



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF CHARACTERISTICS
ASSOCIATED WITH PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS
IN NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

presented by

FORESTINA WARREN

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D degree in Administration and
Higher Education


Major professor

Date May 13, 1980



OVERDUE FINES:

25¢ per day per item

RETURNING LIBRARY MATERIALS:

Place in book return to remove
charge from circulation records

9-12-01
9-12-02
9-12-03

9-309

9 311

© 1980

FORESTINA WARREN

All Rights Reserved

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF CHARACTERISTICS
ASSOCIATED WITH PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVE-
NESS IN NEIGHBORHOOD
ORGANIZATIONS

By

Forestina Warren

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1980

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVE- NESS IN NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

By

Forestina Warren

This study was conducted to identify and test a set of organizational arrangements, primarily administrative practices and procedures of neighborhood organizations, which can be used to predict effectiveness of such organizations in meeting community needs and thus be useful to funding agencies in selecting organizations to be funded.

Concepts of the goal model, system resource model and evaluation methods for determining effectiveness were used to identify organizational arrangements for effectiveness.

The first phase of the study employed a version of the Delphi procedure using a series of two questionnaires and a panel of nineteen experts to agree upon organizational arrangements necessary for effective performance of neighborhood organization. The second phase of the study tested the actual relationship of the

organizational arrangements to effective performance. Organizations were chosen from a total of one-hundred and ten organizations. Thirty met the criteria for study selection. A total of twenty-eight organizations participated in the study.

Measurements on forty-nine organizational arrangements selected from expert consensus served as measurements on twelve clusters of administrative practices for goal attainment, resource utilization, and daily operations. The twenty-eight organizations were assessed for their scores on the possession of these arrangements. Nineteen result measures from the delivery of a service served to define effectiveness. An analysis of the twelve clusters of administrative practices was conducted to determine whether the organizations use of administrative practices correlated with the organizations results in performance. A second purpose of this study was to determine whether administrative practices could distinguish levels of performance on a combined index for effectiveness. An analysis of the administrative practices was conducted to determine whether high and low performing organizations showed any difference in the use of administrative practices. Multivariate statistical procedures were used for analysis of data.

The study found that the administrative practices agreed upon by experts can predict the performance of

neighborhood organizations in the delivery of a service. Significant relationships were found with varying subsets of the clusters of administrative practices and nine of the nineteen performance measures. Three clusters of the administrative practices, inter-organizational relationships, political relationships, and operational controls, were found to best characterize overall effectiveness in neighborhood organizations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks are due to the following people who have been of special help to me in completing this dissertation:

Russell J. Kleis, my advisor, for his guidance and support.

Dr. Floyd G. Parker for graciously chairing my committee.

Dr. Duane L. Gibson, director of this study, for his guidance, interest and encouragement.

Dr. Lawrence W. Lezotte for his support and invaluable assistance.

Dr. Max R. Raines for ably serving on my committee.

Dr. Robert L. Green for his help in getting me started.

Richard F. Huegli and S. Sidney Newhouse of United Community Services for their interest and cooperation.

Fred D. Watts for his professional guidance and continued support throughout this endeavor.

My mother and sisters for their caring encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM	1
Purpose	3
Rationale of the Study	4
Theoretical Justification	7
Importance of the Study	7
Research Questions	9
General Hypothesis	10
Assumptions	10
Limitations	10
Definitions	10
Overview	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Goal Approach Model	15
Discussion of the Goal Approach Model	20
System Approach Model	22
Discussion of the System-Resource Model	31
Evaluation Approach	32
Discussion of Evaluation Methods	38
Other Studies	39
Summary	40
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	42
Description of Methodology	42
Phase 1. Development of a Yardstick Against Which to Assess Organiza- tional Arrangements for Effective Performance	43
Delphi Instruments	45
The Delphi Participants	48
Delphi Procedure and Data Collection	48

CHAPTER	Page
Phase 2. Application of Delphi Findings to Organizations and Observation of Performance	52
Organizations Studied	53
Research Instruments	54
Data Collection	56
Observation of Performance	56
Design of the Study	57
Statistical Analysis	60
Research Hypotheses	64
Limitations	64
Summary	65
IV. FINDINGS FROM THE DELPHI PROCEDURE: ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS HAVING IMPORTANCE FOR EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE	67
Selection of Statements on Organizational Arrangements	67
Findings from the First Round Delphi Questionnaire	70
Findings of the Second Round Delphi Questionnaire	79
Summary	87
V. FINDINGS: ANALYSES AND RESULTS	89
Research Question 1	92
Rating of Success by Program Director	94
Rating of Success by Funding Agent's Monitor	94
Program Days	97
Program Hours	97
Number Served	98
Total Attendance	98
Average Daily Attendance	99
Average Participation of Youth	100
Percent Utilization of Program	100
Cost per Youth	101
Cost per Day	103
Cost per Youth per Day	105
Cost per Hour of Service	107
Percent of Grant for Salaries	108
Percent of Service Cost for Salaries	110
Percent of Manpower Paid by Funder	113
Percent Manpower Paid by Other Sources	115

CHAPTER	Page
Percent of Manpower Voluntary	118
Ratio Youth to Worker	120
Research Question 2	121
Summary	124
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	130
Summary of Project and Procedures	130
Hypothesis Testing	136
Discussion of Findings	138
Conclusions	146
APPENDICES	154
APPENDIX	
A. Delphi Instruments	154
B. Delphi Participants	175
C. Participating Organizations	177
D. Research Instruments for Interview and Follow-Up Survey	178
E. Format for Assessing Organizational Arrangements	201
F. Forms for Collection of Performance Data . . .	220
G. Summary of Responses to Free-Form Questions From Delphi Survey on Attributes and Deceptions of Neighborhood Organizations . .	227
H. Listing of Effective Administrative Prac- tices for Neighborhood Organizations	234
I. Correlation Matrices	237
BIBLIOGRAPHY	240

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1. Performance Factors in Insurance Agencies . . .	27
3.1. Summary of Questionnaire Returns	50
3.2. Performance Measures for Organizations Providing Summer Programs	58
4.1. Dimensions of Organizations for Analysis . . .	68
4.2. Summary Table of Item Distribution--As a Result of the First Round Returns on the Neighborhood Organization Delphi Survey	71
4.3. Organizational Goal Achievement Arrange- ments of Importance for Effectiveness from First Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance	74
4.4. Organizational Resources Arrangements of Importance for Effectiveness from First Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance . . .	75
4.5. Organizational Operations Arrangements of Importance for Effectiveness from First Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance	78
4.6. Summary Table of Item Distribution--As a Result of the Second Round Returns on the Neighborhood Organization Delphi Survey	81
4.7. Organizational Goal Achievement Arrange- ments of Importance for Effectiveness from Second Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance	83
4.8. Organizational Resources Arrangements of Importance for Effectiveness from Second Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance	85

Table	Page
4.9. Organizational Operations Arrangements of Importance for Effectiveness from Second Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance	87
5.1. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Seven Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Rating of Success Externally	96
5.2. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Cost per Youth	102
5.3. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Four Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Cost per Day	104
5.4. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Cost per Youth per Day	106
5.5. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Eight Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Percent of Grant for Salaries	109
5.6. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Percent of Service Cost Salaries	112
5.7. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Eight Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Percent of Manpower Paid by Funder	114
5.8. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Percent of Manpower Paid by Other Sources	116
5.9. Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Nine Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Percent of Manpower Voluntary	119
5.10. Summary of Stepwise Discriminate Analysis	123

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
5.1. Correlation Coefficients of Multiple Regression Equations	93

CHAPTER I

IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM

Organizations play major roles in society. It is through organizations that goods and services are provided which contribute to the economic, social and political lives of the citizens. In part, how well organizations carry out their tasks determine the well-being of society. Consequently, the quality of life depends upon effective performance from organizations. The local citizen-based organization as provider of services is presently receiving attention from society. These organizations are seen by many as appropriate and necessary vehicles for the delivery of some social services to localities. In general, how well these organizations perform can affect the quality of life in communities. The study of the performance of these organizations could have far reaching implications in building and shaping the life in communities.

More immediately, it was believed that the study of the performance of local citizen-based organizations could be of assistance to social planners and policy-makers when they are involved in the allocation of resources to these organizations. With limited funds available it is

desirable to select for support those organizations which are most likely to be effective, that is, those organizations which are most likely to achieve objectives within the constraints of limited resources. While the local citizen-based organizations as providers of services to the locality have received some support for their existence and contributions to society, the rapid and continuous growth of such organizations has resulted in most of these organizations competing for financial support for their survival.

Historically, many of these organizations have their origins in the social action activities of the 1960s; others represent continuation or revival of neighborhood organizing activities of settlements and welfare councils of the social reform activities of earlier decades. These movements attempted to develop direct relationships between service agencies and the people that they were designed to serve. Typically, the efforts stressed participatory democracy and the educational process through which people in a local community situation seek or are helped to improve their capacity for problem-solving. These efforts were to bring about relevant programs and services in the locality. Here the benchmark of effectiveness was participation of the locality in problem-solving.

Today there has emerged a multiplicity of local organizations based upon these principles and aspiring to meet the needs of the locality. Social planners and policymakers advocate self-help and maximum citizen-participation

if organizations are to effectively create and provide services to improve localities. Yet, these do not serve as distinctive features of local organizations in determining the relevance of the organization in performance. The notion that an organization is relevant because it has citizen-participation, it is engaging in self-help activities, and it seeks solutions to problems of the locality continues to leave the crucial question of determinants of effectiveness and selective criteria unanswered. While relevancy to the locality and oftentimes value issues are basic to an understanding of local organizations, they do not exclude the possibility of applying rational analysis to the task of defining and assessing effectiveness in a neighborhood organization. The problem in identifying effective neighborhood groups was well stated by Arnold Gurin (1973, p. 1330), whose concern is for selective criteria for tracing out the groups that may be involved in relevant community action. "No coherent body of concepts exists as yet, nor does a satisfactory methodology for pursuing such an analysis."

Purpose

This study inquired into the relationship between administrative practices and procedures used by neighborhood organizations and the performance these organizations demonstrated in the delivery of a service. It tested some hypotheses about the relationship between the organizations'

practices and procedures for goal attainment, use of resources and daily operations as they related to performance effectiveness.

Rationale of the Study

Local organizations have been forming as a means of dealing with community problems. As such organizations have proliferated increased attention has been focused on selection of those organizations which can best meet the needs of the people in the locality. Selection of local organizations for financial awards to meet the needs of the locality has been accomplished in a variety of ways: value judgements made by funders; demonstration of social action strategies by the organization, protest, political processes, and citizen participation. While useful in their own right, these strategies are limited as measures of organizational performance and guides to choices among organizations competing for always limited financial assistance.

Lipsky (1969) in studying protest as a political resource examined the efforts of a local organization in the Harlem rent strike of 1963 and 1964. The rent strike was an effort of a local organization led by a dynamic leader who had been agitating about slum housing for more than fifteen years. The local group used protest strategies with a combination of appeal and threat in their movement to improve the tenants' conditions in the community. While the rent strike aroused the public and city housing

officials, the group's efforts were not successful in achieving their fundamental goal; general programs to repair slum housing. Lipsky contends that, in part, failures of this kind result when the protest leader gives higher priority to publicity and arousing support than to administrative detail. Administrative tasks are necessary to operate and maintain organizational viability. Failures of this kind focus attention on the need to examine not only the strategies of an organization for protest but the strategies of administrative practices and procedures used to achieve ends as indicators of potential successes or failures.

Thus far the literature has provided little guidance for the selection of local organizations to be supported based upon a comparative analysis of administrative practices and procedures that would lead to expectations of successfully meeting the needs of the locality. Unless greater effort is made to understand some basic characteristics of local organizations which are appropriate to meeting the problems of the locality there is little hope for them ever to achieve the purpose of helping the locality become richer and more stimulating. In fact, unless this is done and the overall viability of the operations of local organizations become strengthened the funding to local organizations as providers of services may be a serious waste of funds.

