



Community Readiness Scale (Chilenski, Greenberg, & Feinberg, 2007)

Chilenski, Greenberg, & Feinberg's (2007) Community Readiness Scale offers an assessment of community readiness to implement large-scale community change projects that involve several community partners. This scale may be administered to mixed samples of community leaders, service agency representatives, parents, and youth during a community's initial readiness activities for scaling programs like the Triple P system of interventions. In the instructions to respondents, it may be helpful to clarify that you will be using the data to gauge readiness for scaling the Triple P system of interventions or some other combination of large-scale community change activities.

Chilenski and colleagues adapted the Community Readiness Scale from previous measures (i.e., Feinberg, Greenberg, & Osgood, 2004; Wandersmann, Florin, Friedmann, & Meier, 1987). The scale consists of four subscales. First, *community attachment* measures community closeness and the level of investments of the residents therein ($\alpha = .56$). Next, *community initiative* measures the active engagement of community members ($\alpha = .65$). *Community efficacy* represents the community's abilities to work together to support a common initiative ($\alpha = .66$). Last, *community leadership* measures the effectiveness of community leadership ($\alpha = .81$).

Response Scale:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

R = reverse-scored (e.g., score of 1=actual score of 5, score of 2=actual score of 4 and vice versa)

Scoring Instructions: Reverse score items 4, 7, 8, & 10. Calculate the average score across all items. Lower scores represent less community readiness; Higher scores represent more community readiness.

Attachment Items

1. All things considered, most people are satisfied with this community as a place to live.
2. Most people care greatly about what this community is like.
3. Most people who live here feel a strong tie to this community.

Initiative Items

4. It is difficult to get people in this community involved in community activities. (R)
5. Most people in this community are committed to addressing community issues.
6. This community is willing to try new ideas to solve community problems.
7. Most people in this community are pretty set in their ways. (R)

Efficacy Items

8. There are political, social, or turf issues between groups in the community that lead to conflict or infighting. (R)
9. In the past the community has been successful at addressing social problems.
10. The community never seems to be able to accomplish much at all. (R)
11. Though community residents may disagree over ideas, these disagreements do not typically lead to a breakdown in progress.



Leadership Items

12. Community leaders are able to represent all sectors of the community, including cultural and ethnic minority groups.
13. Community leaders are able to build consensus across the community.
14. Community leaders are willing and able to involve community members in decision making.
15. Community leaders are able to manage inter-group conflict within the community.

References

- Chilenski, S. M., Greenberg, M. T., Feinberg, M. E. (2007). Community readiness as a multidimensional construct.
- Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R., Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 347-365. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20152.
- Feinberg, M.E., Greenberg, M.T., & Osgood, D.W. (2004). Readiness, functioning, and efficacy in community prevention coalitions: A study of communities that care in Pennsylvania. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 33, 163–176. Doi: 10.1023/B:AJCP.0000027003.75394.2b
- Wandersman, A., Florin, P., Friedmann, R., & Meier, R. (1987). Who participates, who does not, and why? An analysis of voluntary neighborhood associations in the United States and Israel. *Sociological Forum*, 2, 534–555. doi: 10.1007/BF01106625