AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

**ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT**
**to article in**

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (DECEMBER:882–903)

# Dimensions of Social Capital and Rates of Criminal Homicide

Steven F. Messner
*State University of New York at Albany*

Eric P. Baumer
*University of Missouri–St. Louis*

Richard Rosenfeld
*University of Missouri–St. Louis*

**ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT**
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (DECEMBER:882–903)

**Table A1.** Factor Analysis of Putnam's Conceptualization of Social Capital

| 1. Trust | Social Trust |
|---|---|
| % who, in general, trust most people | .922 |
| Mean level of trust in neighbors | .952 |
| Mean level of trust in coworkers | .792 |
| Mean level of trust in fellow religious worshippers | .904 |
| Mean level of trust in shopkeepers | .959 |
| Mean level of trust in local news media | .770 |
| Mean level of trust in local police | .783 |
| Eigenvalue | 5.55 |
| Explained variance (%) | 79.21 |

| 2. Political Participation | Political Activism | Political Engagement |
|---|---|---|
| Mean level of political knowledge | .255 | .342 |
| Mean interest level in politics and national affairs | .341 | .523 |
| % registered to vote | .113 | .819 |
| % who voted in 1996 Presidential election | .234 | .910 |
| % who served as an officer or member of a local club | –.018 | .678 |
| Mean level of attendance at public meeting | .182 | .616 |
| % who signed a petition | .680 | .099 |
| % who attended a political meeting or rally | .775 | .429 |
| % who belonged to a group that took local action for reform | .925 | .124 |
| % who participated in demonstrations, protests, boycotts, or marches | .956 | –.075 |
| % who participated in political groups or committees | .913 | .216 |
| Eigenvalue | 4.58 | 2.72 |
| Explained variance (%) | 41.66 | 24.76 |

| 3. Civic Participation | Community Involvement | Community Activism | Community Service |
|---|---|---|---|
| % involved in youth organization | .074 | –.111 | .715 |
| % involved in parents' association or other service group | –.395 | .423 | .563 |
| % involved in organizations for senior citizens or older people | .119 | .034 | .541 |
| % involved in service clubs or fraternal organization | .357 | –.064 | .661 |
| % involved in a neighborhood block or crime prevention association | –.131 | .758 | .140 |
| % involved in charity or social welfare organization | .132 | .590 | .402 |
| % involved in a literary or art group | .423 | .750 | –.436 |
| % involved in a civil rights organization | –.092 | .733 | –.280 |
| Mean frequency of attendance at club meetings | .674 | .123 | .249 |
| Mean frequency of attendance at community events | .670 | –.273 | .219 |
| % who belong to a hobby, investment, or garden club | .659 | .112 | –.021 |
| % who belong to 'other' clubs | .809 | –.206 | –.115 |
| % who have worked on a community project | .709 | .207 | .256 |
| Eigenvalue | 4.07 | 2.77 | 2.08 |
| Explained variance (%) | 31.28 | 21.23 | 15.98 |

(Table continued on next page.)

**ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT**
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (DECEMBER:882–903)

