Published in final edited form as:

J Adolesc Health. 2014 December ; 55(6 0): S21–S30. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.08.021.

Social Capital and Vulnerable Urban Youth in Five Global Cities

Beth Dail Marshall, DrPH, Nan Astone, PhD, Robert Blum, MD, MPH, PhD, Shireen Jejeebhoy, PhD, Sinead Delany-Moretlwe, MD, PhD, Heena Brahmbhatt, PhD, Adesola Olumide, MBBS, MPH, and Ziliang Wang, MS

Abstract

Background—Social capital is essential for the successful development of young people. The current study examines direct measures of social capital in young people in five urban global contexts.

Methods—The Well Being of Adolescents in Vulnerable Environments (WAVE) is a global study of young people aged 15 to 19 years living in disadvantaged, urban settings. Respondent Driven Sampling (RDS) was used to recruit approximately 500 participants from each site. The sample included 2339 young people (mean age 16.7 years; 47.5% female). We examined the associations between social capital in four domains -family, school, peers and neighborhood -and demographic characteristics using gender stratified Ordinary Least Squares regression. We also examined associations between self-reported health and the four social capital domains is minimal. School enrollment was positively associated with social capital for young women in Baltimore, Delhi, and Shanghai: the association was less consistent for young men. The same pattern is true for perceived wealth. Unstable housing was associated with low familial social capital in all groups except young women in Shanghai and young men in Ibadan and Johannesburg. Being raised outside a two-parent family has a widespread, negative association with social capital. Self-reported health had a mainly positive association with social capital with the most consistent association being neighborhood social capital,

Conclusions—Different types of social capital interact with social contexts and gender differently. Strategies that aim to build social capital as part of risk reduction and positive youth development programming need to recognize that social capital enhancement may work differently for different groups and in different settings.

Keywords

adolescent; social determinants; neighborhood cohesion; family support; peer support; school connectedness

© 2014 Published by Society of Adolescent Health and Medicine.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Beth Dail Marshall, DrPH, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

INTRODUCTION

By 2030 most of the world's population will be urban.¹ Global urbanization has redirected attention to the health of urban dwellers.³

One model of urban health posits *the social environment* as an important influence on health.⁴ Social capital is defined as the resources that inhere in people's relationships.^{5–6} A growing body of evidence suggests that the presence and amount of social capital is essential for the health and successful development of young people.^{7–9}

One aspect of social capital for young people is their connections through their parents to a wider social network. Adolescents report that their parents are the most important people in their lives.^{10–11} Some in the US argue that the rise of single parent households threatens these networks.⁷ Researchers in the US^{12–13} and Europe¹⁴ have shown that young people who grow up without both parents are disadvantaged over peers who do, and this effect persists when the effects of reduced economic resources are controlled.¹⁵ Research documents similar findings in Latin America¹⁶ and Africa,^{17–19} most visibly among orphans in sub-Saharan Africa, while in India, norms prescribing strict age and gender hierarchies within the family inhibit parent-child connections.^{20–25}

There is an association between low income neighborhoods and juvenile violence, teen childbearing,²⁷ adolescent sexual behaviors,^{28–30} STIs;³¹ adolescent mental health,³² and school achievement.^{33–35} High crime and poor environmental conditions may preclude neighbors being cohesive and having the collective self-efficacy of higher income neighborhoods. Such disadvantage may be compounded for rural to urban migrant youth who often lack the social networks to take advantage of urban opportunities.^{36–39} Some argue there is a greater pull for adolescents residing in such communities toward negative peer relationships.⁴⁰

Social capital is rarely measured directly.⁴¹ We examine two indicators of group affiliation that have been used widely as proxies for social capital^{5–6,42}--family structure and school attendance—to see if they are associated with direct measures of social capital among young people - family, schools, peers, and in five diverse urban settings.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

Any relationship between people can be a source of social capital, but if the relationship occurs within an organization (e.g. a school) or an institutional context (e.g. the family), the organizational or institutional structure may affect the levels or type of social capital available. For example, people are more likely to think that adult children should move in with their parents in times of hardship if those children are married versus cohabiting, suggesting marriage increases the social capital children have with their parents.⁴⁴ In classrooms where student network ties are equitably distributed, students with behavior problems are less likely to become disengaged compared with classrooms with more inequitable social ties, suggesting that students can draw on social capital from peers to mitigate academic disengagement.⁴⁵ Even the structural dimensions of neighborhood organization and leadership affect the levels of social capital available in neighborhoods as

shown by the variable impact of immigrant concentration in neighborhoods against crime⁴⁶ People's position within an organization or within a structure may affect the levels and types of social capital available to them both within and outside of the organization.

At the macro level, young people are nested in different cultural environments. At a more proximal level, we expect that young people—even those in resource poor environments—will have different levels of social capital available to them based on their characteristics and social positions. Specifically, we expect that there will be gender differences in levels of social capital because young men and young women are typically embedded in the culturally specific organizations and institutions that surround them differently.

Portes famously pointed out that social capital ought not to be considered to be an unambiguously good thing.⁴¹ We take a preliminary look at whether it is positive by examining the associations between our indicators of social capital and self reported health.

METHODS

Data

The data for this study are derived from the second phase of the *Well-Being of Adolescents in Vulnerable Environments* (WAVE) study. WAVE employed respondent-driven sampling (RDS) to conduct a cross-sectional survey of 15 to 19 year olds in five economically disadvantaged urban sites.

The study was conducted in economically distressed neighborhoods of Baltimore, USA; Shanghai, China; New Delhi, India; Ibadan, Nigeria; and Johannesburg, South Africa among 15–19 year olds during March – October 2013. Inclusion criteria were youth aged 15–19 living or spending a majority of their time in the targeted geographic area within each site. In Shanghai, the sample was limited to migrant youth. Eligibility was based on self-report of residence in a prescribed geographic area. All eligible participants completed a survey programmed using ACASI software (see Decker, M. et. al. in this special edition for a detailed description of the RDS methodology)⁴⁶.

This study was approved by the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health Institutional Review Board (IRB) after local IRB approval in all partner sites.

Measures

Social, Economic and Demographic Variables—These measures are age, gender, current school enrolment, and perceived relative wealth (categorized as: same as others, better off than others, or worse than others), family structure (two Parents, one parent; other), and unstable housing¹

Social capital variables²—The *Family Social Capital* measure (alphas range from .81 to .97) comprises two scales that indicate the presence of caring adults (male and female) at

¹Housing instability is defined as not having a regular place to stay or staying an average of 3–4 nights a week or less in your regular place over the last 30 days and staying overnight in more than one place in the last seven days). This is not measured for Delhi.

