



PCMA

WORKING PAPER SERIES

**INNOVATIVE PARTICIPATION
IN NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE
ORGANIZATIONS**

by Barry Checkoway

PCMA WORKING
PAPER #12

CRSD WORKING
PAPER #359

August 1988

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

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

T. Alexander Alienikoff, Professor of Law
Frances Aparicio, Associate Professor of Spanish & American Culture
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, Co-Director, PCMA and Associate Professor, School of Social Work
David Schoem, Assistant Dean for the Freshmen and Sophomore Years and Lecturer
in Sociology, College of LS&A
Sharon Sutton, Associate Professor of Architecture
Helen Weingarten, Associate Professor, School of Social Work

INNOVATIVE PARTICIPATION
IN NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE
ORGANIZATIONS

Barry Checkoway

PCMA Working Paper # 12 CRSO Working Paper # 359
August 1988

INNOVATIVE PARTICIPATION
IN NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Many neighborhoods of large U.S. cities have declined in population and urban activity in recent years. Economic recession, changes in industry and employment, and reductions in federal and state government expenditures have contributed to decline and caused health, housing, and other urban social problems.

Low income neighborhoods face particular problems. Studies document the pattern of private institutions disinvesting from poor 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, inadequate services, and withdrawal of people and institutions. Those left behind include the most disadvantaged segments of the population. They often feel alienated from decisions affecting their neighborhoods, or retreat from participation in the community (Wilson 1987).

Despite these conditions, some neighborhoods have organized to overcome decline. Their organizations have planned programs, developed services, and advocated change at the neighborhood level. They have taken local initiative, marshalled resources, and accomplished results. They are not necessarily typical in the field, but they provide lessons nonetheless (Checkoway 1984, 1985a, 1985b).

This paper reports progress on a pilot study of innovative participation in neighborhood service organizations in Detroit. The purpose of the study is

to identify organizations which employ innovative methods to encourage participation, to describe their methods, and to analyze factors that influence practice. The project focuses on Detroit as one of the most seriously distressed U.S. cities, but the aim is to develop knowledge and identify issues in terms of their wider significance (1).

Perspectives on Practice

Neighborhood service organizations are formalized structures that enable people to plan programs, develop services, and advocate change at the neighborhood level. They operate in several substantive service or functional fields. They are neither the charter nor the affiliate of another authority whose bylaws control them. They may receive funds from outside sources and abide by their guidelines, but these do not control the organization. They may vary in their scope and structure, roles and responsibilities, internal characteristics and external relationships, but together they demonstrate that they can improve conditions when they involve people in the plans and programs that affect their lives.

Neighborhood service organizations have diverse origins and a range of activities. Some originate in crises which awaken the community before residents set agendas of their own. Others originate when residents initiate a particular program which develops to a stage where they operate several services affecting many aspects of life. Whatever their origins, such initiatives are not a form of outside advocacy for local groups, or of mandated participation in plans from elsewhere, or of subarea planning in

which central agencies deconcentrate functions to local subareas, but a process in which people help themselves and their communities (2).

Neighborhood service organizations often integrate strategies responsive to needs. Previous community-based organizations have tended to emphasize singular strategies; or view strategies as distinct or irreconcilable; or poorly manage the transition from one strategy to another. In contrast, neighborhood service organizations tend to mix and phase strategies to plan programs and develop services without weakening their ability to advocate change (Checkoway 1987, Kolodny 1985).

Neighborhood service organizations can benefit individuals that participate in them. Studies suggest that some residents of low income neighborhoods show symptoms of alienation which affect their ability or willingness to participate in the community. However, evidence also indicates that participation in neighborhood organizations can strengthen feelings of confidence and efficacy; increase social interaction and group motivation; and contribute to leadership development and collective capacity. This is not to suggest that such benefits are evenly shared by individuals in neighborhoods, or that participation in organizations is more therapeutic than increased income, education, or occupational status. But participation can produce positive personal changes (Bulmer 1986, Checkoway 1988, Heller et al. 1984, Naparstek, Biegel and Spiro 1982, Unger and Wandersman 1985).

