



PCMA

WORKING PAPER SERIES

**CORRELATES OF PARTICIPATION
IN NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS**

by Barry Checkoway
and
Marc A. Zimmerman

PCMA WORKING
PAPER #32

CRSO WORKING
PAPER #462

October, 1991

**The Program on Conflict Management Alternatives
at The University of Michigan**

**CORRELATES OF PARTICIPATION
IN NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS**

by Barry Checkoway
and
Marc A. Zimmeraman

PCMA Working
Paper #32

CRSO Working
Paper #462

October, 1991

The Program on Conflict Management Alternatives

The Program on Conflict Management Alternatives was established in January, 1986 by a grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and additional funds from the University of Michigan. These basic grants were renewed in July, 1988 and again in July, 1991. The Program supports an agenda of research, application, and theory development. PCMA also establishes links among other university research and teaching efforts relevant to conflict management alternatives, and maintains liaison and collaboration with similar efforts in other Universities and Practitioner agencies. The Program staffers own work focuses explicitly on the relationship between social justice and social conflict, specifically: (a) the use of innovative settlement procedures and roles for disputants and third parties; (b) the institutionalization of innovative mechanisms and the adoption of organizational and community structures that permanently alter the way conflicts are managed; and (c) the fundamental differences and inequalities between parties that often create conflict and threaten its stable resolution.

We examine these issues primarily in United States' settings, in conflicts arising within and between families, organizations and communities, and between different racial, gender, and economic constituencies. These specific efforts are supported by a variety of research and action grants/contracts with governmental agencies, foundations, and private and public organizations/agencies.

The Program in Conflict Management Alternatives is housed within the Center for Research on Social Organization, College of Literature, Science and the Arts, Room 4016 LS&A Building, Telephone: (313) 763-0472.

Core Faculty of the Program

Alex Alienikoff, Professor of Law
Percy Bates, Director, PEO, Professor of Education
Barry Checkoway, Professor of Social Work
Mark Chesler, Co-Director, PCMA and Professor of Sociology
James Crowfoot, Professor of Natural Resources and Urban
Regional Planning
Elizabeth Douvan, Professor of Psychology
Barbara Israel, Associate Professor, School of Public Health
Edith Lewis, Associate Professor, School of Social Work
David Schoem, Assistant Dean for the Freshmen and Sophomore
Years and Lecturer in Sociology, College of LS&A
Helen Weingarten, Co-Director and Associate Professor, School
of Social Work

CORRELATES OF PARTICIPATION
IN NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

Barry Checkoway and Marc A. Zimmerman

Many neighborhoods of large U.S. cities have declined in population and urban activity in recent years. Changes in the nation's economy and employment patterns, shifts in class composition and social structure, and reductions in public expenditures have worsened conditions in neighborhoods at a time when needs are increasing. Investigators have documented the pattern of private institutions disinvesting from neighborhoods in favor of other locations, and of public agencies disinvesting by reducing the levels of services provided. This often results in a downgrading cycle of deteriorating infrastructure, social dislocation, and withdrawal of people and institutions. Some of those left behind are "the truly disadvantaged" who are socially isolated, feel alienated from decisions affecting their neighborhoods, or retreat from participation in the community (Wilson, 1987).

Despite these conditions, some neighborhoods have organized to strengthen participation and overcome decline. Their organizations vary in their origins and objectives, activities and accomplishments, internal characteristics and external relationships, but together they demonstrate that people can take initiative and create change at the neighborhood level (Checkoway, 1984, 1985a, 1985b). Their organizations can be a source of ideas and support for those concerned with making participation work (Berger and Neuhaus, 1977; Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988).

Studies of neighborhood participation tend not to emphasize organization as a factor in the participation process. Previous studies have examined the impact of ecological forces (Park and Burgess, 1925), social preferences (Hoyt, 1939), cultural traditions (Firey, 1945), demographic variables (Hawley, 1950), cultural attachments (Bell and Boalt, 1957), social class and ethnic ties (Gans, 1962; Liebow, 1967), historical and symbolic meanings (Hunter, 1974), and specific subcultures (Fischer, 1976). Other studies recognize that neighborhood organizations have increased in number and capacity (Boyte, 1980; Goering, 1979), that they have planned and organized programs and services (Checkoway, 1985a), and that there are limiting and facilitating factors in project success (Mayer, 1986). Researchers have compiled case studies of grassroots efforts to promote participation in neighborhoods (Checkoway, 1985a;

Cunningham and Kotler, 1983), but few have studied the relationship of organizational variables with neighborhood participation.

