Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of the Cognitive Social Capital Scale in a Colombian sample

Adalberto Campo-Arias[1]
Carmen Cecilia Caballero-Domínguez[2]

[1]MD, MSc, assistant professor, Medicine Program, Faculty of Health Sciences, Universidad del Magdalena, Santa Marta, Colombia. https//orcid.org/0000-0003-2201-7404

[2]Psychologist, PhD, associate professor, Psychology Program, Faculty of Health Science, University of Magdalena, Santa Marta, Colombia. https//orcid.org/0000-0003-3730-2750

Corresponding author: Adalberto Campo-Arias, Universidad del Magdalena, Carrera 32 No. 22-08, Bloque 8, Gorgona, Segundo piso, oficina Psicología de la Salud y Psiquiatría, Santa Marta, Colombia (Código postal 470004) Teléfono: 57 5 4381000 Ext. 3059. Email: acampo@unimagdalena.edu.co

Funding: University of Magdalena, Santa Marta, Colombia.

Abstract

Social capital is a polysemic concept that hinders the construction of an instrument that addresses all meanings. However, the concept has been used with increasing frequency in health sciences, which has motivated the need for valid and reliable tools. The study aimed to perform exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses on a seven-item scale to measure social capital in adults of the general Colombian population. An online validation study was done, including a sample of 700 adults aged between18 and 76 years (M = 37.1, SD = 12.7); 68% were females. Participants completed a seven-item scale called the Cognitive Social Capital Scale (CSCS). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to explore the dimensionality of the CSCS. Moreover, Cronbach alpha and McDonald omega were computed to test internal consistency. The CSCS presented poor dimensionality and low internal consistency. Then, it was tested a five-item version (CSCS-5). The CSCS-5 showed one dimension with better goodness-of-fit indicators, Cronbach alpha of 0.79 and McDonald omega of 0.80. In conclusion, CSCS-5 presents one dimensional and high internal consistency. It can be recommended for the measuring of social capital in the general Colombian population. Further researches should corroborate these findings.

Keywords: Capital social; factor analysis; validity and reliability; Colombia; validation studies.

Introduction

The construction of an instrument to quantify capital is a complex process due to the polysemy of the concept (Portes, 1998). However, during the last two decades, the concept of social capital has been used with increasing frequency in health sciences (Moore & Kawachi, 2017), due to the direct and indirect relationships between social capital and physical and mental health (De Silva, McKenzie K, Harpham, & Huttly, 2005; Felander, 2007).

Social capital is understood to refer to the resources to which citizens and groups have access through constructed social networks (Moore & Kawachi, 2017). According to the context, social capital can be divided into three types, bonding, bridging, and linking (Poortinga, 2012; Szreter & Woolcock, 2004).

Bonding social capital refers to the resources available within the network for social relationships between individuals with similar characteristics, such as age, social class, or ethnicity/race (Szreter & Woolcock, 2004). Bridging social capital describes the social resources that people with different sociodemographic characteristics can access (Moore & Kawachi, 2017). Linking social capital refers to networks of trust and respect that connect people and groups through formal institutions with authority or power (Poortinga, 2012).

Also, there is one pair of types of social capital, which is relevant to health research. First, cognitive social capital refers to the perception of trust, reciprocity, honesty, truthfulness, and support from other people (Abbott & Freeth, 2008; Harpham, Grant, & Thomas, 2002). The second, structural social capital, refers to formal structures in which citizens can develop ties and social networks and participate in civic associations and events (Moore & Kawachi, 2017).

