A THEORETICAL EXPLORATION OF PSOC IN AN ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT: THE TOWN-GOWN EXAMPLE
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The construct of psychological sense of community (PSOC) is an important multidimensional factor in understanding community well being yet despite this fact, most of the research on PSOC does not adequately account for this reality. Using the example of a residential neighborhood that adjoins a university campus, this article seeks to expand the current conceptualization of PSOC to more fully capture its ecological and cultural complexities. By applying Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) social ecological framework along with a number of related social science concepts to a discussion of PSOC in a campus-adjacent neighborhood, the paper explores theoretical perspectives and related community constructs that may help expand the conceptualization and measurement of PSOC in diverse communities. While town-gown relations provide the focus of this article, this work has implications for the general exploration of the roots and conceptualization of PSOC at multiple systemic levels and in diverse settings.
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1. Introduction

This paper was inspired by a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) that was awarded to a medium-size public university in the Appalachian coal region of the U.S. COPC grants were designed to partner university resources with those of the surrounding community in order to further community development goals¹. Relationships in the campus-adjacent neighborhood, which is shared by off-campus college students and year-round residents, were then further explored in a yearlong ethnographic study (Powell, 2013, 2014). The need for the study was exacerbated by a series of catastrophic neighborhood events including three violent incidents in which two people were killed and several seriously injured and three fires in which three persons were killed and multiple persons displaced.

* Professor in the Department of Social Work, Frostburg State University, USA

¹ The COPC Program was last funded in FY05 and to date, funding has not been restored. For more information, see the website for HUD’s Office of University Partnerships (http://www.oup.org).
Psychological sense of community (PSOC) – an individual’s sense of membership, influence, fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connection – was initially thought to be a fitting construct for the issues raised through this grant and subsequent research study. These issues included questions such as: what beyond physical location marks a meaningful community, how do different populations of people relate to the multiple communities in their lives, and how do researchers go about measuring the existence, development, and maintenance of PSOC at multiple levels of analysis and operation. It soon became apparent, however, that PSOC alone, as conceptualized and measured most often in the field, was unable to provide a theoretically complete definition and description of the complex, multi-population, multilevel context of this neighborhood. Among its conceptual shortcomings was the limited development of PSOC at systemic levels above that of the individual (Long & Perkins, 2007; Perkins & Long, 2002); a restricted contextualization of the impact of a setting’s historical and social/ecological context (i.e., its culture) on the development, maintenance and meaning of PSOC; a frequent assumption in the literature that a strong community and a strong PSOC were inherently good (Brodsky, 1996); and a limited articulation of how PSOC is similar to and different from other measures of community functioning, such as attachment to place (Low & Altman, 1992) or social capital (Bourdieu, 1986) and what these and other community concepts can contribute to a better understanding of PSOC. Very few researchers, with the exception of Long and Perkins (2007) and Perkins and Long (2002), have explored the statistical relationships between PSOC and other related concepts within multilevel models. This paper describes the particulars of town-gown relationships², reviews the relevant literature on PSOC, and then utilizes Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological model and other related social science constructs of community functioning to explore how community theory, research, and practice might benefit from an expanded exploration of PSOC within a multilevel, multisystemic community context. The author takes a theoretical approach to this expansion, because, as will be apparent below, including all of the pertinent levels of analysis into any one study is impossible. This community case study, however, provides an opportunity to theoretically explore the range of levels, perspectives, and variables that would be necessary to fully map the meaning and operation of PSOC in heterogeneous communities. The actual findings from the ethnographic study have been reported in earlier publications (Powell, 2013, 2014) and will not be detailed in this paper.

1.1 Psychological Sense of Community

Much of the work on PSOC, based on Sarason’s (1974) origination of the term and McMillan and Chavis’ (1986) further conceptualization, strives to measure and understand how PSOC is developed and maintained by focusing mainly on correlations between aggregate PSOC measures with individual-level and aggregate community-level variables. The research on individual-level variables often treats PSOC as a “cognitive-perceptual construct” (Long &  