Though many people are concerned for effective local organizational performance, there is not a consensus among

those people about what ought to be done for effectiveness. Some people focus on political processes, some focus on community participation, and others focus on community self-determination as indicators of a local organization's potential for effective performance. There is a need for approaches to measuring effectiveness that can simultaneously promote freedom from the limitations represented by social action strategies and value judgements as criteria for selection, for often these criteria can only be useful after demonstrated performance. Information about a local organization's administrative procedures for goal attainment, use of resources in the environment, and daily operations, which is objective and can be known before selection, coupled with existing knowledge of social action strategies will add another element and can greatly enhance the decision-making process.

One needs to be only casually aware of current events in American society to know that local development and stability is a major concern among social scientists and policy-makers. Adult educators and community developers are as concerned and involved as other professional groups in attempting to provide relevant and meaningful community education to develop viable communities and effective local organizations. This study is a link in attempting to answer some questions that will aid in further development of the needed conceptual framework in bringing about more effective local citizen-based organizations, and in providing guidance

to funding agencies forced to make decisions about which of many competing organizations are most likely to use limited funds effectively.

Theoretical Justification

The process of community development requires some kind of conceptual framework. The character, structure, and method of operation of an organization established by members of a community to deal with community problems are of first importance since the organization becomes the main channel through which the community development process moves. The degree to which the objectives and the unique advantages imputed to community organizations are realized is consequently dependent on the way the organization functions (Ross, 1967, p. 158). If the fulfillment of organizational objectives and the process of community development are dependent upon the character, structure, and operations of the organization, then a comparative analysis of organizations examining these dimensions may identify differing organizational procedures which explain differences in performance.

Importance of the Study

This research is important specifically to the field of social welfare and generally to the field of adult education and other fields which assist in the organization and development of people and their communities. There are several reasons why such a study of organizational

performance among local organizations is important among professional fields.

First, the study explores an area in which little, if any, systematic research has been done. Many studies have been made of organizational effectiveness, but they have been primarily of large scale organizations and profit-making organizations. Studies on small scale organizations and voluntary organizations, in particular, have not examined organizations from a means-ends point of view on a comparative basis to account for differences in performance.

Secondly, with the growing number of such organizations, often competing for scarce financial resources, knowledge and understanding of organizational procedures which facilitate successful performance is needed to aid in maximizing yield from investment in local efforts.

Thirdly, the findings of this study can provide a model for future assessment and analysis of local organizations.

Fourthly, professional disciplines working in community development, community organization, and adult education are currently confronted with the task of helping people within localities to use local organizations to seek solutions to their problems. Thus, effective organizational means must be discovered and tested with regard to the practical implementation for the organization of the concepts of self-help and local autonomy.

It is hoped that this study will contribute to such knowledge and understanding regarding these important matters. It is also hoped the identification and explanation of those organizational procedures that account for effective performance among local organizations will be better understood. Such understanding can be used to assist citizens in developing and maintaining a viable organizational base which will enhance their community development endeavors.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to identify and test a set of organizational arrangements, primarily administrative practices and procedures, of neighborhood organizations which can be used to predict effectiveness of such organizations in meeting community needs and thus be useful to funding agencies in selecting organizations to be funded. The organizational arrangements were considered as means for effective performance and were used to describe effective neighborhood organizations.

To achieve the purpose of the study answers to the following questions were sought.

Question 1. What organizational arrangements are judged to be important for an effective neighborhood organization?

Question 2. Is there a relationship between the organizational arrangements judged as important and performance results?

Question 3. Can the assessment of organizational arrangements judged to be important be effectively used to predict levels of performance?

General Hypothesis

Organizational performance can be predicted from a set of organizational arrangements known before performance.

Assumptions

There were two main assumptions which guided this study. The first assumption was that organizational performance is dependent upon organizational means. The second was that a fit exists between an organization's performance on a selected program during the summer and its performance all during the year.

Limitations

There are two limitations of the study. Both limitations are a result of and reason for the exploratory nature of the study. First, the sample is limited, thus the findings are not necessarily widely generalizable. Second, the study used investigator-developed instruments designed specifically for the study. At this point they can be relied upon only as exploratory tools.

Definitions

Neighborhood organizations are defined in this study as local citizen-based organizations which are autonomous

groups operating in local neighborhoods, controlled predominantly by citizens of the area, and whose prime objective is to improve the general welfare of the locality.

Organizational effectiveness for purposes of this study is defined as the extent to which an organization achieves its objectives within the constraints of limited resources (Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnely, Jr., 1973, p. 20).

Overview

In this chapter a research problem was stated and a rationale for engaging in the study was presented. The guiding research questions were also identified.

Literature reporting studies that are relevant to this study will be reviewed in Chapter II. These studies focus on approaches to the measurement of organizational effectiveness. These studies help give some background into research that has focused on the major variables of this study.

Chapter III contains a description of the research methodology. The research methodology is presented in two phases. For each phase the sample of subjects and the research instruments are discussed in detail. Field procedures and data collection procedures are discussed, concluding with a description of the kinds of statistical procedures used to analyze the data for each phase. The

rationale for the use of the selected statistical procedures is also presented.

In Chapter IV the findings of the first phase of the study are presented. The purpose and procedures for developing criteria in the first phase are restated. Results of the criteria for assessment are reported along with some descriptive statistics which indicate their degree of agreed importance.

In Chapter V the findings of the second phase of the study are presented. The research hypotheses are restated along with the statistical hypotheses. Results of the tests of the hypotheses are reported along with their statistical significance.

Conclusions and implications are the major focus of Chapter VI. The findings are interpreted and suggestions are made for practice in social welfare and adult education as well as for further research.

Overall the study looks at the prediction of organizational effectiveness among small scale citizen-based organizations. It is therefore important to understand what is known about the assessment of organizational effectiveness and how procedures in the organization influence effectiveness. These issues are examined in the following chapter as a foundation is set for the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to explore those organizational arrangements in local citizen-based organizations which are considered to be characteristic of effective performance. In this chapter literature is reviewed which contributed to the development of criteria and the general approach used for studying organizational effectiveness among neighborhood organizations.

The literature related to this exploration deals mostly with the development of frames of reference for determining organizational effectiveness and to a lesser extent with hypothesis testing. Most studies have looked at performance of large-scale organizations and small profit-making organizations. Few studies have looked at performance of small-scale voluntary organizations. Far fewer studies have employed the concepts of organizational effectiveness with respect to small-scale voluntary organizations.

At present, organizational theory concerning effectiveness deals mainly with general propositions which apply equally well but also equally badly to all organizations.

This was indicated two decades ago by Etzioni (1960): "The differences among various organizational types are great; therefore any theory of organizations in general must be highly abstract. It can serve as an important frame for specification, that is, for the development of special theories for various organizational types, but it cannot substitute for such theories by servicing in itself as a model, to be applied directly to the analysis of concrete organizations."

The main thrusts of the literature have developed from two different views of the nature of organizations which determine the conceptual definition of effectiveness. In one view, an organization is seen as a rational set of arrangements oriented toward achieving certain goals. From this position, effectiveness is defined in terms of goal attainment and it is a functional concept. The other view takes an open-system approach to organizations and defines effectiveness as the degree to which the organization can preserve the integration of its parts. In this view the means-ends dimensions which permit organizational adaptation and survival become measures of organizational effectiveness and it is a structural concept. Literature on organizational effectiveness using both the goal approach model and the system model are reviewed in this chapter as well as applied approaches.

Goal Approach Model

Studies using the Goal approach model for determining organizational effectiveness use criteria which measure the extent to which an organization realizes its goals. The basic effort is in defining and measuring what the organization calls goal, purpose, mission or aims. The works of the following persons have contributed to the development of this approach in determining organizational effectiveness: Etzioni, 1960; Perrow, 1961; Zald, 1963; Simon, 1964; Warriner, 1965; Warner, 1967; Price, 1968.

The work of Etzioni (1960) gives the most impetus for developing studies of effectiveness using the goal approach. He views goals as the defining characteristic of modern organizations and refers to goals as a source for standards by which members of an organization and outsiders can assess the success of the organization. Goals are considered as starting points to measure the organization's performance. The model is considered an objective and reliable analytical tool because it omits the values of the explorer and applies the values of the subject under study as the criteria of judgement.

Perrow (1961) presents a more specific framework for understanding the performance of organizations by analysis of the organizations' operative goals rather than the official goals or the stated purposes of the organization as put forth in the charter, annual reports, public statements by key executives and authoritative pronouncements.

The operative goals are the ends sought through the actual operating policies and practices of the organization. The operative goals tell what the organization actually is trying to do, regardless of what the official goals say are the aims.

Zald (1963) studied organizational goals and their consequences in examining the variations in the structure and operations of large-scale organizations. He conducted a comparative analysis of goals among four correctional institutions having as their goal rehabilitation. In measuring the extent to which each of the institutions had treatment and custodial goals he used indicators of official statements, executive perspectives and perceptions of lower level staff. Use of these measures provided an understanding of how official mandates are translated into organizational practice. Once the institution was identified by treatment or custodial goals, he was able to demonstrate three effects of institutional goals on organizational structure. He showed that goals affect organizational norms, departmental structure and power balance.

Simon (1964) recommends that the term organizational goal be used to refer to constraints imposed by the organizational role. In this way the concept of goal can be introduced in an entirely operational manner. This view of the nature of organization goals provides an operational way of showing, by describing the structure of the organizational decision-making mechanism, how and to what extent

overall goals help to determine the actual courses of action that are taken. The index of organizational performance then becomes a measure of how well the resources of internal and external systems are used to achieve the goal, for the organization must operate within sets of constraints. These constraints can be identified as profits, costs, work force, production, etc.

Warriner (1965) focused upon the problems of data and method for identifying organizational purpose among voluntary associations typified by bridge clubs, service clubs, fraternities or study clubs. According to Warriner, "statements of purpose must be treated as fictions produced by an organization to account for, explain, or rationalize its existence to particular audiences rather than as valid and reliable indicators of purpose." To define the purpose of an organization he suggests that the assumed functions or consequences of the organizational activities be examined, then the values inherent in the activities be identified. He identified four value functions among voluntary associations. The performance pleasure function, the sociability function, the symbolic function, and the productive function. He proposes that the concept of assumed value function (A.V.F.) of activities be the operational definition of organizational purpose. If activities are defined in terms of their assumed value function, then weighted by the proportion of member time devoted to each activity, then you have a measure of the relative influence of each value

function in the organization. It is these measures which can be used to define the purpose of the organization.

Warner (1967) discusses two general sources of problems in measuring goal attainment in voluntary organizations. One source is the nature of goals with the attributes of intangibility, change, number, continuousness and remoteness; the problem is one of implementation of measurements. The second is the kinds of decisions made by the researcher in identifying the goals and measuring attainment. He discusses the problems by referring to the measurement of goal attainment by a criteria pyramid and a means-ends pyramid. The criteria pyramid maps the components of the goal itself; the means-ends pyramid charts the means and subgoals needed to reach the goal. He points out the difficulties in using the two approaches as they relate to temporal decisions--"movement toward goals does not necessarily occur in regular increments which are uniformly distributed over all time periods" and absolute and relative standards for measurements--"there are problems of finding truly comparable cases, organizations with similar goals and subgoals, constraints, environments, resources, and the like." While he offers no definitive solution to the problems, he suggests that each of the five attributes of organizational goals be considered in the design of research on the goal attainment of voluntary organizations, and that the combination or configuration of these attributes be considered in the research methodology.

Price (1968) produced an inventory of propositions specifying determinants of organizational effectiveness. Defining effectiveness as the degree of goal achievement, he conducted an analysis of fifty studies. Each study chosen for investigation contained information pertinent to the effectiveness of the organization or information about productivity, morale, conformity, adaptiveness and institutionalization. The studies focused on organizations with "specific purposes" that were administrative organizations, that is, organizations composed primarily of full-time members. The organizations included government agencies, business firms, universities, trade associations, hospitals, prisons, professional societies, and trade unions. He summarized the determinants of the effectiveness of organizations in four categories: the economic system, the political system, the control system, and population-ecology. For each of these categories core variables which influence effectiveness were specified. He identified thirty-one core variables. The core variables ranged from such things as the division of labor in the economic system to size and spatial mobility in the population-ecology system. A review of his work gives an indication of the wide range of elements which can be considered in examining organizational effectiveness.