Social capital has been measured in different ways in various investigations, not always validly and reliably, from the psychometric perspective, and the measurements available for social capital are unable to represent the dimensions raised in theory (De Silva *et al*., 2005; Harpham *et al*., 2002). To date, several English and Chinese instruments have been designed, with different numbers of items and purposes, to which some psychometric tests have been applied: The General Capital Social Scale (Van Der Gaag & Snijdersb, 2005), Bonding Social Capital Scale (Mignone, Elias, & Hall, 2011), Personal Social Capital Scale (Wang, Chen, Gong, & Jacques-Tiura, 2014), Social Capital Investment Inventory (Chen *et al*., 2015), and Trust Scale based on Social Capital in Spanish (Pérez, Bustos, & Reiko, 2017). Also, Wang's

scale has a Spanish version (Fernández, Pinzón, Moreno, Cepeda, & Idrovo, 2014). In other studies, other sets of items have been used as scales without performing a formal process of exploring psychometric performance, and without intention, nomological validity was achieved by exploring correlations with other variables of interest (Alvarado, Sapag, Arellano, Alarcon, & Tapia, 2015; Martin, Rogers, Cook, & Joseph, 2004; Sapag *et al*., 2008).

In the present study, seven face validity items were chosen to measure cognitive social capital, which is most related to mental health (De Silva *et al.*, 2005). Martín *et al*. (2004) took these items as a proxy instrument for measuring the social capital of a scale developed by other researchers to quantify social cohesion and trust (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). Martín *et al*. (2004) did not report psychometric indicators for the set of items. The current authors gave this tool the name of the "Cognitive Social Capital Scale" (CSCS). The CSCS has several questions in common with other instruments that explore cognitive social capital (Abbott & Freeth, 2008; Harpham *et al*., 2002; Moore & Kawachi, 2017). A validity test was done using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. It is technical to assessment dimensionality, which is a mathematical way of testing if the items are distributed in the theoretically proposed factors or dimensions (Gorsuch, 1997; Streiner, 1994), and internal consistency reliability tests, which is the mean of the correlations between the scores of the scale's items (Cronbach, 1951; McDonald, 1970).

It is necessary to have instruments to measure social capital that shows an acceptable or excellent psychometric performance (Drost, 2011; Harpham *et al*., 2002). Validity and reliability of measurements are essential for health research's internal validity (Keszei, Novak, & Streiner, 2010). With the repeated use of the same instrument, it is possible to make more precise comparisons of the findings in different studies and contexts (Drost, 2011).

The present study aimed to perform exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses of the CSCS in adults of Colombia's general population.

Method

Design and ethical issues

A validation study was conducted from secondary analysis; it was nested in a cross-sectional study that included several measurement scales, including a version of the CSCS. The research was endorsed by the research ethics board of a Colombian university. The participants gave informed consent. The research followed the ethical recommendations for research on human subjects following the Declaration of Helsinki (World Medical Association, 2008).

Participants

Seven hundred people residing in Colombia completed the research questionnaire. The participants' ages were between 18 and 76 years (*M* = 37.1, *SD* = 12.7). Other demographic characteristics, in frequencies and percentages, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographical characteristics of participants.

Variable	n	%
Gender		
Female	476	68.0
Male	224	32.0
Permanent couple		
Yes (Free union or married)	336	48.0
No (Single, separated or widowed)	364	52.0
Income (Colombian status)		
Low (I, II or III)	420	60.0
High (IV, V or VI)	280	40.0
Education		
High school or less	72	10.3
College or higher	628	89.7

Instrument

The participants completed the CSCS. This scale explores the current perceptions about the relationship among neighbors. Each item gives four response alternatives since strongly

disagree to agree strongly, rated from zero to three (Martin *et al.*, 2004). The translation and back-translation processes were carried out based on international recommendations to get a culturally adapted and linguistically equivalent translation (Borsa, Damasio, & Bandeira, 2012; Guimaraes, Haas, Spadoti, Marques dos Santos, & Galvão, 2017). Below are the items of the CSCS, they were headed with the phrase "In the block, residential complex, building, or neighborhood in which I live":

1. "People around here are willing to help their neighbors." (La gente está dispuesta a ayudar a los vecinos).
2. "This is a close-knit, or "tight" neighborhood where people generally know one another." (Las personas son unidas y generalmente se conocen entre sí).
3. “If I had to borrow $30 in an emergency, I could borrow it from a neighbor.” (Si tuviera que pedir prestado $50.000, en caso de emergencia, podría pedírselo prestado a un vecino).
4. "People in this neighborhood generally do not get along with each other." (La gente generalmente se lleva bien).
5. "People in this neighborhood can be trusted." (Se puede confiar en las personas).
6. If I were sick I could count on my neighbors to shop for groceries for me.” (Si estuviera enfermo podría contar con mis vecinos para que hiciera algunas compra por mí).
7. "People in this neighborhood do not share the same values." (Las personas comparten los mismos valores).

