

**AN INVENTORY OF MEASUREMENT TOOLS FOR  
EVALUATING COMMUNITY COALITION  
CHARACTERISTICS AND FUNCTIONING**

*Prevention Research Center  
Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health  
University of South Carolina*

Suggested Citation:

Granner ML, Sharpe PA. An Inventory of Measurement Tools for Evaluating Community Coalition Characteristics and Functioning. Last Updated: April 2003. URL address: <http://prevention.sph.sc.edu/tools/CoalitionEvalInvent.pdf>.

Table 1  
Summary of Evaluation Tools or Measures for Member Characteristics & Perceptions

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Representation</b>		
<i>Sectorial representation</i> – total number of unique community sectors (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)		Sectors represented (beta coefficient = .42) (with collaboration, beta coefficient = .45) explained 29% of variance in development of a comprehensive plan. Sectors represented (beta weight = .30) (with collaboration, beta weight = -.45 & diversity, beta weight = .31) explained 34% of variance in policy change.
<i>Member diversity</i> – percentage of non-white members (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)		Diversity (beta weight = .29) (with member participation, beta weight = .59) explained 36% of variance in community prevention systems impact. Diversity (beta weight = .31) (with community sectors represented, beta weight = .30 and collaboration, beta weight = -.45) explained 34% of variance in policy change.
<i>Community representation</i> – perception that coalition is representative (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	1 item	Community representation correlated with staff outcome efficacy (r = .50), member satisfaction (r = .35), staff satisfaction (r = .49), and member commitment (r = .34)
<b>Skills &amp; Experience</b>		
<i>Experience</i> – number of years worked on issue (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	1 item	Member experience correlated with member commitment (r = .34). Member experience (with member expertise and member communication) explained 38% of variance in member outcome efficacy.
<i>Perceived participation competence</i> – level of generic participation skills and skills related to issue (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	6 items. $\alpha = .76$	
<i>Expertise</i> – abilities to address issue and manage coalition (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	11 items. $\alpha = .94$ for members, $\alpha = .92$ for staff	Member expertise correlated with member outcome efficacy (r = .50), staff outcome efficacy (r = .31), member satisfaction (r = .50), staff satisfaction (r = .52), and member commitment (r = .41). Staff expertise correlated with member outcome efficacy (r = .48), member satisfaction (r = .65), staff satisfaction (r = .35), and member commitment (r = .48). Member expertise (with member experience and member communication) explained 38% of variance in member outcome efficacy.
<i>Member profile</i> – coalition size and list of 10 potential member skills and strengths (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	11 items	Member skills related to member participation (Spearman's r = .70)

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Participation</b>		
<i>Level of participation</i> – Classified each participant into 1 of 5 levels of participation determined by role and degree of involvement. Categories included: Max leaders, Active leaders, Worker members, Active members, and Nominal members. (Prestby <i>et al.</i> , 1990)		Comparison of participation levels - increasing levels of benefits and decreasing levels of costs related to higher levels of participation. Specifically, total benefits, personal benefit, social/communal benefit, learning new skills, information, social contacts, personal recognition, social support, helping others, and fulfilling obligations were related benefits; and night meetings, feeling unwelcome, and having no accomplishments were related costs.  Members' participation was related to leaders' efforts in total incentive management, frequency of incentive management, social/communal incentive management, total cost management, frequency of cost management, and social/organizational management.
<i>Average number of members attending meetings in last year and percentage of members serving on subcommittees</i> (Florin <i>et al.</i> , 2000)		Number of members attending meetings correlated with action plan quality ( $r = .41$ )
<i>Attendance rates</i> – measure of group participation; ranked committees by attendance rates and then created high and low attendance groups using a median split. (Chinman <i>et al.</i> , 1996)		Participation over 8-10 months related to benefits (positively) and costs (negatively). (ANOVA between high and low participation groups)
<i>Participant situation is either voluntary, paid, or consultant</i> (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	
<i>Length of group participation</i> (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	
<i>Level of membership</i> – active or inactive and level of leadership (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	
<i>Member participation</i> – level of activity in coalition and number of hours spent on project in average month (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	2 items	Member participation related to member skills (Spearman's $r = .70$ ), communication (Spearman's $r = .70$ ), and length of member recruitment (Spearman's $r = -.61$ )
<i>Member and board participation</i> – commitment, diversity, adequate numbers, recruitment, orientation, drop out (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	2 items	

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Involvement in the organization</i> – has involvement increased, decreased, or stayed the same since beginning. Also asked about time spent working for organization in past 2 months and a checklist of 9 activities. (Giamartino and Wandersman, 1983)	3 items. Validity of the global involvement question supported: reported increased involvement positively related to time spent working in past 2 months and negatively related to reports of decreasing involvement.	Greater involvement correlated with cohesion ( $r = .65$ ), order/organization ( $r = .71$ )  Less involvement correlated with order/organization ( $r = -.50$ )  Increasing involvement related to organizational viability
<i>Member participation</i> – participatory roles, number of meetings attended, number of hours spent on project outside of meetings (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	3 items	Fisher Exact Tests: Participation hours related to number of inter-organizational linkages and a group environment allowing independence and innovation; Number of meetings attended was related to influence in decision-making; Number of roles members assumed related to a climate of order and organization.  Participation hours outside of meetings was related to leadership, decision making, self-discovery, independence, anger/aggression, and order/organization – explaining 23% of the variance.  Number of roles was related to leadership, decision-making, task orientation, and self-discovery – explaining 24% of the variance.
<i>Hours of participation in average month in activities both in and out of meetings</i> (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	4 items	
<i>Types of active roles played each year of participation</i> (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	9 items	
<i>Kinds of participation roles</i> – general participation roles to structural leadership positions (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	9 items	Participation level ( $R^2 = .10$ ) (with benefits of participation, additional $R^2 = .44$ ) related to psychological empowerment

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Member participation</i> – members' perceptions of participation, input, cohesiveness of membership, common vision, effective use of member abilities, personal commitment to coalition (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	10 items. $\alpha = .87$	Member participation (beta weight = .59) (with diversity, beta weight = .29) explained 36% of variance in community prevention systems impact
<i>Number of hours contributed in last year to 10 group activities</i> (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	10 items	
<i>Member involvement and contributions</i> – activities participated in and extent of personal/organizational contributions (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	8 items involvement, 7 items contributions	
<b>Role Clarity</b>		
<i>Role clarity</i> – role perception of members matches that of staff's about the coalition's involvement with developing the action plan, budget, and plans and objectives (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	4 items	
<i>Operational understanding</i> – knowledge about coalition mission, structure, and operations (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	5 items. $\alpha = .78$ for members and $\alpha = .81$ for staff	Operational understanding correlated with staff outcome efficacy ( $r = .30$ ), member commitment ( $r = .34$ )
<b>Sense of Ownership</b>		
<i>Sense of ownership</i> – commitment, sense of pride, and cares about future of coalition (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	4 items. $\alpha = .77$ for both members and staff	Sense of ownership correlated with member outcome efficacy ( $r = .60$ ), staff outcome efficacy ( $r = .58$ ), member satisfaction ( $r = .60$ ), staff satisfaction ( $r = .48$ ), and member commitment ( $r = .36$ )
		Sense of ownership (with coalition benefits) explained 41% of variance in staff outcome efficacy
<i>Organizational perceived control subscale</i> – individual perception of influence on organizational processes (Israel <i>et al.</i> , 1994)	5 items. $\alpha = .61$	