²Psychometric details available from the senior author on request.

home. The *School Social Capital* measure is a scale from 0 to 18 assessing the perceived presence of a caring teacher or adult at school³ (alphas from 0.72 to 0.98). *Peer Social Capital* has two dimensions. *Peer Social Support* is a scale from 0–18 evaluating the presence of at least one caring friend (alphas from .69 to .88). *Peer Network Density* is a single item: *In the past two weeks how many people who you know and who know you have you seen and talked to?* The maximum varies by site from 35 to 250 in Baltimore. For analytic purposes peer network density is clustered into tertiles for comparability across sites. *Neighborhood Social Capital* also has two dimensions. *Community Cohesion* is a scale from 0 to 9 (alphas from .79 to .86) and measures the participant's perceptions of the degree to which individuals are connected to one another in their neighbourhood. *Sense of Belonging* is a scale from 0–9 measuring the participants' perceptions of their own level of connection to their neighbourhood (alphas from .78 to .85). Table 1 describes the items in each scale.

Health variable—Health is a self-report measure of general health with five response options; however, for analytic purposes the measure was dichotomized as 0 for fair or poor and 1 for excellent, very good or good.

Analysis

We first examined the differences in social capital using one-way analysis of variance. We then examined the differences in social capital within each site by gender using t-tests. Given the number of significant gender differences, we then analysed the data using gender stratified Ordinary Least Squares regression models for each measure of social capital as the dependent variable and all the covariates: age, school enrolment, perceived relative wealth, unstable housing, and parent(s) responsible for raising the respondent. Findings from these models are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. We examined a series of logistic regression models with self-reported health as the dependent variable, and each social capital variable as an independent variable controlling for the social and demographic characteristics previously examined. We conducted analyses using Stata using complex design procedures to accommodate the non-independence of observations, i.e., the potential for intercluster correlation within recruitment chain.^{48–49} Weights were generated via the RDSII estimator to account for the intercluster correlation and were used in the analyses presented in Tables 3–6.⁵⁰ Given differences in the age distribution across sites, a post-stratification age weight was also developed and employed in the cross site descriptive presentations.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics

Table 2 displays the demographic characteristics of the samples across all the sites. The analytic sample is comprised of 2339 respondents across the five sites (Baltimore n=456; Delhi n=500; Ibadan n=449; Johannesburg n=496; Shanghai n=438). Across all sites the mean age of participants is 16.7 and 47.5% of respondents are female. With the exception of Shanghai where only 37.2% of participants were enrolled in school at the time of the survey,

³This was asked of all, retrospectively for those not enrolled.

a majority of participants in each site were currently enrolled in school (81.0% in Baltimore – 84.3% in Johannesburg). Sites varied in proportion of unstably housed youth ranging from 4.2% in Baltimore to 21.6% in Ibadan (Delhi is not included). Participants in Delhi, Ibadan and Shanghai were generally raised in two parent households (94.7%, 71.0% and 80.1% respectively). When they were not, other relatives or non-relatives raised participants in Ibadan and Shanghai (19.3% and 16.5%, respectively). In Baltimore and Johannesburg about half of the participants (47.8% and 50.6%) were raised in two parent families with 27.5% of Baltimore participants and 10.6% of Johannesburg participants being raised in single parent households and 38.7% of Johannesburg participants and 24.0% of Baltimore participants being raised by non-parental relatives or non-relatives.

Social Capital

Table 3 displays the summary statistics of the social capital indicators by site and gender. For family social capital, there are slightly higher scores reported by all participants for having caring female adults in the home compared with having caring male adults. There were gender differences in the reporting of caring adults. Young men in all sites except Shanghai report more support from caring adult male in their homes compared to young women ($p < .05$), while male participants in Baltimore ($p < .05$) and female participants in Johannesburg ($p < .05$) also reporting more support from caring female adults than their opposite sex counterparts.

For school social capital, there was no significant variability in the range among sites from a low of 11.4 in Delhi to a high of 13.4 in Baltimore. Only in Johannesburg were there gender differences school social capital with young women reporting higher levels of support from caring adults in school compared with their male counterparts. Neither Shanghai nor Ibadan is included in these analyses because of a differential skip pattern excluding out of school youth from the caring adults in school items.

Peer social capital had significant variation among the sites with a high of 15.3 in Shanghai and a low of 13.2 in Ibadan ($p < .001$). Male participants in Ibadan ($p < .05$) and female participants in Johannesburg ($p < .05$) report more peer social support compared to the opposite gender. Within the upper tertiles of peer network density, there is great variation among the sites with mean high-density networks ranging from 6.4 peers in Ibadan to 35.3 peers in Baltimore ($p < .001$).

Dehli participants report the highest levels of neighborhood social capital. The Community Cohesion scale scores range from 6.3 in Delhi to 3.8 in Baltimore and are slightly lower than scores for Sense of Belonging ranging from 7.4 in Delhi to 4.7 in Shanghai. Examining gender differences, we found that male participants in Johannesburg report higher levels of community cohesion ($p < .05$) while in Baltimore ($p < .05$) and Shanghai ($p < .05$), male respondents report higher levels of a sense of belonging compared to female respondents.

Multivariate Associations between Social Capital and Demographic Characteristics

All estimates in Tables 4 and 5 are adjusted for all the other characteristics listed in Table 2.

School Enrollment—School enrollment (Tables 4a and 4b) was positively associated with at least one measure of social capital in all five sites. School enrollment was positively associated with three indicators of social capital for young women in Baltimore, Delhi and Shanghai, and one for young women in Ibadan. The association between enrollment and social capital was less consistent for young men. It was associated with one indicator in Ibadan, two in Johannesburg and three in Shanghai. There was no dominant pattern connecting school enrollment with specific dimensions of social capital. It is surprising that there was not a more consistent association, for example, between school enrollment and reporting a caring adult at school. In fact, among young women in Baltimore, we find that those currently enrolled reported *lower* levels of support from a caring adult at school compared to those not in school.

Perceived Relative Wealth (Table 4)—The positive association between perceiving that one's wealth is better than others (compared to about the same) and social capital was more consistent for young women than for young men. In Johannesburg and Shanghai, in particular, estimates of the association between feeling relatively well off and familial social capital were large for young women. Approximately half of the estimates that were significantly different from zero were negative, however. For young men, the only estimates that were significantly different from zero for peer and neighborhood social capital were negative. The same is true when the contrast is between perceiving one's wealth to be worse than others. Associations are scattered and as often as not, not in the expected negative direction.

Unstably Housed (Table 5)—Unstable housing was associated with low familial social capital in all groups except young women in Shanghai and young men in Ibadan and Johannesburg. For young women, unstable housing was associated with low social capital across a range of indicators. The pattern was particularly pronounced in Baltimore, where unstably housed young women had lower social capital from all sources except peers. For young men, the associations were fewer and less consistently negative.

Family Structure—(Table 5) Being raised outside a two-parent family has a widespread, negative association with social capital. The estimates are more likely to be significant for being raised in a one-parent family than being raised without parents. There are two exceptions to the hypothesis that young people who grow up with both parents at home have more social capital. For young men in Delhi and Shanghai, being raised in a one parent family seems to increase the levels of social capital from a caring adult female. The other exception is that it appears that growing up with one parent may intensify a young person's relationships with their peers.