Discussion of the Goal Approach Model

The literature reviewed above was selected for review because it dealt with the relationship of organizational goals to organizational performance as criteria for measuring organizational effectiveness, which is a major interest of the present study. The works reviewed looked at methods for defining and methods for measuring organizational goals. It was pointed out that in order to define an organization's real goals different members in different statuses within the organization should be contacted and the operations of the organization should be observed. This is because organizations are social systems and as such are systems of coordinated activities of more than one actor. Consequently, to define an organization solely in terms of its official or stated goals and therefore to judge its effectiveness in terms of its degree of success in obtaining those goals is to limit the investigation of organizational effectiveness. Etzioni comments on this perspective.

All social units, including organizations, are multifunctional units. Therefore, while devoting part of their means directly to goal activities, social units have to devote another part to other functions, such as the creation or recruitment of further means to the goal and the maintenance of units performing goal activities and service activities (Etzioni, 1960, p. 259).

Literature on the goal approach model showed the necessity of identifying an organization's goals in order to assess its effectiveness, for it is through the attainment of goals that an organization is considered effective.

The literature presented the difficulty posed in identifying goals which is necessary if assessment is to occur. Etzioni, Perrow, and Zald propose reviewing written statements provided by the organization, i.e., goal statements or operating policies. Simon proposes examining constraints imposed upon the decisions made within the organization, production targets, expected profits, etc. Warriner proposes examining organizational activities among the members of the organization, the amount of time devoted to activities. Warner identified the problem of studying organizational effectiveness as due to differences among organizations on key attributes which prevent comparative analysis.

This present study included organizations with similar goals, constraints, environments and resources. This was achieved by selecting for study of performance organizations which had a common goal--the provision of a comparable service to the neighborhood. Variability existed in how they went about in achieving those goals. This permitted an observation of the varying operations of the organizations. As suggested by Etzioni this study examined means for goal activity as well as means for maintenance and service by looking at the organizations' administrative practices. Organizational statements of goals, operating policies, activities of members, along with other practices were examined as means for effective performance.

System Approach Model

Conceptualization of the system model and studies using this model for determining organizational effectiveness are based upon developing a rationale and indices for measuring certain elements of the organization as a system which are considered to account for organizational effectiveness. Contributions by the following persons have aided in understanding the system model for determining organizational effectiveness: Georgopoulos and Tannebaum, 1957; Seashore, 1965; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Bennis, 1966; Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967; Seashore and Yuchtman, 1967; Friedlander and Pickle, 1968; Mott, 1972.

The strongest finding which shows that a system model can be formulated and meaningfully applied is a study by Georgopoulos and Tannebaum (1957). They defined organizational effectiveness as the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members.

In their study of an industrial service organization specializing in the delivery of retail merchandise they examined the means-ends dimension of the organization to determine organizational effectiveness. This was achieved by developing operational criteria to measure three basic elements of the system; organizational flexibility, productivity and strain. They then evaluated these

criteria and operations in terms of their organizational character and found that the criteria were representative of an organizational phenomenon, they were reliable, and they were in agreement with independent expert judgement.

Seashore (1965) proposed a framework for conceptualizing organizational performance by outlining a way of viewing the relationships among numerous criteria that might be considered in the evaluation of the performance of an organization.

He distinguished between five kinds of criteria and their uses: (1) Ends vs. means; (2) Time reference; (3) Long vs. short run; (4) Hard vs. soft; (5) Values. A full accounting for the performance of an organization requires consideration for the use of all five kinds of criteria in which the network of criteria of performance is viewed as a pyramid shaped hierarchy. At the top is the "ultimate criterion." It is some conception of the net performance of the organization over a long span of time in achieving its formal objectives, with optimum use of the organization's environmental resources and opportunities. The ultimate criterion is never measured--except possibly by historians. In the middle are the penultimate criteria. These are shorter run performance factors or dimensions comprised by the ultimate criterion. They are output or results criteria. Typical variables in this class for business organizations are: sales volume, productive efficiency, growth rate, profit rate. Some soft variables may be employee satisfaction or

customer satisfaction. In the case of some nonbusiness organizations, these penultimate criteria might be predominantly of the behavioral kind, as in the case of a school whose output is judged in terms of learning rates, proportion of students reaching some standard of personal growth or development. At the bottom of the hierarchy of assessment criteria are measures of the current organizational functioning according to some theory or some empirical system concerning the conditions associated with high achievement on each of the penultimate criteria. These variables include those descriptive of the organization as a system and also those representing subgoals or means associated with penultimate criteria. Among the hard criteria at this level, for business organizations, might be such as scrapage, short run profits, productivity against standard, meeting of production schedules, machine downtime, ratio of overtime to regular time. Among the soft criteria at this level may be such as: employee morale, credit rating, communication effectiveness, absenteeism, turnover, group cohesiveness.

Katz and Kahn (1966) propose that open-system theory supplies the elements of a model of effectiveness for human organizations. They elaborated on this theory to fit phenomena of large-scale human organizations. They defined organizations as open systems dependent on outside agencies in the environment for making available required energetic inputs (labor, materials, and others) and for absorbing the

organizational product. For them the meaning of organizational effectiveness is the maximization of return to the organization, by economic and technical means, and by political means. Organizational effectiveness is determined by a combination of efficiency of the organization as a system and its success in obtaining on advantageous terms the input it requires.

Bennis (1966) referring to organizations as open-systems postulates that the methodological rules by which the organization approaches its task and exchanges with its environments are the critical determinants of organizational effectiveness. His major concern is that when organizations are considered as open-systems, adaptive structures coping with various environments, the most significant characteristic for understanding effectiveness is organizational competence or mastery in problem-solving. He believes that it is the dynamic processes by which the organization searches for, adapts to, and solves its changing goals that provide the critical dimensions of organizational effectiveness.

In 1967 Seashore together with Yuchtman, using Seashore's (1965) pyramid of criteria framework derived from the system model of organizations, presented a conceptual framework for assessing the performance of like and unlike organizations. The organization's success over a period of time in its competition for resources, its bargaining position in a given environment, is regarded as an expression

of its overall effectiveness. Since resources are of various kinds, competitive relationships are multiple, and there is interchangeability among classes or resources, the assessment of organizational effectiveness must be in terms not of any single criterion but of an open-ended multidimensional set of criteria. From the competition of organizations for scarce and valued resources emerge a universal hierarchical differentiation among social organizations. Such a hierarchy becomes a yardstick against which to assess organizational effectiveness. It is by focusing on the ability of the organization to exploit its environment in the acquisition of resources that the performance of both like and unlike organizations can be assessed and evaluated comparatively.

Seashore and Yuchtman (1967) published an empirical investigation of their conceptualization of a system approach to determining organizational effectiveness. They examined the annual performance of seventy-five insurance sales agencies over an eleven year period. Using factorial analysis methods for discovering the factorial elements they characterized the behavior of small business organizations.

From a set of seventy-six selected performance indicators they discovered ten major factors which explained most of the variation in organizational performance. These ten factors and their indicator variables are given in Table 1. They suggest that the factors represent the

Table 2-1.--Performance Factors in Insurance Agencies.

Factor	Assigned Name	Number Assigned Variable	Indicator Variables
I	Business volume*	Ia Ib Ic Id Ie	Number of policies in force (year's end) New insurance sold (dollar volume) Renewal premiums collected (dollars) Number of lives insured (year's end) Agency manpower (number of agents)
II	Production cost	IIa IIb IIc	Production cost per new policy Production cost per \$1000 of insurance Production cost per \$100 of premium
III	New member productivity	IIIIa IIIIb	Average productivity per new agent Ratio of new agent vs old agent productivity (new agent less than five years of service)
IV	Youthfulness of members	IVa IVb	Ratio of younger (under 35) to total membership Ratio of productivity of younger members to total members of agency
V	Business mix**	Va Vb Vc	Average premium per \$1000 Percentage of new policies with quarterly payments Percentage of business in employee trust

Table 2-1.--Continued.

Factor	Assigned Name	Number Assigned Variable	Indicator Variables
VI	Manpower growth	VIa VIb	Net change in manpower during year Ratio of net change to initial man- power
VII	Management emphasis	VIIa	Manager's personal commissions
VIII	Maintenance cost***	VIIIa VIIIb	Maintenance cost per collection Maintenance cost per \$100 premium collected
IX	Member productivity	IXa	Average new business volume per agent
X	Market penetration	Xa Xb	Insurance in force per capita Number of lives covered per 1000 insurables

*Including both accumulated volume and current increment in volume.

**Many low-value transactions versus fewer high-value transactions.

***Refers to maintenance of accounts, not of physical facilities.

Source: Seashore and Yuchtman, 1967, p. 383.

continuing processes of resource acquisition which are characteristics of adaptive open systems. Though the elements described in Table 1 deals with insurance company affairs they are fruitful as a general model in developing the elements considered in this research.

Seashore and Yuchtman propose that the conventional concepts of goals and goal attainment are not applicable to organizations and that organizational performance can be assessed and described better in terms of generalized resource-getting capabilities under conditions of competition for scarce and valued resources. Their objective in the formulation was to seek order and simplicity in the numerous and miscellaneous variables used by managers, researchers, and the general public in defining and evaluating the performance of an organization. They recognized that the ten major factors for the sales organizations did not constitute a universal set of such factors applicable to all kinds of organizations. But they did think it possible that several of them are universal while others may be unique to sales and similar organizations.

Friedlander and Pickle (1968) surveyed ninety-seven small business organizations, represented by retail service, wholesale, manufacturers, and mineral extraction businesses. The purpose of their study was to explore the concept of total organizational effectiveness by studying the relationships between internal and external system effectiveness. Internal system components were those within the formal

boundaries of the organization: the owner, the employee. Societal components with which the organization transacts by exporting and importing energy were considered part of the larger environment in which the organization is located: the customer, the suppliers, the creditors, the community, and the government. Effectiveness was viewed as the degree to which the needs of system components were fulfilled or satisfied in their transactions with the organization.

Findings of their study indicate that there are only a moderate number of relationships between the degree to which the organization concurrently fulfills the needs of its internal system components and the components of its larger society. Concurrent fulfillment of the needs of the five societal components was also of a rather low magnitude. They concluded from their analysis that it is difficult for organizations to achieve a balanced relationship among the component elements examined.

Mott (1972) conducted research to determine some of the characteristics of organizations that influence their effectiveness. He defined effectiveness as the ability of an organization to mobilize its centers of power for action, production, and adaptation. His key theoretical question was how should the centers of power be organized for production, adaptability, and flexibility. He developed and tested the hypothesis that overall organizational effectiveness is directly related to productivity, adaptability, and flexibility. He measured each factor using data from

questionnaires administered to workers in hospitals and federal agencies. He found that all three survival processes can be structured to varying degrees, and the degree affects the organizational characteristics associated with them. No single prescription for effectiveness was found, but rather several ways of organizing that will yield about the same level of effectiveness.

Discussion of the System-Resource Model

The literature reviewed above seems to indicate that certain elements in an organization's structure as a system can influence its performance. It appears that there is no single factor to account for this but rather a combination of factors. It was also indicated that the extent or degree to which these factors should be manifested for effective organizational performance varies. Georgopoulos and Tannebaum measured organizational flexibility, productivity, and strain for determining effectiveness. Seashore and Yuchtman measured results criteria. Katz and Kahn looked at an organization's ability to get from its environment energetic inputs. Bennis stresses the importance of an organization's adaptation to its environment. Friedlander and Pickle stress the importance of internal and external relationships. Mott concentrates on the ways in which the centers of power are organized.