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Community Ownership Scale</i> – perceived influence various constituencies have on program or group goals, processes, and structure (Flynn, 1995)	14 items. Total score calculated for each constituency rated; for community leader $\alpha = .88$ , for external agency $\alpha = .91$ , for local staff $\alpha = .72$	
<b><u>Sense of Community</u></b>		
<i>Sense of community</i> – feelings of connection, support, and collective problem solving (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	5 items. $\alpha = .84$	Sense of community correlated with psychological empowerment ( $r = .57$ )  Sense of community ( $R^2 = .18$ ) (with perceived sense of community problems, additional $R^2 = .01$ ) related to psychological empowerment
<i>Perceived severity of community problems</i> – ranked list of specific problems (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	12 items. $\alpha = .89$	Perceived sense of community problems ( $R^2 = .01$ ) (with sense of community, additional $R^2 = .18$ ) related to psychological empowerment
<b><u>Expectations</u></b>		
<i>Outcome efficacy</i> – confidence that coalition will affect issue (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	1 item	Member outcome efficacy correlated with member expertise ( $r = .50$ ), sense of ownership ( $r = .60$ ), participation costs ( $r = -.34$ ), participation benefits ( $r = .30$ ), resource allocation satisfaction ( $r = .55$ ), leadership skills ( $r = .33$ ), management capabilities ( $r = .48$ ), communication mechanisms ( $r = .35$ ), member communication ( $r = .46$ ), staff-member communication ( $r = .33$ ), and staff expertise ( $r = .48$ )  Staff outcome efficacy correlated with member expertise ( $r = .31$ ), community representation ( $r = .50$ ), member communication ( $r = .29$ ), staff-member communication ( $r = .45$ ), operational understanding ( $r = .30$ ), sense of ownership ( $r = .58$ ), maintenance costs ( $r = -.42$ ), maintenance benefits ( $r = .58$ ), and resource allocation satisfaction ( $r = .32$ )  Member Outcome efficacy (perceived degree of certainty that coalition efforts will be successful): 38% of variance explained by member expertise, member experience, and member communication.  Staff Outcome efficacy: 41% of variance explained by coalition benefits and sense of ownership.

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Expectation</i> – likelihood of planned activities being fully implemented (Kumpfer <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	3 items. $\alpha = .84$	Team efficiency correlated with leader empowerment ( $r = .42$ )
<i>Expectancies for future individual contributions</i> – likelihood of engaging in activities over the next year, personal participation, intentions to produce outcomes (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	4 items. $\alpha = .79$	
<i>Expectancies for future group/organizational accomplishments</i> – likelihood of general and specific group accomplishments (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	5 items, $\alpha = .85$	
<b>Perceived Effectiveness</b>		
<i>Perceived coalition effectiveness</i> – activities, fund raising, coordination, training, goal setting, communication, public relations, evaluation (Gottlieb <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	9 items. $\alpha = .76$	Perceived effectiveness related to perceived activity ( $r = .52$ ), organizational barriers ( $r = .43$ ), formality of structure ( $r = .46$ )  Perceived effectiveness predicted (cross-sectional regression) by personal barriers (beta weight = .47), formality of structure (beta weight = .53)
<b>Satisfaction</b>		
<i>Member satisfaction</i> – global satisfaction with work of coalition (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	Member satisfaction correlated with communication (Spearman's $r = .73$ ), leadership skills (Spearman's $r = .78$ ), cohesion ( $r = .59$ ), task focus (Spearman's $r = .65$ ), and staff skill (Spearman's $r = .82$ )
<i>Member satisfaction</i> – level of satisfaction with committee's work and with the plan produced by committee (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	2 items	Satisfaction with committee work was related to leadership, decision-making, cohesion, and innovation – explaining 23% of the variance.  Satisfaction with the plan was related to leadership, decision-making, cohesion, innovation, task orientation, and leader support – explaining 45% of the variance.

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Satisfaction with the organization</i> – satisfaction with the progress of the organization; also asked about member enjoyment and perceptions about the strength of the organization (Giamartino and Wandersman, 1983)	3 items. Validity of global satisfaction with progress supported - satisfaction with progress positively related to enjoyment of membership (r = .47) and perception organization was getting stronger (r = .72); negatively related to perception organization was weaker (r = -.90).	Satisfaction with progress correlated with cohesion (r = .66), order/organization (r = .61), and leader control (r = .61). Enjoyment of membership correlated with cohesion (r = .62), order/organization (r = .68), and leader control (r = .51). Perception of a stronger organization correlated with cohesion (r = .73), leader support (r = .52), task orientation (r = .56), order/organization (r = .65), and leader control (r = .58). Perception of a weaker organization correlated with cohesion (r = -.84), leader support (r = -.51), task orientation (r = -.62), order/organization (r = -.71), and leader control (r = -.59). Satisfaction with progress and perceptions of a stronger organization related to organizational viability.
<i>Satisfaction level</i> – satisfaction with specific aspects of group function and achievement (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	4 items. $\alpha = .90$	
<i>Team planning</i> – member satisfaction with planning process utilized by the coalition (Kumpfer <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	4 items. $\alpha = .87$	Overall satisfaction correlated with leader empowerment (r = .69) and satisfaction with the planning process (r = .26). Satisfaction with the planning process correlated with overall satisfaction (r = .26) and leader empowerment (r = .39).
<i>Satisfaction with coalition</i> – satisfaction with operations and accomplishments (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	5 items. $\alpha = .91$	Member satisfaction correlated with member expertise (r = .50), sense of ownership (r = .60), participation costs (r = -.65), resource allocation satisfaction (r = .58), leadership skills (r = .38), community representation (r = .35), management capabilities (r = .76), member communication (r = .59), staff-member communication (r = .55), and staff expertise (r = .65). Staff satisfaction correlated with member expertise (r = .52), formalized rules and procedures (r = .33), community representation (r = .49), management capabilities (r = .59), member communication (r = .56), staff-member communication (r = .71), staff expertise (r = .35), sense of ownership (r = .48), maintenance costs (r = -.76), maintenance benefits (r = .49), and resource allocation satisfaction (r = .37). Member Satisfaction: 68% of variance explained by management capabilities (staff management of operations), member communication, and participation costs. Staff satisfaction: 71% of variance explained by coalition maintenance costs, staff-member communication, and formalized rules and procedures.



Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Attitudes toward the partnership</i> – satisfaction with partnership and member involvement, concern, and desire to remain a member (Cook <i>et al.</i> , 1994)	8 items. $\alpha = .77$	
<b><u>Commitment</u></b>		
<i>Commitment</i> – the strength of member commitment to the coalition, caring about future (Kumpfer <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	3 items. $\alpha = .93$	
<i>Member organization commitment</i> – endorsement of mission and efforts (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	3 items. $\alpha = .76$	Member commitment correlated with member expertise ( $r = .41$ ), member experience ( $r = .34$ ), operational understanding ( $r = .34$ ), sense of ownership ( $r = .36$ ), participation benefits ( $r = .41$ ), resource allocation satisfaction ( $r = .37$ ), formalized rules and procedures ( $r = .38$ ), community representation ( $r = .34$ ), management capabilities ( $r = .35$ ), member communication ( $r = .48$ ), and staff expertise ( $r = .48$ )  Member commitment: 33% of variance explained by member communication and formalized rules and procedures
<i>Commitment</i> – sense of pride and commitment toward group (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	4 items. $\alpha = .86$	Commitment ( $R^2 = .04$ ) (with organizational climate, additional $R^2 = .62$ ) related to psychological empowerment
<b><u>Participation Benefits</u></b>		
<i>Benefits to participation</i> – personal and social benefits (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	6 items. $\alpha = .84$	Benefits to participation correlated with psychological empowerment ( $r = .95$ )  Benefits to participation ( $R^2 = .44$ ) (with participation level, additional $R^2 = .10$ ) related to psychological empowerment
<i>Perceived knowledge and skill development</i> – extent to which participation in coalition has changed knowledge, beliefs, and skills (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	7 items. $\alpha = .91$	Perceived knowledge and skill development correlated with implementation effects ( $r = .50$ )

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Participatory benefits</i> – personal, social, and purposive benefits (Prestby <i>et al.</i> , 1990)	9 items. Overall $\alpha = .77$ ; 2 distinct factors: social/communal benefits (7 items, $\alpha = .76$ ) and personal benefits (2 items, $\alpha = .44$ )	<p>Increasing levels of benefits (and decreasing levels of costs) were related to higher levels of participation. Specific related benefits included: total benefits, personal benefits, social/communal benefits, learning new skills, information, social contacts, personal recognition, social support, helping others, and fulfilling obligations.</p> <p>Total benefits, personal benefits, and social/communal benefits were positively related to leaders' incentive/cost management and social/communal incentive management</p> <p>Total benefits and personal benefits were positively related to leaders' total cost management</p> <p>Total benefits, personal benefits, and social/communal benefits were positively related to leaders' frequency of cost management</p> <p>Personal benefits was positively related to leaders' personal cost management</p>
<i>Participation benefits</i> – coalition participation benefits (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	11 items. $\alpha = .91$	<p>Benefits correlated with member outcome efficacy (<math>r = .30</math>), and member commitment (<math>r = .41</math>)</p> <p>Benefits (with sense of ownership) explained 41% of variance in staff outcome efficacy</p>
<i>Benefits</i> – personal, social, and skills (Chinman <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	14 items. $\alpha = .88$ . Principal components = one factor.	Benefits positively related over 8-10 months to participation (ANOVA between high and low participation groups)
<i>Member benefits</i> – material, solidarity, and purposive benefits (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	14 items. $\alpha = .90$	Benefits were related to staff relationship, decision-making, number of inter-organizational links, task orientation, and self-discovery – explaining 38% of the variance.
<i>Impact of participation on members</i> – level of impact on skills (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	18 items	
<b>Participation Costs</b>		
<i>Participation costs</i> – difficulties of coalition participation (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	5 items. $\alpha = .76$	<p>Costs correlated with member outcome efficacy (<math>r = -.34</math>), member satisfaction (<math>r = -.65</math>)</p> <p>Costs (with management capabilities and member communication) explained 68% of variance in member satisfaction</p>

Table 1 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Participatory costs</i> – personal, social, and purposive costs (Prestby <i>et al.</i> , 1990)	7 items. Overall $\alpha = .58$ ; 2 distinct factors: social/organizational costs (3 items, $\alpha = .61$ ) and personal costs (4 items, $\alpha = .53$ )	Decreasing levels of costs (and increasing levels of benefits) were related to higher levels of participation. Specific costs related included: night meetings, feeling unwelcome, and having no accomplishments.  Social/organizational costs were positively related to leaders' total incentive management and social/communal incentive management  Social/organizational costs were negatively related to leaders' total cost management
<i>Costs to participation</i> – personal or coalition/group difficulties (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	7 items. $\alpha = .71$	
<i>Costs</i> – personal, social, and barriers (Chinman <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	13 items. $\alpha = .78$ . Principal components = one factor.	Costs negatively related over 8-10 months to participation (ANOVA between high and low participation groups)
<i>Member costs</i> – material, social, and purposive costs (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	13 items. $\alpha = .75$	Costs were related to leadership, leader control, task orientation, and independence – explaining 14% of the variance
<b>Global Participation Costs and Benefits</b>		
<i>Global assessment of benefits versus difficulties of participation</i> (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	1 item	
<i>Global costs and benefits to participation</i> (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	

Table 2  
Summary of Evaluation Tools or Measures for Organizational or Group Characteristics

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Leadership</b>		
<i>Leader support style</i> – egalitarian, empowering style of leadership, encourages members (Kumpfer <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	3 items. $\alpha = .89$	Leader empowerment correlated with team efficiency ( $r = .42$ ), overall satisfaction ( $r = .69$ ), and satisfaction with the planning process ( $r = .39$ )
<i>Leader decision style</i> – degree of adherence to democratic or authoritarian style of decision making (Kumpfer <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	3 items. $\alpha = .44$	
<i>Leadership effectiveness</i> – decision making, group/incentive management, defined roles, democratic, meeting organization, guidance, feedback (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	5 items	
<i>Leadership effectiveness</i> – members’ perceptions of extent leader directs group toward collaborative group achievement, encourages all points of view, manages conflict (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	6 items. $\alpha = .92$	
<i>Leadership</i> – skills to guide toward goals, effective meetings, articulating vision, nurturing commitment (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	6 items. $\alpha = .86$	Leadership correlated with member satisfaction (Spearman’s $r = .78$ )
<i>Leadership skills</i> – leader’s incentive management skills (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	11 items. $\alpha = .64$	Leadership skills correlated with member outcome efficacy ( $r = .33$ ), member satisfaction ( $r = .38$ )
<i>Leadership role</i> – leader competence, performance, support, and control (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	15 items. $\alpha = .95$	Leadership (with decision-making, cohesion, and innovation) explained 23% of variance in satisfaction with committee work. Leadership (with decision-making, cohesion, innovation, task orientation, and leader support) explained 45% of variance in satisfaction with the plan. Leadership (with leader control, task orientation, and independence) explained 14% of variance in member costs. Leadership (with decision-making, self-discovery, independence, anger/aggression, and order/organization) explained 23% of variance in member participation hours outside of meetings. Leadership (with decision-making, task orientation, and self-discovery) explained 24% of variance in number of participatory roles taken by members.