**Table A1.** Factor Analysis of Putnam's Conceptualization of Social Capital (Continued)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Religious Participation | Religious Participation | |
| % who are members of local church or synagogue | .921 | |
| % who attend religious services weekly or almost weekly | .953 | |
| % who participated in non-regularly scheduled church activities | .975 | |
| % who volunteered for place of worship | .931 | |
| % who participated in organization affiliated with religion | .768 | |
| Eigenvalue | 5.55 | |
| Explained variance (%) | 79.21 | |
| 5. Altruism, Volunteering, and Charity | Volunteering and Charity | Altruism |
| Mean frequency of volunteering | .652 | –.051 |
| % who volunteered to fight a health problem | .610 | .206 |
| % who volunteered for school or youth programs | .764 | –.036 |
| % who volunteered for any organization to help the poor or elderly | .920 | –.004 |
| % who volunteered to help an arts or cultural organization | .458 | .421 |
| % who volunteered for a neighborhood or civic group | .803 | –.138 |
| % who contributed $100 or more to a charity | .488 | .421 |
| % who donated blood | .176 | .806 |
| Eigenvalue | 3.87 | 1.56 |
| Explained variance (%) | 48.38 | 19.49 |
| 6. Connections in the Workplace | Workplace Connections | |
| % who are members of a labor union | .248 | |
| % who are members of a trade association | –.248 | |
| Eigenvalue | 1.06 | |
| Explained variance (%) | 53.11 | |
| 7. Informal Social Connections | Informal Socializing | Team Sports |
| Mean number of friends reported by residents | .708 | .098 |
| Mean number of people with whom residents can share confidences | .670 | .206 |
| Mean number of days talked to or visited with immediate neighbors | .524 | –.188 |
| Mean number of days of socializing with coworkers outside of work | .531 | .076 |
| Mean number of days residents played cards/games with others | .775 | –.409 |
| Mean number of days residents visited with relatives | .574 | –.734 |
| Mean number of days residents had friends over to their home | .637 | .013 |
| % involved in an adult sports club or outdoor activity club | .606 | .628 |
| Mean number of days residents played a team sport | .380 | .527 |
| Eigenvalue | 3.80 | 1.77 |
| Explained variance (%) | 42.24 | 19.71 |

*Note:* N = 40. Factor loadings presented are from alpha-scoring analysis with an oblique rotation.

**ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT**
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (DECEMBER:882–903)

**Table A2.** Correlations for Variables in the Analysis of Social Capital and Homicide Rates

| Variables | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Homicide Rates (logged) | — | –.78* | –.26 | .19 | –.01 | .72* | –.36* | .02 | –.21 |
| (2) Social Trust | | — | .62* | –.01 | .31* | –.45* | .70* | .30 | .33* |
| (3) Political Engagement | | | — | .31* | .49* | .15 | .74* | .38* | .41* |
| (4) Political Activism | | | | — | –.29 | .59* | .45* | –.51* | .55* |
| (5) Community Service | | | | | — | –.02 | .33* | .70* | –.08 |
| (6) Community Activism | | | | | | — | .08 | –.08 | .06 |
| (7) Community Involvement | | | | | | | — | .10 | .47* |
| (8) Religious Participation | | | | | | | | — | –.27 |
| (9) Workplace Connections | | | | | | | | | — |
| (10) Volunteering and Charity | | | | | | | | | |
| (11) Altruism | | | | | | | | | |
| (12) Informal Socializing | | | | | | | | | |
| (13) Team Sports | | | | | | | | | |
| (14) Resource Deprivation | | | | | | | | | |
| (15) Population Structure | | | | | | | | | |
| (16) Divorce Rate | | | | | | | | | |
| (17) Southern Location | | | | | | | | | |

*Note*: N = 40

**Table A2.** Correlations for Variables in the Analysis of Social Capital and Homicide Rates (Continued)

| Variables | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Homicide Rates (logged) | –.11 | –.09 | –.57* | –.19 | .66* | .50* | .17 | .39* |
| (2) Social Trust | .53* | .21 | .81* | .37* | –.61* | –.59* | –.04 | –.30 |
| (3) Political Engagement | .67* | .16 | .59* | .29 | –.13 | –.46* | .11 | –.10 |
| (4) Political Activism | .13 | –.26 | .08 | .21 | –.07 | .16 | .13 | –.40* |
| (5) Community Service | .59* | .49* | .34* | –.07 | –.02 | –.36* | .10 | .33* |
| (6) Community Activism | .22 | –.01 | –.42* | .08 | .37* | .49* | .01 | .18 |
| (7) Community Involvement | .72* | .20 | .66* | .44* | –.41* | –.40* | .01 | –.24 |
| (8) Religious Participation | .55* | .38* | .17 | –.02 | .15 | –.22 | –.08 | .48* |
| (9) Workplace Connections | .21 | –.12 | .54* | .37* | –.37* | –.04 | .10 | –.53* |
| (10) Volunteering and Charity | — | .42* | .47* | .24 | –.12 | –.30 | –.01 | .09 |
| (11) Altruism | | — | .21 | .03 | –.19 | –.10 | .09 | .34* |
| (12) Informal Socializing | | | — | .34* | –.53* | –.61* | .23 | –.31* |
| (13) Team Sports | | | | — | –.35* | .18 | –.11 | –.27 |
| (14) Resource Deprivation | | | | | — | .10 | .08 | .18 |
| (15) Population Structure | | | | | | — | –.22 | .10 |
| (16) Divorce Rate | | | | | | | — | .05 |
| (17) Southern Location | | | | | | | | — |