---

² Sonnad (2003) notes that the phrase, “town-gown,” originated during the Middle Ages when students at European universities were distinguished from local citizens by the academic regalia they wore to classes. These robes had multiple symbolic meanings and helped to shield students from drafty classroom buildings. Today, the regalia are worn only at ceremonial occasions rather than on a daily basis. In this paper, the phrase, town-gown, refers to relationships, positive or negative, among university and community constituents.
Perkins, 2007, p. 564). Work in this area supports the operation of PSOC at the individual level, mediated through temperament (Lounsbury, Loveland & Gibson, 2003), cognition (Mankowski & Rappaport, 1995) and personal experience (Royal & Rossi, 1996). Work attending to community level variables hypothesizes that this cognitive-perceptual “sense” of community is linked to something “real” that exists “out there” in the community and can be measured. Numerous correlational and causational studies have indeed shown the connection of PSOC to important community attributes such as school climate (Pretty, 1990), voter registration (Brodsky, O’Campo & Aronson, 1999), crime rates (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999; Brown, Perkins & Brown, 2003), social capital (Wuthnow, 1998; Putnam, 2000; Kawachi & Berkman, 2000; Lin, 2001), and community typology (Warren & Warren, 1977, Zaff & Devlin, 1998; Long & Perkins, 2007). In addition to research association between PSOC and (usually) aggregated community attributes has been work exploring the connection of PSOC to positive outcomes such as subjective wellbeing (Davidson & Cotter, 1991), civic participation (Brodsky, O’Campo & Aronson, 1999, Long & Perkins, 2007; Mannarini & Fedi, 2009), and community satisfaction (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990; Evans, 2007). A few studies have sought to understand how PSOC operates within the multiple levels of an ecological system, and how PSOC develops and is maintained within complex, multi-population, multicultural communities. Multilevel analyses, for instance, have found that voter registration at the block level is a stronger predictor of positive PSOC than is individual voter registration (Brodsky, O’Campo & Aronson, 1999). More recently, research has also begun to explore the development of multiple senses of community across the multiple communities in people’s lives (Brodsky, Loomis & Marx, 2002; Brodsky, 2009), as well as the ways that multiple populations sharing the same communities may differentially experience PSOC in the same location (Brodsky & Marx, 2001). In some cases though, attempts to explore PSOC across multiple levels has been criticized for engaging in reductionism – treating the sum of individual responses as equivalent to the community, rather than using or developing more holistic measures (Perkins, Florin, Rich, Wandersman & Chavis, 1990). This range of foci and levels of analysis in PSOC studies suggests that capturing the development, maintenance, and meaning of PSOC in communities is still a complex puzzle without a clear solution, particularly in regards to the question of how PSOC is to be conceptualized, measured, and defined vis a vis complex, multilevel, multi-population communities.

As PSOC studies highlight, the role of individual perception as well as collective phenomena based in demographics and population membership, culture, and community, are crucial to explore in order to understand the operation of PSOC. It seems clear that PSOC also cannot be understood without accounting for the larger community historical and social-ecological context as well as the more specific context, or “locally negotiated concepts” (Rapley & Pretty, 1999, p.708), in which an individual experiences his or her community. The measurement and study of PSOC, however, has rarely if ever found a way to take into account this very complicated multilevel, multi-community, multi-perspective, and multi-systemic perspective. Only the work of Long and Perkins (2007) and Perkins and Long (2002) has attempted to touch on a fully comprehensive analysis of this sort. Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) social ecological perspective provides a way to begin to organize the complicated theoretical and measurement picture inherent in the construct of PSOC.

---

Community Psychology in Global Perspective
2. The Organizing Framework

Bronfenbrenner (1979) conceptualizes the individual as surrounded and impacted by five nested, dynamically interacting ecological systems, micro, meso, exo, macro, and chrono. Bronfenbrenner built on Lewin’s (1935) “field theory,” which postulated that behavior is shaped by person-centered as well as environment-centered variables. Bronfenbrenner observed that the interactions among these systems are multidimensional, multidirectional, and by their very nature, complex.

By way of review, Bronfenbrenner’s five systems include microsystems, which consist of the most immediate settings in which an individual lives and is active in constructing. These include family, peers, school, and neighborhood. Meso systems refer to the interrelations among the major microsystem settings that contain the individual, encompassing interactions among family, school, and peer group, for example. Exosystems include social settings in which the individual does not have an active role, but which influence the immediate context. These may include the government and the microsystems of other individuals with whom one is close. Macrosystems provide a cultural context for understanding human behavior and include the influence of collective attitudes and ideologies. Finally, chronosystems describe the pattern of sociohistorical conditions over time in which changing social realities result in the renegotiation of social norms and institutional structures.

To complement the environmental focus of Bronfenbrenner’s work, scholars (Belsky, 1980; Cicchetti & Toth, 1997) have added what they call an ontogenic focus to capture the dynamics that lie within the individual. These six systems can be thought to describe what is often called the context of life.

Based on previous research, PSOC is impacted by, as well as impacts, all six levels, although as alluded to above, it is rarely measured in such multilevel complexity. PSOC has been measured most often at the ontogenic and microsystem level, with some work also focusing on the exosystem levels. Less often has PSOC research fully explored the meso- and macrosystemic levels. However, research on other related community concepts, such as social capital, crime mapping, neighboring, community competence, networking, etc. have focused on these higher-level systems. Importantly, work by Parker et al. (2001) shows that many of these concepts are statistically separate phenomena from PSOC.

The application of these six ecosystems to the study of PSOC expands the understanding of the operation of PSOC, which in turn can improve interventions aimed at improving individual and community well-being. The ethnographic case study serves as a guide for exploring the historical and social-ecological context, suggests related concepts that may have salience, as well as focuses attention on the multidimensional, multilevel, multi-perspective mechanisms through which PSOC develops, is maintained, and impacts individuals, populations, and communities. The application of these six ecosystems is summarized in Table 1 and then later explored using the town-gown example as an illustration.

