

Outcome Measure	Community Integration Measure (CIM)
Sensitivity to Change	No
Population	Adult
Domain	Social Role Participation and Social Competence
Type of Measure	Self-report, interview
ICF-Code/s	d2, d7, d9, e3, e4
Description	<p>The CIM (McColl et al., 2001) is a self-rating scale developed for people with acquired brain impairment. It is one of the very small number of client-centered measures, focusing on the underlying subject “experience of belonging and participating”. Early revisions of the WHO construct of participation informed the development of the CIM, as did personal perspectives of community integration by people with ABI.</p> <p>The CIM comprises 10 items covering 4 factors capturing the clients' experience of community integration: Assimilation (acceptance, conformity and orientation; 4 items), Social support (2 items), Occupation (both productive and leisure; 2 items), and Independent living (2 items).</p> <p>Responses are made on a 5-point rating scale: 1 (always disagree), 2 (sometimes disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (sometimes agree), 5 (always agree). A total score is used (range 10-50), with higher scores indicating better integration.</p>
Properties	<p>See Tate (2010)</p> <p>Internal consistency: $\alpha = .87$ (self .83, family .92, students .78).</p> <p>Factor analysis suggests either the presence of 2 factors (Belonging and Independent participation) (McColl et al., 2001) or 3 factors (Support, Occupation, Independence) (Reistetter et al., 2005).</p> <p>Concurrent validity: with CIQ $r=.34$ and Interpersonal Support Evaluation List $r=.43$ (McColl et al., 2001); with Community Integration Questionnaire- revised $r=.34$ and SWLS $r=.52$ (Reistetter et al., 2005).</p> <p>Construct validity (Reistetter et al. 2005): Higher correlations with similar constructs (with CIQ-R-Social: $r = .58$); lower correlation with dissimilar constructs (with CIQ-R-Home: $r = .10$, CIQ-R-Productive: $r = .11$).</p> <p>Discriminant validity with ABI and normal populations good.</p>
Advantages	<p>Client centred - Developed from a qualitative study on perspectives of community integration with people with ABI, measures ‘successful’ as opposed to ‘independent’ community living i.e. measures the subjective aspects of participation</p> <p>Brief – 10 questions, 3-5 minutes to complete</p>

	Simple – could be self-administered by most people with basic literacy skills.
Disadvantages	Items refer to ‘this community’ but do not specify what community that is. Data on temporal stability and responsiveness are not available.
Additional Information	
Reviewers	Jenny Fleming

References

- McColl, M.A., Davies, D., Carlson, P., Johnston, J., & Minnes, P. (2001). The Community Integration Measure: Development and preliminary validation. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 82*, 429-232.
- Reistetter, T.A., Spencer, J.C., Trujillo, L., & Abreu, B.C. (2005) Examining the Community Integration Measure (CIM): A replication study with life satisfaction. *NeuroRehabilitation, 20*, 139-148.