Neighborhood service organizations also can contribute to organizational development. It is difficult to organize around neighborhoods when residents operate in isolation, or lack local vehicles for intervention, or accept

outside control over local development. However, neighborhood organizations can provide ways for individuals to come together, discuss common concerns, and take collective action. Such initiatives are increasing in number as individuals recognize the importance of organization in creating change (Henderson and Thomas 1987).

Neighborhood service organizations also can improve services by making them more responsive to needs. Studies suggest that neighborhood organizations can increase access to services although quality may vary from one area to another. For example, evaluations indicate that neighborhood health centers can help reduce infant mortality, improve health status, and increase access to care at an affordable cost, while also involving underserved populations in planning and administration (Geiger 1984). This is not to suggest that neighborhood organizations necessarily provide better services than central agencies. But the fact is that some neighborhood organizations provide some services which improve conditions (Cunningham and Kotler 1983, Mayer 1986).

There are obstacles to expanding participation in neighborhood service organizations. But despite obstacles, some organizations have produced results. The organizations provide lessons, although problems and choices remain (Checkoway 1985a).

Case Studies of Innovative Organizations

This section describes three neighborhood service organizations which encourage participation in Detroit. Several studies document disinvestment and deterioration (Bukowczyk 1986, Darden et al. 1987, Watkins 1985) and reinvestment and revitalization (Chaffers 1986, Conot 1986, Goldstein 1986, Thomas 1985, 1988) in the city and its neighborhoods. Soup kitchens, housing shelters, and health clinics report increased requests for emergency services. City officials report that the infant mortality rate rose thirty-five percent in 1985 with some areas approaching Third World levels of more than thirty infant deaths per thousand. Black infant mortality is twice white infant mortality in medical wastelands where underserved residents lack access to affordable care.

Limited resources for this study constrained the research methodology and forced reliance on a few cases. The methodology can be summarized as follows: A steering committee representing organizational leaders and neighborhood residents was formed to participate in project development; criteria were developed to evaluate organizations and develop research questions; informed sources were asked to nominate organizations according to criteria; site visits were arranged to gather information and interview individuals at selected sites. Interviews were conducted using an instrument designed and pretested to guide questions related to research. Information was sought on organizational origins and objectives, activities and accomplishments, facilitating and limiting forces, general propositions and lessons learned. Steering committee members and organizational resource persons participated in the research process and discussed their ideas in an

educational workshop designed in accordance with "action research" and "training of trainers" principles (3).

The following descriptions are to the extent possible taken directly from organizational materials, site visits, and interviews. The aim is to describe each organization in the words of its participants.

Hartford Memorial Baptist Church

Hartford Memorial Baptist Church is located in a predominantly low and moderate income neighborhood in northwest Detroit. Although many residents hold stable employment and inhabit structurally sound housing, others face economic and social problems and turn to the church for help.

Hartford has a history of community action. For years the church was led by a person who advocated civil rights in public housing, provided facilities for automobile workers to organize a labor union, and invited progressive Black leaders to lecture from the pulpit despite white harassment. He was followed by a pastor who has led the city's largest civil rights organization, organized boycotts against discrimination in public parks, and pressured businesses to reinvest in the city. He has recruited talented assistants and committed laypersons to leadership positions, and challenged church members to respond "to the pain and problems of suffering human beings who are unemployed, unemployable, poorly housed, ill-clad, hungry, and abandoned by the economic and social support systems that sustained them in the past" (Adams 1982).

In the 1970s, Hartford established a program for disadvantaged preschool children from families at risk. The program provides learning experiences to encourage social development, nutritional supplements, health screening and referral. The program involves parents in program planning, group training, and special projects designed to stimulate participation.

Hartford also established a senior citizens center which serves lunch in neighborhood sites, and which provides programs to reduce social isolation. Hartford also established an economic development corporation to plan for neighborhood revitalization. They have purchased over \$20,000,000 worth of property and encouraged institutions to locate in the area.

In 1982 Hartford established Agape House as a facility "to bring the spirit of social service and maximum involvement to the community." Through this they provide free food and clothing for the needy, free medical services to those without health insurance or money for private care. They provide counseling to individuals and families, telephone programs for persons with personal crises or children without adult supervision, and job training for unemployed workers (Hartford Agape House n.d.).

