GROWING POWER?:

SOCIAL BENEFITS FROM URBAN GREENING PROJECTS

BY

LYNNE M. WESTPHAL
B.A., University of Wisconsin, 1982
M.A., Northeastern Illinois University, 1992

THESIS

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Public Policy Analysis-Urban Planning and Policy
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Chicago, 1999

Chicago, Illinois

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There is an irony in doing a dissertation: it is a very lonely process, but you don't do it alone. There are so many people to thank, people who have genuinely and generously helped me through this. At the risk of sounding like the Academy Award winner for best sound techniques in a film you've never heard of, I want to thank them all.

Many thanks to the 55 people who allowed a total stranger knocking on their door into their homes and their lives. My respondents' insights and heartfelt answers to my questions made my own task not only easier but a pleasure.

Suzanne Malec, Assistant Commissioner of the City of Chicago Department of Environment, and creator of the Green Corps program, has been the perfect researcher's ally. Eternally curious and striving to re-create her programs to make them better and better, Suzanne helped me think through quandaries in the data, and answer the pesky "so what?" question. Other Department of Environment staff were also of great help. Many thanks to Ellen Gibson-Kennedy, Kevin Carroll, DeAnna DeChristopher, and Richard Dobbins.

I had a *great* committee. I benefited greatly from George Hemmens, my advisor, and his experience ushering students through the dissertation process. Roberta Feldman introduced me to several mother loads in the literature, and helped me hone my analytic skills. Joanne Vining, Steve Warner, and Curt Winkle each lent valuable guidance and camaraderie. I can see each of you in this work, although, as they say, the goofs are mine and mine alone. Many, many thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE OF FIGURES

SUMMARY

In this study I investigated practitioners claims for social benefits of urban greening projects (e.g., tree planting, community gardens). Practitioners' claims of increased neighborliness, reduced drug dealing and other social benefits have led to interest in using greening projects specifically to achieve these ends.

Four sites that participated in a City of Chicago sponsored greening program in 1995 were selected for the study: two were sites where practitioners thought there were social benefits from the project, two were sites where practitioners thought there were no such benefits. Photo-elicitation and interview techniques were used to assess each site, including the greening projects. Project participants and nonparticipants were interviewed. Empowerment theory and the empirical literature on the meanings of urban green space structure the investigation and analysis.

Practitioners assessments of the benefits received modest support, but through lack of awareness of the full story on each block their assessments were not entirely accurate.

Empowerment theory was helpful in understanding some of the outcomes. The concepts of empowering processes versus empowered outcomes were particularly helpful. The postulation from empowerment theory of three levels of empowerment—individual, organization, and community—were problematic with these data. The empowering nature of each site's greening project and the organizing history of the block were important to achieving empowerment outcomes.

Metaphoric meanings of "clean" and "dirt" were found to be important to residents and a source of positive self- and group-image.

INTRODUCTION: THE CLAIMS OF SOCIAL BENEFITS OF URBAN

GREENING PROJECTS

Many neighborhoods in cities across America are beleaguered by a myriad of

problems: poverty, dilapidated housing stock, poor schools, lack of jobs, drug use and

street level drug sales, gangs and violence. Neighborhood residents and others interested in

solving these problems (e.g., academics, politicians, social and governmental agencies) are

in search of simple, effective tools to build upon community strengths and combat these

serious problems.

One group says it has just such a tool: urban greeners. Urban greening practitioners

organize their own projects or assist others to plant trees, create gardens on empty lots, and

add vegetation to urban areas in other ways. These practitioners report dramatic social

benefits for participating neighborhoods. Greening practitioners believe their projects can

be:

> used to improve the local environmental conditions and, more
> importantly, to utilize community tree care and stewardship as tools
> for community development, neighborhood empowerment, and
> social reform (Phillips & Garcia, 1994, p. 154)

This dissertation reports on research to investigate these claims and the potential

usefulness of urban greening projects for revitalizing communities.

Urban Greening for Social Well-being: Historical Perspective

The idea that nature in cities is important for social well-being is not new. The Reform and City Beautiful movements both argued in favor of open space for city dwellers (Cullingworth, 1997). To Frederick Law Olmstead, the leading landscape architect of the era, nature in cities provided not only fresh air for urban dwellers breathing in the smoke and soot of late 19th century American cities, nature also provided a revitalizing release from the stress of the work-a-day world and was a supportive moral force (Lewis, 1996). It was in the 1880's, during the "zenith of the City Beautiful movement" that Arbor Day began to be observed throughout the country (Foster, 1987, p. 4), encouraging individuals and civic organizations to plant trees.

These ideas are reflected a century later in two presidential actions: the Johnson administration's White House Conference on Natural Beauty and the Reagan administration's Commission on Americans Outdoors. In a message to the Congress announcing the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, Johnson said:

> …some things we do know. Association with beauty can enlarge
> man's imagination and revive his spirit. Ugliness can demean the
> people who live among it. What a citizen sees every day is his
> America. If it is attractive it adds to the quality of his life. If it is
> ugly it can degrade his existence. (Johnson, 1965, p. 2)

In the Commission report recreation in general, and access to nearby natural settings in particular, are espoused as supportive of family strength, and of individual and community well-being (Commission, 1987).

It is culturally accepted—some say a cultural myth—that nature is good for the human psyche and spirit (Schmitt, 1990). The influence of this idea can be seen in not only in the examples above, but also in the latest resurgence of the urban greening movement these past three decades.

The Urban Greening Movement

There has been a resurgence of practitioner evidence of the potentially dramatic effects of nature in cities. There is also a new twist. Today's advocates see social well-being enhanced not only by the presence of nature—specifically trees and other plants—but also by citizens' active involvement in planting, maintaining, and even harvesting plants in their neighborhoods.

There are two primary branches of the urban greening movement: urban and community forestry, and community gardening/open space. Although these two subgroups overlap a bit, they also differ in important ways.

The Urban and Community Forestry Movement

Urban and community forestry was a product of two forces in the 1970s: increasing environmental concern and severely decreasing municipal budgets (e.g., Karp, 1973; Lipkis & Lipkis, 1990). Local volunteers and organizers pressed for increased city urban forestry budgets, helped city staff with outreach, created tree councils, wrote tree protection and landscape ordinances, and, of course, planted trees. The movement found support in American Forests, a national nonprofit group with the motto "People caring for trees and forest since 1875." American Forests supported and, to a certain extent, steered

the fledgling urban and community forestry movement. Although some groups were active

at the local block level from the start, most groups began to recognize the importance of

working at the block or neighborhood level in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The urban

and community forestry movement is thought of as grassroots by the USDA Forest

Service, as the movement is based by and large in municipality-wide organizations rather

than federal, state, or municipal government (Lyons, 1986; Vento, 1994).

<div align="center">The Community Open Space Movement</div>

The community open space movement started as more of a grass roots movement,

in local response to disenfranchisement and abandonment of city neighborhoods (Francis,

Cashdan, & Paxson, 1984). These urban greeners took all-too-available vacant land in

cities and put it to good use. Community open space often incorporated food production

(i.e., gardens or orchards) on individual or communal plots. A national level group, the

American Community Gardening Association, was formed in 1984 to foster an exchange

of ideas between community garden groups across the country (Francis et al., 1984).

In 1991, a definition of community greening was proposed that brings these various

strands together.

> [Community greening] has a social and political context. It is an
> essential, often grassroots activity that derives from and bridges the
> environmental, civil rights, and horticultural movements of the
> 1960s. It is undertaken, in part, to encourage feelings of
> empowerment, connectedness, and common concern among the
> settlement's human residents and visitors (Breslav, 1991, p. 9).

Community organizing principles and community development ideas came sooner

to the community open space movement than to the urban and community forestry

movement. Both movements, however, are committed to the idea that enhanced access to nature for urban dwellers is good and worthwhile, capable of bringing many benefits to city residents.

Urban Greening for Social Well-being: Current Observations

Let's begin our look at the current claims of social benefits from urban vegetation with a story of one tree planting event.

Planting Community Spirit[1]

In a low-income area not known for its trees, Global ReLeaf is helping residents plant a greener tomorrow.

City employees cut the concrete and dug the holes; East Side residents planted the trees. A state representative bought sodas for all the children, while longtime-resident Bertha Hill shouted instructions from her balcony. Hanibals, a local restaurant, provided fried fish, rice, and corn bread for lunch. There was even a minister to bless the newly planted trees.

This home style tree planting on America Street in Charleston, South Carolina, is a lesson in "standard sociology," to use the words of Danny Burbank, the city's superintendent of grounds maintenance and urban forestry. Because the event was organized and implemented entirely by members of Charleston's East Side neighborhood, a low-income area with high crime rate, the new street trees live happily in the ground as well as in the hearts of the planters.

"Just 10 minutes ago I came down America Street and I said to myself 'look at all those healthy trees!'" says Carolyn Brown, an East Side resident who was Charleston's citizen-participation director at the time of the planting. "The residents still talk about that day. They keep asking me, 'when we going to plant more trees?'"

---

[1] Reprinted with permission from Urban Forests 12(5), p. 16

Not only are the trees lifting community spirit and pride, they're beautifying the street, improving neighborhood property values, and cooling the homes, most of which did not have air conditioning.

The momentum started to build early in the day and kept growing, allowing organizers to finish the plantings two hours earlier than expected. There were more volunteers than expected, and many participants lured passers-by off the street and put shovels in their hands; they can take partial credit for the high turnout. But perhaps even more credit should go to those who called each of the 160 volunteers early in the morning to remind them of the day's event. This kind of dedication—coming from within the community—is the secret to a successful tree planting. So says Lydia Evans, Executive Director of Lowcountry ReLeaf, which, along with the Parks Department and a Global ReLeaf grant from Texaco, helped put the event together.

American Forests President Charlie Tarver represented Global ReLeaf at the event. The event was so successful, he says, because, "It was the community's project—it was their deal—and that was so refreshing."

At the event, Tarver spoke with a local politician whose motorcycle "gang" had become known as a do-good "club." Before they finished talking, members of the two local clubs—the Thunderguards and the Lowcountry Travellers—arrived with a rumble on their Harley-Davidsons. Club members quickly put their muscle power to work, helping residents plant tree after tree.

East Side residents have taken responsibility for watering the trees, and for the first time in a long while, trees are blooming in their neighborhood. "We've been showing off," says Carolyn Brown. "Now other neighborhoods want to know how they can do similar projects."

More power to them. (Wright, 1992, p. 16)

This story states or hints at a number of the overlapping social benefits of greening

projects: involvement, working together, getting to know neighbors, sense of

accomplishment, reducing crime and the effects of drug use and trade, new contacts, access to resources, and transformation of space. I will outline these observations, as represented in the practitioners' literature.

Involvement

> Encouraging active volunteer participation enables people to have a
> tangible stake in how they and their community thrive (Eber-
> Schmid, 1994, p. 157).

The social benefits all start with people getting involved in local projects. Community greening offers an easy, most-anyone-can-do-it project, and hence these projects may foster involvement where other projects may not. In the story above, East Side participants recruited others throughout the day. This happens often: people see the bustle and activity and come to join in.

Through this involvement, people who start with a greening project out of the love of gardening develop into neighborhood leaders on other issues. Because of the greening projects' relatively manageable size, people can learn the leadership role in a comfortable, known environment of gardening or tree care and then branch out into new areas. Some practitioners contend that in greening projects everyone on the block can be heard, and everyone's voice counts (Lewis, 1996). This, too, fosters new leadership.

Getting to Know Neighbors and Working Together

> A year ago we didn't even know each other to speak to by name, an
> now we are all neighbors working together (greening project
> participant quoted in Bush-Brown, 1969, p. 32).

By becoming involved, people get to know each other. When that happens, other changes can follow—some as simple as borrowing a tool from a neighbor. Practitioners also report that with getting to know people on the block comes an opportunity to share knowledge, often across generations (Sneed, 1998, ix).

Other urban greeners highlight the ability of different racial and ethnic groups to build relationships over tree planting and community gardening (Eber-Schmid, 1994; Matz, 1994).

<u>Pride, Ownership, and Sense of Community</u>

Reaching out to these troubled neighborhoods to create opportunities for pride and ownership can be an important mission of volunteer-based tree programs. Community tree planting along neighborhood streets, parks and schools brings people together to build a sense of community. (Berry, 1994, p. 228).

Pride and ownership come up again and again in the practitioners literature (Bethea, 1979; Bush-Brown, 1969; Kollin, 1986; Lewis, 1986 ; Matz, 1994; Ramsay, 1994). As the quote above makes clear, this pride and ownership is thought to foster an increased sense of ability, efficacy, and sense of community, and it is the basis of many of the social benefits identified by practitioners.

<u>Sense of Accomplishment and Efficacy: Taking on Other Problems</u>

Tree planting fosters community pride and opens channels for individuals to meet their neighbors and then tackle other community problems (Kollin, 1986, p. 96).

Growing plants is relatively easy, planting trees is relatively fast, and both provide a sense of accomplishment. From this initial success comes an increased sense of efficacy, and people start to take on new problems. One of the first reflections of this is a general "spiffing-up" of blocks after greening projects as people do things like paint the trim on their houses. Practitioners also report residents organizing neighborhood watch programs as a common next step (Bush-Brown, 1969; Lewis, 1996). From the increased sense of efficacy, still greater things can happen for the neighborhood. Some neighborhoods then take on larger projects, like job training (Riddell, 1993).

Reducing Crime and Drugs

Trees are not going to produce miracles of safety in our violent society, but their presence is important. They are a statement of caring. Their absence is a testament to neglect. The residents do get the message. *Anthony Bouza, former Police Commander, New York City* (Bouza, 1989)

The effects on crime are only hinted at in the story of the East Side neighborhood in Charleston (above). Some practitioners report reduced crime and drug dealing on blocks after tree planting, although they rarely do so in print (personal communication with Susan Phillips, formerly with Philadelphia Green). There are several reasons why greening projects might reduce crime.

The new gardens and trees lead to people being outside more, sitting on their porches, talking with neighbors, working in the garden—and more eyes to see the negative things on the block. This presence also provides social pressure against illegal activities.

Sometimes the police or firefighters join in the greening projects (Ricard, 1994). By working together planting trees, residents and police come to know each other as

people rather than as perpetrators and aggressors, which can lead to cooperation in efforts to reduce crime in the affected neighborhoods. It can also work against 'profiling'—a procedure of guessing who is likely to be engaged in criminal activity based on external characteristics like race and gender.

Finally, trees and gardens are thought to create a higher quality neighborhood, which, in turn, fosters more civil behavior. Anthony Bouza (quoted above), as a police captain in Harlem, planted trees in front of the police station houses. Asked by an officer why they were planting trees, Bouza replied "'Because I want the [residents] to have beauty and nature…They lead to civilized behavior" (Kostouros, 1989).

Connections and Resources

> The neighborhoods assess their own needs, and plant their own
> solutions. In doing so, interesting things happen. The communities
> involved formed their own group, the Trident Neighborhood
> Coalition, so that they could continue to get together and share ideas
> and creative solutions. Through this process, they have also had an
> opportunity to meet with folks from North Carolina, South Carolina,
> and other parts of the country (Evans, 1994, p. 248)."

The East Side residents in Charleston not only came to know each other better, but also got to know city employees, a State representative, an Executive Director from a nonprofit group, members of two motorcycle clubs, and a member of the clergy who were all there to help them on the planting day. The contacts developed through a tree planting project may continue after the planting day, facilitating access to additional resources needed to address other problems identified by block residents.

Contacts and resources can be equally important for the greening program. More and more, greening programs partner with existing organizations aimed at community development, health care, and education (Bisco Werner, 1995; Evans, 1994; Hynes, 1995). Through these partnerships, greening groups are better able to address a wide array of social problems, bringing a broader set of resources to communities they work with.

Transforming Space

"This was the most dumpified place I ever had seen. … Now it even smells good" (greening project participant quoted in Bush-Brown, 1969, 27).

Trees and gardens often transform a place. With the transformation of the space, the greening projects become places for community activity. Greening project sites become places for picnics, community meetings, even weddings (Bush-Brown, 1969; Lewis, 1996). This transformation also fosters some of the elements already mentioned, including pride and sense of community.

Job Training

Bernadette Cozart, the Director of The Greening of Harlem, sees community and market gardens as both open space and economic opportunity. 'I see vacant lots as sources of jobs.' …says Cozart (Hynes, 1995, p. 114).

Some projects become job training projects as well as greening projects. Some are designed as such, working with area youth, ex-offenders or others to provide job skills and training (Riddell, 1993). Sometimes job training is more informal where volunteering at a

garden leads to employment (e.g., with the nonprofit greening group providing technical

assistance) or a reference as a participant is searching for a job.

<u>Meaning of Vegetation</u>

> Somewhere during those days spent quietly working the earth,
> seeing a previously unknown cycle of growth and renewal, nurturing
> and persistence, something is released and something changes.
> People ask me what I tell young people to inspire and support them.
> I say, I don't—it's working with green things that does that (Sneed,
> 1998, ix).

The East Side residents had a member of the clergy at their planting day who

blessed the trees. This is one of many indications of the meaning that many people

attribute to plants, trees, and gardening. Practitioners report that working the earth,

planting seeds and harvesting tomatoes, nurturing something and watching it grow, all

seem to have an effect of calming, centering, and healing (Bush-Brown, 1969; Lewis,

1996; Lipkis & Lipkis, 1990; Riddell, 1993; Sneed, 1998). Growing plants gives chances

for solitude while also creating stronger ties to family and neighbors (Hassler & Gregor,

1998). Trees live a long time, and this has value for many people. Through their long life

span, trees bridge the generations and foster a connection to past and future (Lewis, 1996;

Lipkis & Lipkis, 1990).

The Federal Government Buys In

The evidence from practitioners and participants about the possibilities of social

change from urban greening projects has reached the federal government. It is reflected in

the language of the Urban and Community Forestry Act (a part of the 1990 farm bill)

which states that "forest lands, shade trees, and open spaces in urban areas and communities improve the quality of life for residents" and "efforts to encourage tree plantings and protect existing open spaces in urban areas and communities can contribute to the social well-being and promote a sense of community in these areas" (Representatives, 1990, p. 183-184). The federal government spends over $20 million annually on urban and community forestry projects, up from $2 million in the mid-1980s. Additional funds are spent to support community gardening and other community greening activities as well (Lyons, 1986).

The federal government's support for community greening as a force for positive social change was perhaps most clearly stated in a speech given by James Lyons, USDA Under Secretary for Natural Resources, at the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference in 1993. Excerpts include:

> …trees, forests, open space, rivers and streams, and associated natural resources…improve our quality of life, provide us with a sense of community, help improve our individual and community self-esteem, and promote our physical and mental well-being. …

> … People who live in healthy ecosystems are healthier themselves. People who view themselves as part of that ecosystem and are actively involved in its protection, care, and restoration, develop a sense of empowerment and ownership over their lives that translates into socially, culturally, and economically stronger cities, communities, neighborhoods and society as a whole. …

> …Urban ecosystem management can bring … opportunities for…the rebuilding of individual and community self-esteem, self-worth, and social stability. It can bring diverse cultures together to facilitate the healing of community spirit through shared planning and sweat equity as people create their own sustainable urban environment. (Lyons, 1994, p. 111)

Many projects funded through Federal appropriations plan for social benefits as a project outcome. For instance, after the unrest in Los Angeles caused by the Rodney King verdict, the USDA Forest Service joined the Rebuild LA efforts with a grants program for greening projects. The goals included promoting "an empowered and responsible citizenry" and "models for sustainable communities that address the underlying causes of racial and ethnic strife" (USDA Forest Service, No date).

Urban Greening as Empowering

As indicated in the above excerpts from Under Secretary Lyon's speech, greening practitioners use empowerment language as they outline the benefits of urban greening projects. Some definitions of empowerment used by greening practitioners include:

> Empowerment means that you lead by helping your customers first to obtain knowledge and then to establish networks, secure resources, and take action. By empowering your customers to attain skills and play major, creative roles in your program, you can mine a 'mother lode' of support from people who want to contribute to their environment (Giedraitis, 1994, p. 41).

> I think the definition of empowerment is ability, knowledge, possessing the authority and ability to govern, in short, self-determination. … I think there are three definite steps to empowerment:
>
> 1. Obtaining knowledge
>
> 2. Establish networks
>
> 3. Acquiring access to resources
>
> Once all this information has been synthesized, the community acts upon it, and then attempts to affect change, they are empowered (Evans, 1994, p. 248, emphasis in original).

Empowerment was also thought to be fostered by information dissemination (Murray, 1994), and to be based on economic benefits (Toups, 1992).

Empowerment then, to greening practitioners, is good for both the residents and the greening program. It captures many of the social benefits discussed earlier: involvement, efficacy, resources and contacts, and taking action to address problems. Practitioners do not have a codified approach to empowerment practice. A few practitioners are eloquent and even thoughtful about how empowerment outcomes may be derived from greening projects, but most use the concept loosely and do not specifically shape their programs to be as empowering as possible.

Social Science Perspectives

Collectively, these observations build a compelling story about these potential social benefits of urban greening projects. What does social science tell us about these expectations and observations? Do sociology, psychology and other fields have theories that help us make sense of these claims? Several areas do support the claims made by practitioners. These include empowerment theory, neighborhood satisfaction studies, and the results of empirical studies about the interaction between people and urban vegetation. But the social science literature also provides some cautionary evidence.

Empowerment Theory

Empowerment theory explicates the development within individuals and groups of a greater ability to address problems, a greater competency to act on one's own or one's group's behalf (Kieffer, 1984; Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995; Rappaport, 1993 ;

Zimmerman, 1995). The empowerment literature draws on many constructs, from locus of control to sense of community to class action (Bookman & Morgen, 1988; Kieffer, 1984; Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995). But there are several problems with the developing empowerment theory. Several concepts are drawn on so heavily that empowerment is almost synonymous with them. Participation and sense of community are primary examples. Empowerment has become trendy and has been co-opted into policy and ideology language on all sides of the political spectrum. This wide use of "empowerment" and empowerment's overlap with other constructs complicates the already difficult process of trying to carefully develop and analyze a multi-faceted construct (Kieffer, 1984; Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995).

Roots of Empowerment Theory

Community Psychology has made the largest contribution to developing empowerment theory. Feminist scholars and, lately, a few business researchers have also made valuable contributions (Bookman & Morgen, 1988; Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998; Riger, 1993). In general the empowerment push in business has come from a different perspective: attention to the bottom line (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998).

In community psychology, empowerment has grown from a recognized need to change the paternalistic outlook on the part of service providers in various fields. This has meant a change from illness- or needs-based interventions where the practitioner is the expert aiding patients to an approach of collaboration where an individual's or group's strengths are recognized and developed (Rappaport, 1981; Zimmerman & Warschausky, 1998). The research and theoretical development of community psychology's

empowerment theory to date has been strongest at the individual level, often looking at physical and mental health issues.

Feminist scholar's approach to empowerment theory is slightly different. Their attention is more often on the group level, on women's struggles to obtain control of resources needed to improve their and their families lives. For instance, Bookman and Morgen's edited volume focuses on working class women's struggles to gain control of local schools, clinics, labor unions, and other organizations (Bookman & Morgen, 1988). The individual may benefit from empowerment outcomes, but the analytic focus is an organization or institution.

The business literature, on the other hand, uses empowerment as a new tool to increase the bottom line (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). Applied unevenly and with no political intent whatsoever, the business use of empowerment often bears little resemblance to its use in the social sciences (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998).

<u>Multiple Definitions of Empowerment</u>

These various strands of empowerment theory and the relative youth of the theory has led to multiple, even competing, definitions. These include:

> [Empowerment is] an intentional ongoing process centered in the local community, involving mutual respect, critical reflection, caring, and group participation, through which people lacking an equal share of valued resources gain greater access to and control over these resources (Cornell Empowerment Group cited in Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995, p. 570).

> Empowerment is not only an individual psychological construct, it is also organizational, political, sociological, economic, and spiritual.

(p. 130). Empowerment is also multi-level (p. 133). (Rappaport, 1987)

Empowerment refers to processes and outcomes relating to issues of control, critical awareness, and participation (Zimmerman & Warschausky, 1998, p. 4).

We use the term *empowerment* to connote a spectrum of political activity ranging from acts of individual resistance to mass political mobilizations that challenge the basic power relations in our society. … Fundamentally, then, empowerment is a *process* aimed at consolidating, maintaining, or changing the nature and distribution of power in a particular cultural context. (Morgen & Bookman, 1988, p.4)

Empowerment is "any process by which people's control over their own lives is increased." (Somerville, 1998, p. 1)

To *empower* means to give power. *Power*, however, has several meanings. … power can also mean *energy*. Thus to empower can mean to energize (Thomas and Velthouse cited in Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998, p. 471, emphasis in the original).

In these definitions, empowerment can be anything from a caring relationship to mass political action, or even simply energizing employees. Still, there is general agreement that empowerment relates to control over one's life, an ability to take action to improve one's life or one's community.

Power and Empowerment

Inherent in empowerment is power. As obvious as this is, there has not been a full discussion about power in the empowerment literature. This may be because the literature on power is even more complex and contentious than that on empowerment, and for that reason it is not my intent to launch into a full-fledge discussion of power here. But because

empowerment theorists often equate a *feeling* of power with empowerment, some discussion of power is necessary.

Definitions of power abound. Within the empowerment debate, several approaches to power have been used. To date, Riger (1993) and Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullivan (1998) have given the most careful attention to the power behind empowerment.

Riger (1993), uses Hollander and Offermann's conception of power as having three primary forms: power over, power to, and power from. *Power over* is "dominance." *Power to* is the ability to use power to act more freely. *Power from* is an ability to resist the power of others (Riger, 1993, p. 282).

Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullivan detail four dimensions of power, the first three of which are based on Lukes. The first dimension focuses on the "management of resources dependencies" (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998, p. 462). The second dimension focuses on the management of the decision making process. The third dimension addresses the "management of meaning," or the ability of those with power to obscure the lack of power of certain groups (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998, p. 462). Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullivan add a fourth dimension based on postmodernist ideas. In this dimension, there is nonmanagement of power, instead power is "embedded in the system" (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998, p. 462). Empowerment theory to date has dealt within the first three dimensions. In the first dimension, acquiring and mobilizing resources is most important. In the second, gaining access to the decision making process is most important. And in the third dimension, gaining critical consciousness is most important. Hardy and Leiba-

O'Sullivan theorize that in the fourth dimension, empowerment will reflect a freedom from power (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998, p. 462).

<u>Zimmerman's Empowerment Theory</u>

Marc Zimmerman, a community psychologist, has made the largest single contribution to explicating empowerment theory (Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman, 1995; Zimmerman, in press; Zimmerman, Israel, Schulz, & Checkoway, 1992; Zimmerman & Warschausky, 1998). He has theorized that empowerment occurs at three levels: the individual level or psychological empowerment, organizational empowerment, and community empowerment. Of the three, psychological empowerment is the most carefully delineated. He has further theorized a difference between empower*ed* outcomes and empower*ing* processes (Zimmerman, 1995).

<u>Levels of empowerment.</u> Psychological empowerment is differentiated from individual empowerment because, rather than considering solely internal processes, psychological empowerment takes the context of the individual into account (Zimmerman, 1995). Psychological empowerment has three interrelated domains: the intrapersonal component, the interactional component, and the behavioral component. The nature of empowerment varies for each component. The intrapersonal component is focused on effects at the individual psychological level; the empowerment changes include self-efficacy and control. The interactional component is concerned with perceptions of an individual in a setting; empowerment is focused on critical awareness and resource mobilization. The behavioral component looks at actions on the part of an individual; community involvement and coping behaviors are important aspects of empowerment

(Zimmerman, 1995). Therefore, psychological empowerment is typified by an increased sense of efficacy and control, and participation in organizations or processes (e.g. local politics) in order to improve one's life. But Zimmerman does not feel that actual power, defined by him as authority (Zimmerman, 1995), is necessary for empowerment to occur.

Theory for the organization and community levels of empowerment is still relatively undeveloped in Zimmerman's descriptions specifically and community psychology generally. Organizational empowerment is reflected in goal achievement, leadership development, effective resource acquisition, policy leverage, and pluralism (Zimmerman, in press). These organizations may be small (a neighborhood association) or large (a regional nonprofit). Community level empowerment is reflected initially in efforts to improve the community, by opportunities for citizen participation, and by accessible resources like government and media (Zimmerman, in press). This is often achieved through coalitions of larger scale organizations working effectively together (Speer & Hughey, 1995; Zimmerman, in press).

Empowering processes and empowering outcomes. Empowering processes and empowered outcomes (Zimmerman, 1995) differentiates between processes that help foster empowerment and actions that reflect an empowered stance. An organization that is not empowered may still be empowering if it provides opportunities for shared leadership and decision making within its structure. An organization may be able to do this even if its efforts to exert control or effect change are thwarted. If, however, its efforts to effect change are successful but its internal processes are autocratic it may be an empowered organization but *not* empowering. This distinction between empowered and empowering can also be made at the individual and community levels.

Empowerment Indicators

       Zimmerman argues that empowerment measures must be situation specific because empowerment is a "dynamic contextually driven construct" and not a "static, intrapersonal" trait (Zimmerman, 1995, p. 596). Nonetheless, it is possible to derive a general set of empowerment indicators from Zimmerman's explication of empowerment theory. These indicators follow the individual, organization, and community levels of the theory.

       Indicators at the individual level include efficacy, mastery, control (including perceived control and efforts to exert control), new resources, participation, increased skills, becoming a problem solver and/or decision maker, proactive behavior, critical awareness, and a sense of competence.

       Indicators at the organizational level include participation, shared leadership, effective resource acquisition/mobilization, understanding socio-political environment, giving opportunities to develop skills or a sense of control, meeting organizational goals, developing ways to enhance effectiveness, becoming key brokers in policy decisions, having an impact on policy, extending the influence of the organization (e.g., wider geography/more diverse audience).

       Indicators at the community level include connections to other community groups and organizations, coalitions that are both empowered and empowering, accessible community resources (government, media), pluralism, initiating efforts to improve community, responding to threats to quality of life, providing opportunities for citizen participation, and a critical awareness among residents.

Summary of Empowerment Theory

Empowerment theory is still in its infancy. There is no shared definition of empowerment, but most definitions include control and efficacy, an ability to exert some control over one's life. Empowerment theory looks somewhat different in different fields. In community psychology, the focus to date is on empowerment at the individual level. In feminist research the emphasis is more often on group and organizational issues, with a clear call for actual changes in power structures. In business, empowerment has been more a matter of lip service, with business leader's attention firmly focused on the bottom line.

Marc Zimmerman, a community psychologist, has most clearly outlined the basics of a theory of empowerment. He theorizes empowerment at three levels: individual, organization, and community and discusses the difference between empowering processes and empowered outcomes.

Evidence of Effects of Urban Vegetation on Social Well-being

The existing social science literature is rich with sources to better understand the potential for social benefits from urban greening projects. First, some research has been done specifically looking at urban greening programs and the social benefit outcomes of these projects. Additional contributions from environmental psychology, sociology, planning, and social theorists and critics are also helpful in understanding the potential for social benefits of urban greening. These fields also offer some cautionary ideas.

Studies of Community Gardening and Tree Planting

Several studies have investigated tree planting and community garden projects directly. These investigations are largely qualitative, primarily using interviews with participants. These studies have generally been done on or near the planting day and/or in the garden. A few studies have included surveys in their research design (Hlubik, Hamm, Winokur, & Baron, 1994; Sommer, Learey, Summitt, & Tirrell, 1994 -a; Sommer, Learey, Summitt, & Tirrell, 1994 -b).

Residents reported getting to know their neighbors through participation (Francis et al., 1984 ; Learey, 1994; Sommer et al., 1994 -a; Sommer et al., 1994 -b). Sometimes residents who were not involved in the planting activities still took part in the other social activities—like a potluck—surrounding the event (Learey, 1994). "Its so nice to see the neighborhood working together" was a frequent comment from neighborhood residents (Learey, 1994).

Resident involvement was shown to have a positive impact on neighborhood attachment, including how much residents liked the trees and their location, as well as having a positive impact on how residents perceived the neighborhood (Sommer et al., 1994 -a; Sommer et al., 1994 -b). In at least one study, participants reported liking their neighborhoods better than the non-participants did (Sommer et al., 1994 -b).

Other research projects have found a variety of issues important to participants. Economic and subsistence benefits are often important to community garden participants (Francis et al., 1984 ; Mattson, Merkle, Hassan, & Waliczek, 1994; McDonough, Vatcha, Funkhouser, & Gieche, 1994 ; Patel, 1992 ; Rymer, 1997). Fostering stronger social ties was also either an aim of organizers or an observed outcome of several projects (Francis et

al., 1984 ; McDonough et al., 1994). Other benefits include political awareness and ties to community resources, a sense of ownership, and the instigation of other changes in the neighborhoods by residents (Ames, 1980 ; Francis et al., 1984).

There is some evidence that reported importance of benefits varies with race and ethnicity (Rymer, 1997). African American community gardeners reported greater importance of a broad range of benefits: working outdoors, with the soil, with nature, and with one's hands; feeling safe in the garden; helping others in the garden, beautifying the neighborhood, sharing produce; taking pleasure in producing one's own food, feeling good about abilities; and teaching gardening to children (Rymer, 1997).

Francis et al. (1984) found several other benefits from efforts to create community open space in New York City, including conserving neighborhood open space, providing recreation opportunities, promoting competence and environmental learning, providing ecological benefits, developing control, improving resident satisfaction with the visual character of the neighborhood, improving the image of the neighborhood, and motivating residents to further neighborhood improvements.

These studies have some weaknesses. In some cases, the severely limited reporting of methods diminishes the trustworthiness of the findings (Ames, 1980; Ames, 1980; Patel, 1992). In other studies, the lack of pre-planting data limits the ability to determine direction of effects, and hence to determine if those who participated did so out of stronger ties to the neighborhood, if their ties grew from participation, or both (Sommer et al., 1994 -a; Sommer et al., 1994 -b). In most studies the effects were measured on or near the planting day, during the glow of the event, before the day-to-day management of the site

became a reality (Ames, 1980 ; Ames, 1980; Learey, 1994). This is particularly true for studies investigating urban and community forestry projects. Finally, all of these studies may have suffered from reactivity because each presented the study as an investigation of the greening projects. This runs the risk of steering respondents' behavior and reports to the researcher and, hence, the research results (Lofland & Lofland, 1995).

The Effect of the Environment on Psychological Functioning

The physical environment has been shown to have a significant effect on the psychological functioning of individuals. Trees and vegetation in urban areas have been shown to reduce stress and mental fatigue, improve mood, and decrease domestic violence (Hull, 1992 -a; Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989; Kuo & Sullivan, 1996). Views of green space out a hospital window can support and speed healing (Ulrich, 1984). These findings have led to suggestions to use vegetation or nature images in highly stressful environments in order to lessen their fatiguing impact (Kuo, 1992; Ulrich & Parsons, 1992).

Neighborhood Assessment and Identity

At the neighborhood level, trees and other natural elements are know to have a significant positive impact on residential satisfaction (Fried, 1982), and there is evidence that street trees give a perception of a higher level of quality of life in a neighborhood (Sheets & Manzer, 1991).

The physical environment has been shown to be as important to psychosocial health as the sociocultural environment (Brogan & James, 1980). An example of this is the finding that neighborhood trees and grass may increase the creativity of children's play as

well as the level of adult supervision and that they may help to reduce the incidence of

domestic violence (Coley, Kuo, & Sullivan, 1997; Kuo, 1992; Kuo & Sullivan, 1996;

Taylor, Wiley, Kuo, & Sullivan, 1998).

Community Theory and Sense of Community

"Planting trees increases sense of community" urban greeners say. Just what is a

"sense of community"? The answer to this question has been debated for centuries, and we

are certainly not going to answer it here. Still, it is important to consider "community" at

least briefly.

A fundamental question in the debate on "community" has been whether or not a

community must be place-based (Wellman & Leighton, 1988). This is the traditional view

of community, one challenged by the conception of communities of interest (e.g., the les-

bi-gay community). Urban greeners use the traditional, place-based definition of

community:

> a group of persons living in close proximity, under the same
> government and often working together in self-defined community
> organizations to address common goals and interests (McDonough
> et al., 1994, p. 32).

Roland Warren suggests that one structure of a strong community, specifically a

hierarchically structured place-based community, is its vertical and horizontal ties

(Warren, 1988). Vertical ties are between levels in a community, like a school and the

District office. These ties can also be between a neighborhood and civic groups. Horizontal

ties are between groups at a similar level of a hierarchical system; a network of school

principals is one example, a coalition of neighborhood homeowner associations is another.

The vertical ties strengthen a community while the horizontal ties create its stability

(Warren, 1988). These systems of vertical and horizontal ties can be writ large or small; a

smaller level example pertinent to urban greening might be horizontal connections

between block residents as they form a block club and their vertical ties to a greening

nonprofit organization or the Alderman's office.

"Sense of community" as a psychological construct, is argued by Sarason to be the

primary raison d'être of community psychology (Sarason, 1974). McMillian and Chavis

(1986) operationalize the psychological sense of community with four domains:

membership, influence (both the individual on the group and visa versa), integration and

fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connection. Urban greening projects could

conceivably have an impact on each of these domains.

Participation and sense of community are intertwined (Chavis, Hogee, McMillan,

& Wandersman, 1990; Wandersman & Giamartino, 1980). Sense of community is

hypothesized to play "a catalytic role" for participation (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990, p.