Table 2 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Leadership, lead agency, and staff</i> – knowledge, contributions, guidance, group management skills (Goldstein, 1997)	Leadership: 16 items; Lead agency: 7 items; Staff: 6 items	
<i>Incentive and cost management</i> – leadership guides and provides opportunities to manage members' benefits and costs of participation. 8 different scales: total incentive management, frequency of incentive management, personal incentive management, social/communal incentive management, total cost management, frequency of cost management, personal cost management, social/organizational cost management (Prestby <i>et al.</i> , 1990)	Number of items on subscales ranges 7-60 items. $\alpha = .24-.64$	Leaders' reported incentive/cost management efforts were related to members' perceived benefits/costs. Specifically, both total incentive management and social/communal incentive management were related positively to total benefits, personal benefits, social/communal benefits, and social/organizational costs; total cost management was related positively to total benefits, personal benefits, and negatively to social/organizational costs; frequency of cost management was related positively to total benefits, personal benefits, and social communal benefits; personal cost management was related positively to personal benefits  Members' participation was related to leaders' efforts in total incentive management, frequency of incentive management, social/communal incentive management, total cost management, frequency of cost management, and social/organizational management.
<b>Staff Performance</b>		
<i>Staff time devoted to coalition</i> (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	Staff time related to resource mobilization (Spearman's $r = .78$ ), extent of plan implementation (Spearman's $r = .65$ ), and number of activities implemented (Spearman's $r = .71$ )
<i>Capacity building</i> – transfer of knowledge and skills from staff to members, quality of preparation to be effective member (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	
<i>Staff skill</i> – ability of staff to guide and support coalition, including ability to shift responsibility from staff to members over time (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	7 items. $\alpha = .83$	Staff skill related to member satisfaction (Spearman's $r = .82$ )
<i>Personnel barriers</i> – includes staff and volunteer expertise, priorities, interest, availability, turnover (Gottlieb <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	9 items. $\alpha = .79$	Personnel barriers correlated with organizational barriers ( $r = .68$ )  Barriers (beta weight = .47) (with formality of structure, beta weight = .53) predicted (cross-sectional regression) perceived effectiveness  Barriers (beta weight = .49) (with formality of structure, beta weight = .30) predicted (cross-sectional regression) perceived activity of the coalition

Table 2 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Staff-committee relationship</i> – perceptions of staff competence and performance (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	10 items. $\alpha = .45$	Staff relationship (with decision-making, number of inter-organizational links, task orientation, and self-discovery) explained 38% of variance in member benefits
<i>Maintenance costs</i> – staff's perceptions that coalition management is difficult (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	6 items. Staff evaluated; $\alpha = .84$	Maintenance costs correlated with staff outcome efficacy ( $r = -.42$ ), staff satisfaction ( $r = -.76$ )  Maintenance costs (with staff-member communication and formalized rules/procedures) explained 71% of variance in staff satisfaction
<i>Maintenance benefits</i> – staff's perceptions that coalition is beneficial to organization (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	9 items. Staff evaluated; $\alpha = .94$	Maintenance benefits correlated with staff outcome efficacy ( $r = .58$ ), staff satisfaction ( $r = .49$ )
<i>Management capabilities</i> – effective management process and policies, efficient operation, democratic (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	23 items. $\alpha = .95$	Management capabilities correlated with member outcome efficacy ( $r = .48$ ), member satisfaction ( $r = .76$ ), staff satisfaction ( $r = .59$ ), and member commitment ( $r = .35$ ). Management capabilities (with member communication and participation costs) explained 68% of variance in member satisfaction.
<b>Formal Organizational Structure</b>		
<i>Organizational structure</i> – two aspects: formalization and complexity. Formalization score calculated by giving one point each for bylaws, written agendas, and written minutes. Complexity calculated from number of functioning task forces (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)		Structural complexity related to number of activities implemented (Spearman's $r = .89$ )  Formalization related to resource mobilization (Spearman's $r = .66$ ) and extent of plan implemented (Spearman's $r = .57$ )
<i>Organizational structure</i> – subcommittees, bylaws, planning mechanism, leadership stability and renewal policies (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	5 items	
<i>Formality of coalition structure</i> – written agreement of responsibilities, fund raising, mission statement, annual goals, objectives (Gottlieb <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	6 items	Formality of structure related to perceived effectiveness ( $r = .46$ ) and perceived activity ( $r = .25$ )  Formality of structure (beta weight = .53) (with personnel barriers, beta weight = .47) predicted (cross-sectional regression) perceived effectiveness  Formality of structure (beta weight = .30) (with personnel barriers, beta weight = .49) predicted (cross-sectional regression) perceived activity of the coalition

Table 2 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Formalized rules and procedures</i> – operating systems, member orientation, mission (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	8 items. $\alpha = .72$	Formalized rules and procedures correlated with staff satisfaction ( $r = .33$ ), member commitment ( $r = .38$ )  Formalized rules and procedures (with staff-member communication and maintenance costs) explained 71% of variance in staff satisfaction  Formalized rules and procedures (with member communication) explained 33% of variance in member commitment
<i>Formalization</i> – formalized rules and procedures, bylaws, meeting organization, decision making procedures (Florin <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	11 items	
<i>Coalition structure and process</i> – bylaws, written objectives, communication/decision making procedures, resource allocation, training, orientation (Goldstein, 1997)	Coalition structure 9 items; coalition process 7 items	
<b>Task Focus/Meeting Effectiveness</b>		
<i>Task focus</i> – order and organization of the group, efficiency, formalization, structure (Florin, Mitchell, <i>et al.</i> , 2000; As developed in: McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)		Task focus correlated with implementation effects ( $r = .38$ )
<i>Task focus of meetings</i> (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	4 items. $\alpha = .85$	
<i>Task focus</i> – order and organization of the group, efficiency, formalization, structure (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	5 items. $\alpha = .84$	Task focus correlated with member satisfaction (Spearman's $r = .65$ ),
<i>Meeting Effectiveness Inventory</i> – organization, participation, leadership, decision making, conflict resolution, cohesion, productivity (Goodman <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	10 items	

Table 3  
Summary of Evaluation Tools or Measures for Organizational or Group Processes & Climate

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Stages of Coalition Development</b>		
<i>Stages of coalition development</i> – list of tasks accomplished by stage: formation, implementation, maintenance, institutionalization (Goldstein, 1997)	Formation: 4 items; Implementation: 4 items; Maintenance: 8 items; Institutionalization: 6 items	
<b>Community Capacity</b>		
<i>Community capacity</i> – community’s ability to solve problems; activities, preexisting networks and collaboration <i>prior</i> to coalition’s existence (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	2 items	
<b>Organizational Climate</b>		
<i>Organizational climate</i> – generated by combining 4 individual constructs (see rest of table for descriptions of individual constructs): Involvement/inclusion and Task focus (see Table 3), Satisfaction level and Commitment (see Table 1). (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)		Organizational climate correlated with organizational empowerment ( $r = .31$ ), psychological empowerment ( $r = .85$ )  Organizational climate ( $R^2 = .62$ ) (with commitment, additional $R^2 = .04$ ) related to psychological empowerment
<i>Organizational climate</i> – modified from the Moos Group Environment Scale, short form of GES Form R: Moos RH, Insel PM, Humphrey B. <i>Preliminary manual for family environment scale, work environment scale, and group environment scale</i> . Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1974. (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	40 items (10 subscales, 4 items each). In this study: overall $\alpha = .78$ ; cohesion ( $\alpha = .11$ ), leader support ( $\alpha = .68$ ), expression ( $\alpha = .43$ ), independence ( $\alpha = .17$ ), task orientation ( $\alpha = .77$ ), self-discovery ( $\alpha = .60$ ), anger and aggression ( $\alpha = .50$ ), order and organization ( $\alpha = .47$ ), leader control ( $\alpha = .11$ ), innovation ( $\alpha = .39$ ). See Moos, Insel, Humphrey, 1974 for psychometrics of original scale.	Independence and innovation related to member participation hours outside of meetings (Fisher Exact Test). Order and organization related to number of participatory roles taken members (Fisher Exact Test). Cohesion and innovation (with leadership and decision-making) explained 23% of variance in satisfaction with committee work. Cohesion, innovation, leader support, and task orientation (with leadership and decision-making) explained 45% of variance in satisfaction with the plan. Task orientation and self-discovery (with staff-committee relationship, number of inter-organizational links, and decision-making) explained 38% of variance in member benefits. Task orientation, leader control, and independence (with leadership) explained 14% of variance in member costs. Self-discovery, independence, anger/aggression, and order/organization (with leadership and decision-making) explained 23% of variance in member participation hours outside of meetings. Task orientation and self-discovery (with leadership and decision-making) explained 24% of variance in number of participatory roles taken by members.