What are the correlates of participation in neighborhood organizations? What are the organizational and community factors associated with the quality of participation? Research on neighborhood participation generally has not included aggregate analysis of neighborhood organizations on an areawide basis. However, such research has the potential to develop knowledge which could strengthen practice in the field.

This paper reports research designed to assess the correlates of participation in neighborhood organizations. It draws on data from a survey of organizations in a single city, and analyzes the correlates of organizational score on a scale designed to measure the quality of participation. A measure of quality participation is related to several organizational and community factors, and used as a basis for conclusions about practice in the field.

This paper reports research on neighborhood organizations in Detroit, one of America's most distressed cities. Several studies document disinvestment and deterioration (Bukowczyk, 1986; Chafets, 1990; Darden, Hill, Thomas, and Thomas, 1987; Watkins, 1985) and reinvestment

and revitalization (Chaffers, 1986; Checkoway, 1991; Conot, 1986; Goldstein, 1986; Luria and Russell, 1981; Thomas, 1985) in the city and its neighborhoods. In recent decades, population has decreased significantly, manufacturing firms have closed or moved away, and housing units have been abandoned or destroyed. Brick-strewn or weed-covered vacant lots whose structures have been demolished cover several areas of the city. Thus the study provides information and insights into a single city, but the aim is to develop knowledge in terms of its wider significance.

METHODS

Procedures

The analysis is based on data drawn from responses to a mail questionnaire sent to leaders of neighborhood organizations in Detroit. The questionnaire was mailed to each of 113 organizations listed in the Detroit Neighborhood Handbook (Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit, 1987), a comprehensive citywide listing prepared in conjunction with neighborhood leaders. A response rate of 82 percent was achieved, with 93 questionnaires returned by respondents representing all geographical areas of the city. Most questionnaires were completed by the president or other officer of the organization, although some were completed by another organizational member or staff person.

Measures

A ten-item scale was used to measure the quality of participation to (a) improve effectiveness of services (b) strengthen sense of efficacy among residents (c) increase neighborhood power and leadership and (d) increase influence in decisions affecting the neighborhood. "Quality" participation refers to its impacts on outcomes at multiple levels rather than to the "scope" of its frequency or duration of occurrence, as was common in earlier evaluations of participation. This measure was used as the primary independent variable in this study. The ten items are presented in Table 1.

The scale used a four-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating greater quality. A composite community participation index, calculated by summing the values for each of the ten items, was computed for each organization. Organizations with a total score above 32 were designated as high, moderate designations were given for total scores ranging from 28 to 32, and organizations were rated as low if their score was below 28. The cutoff points for group identification were chosen to divide the sample into equal thirds (i.e., 1/2 standard deviation above and below the mean). The total sample mean for organizational quality was 30.1 ($SD = 5.2$) and ranged from 18 to 40.

Twelve cases had missing data on one of the ten items, two had missing data on two items, and one had missing data on three items. Three cases were dropped because they had missing data on seven or more items. The mean score of the rated items for each item with missing data was used to replace missing ratings. Means substitution was used to insure adequate sample sizes in each group for comparison purposes. It should be noted that this procedure added organizations equally to the three categories. The sample size for the analyses presented was 90 with 29 organizations in the high group, 33 in the moderate group, and 28 in the low group.