56). The direction of the connection has tested positively in a path analysis as an effect of

sense of community on level of participation; these tests also show an interdependence

between the two constructs (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). Increasing participation, then,

may also contribute to a stronger sense of community.

There is also evidence from urban forestry research that trees play an integral role

in community. Trees "create a strong sense of community and something to belong to" said

an urban forestry volunteer in Chicago as she commented on what she likes about trees in

her neighborhood (Westphal, 1993). Other research has also documented the role trees play in creating community. Respondents in Charleston, SC, interviewed after the devastation of Hurricane Hugo cited trees as the greatest loss from the hurricane damage. This loss was more important than the loss of house or place of worship, and the reasons given indicated that trees made Charleston home (Hull, 1992 -b; Hull, Lam, & Vigo, 1994). Respondents have also reported moving because of the loss of trees to Dutch elm disease–home wasn't home anymore with the trees gone (Dwyer, Schroeder, & Gobster, 1992).

The Environment as a Social Symbol

Respondents have told us *that* trees and vegetation are important to community, but *why* is this so? Appleyard (Appleyard, 1979; Appleyard, 1979) discusses "the environment as a social symbol" saying "sociologists and social planners should begin to appreciate that aspects of the physical environment play a significant role in the social lives of citizens" (p. 152). Proshansky, in discussing space appropriation, also sheds light on the role of the meaning of physical space for creation of individual and group identity. He says "there are no physical settings that are not by definition also social settings" and that individuals "not only project [their identity onto space] but *introject*" (Proshansky, 1976, p. 37). There is evidence that we select residential community types based on our definitions of ourselves (Feldman, 1990; Feldman, 1996). Hull et al. (1994) suggest that these meanings were behind the importance of the loss of trees in Charleston.

Gardens and landscape projects are signs of human intent. In the context of restoration and conservation efforts using native plant species, these signs of intent,

dubbed "cues to care," like edging, fences, and bird feeders have raised the acceptance of the vegetation and lent a sense of order to what is commonly thought of as messy (Nassauer, 1995; Nassauer & Westmacott, 1987). It is possible that gardens act as "cues to care" in distressed neighborhoods, and hence have a positive social impact.

Gardens may also be acts of resistance and as such an act of power (Hooks, 1994; Morgen & Bookman, 1988). Many people do not have choice in their residential environments. Poverty and other social factors limit their options when seeking shelter. Yet homespace is a powerful need, a critical refuge—particularly for those facing discrimination in our society (Hooks, 1990). Even without choice in the setting, people create homespace. And in these situations gardens may be a small act of resistance. Alice Walker eloquently describes her mother's gardens:

> …my mother adorned with flowers whatever shabby house we were forced to live in. And not just your typical straggly country stand of zinnias, either. She planted ambitious gardens—and still does—with over fifty different varieties of plants… before she left home for the fields, she watered her flowers, chopped up the grass, and laid out her new beds. When she returned from the fields she might divide clumps of bulbs, dig a cold pit, uproot and replant roses, or prune branches from her taller bushes or trees—until night came and it was too dark to see. …

> I notice that it is only when my mother is working in her garden that she is radiant, almost to the point of being invisible—except as Creator: hand and eye. She is involved in work her soul must have. Ordering the universe in the image of her personal conception of Beauty. …

> For her, so hindered and intruded upon in so many ways, being an artist has still been a daily part of her life. This ability to hold on, even in very simple ways, is work black women have done for a very long time (Walker, 1983/1974 , pp. 241-242).

What Alice Walker describes is a subtle, yet clear act of resistance. Planting

flowers and trees was an act of resistance against a society that did not allow Mrs. Walker

choices for her life (Walker, 1983/1974). Her resistance was in your face, beautifully.

Small Wins

Just as the environment may have important symbolic meanings, the success (or

failure) of a specific project may also have important meanings. A successful project may

indicate what can be accomplished by working together. In this sense, projects may be

modest victories or small wins–important first steps that help galvanize further action by a

group (Feldman and Stall, 1994; Weick 1984).

Crime

Studies have shown that trees and vegetation can increase a sense of safety (Kuo,

Bacaicoa, & Sullivan, 1998). Perhaps because "presence of dis-order related cues engender

perceptions of social and crime problems" (Perkins, Meeks, & Taylor, 1992, p. 21). Trees,

gardens, and other landscape features may be a part of defensible space, thereby having an

impact on crime and safety (Newman, 1972; Perkins, Wandersman, Rich, & Taylor, 1993).

Besides being a part of a supportive physical environment, the social networks

strengthened through the projects may have crime fighting benefits. Recent studies have

shown the importance of informal social networks in minimizing crime, particularly by

exerting social controls on marginal offenders (Rose & Clear, 1998). If urban greening

projects do indeed foster stronger local social networks, then they may also have an impact on crime as these social networks exert influence over residents.

Cautionary Tales from the Social Science Literature

The social science literature provides positive support for the claims of urban greeners, but it also sounds cautionary notes.

I outlined above the empirical research about the deep, positive meanings that vegetation can have for urban residents. But trees and vegetation do not carry only positive meanings. Tree planting can be seen as impending gentrification (Appleyard, 1979) or "gilding the ghetto" (Hester, 1987, p. 292). Trees can symbolize lynching, as in Billie Holiday's (Holiday, no date) powerful song "Strange Fruit":

> Southern trees bear strange fruit,
> Blood on the leaves and blood at the root,
> Black bodies swinging in the southern breeze,
> Strange fruit hanging from the poplar trees.

Although some projects may be a small win and symbolize the possibilities for positive change, other projects may symbolize that certain neighborhood subgroups got their way over the general interests of the neighborhood. In these situations, the projects limit the possibility of social benefits.

The process of empowerment is a delicate one and done poorly disempowement is a distinct possibility (Crowley, 1999). Token involvement in all its forms can be disempowering. Arnstein's "Ladder of Participation" (1969) is useful in understanding this. At the lower rungs of the ladder, where participation is merely being informed of a

pending project, participation is little more than lip service. At the higher rungs of this ladder, participants are a part of the decision making process, with real input. McDonough calls this "true" participation, where residents have veto power over projects and ideas (McDonough et al., 1994). Empowerment can be thought of in a similar way (Rocha, 1997). In a truly empowering process, people will develop the means by which they can achieve self-defined desired ends.

This Study

Urban greening practitioners make a compelling case for the social benefits of urban greening projects, one that is being listened to everywhere from local neighborhoods to the White House. Various elements from the social science literature provide some potential support for these claims. Yet there is little research to guide efforts to enhance these interactions and any resulting benefits. A full understanding of community revitalization benefits of urban greening projects requires study at the individual, organizational, and community levels. Research to date has focused largely on individual benefits from passive involvement with vegetation (i. e., views through a window) or perceptions of vegetation (i. e., street tree preference studies). Little research has focused on the ties between the benefits from passive involvement and changes in people—changes in attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Researchers have found that people have strong perceptions and beliefs about the vegetation around them, but they have not found yet whether changes in the vegetation can lead to changes in these perceptions and to social changes as a result.

Compounding this lack of information is our inability to extrapolate from individually based benefits because community benefits are not simply the sum of individual benefits. A community benefit has the fundamental qualities of a public good: it is available to all community members and it is inexhaustible (non-exclusive and non-rivalrous). A lowered crime rate is an example of a community benefit. It may result from a strong neighborhood watch program, a police crackdown, or some other means. But its benefits are enjoyed whether or not one puts a neighborhood watch sticker in one's window, plants a tree, or advocates for more police funding. Some social benefits from urban greening projects reported by practitioners fit these criteria, others do not.

Urban Greening for Social Well-being: The Practitioners' Model

Greening practitioners talk a lot about social benefits, and they use empowerment language to do so. However, they have not developed a protocol to foster empowerment outcomes. Rather, most practitioners work by instinct and gather successful ideas from colleagues. Most practitioners do not think about *how* and *why* urban greening projects may be empowering. Rather, they are aware of the outcomes.

Still, a working model of how greening practitioners think of empowerment can be gleaned from the literature outlined earlier in this chapter. Combining the practitioners literature and empowerment theory I developed an "ideal type" of empowerment outcomes to structure this investigation and analysis. Ideal type analysis is a process in which the "pure" form or structure of a concept is outlined (Lofland & Lofland, 1995, p. 128)[2]. Table

---

[2] It is worth noting that my source for ideal types is a methods book, not Weber. I am using the ideal type as a tool to structure the analysis and am not drawing on its rich history and development from Max Weber

1 presents the empowerment indicators with the ideal type of social change from urban greening projects as drawn from the practitioners' literature. The model will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, the Empowerment Discussion chapter. The additional social science literature cited above provides a useful context for the investigation and analysis. The deep meanings of vegetation in urban areas may be particularly fruitful. Clarifying whether or not these meanings play a role in social change is an important next step. If we can make this tie we will have a new understanding of how the importance of trees and vegetation in city neighborhoods can have an impact beyond beautification.

---

forward. Instead, it offers a clear means to first structure the ideas floating in the practitioners' literature and then test these ideas against findings in an empirical study.

TABLE 1

PRACTITIONERS' MODEL OF EMPOWERMENT THOUGH URBAN GREENING
PROJECTS

Individual level	Practitioners' Model
Efficacy	Will increase as residents achieve a small win by addressing a block problem.
Mastery	May be increased as they learn gardening and project management skills.
Control (perceived, situation specific, efforts to exert)	Will gain control of at least the garden site, perhaps the block. This is important for reducing drug dealing and dumping.
Personal control	Will increase either in relation to plants in a garden lot or for the tree in front of their house, and then radiate out from that to a wider circle of control. This feeds into the block level control above.
New resources	Will get resources through the program.
Participation	Will increase as the project goes on. Participation continues in the maintenance of the garden and may extend to new projects or behaviors (e.g., voting, calling police).
Increase skills, become problem solver, decision maker	Some will learn to be decision makers and problem solvers; the more that do the better. Many will also increase a range of skills from gardening to organizing.
Proactive behavior	The block group will instigate projects to solve other problems on the block on their own rather than wait for outside others (e.g., neighborhood watch groups).
Critical awareness among residents	Not a component of the practitioners' model.
Sense of competence	Increases due to success with the garden.

TABLE 1, CONT.

PRACTITIONERS' MODEL OF EMPOWERMENT THOUGHT URBAN GREENING PROJECTS

Organizational level (local organization, not practitioners' organization)	Practitioners' Model
Participation	Participation increases on the block because of the formation of block club groups.
Shared leadership	Is not a component of the practitioners' model.
Effective resource acquisition/mobilization	Participants learn where to get additional resources as well as fully using what is available from the greening program.
Understanding socio-political environment	Emphasis is on understanding this in environmental terms.
Give opportunity to develop skills/sense of control	The block level organization is inclusive and therefore allows residents to learn things and gain from the project.
Meet organizational goals	The organization is successful, hence it meets its original goals from the garden and then sets new goals.
Develop ways to enhance effectiveness	Participants develop ways to enhance the greening project specifically and the neighborhood generally.
Key brokers in policy decisions; impact on policy	Participants learn to have a voice in local government, particularly as it effects their neighborhood and the environment.
Extend influence: wider geography/more diverse audience	Block level groups may join with others in regional greening activities.

TABLE 1, CONT.

PRACTITIONERS' MODEL OF EMPOWERMENT THOUGHT URBAN GREENING
PROJECTS

Community level	Practitioners' Model
Connection to other community groups and organizations; coalitions; coalitions that are both empowered and empowering.	This is not a priority in the practitioners' literature.
Accessible community resources (government, media)	Access to media is important and developed among the participants. Access to government is increased through contacts with police and city departments in the course of the project.
Pluralism	Residents may be more involved in politics, but pluralism per se is not a factor in the practitioners' model.
Initiates efforts to improve community	The beginning point of greening projects. After the project, other efforts to improve the community are easier to begin.
Responds to threats to quality of life	Often the beginning point of greening projects. After the project, responding to future threats is easier.
Provides opportunities for citizen participation	With the greening project and subsequent projects, there are more opportunities for participation.
Critical awareness among residents	Not a component of the practitioners' model. In fact, sometimes practitioners' view is that bootstrapping is necessary for the neighborhood and the greening project is a part of this.

Research Question

To meet the high expectations of urban greening's contribution to community revitalization, we must improve our understanding of how interactions with vegetation through urban greening projects benefit communities, and what planning and management tools can most effectively enhance those benefits. An initial investigation of benefits from greening projects at two levels−individual and neighborhood organization−will lay the groundwork for subsequent studies at the agency, organization and community levels. Towards this end, this project will:

- investigate claims of social benefits by comparing neighborhood greening project sites where practitioners thought there were benefits to sites where they thought there were no benefits;

- determine the social benefits and problems perceived by neighborhood residents, both participants and nonparticipants;

- gain an understanding of these benefits and problems at the individual and neighborhood organizational levels; and

- explore the usefulness of empowerment theory and empirical findings regarding the meanings of urban green space to understand these benefits.

RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODS, DATA ANALYSIS

Research Design

To investigate the potential of social benefits from urban greening projects, I conducted a comparative case study with four residential blocks that participated in a local greening program, the City of Chicago's Green Corps Chicago. This program provides technical assistance to neighborhood groups interested in starting community gardens, planting street trees, or other urban greening projects. I selected blocks where program practitioners perceived varied social benefits as outcomes of the project: two were sites where practitioners thought there were social benefits, two were sites where practitioners thought there were no social benefits (or perhaps even negative consequences) from the project. I also interviewed aldermanic staff, police, letter carriers—nonresidents with special knowledge of the neighborhood and the impact of the project. This created three sets of comparisons: participant/nonparticipant; failure/success sites; and across all four sites. The interviews used several protocols designed to elicit detailed information about the site, the project, and the process. Photo-elicitation methods formed the basis for the interviews. The interview guide included open-ended questions based on empowerment theory and the meanings of urban green space, along with two structured instruments to measure perceptions of change of block attributes and sense of community.

Methods

<u>Site Selection Criteria</u>

I selected 1995 as the project year to avoid potential problems associated with new projects. The goal was to find projects where the interview year (1997) was not the first spring the project is in place. This was a concern because a new project may have been overwhelming or underwhelming. Flowering crab apples could have been so pretty and new that this could have affected responses. Or a warm period in February followed by a hard freeze could have damaged the buds, causing poor flowering. If people had been anxiously awaiting these new spring flowers—the fruits of their labors—the disappointment could have affected their responses as well. Selecting 1995 projects meant that the project had been around longer and therefore avoided some of these potential problems. Having more than a year gone by since planting also allowed the impact of the project on the block to be assessed and assimilated by residents, even if this was not at a conscious level. The 1995 projects fulfilled these goals.

Green Corps had 95 projects in 1995. Of these, 25 were potential sites for this study. Sites were eliminated from the potential pool if they were school or other institutional projects (e.g., hospitals or libraries), were implemented by aldermanic staff, were implemented by people from outside the neighborhood, or were in neighborhoods where I would be in serious danger. I also eliminated projects in neighborhoods with other major events or projects (e.g., one area was in the midst of a major police scandal, another was experiencing demolition of public housing).

Respondent Criteria

It was important that respondents had lived in the neighborhood for several years. Otherwise, they could not assess any impacts of the greening projects. It was also important to have a wide range of block residents as possible participate in the study— those who had participated in the greening project and those who had not; the organizers of the project; block cheerleaders and block curmudgeons—and as representative a demographic mix as possible. Ideally, each household would be represented in the sample. Given considerations of the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board, respondents were required to be at least 18 years old (i.e., adults).

Measures

Photo-elicitation

Photographs have been used in research for a wide range of purposes. Researchers have given cameras to hikers and canoers asking them to photograph important scenes and views as they hike or paddle. These photos were subsequently analyzed to identify important views and places along a given trail or river (Chenoweth, 1984). Collier and Collier used photographs in interviews as a component of a project investigating mental health among rural Arcadian residents in Canada (Collier & Collier, 1986). Photographs are used in participatory design and planning to gather information about settings that are critical to preserve and nurture as well as those that are critical to mend and change (personal communication, Dr. Kenneth Reardon, Regional Planning, University of Illinois at Urbana, spring 1996).

Photo-elicitation techniques in this study Through photographs, we can get at the salience of specific changes, the meaning of spaces and changes in those meanings, and changes in individuals and groups brought about by changes in the physical environment. Collier and Collier (1986) report on various techniques using photographs in interviews. In an interview, photographs can often get people talking, and keep them talking, providing more in-depth information. The photographs can become the focus of the interview, thereby minimizing differences between the interviewer and interviewee. Went the respondent is talking about their own photos, there is an added excitement, even fun, in participating in the research project. These combine to make photo-elicitation a promising research tool.

Respondents were given single-use cameras and asked to "please take 10 pictures of changes for the better or worse on your block in the last five years. Please take pictures of what is important to *you*" (the camera was also labeled with the instructions and my phone number).

Many people were pleased to take photographs of their block, even excited about it. But not everyone was comfortable with the idea. Some had physical difficulties that made getting out and about in their neighborhood hard. Others did not say exactly why they did not want to take photos, but shyness seemed to play a role. Whatever the reason, I interviewed those who wished to participate but not take photographs using a subset of the photographs from their neighbors. This subset was made up of photographs of block changes common to most, if not all of the respondent photograph sets (each site had two to four common block changes). In each case, I included the greening project in the discussion.

Interviews

After the respondents took photographs, we met again for a one-on-one, face-to-face interview (there was one exception where I interviewed two people at once, twin sisters that organized one of the projects). Interviews were conducted between late July and early October 1997. By interviewing during these months, seasonal changes were kept to a minimum.

The interviews used respondents' photographs as a basis for discussion (or a subset of neighbors' photographs as discussed above). The interview began with general questions about each photograph and why the respondent took it. I then probed more deeply into one or more changes, always covering the greening project in these in-depth questions. This semi-structured approach allowed respondents to fully discuss their issues and interests, which in turn provided detailed information about the site and its social workings. At the same time, I was able to probe specifically for details on the garden project and theoretical issues pertinent to the study.

Two structured instruments were modified for use in the interview. One measured people's ratings of block attributes and their reported changes over time. The other measured sense of community. I asked about activities the respondents participated in, and I asked basic demographic questions (Appendix 1 contains the interview guide). Details about the block attribute and sense of community questions follow.

Block Attributes and Sense of Community Questions

Perceptions of changes in block attributes were measured with a general satisfaction question and a set of semantic differentials. These block attribute questions were asked twice. First, the respondents were asked how they felt about their block at the time of the interview. The second time, the respondents were asked to think back five years and answer the set of questions based on their memory of how they felt at that time.

This set opened with a general satisfaction question: "All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with this block as a place to live (today/five years ago)," with a five-point Likert scale from very satisfied to very dissatisfied. Then respondents were asked to rate their block with a set of semantic differentials on a seven-point scale. The semantic differentials were introduced with the example "good" to "bad." All but one of the semantic differentials were chosen from those used by Feldman (Feldman, 1990). These were: unsafe to safe, high crime to low crime, unfriendly to friendly, poorly maintained to well maintained, little greenery to much greenery, and stressful to not stressful. I added unattractive to attractive. Attractiveness was included in Feldman's study but had been asked in a different, architecturally specific way.

After asking both sets of general satisfaction and semantic differential questions, I reviewed the similarities and differences between their "then" and "now" ratings and asked respondents their reasons for any differences.

Sense of Community The sense of community questions were based on a Neighborhood Cohesion scale developed by Buckner and modified by Brunson (Brunson, Kuo, & Sullivan, submitted; Buckner, 1988). I selected a subset of the items in Buckner's

scale and followed Brunson's adaptation of the questions to ask about "block" rather than "neighborhood."

Buckner's full scale has 18 items. Nine of these make up a subscale on sense of community. The length of the interview required that I cut where possible, so I asked five of these nine questions. I selected the subset based on Brunson's having used them and their correlation coefficient in Buckner's study (each was .70 or greater) (Buckner, 1988). The questions were used to support analysis of the interview data rather than as a variable in statistical analysis. I needed previously tested *questions*, not previously tested *scales* in this study. These questions were: How much would you say that you have a sense of belonging with the people on this block? How much would you say that the friendships and associations you have with other people on this block mean a lot to you? How much would you say that, if the people on this block were planning something, you'd think of it as something "we" were doing *together* rather than something "they" were doing? How much would you say that you feel loyal to the people on this block? How much would you say that you get a sense of community from living on this block? The answer set was "not at all," "a little," "a medium amount," "quite a lot," or "very much."

Activities A final open-ended question was included after the structured instruments and before the demographic information. I asked respondents to tell me what activities they participated in and then "Which of these activities do you think of as *neighborhood* related?"

Demographics Respondents were asked a set of questions about their household and other demographic information. Questions included race/ethnicity, gender, age,

number and ages of children, how long they had lived in their current home (and where they had moved from if they were relatively new to the block), whether they own or rent (I noted home/apartment and floor), members of the household, level of education, work status, and household income. Some of these items were obvious and therefore I did not ask them (e.g., race, gender).

Wrap up Each interview ended with a chance for the respondents to ask me questions. I also asked most respondents if I could be in touch in the future if I had additional questions. Each respondent received another single-use camera as a thank you.

As a further thank you, Green Corps provided labor and plant materials to each block in the study (about $300 in plants and a four-person work team for one day). This was mentioned to the block residents *after* I completed interviews on the block.

Institutional Review Board Approval I received University of Illinois Institutional Review Board approval for the research project (IRB No. H-97-560). The project did not need formal IRB review because it posed minimal risk and did not include protected classes of respondents.

Pilot test I pilot tested the photo-elicitation and interview process in three interviews with individuals similar to residents in the study neighborhoods. Two of these individuals took pictures of changes on their block. The third was interviewed using a subset of these photos. Minor modifications to the guide were made to clarify the meanings of questions based on the pilot test results.

Procedures

Site selection

All Green Corps projects completed in 1995 by neighborhood-based groups were included in the potential sample pool. I discussed each of these sites with Green Corps staff members, asking them to tell me which sites they thought had social benefits from the projects and which had had negative consequences from the project. The Green Corps staff involved in these discussions were in project manager roles for the projects, and knew about each project from beginning to end. We met once for two hours and had subsequent follow up phone conversations. From this discussion, we developed a list of 25 sites that were significant in terms of social benefits and that met the other study criteria.

The list of 25 sites was explored in more detail. Demographic information including percentage of low to moderate income residents and race was examined for the census tract of each site. The sites were also categorized based on Green Corps staff assessments as a grassroots/neighborhood project, a nonprofit group project, or a project that was a "one person wonder"—spearheaded by one local individual (as opposed to a neighborhood group like a block club).

After visiting the 25 sites, I further narrowed the lists to four success sites and two failure sites. The sites were selected because they were in neighborhoods with a narrower range on demographic variables (to reduce the number of intervening variables; Table 2), each project was on an empty lot, and all but one project site was within the residential block. The exception to this was a site where I had already gained entree through previous

field work (this previous field work was not greening related). This garden project was across a busy street from where respondents lived. Already having a relationship with respondents outweighed potential problems due to the location of the project site.

From this short list, I selected the final four sites, based on my success gaining access to the sites. I already had access to one of the failure sites. I began to try to gain access to the success sites by calling the greening project organizers one at a time until I gained access to two sites. I did not gain access to the first success site I tried, and followups on initial contact also failed. At two of the other success sites, initial phone calls to the garden organizers were enthusiastically received and I proceeded to work with these blocks. Organizers were told only that I was interested in block change and that I had gotten their numbers from Green Corps. I also called and spoke with my contacts at the failure site where I was already known. An exception to my pattern of calling the organizer first was with the second failure site. In this case, I chose to first make contact with block residents because the organizers were reported to be "political brutes." I was concerned that my credibility and ability to gain access would be jeopardized if I was seen to be associated with the garden organizers. I approached this site last, after developing my approach methods in the other three sites.

TABLE 2

CENSUS TRACT DEMOGRAPHICS
BY SITE

	Halsted		Ashland		Pulaski		Jefferson Homes[b]	
	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990	1980	1990
Total population[a]	6517	5391	2721	2452	6560	7798	2233	1479
% Male	47	45	47	43	50	48	44	38
% Black	100	98	94	99	6	65	100	100
% 13 years old or under	22	19	34	32	22	29	32	32
% Families with female headed household	23	35	41	55	14	35	67	98
Median family income	$24,508	$26,464	$11,109	$18,750	$20,621	$30,389	$9,052	$5,625
% Below poverty	19	11	39	31	10	19	45	88
Population per household	3.9	3.6	3.6	4.2	2.8	3.7	3.9	2.8
% Owner occupied	89	89	39	46	51	49	11	0

NOTES: [a] Source: (Consortium, 1995) [b] The changes between 1980 and 1990 likely reflect the destruction of single family homes in the census tract rather than changes in the population of the Jefferson Homes development.

The final four sites were located on the south, west, and northwest sides of the city. I have named them with a nearby major street, except for the public housing development that I have given a fictitious name. The sites are Halsted (on the far south side), Ashland (on the south side),

Pulaski (on the northwest side), and Jefferson Homes (on the west side). At each site I interviewed on the specific block where the greening project took place. The exceptions were Jefferson Homes, where the project was not within the development, and Pulaski where some garden participants lived one block away. I worked at the block level for two main reasons. First, the greening projects were all relatively small and a part of the day-to-day landscape for the blocks, not the neighborhood. Second, the program was designed to work at the block level, and, with the exception of institutional projects, most were instigated by block groups. Working at a larger scale would have diluted the likelihood of capturing effects of the project.

<div align="center">Respondent Selection</div>

I had hoped that work day sign-in sheets and other materials would be available for each project, but they were not. Therefore, I found respondents by going door to door in each neighborhood. After initial phone contacts with the organizers (except for the Pulaski failure site), I visited each block and went door to door trying to meet someone in every household (Table 3 and Table 4 detail information of households contacted, and refusals and acceptances for participation). I carried letters of introduction explaining the study and my presence on the block. I left one at every household, whether or not I made contact in that first visit (a copy of this letter is in Appendix 2).

TABLE 3

HOUSEHOLDS AND INTERVIEWS BY SITE

Site	# Occupied Households [a]	# Empty or Abandoned Households	Total # Households	# Interviews Completed	# Households Interviewed
Halsted	39[b]	6	45	10	9
Ashland	18	2	20	9	7
Pulaski[c]	50	2	52	9	6
Jefferson Homes[d]	112	2	114	23	19

[a] Two flats with one family are counted as one household.

[b] Includes an apartment building of approximately 10 units I was warned not to enter and one house that was not technically lived in. This house had people coming and going from it, and I was warned to stay away from it as well. My instincts supported both of these warnings.

[c] Interviewed three households on adjacent blocks because they were the project organizers and main participants. They are included in the number of interviews column, but *not* in the number of households interviewed column.

[d] Interviewed three additional people who had been involved in greening projects but did not live in these two sets of units. They are included in the total number of interviews column, but *not* in the households interviewed column.

TABLE 4

INTERVIEWS AND REFUSALS BY SITE

Site	No	Yes, but did not complete	Couldn't make contact	Warned to ignore	Didn't meet criteria	Completed but deleted from data set	# Interviews completed
Halsted[a]	4	3	9	11	2	1	12
Ashland	1	2	4	0	2	0	10
Pulaski	6	6	20	0	12	1	10
Jefferson Homes	20	15	51	0	3	1	23
TOTAL	31	26	84	11	19	3	55

[a] I was warned away from entering one apartment building with about 10 units and one house that was ostensibly vacant.

I visited each household on each block at least three times, varying my visits by time and day to accommodate different working schedules. This was to avoid potential biases like missing all 9-5ers and to increase the number of respondents on each block. My varied visits resulted in a purposeful sample with participants, nonparticipants, block cheerleaders and curmudgeons, and young and old in each sample. A mix of men and women was harder to achieve; in two sites my respondents were mostly female (this will be discussed in more detail later).

Jefferson Homes needed additional consideration about selecting respondents. Because there are over 400 units in 37 buildings, I needed to select a subset of the Jefferson Homes residents from which to recruit for the study. Jefferson Homes is organized into seven "blocks"[3] or sets of three to five buildings. I talked with the primary organizer at Jefferson Homes (who was also the garden organizer) to find out who had been involved in the greening project. After this discussion I selected two blocks at Jefferson Homes as the subset of units from which to sample. Some of the garden organizers lived in these two blocks. The blocks also reflected the two architectural styles in the development: row houses and three-story walk-ups. I also interviewed three key Jefferson Homes residents who did not live in these two blocks.

When I made contact with a potential respondent, I introduced myself and my study. I explained that I was interested in changes on the block. I did not mention the garden. Sometimes I used the organizer's name as I made initial contact, but more often not. If the person seemed interested, I verified that they met the respondent criteria and

---

[3] Although these are not residential blocks, residents use the term for subgroups of buildings at Jefferson Homes.

asked if they were willing to participate in my study. If they said yes, I gave them each a camera and instructions on its use and what I wanted them to photograph. We then arranged a good time for me to return and pick up the camera to have the photographs developed. When I picked up the camera, we made a third appointment for the interview itself. This data collection procedure was very labor intensive because *each* interview required a minimum of three successful contacts with each respondent.

Again, Jefferson Homes needed additional consideration. The sample population was significantly larger than at the other sites, and it was difficult to find people at home so that I could pick up cameras and conduct the interviews. This slowed down my interviewing. I did not want people wondering what had happened to me, so I distributed a second letter explaining that I was still interested in the interview and would be contacting them soon (Appendix 3). I also stopped interviewing at Jefferson Homes with several interviews left uncompleted. I had already conducted a sufficient number of interviews, and I was having no luck reaching the remaining potential respondents. I left a third letter for these respondents, thanking them for their interest, but letting them know that I needed to move on to another site to interview (Appendix 4).

I interviewed 58 people in 57 interviews and deleted three respondents from the sample, resulting in 55 respondents. Two of the three people dropped from the sample turned out to be too new to the block. The third respondent was deleted for several reasons. She had her 13-year-old daughter take the pictures and therefore did not understand why various pictures had been taken. She was not comfortable having the interview taped. Finally, because English was her second language and her command of it was limited, she had another daughter translate most of the interview questions into Spanish. Because I do

not speak Spanish, I could not be sure of the translation and any possible

misinterpretations of my meaning. For these reasons, I removed her from the data set.

I also interviewed people knowledgeable about each neighborhood like police,

letter carriers, and aldermanic staff. These people were in a position to see any changes

that took place because of the project, and the interviews focused on those changes. Many

of these were telephone interviews. The guide for these interviews is in Appendix 5.

I interviewed several Green Corps Chicago staff members about each project and

the types of social benefits they saw coming from the greening projects. Specifically, I

interviewed Assistant Commissioner for Natural Resources, Suzanne Malec; and

Horticulturists Deanna DeChristopher and Kevin Caroll. These staff members were most

closely associated with the projects throughout the program.

<u>Procedures at Interview</u>

Once I had the respondents' photographs, we conducted the interview. The

interview began with a brief review of the purpose of the study: an investigation of change

in residential blocks in Chicago. The greening project was not mentioned as a focus of the

study.

The interviews lasted between 25 minutes and two hours, with an average length of

about 45 minutes. Most interviews took place at the respondents' homes, many on front

porches or stoops.

When a respondent had not taken photos, I began the interview by asking them

what they would have photographed if they had taken pictures. Their answers usually

matched what their neighbors photographed and gave me the opportunity to bring out the set of photos and get the respondents' views on those changes.

After a review of the full set of photographs, I would select two of the changes to go into in more depth: the greening project and one other change. After the open-ended questions about block changes, I asked the structured instrument items on block attributes, sense of community, activities, and demographics.

Respondents often asked for clarification or showed confusion with one of the questions: "How did this affect the appearance of your block?" I learned to re-phrase this as "Did this make your block look better or worse?" For consistency, I continued to use the "appearance" version of the question, but followed more quickly with the alternate phrasing.

During the wrap up, respondents handled the opportunity to ask me questions differently. Occasionally the respondent asked me many questions: did I have children, where did I live, etc. But the most common question was how the project might help their neighborhood. I replied honestly that the project would have minimal impact on their neighborhood, that its main impact was in helping me graduate, but that I hoped to develop information that would help city government and non-profit groups help neighborhoods like theirs. I added that if I could help them in some way to please let me know.

Some block residents asked me for information about finding jobs with the University or for information about GED and other training opportunities. This happened during the interview itself as well as during the recruitment phase, or when they saw me walking around their block. I therefore carried with me a sheet on how to contact the

University for jobs and the civil service test applicants needed to take. I also found and distributed information for nearby adult education programs with good reputations (e.g., The University of Chicago's Blue Gargoyle Adult Learning Program). At least one respondent acted on this information and enrolled in an adult learning program between our second and third contacts.

When the interview was completed, I gave the respondent their copy of the photographs, asked if I could be in touch again if I had additional questions. I also gave respondents another camera as a thank you.

Post Interview

After the interview, I tape recorded field notes for subsequent transcription and listening. The interviews themselves were transcribed by a transcription service. Because the interviews were often conducted outdoors the considerable background noise made some of the tapes difficult to understand. I checked each transcript completely and was able to fill in at least 90% of the segments the transcriber could not understand. I inserted pause and emphasis indicators throughout the interviews. A "p" indicated a pause at roughly one "p" per second. A "+" indicated emphasis (the software package used for analysis works with ASCII files so bold and italics would not work for emphasis). Any time I surmised or guessed what a respondent said, I put the text in brackets.

<u>Protecting Human Subjects</u>

The respondents were guaranteed confidentiality before the interview. To maintain this, all reports use fake names for both respondents and sites. I have the respondents' names on file and have maintained an archived set of tapes.

<u>Data Management and Analysis</u>

The primary data in this study are the interviews in transcribed form. This provides largely qualitative data, with some quantitative data from the structured instruments. The photographs taken by respondents; my field notes; interviews with aldermanic staff, letter carriers and the like are secondary data. Data for the greeners' model of social benefits were collected from conference proceedings, books, and other secondary sources, as well as from personal discussions with practitioners from across the country.

Interview transcripts were imported into QSR NUD*IST version 4 for Windows (N4) for data management and analysis (Qualitative Solutions and Research, 1997). N4 is a software package designed for analysis of text data. It allows the researcher to code and categorize data and then search the data by document and/or by category, from simple searches to searches that answer complex questions of the data. Data can be summarized in text and numerical reports.

The researcher must decide what to use as the text unit in N4: a line? A paragraph? Some other unit? I chose to use each exchange as the text unit. Line-by-line analysis has advantages, particularly by facilitating fine grained coding. But I wanted to keep the thoughts of my respondents intact, so I chose the paragraph as text unit. In a few instances,

I separated very long speeches by respondents into two or more text units. In some other instances, I condensed an exchange into one paragraph. This was done when little of substance took place in a series of exchanges.

Quantitative data was entered in SPSS for Windows, version 7 (SPSS, 1996). The SPSS file was used for automatically coding part of the qualitative data (e.g., with demographic information for each interview).

<div align="center">Data Coding and Categorization</div>

I followed a thematic process for the coding and categorization. In this process, the themes relevant to the purpose of inquiry are marked and coded. One level of categorization focused on the probes and a priori issues that I built into the interview guide (e.g., "appearance"). Other themes emerged from the data as the analysis progressed (e.g., "clean" and "fences").

Initial Coding

I began the coding process by coding line-by-line the garden data for two sites. The garden data were the section in each interview where we discussed the greening project. I developed a beginning set of codes and categories based on the issues as represented in the interview guide: appearance, safety, control, etc. I read the section of each interview that dealt with the greening project, coding text to my a priori categories and creating new coding categories to capture emergent issues.

The coding structure is represented in N4 in the "index tree," and each category is called a "node" (Qualitative Solutions and Research, 1997). Often hierarchically arranged,

the index tree is fluid and easy to rearrange as ideas develop and change. Early in the

analysis process, I quickly went through three index tree structures as I grappled with the

data and my interpretation, as well as learned the software itself. Each restructuring

brought me one step closer to a sound, defensible analysis of the data. The final tree is in

Appendix 6.

Using Text Search in Coding

After the line by line coding of garden data from two sites, I developed a text

search routine and applied this to all data. I reviewed the categories already developed and

looked for the words respondents used to talk about the issues. Sometimes these were

obvious. For instance, the search criteria for "fences" was "fence, fenced, fences, lock,

locked, gate." Others were more complicated or abstract. For instance, the search criteria

for appearance included "appearance," "beauty" (and its variants), "eyesore," "looks,"

"terrible," "ugly," "awful," "pretty," "brings out," and others. I was able to develop search

criteria for all of the concepts in the interview guide and most of the emergent concepts.

After stipulating the search criteria, I wrote a command file for N4 to search all the

interview data and create new nodes for each search result. Reading and refining the

results of these searches allowed me to look at all data from all interviews by concept.

This style of coding and review saved time and, more importantly, allowed

different perspectives on the data. While reviewing the results of each text search, I could

still interactively code for other concepts, and I could run additional searches and add them

to existing search results. This approach also coded the entire interview for each

respondent, not just the garden section.

Further Line-By-Line Coding

After the text search results were compiled, I continued the line-by-line analysis of all the garden data. When new concepts emerged, if I could create applicable search terms, I would run a new text search. In this way I conducted a thorough, detailed analysis of the data most relevant to my study—the garden data—and captured major themes from the remaining sections of the interview data.

Auto Coding

The SPSS file was used to code the qualitative data for demographics and responses to the structured interview questions. This allowed me to analyze the coded text data by gender, age, level of community satisfaction, and other variables.