The present study incorporated from the system resource literature a way of looking at organizational

effectiveness among the organizations presently under study. Based on a review of the systems model two major aspects emerged to be incorporated into the present study. First, the area of adaptation to the environment through use of resources available. Second, results criteria as measures of performance. Operational criteria to examine effective use of resources by energetic inputs, i.e., people, money, other agencies, external relationships, were developed for the present study (Georgopoulos and Tannebaum, 1957; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Friedlander and Pickle, 1968). Also developed were results criteria applicable to the performance of small-scale nonprofit voluntary service organizations, i.e., volume of service, costs, perceptions of service (Seashore and Yuchtman, 1967). Adapted from the framework presented by Mott (1972) this study examined how an organization's administrative practices should be arranged for goal attainment, resource utilization and daily operations. Since goal statements, operating policies and organizational activities, and adaptation to the environment through judicious use of resources have been the major areas presented in the literature, this study examined these three dimensions as basic areas for organizational effectiveness.

Evaluation Approach

There is much written in social welfare literature about organizational effectiveness. But most of it in relation to effectiveness deals with acknowledging the need to

develop and apply better measures of effectiveness in social welfare for consequences of social welfare programs have been only partially evaluated (Levinson, 1966).

In a report to the National Association of Social Workers, Stein (1962) discussed organizational effectiveness relating it to social work administration and community welfare organization. He considers both the goal model and the system model for analysis in social agencies. He suggests that the goal model has considerable merit in the present stage of social work development:

Despite shortcomings in evaluations based on the goal model, it is at this stage necessary to encourage the analysis of both stated and implicit goals in social agencies in order to permit and encourage a more realistic and hard-headed examination of agency objectives, and to provide the basis for comparative studies of social welfare organizations in terms of goals.

The system approach to organizational effectiveness is viewed by Stein as having relevance to the analysis of social agencies, specifically as presented by Georgopoulos and Tannebaum in their three basic criteria of productivity, flexibility or adaptation and absence of tension. Yet, he recognized that there is no generally conceded operational definition of productivity; "the development of standards of productivity related to different types of social agencies remains an important requirement for research if the systems model of Georgopoulos and Tannebaum is to have value."

Levinson (1966) combines the goal-oriented model and the system-oriented model to provide a framework for

evaluating organizational effectiveness in social welfare programs. The goal-oriented model facilitates the measurement of inputs, outputs, and outcomes in relation to formal agency goals in terms of effectiveness and efficiency criteria. The system-oriented model focuses on interconnections among simultaneously operating programs as well as other organizational factors. Within the context of these two models he identifies several clusters of variables and their interrelationships: outcomes, program services, staff, characteristics of new and potential clients. It is these variables which should be subjected to measurement in order to evaluate the effectiveness of various program components.

Stein, Hougham, and Zalba (1968) presented a conceptual framework for assessing social agency effectiveness using a goal model approach. The model evaluates the agency as a delivery system by comparing its actual service output with its formal output goals. They recommend that in order to evaluate the agency's effectiveness in relation to the stated goals the following kinds of data concerning the agency's actual operation should be sought and summarized:

1. Quantity goals--compilation and analysis of relevant statistics on agency service (e.g., number of cases processed, interviews conducted, etc.);
2. Quality goals--classification of cases and outcomes (success/failure) by risk or problem categories;
3. Coverage goals--definition and size of target population. Of this entire population, how many are being served by the agency? How many are being served elsewhere? What proportion of the agency caseload actually meets the criteria stated in coverage goals?

Zald (1966) focused on analysis of community organizations that takes the total organization as its object. He presents a conceptual framework for the analysis of community organizations as miniature polities with the following four interrelated concepts forming the core of the analysis: (1) organizations have constitutions, (2) constitutions are linked to the constituency and resource base of the organization, (3) community organizations wish to affect target populations, organizations, or decision centers, (4) community organizations exist among a welter of other agencies; they have foreign or external relations that can facilitate, impede, or be neutral to the accomplishment of their goals. Zald suggests that empirical studies which analyze community organizations along these lines will permit an examination of problems of mobilizing support and community consensus, and an analytic and differential basis will be developed by which to assess community organizations and evaluate practice roles.

Vanecko, Orden and Hollander (1970) have one of the few studies in this area that includes a component relating organizational analysis to social change. In an applied study they examined process and outcomes of community organization efforts and institutional change. The purpose of the study was to evaluate those characteristics of community action agencies that determine how effective they are in influencing other institutions to be more responsive to the needs and demands of the poor. Using survey research methods,

they selected fifty cities to obtain information on the attributes of community action agencies; to learn about the activities, goals, and organization of community action agencies; to gain knowledge about the characteristics of the cities and of the neighborhoods expected to be important factors in the changes being studied; and to actually uncover changes. They found that the degree to which the community action agency's board of directors and executive director state that community organization goals are the goals of the community action agency strongly predicts the extent to which other institutions serving the poor will change. Other variables which influenced institutional change were identified as the characteristics of the city in which community action agency operates, characteristics of the target neighborhood in which the community action agency operates, i.e., poverty level; and characteristics of the community action agency itself, i.e., goal orientation, involvement in militant activities.

More recently, Rothman (1974) has provided action guidelines that offer strategies and tools for social change in grassroots organizations and in human service planning organizations. He systematically reviewed social science research studies over a six year period, codified them, and gave them an applied formulation. While the guidelines are useful in providing a better direction for affecting practice outcomes they are limited in their existing formulation because they have not been directly tested scientifically.

Generalizations which are pertinent to understanding organizational performance are provided in the area of contextual factors of organizational behavior in which the environment, goals and size of an organization are focused upon. While he provides many effectiveness indicators the following are of particular interest to this study:

1. Diverse resource bases for funds.
2. Joint programs with similar organizations.
3. Goals directed toward satisfaction of community needs.
4. Programs determined by citizens.
5. Short range projects with quick payoffs.
6. Issues voted on by group members.
7. Recruitment of primary group.
8. Recruitment of memberships with occupational and friendship ties to the community.
9. Verbal and written contacts with political representatives.

Patillo (1975) views a social agency as a dynamic system operating in interaction with its environment. He provides a format to systematically review any social agency for potential performance. His design for assessing the capabilities of social agencies is an examination of selected aspects of the agency's management and administration. He views the social agency as an organization having purposes, goals, objectives and programs; having structure; and interacting with its environment. To analyze and evaluate the organization's capabilities he focuses on ten major areas: (1) structure and formal organization, (2) board operations, (3) purposes, goals, objectives and programs, (4) organizational control, (5) fiscal administration, (6) personnel administration, (7) communications, participation and

coordination, (8) leadership and direction, (9) staff and facilities, (10) community relations. For each of these areas he provides a list of statements which details optimum conditions to insure effective performance. While the statements are not exhaustive they can be seen, not only as starting points for detailed analysis and review of a social agency, but also as a basis for an initial exploration of what conditions and situations ought to exist for a local citizen-based organization to be effective.

Discussion of Evaluation Methods

In applying empirical methods to the assessment of organizational effectiveness there seems to be consistent agreement on the need to develop and apply methods which will take into account the goal approach and the system approach. The present study attempted to link the goal approach model and the system model in developing a strategy for identifying the characteristics of effective local citizen-based organizations. From evaluation methods, processes and procedures of organizations under study was operationalized for measurement. As Zald (1966) discussed, external relations of the organizations was examined for their influence on goal accomplishment. Effectiveness indicators of Rothman (1974) and Patillo (1975), were adapted and explored for their pertinence to neighborhood organizations. These indicators were consistent with what Levinson (1966) referred to as organizational factors, i.e.,

characteristics of manpower and operations. These organizational factors were examined for their interconnection with each organization's operating program for service delivery, Levinson (1966), Stein, Hougham, and Zalba (1968).

Other Studies

A plethora of literature related to the study of effectiveness has emerged during the 1970s. This has resulted because of the increased interest in seeking out those organizations, programs, and services which work effectively to diminish or resolve social problems confronting society. This literature dealing with effectiveness is often described under the terms accountability and evaluation. Conspicuous failures of some programs to fulfill public expectations and concern for the soaring costs of services have added greatly to interest in careful program evaluation. No effort was made to explore all of the literature in these areas but a cursory review indicated that many of these works include the examination or consideration of measuring the effects of public services and programs in a variety of areas such as: Human Services and Social Work (Weschler, Reinherz, and Dobbin, 1976; Sze and Hopps, eds., 1978); Social Programs (Caro, ed., 1977; Rossi and Williams, eds., 1972); Social Action (Weiss, 1972); Mental Health (Neigher, Hammer and Landsberg, eds., 1977); American Education (Martin and Overholt, 1976); Higher Education (Dressel, 1976). These works were not systematically explored because

it was felt better to explore the general types of frameworks as was done above and to seek out some of the specific attempts to measure effectiveness which could be applicable to neighborhood organizations.

Summary

In this chapter conceptual frameworks, research studies and applied investigations were reviewed concerning the determination of effectiveness in organizations, using the goal approach model and the system model.

The literature concerning the goal approach model assumes that each organization has a goal or set of goals, that these goals can be defined and understood, and that it is possible to plan the best strategies for attaining them. With this orientation the way to assess organizational effectiveness is to develop criterion measures to assess how well the goals are being achieved.

The literature concerning the system model assumes that organizational effectiveness is a multidimensional concept, that demands placed on an organization are dynamic and complex, and that therefore, it is not possible to define a finite number of organizational goals in any meaningful way; rather, the organization adopts the overall goal of maintaining its viability or existence through time without depleting its environment. With this orientation the way to assess organizational effectiveness is to develop criterion measures to assess if an organization is internally

consistent, and if its resources are being judiciously distributed over a wide variety of coping mechanisms.

The most complete approach for predicting or explaining organizational effectiveness seems to require a combination of the goal approach model and the system model. When seeking to explain or predict an organization's degree of success in meeting its goals the system variables should be investigated.

No necessary and inclusive operational definition applicable to all organizations has been found for determining organizational effectiveness.

The model explored in this study for determining organizational effectiveness was exploratory and was an attempt to converge concepts of the goal approach model and the system model. The focus of this research was to determine the best strategies for predicting organizational effectiveness among neighborhood organizations. Drawing from the literature reviewed organizational effectiveness was investigated by looking at results criteria in performance. Predictors of performance were administrative practices and procedures used by organizations for goal achievement, use of resources, and daily operations.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the research methodology of the study is presented. The research design, including variables and research hypotheses, is described. The characteristics of the universe of organizations, the research instruments used in data collection, and the methods used to analyze the data are also described.

Description of Methodology

This was a descriptive study which explored whether certain performance elements of local citizen-based organizations could be predicted by a selected set of organizational arrangements. The study was developed in two phases. First, the Delphi technique employing a panel of experts was used to identify organizational arrangements of local citizen-based organizations believed to be crucial for their successful performance in the delivery of a service. In the second phase of the study, a group of local citizen-based organizations were selected and data on the organizational arrangements identified by experts were gathered from each organization. Subsequently, the performance of each

organization was observed in the delivery of a service. In design terms the study examined the predictability of an organization's performance based upon its rating on a set of measures describing organizational arrangements identified by experts. The study also examined the discriminating value of the expert-identified arrangements in identifying a developed overall index of high and low effective performing organizations.

This study was heuristic and because of the limited sample was in some respects similar to case studies. A description of the methodology for each phase of the study follows.

Phase 1. Development of a Yardstick Against
Which to Assess Organizational Arrangements
for Effective Performance

The Delphi technique for decision-making was used for this part of the study. Since the technique is comparatively new, there is little that can be said about it that would generate complete agreement among current practitioners. The Delphi procedure used in this study was adapted from a review of the Delphi procedures developed and used by Dalkey and Helmer (1963), Turoff (1970, and Van de Ven and Delbecq (1974).

The Delphi technique is a method for the systematic solicitation and collation of informed judgments on a particular topic. Its purpose is to seek out information which may generate a consensus of judgment on the part of the

respondent group. While considerable variance exists in administering the Delphi process, the basic approach employs only two iterations of questionnaires and feedback reports. First, a questionnaire designed to obtain information on a topic or problem is distributed by mail to a group of respondents who are anonymous to one another. The respondents independently generate their ideas in answering the questionnaire, which is then returned. The responses are then summarized into a feedback report and sent back to the respondent group along with a second questionnaire that is designed to probe more deeply into the ideas generated by respondents in the first questionnaire. On receiving the feedback report respondents independently evaluate it and respond to the second set of questions. Typically, respondents are requested to vote independently on priority ideas included in the feedback report and to return their second responses, again by mail. Generally, a final summary and feedback report is then developed and mailed to the respondent group (Van de Ven and Delbecq, 1974, pp. 606-607).