Limitations

The findings presented here should be considered in terms of their limitations. This study recognizes the possibilities of bias (due to self-selection or self-reporting by nonrandom respondents inside the organization), differences in views among community leaders and organizational staff, and contrasting evaluations by groups not listed in the handbook. Respondent bias due to the possibility of a halo effect of reporting in a socially desirable manner may have resulted in a restricted range for some variables, making it more difficult to find statistical significance. Although bias is possible, studies suggest

that neighborhood leaders tend to have high levels of information about organizational resources and neighborhood condition (Checkoway, 1985a). However, even if bias were present in the responses, there is no reason to believe that a halo effect would more likely influence some respondents but not others. Thus positive ratings by all respondents may have been inflated by halo effects and made it more difficult to find differences among them because of the restricted range of variables overall.

RESULTS

Participation Strategies

Several strategies of participation are available to neighborhood organizations. Studies report efforts to mobilize individuals around issues through highly-visible protest demonstrations, or to organize constituency groups through social action tactics. Neighborhood organizations can involve people in policy formulation and program planning through advisory committees of government agencies, or advocate for local interests through representation in legislative or administrative institutions. They can raise critical consciousness through small group discussions, or provide services through locality development of their own.

Previous analysis of the present data reports reports that these neighborhood organizations employ a wide range of participation strategies (Checkoway, 1991b). Most frequently used were activities to educate a neighborhood on an issue, plan a neighborhood program, contact public officials about neighborhood needs, organize a group for social action, or form a coalition with other groups. Less frequent were activities to advocate with government or business, or to testify in a public hearing. Less than half developed social services or a community-based corporation, or turned out voters in political elections. Only a fraction reported activities to mobilize a protest demonstration in the previous year.

Table 2 reports results of chi-square analyses with the number and percentage of high, moderate, and low scoring organizations reporting each strategy listed. The results suggest that the choice and use of strategies differ across organizations defined by the quality of participation measure. The organizations do not differ regarding strategies to plan a neighborhood program, educate the community on an issue, advocate with government or business, contact public officials, or mobilize a protest demonstration. Significant differences were found for developing a social service, representing the neighborhood in government, testifying in a public hearing, organizing a group for social action, registering voters, and developing

a community-based corporation. For each of these activities except organizing for social action the high scoring organizations were more likely to report more involvement than the low or moderate organizations. It is interesting that the high and low scoring organizations reported nearly equal levels of organizing for social action.

It is possible to view service delivery and community incorporation as internal methods of "helping themselves" that develop community capacity from within, and government committees, public hearings, and voter participation as forms of "external involvement" in the larger sociopolitical system. This study suggests that organizations with high quality participation have reached a stage at which they recognize the importance of engaging in both internal activities for helping themselves and external efforts for influencing their environment.

Participant Characteristics

Studies show that participation is exercised in differential frequency by individuals and groups in society, and that the scope of participation varies with the sociodemographic characteristics of the participants. Income, education, and other characteristics correlate positively with individual participation, and contribute to conditions that support further activity. The scope of

participation also varies with the personal perceptions and social attitudes of the participants. People with a sense of self-satisfaction, self-efficacy, or personal power are more likely to take initiative and participate in decisions that affect their lives, and its quality or impact should improve as a result (Bandura, 1977; Zimmerman, forthcoming).

Neighborhood leaders responding to this survey were asked about their age, gender, race, and other characteristics. A majority of the respondents were Black and women, but there were no statistically significant differences in organizational performance according to the race and gender characteristics of these participants. The data in Table 3 show that the respondents in high scoring organizations tend to be older in age and active in the organization for more years than the respondents in the moderate and low scoring organizations, but these differences are not statistically significant.

Neighborhood leaders were asked about their satisfaction with themselves, with their organizations, and with their neighborhoods. The data in Table 4 indicate that respondents from the high scoring organizations were more satisfied with their organization and with their work in the organization than those in the moderate and low scoring organizations. Respondents from high and moderate scoring organizations were more satisfied with their life in general

and more optimistic about the future than those in the low scoring organizations. Respondents reported equal dissatisfaction with their neighborhoods.

These data suggest that participant characteristics are uneven in their association with the quality of participation. Sociodemographic characteristics such as race, gender, age, and education do not differ among these organizations in statistically significant ways. Yet, personal perceptions and social attitudes such as satisfaction with work and life and optimism for the future do differ among these organizations in statistically significant ways. Apparently it is not sociodemographic characteristics, but personal perceptions and social attitudes that relate to the quality of participation. Perhaps optimistic leaders help to create higher quality participation in their organizations.