Memoing

Memoing is a basic element of qualitative analysis (Charmaz, 1988; Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Researchers can use memos to develop their ideas about the data, writing about what is interesting, confusing, and surprising in the data and why. Memos can become data themselves, documenting the researcher's analysis. Memos can be used to track the development of a particular code, to create an analysis log or audit trail.

N4 supports memos on nodes and documents. Text can be copied from the data set into the memo, keeping track of the source of an idea and keeping the research grounded in the data. N4 also makes automatic memo notations any time a node is moved from one location to another on the index tree.

I wrote many memos, occasionally creating a node—before there were specific data to code to the node—just to keep track of an idea. I wrote memos for the nodes, not documents. I noted how I used a specific node, developing my decision criteria for its use. I also wrote stream-of-consciousness notes about the data. I copied quotes from the interviews that seemed particularly illustrative of the category or concept.

Management of Quantitative Data

Some minor statistics were calculated with the quantitative data. These were limited to descriptive statistics like means and ranges; a few t-tests were also run on the block satisfaction data. I ran a reliability check on the survey instruments. The data did not support analysis beyond these simple procedures.

Checks on Analytic Rigor

Qualitative researchers are still grappling with how to best judge qualitative work in terms of validity and reliability issues. Many scholars reject quantitative research's labels and underlying constructs of internal validity, external validity, and reliability, choosing instead to create new terms more specific to and reflective of issues in qualitative research (Guba, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Some reject these issues altogether, usually on the grounds that socially constructed meanings belie any possibility of "truth" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

But most scholars see the need for reliability and validity issues to be addressed carefully in qualitative research (Dey, 1993; Guba, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Silverman, 1993; Wolcott, 1994). Many approaches and tactics to

increase rigor have been developed, as researchers present their individual approaches to

the scholarly community. The growing list of tactics for trustworthiness in qualitative

research is helpful, but dizzying. With so many tactics and variations, what's the novice

researcher to do? I came to realize that I cared most that I:

- not overlook something,

- not overrate something,

- apply my codes consistently and clearly,

- can support my claims and findings with traceable data,

- have coherent analyses and findings that contribute to theory,

- have findings that are cogent to practitioners,

- reflect relatively accurately the slice of life I saw and heard.

Using these concerns as a guide, I reviewed the tactics in the qualitative literature

and selected the following as tools to increase the trustworthiness of my interpretations. It

is worth noting that having my data online in N4 helped considerably in implementing

these tactics. Tactics that were easier because of computerization include (but are not

limited to) searching for negative evidence and rival explanations, and intra-coder checks

(Charmaz, 1988; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Dey, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Lofland &

Lofland, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Tactics to Guard Against Overlooking and Overrating Data

Second readers, following random paths through the data, searching for negative

cases and evidence, searching for rival explanations, and using data displays can all help to

ensure that I appropriately interpreted the data (Dey, 1993; Huberman & Miles, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

To corroborate my reading and interpretation of the interviews, it was particularly important to review the ground-up analysis. I had some concrete top-down issues that I asked about in the interview, and these were relatively easy to categorize and interpret. For example, when I ask about appearance and the respondent tells me about appearance, it is logical to categorize this exchange under "appearance." But the data were rich and I was not just interested in the face value of answers to specific probes. It was in this area that I was more concerned about verifying my interpretations and analysis. To this end, two separate readers reviewed a subset of interviews selected at random, with two interviews per site. This is 15% of the interviews.

I gave the readers an excerpt from my dissertation proposal and a copy of the interview guide so that they would know the basic issues that were of interest to me (for instance, it is possible to read my data for satisfaction with city services, the importance of religion, or family coping strategies, but these are not directly relevant to my substantive interests). These readers did *not* have my coding structure for the data. I asked them to note the themes and issues that seemed important or significant to them. I compared their interpretations with my own. Our interpretations were similar. Mine were, of course, more detailed. My second readers both have training in psychology and were more likely to describe the emotional content of the data than I was. The second readers did not uncover important points in the data that I had overlooked.

Tactics to Guard Against Inconsistent and Unclear Coding

I conducted intra-coder reliability checks, used random paths through the data, and defined each node with a description of its development and final decision rules for its application (Dey, 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

When I felt nearly done with the coding, I codified my decision rules for each category and conducted the intra-coder tests. My code memos were invaluable in tracing the development and final meaning of each code. Then I re-coded garden data from four of the interviews reviewed by the second readers and compared the second coding to the first. I had an intra-coder reliability level of 94%. While I applied the codes uniformly, the process did uncover some redundant nodes which I combined or deleted.

Tactics to Guard Against Insupportable Claims and Findings

I used thick description and a contextual presentation, and searched for negative cases/evidence and rival explanations (Dey, 1993; Guba, 1981; Lofland & Lofland, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

I use quotes and some pictures taken by respondents to provide the thick description and context in this report. Negative case analysis and rival explanations are also reported, sometimes with supporting quotes.

I tried developing an audit trail and analysis log as outlined by Miles and Huberman and Guba and Lincoln (Guba, 1981; Huberman & Miles, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994). I found the process time consuming in the extreme and somewhat duplicative of features in N4. Huberman and Miles (1994) acknowledge this and suggest that audit trails are more appropriate for high-stakes studies. N4 tracks some audit trail information. Text search results are saved as separate nodes, with a date and time stamp.

When nodes are merged, N4 notes this in a node memo, again including the date and time the nodes are merged. I also used the node memos to track my train of thought about the data I coded to a particular node. These features allow a researcher to trace the development of the analysis, the primary function of an audit trail. For these reasons, I stopped creating a separate, detailed analysis log.

Tactics to Guard Against Incoherent Analyses and Findings that are Disconnected from Theory

In the literature, the tactics presented in this area are more declarative: one should be sure one's conclusions are linked to theory. *How* to be sure one's conclusions are linked to theory is left unclear. This is somewhat resolved in my current study because I built some of my questions and probes around empowerment theory and the meanings of green space. To expand on this in the analysis, I reviewed data for examples of empowerment variables and meanings of green space and for potential new variables and meanings related to these theoretical domains.

Tactics to Guard Against Findings that are not Cogent to Practitioners

I reviewed findings with practitioners from Green Corps and with other Forest Service colleagues. This took place during the analysis and writing phases of the project. Discussions with Suzanne Malec, the creator of Green Corps and research ally, were quite useful in designing the study, understanding preliminary findings, and developing the practitioner's model.

<u>Summary of Design, Methods, and Analysis</u>

In summary, this study used primarily qualitative methods of photo-elicitation, interview, and thematic analysis to investigate the claims of social benefits arising from participation in urban greening projects. Residents of four blocks in Chicago were interviewed. The blocks were selected from all the residential blocks participating in the 1995 Green Corps Chicago program. Two of the sites were thought by Green Corps practitioners to have had social benefits from the project and two were thought to not have had such benefits. Both participants and nonparticipants on each block were interviewed. This created a set of comparative cases: success and failure sites, participants and nonparticipants, and across all four sites. The final, purposive, sample included 55 respondents in 54 interviews across the four sites.

Respondents were asked to take ten photographs of changes for the better or worse in their neighborhood over the past five years. These photos were used in interviews with each respondent. We discussed the changes and their impacts on the individual and the block. The transcripts of the interviews were analyzed; QSR's NUD*IST version 4 was used both for data management and to assist in-depth analysis. A priori and emergent themes were explored in an iterative, interactive coding and analysis process. Trustworthiness techniques including second readers and intra-coder reliability checks were used to ensure the rigor of the analyses.

RESULTS: STORIES FROM THE FIELD

In this chapter, I will present the interview results: the closed-ended question responses and the story of each block. While this is largely a results section, analysis of each site individually and in comparison to others shapes the telling of each block's story. Two discussion chapters follow. The first examines empowerment theory and empowerment outcomes at each site and across sites. The second discussion chapter is a preliminary investigation of the subtle impacts of "clean" and "dirt" on social outcomes of greening projects. These two discussion chapters build on the stories told here.

Block Satisfactions and Attachment

Before telling the story of each site, let's take a quick look at the results of closed-ended questions on general block satisfaction, ratings of block attributes, and block attachment. These results are summarized in Tables 5-8. I ran simple statistical analysis on these data to support the qualitative analysis of the interviews. Given the nature of these data (self-report, small sample sizes, and categorical), the statistical tests should not be given too much weight.

Satisfaction and Attribute Ratings

The success site respondents (those from Ashland and Halsted) generally reported higher satisfaction and more positive changes on their blocks than did respondents on failure sites (those from Pulaski and Jefferson Homes). The Ashland respondents reported the most positive change. They rated everything as better, particularly safety and crime. At the Halsted site, respondents

TABLE 5

SATISFACTION AND BLOCK ATTRIBUTE RATING COMPARISONS
NOW VERSUS FIVE YEARS AGO
BY SITE

Attributes rated	Halsted			Ashland			Pulaski			Jefferson Homes		
	then	now	change	then	now	change	then	now	change	then	now	change
General block satisfaction[a]	3.08	2.67	-0.41 +	4.20	2.70	-1.50 ++**	2.18	2.91	0.73 -	2.38	2.21	-0.17 same
Unsafe ... safe	3.50	5.25	1.75 ++***	2.30	4.70	2.40 ++***	5.36	3.91	-1.45 --**	4.88	5.13	0.25 same
Unattractive ... attractive	4.17	4.25	0.08	3.10	4.50	1.40 ++	5.82	3.91	-1.91 --***	4.50	4.71	0.21 same
High crime ... low crime	5.25	6.08	0.83 +	1.90	3.90	2.00 ++***	6.27	4.09	-2.18 --***	4.92	5.63	0.71 +*
Unfriendly ... friendly	5.00	5.17	0.17 +	4.40	5.60	1.20 ++*	5.64	5.64	0.00	5.13	5.33	0.20 +
Poorly maintained ...well maintained	4.25	4.42	0.17 +	3.40	5.00	1.60 ++**	5.73	3.55	-2.18 --***	4.13	3.67	-0.46 -
Little greenery ... much greenery	3.33	5.33	2.00 ++***	3.30	5.40	2.10 ++**	5.45	4.64	-0.81 -	3.79	4.88	1.09 ++**
Not stressful ... stressful	5.00	4.50	-0.50 -	2.60	3.80	1.20 ++*	5.82	4.36	-1.46 --**	4.29	4.09	-0.20 same

NOTES: [a] This question was asked with a reverse scale. * significant at the .1 level. ** significant at the .05 level
*** significant at the .01 level

TABLE 6

SATISFACTION AND BLOCK ATTRIBUTE RATING COMPARISONS
NOW VERSUS FIVE YEARS AGO
BY PARTICIPANT STATUS

Attributes rated	Participants				Nonparticipants			
	then	now	change		then	now	change	
General block satisfaction[a]	2.95	2.68	-0.27	same	2.79	2.45	-0.34	+
Unsafe … safe	3.91	4.77	0.86	+[*]	4.30	4.85	0.55	+
unattractive … attractive	4.59	4.91	0.32	+	4.33	4.06	-0.27	same
high crime … low crime	4.86	4.95	0.09	same	4.39	5.06	0.67	+[*]
unfriendly … friendly	5.50	5.59	0.09	same	4.70	5.18	0.48	+
poorly maintained …well maintained	4.73	4.23	-0.50	-	4.09	3.94	-0.15	same
little greenery … much greenery	3.86	5.45	1.59	++[**]	3.91	4.70	0.79	+[*]
not stressful ... stressful	4.16	4.47	0.31	+	4.18	4.06	-0.12	same

NOTES: [a] This question was asked with a reverse scale. [*] significant at the .1 level. [**] significant at the .05 level
[***] significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 7

SATISFACTION AND BLOCK ATTRIBUTE RATING COMPARISONS
NOW VERSUS FIVE YEARS AGO
BY SUCCESS/FAILURE SITE

Attributes rated	Success sites				Failure sites			
	then	now	change		then	now	change	
General block satisfaction[a]	3.59	2.68	-0.91	+[**]	2.36	2.45	0.09	same
Unsafe … safe	2.95	5.00	2.05	++[***]	4.94	4.70	-0.24	-
Unattractive … attractive	3.68	4.36	0.68	+	4.94	4.42	-0.54	-
High crime … low crime	3.52	4.95	1.43	++[***]	5.24	5.06	-0.18	same
Unfriendly … friendly	4.73	5.36	0.63	+	5.21	5.33	0.12	same
Poorly maintained …well maintained	3.86	4.68	0.82	+[*]	4.67	3.64	-1.03	--[**]
Little greenery … much greenery	3.32	5.36	2.04	++[***]	4.27	4.76	0.49	+
Not stressful ... stressful	3.50	4.40	0.90	+	4.59	4.09	-0.50	-

NOTES: [a] This question was asked with a reverse scale. [*] significant at the .1 level. [**] significant at the .05 level
[***] significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 8

BLOCK ATTACHMENT ACROSS COMPARISON GROUPS

Block attachment question [a,b]

I have a sense of belonging with the people on this block.

Block	mean	min/max.	Success/failure	mean	min/max.	Participant status	mean	min/max.
Halsted	3.42	2 - 5	Success	3.27	1 - 5	Part.*	3.68	2 - 5
Ashland	3.10	1 - 5	Failure	3.33	1 - 5	Nonpart	3.06	1 - 5
Pulaski	3.55	2 - 5						
Jefferson	3.29	1 - 5						

Friends and associations on the block mean a lot to me.

Block	mean	min/max.	Success/failure	mean	min/max.	Participant status	mean	min/max.
Halsted	3.58	2 - 5	Success*	3.77	2 - 5	Part.*	3.77	2 - 5
Ashland	4.00	2 - 5	Failure	3.15	1 - 5	Nonpart	3.15	1 - 5
Pulaski	3.00	1 - 5						
Jefferson	3.25	1 - 5						

I think that we plan things together rather than they plan things.

Block	mean	min/max.	Success/failure	mean	min/max.	Participant status	mean	min/max.
Halsted	3.42	1 - 5	Success	3.32	1 - 5	Part.**	3.82	1 - 5
Ashland	3.20	2 - 5	Failure	3.36	1 - 5	Nonpart	3.03	1 - 5
Pulaski	3.55	2 - 5						
Jefferson	3.29	1 - 5						

I feel loyal to the people on the block.

Block	mean	min/max.	Success/failure	mean	min/max.	Participant status	mean	min/max.
Halsted	4.00	1 - 5	Success*	3.86	1 - 5	Part.**	3.95	1 - 5
Ashland	3.70	2 - 5	Failure	3.15	1 - 5	Nonpart	3.09	1 - 5
Pulaski	3.36	2 - 5						
Jefferson	2.96	1 - 5						

I get a sense of community from living on the block.

Block	mean	min/max.	Success/failure	mean	min/max.	Participant status	mean	min/max.
Halsted	3.67	1 - 5	Success	3.55	1 - 5	Part.*	3.77	1 - 5
Ashland	3.40	2 - 5	Failure	3.27	1 - 5	Nonpart	3.12	1 - 5
Pulaski	3.09	1 - 5						
Jefferson	3.33	1 - 5						

NOTES: [a] Questions were answered on a five point scale: (1) not at all, (2) a little, (3) a medium amount, (4) quite a lot, and (5) very much.

[b] These items had a Cronbach's alpha of .88. * Significant across this comparison group at .1. ** Significant across this comparison group at .05

reported positive change as well. Safety was rated higher, as was greenery. The Jefferson

Homes respondents reported the least change, although they reported somewhat less crime

and more greenery. Pulaski respondents reported a significant worsening of their block.

Every indicator was rated worse now than five years ago, with attractiveness, crime, and

maintenance rated much worse. Analysis by success/failure blocks reflected these

differences. Analysis by participant/nonparticipant status showed no significant differences

in their ratings.

<div align="center">Block Attachment</div>

The block attachment questions were:

- How much would you say that you have a sense of belonging with the people on this block?

- How much would you say that the friendships and associations you have with other people on this block mean a lot to you?

- How much would you say that, if the people on this block were planning something, you'd think of it as something "we" were doing *together* rather than something "they" were doing?

- How much would you say that you feel loyal to the people on this block?

- How much would you say that you get a sense of community from living on this block?

The response scale was (1) not at all to (5) very much.

Although the respondents within each site ranged from negative to positive, the

overall response to the block attachment item was generally positive (Table 8). The major

differences in respondents' block attachment show up in the participant status analysis.

Participants reported more attachment to the people on their block, with a significant difference in their responses for all the questions, but particularly in feeling that *we* plan things on the block and in their sense of loyalty to people on the block.

<u>Block Stories</u>

<u>Halsted</u>

"*Girl,* do you know where you are?" the letter carrier asked me my second time on the block. He had made a beeline for me from across the street as I was going door to door late one morning. I assured him that I did know where I was, but he pressed on: "No, do you know where you *are*? Where are you from?" He relaxed, though, when I told him that I was interviewing people on this block and only this block of Halsted. "Oh, OK then. If you're on this block, you'll be OK." He was insistent that I would *not* be OK if I were one block north, east, or west, but that "this block is different." And it is. This block has a group of determined residents working to "improve the community and make it a better place to live." I was safe on this block, although I followed the letter carrier's advice and did not go into one particular apartment building. People on the block came to know who I was, and several kept an eye out for me. Usually this was in a positive way, but others were interested in my presence, too. Once as I climbed out of my car, a young man walked through the neighborhood shouting "Federal agent alert! Federal agent alert!" acting the town crier, notifying others to beware my presence.

Setting

This block of largely residential homes is worn. Frame and brick two-flats with occasional

single family homes line each side of the street (Figure 1A, unless otherwise indicated all

photographs were taken by respondents as a part of the photo-elicitation exercise). There

are a few empty lots, but they do not dominate the block. One larger apartment building

(the one I was warned away from) sits next to the garden lot. The street intersects with a

busy, commercial and industrial through street to the south and a residential street on the

north. On one corner of the northern intersection is a small commercial building that

houses a church. Kitty corner from the church is a boarded up, mixed residential and

commercial building. Small, neat, single family, brick ranch houses are on the other two

corners of this intersection. More storefront churches are on the commercial street on the

south end of the block.

The street is lined with large, old trees, mostly silver maples. As is customary with

this species, the roots are at the surface, making a lawn difficult, if not impossible, to

maintain. Many backyards have towering cottonwood trees. A few residents have planted

flowers in front of their houses. Signs of the residents' interest in improving the block

abound: "adopt a block" signs hang on the street poles, a block club sign outlining the

block rules sits on the corner. Those rules are: no littering, no loud radio playing, no

working on cars.

Residents and Actors

Several residents are active in the block and the block club (sample characteristics

are summarized in Table 9). Some residents cite three older women as the core of the

1A   BLOCK

1B   GARDEN

FIGURE 1. HALSTED.

TABLE 9

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

	Success Sites		Failure Sites	
	Halsted	Ashland	Pulaski	Jefferson Homes
Racial/ethnic composition	Black[a]	Black	mixed	Black
Gender	7E, 5G	7E, 3G	11E, 0G	23E, 1G
Average age	47	41	34	46
Average number of children	3.1	2.4	1.8	3.7
Average household size	3.2	3.4	4.2	3.1
Average length of residency (years)	17	15.4	13.4	18
% Homeowners	67	60	64	0
Education (% with education/training past High School)	50	70	82	54
Work status (% employed)	66	80	100	42
Income	58% under 25,000 (25% < 15,000)	economic mix: 33% under 15,000; 44% over 40,000	economic mix: 44% under 25,000 (18% < 15,000), 27% over 25,000	all less then 25,000; 54% under 15,000.
Average number pictures taken	18	15	7	15
% Respondents that photographed the garden	75%	44%	71%	never
Pictures of other greening projects?	no	yes	no	yes, over half
How many participants in these?	None	several	NA	almost half

Note: [a] I use the term "Black" rather than "African American" because when I asked respondents how they wanted their race and ethnicity identified, most said "Black" or "I don't care."

block: Harriet, Sharon, and Veronica. Harriet, although not currently the block club

president, is the leader of the block. She is their connection to the outside world, the one to

call the Alderman or other city offices. A woman in her late forties, she is articulate and,

with a bachelor's degree, more educated than most block residents. Harriet is also very

active in her church, the neighborhood homeowners association (a community-wide

organization), and CAPS (community policing in Chicago). She has lived on the block for

20 years. She is determined to make a better block:

> [I] still feel that one day this will be a better block or a *beautiful*
> block. That it can be done. All it takes is for people to care, uh,
> maintain their property and up keeping their lawn and keep our area
> *clean*.

Sharon is equally active. Designated as the one who knows about flowers, she

designed the garden plantings. Limited by arthritis, gardening is becoming difficult for her.

Sharon has lived on the block for 15 years, is quite vocal about the change they are trying

to make on the block, and catches grief for it. She acknowledges this, telling me:

> And I wouldn't have to walk down the block and [hear them] say
> "there come Miss nosy Samuels trying to tell us what to do," you
> know. You don't want to tell grown people what to do. You want
> them to do what they got to do. You know, to clean up in front of
> their own front door. All I can say, clean up in front of your front
> doors.

She has planted many flowers in her yard, her parkway, and in her neighbor's yard.

She has hanging plants on her front porch. She cleans up the block regularly, often

enlisting the help of other block residents to do so. Sharon is in her mid fifties, educated

through grade school. She has four adult children who help her out financially. She is

interested in starting a home day care but unsure how to go about it. She was unsure of herself in the interview, worried that I wouldn't understand her and anxiously trying to speak as properly as possible.

Veronica is the current block club president. She lives with her "old man" in a house they bought 20 years ago. A high school graduate, Veronica is quiet, even laconic, and listless. She saw things in a negative light compared to others' positive interpretation of events on the block. Still, she was active in the garden project, often going down to pick up bottles and trash, and chase the children out of the garden lot.

Doc Martin is somewhat itinerant, but a firm fixture on the block. His aunt owns a home and his sister rents on the block. He stays with each of them, or off the block. Doc Martin is very active, sweeping and cleaning up and down the block. Sometimes he is asked to do this by Sharon; other times he just does it. In his forties he has six children and was job hunting while I was on site. Doc Martin is jovial, smiles a lot, but seemed uneasy with his lack of property.

Mr. Nichols is a retired man who has lived on the block for nine years. A bricklayer by trade, his neat brick ranch is carefully maintained. Flowers abound in front, courtesy of Sharon. Mr. Nichols participated in the garden project and then took the ideas to his church. The church members cleaned up a lot across the street from it. Mr. Nichols says that a neighbor of that lot now keeps it clean and mowed. Mr. Nichols is determined to make his block a better place. He did not take photographs for me and returned the camera. When I asked what he would have taken photos of, he said the drug dealers so that he could show the photos to the police. I gave him the camera back.

Doug, Thomas, and Charles hang out together a lot. Doug and Charles are relatives and live in the same home, a brick bungalow. Thomas lives one block north, but is so much a part of the block that I included him in the sample. Doug is a quiet young man, at least when around me. His pet pit bull, Diamond, sat in my lap for much of the interview. Doug reports being self-employed as a car mechanic. He had been incarcerated, but did not tell me for what. He helped with the garden, mostly by hauling wood chips. Doug's mother used to be the president of the block club but is no longer active in the club. Charles has some college and is employed. He did not participate in the garden project, and participates minimally in the block party.

Mrs. Robertson is a visiting nurse. She has lived on the block the longest of those that I interviewed. She is not a part of the block club and feels somewhat excluded by the club's activities. She has a well-maintained yard with flowers in a tire planter and around the base of a tree. She shares her modest home with her husband and one of her eight adult children.

Shirley is in her early sixties and another long-term resident of the block. She is active in the block club and sums up her role this way:

> I am not the leader, I'm a follower so, whatever decisions that they
> made and whatever need to be done I'm there to *help* to do it. So, I
> help them with everything they do.

And help she does, with the garden, the block party, and with cleaning up the block on a regular basis. She lives with her husband on the first floor of a worn frame two-flat. Her daughter rents the upstairs apartment.

There were several residents who either declined to be interviewed or I was unable to catch. Carmen is a young woman who lives on the block and works with the children. Sharon and other residents chip in whatever money they can so that Carmen can take the kids places. She worked with the girls on a dance routine for the block party. Other residents definitely did not want to talk to me. None were rude. In some cases it seemed that I was too much of an unknown. In other cases, people were too busy or simply uninterested.

I was able to interview the letter carrier as well as the pastor of the church on the corner and the chief of staff for the Alderman's office. The aldermanic staff member was aware of the garden; the pastor was not.

History of the Block

This block had previously had a block club, but it became inactive. What brought it back to life was the act of signing petitions to prevent a tavern from reopening on the block. A tavern had been located on the residential corner of the block, but it was closed because of frequent fights and a murder in front of the tavern. When another tavern wanted to open in the same building, the precinct captain brought petitions around to the neighbors. The residents signed against a tavern. A little while later, a church was interested in opening in that building. Again, the precinct captain came around with petitions, and the residents signed in favor of the church. This small amount of activity— signing the petitions—spurred people on to want to do more. They had had an impact on their block, and now wanted to take the next step. They resurrected the block club, started to meet more regularly. Together they tried to address other block problems: prostitution,

abandoned buildings, drug dealing, guys hanging out and sometimes running through their block to get away from police. The new block club operates democratically: they vote on issues after a discussion period. They have a president and vice president, and the people in these positions change regularly.

Another block club effort has been to encourages rental property owners to do more to keep up their buildings. One uncooperative target has been the owner of the garden lot. He also owns a rundown house on the lot next to the garden. The yard has not been mown and the garage door is falling off. Harriet said they try to get the owner to fix up the property, sometimes they do some work themselves, and sometimes they get some help from the Streets and Sanitation Department when the situation gets out of control.

The changes instigated by the block club have not all gone smoothly. The young men on the block reported mixed feelings about the block club. Some credit the club with making some good changes, some felt excluded from the group, and some called the block club leaders "nosy bitches." One of the changes that the club instigated was a ban on auto repair in the street. One day Sharon called the police about some of the guys working on their car. The police came and intervened. That night the guys congregated outside Sharon's house. A neighbor tells it:

> Oh honey they had a, you might say they had a disco party going on
> in the middle of the street and they was playin' all kinds of music
> and they was dancing and partyin' and saying 'call the police you
> bitch' you know.

The young men are not the only ones to feel excluded. Most of my respondents belonged to the block club. Mrs. Robertson was an older woman, a long-term homeowner

on the block, who was not a block club member. She, too, felt excluded from the block club. She agreed with many of the aims of the block club members, but felt that their style was too dictatorial. She had two separate encounters with the club that left a sour taste. First, the block club was working on getting yard lights into everyone's front yard. Those without the resources would be helped by a kitty. Mrs. Robertson was under the impression that the costs for installing the lights would be paid for out of the kitty:

> From what source? I don't know, the precinct? I don't know. But they came from someplace! … They said they was gonna reimburse us for having our lines run and all this. Which they never did. And um, you know, it seem like we was just, we had to do it all on our own. You know, we had to do it all ourselves. Which we really didn't mind, it was the idea why did they get theirs free and we had to *buy* ours and sit it out there?

> Her next encounter happened when she came back from a trip in late October. She

found her yard light decorated for Halloween. Mrs. Robertson does not like Halloween:

> so I had to tell [the block club members] about it and I think they got pretty upset with me about it. I told them don't ever do it. I said do *not put those things in my yard*. They said 'our lights.' What lights? That's my light. I brought those lights. I brought those lights and put that there so, ask me if at least if I *want* it in my yard.

The block club also encourages people to clean up around the fronts of their houses. Mr. Nichols said there was some pressure not to cooperate and some garbage tossed into front yards. Mrs. Robertson sums up the need this way:

> I think, um, a lot of this stuff would be eliminated if they just try to ease they self into a situation where you talk to the younger people and you can really make a lot of sense that way. You can really get through to people if you go talk to them in the right way instead of pushing. Its um, I used to hear this saying 'you can lead me with a [kite string] but you can't drive me with a 45'.

Harriet, however, felt that one of the strong points of the block club was that they had made communication with the young men better, not worse:

> I think the project brought us closer together uh, it made us become, uh, concerned, really being more watchful, um, treating each other better uh, as neighbors. Because we even worked with, you know some of the young mens, they are in their early twenties and early thirties, some of them even came out to help and it sort of opened up a line of communication with the older people on the block and the young adults. And we even, even some of the children, just kind of open up the lines of communication that we all care and let's all just try to show love and be concerned about each other. So, I think it helped us, because we do now. We didn't have that closeness um, and the garden really helped to develop that and bring us closer together.

And some of the young men corroborate this:

> L: OK. Do you think that the project changed how the neighbors worked together?
> Charles: Yeah.
> L: How'd it do that?
> Charles: Getting more communication.

The new church was well liked. The programs for the children were particularly appreciated. These included a summer lunch program, winter coat drives, and a children's choir. The pastor was not aware of the garden and attributed the positive changes on the block to his church's activities on behalf of the block.

The Garden

After the church opened, residents turned to try and find what else they could do to improve their block. An empty lot was a prime target. It was "a garbage dump" with old

tires, bottles, and abandoned cars. The kids played on the lot amid the garbage, doing flips and other tricks. Guys would hang out there, "drinking, playing loud music, it was really, really filthy, I mean really filthy." The block wanted to make a play lot for the kids, and it was with this idea that they approached the Alderman.

The Alderman's office told the block club about Green Corps. Harriet contacted Green Corps, and their block was selected for the 1995 classes. They went in with the idea of creating a play lot, but the lot's owner wouldn't go along with that due to liability fears. The group decided to go ahead with a flower garden instead of the play lot (Figure 1B). Word of this change and the reasons for it did not get disseminated widely on the block. Some people knew what happened, but some felt betrayed by the change:

> All right. It looks good. And it made the [block?] look better, but
> before that yard was there … you could play in there. Used to do
> their little flips and everything. And as I was saying, keep the kids
> off the street … Now the kids'll run up and down the street.

The block club divvied up responsibilities based on residents' skills. Sharon designed the garden. Harriet went to the Green Corps courses. Mr. Nichols supplied cheerful hard work, as did Doc Martin and others. The guys helped to clear the lot and to haul the wood chips.

Since the garden went in, the block club has had to police it to keep the kids out.

Harriet:

> We *would* let them play there if a parent would supervise them. Last
> summer they were playing on the lot and they broke a window out
> of the apartment building and the person who owned the apartment
> building had to pay for the window … so, the community said 'no

there will be no baseball or football playing because you are subject
to breaking the woman's window.' …

The garden is at least moderately well maintained. The garden had clearly been

weeded at least once in the summer of 1997 (two years after the garden had been

installed), because there were so few weeds the work day I was there. Sharon and Veronica

talk about getting in there to clean up. But the gate on the garden lot is locked, with a

three-foot-high chain link fence. The block club also installed a fence along the alley

behind the garden lot. This helps to stop guys from running through the lot and from

hiding in the back of it.

Everyone I spoke with felt the garden made the block look much better. This was

true of the ardent block club members and the people who were not active in the project or

the block club:

> Mrs. Robertson: …Well it's improved because of the flowers and
> they put in and try to beautify it and everything. It looks better.

> L: … did this change how you feel about your block?
>
> Mr. Nichols: Yes, Ma'am. It did. Because like I say, like the
> flowers, you walk by that and you see the flowers on the block and
> you can look here and compare it to what it used to be. You know,
> and you would say 'well, I never would have thought this could be
> like this'. You know, especially *here* and then something you took
> part in you know it too, it just makes you feel warm on the inside.
> You know, like they say you know that would make the community
> look better, it's better to be looking across and see flowers than
> seeing old couches and chairs, bottles and things over there. So that
> you know, it looks a whole lot better. Like I said, to me it just bring
> life more to the neighborhood.

The garden was felt to have made the block safer in terms of accidents. Crime and related issues (e.g., safety from attack) were not considered to have been major problems before the garden, so there was no impact from the garden. Guys hanging out, dumping on the lot, drinking, working on cars, abandoned cars, were all considered to have been major problems before the garden, and ones that the garden helped to alleviate.

The garden was also thought by some to have had an impact on the maintenance of the block as a whole. Mr. Nichols put it this way:

> I do think that's a greater effect there in the peoples taking care of their houses and things. They seen that because, you see, that just a vacant lot out there and they saw that peoples was laboring out in that vacant lot you know to get it to look like it is looking now and what, what about your home? I know since then people sometime, every morning you get up you see somebody out there with a broom pushing it, not just *only* in front of their house you know, down the next houses and start me, started me to cutting this guy, cutting these here houses ...

Whether or not the garden was the inspiration for increased block maintenance, residents report that people are taking better care of their houses. There has been an effort to get more people to plant grass in front, and people have been doing this. I asked Sharon why grass is important. She told me, in a tone of voice like I was nuts:

> *Why*? It make it beautify your block more. It make it look like someone *live* there. You know, you don't just have to go down this dirt road with no grass.

According to the aldermanic staff member I interviewed, the Alderman was very impressed with this block. "If they can do it, anyone can do it." The Alderman extended a

proposed Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district boundaries to include the block so that residents could take advantage of any benefits available from the TIF designation. This was the only Alderman specifically aware of the garden projects.

<u>Halsted Summary</u>

Halsted residents were excited at the prospect of improving their block. They had participated in the successful fight to keep a tavern from re-opening on their block and were looking for the next step. The Alderman's office got them in touch with Green Corps, and they pursued the project.

The revived block club managed the project, led by three women. They delegated work based on people's skills, and voted at meetings to make decisions about what to do with the garden and other block issues. The garden has been maintained, and was appreciated by most block residents, whether or not they participated in the garden project.

There were some problems on the block, particularly in tense relationships with the young men. They felt blamed for any problem in the garden and felt that their interests were ignored. Still, the garden project helped several residents feel better about themselves and their block, more in control of their neighborhood, and the project also brought them to the attention of their Alderman who included their block in a TIF district.

<center><u>Ashland</u></center>

Each block had its own flavor as I made my way into the social network and started interviewing residents. Ashland, in the Englewood neighborhood, felt like old home week.

It was August and people were outside working on their lawns, sitting on the front stoop braiding their children's hair, sweeping up, saying hello as they came and went from errands. Children were out playing, riding bikes, jumping rope, just about every time I was on this block.

Setting

The Ashland site is a residential block with two-flat greystone and brick buildings (Figure 2A). There are two single family homes on the block and larger apartment buildings (approximately 10-15 units) on some of the corners. Nine lots on the block are empty.

There are many long-term residents on this block, and families living in the two-flats, with different generations taking each apartment. About one-third of the residents have iron or chain link fences around their front yards. Most residents keep up the front of their houses at least minimally; some work hard, planting, mowing, putting up decorative fences, painting the trunks of the mature street trees. The street trees are primarily on the southern half of the block. The mature catalpa, American elm, and Norway maple are quite large.

One resident on the block has built fences of found materials to enclose empty lots on either side of her house. These lots have been planted with a variety of shrubs and trees, some reportedly appropriated from nearby street and park tree plantings. Odd bits of furniture and statuary also decorate these lots, along with over 30 big red bows on many of the shrubs and trees.

2A BLOCK

2B MARTHA'S GARDEN

2C CORNER GARDEN

FIGURE 2. ASHLAND.

<u>Residents and Actors</u>

There are several very strong personalities on this block (sample characteristics are summarized on Table 9, page 77). Martha Martin is the garden organizer and one of the block leaders. She used to be president of the block club. She is dealing with serious health problems these days, but reports a lot of activism in the past, including trips to protest in Springfield. Darius, a young man in his early twenties and the junior block captain, had this to say about Martha:

> That's Mrs. Martin. She's another very important person in the
> block. She, … my grandmother and maybe a few other people,
> maybe before my time, actually got the block together, sort of
> organized the block, have some unity. …

Kanisha Martin, Martha's daughter, is a headstrong woman in her late twenties. She also worked on the garden. She is active in the block: she used to be an officer in the block club and the primary organizer of the block back-to-school parties. Kanisha reported several altercations with neighbors, and I witnessed one. Exactly what the arguments were about wasn't always clear to me, but they were loud and had lasting repercussions with the relationships on the block. Kanisha cares fiercely about the neighborhood and cares even more about raising her kids:

> …I care, I am one of those parents that care. I'm not strung out on
> drugs and I don't drink. I'm the one that cares. So I'm not going to
> see my son out there doing something wrong and I'm sittin' there
> watching. I see parents out there seein' they kids doin' something
> wrong and won't say nothin.

The current president of the block club is Hettie Campbell. She was not home when I first stopped by, so I left my letter of introduction. She called me the minute she got my letter—the only person to do this—eager to talk to me and tell me the story of her block. She is a fairly new resident, having moved to the block about five years earlier. She became an organizer, and now is very active in CAPS. She has received local and national awards for her efforts in that program. She is a forceful yet gentle woman, with a fierce devotion to God, the Virgin Mary, and her family. About Hettie, Darius said:

> … she just had the power that the block needs. She's resourceful, you know, she knows the system, she has friends. If you ever need something, like the garbage is not being picked up, you know, you can call her and she'll get someone out here to pick up the trash. …

Miss Eva is the woman who built the makeshift fences around the empty lots that surround her house, decorating them with Christmas bows. She was sweeping the street when we were introduced. We did not have a formal interview (she did not want to have one), but did talk a time or two on the street. Other residents reported that she would start to tear down the houses next to her when they were vacant, thereby forcing their demolition by the city. Then she would appropriate the lots, fencing them in with makeshift fences.

Darius is a member of one of the long-time families on the block. His grandmother and Martha are good friends. He is active in projects and activities on the block, buying supplies for block parties and other events. He is working and going to college, and is proud of his cherry red, Mustang convertible. Children from the block came to the door several times during our interview, calling for Darius to come and do things with them.