Table 3 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Group climate</i> – Moos Group Environment Scale, short form of GES Form R (see reference for GES above). (Giamartino and Wandersman, 1983)	40 items. See Moos, Insel, Humphrey, 1974 for psychometrics of original scale.	<p>Cohesion (<math>r = .66</math>), order/organization (<math>r = .61</math>), and leader control (<math>r = .61</math>) correlated with satisfaction with progress</p> <p>Cohesion (<math>r = .62</math>), order/organization (<math>r = .68</math>), and leader control (<math>r = .51</math>) correlated with enjoyment of membership</p> <p>Cohesion (<math>r = .73</math>), leader support (<math>r = .52</math>), task orientation (<math>r = .56</math>), order/organization (<math>r = .65</math>), and leader control (<math>r = .58</math>) correlated with perception of a stronger organization</p> <p>Cohesion (<math>r = -.84</math>), leader support (<math>r = -.51</math>), task orientation (<math>r = -.62</math>), order/organization (<math>r = -.71</math>), and leader control (<math>r = -.59</math>) correlated with perception of a weaker organization</p> <p>Cohesion (<math>r = .65</math>) and order/organization (<math>r = .71</math>) correlated with greater involvement</p> <p>Order/organization (<math>r = -.50</math>) correlated with less involvement</p> <p>Cohesion (<math>r = .78</math>), leader support (<math>r = .43</math>), task orientation (<math>r = .43</math>), order/organization (<math>r = .68</math>), and leader control (<math>r = .69</math>) correlated with Organizational viability</p>
<b>Group Relationships</b>		
<i>Partnership relations</i> – identify which members most important to success and which members most often interact with, rate quality of most frequent interactions (Cook <i>et al.</i> , 1994)		
<i>Group relationships</i> – trust, conflict management, team work, use of talents, recognition (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	3 items	
<i>Cohesion of the group</i> (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	4 items. $\alpha = .85$	Cohesion related to member satisfaction (Spearman's $r = .59$ ) and number of activities implemented (Spearman's $r = .63$ )
<i>Satisfaction with group</i> – feeling heard and valued, comfort, satisfaction (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	4 items	

Table 3 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Communication</b>		
<i>Communication</i> – quality of member-staff and member-member communications, frequency, productivity (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	4 items. $\alpha = .87$	Communication related to member participation (Spearman's $r = .70$ ), member satisfaction (Spearman's $r = .73$ ), extent of plan implementation (Spearman's $r = .75$ ), and number of activities implemented (Spearman's $r = .65$ )
<i>Member communication</i> – quality of member-member communication (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	5 items. $\alpha = .90$	Member communication correlated with member outcome efficacy ( $r = .46$ ), staff outcome efficacy ( $r = .29$ ), member satisfaction ( $r = .59$ ), staff satisfaction ( $r = .56$ ), and member commitment ( $r = .48$ )  Member communication (with member experience and member expertise) explained 38% of variance in member outcome efficacy  Member communication (with management capabilities and participation costs) explained 68% of variance in member satisfaction  Member communication (with formalized rules/procedures) explained 33% of variance in member commitment
<i>Staff-member communication</i> – quality of staff-member communication (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	5 items. $\alpha = .91$	Staff-member communication correlated with member outcome efficacy ( $r = .33$ ), staff outcome efficacy ( $r = .45$ ), member satisfaction ( $r = .55$ ), and staff satisfaction ( $r = .71$ )  Staff-member communication (with maintenance costs and formalized rules/procedures) explained 71% of variance in staff satisfaction
<i>Communication mechanisms</i> – use of various methods of communication (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	8 items. $\alpha = .66$	Communication mechanisms correlated with member outcome efficacy ( $r = .35$ )
<b>Conflict</b>		
<i>Conflict</i> – measure of tension in coalition caused by opinion differences, personality clashes, hidden agendas, power struggles (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	
<b>Decision Making</b>		
<i>Decision making</i> – extent of influence in determining certain types of coalition's actions (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	4 items. $\alpha = .84$	Related to action plan quality (Spearman's $r = -.55$ ) and resource mobilization (Spearman's $r = -.74$ )

Table 3 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Influence in decision making</i> – influence of individuals, group, staff, and leaders have in determining policies and actions of committee (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	4 items. $\alpha = .47$	Decision-making related to number of meetings attended by members (Fisher Exact Test)  Decision-making (with leadership, cohesion, and innovation) explained 23% of variance in satisfaction with committee work  Decision-making (with leadership, cohesion, innovation, task orientation, and leader support) explained 45% of variance in satisfaction with the plan  Decision-making (with staff-committee relationship, number of inter-organizational links, task orientation, and self-discovery) explained 38% of variance in member benefits  Decision-making (with leadership, self-discovery, independence, anger/aggression, order/organization) explained 23% of variance in member participation hours outside of meetings  Decision-making (with leadership, task orientation, and self-discovery) explained 24% of variance in number of participatory roles taken by members
<i>Involvement/inclusion</i> – member involvement in group processes (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	5 items. $\alpha = .85$	
<b>Recruitment</b>		
<i>Recruitment pattern</i> – evolution of coalition membership through stages of development based upon number of community sectors represented and average length of membership (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	2 items	Length of recruitment related to member participation (Spearman's $r = -.61$ )  Number of sectors recruited from related to number of activities implemented (Spearman's $r = .59$ )
<i>Recruitment subscale</i> – success in recruiting new members and steps taken to ensure representativeness (Cook <i>et al.</i> , 1994)	3 items. $\alpha = .78$	
<b>Action Plan Quality</b>		
<i>Organizational assessment</i> – evaluation of goals and processes (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	