Organizational Factors

Organization is considered instrumental for individuals seeking to participate in their community. Organization serves to bring individuals together, stimulate collective action, and generate resources for implementation. Training manuals include "forming and building organizations" and "keeping the organization going" among the core skills of the field (Cassidy, 1980; Thomas, 1990). Textbooks identify

"goal setting," "decision making," "division of labor" and other formal and nonformal organizational elements as part of the neighborhood participation process, although these are not usually based upon empirical research (Staples, 1984).

Table 5 reports the means, standard deviations, and results of Duncan's multiple range test for different organizational characteristics across high, moderate, and low scoring organizations. Although the error rate of the Duncan's multiple range test is not as low as other multiple comparison tests (e.g., Sheffe, Tukey), it offers a more sensitive test for finding group differences when the overall F-test is significant. This is especially useful in research such as this as a means to identify areas for future research in which more stringent comparisons might help confirm previous findings.

The data indicate that all organizations had scores of more than 2.00 and thus view themselves as somewhat adequate in all perceived levels. The organizations, however, differ on all twelve characteristics. For example, the high scoring organizations scored higher than the low scoring organizations on every dimension of organizational adequacy. The table shows that significant differences exist on organizational leadership, clear goals and objectives, careful planning, organizational strategy, organizational

structure, political clout, and cooperation with other groups. The data suggest the importance of leadership, planning, and cooperation as organizational factors in neighborhood participation.

Although high scoring organizations tend to be older organizations with more members and more active members than moderate and low scoring organizations, the differences are not statistically significant. And although the leaders and managers of community-based organizations often complain that they need more money and resources to make participation work, these data suggest that budget size and staff availability are not statistically significant in differentiating high scoring organizations from the others. Previous analysis of the present data show that these are voluntary organizations with varying size memberships, boards of directors and activist cores, budget sizes and funding sources, working largely without remuneration or paid staff (Checkoway, 1991b).

Community Factors

Researchers make many assertions about the association of organizational performance and external environment (Hasenfeld, 1983). They report that a number of community contextual factors affect the scope and quality of participation in an organization, and that organizations

vary widely in their ability to adapt to changing community conditions. The presence of a tradition of citizen participation, resident awareness of issues affecting the neighborhood, local levels of community organization, and responsiveness of public officials to the neighborhood are among the factors thought to affect participation. How significant are such community factors as correlates of quality participation?

Table 6 reports the means, standard deviations, and results of Duncan's multiple comparison test for high, moderate, and low scoring organizations for eight community characteristics. The table indicates that resident awareness, leadership, depressive affect, level of organization and outstanding group dominance are not statistically significant across groups. Respondents from high scoring organizations did view public officials as more responsive and the mayor as more committed to the neighborhood than other respondents, and low scoring organizations were more likely to report that neighborhood problems were getting worse.

The perception that public officials are responsive and that the mayor has commitment suggests a situation of efficacy. The perception that neighborhood problems are getting worse suggests a situation in which a perception of worsening conditions may contribute to feelings of

hopelessness, frustration, and withdrawal from participation. Have they become frustrated, felt helpless, and withdrawn from participation as a result?

DISCUSSION

The data suggest that neighborhood organizations can be distinguished by the quality of their community participation and that meaningful differences among them can be noted. High scoring organizations were more likely to select strategies of "helping themselves" by developing their own social service or community corporation, and of "external involvement" by registering voters or testifying in public hearings, although there are few differences among them in their use of most other strategies. They have leaders who have positive personal perceptions and social attitudes such as satisfaction with their organizations, their work in the organization, their life in general and optimism for the future. They operate in neighborhoods whose public officials are considered responsive, whereas low scoring organizations operate in ones whose conditions are perceived as worsening.