Church and community members participate in program planning. Planning often originates with awareness of problems which require action. Individuals may call the church for help, church leaders or community members may identify needs, and a group may form to plan programs responsive to needs. Each program is organized around a core group or committee of volunteers responsible for implementation. Some volunteers gather and distribute food, others conduct or

enroll in courses on helping skills, yet others provide medical care or refer persons to cooperating physicians and nurses.

Each committee is represented on the board of directors. Board members set policies, formulate plans, and review programs. Board members represent program areas and neighborhood organizations, community service agencies, health and education institutions, labor unions and business associations, civil rights groups and legislative offices.

The organization is led by church officials and community members. The president is the pastor who grew up in the neighborhood and inspires people as "a man of tremendous vision who can speak equally to a person of much education and to a person with none at all. He has a common touch and an ability to inspire people that makes him a real leader." The executive director is an assistant to the pastor with experience as a religious leader and community organizer. He supervises core staff, manages program operations, and recruits and maintains volunteers. Church and community members serve as officers and commit significant time to the organization.

Agape House seeks to sensitize the community. Ministers preach to inspire change and counsel those with particular needs. They sponsor group discussions, training workshops, community conferences, and educational programs on change strategies. Health Fairs raise awareness of health problems. Family Days strengthen the family through sessions on family skills. Economic Awareness and Economic Empowerment Days emphasize job opportunities. They inform the community through mass media, newspaper columns, television and radio shows.

Franklin-Wright Settlements

Franklin-Wright Settlements are located on the east side of Detroit about four miles from downtown. Although once an area of small houses and commercial structures serving southern and eastern Europeans, over time the area has declined in housing and services for low income families, unemployed youth, and isolated elderly.

Franklin-Wright was established in 1881 and has adapted to changing neighborhood needs. In the 1880s workers established a day nursery and kindergarten for young children with working parents. In the 1920s they held health clinics and advocated improvements in sanitation and housing. In the 1940s they organized district councils, formed youth groups and senior citizen clubs, registered voters and transported them to the polls (Beattie, Courtis, and Sheplow 1948). In the 1960s they worked with juvenile gangs in the streets, sought community control in public facilities, and protested city plans which threatened the neighborhood. Today they provide early childhood intervention, youth counseling, family outreach and parental training, senior citizens programs, neighborhood advocacy and community development.

Franklin-Wright involves the community in the organization. A board of directors incorporates racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity in organizational governance. Board members select officers and serve on executive, long-range planning, buildings and grounds, housing and neighborhood development committees.

Long-range planning committee members employ a planning process for neighborhood service. The process began when they conducted a community survey, studied physical conditions, inventoried area services, and analyzed their own organizational activities. They documented crime, employment, housing and neighborhood development, child care, teenage pregnancy, legal aid, health, and other community conditions. For each condition, they indicated goals and objectives, specific strategies, board and staff responsibilities, and deadlines for implementation. They annually evaluate progress and discuss programs for the year (Franklin Wright Settlements, 1985).

Franklin-Wright operates from facilities around the area. One facility offers subsistence services, cultural and recreational activities, group work and outreach to strengthen skills of youth and adults. Another offers counseling for youth, programs for families, food for senior citizens, and assistance in community organizing. Yet another offers counseling for youth and advocacy for the elderly through satellite programs in public housing. Each facility is a physical meeting place, community center, and organizational resource.

A Franklin-Wright parent child center offers early childhood and parent education programs for the economically disadvantaged. A family growth and development center has child abuse counseling and family development training to strengthen family functioning. A senior outreach program provides support and advocacy for senior citizens. An employment project emphasizes education for unemployed youth who have dropped out of school. The project involves them in community service and returns them to the workplace. A sleepaway camp takes

low income youth from the neighborhood to a rural area for the summer. A neighborhood organization and community development unit plans projects addressing environmental concerns (Franklin Wright Settlements n.d.).

These programs recognize the importance of social development in low income neighborhoods. Many residents feel alienated from decisions or institutions affecting them. They often withdraw from participation in the community, although this should not be interpreted as apathy but as alienation from a situation from which they feel displaced. Franklin-Wright recognizes that reducing alienation and enhancing efficacy are a foundation for participation.