Multivariate Associations between Self-Reported Health and Social Capital

Self Reported Health—(Table 6) Here we find support for the hypothesis that social capital is associated with good health as the majority of associations between self-reported health and the various domains of social capital are positive. Across both young men and young women, the indicators of neighborhood social capital appear to be the most important across the sites. For young women (especially in Baltimore), indicators of social capital

across the four domains are positively associated with self-reported health, however young men experience some negative associations between peer social capital and self-reported health.

DISCUSSION

This analysis shows similar levels of social capital across five diverse sites and stronger associations between social capital and social and demographic characteristics for young women in those sites. Young women also had stronger associations between social capital and self-reported health with neighborhood social capital being especially salient for self reported health among young men and women in all sites.

This analysis contributes to our understanding of social capital among young people by avoiding the pitfall of proxy reporting so common in studies of social capital among youth.⁴¹ The surprisingly similar levels of social capital across sites underscores how the structural constraints of urban poverty and exclusion from the mainstream global economy can have a similar impact on the social resources that young people depend upon as sources of resilience across a diverse set of vulnerable environments.

Examining the associations between social and demographic factors and direct indicators of social capital by gender is a contribution to an extensive field, which has long ignored the gender differences in social capital.⁵¹ The associations between social and demographic factors were more consistent among young women across the five cities compared to young men. This finding may reflect that women, because of barriers to their achievement at school and at work are often more dependent on social capital for resources than on economic and human capital and the absence of it is more profound.⁵²

The associations between social and demographic factors and direct indicators of social capital are not consistent across or even within sites. More qualitative research is needed to examine how the organizations and institutions across our five settings differ such that a status, which in one place helps a person accumulate social ties and social resources in another setting, does the opposite. Is it the community norms around family structure that drive associations between being raised by a single parent in Baltimore and more dense social networks and just the opposite in Shanghai where being raised by a single parent is less prevalent? Likewise, are these norms driving the lack of associations between social capital across the domains and being raised by other relatives in Johannesburg?

These conflicting findings around the family structure in which a participant was raised and the school enrollment lead us to believe that these are not straightforward shorthand proxies for social capital. Both these statuses exhibited different (and sometimes negative) associations with social capital in different social settings and for young men or young women. It is possible that both the variability in both school contexts and family norms across the sites may lead to the inconsistency. In order to use group membership as a proxy for social capital, researchers must be very aware of the particular cultural context in which they are working and even then proceed with caution.

Despite the complexity of how young people attain social capital, in every group we found at least one indicator of social capital that was associated with self-reported health and no negative associations. This finding underscores the importance of social resources as a major potential determinant of health, substantiating urban health frameworks with social resources front and center. It is important, when considering this result, to reflect that it is probably the case that young people living in rural areas also use social capital resources in the production of health. The reason that social capital is so critical in the urban context is that the level of social resources is so variable, as our findings also demonstrate.

There are some important limitations to note in this study. RDS is not generalizable to the population in each of the participating sites and as with any cross-sectional data, we are unable to assess causation. It may be that young people who perceive themselves as healthy are able to make greater connections to their neighborhood so that health is the driver and not neighborhood connections as we might expect. Reports of peer network density among female participants may be influenced by our efforts to balance the sample. In Johannesburg particularly, the level of network density among young girls reported was contrary to the recruitment experience and the challenges encountered achieving a gender balanced sample.⁴⁷ Another is the measurement of relative perceived wealth. The associations between this measure of wealth and social capital exhibit a U shaped pattern in Shanghai. It is unclear if this is a poor way to measure wealth with young people or if being apart from the majority actually translates into less social capital even if you are set apart by increased resources.

The study's data collection mode may also have created a limitation. While ACASI was used to increase the accuracy of youth reports, in two sites (Delhi and Ibadan), this was new technology for data collection among adolescents. The participants may have been less trustful of the technology and not fully forthcoming with their responses. Perhaps this explains the lack of strength for findings in these two sites compared to the other three sites where ACASI was not new to the participant population. It is also possible that measures used, which were developed mainly in high-income countries, may need some modification for use in lower and middle-income countries. The concept of unstable housing did not translate well into the context in Delhi and it is possible there are additional concepts that did not translate well but were not brought to the researchers attention in the same manner.

Implications and Contributions

While the evidence is strong that the quantity of social capital is protective for young people, the present paper suggests that different types of social capital interact with social contexts and with gender differently. It suggests that all social capital is not equal; and likewise it suggests that deliberate strategies that build social capital as part of risk reduction and positive youth development programming need to be cognizant that social capital enhancement may work differently for different groups and in different settings. In addition, there is more work to be done to examine how social capital across the different contexts of adolescents' lives is both obtained and operationalized in difference cultural settings.

References

1. United Nations. World Urbanization Prospects: The 2005 Revision. New York: United Nations; 2006.
2. National Research Council. Cities Transformed: Demographic Change and Its Implications in the Developing World. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2003.
3. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World Urbanization Prospects, the 2010 Revision. New York, New York: 2011.
4. Vlahov D, Freudenberg N, Proietti F, Ompad D, Quinn A, et al. Urban as a determinant of health. *J Urban Health*. 2007; 841:16–25.
5. Astone NM, Nathanson CA, Schoen R, Kim YJ. Family demography, social theory, and investment in social capital. *Population and Development Review*. 1999; 25(1):1–+.
6. Carpiano RM, Hystad PW. Sense of community belonging” in health surveys: What social capital is it measuring? *Health & place*. 2011; 17(2):606–617. [PubMed: 21296607]
7. McPherson; Kerr; McGee; Cheater, F.; Morgan, A. The Role and Impact of Social Capital on the Health and Wellbeing of Children and Adolescents: a systematic review. Glasgow Centre for Population Health; Glasgow, Scotland: 2013.
8. Tough, P. How children succeed: Grit, curiosity, and the hidden power of character. London: Random House Books; 2013.
9. Furstenburg F, Hughes ME. Successful development of at risk youth. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 1995; 57:580– 592.
10. Moore, KA.; Zaff, JF. Child Trends Research Brief. 2002. Building a Better Teenager: A Summary of” What Works” in Adolescent Development. American Teens Series.
11. Borkowski, J.; Ramey, S.; Bristol-Power, M. Parenting and The Child’s World: Influences on Academic, Intellectual, and Social-Emotional Development. Mahwah, NJ: Psychology Press; 2001.
12. Cherlin AJ. Going to extremes: Family structure, children’s well-being, and social science. *Demography*. 1999; 36(4):421–428. [PubMed: 10604072]
13. Lenciauskiene I, Zaborskis A. The effects of family structure, parent-child relationship and parental monitoring on early sexual behaviour among adolescents in nine European countries. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2008; 36(6):607–618. [PubMed: 18775817]
14. McLanahan, Sara S.; Laura, Tach; Daniel, Schneider. The Causal Effect of Father Absence. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2013; 39:399–427.
15. Murray NJ, Zabin LS, Toledo-Dreves V, Luengo-Charath X. Gender differences in factors influencing first intercourse among urban students in Chile. *International Family Planning Perspectives*. 1998; 24(3):139–+.
16. Dimbuene ZT, Defo BK. Family Environment and Premarital Intercourse in Bandjoun (West Cameroon). *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2012; 41(2):351–361. [PubMed: 21904944]
17. Goldberg RE. Family Instability and Early Initiation of Sexual Activity in Western Kenya. *Demography*. 2013; 50(2):725–750. [PubMed: 23055236]
18. Pilgrim NA, Ahmed S, Gray RH, et al. Sexual Coercion Among Adolescent Women in Rakai, Uganda: Does Family Structure Matter? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2013; 28(6):1289–1313. [PubMed: 23295373]
19. Birdhistle I, Floyd S, Machingura A, et al. From affected to infected? Orphanhood and HIV risk among female adolescents in urban Zimbabwe. *AIDS*. 2008; 22:759–766. [PubMed: 18356606]
20. Birdhistle I, Floyd S, Nyagadza A, et al. Is education the link between orphanhood and HIV/ HSV-2 risk among female adolescents in urban Zimbabwe? *Social Science and Medicine*. 2009; 68:1810–1818. [PubMed: 19303688]
21. Gregson S, Nyamukapa C, Garnett, et al. HIV infection and reproductive health in teenage women orphaned and made vulnerable by AIDS in Zimbabwe. *AIDS Care*. 2005; 17(7):785–794. [PubMed: 16120495]
22. Kang M, Dunbar M, Laver S, Padian N. Maternal versus paternal orphans and HIV/STI risk among adolescent girls in Zimbabwe. *AIDS Care*. 2008; 20(2):214–217. [PubMed: 18293132]