Darius's mother, Etta Jones, works for the government in a specialized clerical position. She has stayed in the neighborhood because her mother is here and wants to stay. She says it would not be where she would choose to live:

> …It's just too many vacant houses here. You know it looks like, ya know well, what do these people do all day? If everyone is home then that means that no one is working, so what's going on in that neighborhood? Not for one that I would want to live in, not to buy, not to buy now.

Etta is not the only one who has problems with the block. Joyce lives in a bungalow on one of the block's corners. Her main problem is the young men that congregate and hang out on the corner, victims and perpetrators of many shootings. The first time we met, she showed me the gun shot holes in her living room and dining room walls and in her car:

> This [the street outside her house], I call, this strip here, Murderer Row. That's my own name for it. I have had to watch them scrape so many young boys up off these corners. I have become almost immune to gun shots. It is, [pause] It's sad.

Joyce clears the corner by blasting church music from inside her house, walking out and starting to preach "Now that we are gathered together in His name..." She is currently the block club vice president and got a job the day we set up an interview time. She had been going to school for her master's in education and landed a job at a nearby school. She was ecstatic to get the job, then exhausted by it when it started.

Other block residents include Albert, a single man in his middle years. Albert mowed the lawns on the parkway for awhile, and he and Darius considered getting a school bus to fix up and use to take the block kids on trips and to school. Still, he

complains that there are "too many kids" on the block. Jerry lives with his sister and her kids in a brick two-flat. He is under-employed and says he is willing to help in block projects but currently does not actually get involved. Christine lives with her mother and daughter in one of the greystone two-flats. Said by others on the block to be a drug user, Christine loves babies and helps a little bit with block activities. Patricia rents an apartment on the block. A newer resident, she is job hunting and trying to figure out what to do with her son when he gets out of prison. Mrs. Sheron and her 20-something daughter were packing to move, anxious and excited about having bought a house and at the same time sad about leaving her friends on the block where she had lived for 15 years or more.

There are many old, strong friendships on the block, and in many ways the residents embody the "it takes a village" approach to the children on the block. At the same time, there are tensions. The strongest is between Martha and Hettie. The two women do not like each other, and their antipathy affects the entire block. Martha feels usurped by Hettie. Hettie feels Martha is selfish and mean spirited. Kanisha says of the block:

> I mean like towards like strangers, you know like you, they're
> friendly. But neighbors, it's something about us, just us. Everybody
> else get along. But us, they don't like us. [laughs] I don't know why
> they don't like us, but they don't.

Aside from not liking each other, Martha and Hettie have different contacts outside the neighborhood. Hettie's are with the police and city administrative departments (e.g., housing). Martha generally works through the Alderman's office, reportedly attending his Wednesday open office sessions frequently.

A second major tension on the block is with Miss Eva and her appropriation of the empty lots. People resent losing solid housing stock to her demolition and particularly dislike the red bows. Her appropriation of the lots is a problem now that the block has become a Super Model Block. This will be discussed more in the following section.

History of the Block

This block is relatively stable. People move on and off the block, but many are long-term residents of 10, 20 years or more. The residents remember a vital community with many services needed for day-to-day living as well as social support:

> … when we moved over here, we had a Kroger [grocery store], we had a 5 and 10, a meat market, we had _____, we had a nice hardware, we used to have a little [family] owned restaurant where you could sit and drink sodas, we had all that stuff. (Martha)

Many of the empty lots were photographed as changes on the block. Darius remembers the tearing down of the neighborhood as a child:

> … You see so much being torn down over the last years. I mean I was young. … Miss Eva's, her yard actually was two homes there, they were built there and they were torn down when I was a young kid. And then they recently tore a building over here down, they tore this one down. Before that, they tore the laundromat down and they tore this down and like, OK, well, what's next? They really tear everything down and we won't have a block. The block's going to look like little spots here and there with people living in it and it looks kind of, kinda, kinda, rugged. Not to have every home sitting up looking nice, like someone living in it and someone taking care of it. So, we try to do our best. …

This block is near one of Chicago's boulevards. Several residents photographed the recent plantings the City put in on the boulevard. The trees and flowers are appreciated by many residents. The boulevard is a place for hanging out as well. Residents photographed the bottles that littered the ground. As Hettie put it as she described her photograph:

> Flowers on [the Boulevard]. But next to the flowers is bottles, whiskey bottles, trash and garbage. But this is a *beautiful* boulevard. And the city just, this is the second year that I requested those flowers. They started out with one and now there are three little patches of these flowers up there in just that picture.

Hettie is the resident responsible for bringing an active CAPS organization to the block. She says when she first moved to the block:

> … I got tired of running home every night when it get dark. I couldn't work oh, I was, 'I gotta get home, I gotta get home'. And then I was like 'shit, nobody should have to live like this' Not 24-7. Lord, what can I do, I walked, I _____. Oh, Lord, what can I do? Write the Commander [said like an answer to prayer, sign from God]. I never did this before in my life. Called once. 'Where am I?' 'You're in the 7th district.' 'Who, who's the commander?' 'Ronnie Watson.' 'OK. What's the address?' I told him everything: the killings, the shooting, the dope dealing. … He heard me with his heart. Honey, he sent so many police. … about two strong ones they were locking up everybody, honey. Oh, good, gracious alive. Police were everywhere. And after two good weeks, then the neighbors would come out. Start working on the cars. Stand around talking to each other, but they were *still* suspicious of me. They didn't know what my motives were. … After two weeks, then I wrote Ronnie Watson, a thank you letter. 'Do you hear any hallelujahs? Have you heard any Thank you, Jesus? Cuz it's all out here.' Then I just described how it had changed. Then I asked him, 'what can I do? Since you have done all this for me, somebody, you don't even know. What can I do, how can I help?' That's how I got involved with CAPS.

Hettie writes the area CAPS newsletter on a computer given to her by the police department. She is the main CAPS participant on the block. Others active in the program live on neighboring blocks. Some residents on Ashland didn't know the acronym "CAPS."

Hettie is not the block's only organizer. Martha talks of sit-ins in Springfield and other protests and activities to support the neighborhood's needs for good schools and other services. At some point Martha made contact with a greening group (before the Green Corps project). She could not remember the group's name, but I think it was the Resource Center in Kenwood. Working with this group, the block residents built a raised bed on the intersection Joyce called "Murder's Row" (Figure 2C). I call this the "corner garden" to differentiate it from the Green Corps garden project. Hettie participated in this project, purchasing a statue of the Virgin Mary for the box:

> … We were looking for Jesus but we couldn't find a Jesus. And most of these people either Baptist, or Sanctified or something like that but they're not Catholic. But I've got some Catholic background, from a child, So, when I saw Mary is like praying, cause it's mostly all women over here anyway. The women are the *doers*, they're the *movers*, they're the *shakers*. They make the biscuits, they handle everything. They do the *work*. So when I find Mary's, like *perfect*. And then *all* of us got together, we put cement in there, and everything to anchor it. They kept saying 'they'll steal it' and I said 'anybody steal Mary, they need to *have* her. Let that go. We would not file a police report on that.' And then everybody would chip in. Some people that drink a lot, they bought flowers, um, they would send $5.00 or $2.00 and so we just kept Mary up. And that was a bad corner. [pause] um We have a lot of killings and stuff on that corner, but it's not anymore.

Martha and Kanisha (perhaps others) plant the flowers in the raised bed. A sign post for a welcome-to-the-block sign stands behind it, waiting for the sign.

This long history of organizing, Hettie's more recent work with CAPS, and perhaps to a limited extent, the gardens, led the local police commander to designate the block a Super Model Block. Martha tells me why they were chosen for the program:

> Martha: … You know why we was chosen a super model block, right?
>
> L: No, I don't, why were you?
>
> Martha: We always have kept our block up. And the reason that they chose us as a super model block, is, OK, because of the people, OK, its just like a high crime area, that's the way the mayor look at it. If you have a rebirth of a community and you go in there and put something *in* there for these people that'll bring the community *up*…I don't care what nobody tell you, this is what *Commander Evans say*.

Commander Evans was not aware of Martha's garden project. Hettie is his main contact on the block. With the Super Model Block comes both problems and opportunities. Miss Eva's lots are prime for the promised new development of homes and tot lots. But she considers the lots hers and does not want to give them up. Some residents went to the housing department to try and force her to take down the bows and fences. Miss Eva retaliated by going to the Alderman, who issued a command to housing to leave Miss Eva alone. The tensions between Martha and Hettie are fueled by the Super Model Block program, too. Still, residents are cautiously hopeful that positive changes are on the way. As Etta told me: "They said to be patient, that this was more than a year program." The hopes are high—for houses, a field house or other youth center, new wrought iron fences for each house, and other major improvements to the built environment.

The Garden

It is in this context—a deteriorating neighborhood with residents prepared to fight for their homes—that the Green Corps garden project took place.

The lot where the garden went in once had a two-family building on it. This building was owned by Martha's friend Alonzo. The lot is right behind Martha's and Sandy's house, facing onto a side street (Figure 2B). There was a fire and the burned out shell of the house remained for several years. During this time, people hung out at the building, drinking and doing drugs. Joyce called the Alderman's office frequently to complain:

> Oh, listen, listen, I was practically on a first name basis with the [Alderman's] secretary for a while. I went from one extreme to another tryin' to get that building torn down, and it was not until I said "Don't you *dare* ring my bell and ask me to sign a damn thing for this man when re-election comes up 'cause I'm gonna ask him what the hell has he done for me lately?" It takes more than barbecue bowl and a slice of watermelon to pacify me. … And then, low and behold, who knocked on my door? Alderman [_____]. It was like, I'll be damned.

When the building was slated for demolition, Martha applied to Green Corps. Her motivation was, in part, to make something good for the block. But her motivation was also to keep the lot from Joyce, something Alonzo was probably in on. In her daughter's words:

> Kanisha: … the man that use to live there, he was having problems with the lady next door. She didn't like him either… Now if *she* [Joyce] would have took over it, it would have been [a horrible mistake] I believe that she wanted that property. And she probably still do _____. But we had signed a contract[4], we got permission from the owner saying that we could use that lot when it

---

[4] A reference to Green Corps' requirement for written permission from the lot owner before the garden is installed.

was torn down to build the garden. We did this before the building got tore down. We knew the building was gonna be tore down because it was on the demolition list. It so happen that we was, um, Martha knew Kristin [from the Resource Center], and Kristin knew something about Green Corps, and they was having money funding for the garden, if it was a *block* program. So we looked into it and that's what we did. When they tore down the building we went to the next garden class and then we got it started. So they was tearing it down, and _____. Permission from the owner and everything and he said you all can use it indefinitely, as long as she don't have it, I'll be happy [laughs].

This conflict over the lot is recognized by many of the block residents I talked with, both garden participants and nonparticipants.

The decision to put in the garden was made by Martha. She went door to door in the neighborhood talking with residents, but she made the decision. She created the name "Concerned Residents of Ashland" as the block club name, formalizing what had been an informal network. There were no meetings or discussion about which lot to use for the garden. This is problematic because several other possible sites were more central for the block. The garden site is behind Martha's house; as one resident put it: "It's around the corner. It's not even on this block."

Martha and Kanisha went to "school"—Green Corps—to learn how to plan and implement the garden project. Several block residents helped, particularly Darius. Albert also helped, although not with great enthusiasm: "I didn't like doing nothing when I got *off* work. But I was pushin' myself going back there to help her so she leave me alone." But he also reports that "we had, it was quite a—woooo—we had all kind of people out there doin' that stuff, little kids, old and young." But in my interviews it became clear that the primary participants were the Martin clan. Albert and Darius notwithstanding, this was not

a major *block* effort, but a major *extended family* effort. This included Martha's sister and

other relatives who lived in an apartment building across the street from—and with a full

view of—the garden lot. These family members have since moved. A potential exception

to this is the block's children. Both Martha and Kanisha say that they involved the

children. Darius corroborates this:

> … a lot of kids had a lot of input into how things were going to be
> matched up and how it was going to be, the whole layout. So kids
> had a little bit of influence on how they wanted it to look, so. It's
> kind of like a learning experience for the kids, well, I have a little
> control over how *I* want it to look, so, hey, it gave them the initiative
> to come out and help.

The garden has several raised beds with small to moderate perennials and shrubs

planted around the garden perimeter (Figure 2B). The space between the raised beds is

mulched with wood chips. The center, octagonal raised bed has a set of sculptures of the

Virgin Mary, Joseph, and Baby Jesus. There are also two raised beds on the parkway in

front of the garden. The plants Martha chose have biblical meanings:

> You know the story of the burning bush right? To show strength.
> Strength and power. Then we had Jacob's ladder in there, and that
> shows determination. Every tree in there, it means something. That's
> the way the garden is set up. It *means* something. Symbolically,
> naming, in the biblical sense. Because it's strength and hope. My
> goal was, like a lot of people came through here. Some people be
> down and depressed. They stand there and they just look and a smile
> come on their face, it uplifts.

Martha did have the altruistic goal of creating an uplifting space in the

neighborhood. At the same time (as mentioned earlier), she had the goal of keeping the

space out of the hands of her neighbor Joyce. Like the conflicting motivations for the

garden, Martha had conflicting motivations in her decision to build a fence around the

garden. She explains the motive as protecting the children. She was concerned that they

were finding hypodermic needles and used condoms on the lot when they would help her

clean it up. I found supporting evidence for these concerns. When I helped on a work day,

I found several crack cocaine bags in the garden. At the same time, Martha was interested

in securing the back of her house. Martha asked Green Corps for help with a fence and got

it. She installed a six-foot-high fence around the garden and put a padlock on the gate.

Martha and Kanisha are the only residents with a key. Residents of the block view the

fence with, at best, skepticism. Darius said:

> …One thing I don't like about it, I *love* this part [the plants], but I
> don't like the big fence. The big fence takes away from the beauty
> but they say we have to protect it. Can't be open. I prefer a little
> fence, maybe 3,4, maybe 2-3 feet high. It would look more pleasant.
> This looks like we're just trying to protect something instead of
> having it you know be there for the public to see and utilize. Maybe
> you want to sit around and just look at it, and just feel comfortable.
> This is Miss Johnson's idea, the big six-foot fence put around it. I
> was against it, she was for it and you know who won out. …

Hettie and I had the following exchange:

> L: Do you have any idea why they put the fence up?
> Hettie: [pause] ownership.

And from Etta:

> I think the intentions were good. But I think it's over processed then
> it's roped off and only *one* person has access to this. And that's Miss
> Martin. So if it were something being done for the community, the
> community has no access! … why just take the small parcel and you

know fence it off and say well this _____, it's right behind your
house and it makes it look awful nice.

Still, not everyone had just negative things to say about the fence. Jerry thought

there were some positives because the fence reduced hanging out. Joyce, Martha, and

Kanisha recognized positive benefits for their homes. The fence keeps trash from blowing

into their yards, but more importantly it protects them from break-ins. Other residents also

recognized these benefits to Martha's and Sandy's homes.

The garden is not open for residents to sit or play in it, or to maintain it. This is due

in large part to Martha's putting up the fence, but it did not sound like the garden was

heavily used before then. Albert spoke of going there a couple of times "but there ain't no

peace." Still, the garden has had an impact on the appearance of the block. Darius said:

Oh, it looked *much* more beautiful, *much more* attractive. You see
so much being torn down over the last years. ...

...It beautifies the block. As far as anything else that's happening, as
far as all the other buildings being torn down, it becomes, not a
disgrace, but uhh, something unpleasant to look at. It kinda like, you
know hey, this is something different, this is something no one has
ever thought about, you know, having a garden that most of us have
grass, with shrubs and trees, something different. ...

Other residents had this to say about the effect of the garden on the appearance of

the block:

Martha: It made it more beautiful. Some beauty, color than just a
plain, dirt yard makes a great difference. It enhanced a lot of
positive thinking by that garden being there, you know. ...

Albert: Ah, in a sense, cause when you drive up in the alley you see all, how everything look all raggedy and this like a bright light at the end of the rainbow. [chuckles]

Joyce: ...it certainly looks better, *when* it's kept up. It looks better than it would if it were just a, you know, vacant lot, and umm, I don't worry so much about the vagrants, you know, they used to hang out in that buildin' even though it was unsafe, you know. It was a place they could go and do their dirty deeds.

As is hinted at in the quotes above, maintenance was a major issue. People want the garden to be better maintained. But, since it is perceived as Martha's alone, and no one can get in there without her, the maintenance is up to Martha and her family:

Christine: This is what I was talkin' about where they had planted the trees and stuff. It was, it used to look better than that. I don't know what happened to Miss Martin and her daughter. They used to keep the, they got the keys to the gate and stuff. They used to keep it up but now it just lookin' like a *forest* or somethin'. Too many weeds and stuff.

Martha and Kanisha thinks no one on the block will help:

Kanisha: … Cause we need help. See this is a project where the *whole* block is supposed to get involved. The whole block don't want to get involved. That's why it look like that. Me and my mom [get together] you know, she not able to do all the stuff and I get *tired* doing it by *myself*. So it looks like that. _____ We gonna have to call some city help on this. I mean it was a good project and looked real nice. But you gotta keep it up and you have to have volunteers *help* keep it up. …

The end result is resentment all around. Martha and Kanisha feel put upon with the garden maintenance while many other block residents feel both shut out of the garden and frustrated that Martha and Kanisha are not taking better care of it.

Green Corps staff, Martha, and Darius report that people from neighboring blocks liked the garden and instigated similar projects on their own blocks. According to Green Corps horticulturist Deanna DeChristopher, three to five other projects began on nearby blocks after residents saw the Ashland garden project. Darius said residents of neighboring blocks gave them kudos for their work:

> … the Hermitage Street Block, [said] 'you guys are doing a nice job of renovating when a building was torn down,' 'looked like an eyesore,' 'do something different with this so it looks a little bit better.' So they really kinda like gave us a pat on the back for our initiative.

Ashland Summary

Ashland was not quite the success that Green Corps staff members thought it was. Led by Martha, an indomitable woman, most participants were in her extended family. Green Corps staff through that the level of participation was broader than this. But block residents thought of the project as Martha's, particularly since it was behind her house and "not really on this block."

But residents from nearby blocks saw the garden as it was going in. Several acted on their interest and Martha's information on how to get in the program and contacted Green Corps to begin their own greening project. This was the other primary evidence to Green Corps staff of the social benefits of this project.

Martha's garden is not the only project on Ashland. Before Martha's garden, the residents worked together to put in a garden on a corner of the block. This garden was important to more of the block residents and is visible as residents and visitors turn onto the block. After the Green Corps project, the block was chosen as a Super Model Block.

However, this was not due to the garden. Instead, this project came to the block because a rival block leader, Hettie, was very active in CAPS. Martha laid the foundation of the block club when she did the garden project, and the Super Model Block program has built on this foundation.

<div align="center">Pulaski</div>

"They might get me," worried one older woman as she explained why she would not talk to me. She was not alone. I got this response directly from another woman, perhaps indirectly in the number of unanswered doors. Pulaski was the only block where people were scared to talk with me.

This neighborhood has been undergoing many demographic changes as reflected in the 1980 and 1990 census figures (Table 2). The block has shifted from predominately White to majority Black, with Hispanics as the second largest racial/ethnic group. There are very few white households remaining in the neighborhood as a whole and only one on the block where I interviewed. Racial issues came up on this block as on no other. It was the only site where I felt edgy; I paid much more attention to my own safety here than at any other site.

Setting

The block is primarily single family homes that were converted to two- and three-unit buildings, perhaps after World War II (Figure 3A). There are standard two-flats, but no larger apartment buildings on this block (although nearby blocks do have larger

apartment buildings). Many of the houses have wrought iron or chain link fences around

the front

3A   BLOCK

3B   GARDEN

FIGURE 3. PULASKI.

yards. Several front gates were locked. One corner had a small, "raggely" store that sold chips, pop, and some groceries.

The block has some large, older trees and some moderate size Norway maples (probably planted after the Dutch elm disease epidemic in the 1960s and 1970s). Several houses had small, recently planted trees in the parkways. The north end of the block had few trees and many open parkway planting spots.

This neighborhood had been hard hit by the flash flood the summer of 1997. People thought I was with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and in fact, FEMA representatives were around the neighborhood while I was interviewing.

Residents and Actors

Several of the actors in this story do not live on the Pulaski block (sample characteristics are summarized on Table 9, page 77). These include the garden organizers, Jill and Jane, and the two main garden participants, Ellen and Jolanta.

Jill and Jane raise eyebrows. A Green Corps staff member described them as "political brutes." A block resident described Jill, the precinct captain, as "pushy." Jill and Jane are twins. White women, they live a block away from the garden site. They work together on the garden, on other projects in the neighborhood, and in their business. They run the beat meetings together. They finish each others sentences. They are very well connected with city politicians and staff. At a celebration for the first Super Model Block on Harding, they introduced me to the district police commander and then gave me his direct line to call and set up an interview. They also introduced me to the Alderman for the Harding Super Model Block and other community activists. They are resourceful,

scrounging materials and plants for the garden. Jill and Jane know that they are not liked

by neighborhood residents. They are not entirely sure why, but attribute some of it to race:

> Jill: A lot of people don't like us, if we aggravate you because we
> try to do the *correct* thing,

> Jane: It's not the *white* thing, it's the *right* thing like I always say.
> It's not a black and white issue but if you want to make it one we
> can, uh, we can do it that way. Umm. [pause] That's why we know a
> lot of people [don't like us].

> Ellen lives one block south of Pulaski. A Black woman in her late thirties, Ellen

organizes the block cleanups and parties. She has gone door to door with flyers and sign-

up sheets, trying to get residents of the Pulaski block involved in block activities. She has

had little luck and resents people coming to her later complaining that they hadn't heard

about an event:

> … They always say 'I didn't get flyer', or 'no one told me'. It kind
> of makes you upset, knowing that you done left a flyer at this door,
> and knowing you done talked to this person. Then when they come
> up and when they take place, 'I didn't know anything about it.'

Jolanta is also active in neighborhood activities. She also works with the boys on

her block, trying to create activities for them. Jolanta is active in CAPS and proud of her

certificate of achievement for her involvement. She started gardening at her apartment

after the garden project, raising vegetables and some flowers.

On the block itself, I spoke with several young women and a couple of older adult

women. I had an informal interview with a man on the block, but had no other luck in

interviewing male residents.

Emily, Morgan, Tarina, and LaShandra were all young women in their late teens to mid-twenties. Each has one child, and varying levels of education. They are either employed, in school, or both. All lived with their families, some in their own apartments within the family house. They spoke of gangs, drug dealing, and drug use as problems on the block. LaShandra was about to move back down south with her family. Her mother didn't like living in the city.

Patricia is in her late forties. On disability, she is taking care of two foster children from another branch of the family. Patricia has been having a hard couple of years, with divorce, the foster children, and the flood damaging meaningful possessions in her home, including the photos of her kids as they were growing up. She has lived on the block for 12 years and does not want to move although she is concerned about the empty lot:

> Then the value of the property is going to start going down. Who wants to buy a house on a block where you have a lot of empty lots? That's number two then we'll have three, [pause] then after a while we'll look like Roosevelt Road, 15th Street. You know what I'm saying. You can stand on one corner and look five blocks down. There is nothing but vacant lots, you know where the property *used* to sit. Then I'm still fightin not selling, *because* I like it here. I hate change.

Mrs. Hale is a fairly new resident. She and her family have been living on the block for three years. In her early forties, she has two small children at home and three more grown and out of the house. She keeps an eagle eye on her kids. She is willing to donate to neighborhood events, but does not participate much. Her husband volunteered with the garden, and she did too to a limited extent. They allowed garden materials to be stored in

their garage before the garden went in. She is particular about how the block should be

kept up and dissatisfied with her neighbors and the litter on the block.

History of the Block

Residents reported decreased maintenance of the block and an increase in gangs,

drugs and related problems:

> Morgan: … little thugs, on the street, runnin' up and down the in the
> block, gangs … it is a *problem*. They are a problem around here.
> That was *not* around here when I first moved around here so, as far
> as like the gang violence and people hanging out, … It is a *big*
> problem. I mean within this past month, um, [pause], four people
> have been shot around here.

> LaShandra: [They started hanging out] last summer. Just really
> hangin out on the corners and stuff.
>
> L: Why do you think they started hangin out then?
>
> LaShandra: 'Cause they know they can do it. The police, it's one
> live across the street. That's another thing, that police now. But
> before that they never like came over here because the neighborhood
> was quiet. They really never were around and they know they can
> do it, they know they can hang on the corner and sell drugs, or
> whatever, and gang bang. They know they can do it, they know they
> can get away with it, that's why they do it.

Most residents were concerned that grass and yards were not kept as well. Litter

and garbage were seen as an increasing problem:

> Morgen: Oh! Their yards. Everyone yard _____ was, I don't know if
> it's like a little rain. But everyone's yard was *much better*. They
> would mow their yards and trim and people had like little flowers
> out. It was like real nice. Now, I guess people just don't care. It's
> like how they use to be like trimmed, and people keep their little
> parts, you know, the outside clean, mowed, and now they just don't
> care. Pick the paper up, and pick it up in front of other peoples

> yards. They'll go so far as to put it inside your yard. And we have a
> gate! So I don't understand how the papers get there.

But not everyone felt that the block was less well maintained:

> L: How about how people take care of their buildings?
>
> Patricia: You know what? We all pretty much take care of it, you
> know, I mean. … Even the burnt out building, the lady that lives
> next to it at 936, um . . . Her grandson has cleaned in the front of
> that yard. He did it before the fire and he done since the fire. This is
> one of the grandsons of the other house.

The burned out house she mentions still stands. Reportedly the fire started from

crack users falling asleep with their pipes still lit. Residents thought that the shell was

dangerous, that drug dealers and users could and did still use it, that kids could get in to the

remains of the house and get hurt, that it brought the property values down:

> Tarina: I think they should have been done did something about it.
> Cause it's been up there for a few months, lot of people on the block
> been calling the people about it and you know it looks *bad*, it really
> look bad. Then you know there is a lot of drug addicts and stuff
> around and sometime they might go in there. Or sometime, you
> know, somebody can get raped, you know. …

There had been one other fire on the block. Most block residents say it was an

electrical problem that caused the fire. Jill and Jane attribute it to "squatters" and "dope

heads." The house was in particularly bad shape after the fire. Jill and Jane went to housing

court to get the house torn down quickly. This was the first empty lot on the block and the

one where the garden was installed.

Although there is no block club for this specific block, there is a neighborhood

organization. Jill and Jane ran the block club meetings, which evolved into beat meetings.

The meetings are held at a local school for developmentally disabled people. Some of the

residents are unclear about this organization, thinking that it is affiliated with the school

itself. No one I spoke with on Pulaski currently goes to the beat meetings. Some reported

that before the garden project, some residents did go to these meetings.

The Garden

The garden was Jill and Jane's idea (Figure 3B). They wanted the garden to limit

fly dumping on the lot and:

> Jill: … we thought it would bring people out to work on it,
> remember, and 'oh, well you got something interesting going on her
> let's all work on it.' Nobody's done anything for it. Everybody
> wants you to do everything for em. …
>
> Jane: Well the other thing was the thing that we thought that we
> were gonna do, put the garden there, is like, what's going to end up
> happening today on Harding. The Mayor's gonna come out,
> rejuvenate the block, that they've worked on with the … old police
> commander that was transferred.
>
> Jill: And the whole community.
>
> Jane: And the whole community. Everybody get together and
> neighbors start, neighbors helpin' neighbors, …

This did not happen. Jill and Jane presented the idea to do something with the lot at

the beat meetings. Pulaski residents reported that they and other neighborhood residents

wanted a play lot but were told no by the "head people" (probably Jill and Jane, perhaps

the police at the beat meetings?):

> Emily: Oh, everybody was saying it should be a playground. But
> then they said 'no' that if we make it a playground, then it invites
> gangs for them to sell drugs over there. … They were either going to
> make it a playlot or a that. So that's what they came up with. That's

what the *head* people came up with. Everybody said make it a playground for the kids.

Jill and Jane passed a sign up sheet around the beat meetings and got several signatures of people interested in working on the project. None of them lived on the block where the garden was installed. Some residents did help with the garden, but not many. Mr. Hale worked on it; Mrs. Hale passed out flyers a time or two. They stored garden materials in their garage. Jill and Jane mentioned a young man who had helped, but who also stole things from the garden. I spoke briefly with another man who said he had worked on it but "oh no, I won't talk about that."

Jill and Jane, Ellen, and Jolanta planted the garden several times. Each time, the plants were taken:

L: So you've said you've done that like four times, tried to put them in.

Jane: Yeah. Three or four times, yeah!

Jill: At least three times. The minimum was at least three times that we've put in there.

Jane: Plus we had a lot of help from the kid upstairs.

Jill: He was [demonous] guy.

Jane: He was steady out there doing everything rippin things out.

Jill: just going there and ripping stuff out of the ground...

Jane: ...The trellis he broke it off, [both] all the lattice work.

L: Wait, did I miss something, did you tell me that he did help and he tore the place up?

Jill & Jane: Yeah.

L: Both.

Jill & Jane: Both.

Jill and Jane were quite resourceful with the garden. The salvaged a fence to put up across the garden and scavenged more plant materials. They were *personally* resourceful, but the process did not allow others input. In fact, they managed to alienate and anger the one participant I talked with. Mrs. Hale tells of the day that Jill and Jane came to get the stored materials out the Johnson's garage. According to Mrs. Hale, Jill and Jane forced their way into the garage. Mrs. Hale felt they should have waited until they made contact with her, preferably by calling before coming over. The story reflects Jill and Sandy's rather bullish approach:

> Mrs. Hale: Furthermore, get [the materials] out. I don't want it in there no more. If you can't come to me like a lady should, you know. That's the only thing that I got upset about because uh, even though you give me permission the first time, the second time I'm gonna find out if you're not going to be there then you tell me to just go on in. Yeah, but she had after that, before she pushed her way *into* the garage. My husband had fixed the door and I know you couldn't just push it and go in. She had to put force against it to get in and that just made me mad you know I got on her case and then my husband came in and I got on his case, …
>
> L: Did she ever, did she see your point?
>
> Mrs. Hale: I don't know, she just walked away.

Jill and Jane, Ellen, and Jolanta resented not getting help from block residents. Ellen spoke for all the participants when she said:

> Ellen: The [garden] down there? It looks terrible. It looks terrible.
>
> L: Does that have any impact on how you feel about the block, either that block or your own?
>
> Ellen: [pause] *That* block.
>
> L: How is it, what's different?
>
> Ellen: Because the people don't care. They don't care. You know, we hadn't did anything this year, we went down there I think one or

two times and cleaned up. When you feel that the peoples, we feel were doing it to *their* block. OK? After you feel that nobody came out in two or three years, to help do anything with theirs, that they helped let it help go down. They don't care. They don't care. They don't care at all. But then we do something on our block or Kedvale or, they why know why they wasn't notified, or why they, no one came down there. After you go down there and do so *much* and nobody get involved. Why you wants to get involved with other things, when you can do the same thing for your block.

But the garden did have some modest support on the block. Several residents conceded that it was at least better than the burned out house. Some felt that it did quite a bit to keep the lot from becoming a dump and to keep gang bangers from running through the yard:

> Mrs. Hale: … like I said, [if it] wasn't then it would be just dumping and there would be probably lots rats around [pause] that would give the drug dealers uh, another leeway of going, if the fence wasn't there they could cut through there or go whatever you know or if running from a police or something they wouldn't have to worry about trying to jump a fence. They know if they go through there they got to climb a fence and everything and that's going to give them lesser time to get away cause you got to climb the fence.

Other residents dispute this last part, feeling that it was used as a thoroughfare by gang members escaping each other or the police:

> Emily: … her grand kids, and they're like teenagers or stuff, and I guess they had gotten in a feud with someone around the corner and by *that* lot, they accessed the rest of the alley, and you know, shooting at them, and run back. So its like a get away, an easy get away. If the police were to chase somebody, they go right through there. Or if somebody want to come and *get* somebody, they see somebody over here that they want to shoot, they just come right through there. And go right through there. It don't have no purpose. You know, its *weeds* over there. I could see if it looked decent, but it don't.

Pulaski Summary

Pulaski has the hallmarks of urban renewal projects in miniature. Jill and Jane, the organizers, did not live on the block where the garden was to go in. They thought that the project would be good for the block and they went ahead with it, regardless of block residents' opinions. The garden failed. The organizers and other participants (all from adjacent blocks) were frustrated by the lack of interest on the block. Block residents were angry that their interest in a play lot was ignored. Some residents took plants from the garden, perhaps in resistance to having the project foisted on them.

Still, even in this problematic situation, some residents had good things to say about the garden. Some felt that it limited the dumping that would otherwise have taken place on the lot. Others felt that it made the area safer. For most, it was at least better than a burned out shell of a house—exactly what was there before the garden.

Jefferson Homes

Jefferson Homes residents say Jefferson Homes is the "Pill Hill" of the CHA. Pill Hill is a middle to upper middle class Black neighborhood in Chicago. Many Jefferson Homes residents are proud of their development:

> Mrs. Wells: I always tell everybody Jefferson Homes is the cream
> of the crop. Out of the 19 CHA developments come to Jefferson
> Homes. There was a time when Miss Thompson used to say that
> Jefferson Homes was the forgotten development within CHA.
> Because it was always so quiet. You never heard anything on the
> news about it. Or anything like that. So, uh, I just think this is a nice
> place. It could be nicer, but it's nice. …

The development is in the midst of change, however. Several years ago nearly half of the development was reportedly threatened and almost all nearby shopping was lost to expansion of a professional sport facility. Because of the demolition of other CHA developments, CHA is sending an influx of new residents to Jefferson Homes, much to the consternation of Jefferson Homes resident leaders. These leaders are in the process of taking over management of Jefferson Homes, and screening new tenants is one of their primary goals.

Setting

Jefferson Homes is a development of row houses and three-story walk-ups (Figure 4A). The center of the development is a park with a small CHA office and Chicago Park District field house. According to residents, the park was built at the same time as the sports facility redevelopment, reportedly to appease residents.

The grounds vary considerably, particularly around the row houses. Some residents put a lot of work into their yards as well as the interior of their apartments. Decorative fences, lattice work, flower gardens, and painted facades are common in some areas. Others are virtually bare, with minimal lawns or bare dirt. There are some mature trees around Jefferson Homes, but also open, deteriorated courtyards.

4A   BLOCK

4B   LOT WHERE GARDEN WAS TO GO
(photo not taken by respondent)

4C   CORNER GARDEN
(photo not taken by respondent)

FIGURE 4. JEFFERSON HOMES.

Residents and Actors

There is a core of long-term resident activists at Jefferson Homes (sample characteristics are summarized on Table 9, page 77). I interviewed some of these women and other residents in the development.

Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. Weston, Mrs. Tipple, Mrs. Wells, Betty Addis, Nell Luskin, Mrs. Bonner, and Adeline Collins who have all been involved in Jefferson Homes activities, some for decades.

Mrs. Thompson is perhaps the most important of the organizers. Everyone who knows her respects her and will do what she asks of them, even those with hard feelings towards the resident organizers. In her mid seventies, Mrs. Thompson is soft spoken, genuinely caring, with an iron core. She is the Resident Management Corporation (RMC) president, but her organizing activities started back in the 1960s with the development of Head Start-like programs for the children in the development.

Mrs. Weston is the Local Advisory Council (LAC) president and the vice president of the RMC. Also a long-time activist and critical to organizing at Jefferson Homes, Mrs. Weston is insistent that by working—fighting—together, residents can make a better Jefferson Homes. Some residents view her (and others of the RMC and LAC leaders) with skepticism, even cynicism. Residents think that Mrs. Weston and others focus the incoming resources and opportunities to their own family and friends. Diane:

> Well, you know what? When things are issued out, or someone
> contributes or you get a grant, … [i]t's the same people that pass
> out anything, it's arguing, who's getting what, how much is so and
> so getting.

Mrs. Luskin is a quiet, older woman active in LAC and RMC activities. She is more of a follower than leader. Mrs. Collins is Mrs. Luskin's opposite. Brash and in-your-face, Mrs. Collins is also the contact with the outside world. She knows the Alderman, a County Commissioner from a nearby neighborhood, and officials with the sports facility by name. She contacts them frequently with requests for donations to help Jefferson Homes. Mrs. Tipple, the local gardener, has chaired the gardening committee and has gardened yearly in a small vegetable garden in her courtyard area. She grows roses around her apartment. Mrs. Clark chairs the RMC's education committee and is active in other Jefferson Homes activities. Mrs. Wells is another ardent gardener. She is also active in the LAC and considered by some to be the real, if behind the scenes, leader at Jefferson Homes. Mrs. Bonner is at the periphery of this group. A preacher, she heads the spiritual committee and is called on for opening prayers at Jefferson Homes events. Finally, Betty Addis is one of the few leaders at Jefferson Homes to be of a younger generation. She sits on the RMC board and runs the local laundromat.

Mrs. Jordan used to be in this group, but pulled completely out of RMC and LAC activities after a decade of volunteering because she did not get a job when money became available to hire people for RMC organizing. She felt that after her years of volunteering she should have been at the top of the list for the job. She stopped participating in activities at the development in protest. She is angry and bitter over this turn of events.