Designs of the Delphi technique covering the same basic subject area may vary considerably. Also, the design of the summary and feedback procedures of an actual exercise may be influenced by the objectives or combination of objectives of the use of the procedure (Turoff, 1970, p. 149). Not only are there variations in the design of Delphis covering the same basic subject area, but also, in the number of informed respondents needed for participation. Dalkey

and Norman (1963) used five respondents in their procedure; Turoff (1970) suggests the use of as many as ten to fifty respondents; Van de Ven and Delbecq (1974) used seven respondents. While there is no general rule for the number of respondents needed to participate in the procedure, Turoff (1970) indicated that there is agreement on two separate groups of individuals needed to participate; the user body and the respondent group. The user body would be the individual or individuals expecting some sort of product from the exercise which is useful to their purposes. The respondent group is the group chosen to respond to the questionnaires. This may sometimes be the user body or the respondent group may contain a subset of the user body. The respondent group for this study included persons from the user body and persons outside the user body.

The present study used a series of two questionnaires and a panel of nineteen informed respondents. Persons of the user body--persons employed by a funding agency--were used in the procedure for questionnaire construction and selection of the informed respondents for participation.

Delphi Instruments

The first questionnaire was developed by the researcher in consultation with two persons, one a representative of the user group, an agency program consultant with a social planning and allocating agency, Edward G. Marsh, MSW; and the other a person representative of the

respondent group, a professor of social work at a higher education institution, Jack Rothman, Ph.D.

The first questionnaire contained items adapted from evaluative and self-study information about the administration and management of social agencies (Rothman, 1974; Patillo, 1975) and ideas suggested by the researcher and consultants. The initial questionnaire was pre-tested using three staff persons from a social planning and allocating agency who were not part of the respondent group. At pre-test seventy-six items on organizational arrangements were included in the questionnaire. After pre-testing sixty-two items were considered usable.

The sixty-two items pertained to the subject areas of goal achievement, resources and operations. Of the sixty-two items on the first-round questionnaire fourteen were in the subject area of goal achievement. Six of these goal achievement items pertained to purposes-goals-objectives; and eight pertained to programs.

Thirty-two of the items were in the subject area of resources. Seventeen of these resource items pertained to the manpower of organizations, seven of which related to the board or steering group, four related to the leader and six related to staff and volunteers. Ten of the thirty-two resource items pertained to organizational relationships, three of which related to relationships within the community, six related to inter-organizational relationships and

one related to political relations. Five of the thirty-two resource items pertained to funding.

The remaining sixteen of the sixty-two items were in the subject area of operations. Twelve of the operations items pertained to controls and four pertained to activities.

Any item mentioned by at least one respondent on the first questionnaire was added on the second round questionnaire. A total of thirty-seven new items were added to the second questionnaire by the respondent group for rating. Eighteen of these items were in the subject area of goal achievement, fifteen were in the subject area of resources, and four were in the subject area of operations.

Of the eighteen items pertaining to goal achievement, fourteen related to purposes-goals-objectives, and four related to programs. Seven of the fifteen resource items pertained to manpower, one relating to the board, two relating to the leader, and four relating to staff and volunteers. Four of the fifteen resource items pertained to organizational relationships, one of which related to inter-organizational relationships and three to political relationships. The remaining four resource items pertained to funding. All four of the operations items pertained to organizational controls. The questionnaires used for the first and second round of the Delphi procedure are provided in Appendix A.

The Delphi Participants

Since the study was interested in organizational effectiveness of local citizen-based organizations the panel of experts selected for participation consisted of persons with expertise in citizen-based organizations and/or organizational effectiveness theory. The persons selected for participation were either recommended for participation by a representative of the user body, S. S. Newhouse, Executive Research Associate for a social planning and allocating agency or were chosen by the researcher for their contributions to the literature in developing theoretical frameworks for the study of organizational effectiveness. The respondents were past or present executives or program personnel in social agencies which provide assistance to citizen-based organizations and professors from universities who had published articles pertinent to the subject matter. Twenty-two persons were asked to participate. Nineteen of the twenty-two participated in the procedure. They are listed in Appendix B.

Delphi Procedure and Data Collection

The procedure was developed and conducted during May through September of 1977. The first round of questionnaires was mailed June 2, 1977. All respondents returned their questionnaires by June 27, 1977 after some follow-up calls. The second round questionnaires were mailed July 27,

1977. All second round questionnaires were returned by September 14, 1977 after some follow-up telephone calls.

The first mailing to each respondent contained the following materials:

1. A letter asking for participation, an explanation of the policy issue being addressed, and factual information about the organizations under examination.
2. A general information and instruction summary of the Delphi procedure and specific instructions for participation.
3. A general summary of the content areas included in the questionnaire.
4. Description of the evaluation scale to be used.
5. Two copies of the questionnaire so the respondent could retain a copy of his/her answers.

As described above, the Delphi procedure began with sixty-two items for consideration. The sixty-two items were divided into three separate sections: Goal Achievement; Resources; and Operations. The respondents were asked to rate the relative importance of each item for an organization's success. In addition, two free form questions asked for respondents' recommendations on attributes of successful neighborhood organizations, and information about neighborhood organizations that can be deceptive in assessing their potentials, that is, information which could be misleading.

The second mailing to each respondent contained the following materials:

1. A cover letter thanking respondents for participation, summarizing the results, and giving the percent of returned questionnaires.

2. A summary table giving the ratings of the sixty-two items by subject area, the items repeated for consensus, and the new items added by respondents.
3. A copy of the first-round questionnaire with ratings by the respondent group for each item.
4. A summary listing of the items generated by the two free form questions.
5. A reiteration of the organizations under examination, and description of the rating scale to be used.
6. Two copies of the second-round questionnaire containing the thirty-seven items generated by respondents for rating, and three items for a revote.
7. Specific instructions for questionnaire returns.

Table 3.1 displays for each round of questioning the number of questionnaires sent, the number of questionnaires returned, the percentage of questionnaires returned, and the percentage of the original group contacted of twenty-two who returned questionnaires.

Table 3.1.--Summary of Questionnaire Returns.

Questionnaire	Total Number Sent	Total Number Returned	Percent Returned Each Round	Percent Returned of Original Group Contacted
I	22	19	86.4	86.4
II	19	19	100.0	86.4

The outcome of the Delphi procedure provided a fifty item checklist of organizational arrangements considered by experts as necessary for the effective performance of a neighborhood organization. The fifty items were

grouped under twelve clusters representing the major categories of organizational arrangements for goal achievement, use of resources, and daily operations. For each item on the checklist, indicators on an interview questionnaire were developed to examine whether an organization did or did not possess the organizational items. Only items selected as very important and important were used. Arbitrary weights of 2 and 1 were used for determining scores. Each arrangement with a consensus rating of "very important" was weighted 2. Each arrangement with a consensus rating of "important" was weighted 1. Where more than one indicator was developed on the questionnaire to provide information in determining if an organization possessed the arrangement the weight given each indicator was distributed in proportion to the value of the organizational arrangement.

The fifty items provided seventy-one possible points that an organization could receive, since twenty-one of the items were rated as very important and twenty-nine were rated as important; thus, $(21 \times 2) + (29 \times 1) = 71$. However, of the fifty items selected by experts, only forty-nine were employed in this study. The one item not systematically examined was "programs with quality outputs." This item was eliminated because the purpose of the study was to examine organizational arrangements observable at any point in time by a review of organizational records, files, and statements before outcomes were achieved. This item did not lend itself to such examination, because

"outputs" come after, or as a result of, the organizational arrangements. This item had received an importance rating of 2. Since it was eliminated the total possible points for this study was 69.

This study was interested in identifying the organizational arrangements which best predicted performance among local citizen-based organizations. Therefore, the organizational arrangements selected by experts were explored further by applying the Delphi findings to organizations, observing the organization's performance, and determining what performance was predicted by the organizational arrangements selected by experts. The methodology used for this procedure is presented in Phase 2 of this chapter.

Phase 2. Application of Delphi Findings to Organizations and Observation of Performance

This part of the study sought to apply the organizational arrangements identified by experts through the Delphi procedure to citizen-based organizations. For this purpose a group of local citizen-based organizations was selected. The head of each organization was interviewed, and later invited to complete a questionnaire in order to obtain information on organizational arrangements for each of them. At the time of the interviews organizational arrangements selected from the second round Delphi survey were not completed. Rather than delay the interviews until the Delphi process could be completed, it was considered

important to interview organizations' representatives prior to the start of their summer service to youth to prevent intervention and possible biasing of program operations once the program started. Thus, to take full advantage of the finalized Delphi process a mail questionnaire was later developed and distributed specifically to obtain information on organizational arrangements not ascertained in the original interview.

Organizations Studied

Twenty-eight citizen-based organizations were examined. The organizations were representative of small-scale citizen operated organizations, locally autonomous and not identified with a national parent organization. These organizations had no endowment for funds but were constantly dependent on themselves and others for operating funds. They were funded by a private social planning and allocating agency to provide a service to youth during the summer of 1977. They were chosen from a total of 110 organizations who were funded under the same program. They met the following criteria:

1. Were independent voluntary organizations.
2. Had federal tax exempt status or state incorporation status.
3. Had specified target populations and geographical boundaries.
4. Operated all year.

Of the 110 organizations funded for providing 1977 summer programs to youth, eighty organizations did not meet these criteria and were eliminated from consideration.

They were: sixty-seven organizations affiliated with a public or private sponsoring organization or church; two social agencies serving large metropolitan areas; eleven not state incorporated and not operating all year.

Of the thirty organizations remaining all met the criteria for study selection. Each of the thirty organizations was contacted by the researcher and asked to participate in the study. Two groups decided not to participate. Thus, a total of twenty-eight organizations participated. A list of the organizations participating in the study is given in Appendix C.

Research Instruments

Two instruments were employed to gather required data. A questionnaire was designed specifically for the collection of data through an interview procedure. The questionnaire was comprehensive and included questions from the initial Delphi survey dealing with organizational arrangements, and other questions seeking general information. An additional mail survey was later conducted to obtain information selected by experts in the Delphi procedure which was not included in the original research instrument. The research instruments used for data collection in this part of the study are included in Appendix D.

The questionnaire for the interview covered six major descriptive areas about organizations: background and development, goals, resources, operations, constituency,

and leadership. The principal purpose of the questionnaire was to solicit information to determine whether the organizations possessed the organizational arrangements identified through the Delphi procedure.

The first section was used to obtain information on the historical background of the organization: its age, initiation, affiliations, and location of target population.

The second section was to obtain information on the goals and programs of the organization. Goal statements, types of programs, changes in goals and programs, role of the organization in the community, and program determination were examined.

In the third section the resources were examined. Structural aspects such as board members, staff and volunteers by occupation, residence, and length of service with the organization, organizational relationships with the community and other organizations were examined, as well as the organization's financial resources.

The fourth section sought information on the operation of the organization: controls on bookkeeping, policy determination, committees, and records of services. Activities in the facility of the organization were ascertained as well as facility ownership, daily hours, and use by residents.

The fifth section was used to obtain general information on the organization's members and recipients of services: number of members; and number, sex, age groupings,

race and residence of persons served and fees charged for services.

The sixth section of the questionnaire contained questions to elicit biographical information on the leader of the organization.

Data Collection

During late June and early July of 1977 personal interviews ranging from 1½ to 2 hours were held with top officials of the twenty-eight organizations or their designated representatives. The interviews were conducted by the researcher. A follow-up mail survey was conducted during March of 1978 to gather information recommended on the second round Delphi survey procedure and not obtained at the time of the interviews.

The information from the interviews and follow-up mail survey was used to provide a discrete application of the organizational arrangements from the Delphi findings to each organization in the study to later examine the clusters of organizational arrangements in relation to organizational performance. Appendix E gives the format used in assessing an organization for each of the organizational items.