It is noteworthy that the high scoring organizations select strategies of both helping themselves in the neighborhood and of external involvement in the larger external sociopolitical system. Voluntary nonprofit

community organizations used to focus on singular strategies of participation like direct action organizing or protest demonstrations, or distinguished strategies of self-help from those seeking sociopolitical change, or had difficulties in managing the transition from one strategy to another. Now, however, some such organizations have reached a stage at which they combine diverse strategies whose orientations are both internal to the neighborhood and external to the sociopolitical system. It is interesting that despite some of their origins in the halcyon 1960s and earlier reputations for conflict, none of the organizations in the study feature protest demonstrations as a principal part of their repertoire of activities.

Overall, these findings do not support the frequent focus on strategy as an avenue to quality participation. It is common for community organization workers to emphasize the formulation of strategy as a core skill in neighborhood participation. Thus Booth (n.d.) views strategy as a resource for taking "direct action" at the community level; Staples (1984) views strategy as essential to "winning victories, empowering people, and bringing about change"; and Speeter (1986) views strategy as "the most important question for the community organization." This study suggests that some strategies show significant association with quality participation, that others show little or no association, and that there is little support for the belief

that strategy alone assures quality participation. Those that focus on the formulation of strategy as a core skill in neighborhood participation should recognize that strategy alone is unlikely to enhance quality participation in the absence of other individual, organizational, or community factors.

These findings also indicate the importance of organizational adequacy in the quality of community participation. High scoring organizations are more likely than other organizations to view themselves as adequate on the dimensions of organizational leadership and planning as factors in neighborhood participation. The implication is that improving the adequacy of the organization to address neighborhood concerns will affect the quality of participation. Participation thus operates in an organizational context in which efforts to strengthen the adequacy of the organization can be expected to strengthen the quality of participation. However, it is important to note that while leadership and planning are associated with quality participation, the amount of the budget and size of the staff are not significant in differentiating high scoring organizations from the others.

This study suggests that personal perceptions and social attitudes are significant factors in quality participation. High scoring organizations do not

significantly differ from others in terms of the race, gender, or other sociodemographic characteristics, of their respondents, but their leaders do show more satisfaction with organizations, work in the organization, life in general, and optimism for the future than those in low scoring organizations. These findings are consistent with studies showing that self satisfaction, self efficacy, and other perceptions and attitudes are important ingredients in social behavior. The notion is that persons with stronger feelings of self satisfaction and self efficacy are more likely to participate in the community and engage in the external environment, whereas persons with weaker feelings of satisfaction and efficacy are more likely to act passive and withdrawn from their community. In the present study, high scoring organizations were more likely to have respondents who hold positive perceptions, social attitudes, and satisfaction with their organizations and themselves.

The notion that attitudes affect behavior and predispose participation in organizations and communities is common in various fields. For example, Wilson (1966) argues that some people have "private regarding" attitudes that cause them to act in their own special interest and withdraw from the process of public participation. Friere (1970) argues that some people face situations which produce attitudes of nonparticipation and a "culture of silence" and that nonformal education will raise their consciousness and

empower them in the community. Future research could examine the relationship between members' efficacy and satisfaction and organizational participation.

It is important, however, to recognize that attitudes themselves often result from forces in the larger society. It is mistaken to conclude that because a person appears passive or withdrawn from participation in the community, that this results from some inherent characteristic of the person. On the contrary, nonparticipation is not necessarily a personal characteristic but may be symptomatic of alienation from a structural situation in which the person has been displaced. It is mistaken to blame a person for a process by which he or she has been victimized.

CONCLUSION

Despite urban decline, some neighborhoods have organized to strengthen participation. These organizations vary in their activities and accomplishments, and some are more successful than others in the quality of their work. Several factors affect their quality of participation--- including individual, organizational, and community characteristics.

High scoring organizations employ various participation strategies integrating internal methods of help[ing] themselves and external involvement in the larger sociopolitical system, although the choice and use of strategies alone are not enough to assure the quality of participation. Respondents from high scoring organizations are more likely to have personal perceptions and social attitudes of satisfaction and optimism than those in low scoring organizations. Organizational factors such as leadership, planning, and cooperation---but not budget and staff size---relate to the quality of participation. And high scoring organizations operate in communities with perceptions of public responsiveness and political commitment, whereas low scoring organizations operate in communities with perceptions of worsening conditions and alienation from the sociopolitical system.