Franklin-Wright has a history of housing and neighborhood revitalization. In the 1970s, they formed a nonprofit housing corporation to help low and moderate income residents rehabilitate housing. Their major project was construction of a large-scale "village development" on the edge of the neighborhood. In the 1980s, they worked with district councils to develop a unity plan for revitalization. Board and staff members convened meetings for residents and homeowners with city officials to learn how to qualify for home improvement loans. Each summer they employ youth to rehabilitate a home of a neighborhood resident. The project provides employment training for youth and housing rehabilitation for residents.

Franklin-Wright has a history of community action. In the 1960s and 1970s, they applied action tactics to targets that threatened the neighborhood. Following an announcement by the city planning commission that land would be cleared for industrial expansion, they organized a new neighborhood association, testified at city planning and city council

meetings, and forced postponement of the decision. They opposed urban renewal plans for the area, demonstrated with welfare rights organizations for increased funding of social programs, and supported community control of the schools and other municipal services.

In the 1980s, Franklin-Wright formed a housing and neighborhood development committee to plan community programs. They established a neighborhood organization and community development unit and hired an organizer to assist in projects. Staff help create community block clubs and neighborhood watch programs. They cooperate with groups to conduct clean-up campaigns and demolish deteriorated structures. They participate in local boards and committees, and join coalitions on citywide issues.

Franklin-Wright takes a broad time perspective on neighborhood planning. They adapt to their situation in a style which respects their history. The executive director recognizes the serious problems they face, and contrasts Franklin-Wright with others that employ hit or miss tactics. "Seldom is the work of its members ever loudly heralded, few ever know how diligently they work behind the scenes on behalf of the community," he reports.

Franklin-Wright integrates individuals, families, and community in a multilevel approach to social development. Some analysts criticize settlements that serve residents rather than organize them for change. But Franklin-Wright aims to help people to develop themselves and enhance community without compromising the ability to create change.

Warren/Conner Development Coalition

Warren/Conner Development Coalition is an alliance of residents, businesses, and community service institutions working to revitalize an area on the city's east side. Despite economic changes which had weakened the neighborhood, many residents and institutions recognized its strengths and wanted to revitalize the area (Warren/Conner Development Coalition 1986).

Warren/Conner originated in the early 1980s with construction of a new health center whose staff convened neighborhood meetings to build support for revitalization. Local leaders incorporated as a nonprofit organization, hired an executive director with funds from the health center, and committed themselves to fight crime, unemployment, and blight.

Warren/Conner is governed by a board of directors representing residential, business, and institutional sections of the membership. The residential section includes block clubs and neighborhood councils; the business section includes industrial, commercial, and retail establishments; and the institutional section includes schools, churches, and service agencies. Each section selects representatives to the board; representatives form committees and task groups that take responsibilities; and section members provide a foundation for community participation.

Neighborhood planning is a regular activity of the coalition. Board members conduct meetings to plan for the year. They consult with each committee, task force, and membership section about areas of concern. They

then set goals and objectives, organize committees and staff assignments, and determine steps and dates for implementation.

Committees and task forces also may prepare plans. In 1985, the coalition formed a task force to design a long-range plan for community revitalization. The task force represented membership sections, reviewed city plans for the area, and drafted a document based on the identified needs of those who live and work in the community.

In that year they convened a coalition of member organizations to plan a joint proposal to the city's neighborhood opportunity fund. They felt that collaboration rather than competition would bring funds into a larger area for housing rehabilitation and economic development. They conducted planning meetings, worked with city planning and city council staff, and developed a joint proposal for an unprecedented grant to create United Street Networking and Planning: Building a Community (U-SNAP-BAC). U-SNAP-BAC involves residents and businesses from twelve organizations to plan housing programs, strengthen business, and provide jobs in the area.

The coalition implements programs consistent with plans. Project Cops and Neighbors (CAN), initiated in partnership with crime prevention police, form residential neighborhood and business watch organizations which conduct security surveys, crime prevention programs, theft prevention and self protection workshops. Project Beginning Alcohol and Addictions Basic Studies (BABES) presents substance abuse prevention programs to young children. Network Activated to Report Crime (NARC) provides safe ways for people to report suspected illegal activity through drop boxes and crime report

hotlines. Coalition programs have received awards for crime reduction in target areas.