Table 3 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Plan quality</i> – clarity, effectiveness, and quality of plans (Florin <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	3 items. Expert panel conducted evaluation; $\alpha = .94$ ; inter-rater reliability = .76	Action plan quality was correlated with paid staff hours ( $r = .35$ ) and number of members attending meetings ( $r = .41$ )
<i>Plan has clear and achievable goals, mission statement, goal agreement</i> (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	4 items	
<i>Scope</i> – number of categorically different strategies proposed in plan (Florin <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	7 major categories. Expert panel conducted evaluation; inter-rater reliability (Cohen's $\kappa$ ) = .65	
<i>Comprehensive, research-based planning</i> – strategies to meet goals/outcomes, plan rating (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	8 items. Expert panel conducted evaluation; $\alpha = .70$	Development of a comprehensive plan was related to community sectors represented (beta coefficient = .42) and collaboration (beta = .45) – explaining 29% of the variance
<i>Quality of action plan</i> – Plan dimensions: measurable objectives, target population, plan related to state-level plan, plan tailored to local level, clear/defined tasks, responsibilities identified, clear timelines, comprehensive (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	10 dimensions. Expert evaluation	Action plan quality correlated with resource mobilization (Spearman's $r = .84$ ) and extent of plan implemented (Spearman's $r = .59$ ), decision making (Spearman's $r = -.55$ ), extent of plan implementation (Spearman's $r = .59$ ), and resources mobilized (Spearman's $r = .84$ )
<i>Plan Quality Index</i> – clear and realistic objectives and activities, scope of plan, resources in the community, overall impression of plan quality (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	18 items. Trained raters; inter-rater reliability = .73	

Table 3 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Implementation</b>		
<i>Implementation</i> – progress assessment of extent of implementation of the action plan, resources generated, and capitalization of opportunities outside of plan. Also measure absolute number of completed activities (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	Leadership and coordinator evaluated	Extent of plan implementation correlated with action plan quality (Spearman's $r = .59$ ) and resource mobilization (Spearman's $r = .59$ ), communication (Spearman's $r = .75$ ), formalized structure (Spearman's $r = .57$ ), action plan quality (Spearman's $r = .59$ ), resources mobilized (Spearman's $r = .59$ ), and staff time (Spearman's $r = .65$ )  Number of activities implemented correlated with communication (Spearman's $r = .65$ ), structural complexity (Spearman's $r = .89$ ), number of sectors recruited members from (Spearman's $r = .59$ ), resources mobilized (Spearman's $r = .72$ ), cohesion ( $r = .63$ ), and staff time (Spearman's $r = .71$ )
<i>Perceived activity of the coalition</i> – information about the level and type of activities for previous year, including, fund raising, media coverage, number of purchases and requests for materials, distribution network, innovative methods of distribution, and number of kits distributed. (Gottlieb <i>et al.</i> , 1993)		Perceived activity related to perceived effectiveness ( $r = .52$ ), organizational barriers ( $r = .46$ ), formality of structure ( $r = .25$ )  Perceived activity predicted by personal barriers (beta weight = .49) and formality of structure (beta weight = .30)
<b>Resources</b>		
<i>Resource mobilization</i> – one point assigned for each resource, sponsorship, or donation generated (Kegler <i>et al.</i> , 1998)		Resources mobilization correlated with extent of plan implemented (Spearman's $r = .59$ ) and number of activities implemented (Spearman's $r = .72$ ) and action plan quality (Spearman's $r = .84$ ), decision making (Spearman's $r = -.74$ ), formalized structure (Spearman's $r = .66$ ), action plan quality (Spearman's $r = .84$ ), extent of plan implementation (Spearman's $r = .59$ ), and staff time (Spearman's $r = .78$ )
<i>Financial resources</i> – average annual fund allocation for issue (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	1 item	
<i>Resource allocation satisfaction</i> – satisfaction with the use of funds in the community (Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	1 item	Resource allocation satisfaction correlated with member outcome efficacy ( $r = .55$ ), staff outcome efficacy ( $r = .32$ ), member satisfaction ( $r = .58$ ), staff satisfaction ( $r = .37$ ), and member commitment ( $r = .37$ )
<i>Fiscal resources</i> – sufficient, effectively used (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	2 items	

Table 4  
Summary of Evaluation Tools or Measures for General Coalition Function or Scales Bridging Multiple Constructs

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Member Characteristics</b>		
<i>Members</i> – contributions, responsibilities, satisfaction, involvement, and communication (Goldstein, 1997)	10 items	
<b>Organizational Climate</b>		
<i>Organizational barriers</i> – mix of organizational climate and processes that may impede coalition functioning including: goal setting, decision making, funding, leadership, recognition, communications, structure, and priorities (Gottlieb <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	19 items. $\alpha = .78$	Organizational barriers (selected organizational climate and processes) related to personal barriers (selected staff and member characteristics) ( $r = .68$ ), perceived effectiveness ( $r = .43$ ), and perceived activity ( $r = .46$ )
<b>Collaboration</b>		
<i>Cooperation and networking subscale</i> – degree to which partnership has increased cooperation, networking, and information exchange (Cook <i>et al.</i> , 1994)	2 items. $\alpha = .87$	
<i>Collaboration</i> – information exchange/networking, joint planning of activities; heavier weighting of collaboration over networking items (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	6 items. $\alpha = .87$	Collaboration (beta coefficient = .45) (with community sectors represented, beta coefficient = .42) explained 29% of variance in development of a comprehensive plan. Collaboration (beta weight = -.45) (with community sectors represented, beta weight = .30 and diversity, beta weight = .31) explained 34% of variance in policy change.
<i>Internal collaborative functioning</i> – shared vision, understanding of goals and objectives, clear roles and responsibilities, decision making procedures, conflict management, changing membership, leadership, plans, relationships/trust, internal communication, external communication, and evaluation (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item each component (12 items)	

Table 4 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Collaboration checklist</i> – collaboration functioning including: communication, sustainability, research and evaluation, political climate, resources, catalysts, policies, community history, connectedness, leadership, community development, understanding of community (Borden and Perkins, 1999)	1 item each component (12 total)	
<b>General Functioning</b>		
<i>Self-evaluation tool</i> - Rating on 5-point scale (low to high) of coalition’s capacity for effective action. Goals, outcomes, leadership, commitment, communication, turf, and diversity. (National Network for Health, 2001.)	7 items	
<i>Coalition Checklist</i> -- Diagnostic tool to identify gaps. Yes/No checklist of activities or factors across formation, building membership, member benefits, member philosophies and processes fit with coalition’s, goals, commitment, leadership, role responsibilities, decision making, fund raising, managing negotiations, and cultural competence. (Brown, 1984; Also reprinted in Minkler, 1997)	12 items	
<i>Group functioning</i> – effectiveness in collaboration, communication, decision making, building trust, operating procedures, planning, leadership, making linkages, securing resources, conflict resolution, recruitment, training, evaluating, and building capacity (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	26 items	