Overall the quality of participation relates neither to strategic choice, nor budget size, nor staff availability alone, but also to the social attitudes, organizational abilities, and perceptions of the community. Efforts to strengthen neighborhood participation may be most successful if they take a wholistic approach in how and where to intervene. Intervention strategies may need to focus on both internal and external dimensions of organizations, help to enhance individual perceptions of self and community, and

assist in overall improvement of communities in which they operate.

Table 1. Ten Items Used to Develop the
Composite Quality of Participation Index

-
1. Made government more responsive to neighborhood needs.
 2. Increased neighborhood power.
 3. Developed new neighborhood leadership.
 4. Improved the quality of services.
 5. Improved access to services.
 6. Raised public awareness of neighborhood issues.
 7. Reduced social isolation.
 8. Blocked or delayed changes that the neighborhood opposed.
 9. Strengthened the confidence of residents.
 10. Increased pride in the neighborhood.
-

Note: A four-point Likert rating scale was used for each item with score indicating more agreement.

Table 2. Percentage (and number) of High, Moderate, and Low Effective Organizations That Reported Doing Each Activity in the Past Year

	High Organizations (>32) N = 29	Moderate Organizations (28-32) N = 33	Low Organizations (<28) N = 28	χ^2
Plan a neighborhood program	100 (28)	94 (30)	89 (23)	3.29
Develop a social service	68 (19)	36 (9)	23 (5)	11.16**
Educate the neighborhood on an issue	100 (28)	97 (31)	96 (26)	.99
Publish a newsletter	89 (24)	80 (24)	76 (19)	1.54
Represent the neighborhood on government board or council	89 (24)	60 (18)	52 (13)	9.07*
Testify in a public hearing	92 (24)	57 (17)	64 (16)	9.19*
Organize a group for action	100 (27)	77 (23)	93 (25)	8.54*
Neighborhood advocacy with government or business	85 (22)	64 (16)	65 (15)	3.34
Form a coalition	97 (28)	90 (28)	82 (23)	3.24
Register or turn out voters	70 (19)	26 (7)	28 (7)	13.82**
Develop a community-based corporation	62 (16)	27 (7)	48 (11)	6.37*
Mobilize a protest demonstration	32 (8)	19 (5)	24 (6)	1.28
Contact public officials about neighborhood needs	96 (27)	87 (26)	100 (28)	5.08

Note: Some of these data may have been missing for some respondents so the percentages and numbers listed in the table may vary for each item.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 3. Means (and Standard Deviations) of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents Across High, Moderate, and Low Effective Organizations

	High Organizations (>32) N = 29	Moderate Organizations (28-32) N = 33	Low Organizations (<28) N = 28
Education	14.59 (2.79)	14.97 (2.80)	15.11 (3.32)
Age	56.63 (12.90)	49.06 (16.88)	47.71 (15.97)
Years active in organization	11.86 (8.92)	9.86 (7.50)	7.15 (4.20)

* p < .05

** p < .01

Table 4. Means (and Standard Deviations) of Satisfaction with Neighborhood, Organization, Personal Work in the Organization, Life in General, and the Future Across High, Moderate and Low Effective Organizations

	High Organizations (>32)	Moderate Organizations (28-32)	Low Organizations (<28)	Duncan Paired Comparison
Neighborhood	2.62 (.94)	2.44 (1.05)	2.11 (.89)	—
Organization**	3.34 (.77)	2.81 (.93)	2.63 (.93)	H>M,L
Work in organization**	3.72 (.53)	3.19 (.78)	2.96 (.88)	H>M,L
Life in general**	3.57 (.74)	3.38 (.83)	2.79 (.99)	H,M>L
Future**	3.55 (.63)	3.59 (.56)	3.00 (1.07)	H,M>L

Note: A score of 1 indicates low satisfaction and a score of 4 indicates high satisfaction

* p < .05

** p < .01

Table 5. Means (and Standard Deviations) of Adequacy of Organizational Characteristics Across High, Moderate, and Low Effective Organizations