23. Operario D, Pettifor A, Cluver L, et al. Prevalence of parental death among young people in South Africa and risk for HIV infection. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*. 2007; 44:93–98. [PubMed: 17075394]
24. Nyamukapa C, Gregson S, Lopman B, et al. HIV-associated orphanhood and children's psychosocial distress: theoretical framework tested with data from Zimbabwe. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2008; 98:133–141. [PubMed: 18048777]
25. Jejeebhoy, S.; Santha, K. Parent-Child Communication on Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters: Perspectives of Mothers and Fathers in India. New Delhi: Population Council; 2011.
26. Shaw, C.; McKay, H. Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1942.
27. Crane J. Effects of neighborhoods on dropping out of school and teenage childbearing. *The urban underclass*. 1991:299–320.
28. Billy J, Brewster K, Grady W. Contextual effects on the sexual behavior of adolescent women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1994; 56:387–404.
29. Ku L, Sonenstein F, Pleck J. Factors influencing first intercourse for teenage men. *Public Health Reports*. 1993; 108(6):680–694. [PubMed: 8265752]
30. Browning C, Buntington L, Levethal T, Brooks-Gunn J. Neighborhood Structural Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and Sexual Risk Behavior among Urban Youth. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 2008; 49:269–285. [PubMed: 18771063]
31. Jennings JM, Taylor R, Iannacchione VG, Rogers SM, Chung SE, Huettner S, Ellen JM. The available pool of sex partners and risk for a current bacterial sexually transmitted infection. *Annals of Epidemiology*. 2010; 20(7):532–538. [PubMed: 20538196]
32. Chase-Lansdale PL, Gordon RA. Economic Hardship and the Development of Five-and Six-Year-Olds: Neighborhood and Regional Perspectives. *Child Development*. 1996; 67(6):3338–3367.
33. Entwisle B. Putting people into place. *Demography*. 2007; 44(4):687–703. [PubMed: 18232206]
34. Brooks-Gunn J, Duncan GJ, Klebanov PK, Sealander N. Do neighborhoods influence child and adolescent development? *American Journal of Sociology*. 1993:353–395.
35. Alexander K, Entwisle D, Olson L. Lasting Consequences of the Summer Learning Gap. *American Sociological Review*. 2007; 72:167–180.
36. Clark S, Cotton C. Transitions to Adulthood in Urban Kenya: A Focus on Adolescent Migrants. *Demographic Research*. 2013; 28:1053–1092.
37. Luke N, Xu HW, Mberu BU, Goldberg RE. Migration Experience and Premarital Sexual Initiation in Urban Kenya: An Event History Analysis. *Studies in Family Planning*. 2012; 43(2):115–126. [PubMed: 23175950]
38. Greif MJ, Dodo FNA. Internal migration to Nairobi's slums: Linking migrant streams to sexual risk behavior. *Health & Place*. 2011; 17(1):86–93. [PubMed: 20884274]
39. Mberu BU, White MJ. Internal migration and health: Premarital sexual initiation in Nigeria. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2011; 72(8):1284–93. [PubMed: 21435767]
40. Pebley, A.; Sastry, N. RAND Working Paper DRU-2400/9-LAFANS. 2002. Neighborhood Effects on Adult Health in Los Angeles.
41. Morrow, V. They Don't Ask Us: Taking Account of Children's Views in Improving Local Environments. In: White, K., editor. *Annual Review Journal*. Vol. 3. 2002. p. 51-66. NCVCCO (National Council for Voluntary Child Care Organizations)
42. Portes, Alejandro. Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1998; 24:1–24.
43. Schaefer-McDaniel, Nicole J. Conceptualizing Social Capital among Young People: Toward a New Theory. *Children, Youth and Environments*. 2004; 14(1):140–150.
44. Seltzer JA, Lau CQ, Bianchi SM. Doubling up when times are tough: A study of obligations to share a home in response to economic hardship. *Social science research*. 2012; 41(5):1307–1319. [PubMed: 23017934]
45. Cappella E, Kim H, Neal J, Daisy J, et al. Classroom Peer Relationships and Behavioral Engagement in Elementary School: The Role of Social Network Equity. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2013; 52(3–4):367–379. [PubMed: 24081319]

46. Graif C, Sampson R. Spatial Heterogeneity In the Effects of Immigration and Diversity on Neighborhood Homicide Rates. *Homicide Studies*. 2009; 13:242–260. [PubMed: 20671811]
47. Decker, et al.
48. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 12. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP; 2011.
49. Szwarcwald C, Borges de Souza P, Damacena G, Barbosa A, Kendall C. Analysis of Data Collected by RDS Among Sex Workers in 10 Brazilian Cities, 2009: Estimation of the Prevalence of HIV, Variance, and Design Effect. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*. 2009; 57(Supp 3):S129–S135.
50. Volz E, Heckathorn DD. Probability based estimation theory for respondent driven sampling. *Journal of Official Statistics*. 2008; 24(1):79.
51. O'Neill, B.; Gidengill, E. Introduction. In: O'Neill, B.; Gidengill, E., editors. *Gender and social capital*. New York: Routledge; 2004.
52. Moser, C. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training*. New York and London: Routledge; 1993.