Table 4 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<p><i>Evaluation Rubric</i> - Rating of effectiveness as low, medium, or high (descriptions for each level of effectiveness provided for each item). <u>Community ownership</u> – awareness, multi-sector involvement, local focus, financial, goal consensus, broad-based representation, knowledge transfer, political landscape, community engagement, and leadership. <u>Organizational effectiveness</u> – collaboration, member participation and turnover, formalization, resources, communication, organizational structures, attendance, common vision/mission, conflict resolution, and domination. <u>Comprehensive prevention approach</u> – strategic planning process, comprehensive plan, multiple domains, age-developmental focus, research-based programs/policies/principles, and IOM classification. <u>Commitment to results orientation</u> – results oriented, coalition quality improvement, coalition outcome evaluation, community impact evaluation, program process evaluation, and program outcome evaluation. <u>Linkage relationship between coalition and communities or community programs</u> – structure/organization, participation/integration, and communication. (The Center for Prevention Research and Development, 1999.)</p>	<p>35 broad categories, one item each (total 35 items)</p>	



Table 5  
Summary of Evaluation Tools or Measures for Impacts & Outcomes

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Community Linkages</b>		
<i>Community networking</i> – methods of linkage to other groups or organizations (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	1 item	
<i>Community-committee linkage</i> – number of organizations or groups with which increased linkage had occurred (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	1 item	Number of inter-organizational linkages related to member participation hours outside of meetings (Fisher Exact Test)  Number of inter-organizational links (with staff-committee relationship, decision-making, task orientation, and self-discovery) explained 38% of variance in member benefits
<i>Nonmember contact subscale</i> – how well members have cooperated, networked, and exchanged information with nonmembers (Cook <i>et al.</i> , 1994)	2 items. $\alpha = .86$	
<i>Personal awareness subscale</i> – degree of increased awareness of other organizations' activities and constraints and ability to form relationships with other organizations (Cook <i>et al.</i> , 1994)	3 items. $\alpha = .80$	
<i>Team networking</i> – organizational changes taking place through coalition action, information exchange, number of referrals (Kumpfer <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	4 items. $\alpha = .80$	
<i>Community prevention systems impacts</i> – increased awareness, increase resources, and improved community communication (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	7 items. $\alpha = .91$	Community systems impact related to diversity (beta = .29) and member participation (beta = .59) – explaining 36% of the variance
<i>Community-committee linkage</i> – determine the change in types of exchanges with other organizations or groups as a result of committee participation (Butterfoss <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	7 items. $\alpha = .99$	
<i>Inter-organizational linkages of the coalition</i> – extent of contact with various community constituencies (Florin <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	12 items	Inter-organizational linkages correlated with implementation effects ( $r = .48$ )

Table 5 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Impacts</b>		
<i>Public policy change</i> – extent strengthened policy or regulations (Hays <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	1 item	Policy change related to community sectors represented (beta = .30), collaboration (beta = -.45), and diversity (beta = .31) – explaining 34% of the variance
<i>Implementation effects</i> – effects on dimensions of community life expected to influence (Florin <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	5 items. Key informant rated; $\alpha = .87$	Implementation effects (including on youth/parents, community attitudes, inter-organizational connections, organizational policies, and resources available) correlated with task-focused social climate ( $r = .38$ ), perceived knowledge and skill development ( $r = .50$ ), and inter-organizational linkages ( $r = .48$ )
<i>Perceived group/organizational accomplishments</i> – extent felt had produced community effects generally, on services, proximal outcomes, and distal impacts (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	7 items. $\alpha = .89$	
<i>Impact of group on others</i> – community involvement, community planning, group and community capacity, resources, services/programs, policy, and community conditions (Taylor-Powell <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	43 items	
<b>Organizational Viability</b>		
<i>Organizational viability</i> – 2 level outcome variable: active groups continued to meet for 1 year after interviews, inactive groups did not meet during last 6 months of the year following interviews. (Giamartino and Wandersman, 1983)	1 item	Organizational viability correlated with cohesion ( $r = .78$ ), leader support ( $r = .43$ ), task orientation ( $r = .43$ ), order/organization ( $r = .68$ ), and leader control ( $r = .69$ )  Organizational viability related to satisfaction with progress, increasing involvement, and perceptions of a stronger organization

Table 5 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<p><b>Institutionalization</b></p> <p><i>Level of Institutionalization</i> (of health promotion programs) –composite of the number of dimensions (extensiveness) and degrees of depth (intensiveness). <u>Routinization of program production</u> -repeated deployment of program activities reflected in written plans/evaluations. <u>Niche saturation of program production</u> - extent to which all program activities are written and operationalized. <u>Routinization of program maintenance</u> - host organization’s staff’s involvement and commitment to operations. <u>Niche saturation of program maintenance</u> - extent to which staff involved and committed to operations. <u>Routinization of program support</u> - regular commitment of host organization’s administration to program through funding, staffing, and status afforded. <u>Niche saturation of program support</u> - extent to which the host organization’s administration committed to the program. <u>Routinization of program management</u> - formal and routine application of program supervision through assignment of supervisors, development of written job descriptions, and establishment of accountability through evaluation. <u>Niche saturation of program management</u> -extent to which the program is formally supervised, staff has written job descriptions, and program evaluation occurs. (Goodman <i>et al.</i>, 1993)</p>	<p>15, 3-part items (45 total). Confirmatory factor analysis found 8 factors (loading <math>\geq</math> .40): Routine production (5 items; <math>\alpha = .86</math>), Niche saturation production (5 items; <math>\alpha = .85</math>), Routine maintenance (3 items; <math>\alpha = .65</math>), Niche saturation maintenance (3 items; <math>\alpha = .44</math>), Routine support (4 items; <math>\alpha = .64</math>), Niche saturation support (4 items; <math>\alpha = .69</math>), Routine managerial (3 items; <math>\alpha = .71</math>), and Niche saturation managerial (3 items; <math>\alpha = .66</math>).</p>	<p>The 4 routine scales were significantly correlated with number of years the program had been in operation, all 4 niche saturation scales and 2 routine scales were significantly correlated with perceptions of program permanence.</p>

Table 5 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<b>Capacity/Empowerment</b>		
<i>Psychological empowerment</i> – generated by combining 5 individual constructs (see rest of tables for descriptions of the individual constructs): Perceived knowledge and skill development, Perceived participation competence, Expectancies for future individual contributions, and Expectancies for future group/organizational accomplishments (Table 1), and Perceived group/organizational accomplishments (Table 5). (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)		Psychological empowerment correlated (adjusted for individual effects) with net benefits of participation ( $r = .95$ ), organizational climate ( $r = .85$ ), commitment ( $r = .90$ ), sense of community ( $r = .57$ ), and organizational empowerment ( $r = .42$ )  Psychological empowerment was related in hierarchical regressions: 1) Sense of community ( $R^2 = .18$ ) and perceived sense of community problem (additional $R^2 = .01$ ) 2) Net benefits of participation ( $R^2 = .44$ ) and participation level (additional $R^2 = .10$ ) 3) Organizational climate ( $R^2 = .62$ ) and commitment (additional $R^2 = .04$ )
<i>Organizational empowerment</i> – key informant ratings of group's impact on organization's policies and use of resources. (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	2 items. Key informant rated.	Organizational empowerment was correlated (adjusted for individual effects) with psychological empowerment ( $r = .42$ ) and organizational climate ( $r = .31$ )
<i>Organizational empowerment</i> – coalition impact on policies and regulations; impact on donations/resources generated (McMillan <i>et al.</i> , 1995)	2 items	Organizational empowerment was correlated (adjusted for individual effects) with psychological empowerment ( $r = .42$ ) and organizational climate ( $r = .31$ )
<i>Perceived Control Scale</i> – multiple levels of empowerment assessment: individual, organizational, community levels, and overall (Israel <i>et al.</i> , 1994)	12 items. Overall (all 12 items, $\alpha = .71$ ), Individual (2 items, $\alpha = .66$ ), Organizational (5 items, $\alpha = .61$ ), Community (5 items, $\alpha = .63$ )	

Table 5 (cont.)