I interviewed several women of the "younger' generation, women in their twenties and thirties. Some are moderately active, particularly in tenant patrol. Other residents are not at all active, some specifically choosing to not participate in response to what they feel

is a clique on the part of the primary organizers. Betty, Rhonda, Monique, Celine, and Lisa all live near the RMC. They see their issues as different from those of the older generation. Two of the younger women, Diane and Judy, are daughters of organizers. They, too, are active in Jefferson Homes. Diane has become less involved as she has been going to school. Her involvement has also been more at her own instigation. Judy, on the other hand, is involved because her mother, Mrs. Weston, expects her to be. Judy likes to play at being community leader. Bonnie Addis, Betty's sister, is one of the residents who avoids Jefferson Homes activities in reaction to what she perceives as a nepotism-ridden clique. Her son Robert shares her views, but is willing to help if called upon.

Finally, other residents are outside the involvement circle. Lucy helps occasionally with activities right around her apartment but is not an organizer. Mrs. Taylor, too, will help clean up near her apartment but is not involved at all beyond this. Earline lives quietly in her apartment, getting ready for long-distance trucking school and hoping to move out of Jefferson Homes. Eloise lives in a row house, recently completed a professional training program and is job hunting. She loves the garden she has planted in her front yard.

History of the Block

Jefferson Homes was built in 1945 to provide safe and decent housing for low income families. A core of resident activists that have been pressing for residents' issues and needs since the mid-sixties. They have been successful with many of the activities, including protesting to save the field house from demolition, starting and maintaining a laundromat and store on site, planting several vegetable gardens, and finally organizing for resident management (Feldman & Stall, 1994).

Like all public housing in the United Sates, Jefferson Homes suffers from

disinvestment and poor management (Feldman & Stall, 1994). Residents remember

Jefferson Homes in its prime. Mrs. Weston:

> … it was such a beautiful place. It was *beautiful*, you hear what I'm sayin'? Yes. And the peoples was strict then. They was keepin' it beautiful. CHA, they janitors honey was on the *ball* here. Then all at once they just *pulled* 'em all out, change things, did things different. …

Now some of the residents feel the need to fight for their homes. Mrs. Weston:

> … if we sit here and just say and not do *nothin'*, to try to make the place look good, or clean it up or do something, what they gonna say, 'oh those people there ain't tryin to do nothin'. Look at the ground, look around and just look. They don't care nothin' about where they live.' That's what they gonna do, and say. So we tryin to save our place, where we live.

Residents have been active for some time, but a major challenge came when a

sports facility that bordered the community wanted to build a new sports complex. The

original plans were perceived as a major threat to Jefferson Homes, and the women

protested. Mrs. Weston again:

> You know we had to fight to *keep* this community when the [sports] park was in development. … They sent us the drawin to let us know how far they were going. I said now how is they gonna cut that building in half there? … So we got out there and we got our little picket signs, we got our bull horns, and we was going through here screamin and hollerin at these people, that we better come on out of here, you fixin to be moved. People sit up there, 'yall crazy'. They don't believe nothin. Then they did turn around and say that was *our* [the LAC] job to do it, not theirs.

As a part of the struggle, the residents formed a coalition with neighboring private homeowners. This coalition took the sports facility to court. This court battle was long, often delayed. Still, the community pressed on with it and developed plans for the money they hoped to receive as a settlement. Working with faculty and students at the University of Illinois at Chicago, the community drafted plans for a strip mall on empty Archdiocese land adjacent to the community—land sometimes used by Jefferson Homes residents for a vegetable garden. Eventually the community lost the court case, but they continue to pursue other means of financing for the mall project (e.g., Empowerment Zone and other funding).

Another major struggle occurred about the same time as the sports facility fight. Jefferson Homes began organizing for resident management. The RMC was formed, and many of the activist women on the board were those who had been involved with the previous struggles and projects. The process of moving to resident management has been long, detailed, and difficult, requiring paperwork, meetings, training, and more paperwork. It has taken the attention of the activists, particularly Mrs. Thompson, over the past several years. At the time of my interviews, the residents of Jefferson Homes were beginning to operate under their dual management contract with the CHA.

In the midst of these two major projects, other projects and activities have continued. Because Jefferson Homes is an institutional setting, many resources and projects are offered to the residents, although not always what they need or want, or in a timely fashion. This, combined with a lack of day-to-day management skills on the part of some of the activists, leads to some problems. Diane:

> … We have a problem around here, everything is always the last minute. You know it's only certain things that you be aware of and that you learn about it. You know then when they really get in a bind, they really need your help. That's when they'll call you. But things that they think they can take care of they just go on and do it. …

Some residents feel that the resident leaders are a clique, and that they have lost touch with the needs of the younger residents:

> Betty: You know, is this going over towards this way, or is this going up, sorta always wrong. … You know, like they say, it's still, well the LAC gets everything, and everything has to come down to the LAC and, once it gets to the LAC you can forget it. *That's* the way the residents feel. … I keep trying to tell [the RMC Board], when we have our meeting at the RMC, the people *outside know* what's going on. They *know*, you can't fool them. When you all, like when you come in and do certain things to have activities and things that have everybody acting like they love one another, you all know, you all know better. You know what I'm saying. The *alderman* even *knows things now*!!

Some of the projects that residents have worked on include several greening projects done both before and after the garden I was specifically investigating. The Archdiocese land that residents hope to develop as a strip mall has been used as a community vegetable garden (and was the site of the project I was looking into). The residents first worked with the Chicago Botanic Gardens to establish a garden on the site. It was a successful, productive garden:

> Mrs. Thompson: … A couple of years we had a very, *very* successful garden. Rows and rows of cabbage. Rows and rows of collards, string beans, oh boy that was so beautiful! Then we worked and then we had harvest time and bagged the stuff up and sold it to the community. Oh, it was *real* nice, real nice. The main thing just to watch it grow.

Another greening project took place on the corner of the development with the "Welcome to Jefferson Homes" sign, a corner that had had a much-loved landscape lost to lack of maintenance of the development (Figure 4C). In its prime, this corner had a small pool—called a wishing well by the residents—with a bridge and a dense planting of annuals. In the project that went in later—also a Green Corps project—the residents wanted to recreate this landscape. A CHA employee on site made many promises about being able to dig out the wishing well, but was not able to make this happen. This particular employee made these kinds of promises frequently and just as frequently did not come through. The project that finally went in was based on an aesthetic different from that preferred by many of the Jefferson Homes residents. The design included many perennials that looked sparse at first planting but would become more dense as they became established. Many of the plants were native varieties and less known to residents. The landscape did not get maintained and became weedy:

> Celine: Because, um, years ago they had wishin well there and I
> thought the wishin well looked way better than that. That look
> messy and junky. The wishin well it had Mr. Belmont built it. It
> was, I can't explain it unless they had a picture of it. It was *so* pretty.

> Mrs. Wells: I don't know what happened. It was sometime after I
> moved in here, just one day I looked and it wasn't there anymore.
> [chuckles] It just became like a bare hill there until Green Corps
> decided to invest a few dollars in it. … So the weeds will exceed the
> flowers if you don't keep them down. So this just kind of got out of
> hand because the residents just didn't take care of them. Let's face it
> they didn't do their job.

Mrs. Weston did not think that the residents would maintain the landscape:

> No, residents is not gonna do it. Well it's because they figure, it's
> that I'm rentin. I'm payin my rent and everything else is CHA job.
> They don't understand like *me*, after I figure out that CHA wasn't
> gonna do *nothing*, if you don't get out there and say something, and
> *holler* and scream at CHA. You ain't gettin nothing. …

The same year that the corner landscape was put in, other residents worked on planting flowers and shrubs throughout the development. The local sport facility donated several thousand dollars to purchase materials. The organizers got donations from other sources as well. They planted annuals in circles in the grass and in flower boxes that had stood empty. This project built on a HUD/CHA "healthy communities" program begun the previous year.

More people liked the flower circles and other plantings than liked the corner landscaping. These flowers went in in more neutral places and were more conservatively arranged:

> Mrs. Jordan: I like [the flower circles] because the flowers have
> some kind of organizations. … The flowers up there on that corner
> is not coordinated. See you put the same kind of flowers together.
> You know they got them in a circle and they got the same kind
> going round and round and round. They look good because of the
> way they got em coordinated. Those up there on that end, like I say
> I'm not just saying that because Mrs. Weston did it, I'm just sayin
> she didn't do a good job of it. She didn't know how to coordinate it.
> A *lot* of people don't know how to organize stuff. …

The Garden

The 1995 Green Corps project took place inbetween the successful vegetable garden in the early 1990s and the corner landscaping and flower circle projects of 1997. But while these two projects were at least somewhat successful, in 1995 the garden project

failed (Figure 4B). It simply never went in. Green Corps staff consider it a total,

unequivocal failure.

Mrs. Thompson received a Green Corps application in the mail (they went to all

CHA developments), filled it out, mailed it in, and promptly forgot about it as she moved

on to the next task. Mrs. Weston again:

> In the first place, Lynne, I didn't even know we were having that
> [grant, program] [lowered her voice]. See Ms. Amie's movin so fast,
> sometime she don't even know what where she goin and what she
> doin unlessin I'm there, to say 'help me we got to this and we got to
> do that. But, Ms. Thompson, they say we suppose to do it you
> know.' But *I* didn't know she had did it. … So *all* we got was the
> tools. The little tools and things that she had brought. Rakes and
> stuff like that. Those were the things that we used *this* year, with the
> one we did up there on the corner. This garden spot it pays off.

Mrs. Thompson admits that "[We] ran out of time again." Diane put it this way:

> Well sometime you have the same people workin on the same, you
> know they can only limit, they can only do so much work. They can
> only be in so many places, you know. Once that started I don't think
> they really could get anybody to finish it up. So you know or take it
> over each summer. It always end up being the same people. You
> know we have a lot of other things going on. We've been having a
> lot things going on in the last two or three years. Like we had this
> resident management that's coming up … You know, gardening *is*
> time consuming. You can't just put it out there and expect for the
> rain to help it grow, it needs to be taken care of, overseen.

Betty put it more succinctly:

> …One year she had so much stuff to do, she [Mrs. Thompson]
> doesn't have time for a garden. Trying to get, she's involved in too
> many things. …

But lack of time was only a part of the reason for the failure. In the summer of 1995 a brutal heat wave that killed over 400 Chicagoans. It was also Green Corps's first year in operation, and they were getting the kinks worked out of their system. One of the kinks was their being late in delivering plant materials to the projects. Because of this, Jefferson Homes got their plants in the midst of the heat wave. Cecelia Tipple:

> Yeah that year it *was* hot. It was really hot. When they delivered the plants I was one of the ones out there taking them off the truck and trying to put them under the shade bushes. It was *so* hot that they didn't never get the water out there right. So we couldn't just sit them in that dry dirt. Cause we had like a 1000 plants.

There was one final reason that might have contributed to the garden's failure that year. Not only is Mrs. Thompson (along with the other organizers) very busy, but she has a particular style of organizing. She is uncomfortable delegating; rather, she wants to be able to be a part of any activity she asks someone else to do:

> … Then I got busy too, I wouldn't put it all on that. Because if you get somebody to work with you, you have to be out there with them.

> … [one of] the neighbors here in the yard. He helped us a *lot*. He said "I would get over there," but I didn't want to send anyone over there to do any work and I wasn't available to go over there, at least to get them started. …

This interest in being a part of every activity could be explained in many ways, from a well-hidden controlling nature or, more likely, a discomfort being in a position that could be interpreted as having power *over* people. Still, there were residents ready to help who could have made the garden more of a success that year:

> Robert: … I was supposed to be involved in some of this. If they would have followed through with it, and told us when they wanted

to do and what they wanted to do, I would have helped. But of
course nothing ever happened with any of this stuff. …

<u>Jefferson Homes Summary</u>

This garden project did not succeed, by either Green Corps or Jefferson Homes

organizers' standards. There were multiple reasons, from organizing styles to the rough

workings of Green Corps's first year. The heat and ongoing organizing activities—

particularly the resident management—sealed the fate of the project that year. The garden

simply didn't go in.

Other greening projects at Jefferson Homes were important to residents. They

photographed these other projects and thought them important to the development.

<u>Block Stories Reprise</u>

These four sites were chosen based on greening practitioners' assessment that there

were or were no social benefits from the greening project. The "success" sites were

Halsted and Ashland. The "failure" sites were Pulaski and Jefferson Homes. The data raise

some questions about these assessments.

Halsted was, indeed a success. There were noticeable, if modest, social benefits

(these will be discussed more fully in the next two chapters). But Ashland was not the

success that practitioners thought. Rather than being an inclusive project, it was divisive. It

was not a total failure, but it was not the glowing success that at least one Green Corps

staff member thought.

The failure sites were likewise not so easy to assess. There were certainly problems

with both gardens, serious problems. But some residents saw positive outcomes of the

Pulaski garden. And the Jefferson Homes residents were too busy working on larger issues at the development to pay much attention to planting a garden in the middle of a heat wave.

These issues will be discussed more fully later, but the general distinction between "success" and "failure" in terms of social benefits is more complex, and related to more than the success or failure of the plants, than greening practitioners may realize.

In the next two chapters, I will examine these findings in the light of empowerment theory and the practitioner's model, and in the context of the meanings of urban green space.

EMPOWERMENT

Now that I have some data to work with, I'll return to the discussion of empowerment and the practitioner's model that I outlined in the introduction. I only sketchily introduced my conception of the practitioner's model there. Here I will fill it out more completely and compare the events at each site to the expectations in the model.

The discussion is organized by empowerment indicator. For each indicator I will briefly discuss it's role in the practitioners' model and then discuss how the model and the data intersect or diverge. Ties to empowerment theory will be made in either section as appropriate.

The indicators are based largely on Zimmerman's explication of empowerment theory outlined in the introduction. He theorized three levels of empowerment: the individual, organization, and community (Zimmerman, in press). The indicators for these levels of empowerment overlap considerably, particularly the major indicators such as participation and control. I will discuss these shared indicators across the three levels and then discuss the remaining empowerment indicators that are unique to a specific level of empowerment[5]. Finally, I will discuss how Zimmerman's concept of empowered outcomes and empowering practices intersects with the impact for social benefits from urban greening projects (Zimmerman, 1995).

---

[5] One community-level indicator, pluralism, will not be discussed. The other community level indicators will be discussed in the context of related indicators at the other levels. Pluralism does not have related indicators at the other level, is not relevant in the practitioner's model, and does not relate to the data.

Multiple-Level Empowerment Indicators

Proactive Behavior, Initiates Efforts to Improve Community, and

Responds to Threats to the Community

Practitioner's Model

      "Proactive behavior" is theorized to be a trait of empowered individuals, while

"initiates efforts to improve the community" and "responds to threats to the community"

are community level indicators of empowerment. Zimmerman and other theorists have not

proposed an analogous organization level indicator. Still, proactive behavior works more at

the organization level in the practitioner's model: individuals will form a block group and

together residents will start to take steps to solve other problems on the block (e.g. forming

neighborhood watch groups to handle a crime problem). This will be possible because of

the organizing around the greening project. At the community level, in the practitioner's

model, the greening project is a first effort that makes later efforts to improve the

community easier to begin and sustain; from these the entire community benefits.

Evidence in the Data

      The greening projects themselves are the clearest sign of proactive behavior at each

site. But the greening projects were not the starting point for organizing on these blocks as

suggested by the practitioner's model. Rather, they were the second or third (or more) step

in the residents' efforts to improve the community. Still, improving the community was a

goal of each project organizer, regardless of other motivations (like Martha's desire to

control the lot behind her house) or the failure of the project to actually improve the

community, as at the Pulaski site.

Ashland and Jefferson Homes have both continued with projects aimed at

community improvement, but the particular greening projects under investigation were not

stepping stones to these other efforts. The corner garden project on Ashland did help with

the organizing efforts there. The corner garden was important to most residents I

interviewed, and it symbolized for them their efforts to improve their block, to show their

block as a "decent place":

> It uh, it kinda makes you feel, when you first turn this corner, makes
> you feel kinda comfortable. 'All right, this is a nice neighborhood.'
> Makes you feel more at least, well I see all the guys out here, but
> somebody really cared about the block to have something that looks
> nice.

Related to "efforts to improve the community" is the community level indicator

"respond to threats to quality of life." There were no actual *threats* to the blocks that

instigated the greening project. Instead, the projects were responding to a chronic problem.

Jefferson Homes residents did respond to a threat when they organized against the

expanding sports facility. As mentioned earlier, the greening project under investigation

did not play a role in spurring or sustaining these efforts.

<div align="center">Participation</div>

Practitioner's Model

Participation was an important indicator at all levels of empowerment. In the practitioner's model, participation continues after the initial garden installation as the residents maintain the site, and it will, in an ideal situation, extend to new projects or behaviors. Residents form block clubs, which provide opportunities for participation, and with the greening project and subsequent projects, bring additional opportunities for participation. From participation comes increased skills, efficacy, and other social benefits for individuals and groups.

<u>Evidence in the Data</u>

The Halsted site most closely matched the practitioner's model. There was a reported resurgence of participation as the block club re-formed around the tavern-to-church issue, and then residents took on additional projects like the garden. Mr. Nichols describes the increasing participation this way:

> Yes, like I say, I have to give all the credit to those three people,
> Miss. Samuels, Mrs. Lewin and Miss. Fisher. How they had to, they
> motivated us. You know, practically everybody on the block, they
> motivated us and I mean, they was there everyday, four to five hours
> *every* day, it was no one time thing, they was at it *every* day.
> Sometime we had a block club meeting just those three, and maybe,
> I didn't go all the time, and sometimes it just be those three but they
> didn't stop. They kept going pretty soon they started to getting a few
> more, a few more, a few more. And it's not where it is suppose to be
> at *yet*, but it's better than it was when it first started.

But the other sites did not show a similar increase in participation. At Pulaski repeated invitations to join the greening project group were rebuffed and participation in neighborhood activities may have decreased. At Ashland, there was a general ethos that favored participation. Albert said:

> Anytime anybody want to start something, let's say they want to do
> that vacant lot over there. So they just want to make a nice garden
> out of it … they *will* come out and help you.

There is no evidence that participation *increased* as a result of this project. In fact, Martha badgered Albert and others into participating in the garden: "Well she had mentioned, the lot around the corner for the longest. So I told her "well, I'll give you hand, so you quit buggin me. If I don't, you won't.""

Technically all four projects provided opportunities for participation. But how real were these opportunities? At Pulaski, block residents were invited to participate in the work, but not in the decision about what to do with the lot. Ashland followed a similar pattern: residents could participate in the labor, but not the decision making. At Jefferson Homes, residents were invited to participate, but the project fell victim to several problems, including an organizing style that relied so heavily on one person that it sabotaged the possibility for successful projects. Halsted was the most inclusive in its opportunities for participation, but even here the young men and some other residents felt excluded.

These issues are reflected in participation theory. Public participation is mandated in many government programs (Feldman & Westphal, forthcoming). These public participation efforts have been critiqued as being co-opted, not truly participatory, or so heavily bureaucratized as to be meaningless (Day, 1997; Feldman & Westphal, forthcoming; Hester, 1996; McDonough et al., 1994). Arnstein's "ladder of participation" is helpful in understanding successful participation (Arnstein, 1969). At the bottom rung of this ladder, participators are merely recipients of information. At the upper rungs,

participators have decision making power in the planning (or other) process (Arnstein, 1969). The stories of these four blocks clearly make the point that this same ladder needs to be climbed at the most local of levels: the residential block. Top-down implementation of a decision made by some without the input and concurrence of many of those affected by the project is no more likely to succeed at the block level than at the regional level. In fact, this sort of implementation can seriously jeopardize the projects, however well intentioned. Pulaski clearly shows this possibility.

Control

Practitioner's Model

Control is the basis of many definitions of power (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998) and hence is critical to empowerment. Control is also important in the practitioners' model. Control, at least of the lot or site itself, will increase with empowerment but in the best circumstances control of the block, even neighborhood, will increase as well. Although this control may be the result of group activity, it will be felt by individuals on the block. This is an important component of reducing drug dealing, dumping, and other social ills on the blocks; through increased control, the residents can stop these behaviors and activities from occurring near their homes.

Evidence in the Data

The levels of personal control changed significantly at Ashland and Halsted. At Pulaski control may have been exerted, but not in the way anticipated by the practitioners' model. Jefferson Homes showed no real evidence of changes in control from the garden.

Martha gained nearly absolute control over the Ashland garden lot. Her neighbor Sandy lost some control over the same lot. Martha's control worked *against* her and block-level empowerment as other block residents resisted the project due to her sole control of the garden.

Residents at Pulaski may have exerted control by *not* participating. Given that the project was organized by the precinct captain, someone they were not comfortable with in the first place, and that the wishes of at least some of the residents were ignored in the process of starting the garden, the decision to not participate may have been a way to exert control. In a small way, this was exerting "power from," or power against the dominating precinct captain (Riger, 1993). The residents were not only uncooperative in the project, but they also worked against it, appropriating plants for their yards. They resisted.

At Jefferson Homes the issue of control takes on another dimension. The resident organizers already had control of the lot in question. They had had a successful garden there in the past and were making plans to purchase the land for use as a mini-mall. Their need for control over the land was moot—they already had informal control and there was no threat to this. What they needed at that point were the resources to gain formal control and take the next development steps; the Green Corps program was not designed to provide these resources.

At Halsted, the control of the lot was won at the cost of another group losing control. It is easy to think of this as upstanding citizens versus nasty gangbangers, but the situation is more complex. Some of the young men who live on Halsted may be gang

members. They may deal drugs. But they also expressed concern with how they were

perceived, and their loss of use of the lot:

> L: But even though this one woman, who was one of the organizers, you don't get along with real well, you still worked on the garden?
>
> Doug: We got along then, but now, it's been changed since then.
>
> L: What happened? If it's any of my business, you don't have to tell me.
>
> Doug: Just, I guess maybe it's my appearance you know, some change, my appearance. Your appearance you know a lot of people judge you by your appearance. I'm [mumble]

> L: Did the change from it being the lot to the yard and cleaned up in there now, did that have any effect on you on feeling you had control over something or losing control over something?
>
> Thomas: Well, I guess that would be losing control.
>
> L: How?
>
> Thomas: Like if they turned to their own little personal property and put chains on the gates.

The block club members made it clear that indeed they did feel, individually and

collectively, that they had the right to start telling people how to behave because of the

work they put into the garden:

> Mr. Nichols: … because like you say you get a sense of feeling if somebody is over there doing something that they aren't suppose to be doing you have a right to tell them not to do it. Why? Because we did this for this particular thing to get it like it is and now we want to keep it like that, you know. So that, it give you the authority to run somebody out of there or talk to 'em about getting out of there if they are doing something against, against the grain. If I had did nothing, nothing, but hadn't participated then I wouldn't have had that type of feeling. …

Harriet: … prior to that becoming garden I, I didn't have any control over the guys standing out there but after we developed it into a flower garden then we had control because they were no longer allowed to stand out there and do what they wanted to do. It was the community garden, you just respect it ...

But gaining of control by one group at another's expense may have some very real ramifications. To date, the block club on Halsted has not effectively dealt with issues that face the young men on the block. Their action may have even exacerbated some of these problems (like the young men's relationships with the police). Riger foretold problems like these when she asked "What's wrong with empowerment?" (Riger, 1993). She raised concerns that empowerment could lead to fighting between newly empowered groups over a small amount of new power. The problem here is slightly different, although related. The overall effects of empowerment may not always be positive and may create new problems in its wake. Control breeds resentment; this can be seen at each site. If control is a primary indicator of empowerment and key to the practitioner's model, what of the people disempowered through loss of control? This needs to be clarified in theory and on the ground.

<div align="center">Resources</div>

Practitioner's Model

Resources are important in empowerment theory. They are integral to moving beyond *feelings* of power to exerting power and control over one's circumstances. In the practitioner's model, project participants learn where to get additional resources as well as

how to fully use what is available from the greening program. Both individuals and the block organization gain these resources and skills. Empowerment theory postulates that resource issues at the community level are reflected in accessible government, media or other resources.

Evidence in the Data

Each site in this study has at least one resourceful person, but resource acquisition at the organizational level is weaker. For instance, at Jefferson Homes, there is one woman primarily responsible for contacts with the local politicians and the sports facility. Should she become unable or unwilling to make these contacts, the relationship between the Jefferson Homes resident organization and these outside entities would suffer. There are residents who could likely take over these contacts and redevelop them, but at least in the short term the relationships would be weakened. Halsted and Pulaski also have a single person (or duo) with skills in obtaining outside resources.

Ashland is an exception. Several people there have outside contacts: Miss Eva, Etta Jones, Martha, and Hettie all were effective at resource acquisition. Each of these women had these skills before the Green Corps project. Do several individuals within an organization equal organizational level results? Perhaps, if the block organization has access to these skills. But this assumes an organization-wide awareness of these skills, a willingness of each resident to bring them to the organization, and, ideally, a willingness to teach others how to obtain resources, too.

Resources from Green Corps were generally not identified as such by most of the respondents. Some people were aware that Green Corps gives up to $3000 for supplies and

materials, but most were not. Those who did recognize the funds from Green Corps did not seem to have a sense of them as necessary to achieve their goals. Instead, they were an opportunity to take advantage of. Other things *were* identified as resources needed to achieve certain personal or collective goals: cars to get to suburban jobs, money for a security deposit to move from public housing, the cameras I gave out as a tool in fighting drug dealing. The garden materials not being identified as significant in this way may indicate that the program was only minimally meeting resource needs for empowerment at these sites.

The primary exception is Martha's fence. It consummated her control of the site, and she pressed hard to get it, even though she was beyond the limit on materials she could get from Green Corps. Martha was also the one who chose the plants, she and her daughter designed the garden, and they keep the tools in their home. Then she enclosed and locked the garden. There was a similar phenomenon at Pulaski, as Jill and Jane had control of the resource from Green Corps and the resources that they scrounged and scavenged from other sources. One way that the Pulaski residents expressed their displeasure was by taking these resources for themselves.

Resources, then, can be problematic as well as empowering. In two of four cases, the new resources were actually disempowering. At Halsted the resources were necessary to achieve the transformation of the lot, but were not seen by the residents as an influx of raw materials for them to mold and shape with their new found power. And Jefferson Homes residents were used to receiving materials from outside well-wishers and using them to the best of their ability. Still, resources were important for these blocks. They set the stage for change, and at one site this change fit the practitioner's model.

Access to the local government and media is a related indicator, theorized to be important at the community level. Access to the local government was increased for Halsted residents because of the garden. In fact, the Alderman changed proposed TIF District boundaries to include the Halsted neighborhood so that residents could benefit from the program and any resources available from it. The Alderman's chief of staff knew the block and recognized the greater effort and organization on this block compared to other nearby blocks. Likewise, some of these residents had close contacts with the police. One of the young men on the block said they "always had their little neighborhood cops, their own personal little police officer to come by down …".

Access to government was delicate at Pulaski. Jill and Jane were, unofficially, no longer the precinct captain. They did not have good feelings about the Alderman, and the Aldermanic office staff seemed to feel the same about Jill and Jane. Jill and Jane were sure that their Alderman would eventually be indicted under the Silver Shovel[6] investigation, and, indeed, he was. Access to government for the residents of the block might, then, have been enhanced by avoiding Jill and Jane rather than working with them on the garden or other projects. Jill and Jane worked closely with the local police, but their supportive feelings for the police were not shared by the other participants. Ellen felt the police were not following through on their promises or responding to neighborhood problems.

Ashland showed strong connections with various parts of the government. Their Alderman, too, was indicted as a part of the Silver Shovel investigation. But Martha and some of the other residents had a close working relationship with the Alderman. Other

---

[6] Silver Shovel was a federal investigation of Chicago Aldermen for allegedly accepting bribes to allow illegal dumping in their wards.

residents also had good connections with the city government. Hettie excelled in this, writing letters and calling the city citizen request number regularly. These contacts became a part of a duel between different groups in the block. In this context, the connections do not reflect a community level benefit. They are far from nonrivalrous. In this conflict, these contacts were not affected by the garden project. In fact, the Alderman and the Police Commander were familiar with the block, but neither was aware of the garden.

<div align="center">Efficacy and Competence</div>

Practitioner's Model

There are several issues related to efficacy in the empowerment literature. Individuals are thought to increase their sense of competence and efficacy while organizations develop ways to enhance their effectiveness. A sense of competence is a *belief* that one is able to take on projects and handle them adequately; efficacy is actually *doing* so. Organizational effectiveness deals with a group's ability to get things done (and is closely related to meeting organizational goals, which will be discussed later).

In the practitioner's model, sense of competence and efficacy will increase as residents have a successful project under their collective belt, and this will support their efforts to take on new, and perhaps larger, block issues. At the organization level, the emphasis of the practitioners' model is on the effectiveness of the greening project; a secondary issue is effectiveness in other block issues or projects. Effective volunteer recruitment and maintenance are primary organizational issues for the ongoing success of a greening project.

<u>Evidence in the Data</u>

An increase in efficacy happened most clearly, although modestly, at Halsted. Participants, be they core or peripheral, felt good about the lot and the change they had created:

> Doc Martin: It was beautiful. It was the first change on the block
> that the block club start.

> Harriet: Yes, it made me feel like, still feel that one day this will be
> a better block or a *beautiful* block. That it can be done. All it takes
> is for people to care, uh, maintain their property and up keeping
> their lawn and keep our area *clean*. So, like I said earlier, we have
> made some improvements, we're not a hundred percent where we
> want to be but we have made progress and I feel we will continue to
> make progress that this will, one day you will come to this block,
> you won't remember it [laughs] that it will look so different.

On the other blocks, however, there were fewer, if any, efficacy effects from the greening project. There was evidence at Ashland of increased efficacy, but not brought about by the garden. Rather, the corner garden was an initial small success, and block residents' involvement led to being chosen as a Super Model Block. But the garden that resulted from the Green Corps program was only minimally effective and did not contribute significantly to the current block activities, like the Super Model Block.

At Pulaski, the block's efficacy was reduced. The garden didn't work and some residents on the block reported feeling excluded from (or uninterested in) the decision making process. At Jefferson Homes, efficacy wasn't enhanced or decreased. The project came and went with few involved and few expectations of the project. There was no change in the individual's or the organization's efficacy.

<u>Understanding Socio-Political Environment</u>

<u>& Critical Awareness Among Residents</u>

<u>Practitioner's Model</u>

Understanding the socio-political environment (organizational level) and developing a critical awareness (community level) are related indicators, both aimed at gaining an understanding of the big picture—the power structure and how to work within and/or against it. In the practitioner's model, the emphasis is on understanding this in environmental terms, which is particularly true for the urban and community forestry branch of the greening movement. Community gardeners have been more focused on community development and, therefore, on an understanding of the socio-political environment. Developing a critical awareness, in the sense of class consciousness or a critique of local power structures, is not a significant component of the practitioner's model.

<u>Evidence in the Data</u>

I did not ask questions specifically to probe these issues, so I have limited evidence of changes in this area. One socio-political reality that many of my respondents seemed to be aware of was that solving a gang or drug dealing problem on their block was "a Band-Aid on cancer." Even if they rid their block of the problem, it really only moves it to the next block or neighborhood; it did not actually solve the larger problem:

> Mr. Nichols: … I found out, see, when they got here they started moving to the next block. But that next block had the same thing then they had to, they got to keep moving you see, keep them on a move. That's what we trying to do, keep them on the move. …

But the greening project did not enhance residents' socio-political understanding. Rather, the garden was a means to a particular end, within the level of socio-political understanding the block already had.

Development of critical awareness is described by DeSena as she tells the story of New Yorkers who organized to get government attention to their neighborhood's needs (DeSena, 1998). The groups came to realize that without serious agitation and demonstration their needs would be ignored. Therefore, they developed savvy political and media skills and won several important local battles with City Hall (DeSena, 1998).

None of the blocks I interviewed on were critically aware to the extent of the neighborhoods described by DeSena (DeSena, 1998). Closest was Jefferson Homes and their efforts to develop a mini mall, and to fight the sports facility in court and on the streets (Feldman & Stall, 1994). Unfortunately, to date, the residents of Jefferson Homes have met with little success at this level of community organizing. More important for this particular investigation, the garden was not a part of these struggles.

Ashland also had a certain level of critical awareness, but it was an awareness of individuals and of what is lacking in the community rather than a deep understanding of the social forces that had such a strong impact on their neighborhood. Although residents were glad to see some development returning to their community, no one indicated in our interview that they had an understanding of why the community had been abandoned in the preceding decades. It is this sort of understanding that is basic to critical awareness.

Neither Pulaski nor Halsted showed any significant level of critical awareness of the larger

social forces that impact their lives.

<div align="center">Extend Influence and</div>

<div align="center">Connecting to Other Community Groups; Coalitions</div>

Practitioner's Model

In empowerment theory, extending influence is a sign of greater organizational

empowerment as organizations begin to have a broader area of impact and influence. At

the community level, this is expressed in building coalitions. Often, greening practitioners

do not see extending influence or broader coalition building as a part of the social benefits

available from the greening project, although some groups have made a point that this

level of coalition building is important.

Evidence in the Data

None of the block organizations extended their influence by joining with other

groups, building coalitions and the like. The greening projects themselves had some

influence or were themselves influenced by other greening projects, but the block

organizations did not extend their influence beyond their blocks in a coordinated, ongoing

way. The Ashland project had a little influence as a number of neighboring block groups

saw the Ashland greening project and then implemented greening projects of their own.

This was a primary factor in the Green Corps practitioners' appraisal of Ashland as a

success site. The Pulaski site was, in fact, the result of the extending influence of the

nearby Super Model Block and its garden project:

> Jane: Well the other thing was the thing that we thought that we
> were gonna do, put the garden there. Is like, what's going to end up
> happening today on Harding. The Mayor's gonna come out
> rejuvenate the block, that they've worked on with the command, the
> old police commander that was transferred.

Individual Level Empowerment

One indicator is theorized primarily at the individual level: increasing skills,

problem solving, and decision making.

Increase Skills, Problem Solving, and Decision Making

Practitioner's Model

In empowerment theory, increasing skills, problem solving, and decision making

are outcomes of the empowerment process. Those empowered gain new skills and use

these in making decisions and solving problems. These lead to further empowerment. In

the practitioner's model, some people will learn to be decision makers and problem solvers

through the project, and the more that do the better. Many will also increase their range of

skills from gardening to organizing. Decision making will be democratic, if not consensus

based.

Evidence in the Data

Although the garden itself was being used as a problem solving strategy by most organizers, outcomes of these projects were not strong in terms of increased skills and problem solving capability. Because of the limited participation and shared decision making on Ashland, increased skills and problem solving were not benefits. At Halsted, the need for play space for the children was the impetus for the project and remains a problem for the residents to this day. Participation was a problem at Pulaski, one that the organizers did not have the skills to solve. And at Jefferson Homes, the familiar problems of lack of time and limited involvement remained. No one became great problem solvers. Not only were the organizers not skilled at problem solving, they were not always skilled at problem identification. This was particularly clear at Ashland and Pulaski where the lack of participation or resistance to the project was not analyzed or understood by participants.

Organizational Level Empowerment

The nature of the organizational level in this study is the block group. Two sites had full-fledged block organizations: Halsted and Jefferson Homes. There was an organization on Pulaski, at least for the neighborhood. But no one from the greening project block was involved in this group, and it was largely a two-woman show, that of Jill and Jane. Martha's formalizing the block club on Ashland did lay the ground work for the organization at work now as a part of the Super Model Block, but at the time Eloise simply named an informal network—there was not an organization per se.

The empowerment indicators that are specific to the organization level (and therefore not discussed in the previous sections) are sharing leadership, meeting

organizational goals, and becoming key brokers in policy decisions or having an impact on policy.

<p align="center">Meet Organizational Goals</p>

Practitioner's Model

Meeting organizational goals is, like building effectiveness discussed earlier, critical to creating actual change, and hence is fundamental to empowerment. In the practitioner's model, the organization is successful, so it meets the organizational goals from the garden. The next step is the organization's setting new goals and achieving these as well.

Evidence in the Data

The first question in the context of this study is whether the residents had *organizational* goals. This reflects the discussion above about the nature of the organizations at each site. Halsted and Jefferson Homes had more concrete organizations and had organizational goals. At Ashland and Pulaski, the organizations were dominated by one or two people, and hence the goals reflected their *personal* goals and were not organizational goals as such.

Halsted met their fundamental organizational goal: improving the block. Their first objective, however, had been to provide play space for the children. This goal was not met by the Green Corps project or other block activities at that time. Providing safe, accessible play space for the smallest children was a consistent priority across the sites, one not being met by city or nonprofit programs.

Jefferson Homes' goals were for an improved development, but they had moved

past the point of expecting a garden project to contribute greatly to this. The primary focus

of the resident organizers was resident management of the development. This was the

effort that would best help them meet their fundamental goal of a better Jefferson Homes,

and the garden was ancillary to this goal.

Shared Leadership

Practitioner's Model

In empowerment theory shared leadership is important to increase empowerment

for as many people as possible and to increase organization viability. It is also important to

ensure that local groups and organizations don't recreate a top-down autocratic structure

that may have created the need for empowerment in the first place (Somerville, 1998).

Shared leadership is not a component of the practitioner's model. Many greening project

are begun by a single, determined individual. Subsequent failure of these projects due to

burn out and other problems has only recently been recognized as a serious issue in the

urban and community forestry movement.

Evidence in the Data

Is there any evidence from this study that shared leadership should be a part of the

practitioner's model? The block with the strongest level of social benefits, Halsted, shared

leadership. Shared leadership on Pulaski could potentially have diluted the effects of Jill

and Jane. Shared leadership is, perhaps, a necessary but not sufficient ingredient for long-

term growth and sustainability of local organizations. Jefferson Homes is a case in point. There are growing concerns about what will happen at Jefferson Homes when Mrs. Thompson is no longer able to be an active organizer. More effectively shared leadership might facilitate a smooth transition and ongoing success.