Observation of Performance

During the summer of 1977 performance data were compiled on the summer programs provided by the twenty-eight organizations included in this study. The planning and

implementation of each of the programs were the responsibility of each of the funded organizations. The programs provided by these organizations served youth between six and fifteen years of age. The activities provided in the programs included arts and crafts, cultural enrichment, sports, games and field trips.

Data for computing the performance measures were taken from administrative records required and maintained by the funding agent for each organization--applications, budgets, and staffing, from daily attendance sheets completed by each participating organization, from a success rating form completed by the director of each participating organization and from a duplicate success rating form completed by the funding agent's monitor on each organization. Copies of the forms are provided in Appendix F.

Using data from the above sources performance scores were computed for each organization. Five organizations did not submit daily attendance records. For these five organizations the monitors' site visit reports were used to estimate youth participation. Table 3.2 lists the units employed for measuring performance from observation of program operation.

Design of the Study

The research design of this study integrates the data generated in Phase 1 and 2 of the study to develop a prediction model for local citizen-based organizations

Table 3.2.--Performance Measures for Organizations Providing Summer Programs.

Group	Sector Evaluated	Number Assigned Variable	Performance Measures
I.	Perceived Success of Service	Y ₁ Y ₂	Rating by organization's director Rating by funding agent's monitor
II.	Quantity of Service Provided	Y ₃ Y ₄	Program days Program hours
III.	Quantity of Service Received	Y ₅ Y ₆ Y ₇ Y ₈ Y ₉	Number of different youth served Total attendance Average daily attendance Average participation each youth Percent utilization of program
IV.	Cost of Service	Y ₁₀ Y ₁₁ Y ₁₂ Y ₁₃ Y ₁₄ Y ₁₅	Cost per youth Cost per day Cost per youth per day Cost per hour of service Percent of grant for salaries Percent of service cost for salaries
V.	Supporters of Service	Y ₁₆ Y ₁₇ Y ₁₈	Percent of manpower paid by grant Percent of manpower paid by others Percent of manpower voluntary
VI.	Supervision of Service	Y ₁₉	Ratio of youth served to workers

regarding their performance in providing a service to their locality. Specifically, the design uses the clusters of organizational arrangements generated by experts through the Delphi procedure and applied to the group of organizations as predictor variables, or independent variables. The performance measures serve as criterion variables, or dependent variables. Each criterion measure is then correlated with the Delphi data clusters.

The model seeks to determine the following: (1) If any of the criterion variables, in this case the performance measures, can be predicted by the clusters of organizational arrangements selected by experts. (2) Which performance measures are predicted best by the clusters of organizational arrangements.

If the organizational arrangements selected by experts can to some extent and in some combination explain one or more of the performance measures, then the criteria identified by experts can be applied to neighborhood organizations in the future and their ranking on the clusters of arrangements can be used to predict propensity for performance. If a discriminating ability can be found in the experts' criteria, then that criteria would be useful in describing the unique characteristics of effective neighborhood organizations.

Statistical Analysis

First, multiple regression, a multivariate statistical procedure, is used to analyze the data. Multiple regression is used because the study is interested in identifying the relationship between an outcome variable and a set of predictors, i.e., a criterion variable and the clusters of organizational arrangements selected by experts respectively. In order to obtain a predictor of rank on the performance measures, the clusters of organizational arrangements are correlated with each performance measure. The regression model

$$y_i = B_0 + B_1x_{1i} + \dots, + B_px_{pi} + e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 28$$

is used to develop equations which can predict each dependent variable, performance measures, from a set of independent variables, clusters of organizational arrangements. The effectiveness or strength of the selected clusters of organizational arrangements as predictors of performance is measured by the multiple correlation coefficient.

Having nineteen performance measures for analysis and predictor measurements on twelve clusters of organizational arrangements, nineteen regression equations were developed. Each equation selected from the twelve clusters of organizational arrangements those clusters which best predicted each performance measure. For each equation the sample consisted of a set of twenty-eight observations

$$(y_1, x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{12,1}), \dots, (y_{28}, x_{1,28}, \dots, x_{12,28}).$$

The results selected from experts through a version of the Delphi procedure indicated that the organizational arrangements could predict performance. Since no empirical studies were available to support this, and since the order of importance of the organizational arrangements in predicting the performance was not known, the Biomedical Computer Program (BMD) for stepwise regression was used. The stepwise regression procedure was an additional technique used in identifying significant clusters of predictors in each of the nineteen equations.

Stepwise regression selected a best subset of the independent variables as predictors according to the following procedure. The first step selected the single variable, from the organizational clusters, which best predicted Y, in this case a performance measure. The second step found the variable which best predicted Y given the first variable entered. In the steps that followed either (a) a variable was entered which best improved the prediction of Y given all the variables entered from previous steps; or (b) a variable was removed from the set of predictors if its predictive ability fell below a given level of .05. The process was terminated when no further variable improved the prediction of Y (Afifi and Azen, 1972, pp. 107-135). This procedure was repeated for each of the nineteen performance measures.

Secondly, discriminate analysis was used to identify a set of the clusters of organizational arrangements which best discriminated between high effective and low effective performing groups. Group designation was determined by rank ordering organizations on selected performance measures. The median was used to separate mid-rank. These performance measures were: rating of success by monitor of the funding agency, cost per youth, and percent of manpower paid by other sources. These measures were used because they were considered as the measures which were most objective and most attributable to the evaluation of success.

The discriminate analysis procedure considered two populations, $K = 1, K = 2$. Organizations (W) in each population were grouped as W_1 and W_2 as a result of the above mentioned predetermined performance measures. If assignment to a group is based on measurements x_i where $i = (1, \dots, P)$ for p characteristics then in vector form $x = (x_1, \dots, x_p)'$. Assuming a normal multivariant distribution for each population group, the expression becomes

$$W_1 = N(\mu_1^{p \times 1}, \Sigma_1^{p \times p}) \text{ and}$$

$$W_2 = N(\mu_2^{p \times 1}, \Sigma_2^{p \times p})$$

where μ = population mean vector

Σ = covariance matrix

If Δ^2 is the measure of the "distance" between populations groups, W_1 and W_2 , and α_i are coefficients which when

maximizing Δ^2 would yield a discriminant score called $\bar{z}$ in the expression:

$$\bar{z} = \alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + \dots + \alpha_p x_p$$

Then for characteristics (X) to be in Group W_k

$$\text{the mean of } \bar{z} = \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j \mu_{kj} \text{ and}$$

$$\text{variance} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_i \sigma_{ij} \alpha_j$$

where $k = 1 \text{ or } 2$

It was believed that high performing organizations would show high scores on organizational arrangements of inter-organizational and political relationships and operational controls. Therefore, these clusters of organizational arrangements would best distinguish high from low effective performers. Since I was not sure if this was true the F-test based on a one way analysis of variance was used to choose the organizational variables that were significant. The Biomedical Computer Program P-Series (BMDP) was employed for this procedure. The procedure first identified the independent variable for which the mean values in the two groups were "most different." For each variable this difference was measured by a one-way analysis of variance F-statistic, and the variable with the largest F was chosen. In successive steps, the conditional distribution of each variable not entered was considered, given the variable(s)

entered. Of the variables not entered, the variable for which the mean values of the conditional distribution in the two groups were "most different" were identified. This difference was also measured by a one-way analysis of variance F-statistic. The stepwise process was terminated when no additional variables significantly contributed to the discrimination between the two groups (Afifi and Azen, 1972, p. 253).

Research Hypotheses

The general hypotheses guiding this study are stated here.

1. The clusters of organizational arrangements as predictor variables will explain each performance measure and the extent of each relationship, expressed as a correlation coefficient, will be significantly greater than zero.
2. The means for one or more of the clusters or organizational arrangements will distinguish, at a statistically significant level of .05, between high effective and low effective performance.

Limitations

There are limitations of this study which affect its generalizability. The sample of organizations for the study was a total sample of available organizations but was not randomly selected from the general universe of neighborhood organizations. Rather were included for study because they were selected for the provision of a common service. Since they had been selected to provide the service these organizations were likely to be high performers. Thus, the

findings cannot be generalized to the universe of neighborhood organizations.

For the kinds of analysis used, the sample of twenty-eight was adequate for an exploratory study to show tendencies but too small for high confidence in findings or widespread generalizations. However, the results can be generalized with some caution. Before generalizations are made the characteristics described in the organizations studied section of the study should be checked for similarities (Cornfield and Tukey, 1956).

Also, the organizational elements selected in this study for analysis represent a limited view of organizational means for performance. The means for effective performance may lie in elements not looked at in this study.

This study is exploratory in nature. It is a beginning step in identifying the characteristics of effective neighborhood organizations and the relationship between the characteristics and performance. Though its findings cannot be widely generalized, the findings can be suggestive of what characteristics are associated with performance and what relationships would provide fruitful grounds for further study.

Summary

This chapter has identified the research methodology of the study. The research procedures and instruments were described and discussed. The research design and

statistical analyses identifying the study's independent and dependent variables were discussed. The research hypotheses were stated and limitations of the study were set forth.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS FROM THE DELPHI PROCEDURE: ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS HAVING IMPORTANCE FOR EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE

In this chapter the data collected through the Delphi procedure for decision-making are reported and analyzed. The organizational arrangements rated as having importance for effective performance are reviewed and reported.

Selection of Statements on Organizational Arrangements

This part of the study was devoted to developing a set of statements which were believed to describe necessary organizational arrangements for effective performance of citizen-based organizations and which received widespread agreement of persons professionally acquainted with such organizations.

The statements were divided into three main subject areas: Goal Achievement; Resources; and Operations. Each subject area was divided into subparts. The goal achievement subject area was divided into two subparts: one

concerned with purposes-goals-objectives, and the second concerned with programs. The resources subject area was divided into three subparts: manpower, organizational relationships and funding. Manpower resources included board, leader, staff, and volunteers. Organizational relationships as resources included community, inter-organizational, and political relations. The operations subject area was subdivided into controls and activities. Statements within each of these areas were selected to describe organizational arrangements. These statements were used for analysis. Table 4.1 gives the subject areas investigated.

Table 4.1.--Dimensions of Organizations for Analysis.

I.	GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
A.	Purposes-goals-objectives
B.	Programs
II.	RESOURCES
A.	Manpower
1.	board
2.	leader
3.	staff
4.	volunteers
B.	Organizational relationships
1.	community
2.	inter-organizational
3.	political
C.	Funding
III.	OPERATIONS
A.	Controls
B.	Activities

Two Delphi questionnaires with statements on organizational arrangements pertaining to these dimensions for analysis were submitted to a group of experts. The group of experts was instructed to rank each statement as to its importance to a neighborhood organization's success according to the following scale:

4. Very Important
3. Important
2. Slightly Important
1. Unimportant

In order to be selected as an organizational arrangement having importance for an organization's success experts had to agree the statement was important or very important and there had to be widespread agreement on the importance of the statement among the expert group.

To make the determination the mean and the variance was used. The spread of agreement was analyzed by rank ordering the statements by the calculated variance within the category to which the statement applied. Then the mean response was examined to determine the importance rating. Since the study seeks those statements on organizational arrangements which best describe effectiveness a statement was selected as very important when the mean response was between 3.50 and 4.00 and the variance for that statement was low. Statements with a mean response between 3.49 and 3.00 were selected as important when the variance was low. Statements with a mean of 2.99 and lower and a high

variance were considered unimportant and were eliminated from investigation. Also, statements with a wide variance were considered non-consensus and were eliminated. Where statements received a mean of 3.00 or above and a wide variance with written responses giving opposing views or questions of clarification, the statements were repeated for reconsideration. Items were selected with the highest mean and the least variance when rank ordered by the variance within each category.

Results of the first round questionnaire were tabulated with nineteen or 86.4 percent returns. Where a consensus was obtained on a statement as important or very important it was selected for the organization analysis form and was dropped from further Delphi rating. Also, dropped from further exploration were those statements which by consensus were rated as not important or received non-consensus. Table 4.2 gives a numerical summary of ratings of importance of the sixty-two statements included on the first round questionnaire.