Procedure

The information was collected by distributing an electronic questionnaire sent by email, WhatsApp, and Facebook to the researchers' contacts. The period to respond was limited from March 30 to April 8, 2020, because in online studies, the highest rate, around 30%, of

response occurs in the first week, and does not improve considerably with additional requests (Sánchez, Muñoz, & Montoro, 2009).

Analysis of data

Using EFA, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) index and Bartlett sphericity test were computed. A CFA was performed to test the dimensionality of the CSCS using the maximum likelihood method. The goodness of fit was evaluated using CFA, and the coefficients for RMSEA and 90% CI, CFI, TLI, and SRMR were calculated. Regarding chi-square, the probability was expected to be higher than 0.05, while RMSEA and SRMR were approximately 0.06, and CFI and TLI exhibited values higher than 0.89. Internal consistency was calculated using Cronbach's alpha (1951) coefficients and McDonald's omega (1970). The analysis was done with the program STATA 13.0 (2013).

Results

CSCS

The EFA showed that the CSCS reached Bartlett's chi-square of 1,224.32, df = 21, $p < 0.001$, and KMO of 0.77. The loadings for item 1 (helping the neighbors) showed a negative value, and item 4 (getting along) presented a very low loading. Commonalities and loadings of the CSCS are presented in Table 2. Regarding internal consistency, the CSCS showed Cronbach's alpha of 0.56 and McDonald's omega of 0.69.

Table 2. Commonalities and loadings of the CSCS.

Item	**Commonality**	**Loading**
1. To help their neighbors	0.032	-0.179
2. “Tight’’ neighborhood	0.177	0.421
3. To borrow $30	0.476	0.690
4. Get along with	0.008	0.088
5. Trust	0.528	0.727
6. If I were sick	0.641	0.800
7. Share the same values	0.471	0.686

The eigenvalue was 2.84, which explained 40.88% of the total variance.

CSCS-5

After deleting items 1 and 4, the EFA indicators for the five-item version (CSCS-5) were Bartlett's chi-square of 1,064.31, df = 10, p < 0.001, and KMO of 0.81. Table 3 compared goodness fit indexes between CSCS and CSCS-5, and Table 4 presents commonalities and loadings of the CSCS-5. The CSCS-5 presented Cronbach's alpha of 0.79 and McDonald's omega of 0.80. Table 5 presents the mean, standard deviation, corrected item correlation, and Cronbach's total score and alpha if the item were omitted.

Table 3. Goodness-of-fit indicators for the CSCS and CSCS-5.

Item	**CSCS**	**CSCS-5**
X^2 (df)*	194.77 (14)	35.14 (5)
X^2 / df	13.91	7.03
RMSEA (IC90%) [p]	0.14 (0.12-0.15) [p<0.001]	0,09 (0,07-0,12) [p=0.005]
CFI	0.85	0.97
TLI	0.80	0.94
SRMR	0.08	0.03

*p<0,001.

Table 4.Commonalities and loadings of the CSCS-5.

Item	**Commonality**	**Loading**
2. “Tight’’ neighborhood	0.181	0.425
3. To borrow $30	0.481	0.693
5. Trust	0.524	0.724
6. If I were sick	0.638	0.799
7. Share the same values	0.473	0.688

The eigenvalue was 2.79, which explained 55.88% of the total variance.

Table 5. Mean, standard deviation, correlation corrected with the total score, and Cronbach's alpha with the omission of the item of the CSCS-5.