*Note*: N = 40

*$p \leq .05$ (two–tailed test)

**ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT**
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (DECEMBER:882–903)

**Table A3.** Influence of Social Capital Variables on Homicide Rates

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Resource Deprivation | .441* | .440* | .496* | .444* | .484* | .446* | .427* | .500* | .440* |
| | (.068) | (.067) | (.074) | (.068) | (.069) | (.067) | (.070) | (.116) | (.075) |
| Population Structure | .395* | .423* | .435* | .352* | .364* | .400* | .370* | .445* | .373* |
| | (.087) | (.087) | (.075) | (.073) | (.066) | (.072) | (.068) | (.125) | (.072) |
| Divorce Rate | .142* | .144* | .148* | .132* | .122* | .147* | .145* | .124* | .143* |
| | (.056) | (.056) | (.054) | (.057) | (.054) | (.055) | (.056) | (.062) | (.056) |
| Southern Location | .435* | .325 | .483* | .512* | .606* | .402* | .467* | .490* | .434* |
| | (.159) | (.198) | (.157) | (.189) | (.178) | (.160) | (.173) | (.182) | (.168) |
| Political Engagement | .012 | | | | | | | | |
| | (.025) | | | | | | | | |
| Community Service | | .042 | | | | | | | |
| | | (.047) | | | | | | | |
| Community Involvement | | | .033 | | | | | | |
| | | | (.023) | | | | | | |
| Religious Participation | | | | –.015 | | | | | |
| | | | | (.019) | | | | | |
| Workplace Connections | | | | | .031 | | | | |
| | | | | | (.017) | | | | |
| Volunteering and Charity | | | | | | .017 | | | |
| | | | | | | (.018) | | | |
| Altruism | | | | | | | –.013 | | |
| | | | | | | | (.024) | | |
| Informal Socializing | | | | | | | | .028 | |
| | | | | | | | | (.042) | |
| Team Sports | | | | | | | | | .004 |
| | | | | | | | | | (.053) |
| Adjusted $R^2$ | .69 | .70 | .71 | .70 | .72 | .70 | .69 | .70 | .69 |

*Note*: N = 40. Data show maximum likelihood unstandardized parameter estimates.

*$p \leq .05$ (two–tailed test)

**Table A4.** Proportion of Variance in Endogenous Variables Attributed to Instrumental Variables

| | Endogenous Variables | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Instrumental Variables | Homicide | Social Trust | Social Activism |
| Violence Arrest Certainty | .23 | | |
| Subjective Alienation | | .58 | |
| Newspaper Readership and Political Engagement | | .48 | |
| Extreme Politics and Television Viewing | | | .23 |
| Newspaper Readership and Percent 18 to 44 | | | .32 |

**ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT**
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (DECEMBER:882–903)

**Table A5.** Reduced Form Simultaneous Equation Model of Social Trust And Homicide Rates

| | Endogenous Variables | |
|---|---|---|
| | Social Trust | Homicide |
| Exogenous Variables | | |
| Resource Deprivation | — | .286* |
| | | (.055) |
| Population Structure | –1.14* | — |
| | (.375) | |
| Southern Location | — | .468* |
| | | (.110) |
| Social Activism | — | .045* |
| | | (.008) |
| Subjective Alienation | –1.20* | — |
| | (.176) | |
| Violence Arrest Certainty | — | –.430* |
| | | (.113) |
| Endogenous Variables | | |
| Social Trust | — | –.041* |
| | | (.013) |
| Homicide | –4.27* | — |
| | (.649) | |
| Adjusted $R^2$ | .95 | .89 |
| $\chi^2$, 11 df | 9.71 ($p$ = .56) | |
| RMSEA | .000 | |
| CFI | 1.00 | |
| GFI | .948 | |