Findings from the First Round Delphi Questionnaire

Of the sixty-two original statements included on the first questionnaire, thirty-three were selected as having importance. Of the thirty-three selected, thirteen were rated as very important and twenty were rated as important. Of the thirty-three statements selected, seven

Table 4.2.--Summary Table of Item Distribution--As a Result of the First Round Returns on the Neighborhood Organization Delphi Survey.

Items	Original Items	Rating on Items				Repeats for Clarifi- cation	Items Added
		Consensus		Unimportant or non- consensus			
		Very Important	Important				
Total Survey	62	13	20	26	3	37	
I. Goal Achievement, total	14	3	4	6	1	18	
Purposes, goals and objectives	6	1	1	3	1	14	
Program	8	2	3	3	-	4	
II. Resources, total	32	3	13	14	2	15	
Manpower	17	2	7	7	1	7	
Board	7	2	2	2	1	1	
Leader	4	-	1	3	-	2	
Staff & volunteers	6	-	4	2	-	4	
Organizational relationships	10	1	4	4	1	4	
Community	3	1	2	-	-	-	
Inter-organizational	6	-	2	3	1	1	
Political	1	-	-	1	-	3	
Funding	5	-	2	3	-	4	

Table 4.2.--Continued.

Items	Original Items	Rating on Items			Repeats for Clarifi- cation	Items Added
		Very Important	Consensus	Unimportant or non- consensus		
III. Operations, total	<u>16</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>4</u>
Controls	12	4	2	6	-	4
Activities	4	3	1	-	-	-

related to arrangements necessary for the achievement of goals, sixteen related to organizational resources necessary for effective performance, and ten related to effective operations.

Of the seven statements selected in the area of goal achievement, two were organizational arrangements necessary for purposes-goals-objectives to be achieved; and five were organizational arrangements necessary for programs to be achieved. These statements are given in Table 4.3 with their importance rating, mean score and variance.

Of the sixteen statements selected in the area of resources, nine pertained to manpower resources, four of which referred to the board, one referred to the leader of the organization, two referred to staff, and two referred to volunteers. Five of the sixteen statements on resources pertained to organizational relationships, three of which referred to community relations and two referred to inter-organizational relationships. The remaining two resources statements pertained to funding. Table 4.4 gives these organizational arrangements with their importance ratings, mean score and variance.

Of the ten operations statements selected on the first round questionnaire, six related to operational controls and four related to organizational activities. Table 4.5 gives these organizational arrangements by importance ratings, mean score and variance.

Table 4.3.--Organizational Goal Achievement Arrangements
of Importance for Effectiveness from First
Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
A. Purposes-Goals-Objectives:			
1. Evidence that purposes, goals-objectives are congruent with community needs.	3.79	0.28	Very Important
2. Evidence of a periodic review of organization's objectives with adjustments and modifications as required.	3.47	0.39	Important
B. Programs:			
1. Objectives manifested in the programs of the organization.	3.50	0.06	Very Important
2. Programs determined by residents.	3.44	0.35	Important
3. Programs with quality outputs.	3.61	0.35	Very Important
4. Short-range projects.	3.16	0.39	Important
5. Programs which provide immediate assistance to residents.	3.42	0.39	Important

Table 4.4.--Organizational Resources Arrangements of Importance for Effectiveness from First Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	S^2	Importance Rating
A. Manpower:			
(Board Members)			
1. Include representation of persons from the neighborhood.	3.58	0.28	Very Important
2. Include representation of persons with knowledge of the programs provided by the organization.	3.39	0.47	Important
3. Elected to office by the membership.	3.63	0.56	Very Important
4. Include representation of persons from the membership of the organization.	3.41	0.63	Important
(Leader-president or chairman)			
1. Knowledge of the organization's impact in the neighborhood.	3.47	0.61	Important
(Staff)			
1. Educational and experience background adequate to carry out the programs of the organization.	3.41	0.79	Important
2. Representative of persons served by the organization.	3.22	0.65	Important

Table 4.4.--Continued.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
(Volunteers)			
1. Volunteers from the neighborhood.	3.35	0.38	Important
2. Professional volunteers from a variety of backgrounds (accountants, lawyers, educators, social workers).	3.41	0.50	Important
B. Organizational Relationships:			
(Community)			
1. Interpretation of the organization's purposes, programs and achievements to neighborhood residents.	3.56	0.23	Very Important
2. Publication of the organization's purposes, programs, and achievements to neighborhood residents.	3.21	0.28	Important
3. Meetings open to neighborhood residents.	3.38	0.53	Important
(Inter-organizational)			
1. Working relationships with other neighborhood organizations similar in program emphasis.	3.42	0.50	Important
2. Participation in community associations or councils.	3.26	0.56	Important

Table 4.4.--Continued.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	S^2	Importance Rating
C. Funding:			
1. Neighborhood based fund-raising activ- ities.	3.26	0.56	Important
2. Grants from foundations, government, community councils.	3.29	0.63	Important

Table 4.5.--Organizational Operations Arrangements of
Importance for Effectiveness from First
Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
A. Controls:			
1. Policies and issues voted on by group members.	3.68	0.22	Very Important
2. Evidence of adequate bookkeeping.	3.79	0.28	Very Important
3. Well defined statements of policies.	3.42	0.50	Important
4. Records of services provided.	3.53	0.61	Very Important
5. Records of persons served.	3.47	0.61	Important
6. Reports which portray the operating results of the organization.	3.58	0.61	Very Important
B. Activities:			
1. Assessment of community needs.	3.79	0.17	Very Important
2. Information source for residents on matters which affect the neighborhood.	3.72	0.24	Very Important
3. Facility open for use by the community.	3.56	0.24	Very Important
4. Evidence of active recruitment of members.	3.37	0.44	Important

Twenty-six of the sixty-two statements included on the first round questionnaire were deleted from consideration from a consensus by experts of not-important. Three statements received written comments suggesting either difference of views or uncertainty of meaning and were repeated on the second questionnaire.

The two free form questions included on the first questionnaire asking for opinions about key attributes of neighborhood organizations and information which could be deceptive whether intended or unintended in assessing a neighborhood organization's potentials generated 112 statements. Seventy-three of the statements were pertinent to key attributes and thirty-nine were pertinent to deceptions. This information was compiled separately and is provided in Appendix G.

Findings of the Second Round Delphi Questionnaire

The second Delphi questionnaire began with forty statements for rating. Thirty-seven of the statements were derived from those written by the expert respondent group on the first questionnaire. Three of the forty statements were revisions of original statement included on the first questionnaire for which comments indicated lack of agreement or uncertainty of meaning.

Of the thirty-seven new statements generated by experts, seventeen were selected as having importance. Of the seventeen selected, eight were rated as very important

and nine were rated as important. Table 4.6 gives a numerical summary of ratings of importance on statements on the second questionnaire.

Of the seventeen statements selected, nine related to arrangements necessary for the achievement of goals, seven related to organizational resources necessary for effective performance, and one related to effective operations arrangements.

Of the nine statements selected in the area of goal achievement, seven were organizational arrangements necessary for purposes-goals-objectives to be achieved; and two were organizational arrangements necessary for programs to be achieved. These statements are given in Table 4.7 with their importance rating, mean score and variance.

Of the seven statements selected in the area of resources, three pertained to manpower resources, two of which pertained to the leader of the organization and one to staff. Two pertained to political relationships and two pertained to funding as resources. Table 4.8 gives these statements with their importance rating, mean score and variance.

One of the seventeen statements of importance selected on the second round questionnaire was in the area of operations and pertained to evaluations, a necessary control in operations for effectiveness. This statement is given in Table 4.9 with its importance rating, mean score and variance.

Table 4.6.--Summary Table of Item Distribution--As a Result of the Second Round Returns on the Neighborhood Organization Delphi Survey.

Items	Total Items	Rating on Items			Unimportant or Non-Consensus
		Very Important	Consensus	Important	
Total survey	<u>40</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>23</u>	
I. Goal Achievement, total	<u>19</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	
Purposes, goals and objectives	15	3	4	8	
Program	4	2	-	2	
II. Resources, total	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	
Manpower	8	3	-	5	
Board	2	-	-	2	
Leader	2	2	-	-	
Staff & volunteers	4	1	-	3	
Organizational Relationships	5	-	2	3	
Community	-	-	-	-	
Inter-organizational	2	-	-	2	
Political	3	-	2	1	
Funding	<u>4</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	

Table 4.6.--Continued.

Items	Total Items	Rating on Items			Unimportant or Non- Consensus
		Very Important	Consensus	Important	
III. Operations, total	<u>4</u>	-		<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Controls	4	-		1	3
Activities	-	-		-	-

Table 4.7.--Organizational Goal Achievement Arrangements of Importance for Effectiveness from Second Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
A. Purposes-Goals-Objectives:			
1. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to volunteers who assist the organization.	3.90	0.09	Very Important
2. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to paid staff.	3.85	0.13	Very Important
3. Established milestones or time periods for reaching goals and objectives.	3.15	0.24	Important
4. Visible goals that can attract support.	3.35	0.35	Important
5. Statements of goals and objectives, well-defined, but flexible enough to accommodate unanticipated action to be protective and reactive to community issues as they arise.	3.55	0.37	Very Important
6. Specificity of objectives even though difficult to quantify, i.e., objectives of community cohesion, community morale.	3.35	0.45	Important
7. Flexibility in long-range planning to accommodate unanticipated projects or programs.	3.35	0.45	Important

Table 4.7.--Continued.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
B. Programs:			
1. Qualitative and quantitative programs that satisfy those who are to benefit.	3.60	0.36	Very Important
2. Programs by and for the community that meet self-defined needs rather than needs defined by others.	3.50	0.37	Very Important

Table 4.8.--Organizational Resources Arrangements of
Importance for Effectiveness from Second
Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
A. Manpower:			
(Leader-president or chairman)			
1. A president or chairman willing and able to learn with commitment to the organization and its programs.	3.79	0.18	Very Important
2. A president or chairman with knowledge of the organization and its programs with chair type skills.	3.65	0.34	Very Important
(Staff)			
1. Staff able to relate to persons served.	3.80	0.17	Very Important
B. Organizational Relationships:			
(Political)			
1. Contacts with agencies handling revenue sharing funds, other financial grants, or sources of funds.	3.37	0.36	Important
2. Contacts with mayor's office, city council, neighborhood city halls, police precincts.	3.45	0.37	Important

Table 4.8.--Continued.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
C. Funding:			
1. Donations from individuals and groups committed to the organization's interest without strings attached.	3.20	0.38	Important
2. Broader community based fund-raising activities which do not result in loss of local autonomy.	3.35	0.45	Important

Table 4.9.--Organizational Operations Arrangements of Importance for Effectiveness from Second Round Delphi by Mean Score and Variance.

Statement	$\bar{X}$	s^2	Importance Rating
A. Controls:			
1. Semi-annual and/or annual evaluations.	3.45	0.37	Important

The following three statements were restated and repeated on the second round questionnaire for a revote.

1. Identification of the organization with a specific geographic area (service area and/or functional area).
2. The board includes representation of persons from the business and corporate community whether residents of the community or outside the community.
3. Joint programs with similar organizations.

Each of the statements were analyzed separately. Neither of the statements received consensus among the experts that they were important and were therefore deleted from organizational analysis.

Summary

In this chapter the results of the Delphi technique for decision-making on characteristics of importance for effective performance of neighborhood organizations were presented.

The information generated in each step of the procedure was presented and analyzed to test agreement among

the expert panel on the significance of the information for assessing a neighborhood organization's potential.

An examination of the variance was used to determine the level of agreement of each statement. The mean was used to determine the level of importance.