TABLE 1

SOCIAL CAPITAL MEASURES

Social Capital Indicator	COMPONENT ITEMS
SCHOOL SOCIAL CAPITAL	
	<p>Has there been a teacher or some other adult in your school who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • really cared about you. • told you when you do a good job. • noticed when you were not there. • always wanted you to do your best. • listened to you when you had something to say. • who believed that you would be successful. <p><i>Response Options: Never True (0) – Always True (3); Range: 0–18</i></p>
FAMILY SOCIAL CAPITAL	
CARING MALE ADULT AT HOME	<p>There is a male presently in your home who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expects you to follow the rules. • believes that you will be successful. • you can turn to when you have a problem. • listens to you when you have something to say.
CARING FEMALE ADULT AT HOME	<p>There is a female presently in your home who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expects you to follow the rules. • believes that you will be successful. • you can turn to when you have a problem. • listens to you when you have something to say. <p><i>Response Options: Never True (0) – Always True (3); Range: 0–12</i></p>
PEER SOCIAL CAPITAL	
SOCIAL SUPPORT	<p>I have at least one friend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that I can trust. • who would lend me money if I needed it. • I can talk to about family problems or real personal problems. • that I find it easy to talk to about sex. • I would turn to if I were in trouble. • who accepts me for who I really am. <p><i>Response Options: Agree a lot (0) – Disagree a lot (3); Range: 0–18</i></p>
NETWORK DENSITY	<p>Number of people age 15–19 years old you have seen and talked to in the past 2 weeks.</p> <p><i>Range: 0–250</i></p>
NEIGHBORHOOD SOCIAL CAPITAL	
COMMUNITY COHESION	<p>People in this neighborhood can be trusted.</p> <p>People in this neighborhood care a lot about each other.</p> <p>People in this neighborhood are willing to help each other.</p>
SENSE OF BELONGING	<p>I feel connected to most people in this neighborhood.</p> <p>I know most of the people in this neighborhood.</p> <p>I feel like I am part of a community in this neighborhood.</p>

Social Capital Indicator	COMPONENT ITEMS
	<i>Response Options: Agree a lot (0) – Disagree a lot (3); Range: 0–9</i>

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2

DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

	BALTIMORE W% (U%, N)	DELHI W% (U%, N)	IBADAN W% (U%, N)	J'BURG W% (U%, N)	SHANGHAI W% (U%, N)
N	456	500	449	496	438
SEX					
Male	46.4 (57.7, 263)	52.8(50.0, 250)	45.2(49.0, 200)	56.7(54.8, 272)	48.0(50.7, 222)
Female	53.6(42.3, 193)	47.2(50.0,250)	54.8(51.0, 229)	43.3(45.2, 224)	52.0(49.3, 216)
AGE GROUP					
15–16	43.0(55.3,252)	47.5(56.8, 284)	49.4(59.5,267)	50.6(24.8,123)	41.9(29.0,127)
17–19	57.0(44.7, 204)	52.5(43.2, 216)	50.6 (40.5,182)	49.4(75.2, 373)	58.1(71.0, 311)
<i>Mean Age (SE)</i>	W 16.8 (0.2)	16.6 (0.1)	16.6 (0.1)	16.6 (0.2)	16.9 (0.2)
	U 16.3(0.1)	16.4 (0.1)	16.4 (0.1)	17.3 (0.1)	17.3 (0.1)
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT**					
Enrolled	81.0(85.3, 388)	82.7(85.6, 428)	81.4(81.3, 364)	84.3(82.2, 406)	37.2(28.5, 125)
Not Enrolled	19.0(14.7, 67)	17.3(14.4, 72)	18.6(18.7, 84)	15.7(17.8, 88)	62.8(71.5, 313)
<i>Graduated of Not Enrolled</i>	66.6(70, 47)	42.5(41.7, 30)	68.0 (69, 58)	42.9(36.4, 32)	30.1(31.3, 98)
PERCEIVED RELATIVE WEALTH					
Better Off Than Most	34.9(34.6, 154)	33.9(31.3, 156)	54.5(54, 237)	21.9(22.2, 110)	8.7(7.3, 32)
Same as Most	58.1(58.9, 262)	58.1(61.7, 307)	39.5 (39.6,174)	68.2(68.9, 342)	80.3 (81.4, 355)
Worse Off Than Most	7.0 (6.5, 29)	8.0 (7, 35)	6.0 (6.4, 28)	9.8 (8.9, 44)	11.0 (11.2, 49)
UNSTABLY HOUSED	4.2 (6.6, 30)	---	21.6 (21.2, 95)	22.0 (19.2, 95)	21.0 (12.6, 55)
RAISED BY					
Two Parents	48.2(45.3, 206)	94.7(94.6, 473)	72.8 (71.6, 320)	54.7(54.55,270)	83.1(82.9, 363)
One Parent	27.7 (23.1,105)	1.31(1.4, 7)	7.4 (7.4, 33)	9.7 (9.7, 48)	1.8 (1.8, 8)
Other Relative or Non-Relatives	24.2 (31.2, 142)	4.0(4.0, 20)	19.8 (18.6, 83)	35.6 (35.6, 176)	15.1(15.1, 66)

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

Table 3

MEAN SOCIAL CAPITAL BY GENDER

		BALTIMORE W Mean (SE), U Mean	DELHI W Mean (SE), U Mean	IBADAN W Mean (SE), U Mean	J'BURG W Mean (SE), U Mean	SHANGHAI W Mean (SE), U Mean
<i>N Females</i>		193	250	220	272	226
<i>N Males</i>		263	250	229	224	216
FAMILY						
Caring Female Adult *		9.76 (.16),10.12	8.56(.23),8.92	8.56(.21),8.56	9.21 (.33),9.43	7.69(.52),7.72
		10.13(.34),10.00	8.47(.08),8.75	8.08(.39),8.46	8.48 (.31),8.77	7.58 (.55),7.40
Caring Male Adult ***		7.10(.18),6.82	7.34(.21),7.69	6.70(.26),6.68	6.82(.26),6.83	6.55(.45),6.23
		7.55 (.07),7.98	8.97(.13),9.19	7.76 (.44),8.00	7.55 (.37),7.66	6.71 (.41),6.58
SCHOOL		13.41 (.16),13.28	11.42(.12),11.43	---	12.26(.21),13.01	---
Caring Adults in School		12.31 (.42),12.61	11.40 (.09),11.57	---	11.24 (.34),11.61	---
PEERS						
Peer Social Support ***		14.93(.23),15.58	13.64(.14),13.64	13.18 (.10),13.18	15.11(.16),14.70	14.91(.14),15.32
		14.72 (.32),14.81	13.63(.26),13.76	13.81 (.13),13.71	13.13 (.56),13.61	15.25 (.06),15.82
Peer Network Density						
<i>Low</i>		2.63 (.19),3.48	3.56(.14),3.99	1.48(.03),1.64	1.93(.08),2.21	2.0(.08),2.16
		3.50 (.14),3.92	3.48 (.11),3.82	1.57 (.04),1.72	1.70 (.13),2.03	2.01(.09),2.22
<i>Medium</i> *		10.29(.36),10.93	6.98(.10),7.13	3.19 (.05), 3.23	4.55(.09),4.65	2.00(.08),5.38
		10.17 (.15),10.86	6.91(.05),7.07	3.28 (.03),3.35	4.80 (.09),5.04	5.15 (.02),5.28
<i>High</i> **		32.61(1.35),43.34	13.77(.46),17.52	6.40(.18),8.95	13.56(.23),23.25	10.16(.35),11.59
		35.28(1.41),65.18	14.45 (1.12),17.25	7.03(.32),8.39	11.24 (.32),14.84	12.81 (.60),14.44
NEIGHBORHOOD						
Community Cohesion ***		3.77 (.16),3.68	5.94(.15),6.09	5.88(.07),6.02	3.83(.10),3.99	5.31 (.12),5.17
		3.96(.17),4.08	6.26 (.08),6.15	6.08(.20),6.03	4.38 (.25),4.47	5.44 (.23),5.66
Sense of Belonging ***		5.00 (.18),5.55	7.02(.11),7.02	6.90(.18),6.96	5.98(.33),5.71	4.74 (.05),4.88
		5.56 (.07),5.71	7.37 (.09),7.37	7.09 (.14),7.14	6.29 (.24),6.31	5.43 (.16),5.57

