THE ORGANIZATIONALLY DEPENDENT COMMUNITY
A Comparative Study of Neighborhood Attachment

EDWARD CRENSHAW
University of North Carolina
CRAIG ST.JOHN
University of Oklahoma

We introduce the concept "organizationally dependent" community to describe communities that lack the basis for developing attachment through informal social integration and in which the primary source of attachment is participation in formal organizations created to protect the community from outside threats. Neighborhoods experiencing residential renovation are examples of organizationally dependent communities. Because renovators are newcomers to their neighborhoods they cannot rely on informal social networks to solve neighborhood problems, but they can become involved in formal organizations to do so. This type of participation becomes an important source of neighborhood attachment. Data testing this hypothesis, generally, are consistent with it.

In this study we introduce a new concept that we think describes the social foundation of an emerging community, the renovated neighborhood.[1] Renovated neighborhoods can be described as "organizationally dependent" communities. In short, sentiment and attachment among residents of such communities are more a function of participation in formal organizations than of the informal social networks often noted in neighborhood attachment research (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Goudy, 1977; Roach and O'Brien, 1982; St.John et al., 1986). We believe renovated neighborhoods are likely to be organizationally dependent because their residents are not well integrated into local social life and because they have the need to organize for neighborhood protection. For reasons that will be discussed, residents of renovated neighborhoods probably are more likely to take a stand against perceived threats to

URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY, Vol. 24 No. 3, March 1989 412-434

their neighborhoods and less likely to respond to threats by moving than are residents of other neighborhoods. As a result, renovated neighborhoods should have a higher level of organizational participation than other neighborhoods, and this participation is likely to enhance the neighborhood attachment of renovators.

THE ORGANIZATIONALLY DEPENDENT COMMUNITY

Since Park and Burgess (1925) introduced the concept of "natural communities," many have questioned the validity of representing urban communities as natural products of primordial solidarities (or communality based on ascribed statuses and social interaction). Moreover, many have doubted the validity of continuing to view the neighborhood as the functional link between urban residents and their environments. Increases in mobility and urban bureaucracy have influenced scholars to argue that neighborhoods no longer are important spatial or social units in understanding human behavior but, rather, have been replaced by diffuse and differentiated social networks with little territorial referent (Wellman, 1976; Taub et al., 1977; Wellman and Leighton, 1979). However, many empirical studies have shown that urban residents still integrate into their neighborhood environments, and their behavior patterns are influenced by the neighborhood (Suttles, 1968; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Hunter, 1974, 1975), which has adapted to the processes of broader societal change.

In general, the natural community has been replaced by the "community of limited liability" (Janowitz, 1952: 222-223). Although similarity of ascribed status and interpersonal contact might still contribute to the development of sentiment, urban residents increasingly view their neighborhoods as consumer goods with commitment based on economic rationality. Given this description, it is important to understand new mechanisms that enhance neighborhood attachment.

Janowitz and Suttles (1978) have proposed that the urban community has evolved from natural communities based on in-group solidarities into a multitiered hierarchy of community organization. The *social bloc* is the smallest unit of community organization. At this level a sense of community is built on person-to-person contact, shared demographic and social characteristics, and a similar view of the residential area. The social bloc is the heir of Park and Burgess's natural community.

Moreover, the social bloc is the most threatened by market forces and broader social change. However, to mobilize the people effectively within a social bloc against environmental threat is difficult because of its small size.

In response to a complex environment a second tier, the *organizational community*, developed within neighborhoods. Because people within social blocs find it difficult to communicate with one another, with other neighborhoods, and with government agencies, and to defend against the city at large, they create voluntary associations (for example, neighborhood associations and crime prevention associations) that constitute organizational communities. In lieu of natural communities, organizational communities now mediate between neighborhoods and their environments and serve as a basis of residential cohesion.[2]

In this study we focus on how the organizational community contributes to community integration and cohesion. An abundant literature demonstrates the importance of this relationship (Hunter, 1974; Fischer et al., 1977; Ahlbrandt and Cunningham, 1979). For example, Hunter (1975), in a study of an urban neighborhood in Rochester, New York, found that a community organization originally formed in response to local problems now serves as a mechanism of social integration that leads participants to increased informal neighboring and to an increased sense of community. Similarly, Ahlbrandt (1984) found that for 74 neighborhoods in Pittsburgh, involvement in the "social fabric" of a neighborhood is positively related to neighborhood attachment and loyalty. Included as an element of the social fabric is belonging to neighborhood organizations. However, more specifically, we examine how the activities of voluntary associations contribute to the development of neighborhood attachment among neighborhoods in which the residents have not developed extensive local social networks. Residents of such neighborhoods are more likely than others to rely on an organizational core for contacts with the rest of the community and to communicate their interests to the larger environment. In so doing, they might develop sentiment toward the communities those organizations represent.

We argue that renovated neighborhoods are examples of *organizationally dependent communities* in which community sentiment results more from participation in voluntary associations than from interaction within social blocs. Such communities are likely to form where sufficient population turnover or ethnic, racial, or socioeconomic heterogeneity

discourages social interaction and where internal or external threats to the viability of the community provide a need for action. Neighborhoods that are experiencing renovation are likely to display these conditions.