*Note*: N = 40. Data show maximum likelihood unstandardized parameter estimates. CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

*$p \leq .05$, two-tailed test

**Table A6**. Reduced Form Simultaneous Equation Model of Social Activism and Homicide Rates

| | Endogenous Variables | |
|---|---|---|
| | Social Activism | Homicide |
| Exogenous Variables | | |
| Resource Deprivation | — | .236* |
| | | (.062) |
| Population Structure | — | — |
| Southern Location | –6.61* | .398* |
| | (1.95) | (.130) |
| Social Trust | — | –.052* |
| | | (.012) |
| Extreme Politics | .822* | — |
| | (.277) | |
| Television Viewing | –3.22* | — |
| | (1.23) | |
| Violence Arrest Certainty | — | –.374* |
| | | (.129) |
| Endogenous Variables | | |
| Social Activism | — | .039* |
| | | (.010) |
| Homicide | 3.40* | — |
| | (1.37) | |
| Adjusted $R^2$ | .56 | .86 |
| $\chi^2$, 17 df | 13.99 ($p$ = .67) | |
| RMSEA | .000 | |
| CFI | 1.00 | |
| GFI | .933 | |

*Note:* N = 40. Data show maximum likelihood unstandardized parameter estimates. CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

*$p \leq .05$, two-tailed test

**ONLINE APPENDIX SUPPLEMENT**
to article in
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2004, VOL. 69 (DECEMBER:882–903)

**Table A7.** Reduced Form Simultaneous Equation Model of Social Trust and Homicide Rates with Different Instruments

| | Endogenous Variables | |
|---|---|---|
| | Social Trust | Homicide |
| Exogenous Variables | | |
| Resource Deprivation | — | .262* |
| | | (.050) |
| Population Structure | –.354 | — |
| | (.370) | |
| Southern Location | — | .340* |
| | | (.084) |
| Social Activism | — | .045* |
| | | (.008) |
| Political Engagement | .537* | — |
| | (.109) | |
| Newspaper Readership | 1.66* | — |
| | (.845) | |
| Violence Arrest Certainty | — | –.292* |
| | | (.085) |
| Endogenous Variables | | |
| Social Trust | — | –.057* |
| | | (.013) |
| Homicide | –5.44* | — |
| | (.723) | |
| Adjusted $R^2$ | .96 | .94 |
| $\chi^2$, 14 df | 13.34 ($p$ = .50) | |
| RMSEA | .000 | |
| CFI | 1.00 | |
| GFI | .936 | |

*Note:* N = 40. Data show maximum likelihood unstandardized parameter estimates. CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

*$p \leq .05$, two-tailed test

**Table A8.** Reduced Form Simultaneous Equation Model of Social Activism and Homicide Rates with Different Instruments

| | Endogenous Variables | |
|---|---|---|
| | Social Activism | Homicide |
| Exogenous Variables | | |
| Resource Deprivation | — | .246* |
| | | (.063) |
| Population Structure | — | — |
| Southern Location | –3.34 | .405* |
| | (2.11) | (.131) |
| Social Trust | — | –.049* |
| | | (.013) |
| % Age 18 to 44 | .515* | — |
| | (.163) | |
| Newspaper Readership | 5.47* | — |
| | (2.11) | |
| Violence Arrest Certainty | — | –.390* |
| | | (.124) |
| Endogenous Variables | | |
| Social Activism | — | .041* |
| | | (.010) |
| Homicide | 2.91* | — |
| | (1.43) | |
| Adjusted $R^2$ | .55 | .84 |
| $\chi^2$, 17 df | 17.13 ($p$ = .46) | |
| RMSEA | .000 | |
| CFI | .999 | |
| GFI | .920 | |

*Note:* N = 40. Data show maximum likelihood unstandardized parameter estimates. CFI = comparative fit index; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

*$p \leq .05$, two-tailed test