In the area of youth development, Youth on the Edge...of Greatness (YOE) was established to involve young people in a structured program of academic support, character development, counseling and recreation. Community organizations and social agencies recommend youth; businesses identify employment opportunities; staff match participants with opportunities and involve families through home visits and group dialogues.

In the area of economic development, Detroit East Community Development Corporation was incorporated to strengthen community control of the neighborhood. The corporation is governed by its own board of residents, managed on a daily basis by the coalition, and sells stock to qualified shareholders each of whom has one vote regardless of the number of shares owned. Sixty percent of the assets are controlled by the community stockholders with the remaining assets held by the coalition. The goal is to create jobs, develop commerce, reduce blight, and encourage community control of the neighborhood economy.

An initial project of the corporation is Mack-Alter-Square, a six block commercial strip and community center. For this they completed a market feasibility analysis, assembled a development team, built corporate support and financial commitments, negotiated purchase agreements with private owners, and recruited tenants for the project.

The coalition also implements plans through research and education. Research involves neighborhood studies and release of information to residents for action. For example, they have studied the credit needs of residents and businesses, disinvestment decisions by public and private institutions, relocation of businesses from an area faced with factory expansion, and the impacts of proposed casino gambling on the neighborhood economy. They have studied plant closings by touring plants and learning from other communities, and have studied the proposed location of a prison by visiting other areas where prisons were located and questioning their residents. Some research is by coalition staff or resource persons, other is by members or residents themselves (Bessette 1987, Warren/Conner Development Coalition n.d.).

The coalition emphasizes education to develop community capacity through neighborhood meetings, public presentations, mass mailings, leaflet distribution, and personal contacts. Training workshops strengthen leadership on such topics as economic growth, organizational development, and strategic planning. Weekly lunch groups provide information exchange and mutual support. Quarterly meetings bring resident and business groups together to discuss problems for solution. Other quarterly meetings give community service institutions an opportunity to discuss the quantity and quality of services. Annual coalition meetings attract hundreds of members to discuss organizational activities and plans for the future. Community education thus goes beyond public relations to develop organizational and community capacity.

A major vehicle for community education is The Pipeline, the coalition's quarterly newspaper. The Pipeline provides information on issues, reports research results, analyzes news and takes editorial positions from a

neighborhood perspective. The newspaper covers such issues as plant relocation, crime prevention, and gun control. The newspaper circulates over 15,000 copies and represents the leading medium for neighborhood news.

The coalition also implements plans by neighborhood advocacy and political action. They review projects affecting the area and hold institutions accountable to neighborhood priorities. In response to plans to open a pawnshop, they mobilized the neighborhood to sign petitions and write letters in opposition, request public hearings on the issue, demand a more acceptable business, and finally defeat the proposal. In response to plans to open a pornographic bookstore, they convened meetings of concerned groups, wrote letters to public officials, prepared people to attend public hearings, and persuaded zoning board members to deny permission. In response to announced plans to locate a new prison, they conducted tours of other similar prisons to question their nearby residents, invited state agency officials to respond to questions, and held general meetings in the neighborhood before the agency decided to locate elsewhere. They have protested illegal drug sales in gas stations until action was taken, and responded to absentee landlords with tenant complaints.

The coalition recognizes the institutions and decisions that affect the area. They form or join task forces to study plant closings and ask plants to coordinate decisions with local priorities; to assure fair compensation for residences and businesses affected by changes in industry; and to create statewide neighborhood development programs. They cooperate with city officials on an ordinance to inform and involve neighborhoods faced with plant

closings. They analyze the internal impacts of external decisions, and the external context in which they operate.

Methods of Participation

Although these cases do not constitute a large enough sample from which to make broad judgments, it is possible to make preliminary observations about the methods of the organizations studied.

The methods used by the organizations are diverse and serve several functions. Among them are methods to organize groups for community action, plan programs and services, and advocate social and political change. They enhance individual and group competence, contribute to organizational and community development, and improve the delivery of services by making them more responsive to needs. They do not rely exclusively on "organizing," "planning," "services" or other singular strategies, but mix and phase various approaches.

Despite diversity, certain methods are common to the organizations. Boards and committees facilitate participation in all cases. Planning involves steps to assess conditions, set goals and objectives, build an organizational structure, formulate plans and implement programs. Community corporations create a mechanism to address the neighborhood economy. Community education helps develop capacity around critical understanding of problems and issues. Each organization seeks to involve the community in the organization and the organization in the community.