In many ways, renovated neighborhoods combine features of communities of limited liability and "defended neighborhoods" (Suttles, 1972). Residents of renovated neighborhoods tend to be middle and upper class, young, highly mobile, and have considerable latitude in choosing a place to live. Not having lived in their neighborhoods long, they are unlikely to be well integrated into informal social networks. Further, where renovation has significantly increased property values, owning property can be viewed as a financial investment. Consequently, it is reasonable to view renovated neighborhoods as "consumer goods" to be treated on the basis of economic rationality.

On the other hand, renovators have many characteristics typical of residents of defended neighborhoods (Suttles, 1972: 34-37). They are likely to feel sentimental attachment to the architectural features of their neighborhoods and, because of the publicity generated by inner-city revitalization, probably are especially aware of neighborhood boundaries. Renovated neighborhoods have come to be associated with well-defined subcultures and life-styles. Because of the residential investments renovators make, they might develop ego-identification with the prestige of their neighborhoods. Finally, given the inner-city location of their neighborhoods, renovators often face a common neighborhood threat. This combination of limited liability and defended neighborhood characteristics increases the importance of formal organizations as the basis of community in renovated neighborhoods.

A number of negative features accompany renovation. Renovated neighborhoods frequently are located in or near high-crime areas, close to central business districts with their noise and pollution, near encroaching undesirable land uses, and in areas with racially, ethnically, and economically heterogeneous populations. With the "community of limited liability" model these features would encourage middle- and upper-class residents to move. However, this model seems more applicable to neighborhoods in which favorable conditions have become threatened than to neighborhoods where the initial conditions are suspect but that incoming residents hope to improve.

Alternatively, residents of renovated neighborhoods differ from the residents of neighborhoods typically thought of as defended and have different resources for facing threat. Whereas residents of renovated neighborhoods tend to be white, reasonably wealthy, and choose to live

in neighborhoods that are known to be threatened, the latter are more racially and ethnically mixed, less wealthy, and seeking to maintain neighborhoods that once were without threat. In addition, renovated neighborhoods are characterized by population turnover and thus many residents lack strong informal social ties in the community. In typical defended neighborhoods, population turnover is less, and informal social ties are stronger.

Choosing to live in neighborhoods facing external threats and lacking informal social cohesion, residents of renovated neighborhoods must use alternative methods to protect their neighborhoods. Building on high levels of education and financial resources, renovators can organize and fund formal organizations that provide protection. Neighborhood improvement associations designed to ensure that residents keep property up to code and to fight the encroachment of undesirable land uses are one example of such organizations. Crime watch associations that actively patrol neighborhoods, purchase private protection, or exert pressure on police departments for better service are another. Renovators are not the only ones to engage in such activities, but because they lack the local busybody to keep an eye on things or close friends to watch out for each other, they have only these formal activities on which to rely. Consequently, participation in such formal organizations is likely to be more prevalent in renovated neighborhoods than in others.

Building on these arguments, we develop and test two main hypotheses in this study. The first hypothesis is that because renovators have chosen to live in neighborhoods that are characterized by external threat and weak informal social networks, renovated neighborhoods will have more highly developed formal organizations than other neighborhoods. An accompanying subhypothesis is that the renovator/nonrenovator difference in formal organization participation should be in response to greater perceived threat on the part of renovators. The second hypothesis posits that because formal organization activities are the most important means of protecting renovated neighborhoods from outside threat, the effect of perceived threat on participation in formal neighborhood organizations will be greater for renovators than for nonrenovators.

Implicit in these hypotheses and the arguments on which they are based is the assumption that perception of neighborhood threat leads to participation in neighborhood organizations, which, in turn, leads to increased attachment. Others might argue that participation in neighbor-

hood organizations contributes to perceptions of threat (for example, Skogan and Maxfeld, 1981) or that being committed to one's neighborhood often is a precursor to participation in neighborhood organizations. With cross-sectional survey data, like that used in this study, the causal ambiguities that pertain to these issues cannot be disentangled. Neighborhood associations can be appropriately thought of as "tools" designed to address specific problems. This is consistent with our observations in Oklahoma City, our research setting, that many neighborhood organizations "lie dormant" most of the time and become active only when neighborhood residents perceive a problem that requires collective action to solve. Once in action, participants' perceptions of the seriousness of problems might be influenced to some extent through interaction with others, but it is the initial perception that precedes participation.

Similarly, we do not doubt that people who are attached to their neighborhoods are more likely to join neighborhood organizations than are others. However, we believe the strength of the relationship between participation and attachment lies in the other direction. Expending time, energy, and money for a neighborhood cause and developing a sense of collective effort should induce strong allegiance. Furthermore, when we examine the effects of participation in neighborhood organizations on attachment, we control (see next section) for a number of individual characteristics that are related to attachment. In effect, following this procedure holds constant the levels of neighborhood attachment existing independent of participation in neighborhood organizations.

DATA AND METHODS

The data we report come from two sources. First, we use data collected in the 1985 Oklahoma City Survey. This survey is one of the annual community surveys conducted by the sociology department of the University of Oklahoma. It is based on a random sample drawn from the *Polk City Directory*, which is a complete listing of residences in Oklahoma City and of the adults who live at each residence. Interviews were conducted by trained interviewers in the homes of respondents. When possible, interviews were scheduled in advance by telephone. Refusals at this stage were replaced by resampling from the directory. Refusals in the field were replaced by interviewers soliciting interviews

door-to-door within a three-block radius of the original respondent's home. Resampling or replacement was required for approximately 25% of the original sample. These procedures were followed until a sample of 360 cases was produced. A comparison of the demographic characteristics of this sample with population parameters for Oklahoma City reported in the 1980 U.S. Census did not yield significant differences.