Item	**M**	**SD**	**CC[1]**	**Alfa de Cronbach[2]**
2. “Tight’’ neighborhood	1.39	0.88	0.37	0.81
3. To borrow $30	1.32	1.01	0.59	0.75
5. Trust	1.68	0.76	0.63	0.74
6. If I were sick	1.54	0.86	0.68	0.71
7. Share the same values	1.51	0.77	0.60	0.75

[1]Corrected correlation.
[2]If item is deleted.

Discussion

In this study, the performance of the CSCS and CSCS-5 is reported. Only the CSCS-5 shows good psychometric indicators. The CSCS-5 is a one-dimensional tool with adequate

internal consistency to assess cognitive social capital, that is, the perception of trust, reciprocity, and support that people have about other individuals and institutions (Abbott & Freeth, 2008; Harpham *et al.*, 2002; Moore & Kawachi, 2017).

During the most recent decades, the interdisciplinary work between biomedical and social sciences makes it necessary to guarantee the validity and reliability of the social variables' measurements, usually approached qualitatively (Drost, 2011). In general, one-dimensional instruments are expected to show three out of five favorable goodness-of-fit indicators (Hu & Bentler, 1999), and high internal consistency reliability (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

The CSCS-5 showed three out of five adequate goodness-of-fit coefficients for dimensionality. The most-reported coefficients are the Satorra-Bentler chi-square (with X^2 / df), the root of the mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI); the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and the Standardized Mean Square Residual (SRMR). For the Satorra-Bentler chi-square is recommended a p-value higher than 0.05 (with X^2 / df < 5); RMSEA, a value of around 0.06; CFI and TLI, values higher than 0.90; and SRMR, a value below of 0.05 (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Likewise, the CSCS-5 achieved two excellent internal consistency indicators, Cronbach's alpha of 0.79 and McDonald's omega of 0.80. Measuring construct instruments should present high internal consistency reliability, with values between 0.70 and 0.95 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). It is necessary to report an instrument's internal consistency every time it is used to measure variables because it can vary significantly between samples from different populations (Keszei *et al.*, 2010).

Practical implications

The provision of the CSCS will facilitate new researches on the issue. The lack of short, reliable, and valid tools to assess cognitive social capital has been a problem for conducting

considerable researches in the general population (De Silva *et al.*, 2005; Harpham *et al.*, 2002). In health sciences, it is necessary to consider and evaluate cognitive social capital, which is most related to mental health outcomes, when the social determinants of health are increasingly taken into consideration (De Silva *et al.*, 2005)

Strengths and limitations

This study shows the performance of a short scale to quantify cognitive social capital using multivariate psychometric analysis. However, given the sample collection technique, the test-retest reliability of the scales could not be established. This measurement is essential to guarantee the measurements' total reliability with the instruments (Keszei *et al.*, 2010). Similarly, the analysis of the device's dimensionality and reliability in other languages is required (Borsa *et al.*, 2012; Guimaraes *et al.*, 2017).

Conclusion

It is concluded that the CSCS scale presents a one-dimensional structure that does not fit the data and low internal consistency. The CSCS-5 exhibits a better one-dimensional structure and internal consistency. It is necessary to corroborate the present findings in future online and face-to-face studies in other Colombian populations. It is vital to have a valid and reliable instrument to evaluate social capital in countries with significant inequalities such as Colombia.

References

Abbott, S., & Freeth, D. (2008). Social capital and health: starting to make sense of the role of generalized trust and reciprocity. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *13*(7), 874-883.

Alvarado, R., Sapag, J. C., Arellano, J., Alarcon, A., & Tapia, E. (2015). [Social capital and mental health in a representative sample of Chilean workers]. *Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Médicas de Córdoba*, 72(4), 227-235.

Bartlett, M. S. (1950). Test of significance in factor analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, *3*(1), 77-85.

Borsa, J. C., Damasio, B. F., & Bandeira, D. R. (2012). Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of psychological instruments: Some considerations. *Paidéia*, *22*(53), 423-432.

Chen, X., Wang, P., Wegner, R., Gong, J., Fang, X., & Kaljee, L. (2015). Measuring social capital investment: Scale development and examination of links to social capital and perceived stress. *Social Indicators Research, 120*(3), 669-687.