Bold indicates a difference between females (top row) and males (bottom row) significant at the .05 level

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

* p<.05;

100>d

;10>d
**

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 4a

School and Relative Wealth Associations with Social Capital (females)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
<i>N Females</i>	193	250	220	272	226
School Enrollment (reference is not enrolled)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	.41* (.09,.74)	1.15(-.03,2.34)	-.75(-1.83,.33)	.31(-.02,.64)	2.19* (.61,3.78)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-.29(-1.07,.50)	1.16* (.20,2.13)	-.21(-1.23,.82)	.56(.03,1.08)	1.80** (.97,2.63)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	-1.18* (-2.06, -.30)	1.21* (.18,2.25)	---	.24(-.19,.68)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-.39(-1.47,.69)	-.79(-1.49, -.08)	-1.42(-3.10,27)	.41(-1.03,1.85)	1.19(-.31,2.69)
Peer Network Density	1.07* (.23,1.91)	.74(-.32,1.81)	-.65* (-1.21, -.09)	-.12(-1.74,1.49)	-.19(-.91,1.29)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	1.12*** (.73,1.50)	.59* (.10,1.07)	-.25(-.62,.11)	.53(-1.00,2.05)	-.26(-.60,.08)
Sense of Belonging	.84(-.53,2.20)	.25(-.30,.81)	.32(-.38,1.02)	-.49(1.44,.46)	.30* (.12,.48)
Perceived Relative Wealth – Better than Most (reference is same as most)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	-2.11*** (-2.44, -1.78)	-.41(-1.30,.47)	-.73* (-1.43, -.02)	-.41(-1.33,.50)	2.55*** (1.92,3.17)
Caring Adult Male in Home	.11(-1.20,1.41)	-.16(-1.27,.95)	.55(-.55,1.65)	1.10*** (.71,1.50)	1.69*** (1.54,1.84)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	1.33* (.36,2.31)	-.16(-1.27,.94)	---	-.02(-.26,.31)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	2.01*** (1.51,2.52)	-.89(-2.23,.46)	.47(-.67,1.61)	-.02(-.43,.39)	.88* (.26,1.50)
Peer Network Density	-1.12(-2.67,.42)	-1.03*** (-1.51, -.54)	.03(-.19,.24)	1.21*** (.85,1.58)	.50* (.03,.97)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-.51(-1.98,.95)	.37(-.18,.92)	.46(-.03,.95)	.07(-.29,.42)	-.85*** (-1.02, -.69)
Sense of Belonging	-1.12(-2.47,.22)	-.04(-.40,.32)	-.19(-.78,.40)	.32(-.07,.71)	1.45*** (1.34,1.57)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
Perceived Relative Wealth – Worse than Most (reference is same as most)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	1.10* (.03,2.16)	-.58(-1.66,.50)	-1.70(-4.09,.69)	-.58(-1.97,.80)	1.14(-1.22,3.49)
Caring Adult Male in Home	.74(-.92,2.39)	.31(-.06,.68)	-1.78** (-2.60, -.96)	-.54(-2.15,1.07)	1.56* (.08,3.04)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	-.98(-3.32,1.35)	.23(-.42,.89)	---	.98(-.03,1.98)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	.63(-.88,2.15)	-.46(-1.02,.10)	.50(-4.67,5.67)	.58(-.17,1.33)	-.76(-2.61,1.08)
Peer Network Density	-.48(-2.33,1.37)	.07(-1.02,1.33)	.16(-.28,.61)	.56(-.00,1.12)	.59(-.29,1.46)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	.82(-2.33,3.96)	-2.06** (-3.10, -.102)	-1.04(-2.50,.42)	-.16(-1.16,.86)	-1.21** (-1.86, -.58)
Sense of Belonging	.36(-2.68,3.41)	-.99** (-1.51, -.48)	-.27(-1.00,.46)	.66* (.06,1.27)	-.22(-.50,.06)

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shading: Grey – Positive associations; Black - Negative

