in my local neighborhood mean a lot to me.	Las amistades y asociaciones que tengo con otra gente en mi barrio local significan mucho para mí.
10) If I don't have something I need I can borrow it from a neighbor.	Si no tengo algo que me hace falta se lo puedo pedir a un vecino.
11) I have made new friends living in my local neighborhood.	Yo he hecho amistades nuevas viviendo en mi barrio local.
12) I often visit my neighbors.	Con frecuencia visito a mis vecinos.
13) If I feel like talking I can generally find someone in my local neighborhood to chat to.	Si tengo ganas de charlar con alguien puedo generalmente encontrar a alguien en mi barrio local con quien platicar.
14) I find it difficult to form a bond with other people who live in my local neighborhood.	Me resulta difícil formar un vínculo con otra gente que vive en mi barrio local.
15) I feel loyal to the people in my neighborhood.	Yo me siento leal a la gente de mi barrio.
16) I chat with my neighbors when I run into them.	Yo platico con mis vecinos cuando me los encuentro.
17) I am quite similar to most people who live in my local neighborhood.	Yo soy bastante similar a la mayoría de la gente que vive en barrio local.
18) I exchange favors with neighbors.	Intercambio favores con los vecinos.
19) I have friends in my local neighborhood, who are part of my everyday activities.	Yo tengo amigos en mi barrio local, quienes son parte de mis actividades diarias.
20) I don't feel a sense of being connected with other people who live in my local neighborhood.	Yo no noto un sentimiento de estar conectado/a con otra gente que vive en mi barrio local.
21) Lots of things in my neighborhood remind me of my past.	Muchas cosas de mi barrio me recuerdan mi pasado.
22) I think I agree with most people in my neighborhood about what is important in life.	Yo creo que estoy de acuerdo con la mayoría de la gente de mi barrio acerca de qué es lo importante en la vida.
23) I really fit in to my local neighborhood.	Yo encajo muy bien en mi barrio local.

24) The people who live in my local neighborhood get along well.	La gente que vive en mi barrio local se lleva bien.
25) I rarely visit other people in my local neighborhood.	Rara vez visito a otra gente en mi barrio local.
26) My local neighborhood is a part of my everyday life.	Mi barrio local es una parte de mi vida diaria.
27) People in my local neighborhood do not share the same values.	La gente en mi barrio local no comparte los mismos valores.
28) In general I'm glad to be a resident of my local neighborhood.	En general estoy complacido de ser un residente de mi barrio local.
29) I ask neighbors to watch my home when I am not there.	Pregunto a los vecinos si pueden vigilar mi casa cuando no estoy allí.
30) I ask neighbors to watch my children when I am not at home.	Pregunto a los vecinos si pueden vigilar mi hijos cuando no estoy en casa.
31) I ask neighbors for rides for myself or a member of my household.	Pregunto a mis vecinos si pueden transportarme a mi o a un miembro de mi hogar.
32) I have parties or other get-togethers where other people in the neighborhood are invited.	Tengo fiestas u otras reuniones donde personas del vecindario son invitadas.
33) Neighbors visit each others' homes.	Los vecinos visitan las casas de los otros.
34) This is a close-knit neighborhood.	Este es un vecindario unido.
35) People in this neighborhood can be trusted.	Se puede confiar en las personas de este vecindario.
Involvement in Neighborhood and Other Voluntary Groups	Spanish
English	
1) The Menlo Park Neighborhood Association	Asociación del vecindario Menlo Park
2) A religious/faith organization (such as church or temple)	Una organización religiosa o de fe (como una iglesia o templo)
3) A business or civic group	Un grupo cívico o de negocios
4) A sports and/or athletic team/organization	Una organización o equipo de deporte o de atletismo

5) A school or parent organization (such as a Parent Teacher Association)	Una organización de escuela de padres (como Asociación de Padres y Maestros)
6) Neighborhood watch program	Programa de vigilancia del vecindario
7) A local political organization	Una organización política local
8) An ethnic or nationality club	Un club étnico o de nacionalidad
9) Día de San Juan Festival	Festival Día de San Juan
10) All Souls Procession	Procesión de todas las almas
11) 4 th of July Celebration	Celebración del 4 de Julio
12) San Agustin Farmers' Market	Mercado de Agricultores San Agustín
13) Mission Garden	Jardín de La Misión
14) Other block groups, tenant associations, or community councils (Please list the name[s])	Otros grupos, asociación de inquilinos, o consejos comunales (Por favor escriba el nombre)
15) Other committees or planning efforts (Please list the name[s])	Otros comités o esfuerzos de planificación (Por favor escriba el nombre)
16) Other community organizing or social change efforts (Please list the name[s])	¿Otras organizaciones locales o esfuerzos de cambio social? Si sí, ¿cuál es el nombre del grupo?

Table 3

Sense of Community, Social Cohesion, and Involvement in Neighborhood and Other Voluntary Groups Scale Items Varying By Latino/Latina or Children

Sense of Community	Latino/Latina Sample	Households with Children Present
I can recognize most of the people who live in this neighborhood.	3.93, 3.4 (.904, 1.195) $p < .001$	3.95, 3.56 (.983, 1.091) $p = .019$
Most of my neighbors know me.	3.88, 3.39 (1.023, 1.133) $p = .003$	ns
I have a lot of influence over what this neighborhood is like.	3.09, 2.77 (1.049, .993) $p = .048$	ns
I expect to live in this neighborhood a long time.	4.14, 3.79 (.829, 1.122) $p = .022$	ns

I feel a strong SOC with the people in my neighborhood.	3.94, 3.57 (.781, 1.001) p = .007	ns
Social Cohesion	Latino/Latina Sample	Households with Children Present
If I need a little company, I can contact a neighbor I know.	3.90, 3.53 (.869, 1.107) p = .014	4, 3.62 (.901, .993) p = .013
A feeling of fellowship runs deep between me and other people in my neighborhood.	3.62, 3.32 (.868, 1.039) p = .038	ns
I have a lot in common with other people who live in my local neighborhood.	3.58, 3.24 (.858, .999) p = .022	ns
I find it difficult to form a bond with other people who live in my local neighborhood.	ns	2.28, 2.69 (.917, 1.006) p = .009
I am quite similar to most people who live in my local neighborhood.	3.53, 2.88 (.969, .993 3.80, p < .001	Ns
Lots of things in my neighborhood remind me of my past.	2.68 (1.161, 1.052) p < .001	Ns
I think I agree with most people in my neighborhood about what is important in life.	3.87, 3.46 (.837, .84) p = .003	Ns
I really fit in to my local neighborhood.	3.91, 3.57 (.761, .753) p = .004	Ns
Involvement in Neighborhood and Other Voluntary Groups	Latino/Latina Sample	Households with Children Present

A religious/faith organization (such as church or temple)	2.10, 1.59 (1.264, 1.150) p = .011	Ns
A school or parent organization (such as a Parent Teacher Association)	1.72, 1.14 (1.815, .56) p = .037	1.52, 1.2 (1.053, .654) p < .001
All Souls Procession	1.59, 2.13 (.947, 1.125) p < .001	ns

Note: The table content includes the Mean (Standard Deviation) and Significance Level for each survey item organized by households that are Latino/Latina and households that have children present. Data are only provided for survey items that have statistically significant differences between the households that are Latino/Latina versus non-Latino/Latina and households that have children present versus households that do not have children present. Non-significant results are represented by “ns.”