Cronbach, J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of the test. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297-334.

De Silva, M. J., McKenzie, K., Harpham, T., & Huttly S. R. (2005). Social capital and mental illness: a systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 59*(8), 619-627.

Drost, E. A. (2011). Validity and reliability in social science research. *Education Research and Perspectives*, *38*(1), 105-123.

Ferlander, S. (2007). The importance of different forms of social capital for health. *Acta Sociologica*, *50*(2), 115-128.

Fernández, J. A., Pinzón, C. E., Moreno, J., Cepeda, M. C., and Idrovo, A. J. (2014). [Social capital in rural areas: adaptation to Spanish and factor validation of a scale]. *Ciencia and Saude Coletiva*, *19*(7), 2207-2214.

Gorsuch, R. L. (1997). Exploratory factor analysis: Its role in item analysis. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *68*(3), 532-560.

Guimaraes, M. B., Haas, V. J., Spadoti, R. A., Marques dos Santos, M., & Galvão, C. M. (2017). Cultural adaptation and validation of an instrument on barriers for the use of research results. *Revista Latino-Americana da Enfermagen, 25*, e.2852.

Harpham, T., Grant, E., & Thomas, E. (2002). Measuring social capital within health surveys: key issues. *Health Policy Planning*, *17*(1), 106-111.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*(1), 1-55.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*(1), 31-36.

Keszei, A. P., Novak, M., & Streiner, D. L. (2010). Introduction to health measurement scales. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *68*(4), 319-323.

Martin, K. S., Rogers, B. L., Cook, J. T., & Joseph, H. M. (2004). Social capital is associated with decreased risk of hunger. *Social Science and Medicine*, *58*(12), 2645-2654.

McDonald, R. P. (1970). The theoretical foundations of principal factor analysis, canonical factor analysis, and alpha factor analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *23*(1), 1-21.

Mignone, J., Elias, B, & Hall, M. (2011). Validation of a culturally appropriate social capital framework to explore health conditions in Canadian First Nations Communities. Int. Indigenous. *Policy Journal*, *2*(1), 3.

Moore, S., & Kawachi, I. (2017). Twenty years of social capital and health research: a glossary. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *71*(5), 513-517.

Pérez, J., Bustos, J. M., & Reiko, M. E. (2017). [Trust: a psychometric study from the perspective of social capital]. *Revista Electrónica de Psicología*, *7*(14), 5-13.

Poortinga, W. (2012). Community resilience and health: The role of bonding, bridging, and linking aspects of social capital. *Health and Place*, *18*(2), 286-295.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *24*(1), 1-24.

Portes, A. (2000). The two meanings of social capital. *Sociological Forum*, *15*(1), 1-12.

Sampson, R., Raudenbush, S., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, *277*(5328), 918-924.

Sánchez, J., Muñoz, F., & Montoro, F. J. (2009). [How to improve the response rate in online surveys?] *Revista de Estudios Empresariales*, *1*(1), 45-62.

Sapag, J. C., Aracena, M., Villarroel, L., Poblete, F., Berrocal, C., Hoyos, R., *et al.*, (2008) Social capital and self-rated health in urban low-income neighbourhoods in Chile. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *62*(9), 790-792.

STATA 13.0. (2013). College Station: STATA.

Streiner, D. L. (1994). Figuring out factors: The use and misuse of factor analysis. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *39*(3), 135-340.

Szreter, S., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Health by association? Social capital, social theory, and the political economy of public health. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, *33*(4), 650-667.

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach□s alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, *2*(1), 53-55.

Van Der Gaag, M., & Snijders, T. A. (2005). The Resource Generator: social capital quantification with concrete items. *Social Networks*, *27*(1), 1-29.

Wang, P., Chen, X., Gong, J., & Jacques-Tiura, A. J. (2014). Reliability and validity of the personal social capital scale 16 and personal social capital scale 8: Two short instruments for survey studies. *Social Indicators Research*, *119*(2), 1133-1148.

World Medical Association. (2008). *Declaration of Helsinki*. Seoul, Korea: WMA. https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/