Key Brokers in Policy Decisions; Impact on Policy

Practitioner's Model

Related to extending influence, empowerment theory suggests that empowered organizations will evolve to have a noticeable impact on policy. In the practitioner's model, participants learn to have a voice in local government, particularly as it affects their neighborhood and the environment.

Evidence in the Data

None of the individuals or groups I interviewed had a strong motivation to help the environment. Instead, their focus was primarily on the social setting of their neighborhood. Jill and Jane began their organizing in response to a junk yard in their neighborhood, one they were convinced accepted illegal materials and released polyfluorocarbons from old refrigerators. But their outrage was in having to live near such a site, they were not interested in saving the environment.

Jill and Jane were also the most adept at local government. They testified at budget hearings and got to know city staff in many city agencies. They describe their relationship with the Commissioner of the Department of Environment this way:

> Jane: …. but then you had to be friendly to him to get the garden. So
> we had to . . .

> Jill: Kick their ass in private and praise them in public. Then and
> Henry knew that we were serious about you know, trying to take
> care of things in the neighborhood. So we just stayed on him. Then
> we just got to be like friends, right.

But Jill and Jane are individuals, and the organization from that neighborhood as a whole did not share in their skills or influence. They represented themselves and their conception of their neighborhood, but they did not represent the organization.

Jefferson Homes organizers were active in CHA government and management. A few respondents reported going to CHA monthly meetings where residents could speak directly to Joseph Shuldiner, then Executive Director of CHA, or organizing protests of planned demolition of part of the development:

> Mrs. Weston: … So we got out there and we got our little picket
> signs, we got our bull horns, and we was going through here
> screamin and hollerin at these people, that we better come on out of
> here, you fixin to be moved. …

But, again, these activities are not related to the garden. Earlier gardens may have played a role in the organizers developing ways to increase effectiveness, but the current project did not.

Empowered Outcomes and Empowering Processes

Along with the three levels of empowerment, Zimmerman theorizes that there are empowered outcomes and empowering processes. An empowered individual or organization is able to use power, skills, and resources to achieve desired ends. An

empowering individual or organization helps others to become empowered. Individuals and organizations can be both empowered and/or empowering. This concept is critical to understanding the social benefits of these greening projects.

Each project fulfilled one of the indicators of an empowered community: each was an effort to improve the community, to preserve or protect the quality of life in the neighborhood. On Ashland, Halsted, and Pulaski, the threat was from dumping, drug dealers, gangs, and violence. The garden organizers were responding to these threats. At Jefferson Homes, the desire was to improve the community by providing activities and subsistence. The decision to pursue the garden project also reflected at least minimal skills in resource acquisition, and proactive behavior. Overall, the decision to enter Green Corps was itself an empowered decision. Although the indicator "improving the community" is theorized to be at the community level, it was in fact the efforts of individuals in disempowered communities that led to the greening project.

The decision to join Green Corps was empowered. But was it empowering? This varied by site. At Halsted, the decision making process about the garden was relatively inclusive, and Harriet and the other organizers were at least somewhat empowering. Some residents felt excluded from the process, but the decision was not made by one person and then presented to the block as a done deal. This is what happened on Ashland, Pulaski, and at Jefferson Homes. On Ashland, Martha decided on the project, then created an official block club because that was needed to get into Green Corps. Creating the block club was not total fiction; there was an informal organization on the block, one aimed primarily at helping the younger children. But it was not a formalized group and no one in it had input in the garden decision. If they had, they might have suggested a different lot be used, one

more accessible to the entire block. On Pulaski, there was some discussion of the project at the beat meetings, but the decision had already been made—it will be a garden, anyone interested should sign up. Interest in a play lot was dismissed. At Jefferson Homes, the decision happened the way many do; a primary organizer says yes to just about any offer of resources or assistance that comes along. Many good things get done, but some also fall through the cracks due to neglect and/or lack of time. But in this setting, the decision making was not done in a collective manner. One person decided on the garden project. The decision making process at each site is reflected in the level of social benefits and empowering processes these blocks experienced from the greening projects: Halsted was empowering, the other sites were not.

Summary

In this study, I used empowerment theory in three ways. First, I used empowerment theory to create the practitioner's model, drawing on the urban greening literature and turning the shared thoughts of practitioners into a working model of empowerment practice through urban greening projects. Second, I used this practitioner's model to assess greening practitioners' assessments of empowerment outcomes in four greening projects in Chicago. Finally, I tested empowerment theory itself by using it in an empirical investigation, something necessary to its further development and refinement (Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995; Zimmerman & Warschausky, 1998).

In this chapter, I discussed each indicator from empowerment theory in the practitioner's model, building in evidence from this study that supports or refutes the indicator and/or practitioners' assumptions. Empowerment theory fit the practitioners'

literature well. Many of the sources of social benefits from the practitioners' literature (and outlined in the introduction) fit with indicators theorized by community psychologists and others to be relevant to empowerment.

<u>Empowerment and the Sites</u>

The support in the data for practitioners' empowerment claims was modest, but there. Halsted, one of the success sites, most closely followed the practitioner's model. Residents there were relatively inclusive in the decision making process, interested in improving their block and community, and participation in the block club increased somewhat. The greening project led to both participants and nonparticipants feeling better about their block, that it was cleaner and more beautiful. The greening project led to a change in control of the lot where the garden was planted. This had some positive impacts, but also led to some resentment of the block club members. The resources from Green Corps were appreciated, but not perceived as central to meeting block goals. The Alderman was impressed with the residents' initiative and changed TIF District boundaries to include this block so that the residents could take advantage of any TIF District benefits. Some block residents worked together, made some positive changes, and felt more capable of transforming their block—the project was modestly empowering.

The second success site and both of the failure sites did not follow the practitioner's model. At the second success site, Ashland, the organizer monopolized the process, creating resentment instead of empowerment. At the failure sites, the projects failed for two very different reasons. At Pulaski, the project was not empowering because the organizers were domineering. Efforts at inclusive decision making were lip service only.

What the organizers decided was done. At Jefferson Homes, the residents had moved beyond gardens in their organizing efforts; they were focused on resident management. At one failure site, they were not yet ready for a greening project; at the other the active residents were past the need for organizing benefits such projects offer. Although Ashland did have a positive impact on neighboring blocks, these projects were not particularly empowering; in fact, there were some disempowering outcomes.

<u>Empowerment Theory</u>

The levels of empowerment theory did not fit the data well. Several indicators theorized to be relevant to one level were exhibited at another. "Initiates efforts to improve the community" is one example—while theorized as a community level benefit, it was evident at the individual level in this study.

Some empowerment indicators were not central to the practitioner's model or in the data. These include pluralism, access to government and media, understanding the socio-political environment, critical awareness among residents, extending influence, building coalitions, key brokers in policy decisions, and impact on policy.

Empowering processes and empowered outcomes was a more useful component of empowerment theory in analyzing these data. As discussed above, the empowering nature of the greening project organizers most determined the empowered outcomes of the project.

CLEAN AND GREEN: A NEW MEANING OF URBAN GREENING PROJECTS

In the introduction I outlined empirical data about the meanings of urban green space that might play a role in explaining the social effects of greening projects on city neighborhoods. These meanings of urban green space developed from studies of neighborhood assessment and identity, the environment as social symbol, and the importance of small wins. What emerged from this study regarding meanings people associate with trees and landscape changes draws on some of these earlier findings and theories, but at its core the findings here give us a new meaning in human/plant interactions: the importance of the greening project in the cultural metaphor of cleanliness.

To start this discussion, consider this brief paper delivered by Mr. Ron Pauline, Executive Director of the Aurora/St. Anthony area block club in Minneapolis, at the 1993 Urban Forest Conference:

Greening, neighborhood pride and sense of place[7]

Ronald Pauline, founder, president and Executive Director
Aurora/St. Anthony area block club.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Abstract: Ron Pauline is the founder, president, and Executive Director of the Aurora/St. Anthony Block Club, Inc., Minneapolis, MN, an organization formed to provide a wholesome neighborhood in all respects. The group tutors children, buys, renovate, and sells vacant homes, distributes home improvement grants, and fights crime.

Residential areas in the urban environment are plagued by a number of challenges. There is a high rate turnover in residency. This is due to many factors, such as unstable families, lack of a sense of direction for people, and problems associated with extreme poverty.

The environment plays an important role in the attitude in conduct of the residents. Brick and mortar, asphalt and concrete, wood, vinyl, and aluminum are hard surfaces that do not lend themselves to life changes.

Trees, shrubbery, grass, and flowers are soft and lend themselves to the growth and changes that we as human beings witness. They also take on different shapes and some different functions.

Trees and greenery provide shade, they soften the environment, and bring in artistic, aesthetic appeal to a neighborhood. Even during winter with the snow and ice, trees frame the natural environment and make our neighborhoods friendlier.

The care and manicuring of landscapes indicate people's pride, their sense of place, and it dictates how people conduct themselves. People behave differently in an area that is obviously cared for.

About 18 years ago, the Twin Cities Tree Trust donated trees for private property planting in our neighborhood. Three to five hundred trees were planted and they have thrived and grown. Today, as you drive in my neighborhood, there is real feelings of urban warmth from those trees, planted by the residents.

The Dutch elm disease enlightened many residents to the importance of trees, especially aesthetically. People no longer take trees for granted. We learned from this crisis, and now we water, prune and fertilize our trees, grass, and flowers.

We now recognized and reward residents who plant and care for their landscapes. This competition for beautiful yards and landscapes has bred and escalated pride in the neighborhood.

There are two major points to be learned from this experience: cleanliness is next to Godliness, and Mother Nature is soothing.

I heard Mr. Pauline present this paper in 1993 and have read it many times since then. I have never understood the final line: "There are two major points to be learned from this experience: cleanliness is next to Godliness, and Mother Nature is soothing." "Mother Nature is soothing" makes sense to me; I have heard it before. In his paper, Mr. Pauline mentioned how Mother Nature soothes him and his neighbors: trees and other vegetation support life changes, they are "friendly." The research literature also supports this part of Mr. Pauline's closing statement by documenting of the deep meanings trees have for some city dwellers, the potential for stress reduction from interaction with vegetation, and other factors (Dwyer et al., 1992; Francis et al., 1984; Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989; Kuo, 1992; Schroeder, 1989). But "cleanliness is next to Godliness"? Mr. Pauline did not mention anything about cleanliness in his paper, and I do not remember it in his presentation. The comment has been an enigma to me for several years. Now, however, I am beginning to understand what he meant: the powerful effect of greening projects in creating cleanliness, and the fundamental importance of cleanliness in building and sustaining strong individual and group identity.

This chapter outlines the evidence from this study on the importance of "clean" and "dirt" in urban greening. First I will look at general meanings in these data of "clean" and "dirt," then look at the issues in the context of the greening projects. Then, I will place these issues in the context of the social science literature. Next, I will present a final connection between "dirt" and greening projects, and finally I will discuss the negative evidence on the issues of "clean" and "dirt.'

Prevalence and Meanings of Clean

Early on in the data coding process it was obvious that cleanliness was important to the respondents. Nearly every respondent mentioned cleanliness in some way, and about half of these comments were related directly to the greening projects. Here is a representative set of comments about "clean" or "cleaning up':

> Bethany (Pulaski, describing a photograph): Oh, that is a neighbors yard and they don't keep their yards up. They're *not* clean, ...

> Shirley (Halsted): What do I do? I help with everything that has to be done. We have block club meeting, and uh, I help like with the flower garden, help keep it clean. Help with the block, help keep it clean, and keep all the litter and stuff from in the streets, we keeps that clean, mm hmm. …

> Darius (Ashland): … Albert is a good guy. He is my confidante and my friend. If I need him, you know, very resourceful, knows a lot about cars. He cuts lot of grass on the block. He's very good, he's good at maintenance. Keeping a house lookin clean, keepin the front of the house looking clean. Always cuts the grass for the block party. *Every* year. He's always cut the grass.

> Mrs. Weston (Jefferson Homes): ... As of now we are not on the trouble list to be torn down. The way I heard 'em say that Jefferson Homes probably would be the last one if they was thinkin about it. But I won't take no chances, because if we sit here and just say and not do *nothin*, to try to make the place look good, or clean it up or do something, what they gonna say, 'oh those people there ain't tryin to do nothin. Look at the ground, look around and just look. They don't care nothin about where they live.' That's what they gonna do, and say. So we tryin to save our place, where we live.

There are a number of themes here. Responsible, respectful, *good* people are clean. They clean up around their homes. Good blocks are also clean, and keeping them so is a group activity. Keeping clean is a way to show that you care about where you live and that

you deserve care in return. Mrs. Weston made this clear: keeping clean is a way to try and "save our place, where we live."

Dirty Deeds

Not only did residents talk of "clean" and "cleaning up" often, but they had specific meanings of "dirt'. "Dirt" was "just dirt," empty, and dead. "Dirt" also referred to illegal activities and dirty deeds (Ashland respondents in particular used the word this way). And "clean" and "dirt" separated "us" from "them." Here are some representative quotes:

Just Dirt

Emily (Pulaski): No. They wasn't no grass, it was just dirt. They just made it into a empty lot of dirt. They couldda put a playground right there, woulda looked better. At least the kids would have somewhere to go.

Judy (Jefferson Homes): ... there were wood chips that were supposed to *stop* the grass. But it seem like when the grass came, it made a little more, wood chips up there like it was green instead of just lookin dead. You know at first it was like, just dirt, dead, …

Dirty Deeds

Jerry (Ashland): ... The main thing was about that over half the guys hanging out over here didn't even *live* over here. They would come over here and do their dirt, ...

Darius (Ashland): ... Most of the guys who do anything around here, don't live here. They do the dirt, they go home. Our block is hard. We have to bear the burden from the police, the crime and everything. When things go down, they go home. It leaves *us* with the burden of worrying about the police or the other gangs that may want to retaliate against this block because they literally, threw their dirt here. So its kinda hard.

Us and Them

Darius' quote above depicts both the "dirty deeds" meaning of dirt and the distinction of those who belong and those who don't, or "us and them." There is additional evidence of the "us and them" concept:

> Etta (Ashland): …If there's the fence there, they sit [on it] and pitch [garbage]. You sit there all night. You eat, you drink, and everything you do you sit and pitch. Sit and pitch. Then if *we* don't go down there, and clean up the mess, debris, probably as tall as the trees. But for 25 years we've been cleaning that lot down there.

> Sharon (Halsted): It make it looks a lots better. All we have to do is go over there every day and pick up *their* bottles out of the garbage you know from there and the paper and stuff that they throw out there every night. And they think you, like they say I know they go get it up, so we're going to do it. …

And, in this instance, Thomas and his friends clean up in order to show that they do, indeed, belong on the block, that "them" is somebody else:

> Thomas (Halsted): And we usually get out early in the morning. We'll clean the yard up, the bottles in there and that, 'cause sometimes somebody in the crowd might do it, but we'll clean it up. So they [i.e. Sharon] come now just blame us for everything over there.

Summary: Clean and Dirty

Dirt is empty and lifeless. It is illegal and anti-social. It separates people, marking who belongs and who does not. Cleaning is an act that residents can take up in the face of dirt. It strengthens bonds between residents as it delineates who belongs on the block. Residents show their self respect and respect for the community by keeping their homes

clean. Those who are particularly good neighbors clean beyond their homes, keeping the entire block clean and respectable.

"Clean" and "dirt" metaphors are clearly present in the data, although their relevance differs from site to site. Dirt is particularly important and clearly stated as an issue at Ashland. Halsted and Pulaski residents were less direct in their statements, but the idea is still clearly present. Evidence of the metaphoric meaning of clean and dirt is weakest at Jefferson Homes. Still, many respondents hold these views strongly; this is closely tied to the potential for social benefits from urban greening projects.

Clean and Green

Half of the comments about cleanliness were made in the context of the greening projects. This is not surprising because the greening projects are acts of cleaning up and are often done in response to dirt. Dirt may be in the form of trash in the lot as in the garden on Halsted, or in the form of outsiders doing "dirty deeds," as was the case in the corner garden at Ashland. Cleaning is often literal, particularly in the cases where debris and garbage is cleared from a lot before planting. Many residents spoke of the gardens' making the block look better:

> Eloise (Halsted): [The garden] make the block look better.
> L: It does? How, how does it do that?
> Eloise: Cleaner.

> Mr. Nichols (Halsted): Yes, I like it. … See cause this here place
> here was all full of bottles and cans and you know beer bottles and
> whiskey bottles and all kind of things they were throwing out there.
> Old clothes, shoes and all that stuff you know just, you know it was
> just bad out there.

Respondents made the connection between the greening project and cleaning quite clear. With a few exceptions, when people spoke of working in the gardens, they spoke of "cleaning" the gardens. They did not talk of weeding them or of planting anything. They cleaned. Granted, literal cleaning—removing litter and debris—was a part of each project. Still, the residents did not often distinguish between cleaning and planting and weeding. It was all one activity:

> Jane (Pulaski, about the garden that failed): … Hopeful next week or sometime in October, I should say when it gets a little colder, we're gonna go out there and clean it up and try again.

> Ellen (Pulaski): … We was mostly doing they work, that's because we cleaned the garden, …

> Sharon (Halsted): … I made a lot of changes here, in this area, in this here, as far as cleaning up, putting flowers out, put trees out, I like that. You know I got flower pots all down the stairs and everything. I just love flowers, OK? So I work *hard* to try to keep clean. …

Up to this point, the project could be a lot cleanup without anything planted and most likely have the same meaning for respondents. What, then, do the plants do?

Cleaner than Clean: Beauty

There is evidence that the gardens go beyond "cleaning up." Ron Pauline hinted at it in his paper: "Trees, shrubbery, grass, and flowers are soft and lend themselves to the growth and changes that we as human beings witness (Pauline, 1993)." Residents in my study talked of the gardens as "more than just plain dirt"; they bring "life," "color," and "beauty":

Martha (Ashland): [The garden] made it more beautiful. Some beauty, color than just a plain, dirt yard makes a great difference. It enhanced a lot of positive thinking by that garden being there, you know. …

Mr. Nichols (Halsted): Yes, I like it. I definitely like it because it's life there. It was, I'm talking about flowers and things you know, it is a bit of scenery. …

Harriet (Halsted): Yes, it made me feel like, still feel that one day this will be a better block or a *beautiful* block. That it can be done. All it takes is for people to care, uh, maintain their property and up keeping their lawn and keep our area *clean*. So, like I said earlier, we have made some improvements, we're not a hundred percent where we want to be but we have made progress and I feel we will continue to make progress that this will, one day you will come to this block, you won't remember it [laughs] that it will look so different.

The gardens add to the block, they make it beautiful. Not only have residents removed the whiskey bottles and tires, but they have added color, beauty, and life to their blocks through the gardens. They have taken a part of their physical environment past clean to beautiful.

Beauty and Self Identity

Why does it matter that the greening projects do more than just clean the blocks, that they make them beautiful? The respondents in this study made it clear that the environment is important and that it is integrally linked to sense of self. Mrs. Weston (Jefferson Homes) was eloquent about this:

Mrs. Weston: [Landscaping is] important because where you live reflect on you. If it looks bad, then you feel bad. You gonna do everything bad, and you ain't gonna have nothin. But if you got a beautiful place where you live, then that makes you wants to do

better and do things better, and it's a reflection on you. Like I say
when I first moved here, before I even moved here, I use to live
right down here, by the church. I use to pass here … This was such a
pretty place, and I use to stop and look at it and say 'oh, I wish I
could live there.' Then I say 'I know I'd never live there, so let me
keep on walking.' I never thought I would live here it was such a
beautiful place. It was *beautiful*, you hear what I'm sayin. Yes. And
the peoples was strict then. They was keepin it beautiful. ...

In its heyday, the development was too beautiful for Mrs. Weston to feel worthy of

it. She knew she'd never live someplace so beautiful. The landscape not only gives clues

about the character of the people who live in a place, but a good landscape also "makes

you want to do better." There is a relationship between the people and the landscape, each

reflecting and supporting the other. Beauty, beyond clean, is important in sustaining this

relationship; many of my respondents would agree with President Johnson's comment:

Association with beauty can enlarge man's imagination and revive
his spirit. Ugliness can demean the people who live among it. What
a citizen sees every day is his America. If it is attractive it adds to
the quality of his life. If it is ugly it can degrade his existence
(Johnson, 1965, p. 2).

Nice and Decent Places to Live

Mrs. Weston's comments above speak to the importance of place to self-esteem.

They also hint at the relationship between place and group identity. Other respondents

made comments that further support this connection between landscape and a group-level

sense of self:

Mr. Nichols (Halsted): You see, you know, see there *can* be a
change if you can put something into it, you got to put something
back into it to make it look presentable, look decent you know, but
once you just let it go, then uh, it deteriorates the neighborhood,
your property and everything else. Everybody looking for something

nice you know, but if you don't keep it up it ain't going to be nice. That's right. … Because like I say, like the flowers, you walk by that and you see the flowers on the block and you can look here and compare it to what it used to be. You know, and you would say 'well, I never would have thought this could be like this'. You know, especially *here* and then something you took part in you know it too, it just makes you feel warm on the inside. You know, like they say you know that would make the community look better, it's better to be looking across and see flowers than seeing old couches and chairs, bottles and things over there. So that you know, it looks a whole lot better. Like I said, to me it just bring life more to the neighborhood.

Shirley (Halsted): Oh, it affected it quite well 'cause it by it being clean and turn it into something, it was much better than uh, the weeds and stumps and the bushes and you know, it made it much nicer, made the block look better.

Darius (Ashland): [The corner garden] is vigil for a young woman who died on our block. … It uh, it kinda makes you feel, when you first turn this corner, makes you feel kinda comfortable. All right, this is a nice neighborhood. Makes you feel more at least, well I see all the guys out here, but somebody really cared about the block to have something that looks nice.

Robert (Jefferson Homes): This the front the very front. I think that's a change for the worse. Because they put up the flowers but they didn't maintain them. As you can see in this picture there are all kinds of weeds and everything up there. It just makes it look *worse* when they do stuff like that. If they would keep the flowers up then it would look better. Even if they didn't put up the flowers at all, and just had grass grow there, and cut the grass every once in while it would look better. But I don't think it looks good at all with the flowers. I mean everybody that comes to [the sports facility] or anyplace else, comes through [_____] Street and turns the corner and you see all that sittin there. If *I* was to see it and I wasn't living over here, I would think that this was you know, …

Not only does a garden make the environment clean, it makes it beautiful,

colorful—it brings life. This, in turn, speaks to people about who they are as individuals

and as a group. When the environment is "nice" and "decent," they are nice, they are

decent. The landscape indicates this good character to residents, visitors, and passersby.

Clean and Dirty in the Context of Social Science

In the introduction, I outlined several discourses that address the meanings of urban

green space, or people/environment interactions more generally. These can help us to more

fully understand the ideas of "clean" and "dirty" and their importance to urban greening

projects. An additional discourse from anthropology on concepts of pollution and taboo is

particularly helpful. This literature has yet to be applied to urban greening, but may

explain important aspects of the social outcomes of greening projects.

The Physical Environment, Sense of Self and Sense of Community

Mrs. Weston's comments about being sure that she would never live in such a

beautiful place indicates poignantly what environmental psychologists have suggested

about the meanings of place identity and space appropriation. Mrs. Weston's comments

gave life to Harold Prosahnsky's presentation on space appropriation:

> In the appropriation of space the individual does not only project he
> introjects. He not only expresses his individuality in the way he
> defines and arranges his physical environment; he in turn creates
> this individuality by incorporating selected aspects of the form and
> substance of his environment (Proshansky, 1976, p. 38).

Environmental psychologists have also spoken about the importance of place in

people's conceptions of themselves and their community (Hummon, 1992). People identify

with a type of residential environment as, for instance, a city person or a country boy

(Feldman, 1990; Feldman, 1996). When self-conception changes, often the type of

residence deemed appropriate also changes (e.g., leaving the suburbs after divorce) (Feldman, 1996). This indicates a give and take between a person's self-image and the image of their residential environment, with the physical environment supporting and reinforcing the self-image. Others have also shown that vegetation (and trees in particular) is important in creating a sense of community and home; vegetation plays a special role in the creation of, and attachment to, place (Dwyer et al., 1992; Fried, 1982; Hull, 1992-b; Hull et al., 1994; Westphal, 1993).

Mrs. Weston's comments indicate that she does not feel herself to be good enough for a beautiful residential environment. This shows that negative reinforcement is also possible between individuals and their environment. Mr. Nichols shows us another aspect of this interaction in his amazement that where he lived could look nice:

> Because like I say, like the flowers, you walk by that and you see the flowers on the block and you can look here and compare it to what it used to be. You know, and you would say 'well, I never would have thought this could be like this'. You know, especially *here* …

His residential environment changed for the better. With this change in environment comes the possibility of an improved self-image as well. Proshansky again:

> If we accept the validity and viability of the concept of place identity, then it is clearly evident that the appropriation of space becomes a critical process for understanding the development of changes in personality of the person over the entire life-cycle (Proshansky, 1976, p. 38).

What is less developed in Proshansky's discussion of place identity and space appropriation is that changing the place has repercussions for the person. This is the logical

extension of the interaction between humans and the places they create. What might be happening here is a subconscious shift in how people see themselves reflected in the world around them. The environment is different, and they have new information that they use as they *introject* about who they are. By changing the environment, it is possible to change a sense of self at the individual and group level. It is possible to shift from feeling unworthy to worthy of respect and dignity. This is no small change.

Marc Fried's study on residential attachment sheds some light here (Fried, 1982). In this study, Freid found that objective features are integral to residential satisfaction. This is true across an urban to suburban continuum and across class lines. "Variations in residential satisfaction associated with status inequities can largely be traced to inequalities in the objective residential environment that result from these status inequalities (Fried, 1982, p. 117)." And, "Surprisingly, the single strongest predictor was the neighborhood attribute, ease of access to nature" (Fried, 1982, p. 114). Thus, vegetation plays an important role in both residential attachment and the perception of residential neighborhood quality.

Environment psychologists have established that there is a tie between people and place—place identity and space appropriation—through which people and groups define themselves. What can social science tell us about clean and dirt?

<center>Pollution: Cultural Meanings of Dirt and Clean</center>

The seminal work on the role of ritual or social pollution (rather than pollution as chemical contamination) is Mary Douglas' <u>Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concept of Pollution and Taboo</u> (1966). Others have used her basic understanding to examine social

relations in a number of settings from slums (Marris, 1979) to traveling Gypsies (Okely, 1983).

Douglas' work carefully analyzes the role of "dirt," or pollution in human society. Douglas outlines how concepts of "dirt" (and hence, "clean") are used by cultures to define who belongs (e.g., to the culture as a whole or to a specific clan or lineage within it), what behavior belongs, what behavior does not, and how power is created in the manipulation of the boundaries between "dirt" and "clean" through ritual practice (Douglas, 1966).

Dirt is Matter Out of Place

Douglas defines "dirt" as "matter out of place." This definition makes "dirt" relative: what is "dirt" to some is not "dirt" to others. A shared definition of "dirt" also means a shared definition of what belongs. *Space* is inherent in this definition of "dirt"—it is out of *place*—and this is important in the context of urban greening projects.

The examples Douglas provides are largely symbolic. The act of cleaning up in the creation of greening projects is both symbolic and literal. Dirt, in the sense of people who do not belong, are removed from the space, bodily barred from it (physically by use of a fence, or symbolically with a statue of the Virgin Mary). Dirt in its literal sense is also removed from the space, and, because this dirt is often symbolic of the people who do not belong (hypodermic needles, used condoms, whisky bottles, old tires), it is one more statement that the space is no longer theirs.

Clean Power

It is in this cleaning, the removing of matter out of place, that people create power. Douglas outlines many rituals from cultures around the world in which the act of purifying rectifies problems, be they personal (e.g., infertility), cultural (e.g., war), or physical (e.g., drought) (Douglas, 1966). These cleansing rituals are important and create the means by which people fix their worlds—a powerful act. Greening projects may work in similar ways. In this context, by cleaning up a vacant lot, residents create power to change their neighborhoods in both literal and figurative terms. Of course, we have seen that this power does not always materialize as is evident in the greening project on Pulaski. But we have also seen evidence that it does sometimes materialize in the changes in places such as Halsted and, to a lesser extent, Ashland. Cleaning is not only a metaphor, it is also an empowering metaphor, a form of space appropriation that may foster positive individual and block level change.

Weeds = Dirt: The Importance of Maintenance

One more chapter to the story from these data about dirt and clean relates to weeds and maintenance. Maintenance, or more accurately lack thereof, is a major theme in urban greening. In the practitioner's literature (at least in urban and community forestry), the emphasis is often on the impact of lack of maintenance on the trees and other vegetation: without watering they die or without pruning they are more susceptible to storm damage. But there is another reason to be concerned about maintenance, and that is the impact on social benefits from these projects. People are often quite emotional about maintenance. One example is from Betty at Jefferson Homes:

> [It's] *sick*. Sick, do you hear me? And they're not _____ and OK.
> You, you, you put so much into it, but no one come back to attend it

anymore. You know what I'm saying. What's the purpose of beautifying something you are not going to keep it up? The upkeep. It's just like Mr. Belmont. He only did what he was suppose had done, when he was asked to do it, that was it. That is he was taken away from here. He planted some flowers out there but the *upkeep* behind it, the grass grew all over, the weeds and stuff, *what* is, what sense does it make to plant something you're not going to care for it? That's why I said it's a lot of money being spent, just a bunch of *bull*. That's all. It was a bunch of bull. Because why would you have so much money to put out that you are going to beautify something, but you are not going to keep it up. I don't understand that, I don't understand, I don't get any reasoning behind that. So, it's a bunch of bull.

Betty's diatribe is stronger than most, but is not uncommon when people talk about the lack of maintenance of greening projects (this may be particularly true for nonparticipants). Why is lack of maintenance so vehemently felt? Weeds. Weeds are often defined by greeners as "plants out of place." Weeds, then, are very much like dirt and can carry many of the pollution and danger cultural meanings that dirt carries in our society.

If the greening projects created a change at a metaphoric level for the block and the individual, and the change was instigated by a removal of dirt, then weeds cropping up in the garden is a return of the dirt. Gang bangers might not be hanging out in the garden, but weeds might be symbolic of their return. The lack of maintenance is, at least in part, "messing" with the metaphor. It is a step backwards, even if the lot looks better than it might have without the greening project.

The connection between weeds and people who don't belong (e.g., gang bangers or new residents) can be seen in these quotes:

Mrs. Weston (Jefferson Homes): Mr. _____ [a CHA employee], right, he said that right now they have started to try to weed out the bad. But after he said that then they sent all of [residents from

another CHA development], just about over here, and we didn't know nothin about it. Before we knew anything they fixin up this apartments for the people there. Now how is that given us some consideration? It wasn't. ...

Emily (Pulaski): Yeah, because, its easy, one day, one thing did happen. … they're like teenagers or stuff, and I guess they had gotten in a feud with someone around the corner and by *that* lot [the garden lot], they accessed the rest of the alley, and you know, shooting at them, and run back. So its like a get away, an easy get away. If the police were to chase somebody, they go right through there. Or if somebody want to come and *get* somebody, they see somebody over here that they want to shoot, they just come right through there. And go right through there. It [the garden] don't have no purpose. You know, its *weeds* over there. I could see if it looked decent, but it don't.

Mr. Nichols (Halsted): Yes, ma'am by that, you know it give you a safety, more safety feelings. Because like it will grow up there like weeds and things out there, and peoples could *hide* behind it and do devilish things behind it you know. But now there's a clear view you can see from the alley to the streets you know it give you a more view, you can see what's going on. They used to run from the policemens and all back through there and hide in the weeds but now there is nowhere for them to hide at in there.

Weeds, then, are related to dirt. If they start to grow in the garden, they can represent the same things as dirt: people and actions that don't belong; matter out of place. If the garden was a positive change that had a positive (if unconscious) impact on people's self-images, the presence of weeds in the lot may have a *negative* impact on their newly enhanced self-images. We all know that new skin is more tender than old, and therefore a newly, and subtly, enhanced self-image may be more subject to damage and undermining than a firmly established positive sense of self. Hence, weeds in garden may have a negative impact on social changes due to urban greening projects.

Negative Evidence: Dirt Don't Hurt

Although much of the discussion of dirt supports my argument, I did get one clear

piece of contradictory evidence. Mrs. Collins said of dirt: "now, dirt don't hurt":

> Mrs. Collins: I love gardening. I love greenery. I love to *work* in the
> garden, because it's healthy. You get your hands dirty in the garden,
> in the fields, wherever … . My kids were all born in Mississippi, but
> one. I never had to take them to the doctor. They don't be sick now,
> a whole lot. Because they're used to the dirt and the outside. Because
> dirt don't hurt. God made dirt, and dirt don't hurt. My older brother
> told me one time it don't *hurt* to *eat* some dirt. Because it makes you
> stronger. I don't know how true *that* is, but it's all right. I know
> people eat dirt a *lot* of dirt down south, they say it's sweet. I don't eat
> dirt, [laughs] I can't stand grit.

Dirt does not *only* mean matter out of place. Mrs. Collins refers to another

meaning: good earth, dirt as nurturing, building character. Although dirt may be nurturing,

Mrs. Collins' tone is almost defensive in her declaration in support of dirt, perhaps tacitly

recognizing that dirt is also taboo.

Respondents also recognized that dirt can be worked with, that it is necessary for

growing things. Their view of dirt in the context is instrumental. For instance, some

lamented that the city puts sand down instead of dirt when a building is demolished. When

they have dirt, they can work with it:

> Darius: that other lot, we did that. We got the grass, they brought out
> some dirt. We spread out the dirt. … But we planted the grass, a
> walkway and everything. …

> Monique: Oh yeah. OK. Uh the summer workers did this for the
> MET program. They had delivered dirt, and they bought truck loads
> of flowers and they dug up the old dirt, and put in new dirt, then he
> planted the flowers into the dirt. Then everyday the workers had to
> water the flowers to make sure they don't die.

Summary: Clean and Green

There is evidence that the greening projects can be metaphors for the transformation of the block. By cleaning up a vacant lot and then adding plants, residents made the blocks not only physically cleaner—obviously an important step—but also more beautiful. This change speaks to residents on an individual and group level. At the individual level, there can be an increase in sense of self-worth, as indicated by respondents' comments that they don't expect where they live to be beautiful, that they know they would never live in a beautiful place. When the environment becomes beautiful, this beauty may echo inside, changing their sense of self. Residents might, as Proshansky puts it, *introject* from their newly beautiful environment and change their sense of self.

At the group level, the cleaner, more beautiful blocks indicate that the place and its inhabitants are "nice" and "decent." This message is sent both to visitors and residents: good people live here. Cleaning up is seen as a way to reclaim space or to save it from outsiders who may threaten the viability of the community. Weeds in a garden may symbolize these outsiders or problems, and as such, take the block back to the "old days" of dirty deeds and ugliness.

These ideas are preliminary. The concepts of "clean" and "dirt" has not been examined in any other greening context, and will need considerably more study before firm conclusions can be drawn. However, the concepts of "clean" and "dirt" explain a number of the impacts of urban greening projects, and begin to explain some enigmas like

Mr. Pauline's comment: "There are two major points to be learned from this experience:

cleanliness is next to Godliness, and Mother Nature is soothing (Pauline, 1993, 125)."

CONCLUSIONS

I began this study with questions about the social benefits of urban greening projects. Were practitioners' claims justified? Did both participants and nonparticipants receive any benefits? Were there problems from these projects as well as benefits? The practitioners spoke of these projects as empowering. Are they? The social science literature spoke of the effects of vegetation in urban areas: stress reduction and health benefits, deep meanings of trees and other vegetation that seem to tie to place identity and sense of place. Do these findings help to us to understand the effects of greening projects?

In this chapter, I will look at how well I can answer these questions and discuss the implications of these study findings for empowerment theory, for researchers interested in the meanings of urban green space, for urban greeners who want to be empowering practitioners, and for future research. I will also discuss the limitations of my study.

<u>Are Greening Projects Empowering?</u>

Are greening projects empowering? The answer is an unequivocal "it depends." Greening projects certainly have the potential to be empowering, and Halsted is an example of this. There, residents largely fulfilled the practitioner's model: working together to create changes on their block, creating a better place to live. They increased participation in the block club, and by taking control of a vacant lot and transforming it from a dump to a garden, they were also able to change how people behaved on the block.

But not all of the greening projects worked this way, and even on Halsted there were signs of potential problems. One person or group gaining control generally means

some other person or group—usually project nonparticipants—losing of control. Sometimes the loss of control is exactly what the greening project organizers had in mind, for instance if they are trying to rid a certain corner of drug dealers. But the effects of a change in control are not always so cut and dried. The experiences of Halsted residents is one example. The young men on the block (and some of the other long-term residents) felt put off by the greening project, and resentful that their needs and wishes were not being taken into account by the garden organizers. On Ashland, Martha's near total control of the lot reduced the empowering benefits of that project. To the other block residents, the lot was Martha's, her responsibility and her problem. Control can be of the lot itself or of the decision making process. The story at Pulaski makes this clear, as does, to a lesser degree, the story at Ashland. Changes in control, then, are seen quite differently by participants and nonparticipants. What is empowering for some can be disempowering for others.