Each organization is unique in its program. Among them are a church that involves people in an extensive range of services, a settlement that responds to changing needs, and a coalition that mobilizes residents, business and service institutions around neighborhood needs. Each has its own background and environment, history and experience, activities and accomplishments. There is no single approach to participation in these organizations.

Factors Facilitating Participation

Individuals in each organization were asked about the factors influencing participation. Among the factors cited were those related to community leadership and voluntary action, organizational management and staff support, planning and collaboration with other organizations.

Community leadership is important in organizational practice. Each organization has active board or committee members who contribute to its work. They may formulate policies and represent institutions whose resources contribute to implementation; represent residential, business, and service groups that discuss solutions to problems; or manage programs and mobilize volunteers for implementation. Each organization has a core group taking leadership for change.

Voluntary action takes various forms in these organizations. They may chair a committee, conduct a meeting, publish a newsletter, or circulate a

petition. They may distribute food and clothing , serve meals to seniors, provide health care, or counsel families. There are many opportunities for voluntary action.

Each organization has an executive director with experience in management of community-based organizations. One has expertise in economic development and neighborhood revitalization. Another has background in social services and agency administration. Another, a pastor with training in community organization, inspires congregants to service from the pulpit, reaches out to the community, and manages from one to another project.

Staff support contributes to organizational practice. Each organization originated with staff that shared responsibility without specialization. With increases in resources and activities, staff differentiated to a stage where they specialize as administrators or organizers, program planners or project directors.

Planning is a resource for neighborhood participation. It may involve steps to assess conditions, set goals, and implement programs. It may involve informal discussions among key actors moving from one project to another. It is not a one-time process to produce a written plan, but a continuous process to develop capacity. It shows commitment to think ahead, anticipate alternatives, and achieve results.

These organizations benefit from collaboration with others. They develop knowledge through conferences and meetings, training workshops and development programs. They strengthen skills through information exchange and technical

assistance, resource publications and network newsletters. They join coalitions for resource allocation, capacity building, and interorganizational influence. These working relationships generate resources and increase influence beyond reach of what each could accomplish alone.

Conclusion

Neighborhood service organizations have increased in number and capacity. They have planned programs, developed services, and advocated change. They have provided health care, built housing, and strengthened the neighborhood economy. They have increased awareness of problems, developed leadership, and produced results.

Despite the accomplishments of such organizations, many neighborhoods and cities continue to decline. Neighborhoods, particularly the poorest and neediest ones, still suffer from disinvestment and decline. Cities continue to experience economic problems and employment changes, infrastructure deterioration and service inadequacies, withdrawal of population and institutions. Neighborhoods served by exceptional organizations contrast sharply with their surrounding areas. This contrast amplifies the accomplishments of organizations and the problems of cities and society.

Neighborhood service organizations demonstrate that people can plan programs, develop services, and advocate change at the local level. They show that the neighborhood is a unit of intervention which can benefit individuals; contribute to organizational and community development; and improve the delivery of services.

Neighborhood service organizations exemplify efforts at social justice to confront unequal conditions, encourage low income participation, and develop organizational capacity at the neighborhood level. They employ conflict management alternatives that go beyond reaction to crises and confrontations to create independent agendas of their own. They try to help

traditionally excluded people to address problems through early intervention and peaceful practice in neighborhoods. They add to the evidence that neighborhood groups can mediate and negotiate their surroundings without outside interests telling them what they need, and that they can improve their community when they participate and plan for themselves.

Yet even exceptional organizations have difficulties influencing the larger context in which they operate. They can take hold of their surroundings, take collective action, and improve their communities. But even the most accomplished organizations cannot be expected to reverse citywide decline. Neighborhood problems often result from decisions and institutions that originate outside the neighborhoods, and the consequences flow from that process. To alter the consequences, it would be necessary to alter the process.

NOTES

(1) This paper is based on a pilot study supported by the Program in Conflict Management Alternatives (through a mini-grant, through funding from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation), and by the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan. An earlier version was invited for presentation at the International Symposium on Neighborhood Policy sponsored by the Laboratory of Architecture and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Samuel Neamon Institute for Advanced Studies in Science and Technology at the Technion Israel Institute of Technology. The author acknowledges the assistance of Maggie DeSantis, Gerald Smith, Reverend Mangedwa Nyathi and other resource persons, although the views reported are solely his.