	High Organizations (>32) N = 29	Moderate Organizations (28-32) N = 33	Low Organizations (<28) N = 28	Duncan Paired Comparison
Organizational leadership**	3.86 (.35)	3.18 (.68)	3.04 (.74)	H>M,L
Staff skill and expertise*	3.56 (.51)	3.20 (.66)	3.07 (.78)	H>M,L
Clear goals and objectives**	3.62 (.49)	3.16 (.81)	3.07 (.68)	H>M,L
Careful planning**	3.59 (.57)	3.03 (.85)	3.07 (.62)	H>M,L
Organizational strategy**	3.59 (.50)	2.90 (.83)	2.96 (.65)	H>M,L
Project management*	3.46 (.64)	2.97 (.95)	3.00 (.77)	H>M,L
Board-staff relations**	3.73 (.45)	3.19 (.83)	2.88 (.99)	H>M,L
Community involvement**	3.72 (.46)	3.00 (.90)	2.79 (.96)	H>M,L
Political clout**	3.43 (.69)	2.50 (.88)	2.27 (.72)	H>M,L
Organizational structure**	3.72 (.46)	3.16 (.81)	3.11 (.)	H>M,L
Resources in time or money*	2.82 (.95)	2.52 (1.06)	2.07 (1.00)	H>L
Cooperation with other groups**	3.72 (.4)	3.09 (.80)	3.04 (.84)	H>M,L

Note: A score of 1 indicates very inadequate and a score of 4 indicates very adequate

* p < .05
** p < .01

Table 6. Means (and Standard Deviations) of Community Characteristics Across High, Moderate, and Low Effective Organizations

	High Organizations (>32) N = 29	Moderate Organizations (28-32) N = 33	Low Organizations (<28) N = 28	Duncan Paired Comparison
Residents are aware of neighborhood issues	3.33 (.55)	3.06 (.80)	2.89 (.74)	--
Residents are well organized	2.89 (.74)	2.63 (.79)	2.39 (.88)	--
Residents lack leadership	2.22 (1.01)	2.27 (.87)	2.32 (.77)	--
Residents are depressed	2.71 (.90)	2.48 (1.00)	2.82 (.94)	--
Organization has solved major neighborhood problems**	3.50 (.64)	3.03 (.65)	2.46 (.88)	H>M,L M>L
Organization has influence**	3.50 (.69)	3.09 (.86)	2.39 (.99)	H,M>L
Public officials are responsive**	2.89 (.83)	2.19 (.93)	1.75 (.84)	H>M,L
Mayor has commitment*	2.15 (1.10)	1.63 (.94)	1.48 (.75)	H>M,L
Outside groups dominate	2.00 (1.07)	2.29 (1.19)	2.54 (1.23)	--
Neighborhood problems are getting worse*	2.61 (.92)	2.74 (.93)	3.26 (.81)	L>M,H

Note: A score of 1 indicates strong disagreement and a score of 4 indicates strong agreement

* p < .05

** p < .01

REFERENCES

Bachelor, L., and B. Jones. (1981). Managed participation in Detroit's Neighborhood Opportunity Fund. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17, 518-536.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.

Bell, W., and M.T. Boalt. (1957). Urban neighborhoods and informal social relations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 62, 518-536.

Berger, P.J., and R.J. Neuhaus. (1977). *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Booth, H. (n.d.). *Direct Action Organizing*. Chicago: The Midwest Academy.

Boyte, H. (1980). *The Backyard Revolution: Understanding the New Citizen Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bukowczyk, J.J. (1986). The Poletown case and the future of Detroit's neighborhoods. *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 25, 449-453.

Carmon, N., ed. *Neighbourhood Policy and Programmes: Past and Present*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Cassidy, R. (1980). *Livable Cities: A Grass-Roots Guide to Rebuilding Urban America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Chaffers, J. (1986). City of promise: The shape of Detroit's environment. *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 25, 435-448

Chavetz, Z. (1990). *Devil's Night and Other True Tales of Detroit*. New York: Random House.

Checkoway, B. (1991a). Innovative participation in neighborhood service organizations. *Community Development Journal*, 26, 14-23.