3. The Community Case Study

The ethnographic study was conducted in in a campus-adjacent neighborhood located in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eco-System</th>
<th>Directions for Expansion of PSOC Research</th>
<th>Related Concepts and Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontogenic</td>
<td>How do individual level factors impact PSOC at the individual and community level?</td>
<td>Generational factors, Individual characteristics, interests, and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsystem</td>
<td>How do immediate interactions among settings and individuals impact PSOC?</td>
<td>Social Capital, Social networks and their functioning, Community as resource and risk, Neighborhood typology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesosystem</td>
<td>How do intergroup dynamics impact settings and PSOC?</td>
<td>Multiple Populations, Group Differences, Prejudices, Sub-community interactions, Symbolic interactionism, Social Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exosystem</td>
<td>How do higher-level organizational and institutional structures impact experience and development of PSOC?</td>
<td>Policing, Policy decisions (e.g., zoning), Power and control dynamics, Psychopolitical validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrosystem</td>
<td>How do larger cultural features of setting and population groups impact PSOC?</td>
<td>Cultural values, Community history, Prior community experiences and expectations, Group and individual backgrounds, experience and expectations, Constructivist and qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronosystem</td>
<td>How do larger institutional trends over time impact PSOC?</td>
<td>Diversification, Setting &amp; institutional histories, Economic conditions, Institutional trends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
small city of Mountainside, USA (2010 population of 9,002)\(^3\). The city is home to Mountainside State University, whose 2010 student enrollment was 5,470 (University’s 2010 Enrollment Profile). The neighborhood is zoned high-density residential with a disproportionate 80% renter-occupied versus 20% owner-occupied housing ratio within approximately 500 residential units that house approximately 1,000 residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010)\(^4\). The vast majority of owner-occupied units are occupied by year-round residents, most of whom are older, white adults who are long-term residents of the neighborhood. In contrast, an increasingly racially diverse population of undergraduate students in their early 20’s occupies most of the renter-occupied units. Because of discrepancies in both Census Bureau and University data, however, the exact demographics of the neighborhood are unknown\(^5\). The neighborhood’s residential pattern has been characterized as “studentification” in the U.K. (Smith, 2008) and as a “student ghetto” in the U.S. (Gumprecht, 2006). Town-gown neighborhoods in the U.S. present an excellent example of the complexity of many modern communities in which geographic settings are shared by multiple diverse populations and cultures.

In this campus-adjacent neighborhood, students, year-round residents, and absentee landlords represent different populations with different interests. Students who move off-campus often do so to pursue individual freedoms. While some students leave campus for economic reasons, many students see moving off-campus as a rite of passage, their first experience managing leases, bills, and a household without constant adult oversight (Powell, 2013). Thus, off-campus living may play an important role in identity formation as an independent adult. At best, however, off-campus students see the neighborhood adjacent to campus as a kind of “home away from home,” a temporary way station in which to live while they are in school. As a result, they may have very little attachment to this place (Low & Altman, 1992) and very low levels of PSOC (Chavis, Hogge, McMillan & Wandersman, 1986) in relation to the campus-adjacent neighborhood.

Year-round residents who live in the neighborhood adjacent to campus have a different set of interests and often report feeling “squeezed” between two large institutions: city government and the university (Powell, 2013). Many of the year-round residents have “aged in place” (Black, 2008) and are fighting to hold onto their identities as well as their properties despite age-related threats such as the decline of physical health, loss of income through retirement, as well as the externally imposed threat of rental conversions in their neighborhood. Older homeowners, in particular, often have a strong sense of “rootedness” as a result of their long tenure and financial investment in the neighborhood (Cuba & Hummon, 1993). To the extent that the identity of year-round residents is wrapped up in their home, any threat to their ability to continue living there and to the “integrity” of their neighborhood experience, whether internal or external, may have a negative impact on their identity and on their PSOC.

---

\(^3\) To protect the anonymity of study participants, pseudonyms are used to disguise all references to the community and the university that were the focus of this research study. In addition, sources of localized information will be generically cited in the text, but not included in the list of references. The campus-adjacent neighborhood in Mountainside will alternatively be referred to as “the campus-adjacent neighborhood” or the “town-gown neighborhood.”

\(^4\) A unit could take the form of an apartment or a house.