(2) The distinction between neighborhood planning and subarea planning is analyzed in Bachelor and Jones (1981) and Checkoway (1984). This section draws directly on Checkoway (1984, 1985a, 1985b) which report additional references.

(3) Action research methodology is reviewed in Brown and Tandon (1983).

REFERENCES

- Adams, C.G. 1982. A challenge to churches. n.p.
- Bachelor, L. and B. Jones. 1981. Managed participation in Detroit's Neighborhood Opportunity Fund. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 17: 518-536.
- Beattie, J.A., S. Curtis, and S. Sheplow. 1948. *The Franklin scene: An informal history of Detroit's oldest social settlement*. Detroit: n.p.
- Bessette, M.C. 1987. Summary of businesses relocated for new Chrysler city project. Detroit: Warren/Conner Development Coalition Economic Development Task Force.
- Brown, L.D. and R. Tandon. 1983. Ideology and political economy in inquiry: Action research and participatory research. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 19: 277-294.
- Bukowczyk, J.J. 1986. The Poletown case and the future of Detroit's neighborhoods. *Michigan Quarterly Review*. 25: 449-453.
- Bulmer, M. 1986. *Neighbours: The work of Philip Abrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaffers, J. City of promise: The shape of Detroit's environment. *Michigan Quarterly Review*. 25: 435-448.
- Checkoway, B. 1988. Community-based initiatives to improve health of the elderly. Ann Arbor: Kellogg International Program.
- Checkoway, B. 1985a. Neighborhood planning organizations: Perspectives and choices. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 21: 471-486.
- Checkoway, B. 1984. Two types of planning in neighborhoods. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 3: 102-109.
- Checkoway, B. 1985b. Revitalizing an urban neighborhood: A St. Louis case study. In B. Checkoway and C.V. Patton, eds. *The metropolitan midwest: Policy problems and prospects for change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Checkoway, B. 1987. Six Empowerment Strategies for Low-Income Communities. *National Civic Review*. 76: 403-408.
- Conot, R. 1986. *American odyssey*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

- Cunningham, J.V. and M. Kotler. 1983. Building neighborhood organizations. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Darden, J.T., et al. 1987. Detroit: Race and uneven development. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Franklin Wright Settlements. 1985. Long range planning report: 1985-1989. Detroit: Franklin Wright Settlements.
- Franklin Wright Settlements. n.d. Summary of services. Detroit: Franklin Wright Settlements.
- Geiger, H.J. 1984. Community health centers: Health care as an instrument of social change. In V. Sidel and R. Sidel, eds. Reforming medicine. New York: Pantheon Press.
- Goldstein, L., ed. 1986. Detroit: An American city. Michigan Quarterly Review. 25: special issue.
- Hartford Agape House. n.d. Services for the community. Detroit: Hartford Memorial Baptist Church.
- Heller, K., et al. 1984. Psychology and community change. Homewood: Dorsey.
- Henderson, P. and D.N. Thomas. 1987. Skills in neighbourhood work. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kolodny, R. 1985. Organizing for neighborhood development. Washington: Center for Community Change.
- Mayer, N.S. 1986. Roles for planners in community development. In B. Checkoway, ed. Strategic perspectives on planning practice. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Naparstek, A., O. Biegel, and H. Spiro. 1982. Neighborhood networks for humane mental health care. New York: Plenum Press.
- Thomas, J.M. 1985. Neighborhood response to redevelopment in Detroit. Community Development Journal. 20: 89-98.
- Thomas, J.M. 1988. Racial crisis and the fall of the Detroit city plan commission. Journal of the American Planning Association. 54: 150-161.
- 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.

881

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.

Warren/Conner Development Coalition. n.d. The economic impacts of casino gambling in Detroit and its neighborhoods. Detroit: Economic Development Task Force and Study Group.

Warren/Conner Development Coalition. 1986. Residents, businesses and institutions working together to rebuild the Warren-Conner community. Detroit: Warren/Conner Development Coalition.

Wilson, W.J. 1987. The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.