<b>Construct and Conceptual Definition (Reference)</b>	<b>Number of Items &amp; Validity and Reliability</b>	<b>Associated Constructs</b>
<i>Community Residents Survey</i> - community competence (item development based upon Cottrell's dimensions of community competence). (Goepfinger and Baglioni, Jr., 1985)	22 items. Factor analysis with oblique rotation found 4 distinct factors (items with factor loading of $\geq .25$ were retained): Democratic participation style (5 items), Crime (2 items), Resource adequacy and use (6 items), and Decision-making interactions (2 items). One item ("all residents may participate") loaded on two factors: Democratic participation style (.274) and Resource adequacy and use (.254). The 4 factors explained 35% of variance.	
<i>Community competence</i> – 8 dimensions of assessment of multiple skills/capacity (Eng and Parker, 1994)	41 items. Participation (9 items, $\alpha = .68$ ), Commitment (6 items, $\alpha = .71$ ), Self-other awareness and clarity of situation (3 items, $\alpha = .58$ ), Articulateness (3 items, $\alpha = .65$ ), Conflict containment and accommodation (4 items, $\alpha = .81$ ), Management of relations with larger society (3 items, $\alpha = .75$ ), Machinery for facilitating interaction and decision making (10 items, $\alpha = .79$ ), Social support (3 items, $\alpha = .67$ )	



## References

- Borden, L.M., Perkins, D.F. (1999) Assessing your collaboration: a self evaluation tool. *Journal of Extension*, **37**. Internet: <http://www.joe.org>.
- Brown, C.R. (1984) *The art of coalition building: a guide for community leaders*. New York: American Jewish Center.
- Butterfoss, F.D., Goodman, R.M., Wandersman, A. (1996) Community coalitions for prevention and health promotion: factors predicting satisfaction, participation, and planning. *Health Education Quarterly*, **23**, 65-79.
- Butterfoss, F.D., Goodman, R.M., Wandersman, A., Valois, R.F., Chinman, M.J. (1996) The Plan Quality Index: an empowerment evaluation tool for measuring and improving the quality of plans. In: *Empowerment evaluation: knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability*. Fetterman DM, Kaftarian SJ, and Wandersman A (eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.; 304-331.
- Center for Prevention Research and Development. (1999) *Building Coalition Effectiveness for Sustainability: An Evaluation Rubric*, University of Illinois. Internet: <http://www.cprd.uiuc.edu/SIG/Illinois/PDF%20files/coalition%20rubric.pdf>. Accessed 8/9/2001.
- Chinman, M.J., Anderson, C.M., Imm, P.S., Wandersman, A., Goodman, R.M. (1996) The perceptions of costs and benefits of high active versus low active groups in community coalitions at different stages in coalition development. *Journal of Community Psychology*, **24**, 263-274.
- Cook, R., Roehl, J., Oros, C., Trudeau, J. (1994) Conceptual and methodological issues in the evaluation of community-based substance abuse prevention coalitions: lessons learned from the National Evaluation of the Community Partnership Program. *Journal of Community Psychology*, **Special Issue**, 155-169.
- Eng, E., Parker, E. (1994) Measuring community competence in the Mississippi Delta: the interface between program evaluation and empowerment. *Health Education Quarterly*, **21**, 199-220.
- Florin, P., Mitchell, R., Stevenson, J., Klein, I. (2000) Predicting intermediate outcomes for prevention coalitions: a developmental perspective. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, **23**, 341-346.
- Flynn, B.S. (1995) Measuring community leaders' perceived ownership of health education programs: initial tests of reliability and validity. *Health Education Research*, **10**, 27-36.
- Giamartino, G., Wandersman, A. (1983) Organizational climate correlates of viable urban block organizations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **11**, 529-541.
- Goeppinger, J., Baglioni, Jr. A.J. (1985) Community competence: a positive approach to needs assessment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **13**, 507-523.

Goldstein, S. (1997) Community coalitions: a self-assessment tool. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, **11**, 430-435.

Goodman, R.M., McLeroy, K.R., Steckler, A.B., Hoyle, R.H. (1993) Development of level of institutionalization scales for health promotion programs. *Health Education Quarterly*, **20**, 161-178.

Goodman, R.M., Wandersman, A., Chinman, M., Imm, P., Morrissey, E. (1996) An ecological assessment of community-based interventions for prevention and health promotion: approaches to measuring community coalitions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **24**, 33-61.

Gottlieb, N.H., Brink, S.G., Levenson Gingiss, P. (1993) Correlates of coalition effectiveness: the Smoke Free Class of 2000 Program. *Health Education Research*, **8**, 375-384.

Hays, C.E., Hays, S.P., DeVille, J.O., Mulhall, P.F. (2000) Capacity for effectiveness: the relationship between coalition structure and community impact. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, **23**, 373-379.

Israel, B.A., Checkoway, B., Schulz, A., Zimmerman, M. (1994) Health education and community empowerment: conceptualizing and measuring perceptions of individual, organizational, and community control. *Health Education Quarterly*, **21**, 149-170.

Kegler, M., Steckler, A., McLeroy, K., Herndon Malek, S. (1998) Factors that contribute to effective community health promotion coalitions: a study of 10 Project ASSIST coalitions in North Carolina. *Health Education and Behavior*, **25**, 338-353.

Kumpfer, K.L., Turner, C., Hopkins, R., Librett, J. (1993) Leadership and team effectiveness in community coalitions for the prevention of alcohol and other drug abuse. *Health Education Research*, **8**, 359-374.

McMillan, B., Florin, P., Stevenson, J., Kerman, B., Mitchell, R.E. (1995) Empowerment praxis in community coalitions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **23**, 699-727.

Minkler, M. (1997) *Community organizing and community building for health*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

National Network for Health. *Coalition self-evaluation instrument*. Internet: <http://www.nnh.org/tobacco/appe-18-2.htm>. Accessed 7/25/2001.

Prestby, J.E., Wandersman, A., Florin, P., Rich, R., Chavis, D. (1990) Benefits, costs, incentive management and participation in voluntary organizations: a means to understanding and promoting empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **18**, 117-149.



Rogers, T., Howard-Pitney, B., Feighery, E.C., Altman, D.G., Endres, J.M., Roeseler, A.G. (1993) Characteristics and participant perceptions of tobacco control coalitions in California. *Health Education Research*, **8**, 345-357.

Taylor-Powell, E., Rossing, B., Geran, J. (1998) *Evaluating collaboratives: reaching the potential*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension, Program Development and Evaluation. Internet: <http://www.cyfernet.org/newsite/collaboration.html>. Accessed 7/25/2001.