\(^5\) The official Census count is disputed by city officials who estimate that it undercounts students who, because they spend the majority of their time in Mountainside, ought to be counted here. According to the City’s 2011 Comprehensive Plan, the undercount may be as many as 1,132. In addition, the University relies on students to update any changes in their local address, and as a result, this information is often inaccurate.
Landlords who own rental properties in the neighborhood and rental agents who manage these properties have a vested business interest and variable personal interest in the neighborhood (Powell, 2013). They are generally supportive of the university’s growth in student enrollments as this will likely increase demand for off-campus rental units. Far from being a homogeneous group, however, their allegiance to the neighborhood and to their properties varies. Some are community residents who own one or more rental properties or serve as local rental agents for out-of-town property owners, while others are parents who have bought properties for their student children. Increasingly, however, many are absentee landlords or more anonymous limited liability companies (LLCs) whose only connection to the area is its supply of affordable real estate investment opportunities.

The ethnographic study was conducted in from the fall of 2011 to the fall of 2012. It incorporated a paradigmatic synthesis of four epistemologies: interpretative, critical, ecological, and social network approaches (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). It sought to answer two primary research questions. First, what are the factors that influence the interactions among residents who share a residential campus-adjacent neighborhood situated in a college town that is home to a medium-size public university? Second, how are these interactions related to larger town-gown relationships between the university and the community both past and present?

The study was organized in three components (“entering the field,” “deepening the insights,” and “capturing the narratives”) and used multiple sources of triangulated data to enhance the study’s rigor and trustworthiness and to capture the perspectives of five stakeholder groups: university students who live off-campus in the neighborhood, year-round neighborhood residents, landlords/property managers, and university and city officials. Study participants were recruited using a variety of case selection methods including typical case selection, unique case selection, bellwether or ideal case selection, comparable case selection, and reputational case selection (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). Seventy-one persons participated in formal aspects of the study, but the researcher estimates that she came into informal contact with another 150 persons.

The researcher used multiple data collection tools including observations, formal and informal interviews, a series of three focus groups (one with student residents of the neighborhood, one with year-round residents of the neighborhood, and one with a mix of these two groups), content analysis of newspaper articles, analysis of secondary data (e.g., tax records, U.S. Census Bureau data, University data on student conduct violations, City data on rental property registration and code enforcement violations), archival research of historical documents, photographs (both those taken by the researcher and those taken by neighborhood residents in a Photovoice Project), and finally, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping.

4. Application of an Ecological Multilevel Framework

The ethnographic study yielded a wealth of insights regarding the multilevel dynamics that are at work in this diverse neighborhood. These dynamics will now be explored through Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) framework in an effort to highlight the complexities that surround PSOC and related community constructs.
4.1 **Ontogenic Focus**

In an ontogenic focus, the unit of analysis is the individual. As such, community experiences, including PSOC, are understood as a function of individual characteristics such as personality traits (Lounsbury & DeNeui, 1996; Lounsbury, Loveland & Gibson, 2003; Frieze, Hansen & Boneva, 2006), attachment to place (Low & Altman, 1992), locus of control (Rotter, 1954), satisfaction (Martinez, Black & Starr, 2002), self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), salience (Obst & White, 2005), perception (Walker & Hiller, 2007; Ohmer, 2008), self-esteem/self-image (Haney, 2007; Mannarini, Tartaglia, Fedi & Greganti, 2006), and identity (Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Pretty, 2002; Rosel, 2003; Knez, 2005; Cook, Martin, Yearns & Damhorst, 2007).

In the case of town-gown neighborhoods, an ontogenic focus on PSOC leads to research questions that center on factors associated with the behavior, perception, and emotions of student and year-round residents and property owners as they relate to the elements of PSOC – membership, mutual influence, fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connection. These factors include, for example, what individual factors influence the degree to which students and year-round residents reach out to one another? What motivates students and year-round residents to become part of a neighborhood association or to take part in neighborhood change efforts? How do students and year-round residents define “community,” and to what degree do they identify with the surrounding neighborhood? Given the generational split in this town-gown neighborhood, research would need to explore the extent to which one’s PSOC and one’s attachment to place vary with age, building on the work of Cuba and Hummon (1993). Other questions include: How do the experiences in this neighborhood figure into residents’ identities? What effect does neighborhood transience have on individual well being for both students and year-round residents? Even though an ontogenic focus is familiar to PSOC studies, there are many untapped areas of exploration that become apparent once population diversity issues are taken into account.

4.2 **Microsystem Focus**

A microsystem focus centers on the settings in which individuals live and work. Here, community dynamics are understood as a function of the interaction between the individual and the settings that immediately surround the individual such as the family, the peer group, the school, and the neighborhood. The measure and mechanisms of PSOC at this level, thus, would be directly tied to these interactions. While this is a common approach to PSOC measurement and study, there are other concepts that have been measured at the microsystem level that may provide an important context for better understanding the development and maintenance of PSOC. The literature on social capital, for example, could be helpful in teasing apart these interactions including, but not limited to, the work of Bourdieu (1986), Coleman (1988), Wuthnow (1998), Fukuyama (1995), Kawachi and Berkman (2000), Putnam (2000), Lin (2001), and Long and Perkins, (2007). The fact that there are two distinct groups living in this town-gown neighborhood lends itself to a comparison of the characteristics of each group’s social networks, the norms that govern these networks, and the level of social trust within and between these networks. This would entail a study of town-gown relationships to ascertain the extent to which the networks of these two groups are inclusive (bridging social capital) or exclusive (bonding social capital) of the other (Putnam, 2000). This can be hypothesized to have a direct
impact on feelings of membership, as well as the other elements of PSOC. Social network theory thus would also contribute to PSOC research that focuses on the microsystem (Wellman & Berkowitz, 1997; Scott, 1991; Unger & Wandersman, 1985).