Because neighborhood renovation is a relatively rare phenomenon, we did not expect to capture enough renovators in the Oklahoma City Survey for our analysis. Rather, these survey respondents primarily serve as a comparison group. To obtain data for renovators we asked informants at the Neighborhood Development and Conservation Center (NDCC) to help us identify neighborhoods where a substantial amount of private residential reinvestment was occurring.[3] With the assistance of this agency we identified three neighborhoods likely to contain residents who could be considered renovators. Each of these neighborhoods (1) was built before 1939, (2) had at one time been a middle- or upper-class neighborhood but had experienced deterioration, (3) is located within a mile of the central business district, and (4) had recently been the site of private residential rehabilitation.

After selecting these target neighborhoods, we turned to the portion of the *Polk City Directory* that lists residences by street number and produced an exhaustive list of the residences found in the three neighborhoods. This sampling universe included 1,071 residences. From this list we randomly selected 40% of the residents from each neighborhood for a potential sample size of 428. Mail-back questionnaires were sent to each of these potential respondents. After a second mailing and a telephone follow-up we obtained completed questionnaires from 127 respondents. During our telephone follow-up we discovered that 72 members of our sample had changed addresses since publication of the *Polk City Directory*, reducing our potential sample size to 356. Thus 127 returned questionnaires represents a response rate of 36%.

That this response rate is not higher is somewhat problematic even though it is not bad for a mail-back survey. If persons who participate in neighborhood organizations were more likely than others to fill out and return a questionnaire pertaining to neighborhood issues, then our data will be biased toward finding participation in organizations in renovating areas, supporting our first hypothesis. This could be especially true if the people recently leaving renovated neighborhoods were unlikely to participate in neighborhood organizations.

Fortunately, there is independent evidence to support our hypothesis that does not contain this potential bias. NDCC plots the location of all known neighborhood associations in Oklahoma City on a map of the city also showing the boundaries of the city's historic preservation districts. These districts are the oldest residential areas of the city, are located near the central business district, and have been the sites of recent private renovation. Thus it is reasonable to think of them as renovating neighborhoods. In addition, the renovating neighborhoods studied in our research overlap considerably with these historic preservation areas. The map clearly shows a higher concentration of neighborhood associations in the historic preservation areas than in any other areas of Oklahoma City, as our first hypothesis would predict. However, this aggregate evidence does not guarantee against bias in our survey data. We caution the reader to keep this in mind as we report our results. That such bias could exist is less important in considering the second part of the first hypothesis and the second hypothesis, which focus on the process of neighborhood organization participation and attachment rather than on differences in their levels.

Since renovation usually is associated with home ownership and we believed the issues we are exploring are fundamentally different for homeowners and renters, we excluded renters from our analysis. This eliminated 111 cases from the Oklahoma City Survey data set. Of the remaining 249 respondents, 52 were living in the core area around the central business district, and 197 were living in peripheral areas of the city or in suburbs.

Because we suspected that not all of the respondents returning our questionnaire would be renovators even though they lived in neighborhoods experiencing renovation, we applied a set of discriminating criteria to them. To be considered a renovator, a respondent from one of the target neighborhoods had to (1) have lived at his/her present residence for less than 15 years, (2) own the home in which he/she was living, and (3) have made major improvements to the home such as additional construction, new plumbing, and landscaping. From the target neighborhoods 63 respondents qualified as renovators. Merging the two sources of data together for our analysis produced three groups: 63 renovators, 116 nonrenovators living in the core area of the city,[4] and 197 nonrenovators living in peripheral areas of the city or in suburbs. From these groupings two dummy variables were created that serve to compare both nonrenovators living in the core (CORE) and nonrenovators living on the periphery (PERIPH) to renovators.

In spite of the potential bias just mentioned, we believe these data and our definition of renovators and nonrenovators provide a conservative test of our hypotheses and, hence, are appropriate for the issues we examine. That Oklahoma City is relatively young and small by national standards has several important consequences for the renovation process. It really has no older neighborhoods that are of true historical significance like the Georgetown area in Washington, D.C., or Beacon Hill in Boston. Thus the neighborhoods on which we focus do not command the same kind of natural affect that others might. The renovating neighborhoods in our study, although they have experienced population turnover, have never "bottomed-out" in a condition of severe dilapidation or been occupied by groups very low in socioeconomic status.

Consequently, the people we have identified as renovators, for the most part, have neither had to make extensive improvements to their homes to make them livable nor had to move into neighborhoods largely inhabited by a low-income population. In addition, even though our target neighborhoods are located close to the central business district and near the lowest income and highest crime areas in the city, they are not surrounded by land uses and population subgroups that would be considered undesirable in cities that are larger and older. As a result, the risk and threat involved in renovating a home in one of these Oklahoma City neighborhoods probably are not as great as elsewhere.