The timing of a project in the organizing of a block was important to empowerment outcomes. The two sites where the greening project failed completely, Pulaski and Jefferson Homes, were at very different stages of organizing. Pulaski was just starting to organize as a group, and this is particularly true on the garden block. The area was also changing dramatically in population. Although they had some successful block parties, even these were marred with some degree of bickering and antagonism. Organizing and sustaining a project may have been beyond the neighborhood's collective skill level. Jefferson Homes residents, on the other hand, were old hands at organizing projects large and small. They were past needing a small, manageable project like a garden; they were successfully organizing for resident management of their development. If something was going to be lost in the time crunch, it was the greening project.

Halsted was in-between these two sites in terms of organizing. Halsted residents had signed petitions against a tavern re-opening on their block and then they revived their block club by actively participating in it. A greening project was the right size project for them to take on, complete successfully, and learn from. Therefore, the timing of a greening project in the organizing development of a block may prove to be critical in the level of empowerment benefits that will be derived from that project. Too much, too soon and the greening project and any potential empowerment from it may fail. Too little, too late and the project may fail for lack of interest or that it no longer meets residents needs.

The empowering nature of the people who started the projects was key to empowerment outcomes. While all the organizers were empowered to at least a minimal degree simply to start the greening project, it was their *empowering* nature (or lack thereof) that was most important for the overall empowerment outcomes of the project. If the organizer was empowering, the project was more likely to be empowering. Harriet from Halsted exemplifies the positive side of this equation, while Jill and Jane from Pulaski exemplify the negative.

<u>Summary</u>

There is evidence in this study that, yes, greening projects can be empowering. But empowerment outcomes depend on many things—the nature of the local organizer, the timing in the block's organizing history, the level of participation in the project. Empowerment is by no means an automatic outcome of greening projects.

Reflections on Empowerment Theory

Empowerment theory proved to be a useful framework for structuring the ideas prevalent, but not codified, in the practitioners' literature. Although not every aspect of the theory was relevant to the practitioner's discussions of empowerment through urban greening projects, the fit was good. But some problems emerged in the fit of the data to the theory. These dealt primarily with the theorized levels of empowerment indicators. Other aspects of the theory were supported and proved to be particularly useful to the analysis. These included the concept of empowering processes and empowered outcomes and the cyclic nature of empowerment. I will also briefly discuss the nature of participation in the context of empowerment.

Developmental Stages of Empowerment

Would empowerment theory have predicted the outcomes I found at each site? The degree and type of participation at three of the sites (Halsted, Ashland, and Pulaski) would have led many empowerment theorists to expect the outcomes at each site. But one site, Jefferson Homes, would have been a surprise. While the nature of participation and leadership at Jefferson Homes was important to the project's failure, equally important to the outcome was the stage of organizing at the site. The concept of empowerment developmental stages needs to be incorporated in empowerment theory.

Developmental stages of empowerment incorporates the concept of small wins and modest victories (Feldman & Stall, 1994; Weick, 1984) into empowerment theory. Developmental stages of empowerment also emphasizes the cyclic nature of empowerment. Even at Pulaski, the site where the garden was disempowering for block

residents, there are still some empowered individuals, some skills and strengths to build upon in future projects. At Jefferson Homes these skills are more developed and the input needed to further empowerment goals is quite different. The same issues might be in play in other settings where empowerment has been brought to bear, from individuals dealing with mental or physical illness to neighborhoods actively engaged in incumbent upgrading and redevelopment.

Empowerment Can Create Disempowerment

At the same time that empowerment theory needs to consider the stages of empowerment and more actively include the cyclic nature of empowerment, it must also address the potential for disempowerment from actions that at the same time empower some people. Two empowerment theorists have begun to ask these questions:

> One of the primary tasks for community psychology, then, is to articulate the relationship between empowerment and community. Does empowerment of disenfranchised people and groups simultaneously bring about a greater sense of community and strengthen the ties that hold our society together, or does it promote certain individuals or groups at the expense of others, increasing competitiveness and lack of cohesion? (Riger, 1993, p. 290).

> All too often, national and local policy has tended to favour the cultivation of an elite of well-informed, skilled residents, who will act on behalf of all the other inhabitants of an area. This is, however, precisely the model of representative democracy which gives rise to the problem of disempowerment in the first place. The irony is that it is only the elites at national and local level who do not need empowerment, so the creation of yet more elites (albeit at lower levels) cannot possible bring about a solution to the disempowerment problem (Somerville, 1998, p. 16).

There is evidence in my data to support both of these concerns. At each site some people did, indeed, feel that certain individuals and organizations were promoted at the expense of others. And at Jefferson Homes, and perhaps the other sites as well, a local elite was in the making, one that created a sense of disempowerment for some residents.

How can empowerment theory account for these disempowerment outcomes? One step is to address the issue more carefully in empirical studies. Are there examples of empowerment with out a mirroring disempowerment? What is different in those situations that can inform empowerment practices and theory? When is the disempowerment socially sanctioned (as when drug dealers are forced off a block), and when is it not?

Problems with Levels of Empowerment

The levels theorized by Zimmerman were problematic in the light of my data. This could indicate problems in the theory and/or problems in my data. For example, both "extends influence" and "key brokers in policy" are theorized to be organizational level indicators. But both presented themselves in these data at the individual level, characterizing empowered individuals rather than empowered organizations. Consider Jill and Jane on Pulaski, Martha and Hettie on Ashland, and, to a lesser extent, Harriet on Halsted. Each personified her block organization, in one case (Ashland) leading to tension between two block leaders. One community level trait was also exhibited by individuals rather than at a community level: "initiates efforts to improve the community" was something done by individuals. Each project organizer was motivated to improve the community, although some had other motivations as well.

The lack of clarity between the individual and organization levels in my study may have compounded the lack of clarity between the levels in empowerment theory. In the context of this study, the nature of the organizations is the culprit. These block clubs are not distinct from the individuals who created them and are members of them. Martha from Ashland called herself an organization, although she did not really have a block organization behind her. Halsted and Jefferson Homes each had block clubs or tenant organizations, but both could also be analyzed clearly in terms of the relatively few individuals who make up those organizations. None of these groups interacted with other organizations *as* organizations themselves. Still, even as fledgling groups, they were identified as groups by others on each block. The nebulous nature of the groups made analysis by individual and organization levels difficult. The gray area between individual and organization may need clarifying in empowerment theory, but certainly needs to be kept in mind when assessing the findings of this study.

Different contingents of empowerment theorists might well have different takes on these problems. Empowerment theorists from community psychology have more strongly developed the theory at the individual level. Given the general perspective of these scholars—the psychological health of individuals—this is not surprising. Feminist, activist scholars come to empowerment theory from a group level. The authors in Bookman and Morgen's 1988 collection typify these scholars (Bookman & Morgen, 1988). Here the focus is on struggles to change societal power structures. As such, the focus is on organizations and groups with benefits redounding to individuals as a byproduct of empowerment. Empowerment theorists in Zimmerman's line would likely be more satisfied with the indications of individual empowerment in these data. Empowerment

theorists from Bookman and Morgen's line would likely be less satisfied with these

indications of individual empowerment, looking instead for larger changes in the

neighborhood and city power structures. Riger, in the quote above, sums up this question:

are certain people becoming empowered at the expense of the local community? To answer

this question we need more research. A longitudinal study would help. Through this we

could examine the effects of newly empowered individuals on the block organization over

time: how often does an empowered organization grow from the work of empowered

individuals?

<div align="center">Empowered Outcomes and Empowering Processes</div>

The distinction made in empowerment theory between empowered individuals and

organizations and empowering individuals and organizations was very useful while

looking at empowerment at the block level. This, rather than the levels of empowerment,

leads to a more fruitful understanding of the empowerment process. I have discussed this

in other places and will not belabor the point here.

<div align="center">Participation and Empowerment</div>

The amount of participation in the project at Halsted was one of the hallmarks of

that project and may be what led to the empowerment outcomes there. The symbiosis

between participation and empowerment needs further investigation. To date, some form

of participation has been integral in empowerment case studies (DeSena, 1998; Feldman &

Westphal, forthcoming; Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Kieffer, 1984; Kroeker, 1996; Morgen &

Bookman, 1988; Reardon, 1998; Saegert & Winkel, 1996). Participation is, basically, a

chance to *do* something, and you have to *do* something to bring about change (this can, of

course, include *stopping* doing something). And because change is integral to empowerment, participation is integral to empowerment as well.

But participation is not synonymous with empowerment. What about the community level benefits that people receive whether or not they lift a finger for some neighborhood project? In the introduction, I used a lowered crime rate as an example of such a community level benefit. One such benefit from the study would be the TIF District benefits that residents of Halsted will receive regardless of their status as participant or nonparticipant. Are they empowered by the greening project? If the TIF District provides resources with which all block residents can make positive changes they could not otherwise have made, and if the TIF District has some impact on their sense of self and/or sense of community, there may be some empowerment outcomes from the District designation. Without the change in sense of self or community, the TIF District may be a good opportunity, but not empowering.

Clean and Green: A New Meaning of Urban Green Space

In the introduction, I said that if a tie can be made between meanings of green space and social change, "we will have a new understanding of how the importance of trees and vegetation in city neighborhoods can have an impact beyond beautification." What I have found instead is how "beautification" itself may be critical to healthy neighborhoods. This is a new meaning that green space can have for residents: that of the metaphor of cleanliness, and then beauty, that speaks to people as individuals and groups.

The desire to "have an impact beyond beautification" stems from a view that sees aesthetics as of secondary importance, as an amenity and as such nice, but hardly

necessary. This view is perhaps epitomized in the address, "Beautification be Damned," to the Urban Forestry conference by Don Willeke, then President of the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Committee. In this presentation, he called for quantifying the benefits of the urban forest, preferably in dollars, as the only information policy makers take seriously.

This study, however, provides evidence that beautification matters, perhaps critically, to individual and group self image. An ugly environment may, indeed, "demean" as President Johnson put it over 30 years ago (Johnson, 1965). This evidence began to build with the predominance of "clean" as an issue to respondents. Responsible neighbors were clean. Irresponsible people were "dirt"—they did dirty deeds and "threw their dirt down" in these neighborhoods. This use of "clean" and "dirt" is a common metaphor in many cultures: "dirt" and "clean" defines who or what belongs (Douglas, 1966). In this case the distinction is made between "nice" and "decent" residents who live solid, respectable lives and people, often from off the block, who act in undesirable, sometimes illegal ways (e.g., dealing drugs). The greening projects, by cleaning up the lot, sometimes worked symbolically to cleanse the blocks of dirty deeds and those who do "devilish" things.

Cleaning up the lots was the first step, but one that could have simply been a block cleanup project. The greening projects took this one step further by bringing "beauty," "color," and "life" to the blocks. There is a tie between the beauty of the block and how residents feel about themselves and the block. The respondents said that a beautiful environment makes you "want to do better." They made it clear that a "nice" and "decent"

looking neighborhood indicated that "nice" and "decent" people lived there. This message was sent both to those who live on the block and to visitors to the area.

With this interpretation of the data, the intensely felt reactions to weeds and maintenance problems at greening project sites makes more sense. Weeds are like dirt: they are plants, rather than matter, out of place. As such, they can represent the return of people or activities that do not belong, that violate the sense of self and block as "nice" and "decent."

Beauty, however, is a tricky area. Practitioners must keep an eye out for the cultural myths of the power of nature and ideals of beauty, and avoid "guilding the ghetto" (Hester, 1987, p. 292). The City Beautiful movement at the beginning of this century and the urban and community forestry movement today both have strong ideologies about nature and beauty. These ideals reflect a narrow range of the various other concepts of beauty and nature that abound, be they other examples from a European heritage or those of non-European heritage. Two examples, one from this study, one from personal communication with an urban forestry colleague:

- At Jefferson Homes, the corner greening project did not follow the aesthetic of the residents. The corner in its heyday had been densely planted with bright annuals. The greening project that went in on the corner was more widely space perennials. Over time they would have formed a dense bed of color, but in the meantime residents thought they were "uncoordinated," that flowers should be arranged in concentric circles of similar colored flowers, not a more free-form arrangement with wood chips between the plants.

- In San Francisco, urban forestry workers realized they were having little to no participation from residents in predominately Chinese neighborhoods. They

decided to investigate and found that the traditional tree planting site—smack in front of the house in the parkway area—was a problem in terms of feng shui (arrangement of physical things to enhance energy flow). The foresters changed the suggested planting location and participation in Chinese neighborhoods skyrocketed (personal communication, Cheryl Kollin, 1992).

These two stories highlight the problems that can come from cultural differences in the concept of nature and beauty. An understanding of the importance of beauty in a neighborhood, then, must be tempered with an understanding of the wide-ranging conceptions of beauty and nature. Acting from pre-conceptions in this regard could lead to unintended, negative outcomes, even disempowerment.

Providing trees and shrubbery but no other real changes to a block could also have negative ramifications. The garden on Halsted may not have had its empowered outcomes if there had not also been a supportive Alderman, growing partnerships with the police, and other means by which residents could make additional improvements in their block.

Lessons for Greening Practitioners

Findings from this study raise several considerations for practitioners, including the accuracy of practitioners' assessments of social benefits, suggestions that may help greening projects achieve empowerment outcomes, and implications from the cleanliness metaphor. There is evidence from this study that greening projects can, indeed, be empowering. This is not a given, however, so understanding the nature of empowerment and how to foster it is important to meeting greening practitioners' empowerment goals.

Practitioners' Assessments of Success and Failure

The practitioners' assessment of the empowerment outcomes on the sites was not completely accurate, for either the success sites or the failure sites. The practitioners' assessments were not completely inaccurate either, but they lacked significant chapters in each story that had direct implications for empowerment outcomes at each site.

Ashland, a site thought by Green Corps staff to be a huge success in terms of social benefits, proved limited in its long-term positive impact. Participants in the project were largely members of one extended family, many of whom subsequently moved. The sometimes testy relationship between Martha, the organizer, and the other block residents was not noticed by the practitioners. The domination of the project by Martha was the primary feature of the project to the other block residents, evidenced in part by the relatively few people who took photos of the garden as either a positive or negative change on their block. The inspirational impact of the project on nearby blocks, however, remained.

The failure of Jefferson Homes was a real failure of that particular project. But the context in which this failure happened mitigates the overall effect of the garden project's total lack of success. Because there was an ongoing organization working for the betterment of Jefferson Homes, the lack of benefits from this particular project was not a major loss for the community.

Pulaski was a failed project. The assessment of this site was on target: the organizers were "political brutes," and the block completely uninterested in the greening project.

The practitioners' assessment of Halsted was also fairly accurate. The residents on this block did experience some positive social benefits from the greening project. What was missing in the assessment was knowledge of other important changes on the block, most notably the tavern becoming a church. The church pastor was not aware of the greening project and was as ready to ascribe all the positive change on the block to his church's activities as the greening practitioners were to ascribe them to the garden. Both changes were important to improving the block.

It is not reasonable to expect greening practitioners to fully understand every site in which they work, certainly not that they should know the changes in dynamics a year or more after the project. However, these fuller stories are important to the social benefits that occur because of the greening projects. The upshot for greening practitioners is to be cautious in their claims and recognize that positive change on a block is multifaceted and can change over time. What began as a positive project may sour, as was the case on Ashland. It may also be possible (although not directly supported by my data) that what begins on a sour note may turn sweet over time.

<div align="center">Creating Empowering Programs</div>

Many greening projects are being implemented with empowerment outcomes as a stated goal, but many greening practitioners have not thought carefully about *how* greening projects may be empowering for residents. Findings from this study point to several issues to strengthen the empowerment potential of greening projects.

First, the cyclic nature of empowerment means that no greening project will start with a group that is *totally* unempowered. In empowering practice, it is critical to

recognize the skills and knowledge that residents will bring to the project (Feldman & Westphal, 1999). These may include knowledge about the owner of the lot, about the local tavern becoming a church with a pastor that might help the greening project, or other useful information. Greening practitioners need to be fully aware of this, and they need to view projects as collaborations in which both they and the participants both bring critical knowledge and skills to the projects.

The cyclic nature of empowerment poses one of the dilemmas that emerged from this research. The gardens began with an empowered act of an individual or group on the block choosing to approach the greening practitioners for help with the project. Much of the potential for empowerment outcomes seems to hinge on this decision, on how and by whom it was made. How, then, can greening programs support empowering activities on the block when the die was cast before they came on the scene? One possible answer is for greening practitioners to actively lead some groups in effective organizing. Perhaps revisiting the decision making process after the block is enrolled in a greening program could undo previous disempowering actions. For instance, on Pulaski, Green Corps practitioners might have discovered that at least some block residents wanted a play lot and might have been able to help the greening project fulfill this need. To effectively assist neighborhood groups in organizing, some greening practitioners will need to gain more organizing skills themselves.

Another aspect of the cyclic nature of empowerment is the need to be able to build again and again on past successes (and even failures) to meet further individual or group goals. For some respondents in this study, those at Halsted in particular, it was hard to identify the next step to take after the garden. Empowerment-oriented greening

practitioners could help in situations like this by building coalitions with empowerment-oriented practitioners in other areas like housing, recreation, and employment. Through these coalitions, greening practitioners may be able to help connect client groups with other program opportunities and thereby help residents continue the cycle of empowerment.

With these coalitions, greening practitioners may also be able to use greening projects as a barometer of a block, its level of organizational skill and its needs. At both Jefferson Homes and Pulaski the greening projects failed, but for different reasons. The type of assistance each block needed was quite different. A little investigation of failed projects might reveal other needs that other empowerment-oriented practitioners might be able to fill. For instance a group that could help with communication and basic community organizing might have been useful at Pulaski.

<u>Implications of the Cleanliness Metaphor</u>

The cleanliness metaphor indicates how visual changes in the block, increased color and beauty, may have important impacts on individual and group self-images. Advocates of tree planting have often used community pride as an argument to gain governmental support for their activities. If the cleanliness metaphor holds up to further study, it may indicate just how important these changes are in fostering a healthy, productive, happy citizenry. Simple beauty may be more than an amenity, it may be an important component of a healthy human ecosystem. It may, therefore, be a new talking point for advocates to use.

As I discussed earlier, some caution is also in order. Beauty is a culturally based ideal, and therefore greeners need to pay attention to the aesthetic ideals of the neighborhood as they work on greening projects. Beauty is an important part of the cleanliness metaphor, making it critical to understand the aesthetics of the people who will live around the project. Planting a garden that is appealing to the practitioners but ugly to the residents may defeat the potential of the cleanliness metaphor.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations of this study to bear in mind. Some are inherent in the design of the study, some emerged as the study progressed. First, this study has the limitations of any qualitative study in that I cannot make generalizations to populations beyond those interviewed. The sample, while theoretically driven, was still self-selected. Participators participate, be it in a garden project or in a research project. I did interview at least two people critical of the project at each site, but still may have missed important views of nonparticipants. The block as a unit of analysis has limitations in looking for group level empowerment outcomes. Individual level benefits are possible and easier to determine at this scale.

There was a strong possibility of reactivity for two reasons. First, I am not of the same race and class background as most of my respondents. A few respondents clearly tried to change their speaking patterns when they talked with me, but I can only guess how many edited what they actually told me. The second potential for reactivity is the photo elicitation process. Suddenly there were a dozen or so people on each block taking pictures of good and bad changes.

One site in particular underwent dramatic changes in the population in the decade preceding the study. Pulaski changed from majority European-American to majority Black and Hispanic. These changes may have exacerbated tensions on the block and skewed results of my interviews at this site.

Another limitation of this study potentially limits the test of practitioners' claims. This limitation struck me as I looked at the photographs my respondents took. Chicago has a largely healthy, mature urban forest. Each site, and for that matter most Chicago neighborhoods, have at least some mature trees. But greening practitioners that have made the strongest claims of social benefits from urban greening projects are in cities where the urban forest is less ubiquitous. Philadelphia is a prime example. The neighborhoods where Philadelphia practitioners observe these changes are blocks of row houses and empty lots, on narrow streets with little planting room. The streets were virtually bare of trees and shrubs. The visual effect of planting trees in areas with less vegetation may be more dramatic than planting a garden on a lot that sits under large old cottonwood trees, elms, and silver maples. This will have a particular impact on benefits that derive from interaction with trees and other vegetation, like stress reduction and its potential for associated benefits. The cleanliness metaphor may have a stronger impact in areas where the visual change is more significant.

Future Studies

This study suggests several avenues for future research. One step is to replicate the study in cities with a less established urban forest and in cities where greening practitioners have been more vocal about social benefits. I may be able to work with master's students in these cities to gather data on one or more project using the methods I developed for this study. I could then conduct a meta analysis on these data.

Another option for future studies could include a pre-post quantitative study of incoming block groups to Green Corps. If I could get sufficient data from nonparticipants, I might be able to trace more carefully the effects of the projects on sense of community, participation, and other issues related to empowerment.

Another study possibility would be a nationwide assessment of structures and processes used by greening groups vis á vis empowerment at the individual and organization level. This study would look more at the greening organizations and less at the project participants.

Finally, the cleanliness metaphor deserves more investigation. In two studies in a row now, I have found concepts of "clean" to be at the heart of the data. First in *People and the River,* I found that images of what a clean river looks like might affect whether or not people saw progress in cleaning up the Chicago River (Westphal, 1995). In this current study, cleanliness is important to understanding the potential for social benefits from urban greening projects. Both times I was surprised by the findings. Now I need to develop a research program to investigate more fully the role of our ideas of clean and dirt as it relates to natural resource management. I will begin this with a more complete literature

review and a meta analysis of existing data sets (e.g., Chicago Rivers, TreeKeepers, and

other data sets we have in house) and the role of cleanliness in these other data sets.

But first, I rest

LITERATURE CITED

Ames, R. (1980). The sociology of urban tree planting. *Journal of Arboriculture , 6*, 120-123.

Ames, R. G. b. (1980). Urban tree planting programs: a sociological perspective. *Hortscience, 15*(2), 135-137.

Appleyard, D. (1979). Urban trees, urban forests: What do they mean?, *Proceedings of the National Urban Forestry Conference* (pp. 138-155). Syracuse, NY: State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry ESF publication number 80-003.

Appleyard, D. (1979). The environment as a social symbol: Within a theory of environmental action and perception . *Journal of the American Planning Association , 45*(2), 143-152 .

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation . *Journal of the American Institute of Planners , 35*(4), 216-224.

Berry, R. (1994). Nature and culture: Building community from the ground up. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 226-228). Washington DC: American Forests.

Bethea, J. M. (1979). Welcoming Remarks, *Proceedings of the National Urban Forestry Conference* (pp. 6-9). Syracuse, NY: State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry ESF publication number 80-003.

Bisco Werner, J. (1995). New Jersey ReLeaf: Empowering people to action. In C. Kollin & M. Barratt (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 144-147). Washington DC: American Forests.

Bookman, A., & Morgen, S. (Eds.). (1988). *Women and the Politics of Empowerment* . Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bouza, A. V. (1989). Trees and crime prevention. In P. D. Rodbell (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Urban Forestry Conference: Making Our Cities Safe for Trees* (pp. 31-32). Washington DC: American Forests.

Breslav, M. (1991). The common ground of green words: one author's search for a definition of community greening. *Community Greening Review, 1*(1), 4-9.

Brogan, D. R., & James, L. D. (1980). Physical environment correlates of psychosocial health among urban residents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 8*(5), 507-522.

Brunson, L., Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. (submitted). Sowing the seeds of community: Greening and gardening in inner-city neighborhoods. *American Journal of Community Psychology*.

Buckner, J. C. (1988). The development of an instrument to measure neighborhood cohesion. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 16*(6), 771-791.

Bush-Brown, L. (1969). *Garden Blocks for Urban America*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Charmaz, K. (1988). The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In R. M. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary Field Research* . Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Chavis, D. M., Hogee, J. H., McMillan, D. W., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community through Brunswik's lens: A first look. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*(1), 24-40.

Chavis, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community in the urban environment: A catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*(1), 55-81.

Chenoweth, R. (1984). Visitor employed photography: A potential tool for landscape architecture . *Landscape Journal , 3*(2), 136-150.

Coley, R. L., Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. (1997). Where does community grow? The social context created by nature in public housing. *Environment and Behavior, 29*(4), 468-494.

Collier, J., & Collier, M. (1986). *Visual Anthropology* . Albuquerque; University of New Mexico Press.

Commission, P. s. (1987). *Americans Outdoors: The Legacy, the Challenge* . Washington DC: Island Press.

Consortium, T. C. F. B. (1995). *Local Community Fact Book Chicago Metropolitan Area 1990*. Chicago: Academy Chicago Publishers.

Crowley, S. (1999, January 22, 1999). Point of View. *Memo to Members, 4,* na.

Cullingworth, B. (1997). *Planning in the USA: Policies, Issues and Process*. London: Routledge.

Day, D. (1997). Citizen participation in the planning process: An essentially contested concept? *Journal of Planning Literature, 11*(3), 421-434.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications Inc.

DeSena, J. N. (1998). Low-income women and community power. *Sociological Spectrum, 18*, 311-332.

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-friendly Guide for Social Scientists*. London: Routledge.

Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge.

Dwyer, J. F., Schroeder, H. W., & Gobster, P. H. (1992). The significance of urban trees and forests: Towards a deeper understanding of values . *Journal of Arboriculture , 10*(17), 276-284.

Eber-Schmid, B. (1994). Trees address social issues. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 157-159). Washington DC: American Forests.

Evans, L. (1994). Empowering people: Local and regional urban forestry organizations. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 248-249). Washington DC: American Forests.

Feldman, R. M. (1990). Settlement-identity: Psychological bonds with home places in a mobile society. *Environment and Behavior, 22*(2), 183-229.

Feldman, R. M. (1996). Constancy and change in attachment to types of settlements. *Environment and Behavior, 28*(4), 419-445.

Feldman, R. M., & Stall, S. (1994). The politics of space appropriation: A case study of women's struggles for homeplace in Chicago public housing. In I. Altman & A. Churchman (Eds.), *Women and the Environment* (Vol. 13 , pp. 167-199). New York: Plenum Press.

Feldman, R. M., & Westphal, L. M. (1999). Participation for empowerment: The greening of a public housing development. *Places, 12*(2), 34-37.

Feldman, R. M., & Westphal, L. M. (forthcoming). An agenda for community design and planning: Participation and empowerment practice. In R. Robert (Ed.), *Open House International: Housing, Urban Planning and Sustainable Development.* (Vol. 12, pp. 34-37).

Foster, P. J. (1987). Denver's street trees as civic symbol. *Journal of Community Gardening, 6*(2), 4-5.

Francis, M., Cashdan, L., & Paxson, L. (1984). *Community Open Spaces: Greening Neighborhoods through Community Action and Land Conservation*. Washington DC; Island Press.

Fried, M. (1982). Residential attachment: Sources of residential and community satisfaction. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(3).

Giedraitis, J. (1994). City foresters and their customers. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 40-43). Washington DC: American Forests.

Gruber, J., & Trickett, E. J. (1987). Can we empower others? The paradox of empowerment in the governing of an alternative public school. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*(3), 353-371.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Education, Communication and Technology Journal, 29*(2), 75-91.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications Inc.

Hardy, C., & Leiba-O'Sullivan, S. (1998). The power behind empowerment: Implications for research and practice. *Human Relations, 51*(4), 451-483.

Hassler, D., & Gregor, L. (1998). *A Place to Grow: Voices and Images of Urban Gardeners*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press.

Hester, R. T. J. (1987). Participatory design and environmental justice: Pas de deux or time to change partners? *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research , 4*(4), 289-301.

Hester, R. T. J. (1996, 1996). *Wanted: Local participation with a view.* Paper presented at the EDRA 27, Montreal.

Hlubik, W. T., Hamm, M. W., Winokur, M. A., & Baron, M. V. (1994, March 24-27 1994). *Incorporating research with community gardens: The New Brunswick community gardening and nutrition program.* Paper presented at the Healing Dimensions of People-Plant Relations, Davis, CA.

Holiday, B. (no date). *Strange Fruit* [http//wwwbartnl/~ecduzit/billie/songs217html, .

Hooks, B. (1990). Homeplace: A site of resistance. In B. Hooks (Ed.), *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics* (pp. 41-49): South End Press.

Hooks, B. (1994). Moving into and beyond feminism: Just for the joy of it. In B. Hooks (Ed.), *Outlaw Culture* (pp. 207-242). New York: Routledge.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 643). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications Inc.

Hull, R. B. I. (1992 -a). Brief encounters with urban forests produce moods that matter. *Journal of Arboriculture , 18*(6), 322-324.

Hull, R. B. I. (1992 -b). How the public values urban forests. *Journal of Arboriculture , 18*(2), 98-101.

Hull, R. B. I., Lam, M., & Vigo, G. (1994). Place identity: symbols of self in the urban fabric. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 28*, 109-120.

Hummon, D. M. (1992). Community attachment: Local sentiment and sense of place. In I. Altman & S. M. Low (Eds.), *Place Attachment* (Vol. 12, pp. 253-278). New York: Plenum Press.

Hynes, H. P. (1995). The greening of Harlem. In C. Kollin & M. Barratt (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 114-116). Washington DC: American Forests.

Hale, L. B. (1965, May 24-25, 1965). *Beauty for America.* Paper presented at the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, Washington DC.

Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (1989). *The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Approach .* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karp, J. P. (1973). Citizens groups and conservation organizations. In H. C. Miller (Ed.), *Proceedings: Urban Forestry Conference* (pp. 32-36). Syracuse: SUNY: College of Environmental Science and Forestry.

Kieffer, C. H. (1984). Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. *Prevention in Human Services, 3*, 9-36.

Kollin, C. (1986). Citizen action and the greening of San Francisco. In A. F. Phillips & D. J. Gangloff (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Third National Urban Forestry Conference* (pp. 96-99). Washington DC: American Forests.

Kostouros, J. (1989, September/October 1989). Trees, crime and Tony Bouza. *American Forests, 95,* 41-44.

Kroeker, C. J. (1996). The cooperative movement in Nicaragua: Empowerment and accompaniment of severely disadvantaged peasants. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*(1), 123-138.

Kuo, F. E. (1992). *Inner cities and chronic mental fatigue: Designs for a fighting chance.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Environmental Design Research Association Conference, Denver, CO.

Kuo, F. E., Bacaicoa, M., & Sullivan, W. C. (1998). Transforming inner-city landscapes: Trees, sense of safety, and preference. *Environment and Behavior, 30*(1), 28-59.

Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. (1996). *Do trees strengthen urban communities, reduce domestic violence?* (Technology Bulletin No. 4, Forestry Report R8-FR 55,). Athens, GA: USDA Forest Service Southern Region,.

Learey, F. (1994, March 24-27, 1994). *Themes of community participation in tree planting.* Paper presented at the Healing Dimensions of People-Plant Relations, University of California, Davis, Departments of Environmental Design and Horticulture. Ed. Mark Frances.

Lewis, C. A. (1986). People and Plants: Blessings and Cures. *American Horticulturist, 65*, 16-21.

Lewis, C. A. (1996). *Green Nature/Human Nature: The Meaning of Plants in Our Lives*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications Inc.

Lipkis, A., & Lipkis, K. (1990). *The Simple Act of Planting A Tree*. Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Lyons, J. R. (1986). Congress and urban forestry. In A. F. Phillips & D. J. Gangloff (Eds.), *Proceedings of the third national urban forestry conference* (pp. 264-266). Washington DC: American Forests.

Lyons, J. R. (1994). Urban and community forestry: Partnerships for urban resources. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 110-113). Washington DC: American Forests.

Marris, P. (1979). The meanings of slums and patterns of change. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 3*(3), 419-441.

Mattson, R., Merkle, J., Hassan, B., & Waliczek, T. (1994, 1994). The benefits of community gardening. *Community Greening Review, 4,* 13-15.

Matz, J. R. (1994). Turning garbage into two million trees. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 229-231). Washington DC: American Forests.

McDonough, M. H., Vatcha, K. E., Funkhouser, S. L., & Gieche, A. L. (1994). *Creating community-forestry partnerships: A participatory approach*. East Lansing, MI: Department of Forestry, Michigan State University.

McMillian, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 6-23.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morgen, S., & Bookman, A. (1988). Rethinking women and politics: An introductory essay. In A. Bookman & S. Morgen (Eds.), *Women and the Politics of Empowerment* (pp. 3-29). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Murray, S. (1994). Urban forestry management techniques in Ecuador: A low-cost, do-it-yourself approach. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 66-69). Washington DC: American Forests.

Nassauer, J. I. (1995). Messy ecosystems, orderly frames. *Landscape Journal, 14*, 161-170.

Nassauer, J. I., & Westmacott, R. (1987). Progressiveness among farmers as a factor in heterogeneity of farmed landscapes. In M. G. Turner (Ed.), *Landscape Heterogeneity and Disturbance* . New York: Springer-Verlag.

Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Okely, J. (1983). *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patel, I. C. (1992). Socio-economic impact of community gardening in an urban setting . In D. Relph (Ed.), *The Role of Horticulture in Social Well Being* (pp. 84-87). Portland, OR: Timber Press .

Pauline, R. (1993). Greening, neighborhood pride and sense of place. In C. Kollin (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 125). Washington DC: American Forests.

Perkins, D. D., Meeks, J. W., & Taylor, R. B. (1992). The physical environment of street blocks and resident perceptions of crime and disorder: Implications for theory and measurement. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 12*, 21-34.

Perkins, D. D., Wandersman, A., Rich, R. C., & Taylor, R. B. (1993). The physical environment of street crime: Defensible space, territoriality and incivilities. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 13*, 29-49.

Perkins, D. D., & Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Empowerment theory: Research and application. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*(5), 569-580.

Phillips, S. B., & Garcia, J. (1994). The Pennsylvania Horticultural Society's Philadelphia Green, *Sixth National Urban Forest Conference: .* Minneapolis MN: American Forests.

Proshansky, H. M. (1976). *The appropriation and misappropriation of space.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 3rd International Architectural Psychology Conference, Strasbourg, France.

Qualitative Solutions and Research, Ltd. (1997). QSR NUD*IST (Version 4) [Windows]. Melbourne: Qualitative Solutions and Research.

Ramsay, S. (1994). Special approaches for communities under 50,000. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 61-63). Washington DC: American Forests.

Rappaport, J. (1981). In praise of paradox: A social policy of empowerment over prevention . *American Journal of Community Psychology , 9*(1), 1-25.

Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology . *American Journal of Community Psychology , 15*(2), 121-148.

Rappaport, J. (1993). Research methods and the empowerment social agenda . In P. Tolan, C. Keys, F. Chertok, & L. Jason (Eds.), *Researching Community Psychology: Issues of Theory and Methods* (2nd ed., pp. 51-53). Washington DC: American Psychological Association .

Reardon, K. M. (1998). Enhancing the capacity of community-based organizations in East St. Louis. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 17*(4), 323-333.

Representatives, House of (1990). Conference Report (to accompany S. 2830): Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990. In n. s. 101st Congress (Ed.) (pp. 1237). Washington DC: Government Printing Office.

Ricard, B. (1994). The Connecticut youth/mentors/trees project. In C. Kollin, J. Mahon, & L. Frame (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixth National Urban Forest Conference* (pp. 126-128). Washington DC: American Forests.

Riddell, J. (1993, 1993). Beyond gardening: Building strong communities through urban gardening. *Community Greening Review, 3,* 4-9.

Riger, S. (1993). What's wrong with empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*(3), 279-292.

Rocha, E. M. (1997). A ladder of empowerment. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 17*, 31-44.

Rose, D. R., & Clear, T. R. (1998). Incarceration, social capital, and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology, 36*(3), 441-480.

Rymer, C. (1997, March/April/May 1997). National survey results of community gardeners. *ACGA Multilogue, 14,* 6-7.

Saegert, S., & Winkel, G. (1996). Paths to community empowerment: Organizing at home. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24*(4), 517-550.

Sarason, S. B. (1974). *The Psychological Sense of Community: Prospects for a Community Psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schmitt, P. J. (1990). *Back to Nature: The Arcadian Myth in Urban America*. (2nd ed.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schroeder, H. W. (1989). Environment, behavior, and design research on urban forests. In E. H. Zube & G. T. Moore (Eds.), *Advances in Environment, Behavior, and Design* (Vol. 2,): Plenum Publishing Corp.

Sheets, V. L., & Manzer, C. D. (1991). Affect, cognition, and urban vegetation: Some effects of adding trees along city streets. *Environment and Behavior, 23*(3), 285-304.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications Inc.

Sneed, C. (1998). Foreword. In D. Hassler & L. Gregor (Eds.), *A Place to Grow: Voices and Images of Urban Gardeners* (pp. vii-xi). Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press.

Somerville, P. (1998). Empowerment through residence. *Housing Studies, 13*(2), 233-257.

Sommer, R., Learey, F., Summitt, J., & Tirrell, M. (1994 -a). Social benefits of residential involvement in tree planting. *Journal of Arboriculture , 20*(3), 170-175.

Sommer, R., Learey, F., Summitt, J., & Tirrell, M. (1994 -b). Social benefits of residential involvement in tree planting: Comparisons with developer-planted trees. *Journal of Arboriculture , 20*(6), 323-328.

Speer, P. W., & Hughey, J. (1995). Community organizing: An ecological route to empowerment and power. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*(5), 729-748.

SPSS. (1996). SPSS for Windows (Version Standard, release 7.5.1) [for Windows]. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Taylor, A. F., Wiley, A., Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. (1998). Growing up in the inner city: Green spaces as places to grow. *Environment and Behavior, 30*(1), 3-27.