Table 4b

School and Relative Wealth Associations with Social Capital (males)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
<i>N Males</i>	263	250	229	224	216
School Enrollment (reference is not enrolled)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	.35(-2.07,2.78)	-.58(-1.31,.15)	-.00(-2.23,2.23)	.80* (.144,1.46)	4.19*** (3.42,4.98)
Caring Adult Male in Home	1.01 (57.2,59)	-.62(-1.34,.11)	-.30(-1.11,.51)	.90(-.02,1.82)	3.89*** (3.72,4.04)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	1.17(-.00,2.35)	-.11(-1.73,1.51)	---	1.14** (.43,1.85)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	.20(-1.39,1.79)	.46(-1.24,2.16)	1.17* (.12,2.23)	-.47(-1.59,.65)	.63** (.42,.83)
Peer Network Density	-.44(-2.76,1.88)	.15(-1.20,1.51)	-.49(-1.36,.38)	.37(-.57,1.32)	-.26(-.86,.34)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	1.08(-.03,2.20)	.19(-.22,.60)	.45(-.40,1.29)	-.33(-.75,.10)	.42(-.37,1.21)
Sense of Belonging	.79(-.92,2.50)	.57(-.25,1.39)	-.29(-.90,.32)	-.48(-1.15,.18)	.59(-.27,1.45)
Perceived Relative Wealth – Better than Most (reference is same as most)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	.16(-.61,.94)	1.03* (.11,1.96)	.13(-1.67,1.93)	.10(-1.39,1.58)	-.207(-5.61,1.47)
Caring Adult Male in Home	.17(-1.13,1.47)	.81(-1.04, 2.65)	-.46(-2.15,1.23)	-.59(-1.44,.25)	-.1.30(-4.33,1.72)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	1.04(-1.30,3.39)	1.08** (.63,1.53)	---	-.42(-1.56,.72)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-.33(-1.35,.70)	.03(-.55,.62)	.03(-1.43,1.48)	-.79(-3.35,1.77)	-.1.36(-3.29,.58)
Peer Network Density	-1.31(-3.35,.73)	-.32* (-.64, -.01)	.02(.17,.22)	-.18(-1.09,.73)	-.21(-2.23,1.81)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-.25(-.54,.04)	.19(-.72,1.09)	.016(-.76,.79)	-.13(-.73,.48)	-.65* (-1.14, -.15)
Sense of Belonging	.08(-.44,.59)	.42(-.09,.93)	.55(-.57,1.68)	-.78* (-1.51, -.06)	-.93(-2.05,.18)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
Perceived Relative Wealth – Worse than Most (reference is same as most)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	-1.59(-4.85, 1.66)	2.28** (1.41, 3.15)	-.84(-3.94, 2.26)	-.81(-2.04, .41)	-.28(-2.52, 1.96)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-.65(-6.87, 5.56)	.87(-1.05, 2.80)	-2.61* (-4.73, -.49)	-1.24(-3.10, .62)	.57(-1.08, 2.22)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	-1.53(-5.32, 2.26)	1.40** (.88, 1.92)	---	.57(-1.06, 2.19)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-2.16(7.40, 3.07)	-.00(-.45, .44)	-.14(-2.62, 2.35)	-2.48(-5.08, .12)	-.26(-1.19, .67)
Peer Network Density	-1.79(-3.65, .07)	-1.49* (-2.65, -.32)	.18(-.61, .96)	-1.56* (-2.88, -.25)	.35(-2.84, 3.53)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-2.24** (-3.70, -.79)	-.89* (-1.70, -.08)	-.22(-1.06, .62)	-.92(-3.54, 1.71)	-.41(-.97, .14)
Sense of Belonging	-2.44* (-4.44, -.43)	.89** (.60, 1.19)	-.43(-2.70, 1.84)	-.96(-2.25, .33)	-.50(-1.55, .56)

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shading: Grey – Positive associations; Black – Negative

Table 5a

Unstable Housing and Family Associations with Social Capital (females)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
<i>N Females</i>	193	250	220	272	226
Unstably Housed (reference is Stably Housed)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	-.58** (-.84, -.32)	---	-.78* (-1.36, -.20)	-.36* (-.69, -.03)	-.49(-1.67, .69)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-3.37*** (-4.08, -2.66)	---	.45(-.80, 1.69)	-.01(-.33, .31)	-.69(-1.60, .23)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	-1.84*** (-2.18, -1.50)	---	---	-2.30*** (-2.69, -1.93)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-.64(-.49, 1.76)	---	-.70(-2.51, 1.10)	.39(-.33, 1.10)	-1.29(-3.03, .45)
Peer Network Density	-9.62*** (4.26, 14.97)	---	-.16(-.59, .28)	-.36* (-.71, .01)	-.24(-1.21, .72)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-.89** (-1.29, -.49)	---	.12(-.83, 1.06)	-.37(-.75, .01)	-1.22** (-1.94, -.51)
Sense of Belonging	-.99*** (-1.26, -.72)	---	.10(-.84, 1.04)	.69*** (.39, .98)	-.84(-1.93, .25)
Raised by One Parent (reference is two parents)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	-.97*** (-1.30, -.64)	-1.01** (-1.54, -.50)	-.21(-1.75, 1.34)	-1.22(-2.66, .23)	-.88* (-.89, -.17)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-2.09*** (-2.45, -1.72)	.03(-2.21, 2.28)	-.26(-.54, .01)	-1.77(-3.60, .06)	-2.72*** (-3.11, -2.33)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	-.71* (-1.41, -.01)	2.51*** (1.76, 3.26)	---	-1.75*** (-2.50, -1.01)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-2.14*** (-3.05, -1.22)	2.21** (1.06, 3.37)	-.03(-1.92, 1.87)	-.70(-1.72, .31)	1.17*** (1.06, 1.29)
Peer Network Density	1.05** (.51, 1.59)	-.53(-3.99, 2.92)	-.20(-1.07, .66)	.68(-.17, 1.53)	-1.42*** (-1.54, -1.30)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-2.25*** (-2.80, -1.69)	-.87(-4.82, 3.09)	-.23(-2.29, 1.84)	-.77(-1.84, .29)	.69* (.24, 1.14)
Sense of Belonging	.21(-.25, .68)	-.23(-2.14, 1.68)	-1.14(-2.89, .60)	-.83(-2.18, .52)	-1.64*** (-2.06, -1.34)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
Raised by Other Relatives on Non-relatives (reference is two parents)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	-1.68*** (-2.06, -1.30)	-1.70*** (-2.39, -1.01)	.23 (-.79, 1.25)	-1.20*** (-1.78, -.63)	-.53* (-.89, -.17)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-3.09*** (-3.77, -2.41)	-2.16*** (-3.47, -.85)	.02 (-1.84, 1.88)	-.34 (-1.19, .52)	-.98*** (-1.22, -.74)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	-.46 (-1.30, .38)	.83 (-.01, 1.67)	---	-.16 (-.73, .41)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-2.44*** (-3.16, -1.72)	.57 (-.44, 1.58)	.76* (.02, 1.50)	-.68 (-1.38, .02)	.14 (-.77, 1.05)
Peer Network Density	.82* (.15, 1.48)	-.94 (-1.90, .01)	-.29 (-.79, .21)	-.10 (-.46, .25)	-.70 (-2.76, 1.35)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-.98* (-1.74, -.22)	-.68 (-1.45, .09)	-.15 (-.98, .67)	.35 (-.08, .78)	-.29 (-1.19, .60)
Sense of Belonging	-.74* (-1.32, -.16)	-.75* (-1.28, -.21)	.25 (-.34, .83)	-.52* (-.92, -.13)	-.34 (-1.23, .55)

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shading: Grey – Positive associations; Black – Negative