Finally, we make our definition of being a renovator somewhat broad to guarantee that we will have a sufficient number of renovators for our analysis. Had we made our definition more stringent (for example, placed a higher floor under the cost of home improvements made) our "renovators" probably would have been more investment-conscious and more concerned with threats to their investments. Because of these features of our data, our renovating respondents are likely to be less subject to the process of developing attachment to their neighborhoods through formal organization participation than are renovating residents in more typical renovation contexts.

We measure perceived threat to one's neighborhood with two items. Using a Likert "strongly agree/strongly disagree" format we asked respondents to respond to the statement, "Some of the neighborhoods surrounding my own would not be places where I would like to live." We believe this item taps respondents' feelings of potential threat to their neighborhoods by undesirable land uses and population subgroups. Respondents agreeing with this statement are likely to anticipate future

undesirable change in their neighborhoods but that such change has yet to begin. Using a similar format, we also asked respondents to respond to the statement, "I am worried that my neighborhood may change for the worse in the near future." This item goes beyond the first by measuring how serious actual threats to the neighborhood are perceived to be. Respondents agreeing with this statement probably have observed what they believe are, at least, the first signs that their neighborhoods might be changing for the worse. We treat these items as separate, single-item indicators of neighborhood threat. Their zero-order correlation is 0.132, indicating that this is appropriate. We predict that renovators will respond that their neighborhoods are more surrounded (SURROUND) and face greater negative change (CHANGE) than nonrenovators and that these perceptions will lead renovators to be more actively involved in neighborhood formal organizations than will others.

We measure participation in formal neighborhood organization activities by asking respondents how many times in the past year they attended (1) a meeting or activity sponsored by a neighborhood association (ASSOC) and (2) a meeting or activity sponsored by a neighborhood crime prevention organization (CRIME). Answers to these questions are treated as continuous variables. Respondents reporting that they were unaware of any neighborhood associations or crime prevention organizations in their neighborhoods received scores of 0 on these variables. Also included, primarily as control variables, are two measures of informal neighborhood social integration. These two variables are (1) the number of times a respondent has contact with neighborhood friends in a week (FRIENDS) and (2) the number of times a respondent attends services at a neighborhood church in a month (CHURCH). These variables are both treated as continuous. Respondents reporting no friends in the neighborhood and not belonging to a neighborhood church received scores of 0 on these variables.

We measure neighborhood attachment with three items having Likert "strongly agree/strongly disagree" formats. The three items are (1) "If I had to move from my neighborhood, I would be sorry to leave," (2) "I am really interested in what happens in my neighborhood," and (3) "It would make me happy to still be living in this neighborhood five years from now." Factor analysis indicated that these items all load on a single factor. An attachment scale (ATTACH) was created by summing the z-score transformations of these items.

Finally, we include a number of additional demographic, social, and economic variables in our analysis as controls. These variables begin to hold constant objective features of neighborhoods and the personal resources of the respondents and have been shown to be related to neighborhood or community satisfaction and attachment (Marans and Rodgers, 1975; Miller et al., 1980; Stipak and Hensler, 1983; St.John and Clark, 1984; Herting and Guest, 1985; St.John et al., 1986). These variables are family income (FAMINC), education (EDUC), occupation of the head of the respondent's household (OCC), reported value of the respondent's home (VALUE), length of time lived at the current residence (LENGTH), age (AGE), gender (SEX), and race (RACE).[5] Zero-order correlations for all of the variables used in our analysis are presented in Table 1.

RESULTS

We begin by examining some of the descriptive statistics for the independent variables in this study separately for renovators and nonrenovators (both in the core and on the periphery) to see how they differ. These statistics are presented in Table 2. They show that renovators are wealthier, more highly educated, and have higher-status occupations than the nonrenovators. They also show that renovators are younger, live in more expensive houses, and have lived at their current residences for shorter periods of time. These comparisons are exactly as expected. Table 2 also shows descriptive statistics for the dependent variables separately for renovators and nonrenovators. Subgroup differences in these statistics also are as expected. We give greater attention to these differences in the multivariate analysis to follow.

Next we examine the effects of the renovation dummy variables, the neighborhood threat variables, and the neighborhood participation variables on neighborhood attachment while considering the control variables we have listed. This will show if the neighborhood participation variables have independent effects on neighborhood attachment and, hence, set the stage for the rest of the analysis. The results of this regression (not shown) indicate that participation in crime prevention organizations (CRIME) is positively related to neighborhood attachment but that participation in neighborhood organizations unrelated to crime prevention (ASSOC) is not. Thus our notion that being engaged

TABLE 1
Zero-Order Correlations for All Variables in Analysis

	CORE	PERIPH	FAMINC	EDUC	OCC	VALUE	LENGTH	AGE	RACE	SEX	SURROUND	CHANGE	ASSOC	CRIME	ATTACH
CORE	1.000														
PERIPH	-0.701	1.000													
FAMINC	-0.057	-0.103	1.000												
EDUC	-0.035	-0.158	0.309	1.000											
OCC	0.062	-0.159	0.115	0.297	1.000										
VALUE	-0.051	-0.188	0.519	0.335	0.208	1.000									
LENGTH	0.274	-0.070	-0.081	-0.182	0.120	-0.080	1.000								
AGE	0.187	-0.066	-0.053	-0.084	0.193	0.004	0.672	1.000							
RACE	-0.073	0.074	0.087	0.077	0.151	0.164	0.052	0.168	1.000						
SEX	0.044	0.071	-0.182	-0.097	0.316	-0.114	0.149	0.097	-0.070	1.000					
SURROUND	0.089	-0.176	0.026	0.095	0.082	0.095	0.070	0.087	0.055	-0.016	1.000				
CHANGE	0.002	-0.048	-0.100	-0.085	-0.041	-0.220	0.030	0.032	-0.099	-0.106	0.132	1.000			
ASSOC	0.085	-0.279	0.061	0.145	0.155	0.192	-0.083	-0.014	0.055	-0.065	0.069	0.060	1.000		
CRIME	0.069	-0.167	0.018	0.168	0.146	0.143	0.012	0.031	0.067	-0.024	0.059	0.070	0.730	1.000	
ATTACH	0.068	-0.131	0.009	0.033	0.122	0.277	0.223	0.283	0.135	0.066	0.105	-0.241	0.158	0.195	1.000