In the town-gown example, however, the original concept of neighborhood social capital (also known as “neighboring”) (Unger & Wandersman, 1985; Buckner, 1988, Long & Perkins, 2007) does not quite fit the realities of this neighborhood due to its transient nature and the fact that there are two groups who share a place, but not necessarily a common neighborhood identity. Some year-round residents identify more with the community as a whole rather than with the neighborhood in particular, and students often identify more with the university as a community than with the neighborhood or the community at large. Viewed from a neighborhood perspective, town-gown neighborhoods may be communities with more bridging; diffuse, distant connections that are not shared with local contacts, than bonding; denser local networks that share geography and resources. (Putnam, 2000) This context is crucial for better understanding how the operation of PSOC is dependent on one’s perception of belonging.

It is also important to consider that social capital, like PSOC (Brodsky, 1996; Brodsky & Marx, 2001), can be both a protective and a risk factor. Take, for example, the alcohol-related behaviors prevalent in this town-gown neighborhood. Studies by Weitzman and Kawachi (2000) and Reifman, Watson, and McCourt (2006) illustrate that students may engage in more high-risk drinking in response to peer group pressure, which may be strengthened as social capital within the peer group grows. On the other hand, these studies also suggest that students who are more engaged in campus activities and leadership roles and who consequently have a greater degree of social capital in the organized campus community are less likely to engage in high-risk drinking. As other studies have shown (Brodsky, 1996; Brodsky & Marx, 2001), PSOC likely has similar variability in meaning and outcomes depending on the community to which it is directed, so in considering the meaning and consequence of PSOC and any intervention to increase PSOC in town-gown groups, one needs to attend to any potential negative consequences of increasing PSOC.

Still another microsystem approach to PSOC builds on Warren and Warren’s (1977) neighborhood typology, which classifies neighborhoods in six categories: integral, parochial, diffuse, stepping-stone, transitory, and anomic (pp. 96-97). These neighborhood classifications may bring to light historical and social-ecological forces at work on the community itself, as well as on the various groups that, while sharing its borders, may or may not share a common history. The characteristics of this town-gown neighborhood lie on a continuum between transitory and anomic. A transitory neighborhood is one where there is a turnover in population and as a result, a divide between “been-heres” (long-term residents) and “come-heres” (newcomers) to use terms coined by Spain (1993). In a transitory neighborhood, there is a moderate degree of participation; however, the base of support for neighborhood organizing efforts lies among those who have lived there for a long time. An anomic neighborhood, in contrast, is described as a “non-neighborhood characterized by individuation and atomization” (Warren & Warren, 1977, p. 108). As the ratio of year-round residents to students in this town-gown neighborhood decreases, there is less and less neighborhood cohesion. Warren and Warren note that anomic neighborhoods are vulnerable to outside influences, which in the case of this town-grown neighborhood means out-of-town landlords and rental management companies, the university, and city government. It is easy to see how this microsystem context may impact PSOC and how attention to neighborhood typology and its change over time may help to better refine the
conceptualization of PSOC in different types of settings and for the different groups that may share the setting.

A final microsystem focus could view PSOC, not as an individual phenomenon, but rather as a community experience. Such a study would incorporate the behavioral indicators outlined by Meyer, Hyde, and Jenkins (2005) including expressions of pride, clean and orderly blocks, positive street-level interactions, and identifiable leadership and progress. Sagy, Stern, and Krakover (1996) examined sense of community as a nested phenomenon allowing both individual and community variables to vary in terms of their predictive qualities and found that micro and macro factors that determine sense of community do indeed vary for different groups of people. Research employing a microsystem focus on PSOC would benefit from examining similar nested, multilevel relationships, and more use of multilevel statistical modeling.