Toups, C. (1992, October/November 1992). Giving life to community roots. *Urban Forests, 12,* 8-15.

Ulrich, R. S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. *Science, 224*(27 April 1984), 420-421.

Ulrich, R. S., & Parsons, R. (1992). Influences of passive experiences with plants on individual well-being and health. In D. Relf (Ed.), *The Role of Horticulture on Human Well-Being and Social Development: A National Symposium* (pp. 93-105). Portland, Or.: Timber Press.

USDA Forest Service. (No date). *Empowering a Community: The USDA Forest Service's Role in Rebuilding Los Angeles*; USDA Forest Service.

Vento, B. F. (1994). The rise of urban forestry, *Sixth National Urban Forest Conference:* (pp. 261-263). Minneapolis MN: American Forests.

Walker, A. (1983/1974). In search of our mothers' gardens. In A. Walker (Ed.), *In Search of Our Mothers Gardens: Womanist Prose*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace.

Wandersman, A., & Giamartino, G. A. (1980). Community and individual difference characteristics as influences on initial participation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 8*(2), 217-228.

Warren, R. L. (1988). The community in America. In R. L. Warren & L. Lyon (Eds.), *New Perspectives on the American Community* (5th ed., pp. 152-157). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Wellman, B., & Leighton, B. (1988). Networks, neighborhoods, and communities: Approaches to the study of the community question. In R. L. Warren & L. Lyon (Eds.), *New Perspectives on the American Community* (5th ed., pp. 57-72). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Westphal, L. M. (1993). *Why trees? Urban forestry volunteers values and motivations* (GTR NC 164). St. Paul: USDA Forest Service.

Westphal, L. M. (1995, 1997). *If we can make it work here, we can make it work anywhere: A case study of urban ecosystem management.* Paper presented at the Integrating Social Science and Ecosystem Management: A National Challenge, Helen, GA.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications Inc.

Wright, L. (1992, October/November 1992). Planting community spirit. *Urban Forests, 12,* 16.

Zimmerman, M. A. (1990). Taking aim on empowerment research: On the distinction between individual and psychological conceptions. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*(1), 169-177.

Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Psychological empowerment: Issues and illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*(5), 581- 599.

Zimmerman, M. A. (in press). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational, and community levels of analysis, *Handbook of Community Psychology* . New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Zimmerman, M. A., Israel, B. A., Schulz, A., & Checkoway, B. (1992). Further explorations of empowerment theory: An empirical analysis of psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 20*(6), 707-727.

Zimmerman, M. A., & Warschausky, S. (1998). Empowerment theory for rehabilitation research: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 43*(1), 3-16.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Interview Guide

Note: the layout has been altered somewhat for this appendix (extra space removed). Comments in () indicate the substantive area that lead to my asking the question. These were not included in the guide as used for the interviews.

Interview with: _____ Block: _____ Date: _____

UNDERSTANDING NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGE

Interview introduction:
I am Lynne Westphal, a graduate student at the University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs.

I am interested in changes in your block over the past five years that are important to *you*. There are no right or wrong answers. Thank you for taking the pictures—we'll talk about them in a minute.

This interview will take about an hour. I would like to tape our conversation so that I can concentrate on what you're saying instead of on taking notes. You may stop the interview at any time. Is it still OK with you to do this interview?

Photographs
Intro for respondents who took the photos:
I'd like to look at the pictures you took of your block. I'd like you to tell me about each picture.

Intro for interviewing with photos other people took:
I asked some of your neighbors to take 10 picture of the block, focusing on **things that have changed for the better or worse over the past five years**. I told them they could take pictures on the street, in the alleys, in front and back yards, in parks, school yards or other places, where ever they chose. Any kind of change was OK to photograph. If I had asked you to take pictures of recent changes in your block, what would you have photographed?

Now I'd like to show you some of the photographs your neighbors took. I'd like to know what you think of these photos.

Intro for Green Corps photos of the garden sites

One change that happened a couple years ago that some people have mentioned was the garden project. I have some photos of that project that I'd like your thoughts on.

<u>All changes</u>
Tell me about each picture…*probe*
- What change is this a picture of?
- Where is it?
- When did it happen?
- What do you like about this ____(change)____? Why?
- What don't you like about this ____(change)____? Why?
- What was the cause of this change?
- What was the block like before this change? After?
- What effect is this change having on **you**? Your **block**?
- Were you involved? Why/why not?
- What did you do?

<u>In-depth questions — for both project -related and *not* project-related changes</u>

- How was the space used before this change? After? (greener's model, empowerment)

- How did _____ effect the appearance of your block? (greener's model, meanings of green space)

- Did _____ change how you feel about your block? How? (greener's model, empowerment, meanings of green space)

- Did _____ change how you felt about your neighbors? How? (greener's model, empowerment)

- Did _____ change how you felt about yourself? How? (empowerment)

- Have *you personally* had any problems because of the _____ project? If so, what problems? What about your block? Have these problems been solved? How were they solved? (greener's model, empowerment)

- Were you in touch with your Alderman or other politicians about _____ ? Had you been in touch with them before _____? Have you been in touch since? (greener's model, empowerment)

- Were you in touch with an organization or agency about _____? Had you been in touch with them before _____? Have you been in touch since? (greener's model, empowerment)

- Did _____ give you control over something you didn't have control over before? How about for your block as a whole — do you have more control over this now? Did it take any control away? (empowerment)

- Did this effect your feelings of safety? How? (greener's model, meanings of green space)

- Did this have any effect on crime on your block? How? (greener's model, empowerment, meanings of green space)

- Did this change how people take care of their buildings or houses? How? (greener's model, empowerment)

- Did _____ have any effect on rents or property values on your block? What effect? (greener's model, meanings of green space)

- Did _____ have any economic impacts on your block, maybe bringing grant money here, or helping people get jobs? (empowerment)

- What else was happening in your neighborhood that summer (block party, CAPS, weather, etc.)? (greener's model)

In-depth questions — project-related change
- What was the project about, how did it work (i. e., neighborhood group, work days, picnic, meetings)?

- Do you know other participants in the project? Who? Probe for whether or not knowing the participants motivated them to participate or stopped them from participating. (greener's model, empowerment, meanings of green space)

- Do you think of the _____ as more of a success or something that didn't work? Why? What made it so? (greener's model)

- What was the organizing group like? were you welcome? how was the group run? (empowerment)

- Did this project change how the neighbors worked together? How? (empowerment, meanings of green space)

- Did this project get you to participate in other neighborhood programs or projects? (greener's model, empowerment)

- Did you learn things from this project that you have, or might, use in other situations? What? (empowerment)

- Are you aware of other block or neighborhood projects that started after this project? Did the _____ project help these project get started or be more successful? Did the _____ project hinder these other projects? Are you involved in any of these projects? (greener's model, empowerment)

///
Additional questions for organizers:

Tell me about the _____ (block or garden group)

     When was the group formed? (How old is it?) (greener's model)

     How is your group organized? Formally, with a president or chair, or more informally? Who would you say is the leader of your organization or group? You? Someone else? A group? (empowerment)

     How do you take care of business, make decisions? (empowerment)

     How do you get word out about your project? (empowerment)

     How do you get people involved in projects? (empowerment)

     Ask of each item above: Has this changed because of the garden project?

Since planting your garden with Green Corps, have you

     Had people participate in your community organization who had never participated before? (greener's model, empowerment)

     Told other community organizations about Green Corps? (empowerment)

     Been in contact with any professional organizations other than Green Corps for help with you garden? If yes, which organizations? (*prompt: Chicago Botanic Gardens, Openlands Project, Green Streets, Urban Resources Partnership)* (greener's model, empowerment)

     Been in contact with the city's Bureau of Forestry? (greener's model, empowerment)

Been in contact with Chicago's Department of Streets and Sanitation? (greener's model, empowerment)

Been in contact with other agencies? (greener's model, empowerment)

Has the garden project tied into any other neighborhood events or activities? (greener's model, empowerment)

Have there been any other activities or programs your group tried that worked well? If yes, what were they? Why do you think your group was able to succeed in that (those) effort(s)? (greener's model, empowerment)

Have there been any other activities or programs your group tried that didn't work so well? If yes, what were they? Why do you think your group wasn't able to succeed in that (those) effort(s)? (greener's model, empowerment)

Did you get much support from outside the neighborhood for this project? (empowerment)

Has your group hooked up with other organizations as a result of the garden project? (empowerment)

Has the garden group participated in anything outside the neighborhood—like the green and growing fair? (empowerment)

What's next for your group? (greener's model, empowerment)
///

About the block   Now I'd like to ask you some questions about how you feel about your block now and about how you felt about your block about five years ago.

All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with this block as a place to live **today**? *show scale on a card:* very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied or dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied.

(*show sample card*) I am going to give you a few pairs of words, like good and bad. I would like you to think about your block and pick a number showing how you feel about your block. For instance, if you think your block is very bad, you might pick 1. If you think your block is very good, you might pick 7. If you think your block is in-between, you might pick 4. OK?

Thinking of your block *today* is your block:

unsafe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	safe
unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	attractive

high crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	low crime
unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	friendly
poorly maintained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	well maintained
little greenery	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	much greenery
stressful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not stressful

Now I'd like to know about how you felt about your block **about five years ago**. Think back about 5 years. All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with your block then? *Show card with scale on it:* very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied or dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied.

If different, Why?

Keep thinking about your block about 5 years ago. I'm going to show you the same pairs of words and would like to know if you would have rated your block differently about 5 years ago. *show each scale again*

unsafe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	safe
unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	attractive
high crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	low crime
unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	friendly
poorly maintained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	well maintained
little greenery	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	much greenery
stressful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	not stressful

If different, Why?

<u>How do you feel about this block</u>

OK, we're done thinking back about your block. I've got one more set of questions about your block. Thinking about your block today,

show card with response categories: not at all, a little, a medium amount, quite a lot, very much

How much would you say that you have a sense of belonging with the people on this block?

How much would you say that the friendships and associations you have with other people on this block mean a lot to you?

How much would you say that, if the people on this block were planning something, you'd think of it as something "we" were doing *together* rather than something "they" were doing?

How much would you say that you feel loyal to the people on this block?

How much would you say that you get a sense of community from living on this block?

Activities

Please tell me that activities you participate in? *probe: Church/mosque, block club, school, civic groups like NAACP, political groups, etc.*

Which of these activities do you think of as *neighborhood* related? (circle)

Demographics

I'd like to ask a few questions about you and your family. Again, your answers are between you and me—I won't tell anyone what you say here. After these questions, we're done!

Clarify if necessary: How do you identify your race or ethnic background?

Note gender

How old are you?

Do you have children? How many? Ages?

How long have you lived in _____? *(probe for specifics if answer is 'all my life' etc. If a new resident, find out where they moved from: same neighborhood?)*

Do you own or rent your [home, apartment, room]?
Note whether they live in a home, apartment, which floor

Please tell me all the people who live with you here. I don't need names, just relationships, like spouse, children, parents, friends, others…

Show a card with education levels on it and ask: How much school have you completed?

1) grade school (through 5th or 6th grade)
2) middle school / junior high (through 8th grade)
3) high school / GED
4) technical training or community college
5) some college
6) college degree
7) graduate degree

What is your work status? Retired, not employed, part-time, full time, occasional

What do you do?

Show income ranges on a card so that they can point or say the item number
What range includes your household's total income (before taxes) for last year?

1) less than$15,000
2) more than $15,000 but less than $25,000
3) more than $25,000 but less than $40,000
4) more than $40,000 but less than $70,000
5) more than $70,000 but less than $100,000
6) more than $100,000

Wrap up

- Is there anything else you want to add, questions you think I should have asked that I didn't?
- If I have a question or two later this summer or fall, may I give you a call?
- Thank you very much for your time. I greatly appreciate it!

APPENDIX 2: Contact Letter

(on University of Illinois letterhead)

August 23, 1997

Hello,

I would like to introduce myself. I am Lynne Westphal, a graduate student at the University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs. I want to talk with residents on your block about changes in your block over the past five years—either changes for the worse or changes for the better. I have spoken with ____(neighborhood contact)____, and they have agreed to help me with this study. I hope you will, too.

You may hear from me soon, or see me around the neighborhood. Of course, participation is voluntary! If you have any questions or want to talk with me, feel free to call me at 312/996-3316 (you can leave a message any time).

Thanks, and I look forward to meeting you in person!

Sincerely,

Lynne M. Westphal
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX 3: Jefferson Homes "Delay" Letter

(on University of Illinois letterhead)

September 9, 1997

Hello,

I wanted to let you know that I haven't forgotten about our interview – and I hope you haven't either! Many people agreed to work with me at Wentworth, so it is taking me some time to get back around to everyone. I may have already stopped by your home, but at a time that you weren't available.

If you have questions, give me a call at 312/996-3316 (you'll probably have to leave a message—I'll call you back). I hope to see you soon, and I am looking forward to our interview!

Sincerely,

Lynne M. Westphal
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX 4: Jefferson Homes Goodbye Letter

(on University of Illinois letterhead)

September 29, 1997

Dear

I'm sorry that I've missed you the times I have stopped by. I need to move on to another neighborhood and so I won't be able to complete our interview. If I had photos from you, I have enclosed them in this letter. I am sorry that we weren't able to talk, but want you to know that I appreciate your willingness to work with me in this survey.

If you have questions about the survey give me a call at 312/996-3316 (you'll probably have to leave a message—I'll call you back). Again, thank you for your help with this project—I *really* appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Lynne M. Westphal
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX 5: Neighborhood Experts Interview Guides

SOCIAL BENEFITS FROM URBAN GREENING PROJECTS

Lynne M. Westphal
UPP

<u>Draft guide community expert interviews</u>[8]
I am Lynne Westphal, a graduate student at the University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs. I am talking to people all around Chicago about changes in their blocks over the past five years—either changes for the worse or changes for the better.

Given your position as _____, you will have important insights into this neighborhood. I would like to talk with you for a few minutes and get your perceptions of recent changes in this neighborhood. I am particularly interested in the area around the _____ block of _____.

Would this be a good time, or should we make an appointment for another time?

If now is OK:
I would like to record our conversation, and I may quote you in a paper or report. You may stop the interview at any time. Is it OK to proceed?

About the block
What have been some of the changes in the _____ block of _____ over the past five years?
Probe as needed: these may be changes for the better or worse, big changes or small.

Are you aware of the neighbors in that _____ block of _____ working together on any projects? If so, what projects were those?

If the garden does not come up:
Are you aware of the garden project that some of the residents worked on a couple of years ago?

If yes:
Overall, what would be your assessment of social benefits from that garden project on the block? Why?

---

[8] Experts may include aldermanic staff, police officers, postal carriers, nonprofit organization staff, clergy, civic group leaders, etc.

Did the neighborhood learn to work more effectively together because of that project?

Did they ask you for any assistance with that project? If so, was that the first time they had asked
you for assistance? Have they asked since? What kind of assistance did they ask for?

Have there been other projects that the neighbors worked on together? What were these?

Did these project take place before or after the garden project?

If after, was the garden project at all responsible for this other project?

If not aware of the garden project:
Have residents from that area asked you for assistance with any projects or problems?
What did they ask for? When?

Wrap up
Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Thank you *very* much for your time.

APPENDIX 6: Project Index Tree (Coding Structure)

Index Tree
    (1)changes on block
        (1 1)garden
            (1 1 1)story
            (1 1 2)what they did for the garden
        (1 2)nongarden
            (1 2 1)tavern to church
            (1 2 2)burned house
            (1 2 3)slum lord
            (1 2 4)increasing vacant lots
            (1 2 5)sm corner garden
            (1 2 6)WW greening
                (1 2 6 1)ww corner garden
                (1 2 6 2)flower circles
                (1 2 6 3)other ww greening
                (1 2 6 4)park
            (1 2 7)super model block
    (2)activites on block
        (2 1)block club
            (2 1 1)block club meetings
        (2 2)work on lot
        (2 3)recruitment
        (2 4)decision making
        (2 5)how got involved
        (2 6)clean ups
        (2 7)block parties
        (2 8)other block activities
        (2 9)flood
        (2 10)all other block activities
        (2 11)activities section of interview
    (3)people
        (3 1)self
        (3 2)block or neighbors
        (3 3)young men
        (3 4)whose idea
        (3 5)garden organizers (about)
            (3 5 1)Martha
            (3 5 2)Hettie H
            (3 5 3)Harriett N
            (3 5 4)Mrs Samuels
            (3 5 5)Jill n Jane
            (3 5 9)RMC and LAC + leaders
                (3 5 9 2)Mrs Thompson
                (3 5 9 3)B Weston
        (3 6)aldermen
        (3 7)lot owners

(3 8)police
(3 10)CHA
(3 11)GC
    (3 11 1)GC as school
    (3 11 2)problems with GC
(3 12) Sports Facility Team
(4)feelings
    (4 1)positive feelings
    (4 2)negative feelings
    (4 4)control
        (4 4 1)increased control
        (4 4 2)decreased control
        (4 4 3)no change in control
        (4 4 4)general control
(5)a priori issues, outcomes
    (5 1)perceived
        (5 1 2)crime
        (5 1 3)worked together
        (5 1 5)prop values
        (5 1 9)safety
    (5 2)community
        (5 2 1)particularly community?
    (5 4)actual
        (5 4 1)participation
        (5 4 2)learned stuff
        (5 4 3)lot use
        (5 4 4)more projects
        (5 4 5)appearance
            (5 4 5 1)int garden and appreance
            (5 4 5 2)nice, decent
        (5 4 6)block maint.
            (5 4 6 15)lot maintanence
        (5 4 7)econ
        (5 4 8)garbage & dumping
        (5 4 9)got to know people
        (5 4 10)participant outreach
        (5 4 11)involve 2
        (5 4 15)meet org goals
        (5 4 16)resources
        (5 4 18)contacts
(6)emergent issues
    (6 1)they don't like me, us
    (6 2)problems
        (6 2 1)lack of time
        (6 2 3)theft
        (6 2 5)vandalism

       (6 2 6)vice: drugs, gangs, hanging, etc.
           (6 2 6 12)hanging
       (6 2 7)play space
       (6 2 8)racial barriers
       (6 2 9)other prejudice
       (6 2 10)no problems
       (6 2 11)car repair
(6 3)off block
(6 4)fences
(6 5)organizing or new organizers
(6 6)i'm not a gardener
(6 7)conflict
(6 8)didn't know about it
(6 9)cleaning up
       (6 9 1)clean: responsibility & respect
           (6 9 1 1)clean: social norm
       (6 9 2)CLEANING not weeding-planting
       (6 9 3)clean: beauty, nice etc.
       (6 9 4)clean: us and them
       (6 9 6)clean: starting point
       (6 9 7)clean: interesting, but where do these go?
(6 10)hard work
(6 11)contradictions
(6 12)kids
(6 13)didn't finish
(6 14)block rejuvination
(6 15)heat
(6 16)dirt
       (6 16 1)just dirt, empty
       (6 16 2)dirty deeds
       (6 16 3)dirt: us & them
       (6 16 4)can work wtih dirt
(6 17)proximity
(6 18)more work to do
(6 19)bad soil
(6 20)the way we were
(6 21)Robinson clan
(6 22)other people oughta do something
(6 23)memorials
(6 24)growth
(6 25)permanence, future?
(6 26)religious
(6 27)ownership
(6 28)cultural references
(6 29)transience
(6 30)vacant or abandoned buildings & lots

(6 31)communication
(6 32)liability
(6 33)wildlife
(6 34)broken window theory
(7)reasons
    (7 1)r for garden
    (7 2)r for participation
    (7 3)r for not partcipating
    (7 4)r for failure (respondent's)
    (7 5)r for success (respondent's)
(9)impressions of garden & other changes
    (9 1)ts sucess
    (9 2)impressions of garden changing with time
    (9 3)better than alternative
    (9 4)what +I woulda done
    (9 5)nothing I +don't like about it
    (9 6)don't like anything about it
    (9 7)houses are better
    (9 8)not better than alternative
    (9 9)could've done more
    (9 10)that's life there
    (9 11)other impressions
(10)cases
    (10 1)sites
        (10 1 1)HS cases
            (10 1 1 2)HS text re garden
            (10 1 1 3)HS CASES by name
                (10 1 1 3 1)Harriett Lewin
                (10 1 1 3 2)Eloise
                (10 1 1 3 3)Mr. Nichols
                (10 1 1 3 4)Veronica Fisher
                (10 1 1 3 5)Shirley
                (10 1 1 3 6)Thomas
                (10 1 1 3 7)Sharon Samuels
                (10 1 1 3 8)Charles
                (10 1 1 3 9)Doc Martin
                (10 1 1 3 10)Mrs. Robertson
                (10 1 1 3 11)Cathy
                (10 1 1 3 12)Doug
        (10 1 2)ASH cases
            (10 1 2 2)ASH text re garden
            (10 1 2 4)ASH CASES by name
                (10 1 2 4 1)Darius
                (10 1 2 4 2)Jerry
                (10 1 2 4 3)martha Martin
                (10 1 2 4 4)Joyce

(10 1 2 4 5)Hettie Campbell
(10 1 2 4 6)Etta Jones
(10 1 2 4 7)Albert
(10 1 2 4 8)Christine
(10 1 2 4 9)Kanisha
(10 1 2 4 10)Patricia
(10 1 3)JH cases
    (10 1 3 2)JH CASES by name
        (10 1 3 2 1)Celine
        (10 1 3 2 2)Robert
        (10 1 3 2 3)Lucy
        (10 1 3 2 4)Monique
        (10 1 3 2 5)Mrs. Johnson
        (10 1 3 2 6)Earline
        (10 1 3 2 7)Betty
        (10 1 3 2 8)Bonnie
        (10 1 3 2 9)Lisa
        (10 1 3 2 10)Mrs. Clark
        (10 1 3 2 11)Mrs. Thompson
        (10 1 3 2 12)Rhonda
        (10 1 3 2 13)Mrs. Cecelia Tipple
        (10 1 3 2 14)Patty
        (10 1 3 2 15)Nell Luskin
        (10 1 3 2 16)Mrs. Wells
        (10 1 3 2 17)Mrs. Jordan
        (10 1 3 2 18)Mrs. Collins
        (10 1 3 2 19)Mrs. Taylor
        (10 1 3 2 20)Diane Luskin
        (10 1 3 2 21)Judy Weston
        (10 1 3 2 22)Sharon
        (10 1 3 2 23)Mrs. Weston
    (10 1 3 3)JH text re garden
    (10 1 3 10)JH folks know gdn?
        (10 1 3 10 1)knew about garden
            (10 1 3 10 1 1)didn't know gdn
            (10 1 3 10 1 2)knew gdn
        (10 1 3 10 2)knew about mall
            (10 1 3 10 2 1)didn't know mall
            (10 1 3 10 2 2)knew mall
(10 1 4)PU cases
    (10 1 4 2) jill & jane
    (10 1 4 3)PU text minus JnJ
    (10 1 4 4)PU cases by name
        (10 1 4 4 1)Ellen
        (10 1 4 4 2)Morgen
        (10 1 4 4 3)Jolanta

(10 1 4 4 4)Mrs. hale
(10 1 4 4 5)Patricia
(10 1 4 4 6)Tarina
(10 1 4 4 7)LaShandra
(10 1 4 4 8)Emily
(10 1 4 4 9)Jill and Jane
(10 2)success or failure
    (10 2 1)R thought it's a success
    (10 2 2)R thought it was a failure
    (10 2 3)GC thought success
    (10 2 4)GC thought failure
(10 3)particpant status
    (10 3 1)participant
        (10 3 1 1)organizer
        (10 3 1 2)particpant, not organizer
    (10 3 2)nonparticipant
(10 4)did they take pictures
    (10 4 1)took pictures
    (10 4 2)didn't take pictures
(10 5)demographics
    (10 5 1)AGE2
        (10 5 1 1)under 20
        (10 5 1 2)twenties
        (10 5 1 3)thirties
        (10 5 1 4)forties
        (10 5 1 5)fifties
        (10 5 1 6)sixties or older
    (10 5 2)HHSIZE2
        (10 5 2 1)1 in hh
        (10 5 2 2)2 in hh
        (10 5 2 3)more than 2 in hh
    (10 5 3)RACE
        (10 5 3 1)Black
        (10 5 3 2)White
    (10 5 4)GENDER
        (10 5 4 1)female
        (10 5 4 2)male
    (10 5 5)WORK
        (10 5 5 1)full time
        (10 5 5 2)unemployed
        (10 5 5 3)retired
        (10 5 5 4)employed part time
        (10 5 5 5)self employed
        (10 5 5 6)disability
        (10 5 5 7)student
        (10 5 5 8)homemaker

(10 5 5 10)works
(10 5 6)ED
    (10 5 6 1)less than HS
        (10 5 6 1 3)grade school
        (10 5 6 1 5)middle school
    (10 5 6 2)high school or ged
    (10 5 6 3)more than HS
        (10 5 6 3 1)college degree
        (10 5 6 3 2)tech or comm col
        (10 5 6 3 6)some college
(10 5 7)INCOME
    (10 5 7 1)less than 15K
    (10 5 7 2)15 to 25K
    (10 5 7 3)25 to 40K
    (10 5 7 4)40 to 70K
    (10 5 7 5)myob or don't know inc.
(10 5 8)KIDS
    (10 5 8 1)has kids
    (10 5 8 2)no kids
    (10 5 8 11)1 kid
    (10 5 8 12)2 kids
    (10 5 8 13)3 kids
    (10 5 8 14)4 kids
    (10 5 8 15)5 kids
    (10 5 8 16)6 kids
    (10 5 8 17)7 kids
    (10 5 8 18)8 kids
(10 5 9)OWNRENT
    (10 5 9 1)own
    (10 5 9 2)rent
(10 5 10)HOWLONG2
    (10 5 10 1)lived here 5 yrs or less
    (10 5 10 2)lived here 6 to 10 yrs
    (10 5 10 3)lived here 10 to 24 yrs
    (10 5 10 4)lived here 25 yrs or more
(10 6)text photo data
    (10 6 5)text docs
    (10 6 6)photos docs
    (10 6 7)text data minus L:
(11)physical features of block
    (11 1)weeds
    (11 2)grass
    (11 3)trees
        (11 3 1)forest, jungle, woods
(12)block comm attachment
    (12 5)block satisfaction

(12 5 1)very sat w block
(12 5 2)satisfied w block
(12 5 3)neither sat or dissat w block
(12 5 4)dissatisfied w block
(12 6)block sat 5 yrs ago
(12 6 1)very sat w block 5 yrs ago
(12 6 2)sat wtih block 5 yrs ago
(12 6 3)neither sat or dissat w block 5 yrs ago
(12 6 4)dissat w block 5 yrs ago
(12 6 5)very dissat w block 5 yrs ago
(12 7)block sat change
(12 7 1)much more satisfied w block
(12 7 2)a little more sat w block
(12 7 3)same sat level as 5 yrs ago
(12 7 4)less sat that 5 yrs ago
(12 7 5)much less sat than 5 yrs ago
(12 8)gdn made a diff
(12 8 1)gdn made a diff on block
(12 8 2)gdn didn't make a diff on block
(12 8 3)gdn made a little diff on the block
(12 9)belonging on block
(12 9 1)belongs 'quite a lot'
(12 9 2)belongs 'a med amnt'
(12 9 3)belongs 'a little'
(12 9 4)belongs 'very much'
(12 9 5)belongs 'not at all'
(12 10)friends and asso imp
(12 10 1)friends mean 'quite a lot'
(12 10 2)friends mean alot 'a little'
(12 10 3)friends mean 'very much'
(12 10 4)friends mean a lot 'a med amnt'
(12 10 5)friends mean alot 'not at all'
(12 11)we do things together on this block
(12 11 1)we? very much
(12 11 2)we? quite a lot
(12 11 3)we? not at all
(12 11 4)we? a little
(12 11 5)we? a med amnt
(12 12)if feel loyal
(12 12 1)loyal? quite a lot
(12 12 2)loyal? very much
(12 12 3)loyal? not at all
(12 12 4)loyal? a little
(12 12 5)loyal? a med amnt
(12 13)feel sense of comm
(12 13 1)community? quite a lot

(12 13 2)community? very much
(12 13 3)community? a little
(12 13 4)community? not at all
(12 13 5)community? a med amnt
(15)meanings of greenspace
(20)quality control
      (20 1)L:
      (20 2)I asked
      (20 3)intra coder check
      (20 4)about me
      (20 5)didn't understand my question
      (20 6)re taking the photos
      (20 7)huh?
      (20 8)leading
      (20 9)reactivity
      (20 10)old text searches and index searches
           (20 10 2)crime probe from me
           (20 10 3)getting to my probes re safety
           (20 10 4)safety minus what I reviewed for 'I asked'
           (20 10 6)safety, I asked TUs
           (20 10 10)crime that I asked about (this search worked)
               (20 11)negative evidence

VITA

LYNNE M. WESTPHAL

<u>Education</u>

Ph.D.   University of Illinois at Chicago. 1999. *Public Policy Analysis (Urban Planning and Policy).*

M.A.   Northeastern Illinois University. 1992. *Geography and Environmental Studies.*

B.A.   University of Wisconsin, Madison, *South Asian Studies*. 1982.

<u>Professional positions (related to doctoral work)</u>

1996-present Research Social Scientist, USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. Conducts original research focusing on the community revitalization outcomes of urban greening projects.

1992-1996   Social Scientist, USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. Conducts original research (individually and with unit scientists and cooperators) on the role of vegetation and open space in human well-being.

1991-1992   Computer Assistant, USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. Assist unit scientists in data coding and analysis. Maintain computer hardware.

1991   Research Assistant, "Integrating Environmental Goals with Product Design. Household Chemical Products, A Case Study." Project through the Industrial Design program at University of Illinois at Chicago. John Kusz and William Becker, Principal Investigators. For US Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, contract number N3-4740.0.

1988-1989   Staff Assistant, American Medical Association, Office of International Medicine. Responsible for development and management of 7 figure annual office budget. Managed public information program and administrative aspects of cooperative grants in South East Asia.

1986-1987   Technical Researcher III, Project Match, Northwestern University Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research. Developed and managed data bases for research and program service, allowing the tracking of program participants and the transition from welfare to work. Contributed to proposals and reports. Managed numerous grants from both private and public sources.

Honors and Awards
    University Fellowship, 1996-7, University of Illinois at Chicago.
    Merit tuition waivers while pursuing master's degree at Northeastern University.

Research Activities Recent research activities at the Forest Service include:
    Assessing the claims of social benefits from urban greening projects (e.g., tree planting projects and community gardens). Study used photo-elicitation and in-depth interview. Findings will be disseminated to urban greening practitioners nationwide and will facilitate strengthening the empowerment outcomes of these projects.

    Assessing the current recreational uses and citizen's perceptions of the Chicago River for the National Park Service/Friends of the Chicago River's ChicagoRivers Project. Methods included on-site survey, focus groups, and expert interviews. Findings have been utilized in demonstration projects currently underway, and by managers to assess and redesign public outreach efforts.

    A study of Openlands Project's TreeKeepers—volunteers trained in urban tree care—to determine their motivations and values regarding the urban forest. Methods included survey, participant observation, and in-depth interview. Findings were useful to planners and managers in Chicago and other metropolitan areas.

Publications
Westphal, Lynne M. *forthcoming*. Increasing trustworthiness of research results: The role of computers in qualitative text analysis. In: Applications of Computer Aided Text Analysis in Natural Resources," ed. David Bengston. St. Paul, MN: North Central Research Station (as a General Technical Report).

Feldman, Roberta M. and Westphal, Lynne M. *forthcoming*. An agenda for community design and planning: participation and empowerment in practice. In: Sustaining Human Settlements: Economy, Environment, Equity and Health. R.J. Lawrence, editor. Newcasle-Upon-Tyne, UK: Urban International Press.

Feldman, Roberta M. and Westphal, Lynne M. 1999. Participation for empowerment: The greening of a public housing development. *Places, 12*(2), 34-37.

Gobster, Paul H. and Westphal, Lynne M.. eds. 1998. People and the river. Chicago: USDI National Park Service. (also available on-line at http://www.ncfes.umn.edu/epubs/ chicagoriver/people/index.html)

Lynne M. Westphal. 1998. Use patterns and user preferences of on-site river recreationists. IN: Gobster, Paul H. and Westphal, Lynne M., ed. People and the river (ChicagoRivers Technical Report No. 2) Chicago: USDI National Park Service and Friends of the Chicago River.

Westphal, Lynne M.. 1997. If we can make it here, we can make it *anywhere* -- A case study of urban ecosystem management. In Cordell, H. Ken (ed.) Integrating Social Science and Ecosystem Management: Proceedings. Conference on Integrating Social Sciences and Ecosystem Management. December 12-14, 1994. Helena, Georgia. Athens, GA: USDA Forest Service Southern Research Station. General Technical Report SRS-17.

Westphal, Lynne M. 1996. Birds do it, bees do it, but why do volunteers do it? A look at motivations. In: The Midwest Oak Savanna Conference. February 20, 1993. Chicago IL. Proceedings are published on the Internet by the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5: http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/oak/westphal.html.

Westphal, Lynne M. 1995. Participating in urban forestry projects: How the community benefits. pp. 101-104. In: Inside Urban Ecosystems: Proceedings of the 7th National Urban Forestry Conference, New York, NY. September 12-16, 1995. Cheryl Kollin and Michael Barratt editors. American Forests, Washington DC.

Westphal, Lynne M. and Paul H. Gobster. 1995. Legacy of the Clean Water Act: Impacts of water quality on urban river recreation. In: Proceedings of the Fourth International Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Trends Symposium and the 1995 National Recreation Resource Planning Conference, May 14-17, 1995, St. Paul, MN. Comp. Thompson, J. L., D. W. Lime, B. Gartner, and W. M. Sames. St. Paul, MN; University of Minnesota College of Natural Resources and the Minnesota Extension Service. pp. 620-624.

Westphal, Lynne and Gina Childs. 1994. Overcoming obstacles: Creating volunteer partnerships. pp. 28-32. Journal of Forestry. 92(10). October 1994.

Westphal, Lynne M. 1994. Urban forestry volunteers and effective outreach. pp. 436-441. Proceedings 1993 Annual Meeting of the Society of American Foresters. November 7-10, 1993. Indianapolis, IN. Bethesda, MD. Society of American Foresters.

Westphal, Lynne M. 1993. Why Trees? Urban forestry volunteers values and motivations. pp. 19-23. In. Gobster, Paul H (ed.). 1993. Managing urban and high use recreation settings. Selected papers from the Urban Forestry and Ethnic Minorities and the Environment Paper Sessions at the 4th North American Symposium on Society and Resource Management. May 17-20, 1992. St. Paul MN: USDA Forest Service North Central Forest Experiment Station. General Technical Report NC-163.

Presentation/conferences

Westphal, Lynne M. Social benefits of urban greening: Preliminary results. International Symposium on Society and Resource Management. University of Missouri, Columbia. May 27-31, 1998.

Westphal, Lynne M. Social benefits of urban greening: Preliminary results. EDRA 29. St. Louis, MO. March 4-8, 1998.

Westphal, Lynne M. and Roberta M. Feldman. Restoring participatory design and planning: Incorporating community empowerment as a tool for social justice. EDRA 28, University of Quebec at Montreal, May 7-11, 1997.

Westphal, Lynne M. Participating in urban forestry projects: How the community benefits. 7th National Urban Forestry Conference, New York, NY. September 12-16, 1995.

Westphal, Lynne M. "How People Relate to the River Today". Presentation at the Northeastern Illinois University Department of Geography and Environmental Studies Earth Day Program <u>Living with the River in Your Backyard</u>, April 11, 1995.

Westphal. Lynne M. If we can make it here, we can make it *anywhere* — A case study of urban ecosystem management. Human Dimensions in Ecosystem Management Conference, Unicoi State Park (GA), December 12-14, 1994. Coordinated by the USDA Forest Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Westphal. Lynne M. Urban forestry volunteers and effective outreach. Society of American Foresters Annual Meeting. November 7-10, 1993. Indianapolis, IN.

Westphal. Lynne M. Birds do it, bees do it, but why do volunteers do it? A look at motivations. The Midwest Oak Savanna Conference. February 20, 1993. Chicago IL.

Westphal, Lynne M. Why Trees? Urban forestry volunteers values and motivations. 4th North American Symposium on Society and Resource Management. Madison, WI, May 17-20, 1992.

<u>Workshops and Symposia</u>

Urban Ecosystem management: Lessons from the ChicagoRivers Project. Ecosystem Management Workshop for State Urban Forestry Coordinators. Morton Arboretum, Lisle, IL, January 12-14, 1995. Coordinated by USDA Forest Service State and Private Forestry. I presented with Wink Hastings, National Park Service.

Why Trees? Urban forestry volunteers values and motivations. Presented at the Volunteer Involvement Workshops for State Urban Forestry Coordinators. January 27-29, 1993, Philadelphia, PA; February 9-11, 1993, Chicago IL; March 9-11, 1993, Portsmouth, NH.

Coordinated the People Communities/Plant Communities Symposium, held at the Morton Arboretum, November 12-14, 1992. The symposia brought researchers and practitioners interested in human/nature interactions together to discuss research needs and approaches.

Professional Membership

Environmental Design Research Associate (EDRA); Nature and Ecology Network chair

American Planning Association

American Collegiate Schools of Planning

American Psychological Association, Environment and Population Division (35)

American Sociological Association

American Community Gardening Association