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics for Renovators and Nonrenovators

	MEANS		
VARIABLES	RENOVATORS	NONRENOVATORS in CORE	NONRENOVATORS on PERIPH
FAMINC	$67,213	$44,818	$44,291
EDUC	17.4 years	15.3 years	15.0 years
OCC	752 SEI	696 SEI	632 SEI
VALUE	$127,167	$84,497	$78,905
LENGTH	6.6 years	17.0 years	11.8 years
AGE	42.2 years	52.1 years	46.4 years
SEX	32% male	52% male	52% male
RACE	92% white	90% white	94% white
SURROUND	3.27	3.12	2.81
CHANGE	2.43	2.29	2.24
ASSOC	3.05 per year	1.60 per year	0.38 per year
CRIME	1.26 per year	0.87 per year	0.36 per year
ATTACH	0.49	0.24	-0.30
N	63	116	197

in protective formal organizations serves to enhance neighborhood attachment appears to be limited to participation in organizations designed to fight crime. Perhaps neighborhood associations have broader interests than crime prevention organizations and engage in many activities that are not of a protective nature that have little impact on how attached people are to their neighborhoods. Also, it is worth noting that both measures of informal neighborhood participation (FRIENDS and CHURCH) are positively related to attachment.

The two threat variables each have independent effects on attachment. Perceiving that one's neighborhood is surrounded by undesirable others (SURROUND) has a small but statistically significant positive effect on attachment, suggesting that believing one's neighborhood is located in a somewhat threatening environment leads to feelings of affect for the neighborhood. On the other hand, fearing that one's neighborhood is threatened by imminent change for the worse (CHANGE), a stronger element of fear than living near undesirable areas, has a strong negative effect on attachment. People who fear their neighborhoods might be on the decline soon are less committed to them than are others.

Finally, there are statistically significant differences in attachment between renovators and nonrenovators living on the periphery (PERIPH) and between renovators and nonrenovators living in the core (CORE). In both comparisons renovators have the higher level of attachment.

TABLE 3
Fear of Surroundings and Change as Dependent Variables

Independent variables	Dependent variables (1) SURROUND		(2) CHANGE	
CORE	-0.168	(-.076)	-0.366**	(-.164)
PERIPH	-0.429**	(-.210)	-0.409**	(-.199)
FAMINC	-0.001	(-.043)	0.001	(.001)
EDUC	0.019	(.064)	-0.016	(-.051)
OCC	0.001	(.010)	0.001	(.047)
VALUE	0.001	(.047)	-0.005***	(-.270)
LENGTH	0.005	(.055)	0.002	(.018)
AGE	0.003	(.045)	0.003	(.043)
SEX	-0.015	(-.007)	-0.296**	(-.144)
RACE	0.170	(.044)	-0.092	(-.024)
INTERCEPT	2.562		3.261	
R^2	0.051		0.089	

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses are standardized coefficients.
*p < .05 one-tailed test; **p < .01 one-tailed test; ***p < .001 one-tailed test.

In Table 3 we treat perception of being surrounded (SURROUND) and fear of unfavorable neighborhood change (CHANGE) as dependent variables in regression equations including the renovation dummy variables and the control variables. In the first column of this table we can see that nonrenovators living in the core (CORE) and nonrenovators living on the periphery (PERIPH) feel less like their neighborhoods are surrounded by undesirable areas than do renovators, although the first difference is not statistically significant. In the second column the regression coefficients for CORE and PERIPH are both negative and significant. This means that controlling for other variables, nonrenovators living in either the core or on the periphery of the city report being less fearful that their neighborhoods might change for the worse than do renovators. This finding provides strong support for our hypothesis that renovators are more likely than others to perceive that their neighborhoods are threatened.