Checkoway, B. (1981). The politics of public hearings. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17, 566-582.

- Checkoway, B. (1984). Two types of planning in neighborhoods. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 3, 102-109.
- Checkoway, B. (1991b). Neighborhood needs and organizational resources: New lessons from Detroit. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 20, 173-189.
- Checkoway, B. (1985a). Neighborhood planning organizations: Perspectives and choices. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 21, 471-486.
- Checkoway, B. (1985b). Revitalizing an urban neighborhood: A St. Louis case study. In B. Checkoway and C.V. Pattons, eds., *The Metropolitan Midwest: Policy Problems and Prospects for Change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Conot, R. (1986). *American Odyssey*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Crenshaw, E., and C. St. John. (1989). The organizationally dependent community: A comparative study of neighborhood attachment. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 24, 412-434.
- Cunningham, J.V., and M. Kotler. (1983) *Building Neighborhood Organizations*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Darden, J.T., R.C. Hill, J. Thomas, and R. Thomas. (1987). *Detroit: Race and Uneven Development*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Davis, J.E. (1991). *Contested Ground: Collective Action and the Urban Neighborhood*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Fasenfast, D. (1986). Community politics and urban redevelopment: Poletown, Detroit, and General Motors. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 22, 101-123.
- Firey, W. (1945). Sentiment and symbolism as ecological variables. *American Sociological Review*, 10, 140-148.
- Fischer, C.S. (1976). *The Urban Experience*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Friere, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gans, H.J. (1962) *The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian-Americans*. New York: Free Press.
- Goering, J.M. (1979). The national neighborhood movement: A preliminary analysis and critique. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 45, 506-514.

- Goldstein, L. (1986) Detroit: An American city. Michigan Quarterly Review, 25, whole issue.
- Haerberle, S.H. (1989). Planting the Grassroots: Structuring Citizen Participation. New York: Praeger Publications.
- Hasenfeld, Y. (1983). Human Service Organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Hawley, A. H. (1950). Human Ecology. New York: Ronald Press.
- Henderson, P., and D.N. Thomas (1987). Skills in Neighbourhood Work. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Hoyt, H. (1939). The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Jones, B. (1990). Neighborhood Planning: A Guide for Citizens and Planners. Chicago: Planners Press, American Planning Association.
- Kieffer, C.H. (1984). Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. Prevention in Human Services, 3, 9-36.
- Liebow, E. (1967). Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit. (1987). Detroit Neighborhood Handbook. Detroit: Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit.
- Mayer, N. (1986). Neighborhood Organizations and Community Development: Making Revitalization Work. Washington: Urban Institute Press.
- Mott, A. (1984). Mixing organizing with development. The Neighborhood Works, 2, 24.
- Park, R., and E. Burgess. (1925). The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Speeters, G. (1986). Power: A Repossession Manual: Organizing Strategies for Citizens. Amherst: Citizen Involvement Training Project, University of Massachusetts.
- Staples, L. (1984). Roots to Power: A Manual for Grassroots Organizing. New York: Praeger.
- Thomas, J.M. (1985). Neighborhood response to redevelopment in Detroit. Community Development Journal, 20, 79-90.

- Thomas, J.M. (1988). Racial crisis and the fall of the Detroit city plan commission. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 54, 150-161.
- Watkins, A.J. (1985). Capital punishment for midwestern cities. In B. Checkoway and C.V. Patton, eds. *The Metropolitan Midwest: Policy Problems and Prospects for Change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Wilson, J.Q., ed. *Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Unger, D.G., and A. Wandersman. (1985). The importance of neighbors: The social, cognitive, and affective components of neighboring. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 139-169.
- Wandersman, A. (1984). Citizen participation. In K. Heller, et al., eds. *Psychology and Community Change*. Homewood: Dorsey.
- Williams, M.R. (1985). *Neighborhood Organizations: Seeds of a New Urban Life*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Zimmerman, M.A. (forthcoming). Empowerment: Forging new perspectives in mental health. In J. Rappaport and E. Seidman, eds. *The Handbook of Community Psychology*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Zimmerman, M.A., and J. Rappaport. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16, 725-750.