Table 5b

Unstably Housed and Family Associations with Social Capital (males)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
<i>N Males</i>	263	250	229	224	216
Unstably Housed (reference is Stably Housed)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	-2.00** (-2.94,-1.06)	---	-.13(-1.04,.79)	-.76* (-1.50,-.01)	-1.71* (-2.69,.73)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-.00(-1.83,1.82)	---	-1.25(-2.61,.11)	.51(-1.68,2.69)	-.19(-1.06,.69)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	1.07** (.52,1.63)	---	---	-.95(-2.35,.44)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-.73(-3.08,2.35)	---	-.15(-.62,.92)	.64(-.48,1.75)	-.84* (-1.31,.37)
Peer Network Density	-1.61(-.40,3.62)	---	.20(-.19,.59)	-.35* (-.62,-.08)	1.04(-.20,2.27)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-1.71* (-3.37,-.06)	---	.95*** (.57,1.33)	.33(-.92,1.58)	.55* (.03,1.07)
Sense of Belonging	-.33(-1.30,.65)	---	-.10(-1.13,.92)	.60** (.31,.90)	-.74** (.48,1.00)
Raised by One Parent (reference is two parents)					
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	.16(-1.48,1.79)	2.32** (.97,3.66)	-.96(-2.34,.42)	.52(-.79,1.84)	1.61** (1.15,2.08)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-3.05*** (-3.86,-2.24)	-.41(-3.81,2.99)	-2.29(-5.80,1.22)	-.90(-2.14,.34)	-1.30** (-1.63,-.97)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	.54(-1.00,2.07)	1.52(-.79,3.84)	----	-.93(-2.99,1.13)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	-.09(-1.43,1.26)	2.59** (1.16,4.03)	.74(-.05,1.52)	.48(-.27,1.22)	2.58** (2.07,3.08)
Peer Network Density	-1.32(-3.89,1.25)	.89(-2.22,2.00)	1.36(-.13,2.85)	-.15(-1.37,1.07)	-1.08** (-1.34,-.83)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	-.82* (-1.46,-.17)	.59* (.03,1.14)	-.72(-3.16,1.73)	-1.25(-2.65,.14)	-1.03* (-2.00,-.06)
Sense of Belonging	-.82(-2.43,.81)	-.16(-1.91,1.58)	-1.18(-4.93,2.58)	-.02(-.24,.21)	-.91* (-1.61,-.21)

	BALTIMORE β (CI)	DELHI β (CI)	IBADAN β (CI)	J'BURG β (CI)	SHANGHAI β (CI)
Raised by Other Relatives on Non-relatives (reference is two parents)					
<i>FAMILY</i>					
Caring Adult Female in Home	-1.20* (-2.24, -.17)	-.60 (-1.68, .48)	-2.40*** (-3.27, -1.52)	-.82* (-1.25, -.39)	-1.88* (-3.40, -.35)
Caring Adult Male in Home	-1.46* (-2.51, -.41)	.13 (-.88, 1.13)	-1.03 (-2.58, .52)	-.70 (-1.94, .55)	-1.84** (-2.21, -1.47)
<i>SCHOOL</i>					
Caring Adults in School	.03 (-.69, .75)	2.54** (1.54, 3.53)	----	.34 (-.84, 1.52)	---
<i>PEERS</i>					
Peer Support	-1.18 (-2.60, .23)	1.06** (.43, 1.69)	-1.97* (-3.37, -.57)	-.53 (-1.41, .34)	-.54 (-1.21, .12)
Peer Network Density	3.86 (-.01, 7.72)	1.36 (-1.70, 4.42)	-.05 (-.82, .71)	-.27 (-.87, .32)	-.43 (-.92, .07)
<i>NEIGHBORHOOD</i>					
Community Cohesion	.44 (-.29, 1.17)	-.83* (-1.61, -.06)	-.37 (-1.51, .76)	-.38 (-1.27, .51)	-.03 (-1.28, 1.23)
Sense of Belonging	-.90** (-1.35, -.46)	-.94 (-2.77, .88)	-.62 (-1.60, .36)	-.21 (-.84, .42)	.08 (.70, .86)

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shading: Grey – Positive associations; Black – Negative

Table 6a

Social Capital Associations with Self-Reported Health (females)[/]

	BALTIMORE OR (CI)	DELHI OR (CI)	IBADAN OR (CI)	J'BURG OR (CI)	SHANGHAI OR (CI)
<i>N Females</i>	193	250	220	272	226
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	1.16*** (1.12,1.21)	1.06(.97,1.16)	1.13(.88,1.44)	.93(.78,1.11)	1.10(.98,1.24)
Caring Adult Male in Home	1.00(.97,1.04)	1.06* (1.01,1.10)	1.09(.70,1.74)	1.04(.95,1.13)	1.25* (1.05,1.50)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	1.26*** (1.22,1.30)	1.07(1.01,1.13)	---	1.02(.96,1.10)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	1.18*** (1.15,1.20)	1.00(.98,1.03)	.86(.70,1.06)	1.10** (1.05,1.15)	.97(.85,1.12)
Peer Network Density	1.02(1.00,1.05)	.99(.96,1.03)	1.23(.55,2.72)	1.08(.95,1.24)	1.08(.92,1.26)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	1.11* (1.03,1.20)	.87(.72,1.05)	1.02(.79,1.31)	1.42*** (1.25,1.61)	1.04(.88,1.22)
Sense of Belonging	1.23*** (1.17,1.28)	.99(.85,1.15)	1.77*** (1.21,2.59)	1.21** (1.09,1.33)	1.15** (1.07,1.24)

[/] Logistic regression analysis controlling for age, school enrollment, perceived economic status, unstably housed, and raised by.

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

* p<.05;

** p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shading: Grey – Positive associations; Black - Negative

Table 6b

Social Capital Associations with Self-Reported Health (males)¹

	BALTIMORE OR (CI)	DELHI OR (CI)	IBADAN OR (CI)	J'BURG OR (CI)	SHANGHAI OR (CI)
<i>N Males</i>	263	250	229	224	216
FAMILY					
Caring Adult Female in Home	1.14(.96,1.34)	.92(.82,1.03)	1.10(.99,1.22)	1.02(.96,1.08)	.93(.71,1.23)
Caring Adult Male in Home	1.14(.91,1.42)	1.00(.73,1.37)	1.36*** (1.26,1.47)	.87(.72,1.06)	.94(.70,1.26)
SCHOOL					
Caring Adults in School	.96(.86,1.07)	1.03(.94,1.13)	---	1.05(1.00,1.11)	---
PEERS					
Peer Support	.79** (.70,.91)	.89(.70,1.13)	1.12(1.00,1.26)	1.00(.89,1.13)	1.13(.83,1.55)
Peer Network Density	.99(.98,1.00)	.96** (.94,.98)	1.11(.84,1.47)	.95* (.90,.99)	1.02(.85,1.24)
NEIGHBORHOOD					
Community Cohesion	1.01(.80,1.27)	1.13* (1.01,1.26)	.119(.99,1.42)	1.22* (1.06,1.41)	1.11* (1.01,1.22)
Sense of Belonging	1.15** (1.06,1.26)	.95(.82,1.10)	1.19(.93,1.54)	1.08(.84,1.39)	1.13(.78,1.65)

¹ Logistic regression analysis controlling for age, school enrollment, perceived economic status, unstably housed, and raised by.

Table Abbreviations: J'BURG – Johannesburg; W% - Weighted Percent; U% - Unweighted Percent

* p<.05;

**

p<.01;

*** p<.001

Shading: Grey – Positive associations; Black – Negative