4.3 Mesosystem Focus

A mesosystem focus on PSOC in town-gown neighborhoods would attempt to understand the intergroup dynamics between the constituencies that have a direct interest in the neighborhood. The fact that in this example both off-campus students and year-round residents share a common place does not mean they have the same PSOC to the neighborhood, but it does demand that they negotiate a set of shared neighborhood norms that govern behavior in their neighborhood. In fact, many of the problems that occur in this neighborhood could be seen as part of this difficult, but necessary negotiation process, and this context probably relates to potential group and/or individual differences in the experience of PSOC, particularly feelings of belonging, fulfillment of needs, and mutual influence. For example, many older residents feel vulnerable to retaliation on the part of students and therefore are reluctant to speak out about the norm-violating behavior they perceive on the part of their student neighbors (Powell, 2013). They are often hesitant to call the police let alone personally confront the students. If this reluctance is widespread in the neighborhood, it could cause an even greater rift between students and year-round residents. Year-round residents’ silence may only serve to reinforce negative behaviors among the students by seeming to condone them, thus allowing those behaviors to continue. This in turn may reinforce year-round residents’ anger at student behavior. Small incivilities can add up and threaten the peaceful relations among students and year-round residents, thus decreasing each group’s PSOC in the neighborhood. Such a dynamic may intensify as the ratio of owner-occupied to rental properties shrinks. These dynamics could be explored by building on the work of Brown, Perkins, and Brown (2003, 2004), which suggested that social cohesion, that is the relationship among neighborhood residents, could buffer the effects of the decline in the physical environment of a neighborhood. While PSOC was not specifically applied in their studies, the construct of social cohesion seems to be a close approximation.

In this town-gown neighborhood, as in many communities marked by diversity, year-round residents and students often do not interact until there is a problem. The net result is a relationship that is built on “sinking sand.” This fact only serves to increase the level of distrust between the two groups and likely negatively impacts the development of a sense of belonging and shared emotional connection that extends beyond the population group to the shared setting level. There are prejudices about “the other” in this neighborhood, both within “town” and “gown” as well as between “town and gown,” that also serve to keep groups apart (Powell, 2013). Class, race, gender, age, religious, and geographic stereotypes fuel these prejudices. A
A study with a mesosystem focus would examine the impact of these sorts of intergroup neighborhood dynamics building on insights from the social psychology literature on prejudice and social contact (Allport, 1954; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood & Sherif, 1961). Examples of this sort of approach as seen in the PSOC literature include the work of Fisher and Sonn (1999) related to the relationships between coloured South Africans and Anglo Indians; Sonn’s (2002) work on immigrant adaptation; and Sonn and Fisher’s (1996) exploration of labeling and community. In addition, Zeldin’s (2002) work examining adult beliefs about adolescents’ ability to contribute to their communities may relate specifically to conflict in town-gown neighborhoods. Adults who themselves had a strong sense of community were more likely to see young people as community resources. This finding supports the need to build a sense of community within the neighborhood of interest in order to facilitate positive intergroup relations between students and year-round residents. The community and PSOC work in subcommunities is also relevant here in laying the groundwork for exploring the ways that multiple microsystems come together to create an exosystem and PSOC can be experienced at each of these separate levels (e.g., Weisenfeld, 1996; Brodsky & Marx, 2001).

Another theoretical lens that is useful in this regard is the field of symbolic interactionism, specifically the work of Mead (1934), Blumer (1969), and Cooley (1918). In this regard, a study would explore the perceptions of “the other” and the ways in which each group feels “the other” perceives them and how these perceptions in turn shape behavior (e.g., the “looking glass self” phenomenon). This type of work would have direct implications for the development of shared PSOC.

4.4 Exosystem Focus

An exosystem focus on PSOC would examine the organizational and institutional factors that indirectly shape individual behavior and interpersonal relationships. In this town-gown neighborhood these factors would include the non-shared environment of students, year-round residents, and landlords that differentially impact their experience, perception, and expectations of the neighborhood and the institutions that indirectly and directly impact their lives in this setting. This organizational and institutional impact is seen in the dynamics that are at work in this town-gown neighborhood where year-round residents complain that both the city and the university have neglected them (Powell, 2013). They commonly express that both the city and the university often “pass the buck” when it comes to improving neighborhood conditions, thus likely undermining feelings of influence and fulfillment of needs that are essential to PSOC. This “buck passing” is acutely felt in the area of police protection where a lack of coordination between the city and university police forces in the past often left this town-gown neighborhood with inadequate protection. When city police officers respond to calls involving off-campus students, there has often been poor communication with university officials (Powell, 2013). If there is a lag time in notifying university officials, it invariably means that whatever action is taken is often “too little too late.” Meanwhile, neighborhood residents, students and year-round residents alike, have to contend with the continuance of these negative behaviors and their impact on both groups’ PSOC for this neighborhood.

Another example of this town-gown neighborhood being neglected by two large institutions is in regards to land use and zoning regulations. Karrow (2005) notes that very little recent funding
has been made available to universities for construction of additional residence halls to accommodate growing student enrollments. Thus, the university has increasingly relied on surrounding neighborhoods to provide housing for students who typically prefer to live close to campus. In this town-gown neighborhood, in an effort to accommodate the needs of the university, the city government has adopted zoning ordinances that allow for higher density and mixed commercial/residential uses. Year-round residents are often opposed to zoning regulations that allow for the development of additional student rental housing and businesses that appeal to a student market (e.g., bars, liquor stores, and tattoo parlors), while they favor regulations that preserve the traditional character of the neighborhood as much as possible (Powell, 2013). This context also surely impacts residents’ and students’ PSOC in different ways, and suggests how similar differences need to be attended to in any study of PSOC in diverse, multi-community settings.