In the next step of our analysis we examine the effects of the renovation dummy variables and the neighborhood threat variables on participation in formal neighborhood organizations. These results are presented in Table 4. Column one contains the results for participation

TABLE 4
Neighborhood Associations and Crime Prevention Organizations as Dependent Variables

Independent variables	Dependent variables (1) ASSOC		(2) CRIME	
CORE	-0.845*	(-.126)	-0.144	(-.035)
PERIPH	-2.061***	(-.333)	-0.558*	(-.145)
FAMINC	-0.006*	(-.079)	-0.005*	(-.107)
EDUC	0.021	(.023)	0.068*	(.119)
OCC	0.001*	(.103)	0.001	(.078)
VALUE	0.007**	(.132)	0.004*	(.127)
LENGTH	-0.024	(-.086)	0.006	(.031)
AGE	0.003	(.018)	-0.001	(-.013)
SEX	-0.275	(-.044)	-0.079	(-.021)
RACE	0.470	(.040)	0.344	(.047)
SURROUND	-0.022	(-.007)	-0.013	(-.007)
CHANGE	0.215*	(.071)	0.175*	(.094)
INTERCEPT	0.454		-1.212	
R^2	0.138		0.079	

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses are standardized coefficients.
*p < .05 one-tailed test; **p < .01 one-tailed test; ***p < .001 one-tailed test.

in a neighborhood association (ASSOC) as a dependent variable. The negative and significant coefficients for CORE and PERIPH indicate that, other things being equal, nonrenovators living either in the core or on the periphery participate less in neighborhood associations than do renovators. Also, fear of negative neighborhood change (CHANGE) has a modest positive effect on neighborhood association participation. Because renovators reported being more fearful than others that their neighborhoods might change for the worse, this effect represents an indirect path through which renovation influences participation in neighborhood associations.

A similar pattern of results is found for participation in crime prevention organizations. Nonrenovators living on the periphery participate less in organizations formed to combat crime than do renovators. A similar difference exists between renovators and nonrenovators living in the core, although this difference is not statistically significant. Further, fearing that one's neighborhood might change for the worse has a

positive effect on participation in a neighborhood crime prevention organization. As with neighborhood association participation, this is a source of an indirect effect of renovation on neighborhood formal organization participation.

We predicted that because renovators have chosen to make important financial and social investments in areas known to be at risk and because they are less able to resort to informal social mechanisms to combat that risk, they will be more likely than others to respond to perceived risk by participating in formal organizations. That is, we expect interactions between renovation and the perception of threat variables on participation in neighborhood associations and crime prevention organizations. We test for these interactions in Table 5. In this table, dummy variable interaction terms created by multiplying the renovation dummy variables by perception of being surrounded and fear of negative neighborhood change are added to the regressions reported in Table 4.

In column one of Table 5, we test for the interaction between renovation and perception of one's neighborhood being surrounded on participation in neighborhood associations. For this interaction we obtain unanticipated results. The coefficient pertaining to nonrenovators living in the core is significant and positive, indicating that the effect of perceived surroundedness on participation in neighborhood associations is greater for this group than for renovators, the opposite of our prediction. Although not significant, the coefficient for the interaction pertaining to nonrenovators living on the periphery also is positive. Furthermore, the coefficient for SURROUND, the main effect of this variable (the effect of SURROUND for renovators), is negative. Combining the main and interaction effects together shows that for nonrenovators living on the periphery the effect of SURROUND is near 0 (−.61 + .50 = .11), for nonrenovators living in the core the effect is positive (−.61 + 1.09 = .48), and for renovators the effect is negative (−.61). Thus the effect of SURROUND is very different for different residential groups.

In the second column for Table 5, we examine the interaction pertaining to fear of negative neighborhood change (CHANGE). The pattern of results for this interaction is exactly as we predicted: There are significant negative coefficients for both interaction terms, meaning the effect of CHANGE on participation in neighborhood associations is less positive for nonrenovators than for renovators. In fact, combining the main and interaction effects of CHANGE together shows its effect to be positive among renovators (.89) and near 0 for nonrenovators in the core (.89 − .74 = .15) and nonrenovators on the periphery (.89 − .85 = .04).

TABLE 5
Neighborhood Associations and Crime Prevention Organizations as Dependent Variables Including Interactions Between Renovator Dummy Variables and Neighborhood Threat Variables

Independent variables	Dependent variables[a] (1) ASSOC	(2) ASSOC	(3) CRIME	(4) CRIME
CORE	-4.310** (-.643)	0.921 (.137)	-2.507** (-.603)	1.447* (.348)
PERIPH	-3.710** (-.599)	-0.048 (-.008)	-1.495* (-.389)	1.065 (.277)
SURROUND	-0.608* (-.200)	0.018 (.006)	-0.381* (-.202)	0.019 (.010)
CHANGE	0.191 (.063)	0.889** (.296)	0.160* (.086)	0.741***(.397)
CORE x SURROUND	1.089** (.542)	---	0.743** (.597)	---
PERIPH x SURROUND	0.504 (.258)	---	0.282 (.232)	---
CORE x CHANGE	---	-0.741* (-.289)	---	-0.670** (-.421)
PERIPH x CHANGE	---	-0.849* (-.368)	---	-0.683** (-.478)
INTERCEPT	2.522	-1.140	0.076	-2.548
R^2	0.152	0.147	0.098	0.097

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses are standardized coefficients.
a. Included as control variables are: FAMINC, EDUC, OCC, VALUE, LENGTH, AGE, SEX, and RACE.
*p < .05 one-tailed test; **p < .01 one-tailed test; ***p < .001 one-tailed test.