Impacts at the exo-systemic level are also apparent in the university’s role (or lack thereof) in helping students locate off-campus housing and in trouble shooting when problems occur. Mountainside State University maintains a list of off-campus housing opportunities that contains a disclaimer statement indicating that the university takes no responsibility for ensuring the quality of rental units nor is it involved in the contractual relationship between landlords and students. What is the university’s role, however, in helping students to avoid exploitation by unscrupulous landlords? Under what circumstances should a university delete a given property or a landlord from its off-campus housing list? Although it may be a thing of the past, universities have traditionally functioned on the principle of in loco parentis, however, it is not clear whether or how this principle applies to today’s students who increasingly live off-campus. All of these questions relate directly to the student resident’s experience of a sense of community with not only the city, but also the university as well as to the general role of public institutions in neighborhood experiences and outcomes. There are important social justice questions here as the fates of the university and the community at large are increasingly intertwined; yet, the two institutional structures do not always negotiate from a position of equal power.

The inclusion of exosystem dynamics in any study of a town-gown neighborhood would involve an analysis of the power and control that these two institutional structures exert on the neighborhood. Such a focus would mean looking at the neighborhood in a larger context perhaps incorporating the concepts of psychopolitical validity (Prilleltensky, Prilleltensky & Voorhees, 2008) and “the third position” (Newbrough, 1995). Thus, in this case, university and city administrators were included in the study’s sample rather than limiting it to those who live or own property in the neighborhood. Inclusion of “third position” players would benefit other studies of PSOC in diverse settings.

### 4.5 Macrosystem Focus

A macrosystem focus on PSOC would result in a study of larger cultural features that provide a context surrounding the ontogenic, micro, meso, and exo systems. In the case of town-gown neighborhoods, cultural values related to higher education, community relations, diversity, and social behavior set the stage for understanding the interpersonal dynamics that occur and that generally undergird the development and maintenance of PSOC. These values may be rooted in the local community, the geographic region, and/or the national experience. A university’s history, its place in the local economy, its administrative auspice (public or private), and its
religious affiliation are important to the interpretation of town-gown dynamics (Gumprecht, 2008). Each group’s connection to this history and these values surely impacts their sense of belonging, shared values, and shared emotional connection to the setting and to each other.

A macrosystem focus would also lead one to examine the prior community experiences of students and year-round residents as they affect their current experiences in town-gown neighborhoods. Students at Mountainside State University come from a wide variety of backgrounds, contexts, and experiences and thus bring different expectations for their off-campus neighborhood. Different expectations among students and year-round residents can result in a kind of “culture clash” that contributes to town-gown tensions and differential expectations and experiences of PSOC. Wiesenfeld (1996) questions the notion that the concept of community implies homogeneity among subgroups. She argues that such conceptualizations oversimplify the dynamic processes that must occur across group differences in order to build a community where groups can coexist and maintain their uniqueness without compromising their community solidarity. Trickett, Watts, and Birman (1993) advocate a constructivist approach to the study of community experiences so as to preserve the integrity of minority voices that may be marginalized in research on the community as a whole. The importance of qualitative approaches is echoed by Sonn, Bishop, and Drew (1999) who recommend their use precisely because they can help capture cultural differences in the way in which community is defined and experienced. Clearly, without an understanding of the multiple meanings of community and the histories, experiences, and expectations individuals and groups bring to bear, it is difficult to define, develop, or maintain PSOC. This fact again speaks to the need of PSOC research to avoid reductionism and to move beyond aggregating individual responses into an assumed collective population or community response.

4.6 **Chronosystem Focus**

Historical past and present trends often have an enormous, unmeasured impact on current community functioning. In this case study, for example, it is notable that as the U.S. has shifted from a manufacturing to a service economy, more and more students are going to college. This economic imperative in combination with the effects of veterans’ educational benefits and an opening up of educational funding opportunities has resulted in a larger proportion of the population pursuing higher education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014a). In the industrial-heavy town that was the setting for this study, residents welcomed the university from its founding in 1898 through the second world war because it provided a way to ensure that their children became the first generation of college graduates in their families (Powell, 2013). However, as local industry disappeared and jobs became scarce, townspeople came to see university education as leading their children to leave home, rather than educating them to rise in hometown jobs. Clearly this changing historical and socioecological context impacts the ways long-term residents think and feel about the university and the students who are their neighbors.