We examine the interaction effects pertaining to participation in crime prevention organizations in columns three and four. These interactions follow exactly the same pattern as those pertaining to participation in neighborhood associations. For renovators the effect of SURROUND is negative (–.38), for nonrenovators living in the core the effect is positive (–.38 + .74 = .36), and for nonrenovators living on the periphery the effect is near 0 (–.38 + .28 = .10). Conversely, fearing that one's neighborhood might change for the worse has a strong positive effect on participation in neighborhood crime prevention organizations for renovators (.74), and virtually no effect for nonrenovators in the core (.74 – .67 = .07) and on the periphery (.74 – .68 = .06).[6]

The interactions reported for fear of negative neighborhood change support our hypothesis, but those pertaining to the perception that one's neighborhood is surrounded by undesirable areas do not. From these results it appears these two variables mean quite different things to our subgroups of respondents. This is consistent with our intent that perceiving one's neighborhood is surrounded by undesirable areas is an indicator of potential threat, whereas fearing one's neighborhood might change for the worse in the near future is an indicator of real and current threat. Among nonrenovators, potential threat might spur preventive collective action, but when the threat becomes real, residents might withdraw from collective endeavors seeking to minimize possible losses by abandoning socially, if not physically, their neighborhoods. Among renovators, believing that one's neighborhood is surrounded by undesirable areas—that is, facing potential threat—might simply be taken for granted as a fact of moving into a renovating neighborhood. As such, the level of threat produced by this belief might not be sufficient to encourage collective action among renovators. On the other hand, seeking to protect their new investments, the threat of actual negative neighborhood change might induce collective action among renovators, whereas it induced withdrawal among nonrenovators. This argument is consistent with the pattern of results we obtained.

RENOVATED NEIGHBORHOODS ARE ORGANIZATIONALLY DEPENDENT COMMUNITIES

We have examined the basis of neighborhood attachment in neighborhoods experiencing renovation in comparison to other neighborhoods. We have argued that renovating neighborhoods are an example of what

we have called "organizationally dependent" communities. Lacking an informal social foundation on which to build commitment to the community, organizationally dependent communities depend on the formal organizational activities of their residents to generate it. Because renovators lack social integration into their neighborhoods but do possess organizational skills, they will be more likely than others to respond to perceived threats to their neighborhoods by becoming involved in formal organizations formed to deal with them. From collectively seeking to deal with threats through formal organizations, renovators become attached to the entity they are seeking to protect.

We have tested this hypothesis by comparing data collected from residents of three neighborhoods in which renovation is known to be taking place with data collected from a general sample of the population of a metropolitan area. These data showed that, controlling for all of the other variables we considered relevant, the respondents we identified as renovators were more likely to report that their neighborhoods were surrounded by undesirable areas, a measure of potential threat, and that they feared their neighborhoods would change for the worse in the near future, a measure of real or actual threat. This difference tends to result in lower neighborhood attachment among renovators since perceived actual threat has a strong negative effect on neighborhood attachment. This negative effect, however, is mitigated somewhat by the fact that fear of undesirable neighborhood change is positively related to participation in formal organization activities, especially those dealing with crime prevention, which, in turn, is positively related to attachment.

Furthermore, we found that renovators were more likely than nonrenovators to translate their fear of undesirable neighborhood change into formal collective action to protect their neighborhoods. We believe this interaction results from renovators choosing to make important investments in neighborhoods with questionable status and then seeking to fight against further status deterioration. On the other hand, our results suggest that nonrenovators are more likely than renovators to respond collectively to the threat of potential undesirable change, a condition that might be accepted as commonplace among renovators and, hence, requires no response.

An additional result worth mentioning is that controlling for participation in neighborhood organizations, neighborhood threat, personal resources, and social and demographic characteristics, renovators are more attached to their neighborhoods than are nonrenovators. This unaccounted for difference might result from several sources.

Renovating neighborhoods may possess a special charm, prestige, or historical significance that is particularly attractive to persons wanting to move into older neighborhoods. Also the act of making substantial home improvements may contribute to a sense of investing oneself in a neighborhood, thereby leading to greater attachment. Finally, people who are willing to renovate older homes, even taking social and demographic characteristics into account, may be especially inclined to form strong bonds to whatever neighborhoods they live in. Regardless, given the intuitive importance of neighborhood attachment to promoting community stability, an examination of the relatively high attachment of renovators to their neighborhoods in greater detail would be worthwhile.

Because the formal organization activities of renovators are important sources of attachment to their neighborhoods, neighborhoods where renovation is taking place are examples of organizationally dependent communities. A potentially fruitful avenue for future research would be to examine the sources of attachment in other community settings where there is not a strong basis for informal social integration. Under what conditions would residents become organizationally active in these communities? How necessary are the elements of threat and personal investment to such activity? These are questions that must be answered to refine more fully the concept of the organizationally dependent community.

NOTES

1. By "renovated neighborhood" we mean one that is experiencing substantial private sector rehabilitation by individual homeowners. Typically, such neighborhoods are located in or near the core areas of large cities. Often, these neighborhoods are referred to as "gentrified neighborhoods." We prefer "renovated" to "gentrified" because the latter implies a "back to the city" movement which, in many cases, may not be true (Laska and Spain, 1980).

2. A third tier in the community hierarchy proposed by Janowitz and Suttles (1978) is the *aggregated metropolitan community*, a coalition of independent organizational communities. Aggregated metropolitan communities come into play when issues involve geographic areas wider than organizational communities. Such communities probably exist only on temporary or very fragmented bases and are larger than what we conceive of as neighborhoods.

3. NDCC is a private agency that assists neighborhoods in forming neighborhood associations and neighborhood watch programs. Also, it organizes a variety of activities designed to benefit neighborhoods.