University students are also increasingly diversified as more and more students of color have been able to further their education beyond high school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014b). Moreover, globalization has meant that an increasing number of international students come to the U.S. in pursuit of higher education (Institute of International Education Network, 2014). These facts have changed the ethnic mix of town-gown neighborhoods and pose
additional challenges in developing cross-cultural relationships and in impacting PSOC across these differences. While community psychology acknowledges that this global context impacts the lives of individuals, the field often does not pay enough attention to it in measurement and research. It is clear that this changing historical background has the potential to impact PSOC beyond what would be readily ascertainable and understandable if studies were merely to correlate race or ethnicity to PSOC levels.

Another chronosystem trend of interest in this case study is the increased emphasis on promoting civic engagement in the form of volunteerism, service-learning, and joint initiatives ranging from programs that support public schools, health education, legal services, and business development (Holland & Meeropol, 2006; Hoy & Meisel, 2008). While it is assumed that student engagement is a positive development, Kahne and Westheimer (1996) note that student engagement can serve various goals, not all of which are designed to promote the best interests of the community at large. It is likely not only in university-community interactions that there can be differences in the intent, enactment, meaning, and perception of service. Thus, a better understanding and measurement of the multi-systemic context might be necessary to understand if a project that is intended to promote community development and PSOC may actually be seen to have a more complicated and perhaps even negative outcome than superficially apparent.

Larger cultural messages about the role of universities as “marriage markets” and in providing students with “rites of passage” often determine how universities and local communities respond to off-campus student behavior as well. For example, the recent Amethyst Initiative, which comes in response to college students’ high-risk drinking behavior, has sparked a discussion among U.S. college presidents of the pros and cons of lowering the drinking age (Amethyst Initiative, n.d.). Well-publicized cases involving hazing (Allan & Madden, 2008), out-of-control student gatherings following sporting events (Suggs, 2003), and violence on college campuses (e.g., the shooting at Virginia Tech) (Hoover, 2008; Lewis, 2007) have awakened a national debate on students’ college experience and university-community relations. All of these issues have a potential impact on students’ and year-round residents’ feelings of belonging, fulfillment of needs, influence, and shared emotional connection, and the cultural messages may change the baseline perceptions and expectations for PSOC long before populations ever interact in real time or share neighborhoods on an everyday basis. Issues of perception, culture, media representation, and behavioral norms can have profound impacts on measurement and meaning of PSOC in many other settings as well.

5. Conclusion

The cumulative literature on PSOC suggests that its measurement is often not fully extended to include the very contexts that give the construct meaning. The net result is an incomplete description, a lapse that is important especially given community psychology’s emphasis on an ecological perspective of human development and behavior. Even if PSOC is high in a given community, there can be many things that the measurement of PSOC does not reveal. It may not identify anything about the process by which PSOC was derived. It may not capture the function of social networking. If treated as an aggregate measure, as it often is, it does not describe the differential experiences of subcommunities (a true ecological fallacy) that share a common place. Because PSOC is not often measured longitudinally, it also cannot fully capture the historical
and social factors that impact on PSOC at any given point in time. Moreover, with few exceptions, PSOC has not been consistently examined as a multidimensional, nested phenomenon with individual, group, organizational, and communal features.

Coulton (2005) emphasizes the importance of community research by noting that “a community may be the agent of change, the target of change, or the context of change” (p. 74) and yet, she acknowledges that community research faces a great many challenges including 1) the need to operationalize community boundaries in ways that consider the perspectives of community members, 2) the need to sufficiently specify community interventions so they may be replicated, 3) the need to develop community measures that capture community attributes rather than merely aggregating individual responses, 4) the need to use sophisticated statistical models that capture the complexities of communal dynamics, 5) the need to establish the counterfactual in order to determine causality in interventional research in communities, and 6) the need to consider spatial and geographic processes that influence communal experiences. These challenges further complicate the study of PSOC, but are essential to move forward in the study of this core concept in the field of community psychology and to the understanding of the rich diversity that exists within and between community settings and contexts. The example of a town-gown neighborhood illustrates the population, systemic, historical, and socio-ecological complexities inherent in the construct of PSOC. As these communities are both ripe for exploration of the convergence of these dynamics across multiple important socio-ecological constructs, it is curious that universities, with all of their resources and research expertise, are not turning the microscope on their own backyards. It is also striking that given the many known problems that continue to exist in many town-gown neighborhoods, universities have also not done a better job of effectively sharing their many resources with their neighbors.

Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) model helps to direct attention to the ecosystems in which PSOC is simultaneously operating, and to a range of related social science concepts that may suggest future directions for PSOC research. While any single study may not be able to address all these systems, perspectives, and variables simultaneously, scholars need to strive for a better balance in the cumulative literature so the dynamics of PSOC at all systemic levels are explored. With a richer and wider base of research on which to build, the design of future studies and interventions will be better informed regarding the ways in which PSOC may be operating and could be explored. An understanding of PSOC in particular and “community” in general will also grow from ensuring that the measurement of PSOC, along with other measures of community, advance beyond the aggregate individual level to fully encompass all of the historical, ecological, cultural, and population components that influence people’s sense of community across the range of settings and relationships in which citizens are engaged.
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