4. None of the 127 respondents from the target neighborhoods were renters so adding the 64 nonrenovators from these neighborhoods to the other core area residents does not violate our decision to exclude renters from the analysis.

5. SEX is coded 1 for males and 0 for females and RACE is coded 1 for whites and 0 for nonwhites. FAMINC is total family income in dollars. EDUC is number of years of education completed. OCC is measured with Duncan's SEI. VALUE is measured in dollars. LENGTH and AGE are measured in years.

6. To substantiate the results of this dummy variable interaction analysis we performed regressions of participation in neighborhood associations and crime prevention organizations on SURROUND and CHANGE separately for renovators, nonrenovators in the core, and nonrenovators on the periphery. All of the control variables were included in these regressions. Coefficients for these effects are shown here. They are consistent with the results presented in Table 5.

	ASSOC		CRIME	
Groups	SURROUND	CHANGE	SURROUND	CHANGE
Renovators	−0.201	0.674	−0.165	0.562
Nonrenovators/CORE	0.510	0.111	0.317	0.116
Nonrenovators/PERIPH	−0.033	−0.006	−0.045	−0.003

REFERENCES

AHLBRANDT, R., Jr. (1984) Neighborhoods, People, and Community. New York: Plenum.

AHLBRANDT, R., Jr. and J. CUNNINGHAM (1979) A New Public Policy for Neighborhood Preservation. New York: Praeger.

FISCHER, C., R. JACKSON, C. STUEVE, K. GERSON, L. McCALLISTER-JONES, and M. BALDASSARE (1977) Networks and Places: Social Relations in the Urban Setting. New York: Free Press.

GOUDY, W. (1977) "Evaluation of local attributes and community satisfaction." Rural Sociology 42 (Fall): 371-382.

HERTING, J. and A. GUEST (1985) "Components of satisfaction with local areas in the metropolis." Soc. Q. 26 (Spring): 99-116.

HUNTER, A. (1974) Symbolic Communities: The Persistence and Change of Chicago's Local Communities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HUNTER, A. (1975) "The loss of community: an empirical test through replication." Amer. Soc. Rev. 40 (October): 537-552.

JANOWITZ, M. (1952) The Community Press in an Urban Setting. Glenco, IL: Free Press.

JANOWITZ, M. and G. SUTTLES (1978) "The social ecology of citizenship," pp. 80-104 in R. Sarri and Y. Hasenfeld (eds.), The Management of Human Services. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

KASARDA, J. and M. JANOWITZ (1974) "Community attachment in mass society." Amer. Soc. Rev. 39 (June): 328-339.

LASKA, S. and D. SPAIN (1980) Back to the City: Issues in Neighborhood Renovation. New York: Pergamon.

MARANS, R. and W. RODGERS (1975) "Toward an understanding of community satisfaction," pp. 299-352 in A. Hawley and V. Rock (eds.), Metropolitan America in Contemporary Perspective. New York: Halsted.

MILLER, F., S. TSEMBERIS, and G. MALIA (1980) "Neighborhood satisfaction among urban dwellers." J. of Social Issues 36 (Summer): 101-117.

PARK, R. and E. BURGESS (1925) The City. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

ROACH, M. and D. O'BRIEN (1982) "The impact of different kinds of neighborhood involvement on residents' overall evaluations of their neighborhoods." Soc. Focus 15 (October): 379-391.

SKOGAN, W. and M. MAXFIELD (1981) Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighborhood Reactions. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

STIPAK, B. and C. HENSLER (1983) "Effect of neighborhood racial and socioeconomic composition on urban residents' evaluations of their neighborhoods." Social Indicators Research 12 (April): 311-320.

ST.JOHN, C., M. AUSTIN, and Y. BABA (1986) "The question of community attachment revisited." Soc. Spectrum 6 (4): 411-431.

ST. JOHN, C. and F. CLARK (1984) "Racial differences in dimensions of neighborhood satisfaction." Social Indicators Research 15 (July): 43-60.

SUTTLES, G. (1968) The Social Order of the Slum. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

SUTTLES, G. (1972) The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

TAUB, R., G. SURGEON, S. LINDHOLM, P. OTTI, and A. BRIDGES (1977) "Urban voluntary associations, locally based and externally induced." Amer. J. of Sociology 83 (September): 425-442.

WELLMAN, B. (1976) "Urban connections." Research Paper 84, Center for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

WELLMAN, B. and B. LEIGHTON (1979) "Networks, neighborhoods, and communities: approaches to study of the community question." Urban Affairs Q. 14 (March): 363-390.

Edward Crenshaw is a doctoral student in sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and a trainee at the Carolina Population Center. In addition to gentrification, his current interests include invasion and succession cycles in suburbia, intra- and intermetropolitan migration patterns, empirical investigation of ecological-evolutionary theory, and issues relating to population and economic development.

Craig St.John is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Oklahoma. His recent research has focused on the standards people use to evaluate

the quality of their residential neighborhoods. In this work he has shown how evaluative standards are a function of individual and group life chances. Recent articles include "The Question of Community Attachment Revisited" (with Mark Austin and Yoko Baba) in Sociological Spectrum *and "Racial Differences in Neighborhood Evaluative Standards" in* Urban Affairs Quarterly. *He currently is working on a project to examine how stage in the life cycle influences evaluations of neighborhood quality.*