A total of ninety-nine statements relating to an organization's internal arrangements for effective performance were reviewed and rated by a panel of nineteen experts for importance. Of the ninety-nine statements, fifty were considered as having importance. Of the fifty selected, twenty-one received a first priority rating and were considered very important. Twenty-nine were considered as second priority arrangements and were rated important. Of the fifty statements selected a total of sixteen pertained to arrangements necessary for goal achievement, twenty-three pertained to effective arrangements of resources and eleven pertained to operational arrangements. The complete list of the fifty statements selected is given in Appendix H. Forty-nine statements were deleted from consideration due to lack of agreement on importance or agreement of not important for effective performance.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: ANALYSES AND RESULTS

In this chapter the statistical analysis of the data collected is reported and analyzed. Statistical hypotheses intended to help answer the research questions have been tested and the results are reported. Finally, the major findings are summarized.

The research methodology of this study focuses on identifying the characteristics of effective neighborhood organizations. The research conducted thus far has shown that there are certain organizational arrangements of a neighborhood organization which can be identified before performance is observed. Such characteristics can be used to evaluate the organization's potential for effective performance. These organizational arrangements have received consensual validity from experts as to their importance for a neighborhood organization's effective performance. These organizational arrangements will be analyzed further for their actual validity in explaining performance as defined by this study. First, clusters of the organizational arrangements were analyzed as factors known before performance with post performance measures to see if the post

performance measures could be explained by the clusters of organizational arrangements or some set of the clusters. Secondly, the pre-performance cluster variables were analyzed with a combined measure of effectiveness for post performance to see if the clusters of organizational arrangements could distinguish between high and low effectiveness. Appendix I includes correlation matrices for all variables analyzed in this chapter.

A review of the correlation matrix between the organizational clusters and the performance measures showed the following significant simple correlations, $r_{.05} = .317$.

<u>Performance Measures</u>	<u>Organizational Clusters</u>	<u>Significant r</u>
(Y ₁) Rating by internal agent	(X ₄) Leader	.338
(Y ₂) Rating by external Agent	(X ₅) Staff	.354
(Y ₄) Program hours	(X ₁) Purposes-goals-objectives	-.360
(Y ₅) Number served	(X ₃) Board	.335
(Y ₁₀) Cost per youth	(X ₇) Community	-.452
	(X ₆) Volunteers	-.424
	(X ₉) Political	-.356
	(X ₃) Board	-.349
(Y ₁₂) Cost per youth per day	(X ₆) Volunteers	-.434
	(X ₇) Community	-.427
(Y ₁₃) Cost per hour of service	(X ₇) Community	-.342
(Y ₁₄) Percent of grant for salaries	(X ₁) Purposes-goals-objectives	.389
	(X ₉) Political	

<u>Performance Measures</u>	<u>Organizational Clusters</u>	<u>Significant r</u>
(Y ₁₅) Percent of service cost for salaries	(X ₁) Purposes-goals- objectives	.510
	(X ₄) Leader	-.332
	(X ₉) Political	-.321
(Y ₁₆) Percent of manpower paid by funder	(X ₁₂) Activities	.450
	(X ₁) Purposes-goals- objectives	.371
(Y ₁₇) Percent of manpower paid by others	(X ₁) Purposes-goals- objectives	-.441
	(X ₉) Political	.423
	(X ₈) Inter-organizational	.409
(Y ₁₈) Percent of manpower voluntary	(X ₁) Purposes-goals- objectives	.429
	(X ₉) Political	-.396
	(X ₁₁) Controls	-.349

The above analysis shows the single organizational cluster variables which best explain the indicated performance measures, the extent of the relationship between the individual variables and performance measures, and the direction of each relationship.

Since this study was interested in reducing error in predicting a neighborhood organization's potential for successful performance multiple regression was used to see if the explanation of the performance measures could be improved by using all of the organizational variables or some multiple set of the organizational variables to explain the performance measures over using individual variables for explanation.

Research Question 1

Is there a linear relationship between the organizational variables as a set or some subset of the variables and the performance measures of this study?

The statistical hypotheses were tested using nineteen separate multiple regression procedures. The F ratios were computed to test significance, i.e., prediction of the set of twelve clusters of organizational arrangements for each of the nineteen dependent variables. The nineteen null hypotheses are that the independent variables, the twelve clusters of organizational arrangements, do not significantly predict each of the nineteen performance measures. The associated alternative hypotheses are that some subset of the twelve clusters of organizational arrangements will significantly predict each of the nineteen performance measures.

The multiple correlation coefficient is used to show the extent of magnitude of linear dependence of a performance measure on some set of the predictor variables. The square of the multiple correlation coefficient is used to show the proportion of variance of a performance measure explained by the regression of the performance measure on the selected cluster(s) of organizational arrangements, which was used as a measure of goodness of fit. Figure 5.1 graphically presents the multiple regression design with resulting equations showing the direction of the correlations.

POST-PERFORMANCE	PRE-PERFORMANCE											
	(X ₁)	(X ₂)	(X ₃)	(X ₄)	(X ₅)	(X ₆)	(X ₇)	(X ₈)	(X ₉)	(X ₁₀)	(X ₁₁)	(X ₁₂)
	Purposes Programs Board Leader Staff Inter- Organ. Political Funding Controls Activities. R											
(Y ₁) Rating by program director	+	0	-	0	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+
(Y ₂) Rating by funding agent's monitor	-	+	+	0	+	0	+	-	0	0	0	+
(Y ₃) Program Days	0	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-
(Y ₄) Program hours	-	+	-	-	-	-	0	+	-	0	-	+
(Y ₅) Number served	-	0	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	0	+
(Y ₆) Total attendance	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
(Y ₇) Average daily attendance	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
(Y ₈) Average participation of each youth	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	0	0	-	+
(Y ₉) Percent utilization of program	-	+	-	-	-	-	0	+	-	+	-	0
(Y ₁₀) Cost per youth	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	0	+	0	-
(Y ₁₁) Cost per day	0	-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
(Y ₁₂) Cost per youth per day	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	0	-	+	0	+
(Y ₁₃) Cost per hour of service	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
(Y ₁₄) Percent of grant for salaries	+	0	-	+	+	0	+	0	-	-	0	+
(Y ₁₅) Percent of service-cost for salaries	+	0	0	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+
(Y ₁₆) Percent of manpower paid by funder	+	0	-	+	0	+	-	-	0	0	+	+
(Y ₁₇) Percent of manpower paid by others	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	+	+	+	-	-
(Y ₁₈) Percent of manpower voluntary	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	-	-	0	-	+
(Y ₁₉) Ratio of youth to worker	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-

Figure 5.1. Correlation Coefficients of Multiple Regression Equations.

* = Significant at .05
 + = Positive Correlation
 - = Negative Correlation
 0 = No Correlation

The sections that follow will examine each of the performance measures in terms of their relationship to the predictor variables. Because of the multiple regression procedure used, the presence or absence of an individual correlation may or may not yield a multiple correlation that will satisfy the requirements of the null hypothesis.

Rating of Success by Program Director

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Rating of Success by Program Director."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, board, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .56 with a F-ratio of 0.78. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Rating of Success by Program Director" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Rating of Success by Funding Agent's Monitor

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Rating of Success by Funding Agent's Monitor."

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, staff, community, inter-organizational and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .70 with a F-ratio of 2.68. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.51$, $df\ 7,20$). The null hypothesis on no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.1. As shown, the correlation between the criterion, Rating of success externally, and the selected subset of organizational variables is 0.696 with a goodness of fit of 0.484.

Within the selected predictor set the organizational variables staff, activities, community, programs, and board correlated positively; inter-organizational and purposes-goals-objectives correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided a neighborhood oriented staff, involvement of residents in operational activities, open communication with the community, community oriented and defined programs, and an informed community based board were rated better on the success of the summer program than organizations with low rankings on these variables. Organizations ranking low on the possession of organizational arrangements which had inter-organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and associations, and well defined and

Table 5.1.--Stepwise Regression of a subset of Seven Predictor Variables for Rating of Success of Organizational Arrangement Externally.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Staff	.354	.126	.126
Activities	.516	.267	.141
Community	.605	.366	.100
Programs	.638	.408	.041
Inter-organizational	.660	.436	.028
Board	.691	.477	.041
Purposes-goals-objectives	.696	.484	.006
Total R = .696	F Square = .484	p < .05	

and manageable purposes-goals-objectives were rated better on the success of the summer program than organizations with high rankings on these variables.

Program Days

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Program Days."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .62 with a F-ratio of 0.91. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 11,16$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Program Days" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Program Hours

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Program Hours."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, inter-organizational, political,

controls and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .65 with a F-ratio of 1.22. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Program Hours" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Number Served

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Number Served."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .52 with a F-ratio of 0.64. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Number Served" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Total Attendance

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Total Attendance."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .41 with a F-ratio of 0.26. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.48$, $df\ 12,15$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Total Attendance" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Average Daily Attendance

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Average Daily Attendance."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .41 with a F-ratio of 0.25. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.48$, $df\ 12,15$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Average Daily Attendance" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Average Participation of Youth

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Average Participation of Youth."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, controls and activities gave a multiple correlation of .42 with a F-ratio of 0.37. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Average Participation of Youth" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Percent Utilization of Program

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Percent Utilization of Program."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, inter-organizational, political, funding and controls gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .36 with a F-ratio of 0.25. This was not significant

at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Percent Utilization of Program" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Cost per Youth

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Cost per Youth."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, funding, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .79 with a F-ratio of 2.79. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.2. As shown, the correlation between the criterion, Cost per youth, and the selected subset of the organizational variables is 0.788 with a goodness of fit of 0.621.

Within the selected subset the organizational variables purposes-goals-objectives, leader, and funding correlated positively; community, board, volunteers, programs, staff, activities, and inter-organizational correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided well defined and

Table 5.2.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement
Predictor Variables for Cost per Youth.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Community	.452	.204	.204
Board	.636	.404	.200
Volunteers	.691	.478	.074
Purposes-goals-objectives	.735	.541	.063
Programs	.748	.559	.019
Staff	.755	.570	.011
Leader	.772	.595	.025
Funding	.781	.609	.014
Activities	.786	.618	.008
Inter-organizational	.788	.621	.003
Total R = .788	R Square = .621	p < .05	

manageable purposes-goals-objectives, a skillful and committed leader, and use a variety of means for funding had higher unit costs for service to each youth than organizations with low rankings on these factors. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided open communication with the community, an informed community based board, had residents and non-residents with a variety of professional backgrounds as volunteers, had community oriented and defined programs, had a neighborhood oriented staff, involved residents in the operational activities, and had inter-organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and associations had lower unit costs for service to each youth than organizations which ranked low on these variables.

Cost per Day

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Cost per Day."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of programs, board, leader, and funding gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .58 with a F-ratio of 2.99. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.80$, $df\ 4,23$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.3. As shown, the correlation between the criterion, Cost per day, and the selected subset of organizational variables is 0.585 with a goodness of fit of 0.342.

Table 5.3.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Four Organizational Arrangement Predictor Variables for Cost per Day.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Funding	.313	.098	.098
Leader	.408	.166	.069
Board	.504	.254	.088
Programs	.585	.342	.088
Total R = .585	R Square = .342		p < .05

Within the selected subset the organizational variables funding, leader, and board correlated positively; programs correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which used a variety of means to obtain funding, had a skillful and committed leader, and an informed community based board showed higher unit costs for each day of service than organizations with low rankings on these variables. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided for community oriented and defined programs

showed lower unit costs for each day of service provided than organizations ranking low on this variable.

Cost per Youth per Day

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Cost per Youth per day."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, political, funding, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .77 with a F-ratio of 2.53. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.4. As shown, the correlation between the criterion, Cost per youth per day, and the selected subset of organizational variables is 0.774 with a goodness of fit of 0.598.

Within the selected predictor set the organizational variables activities, purposes-goals-objectives, leader, and funding correlated positively; volunteers, board, community, programs, staff, and political correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which involved residents in operational activities, provided well defined and manageable

Table 5.4.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement
Predictor Variables for Cost per Youth per Day.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Volunteers	.434	.188	.188
Activities	.532	.283	.095
Board	.603	.363	.080
Community	.672	.451	.088
Purposes-goals-objectives	.708	.501	.049
Programs	.740	.548	.047
Staff	.745	.555	.007
Leader	.754	.568	.013
Funding	.771	.594	.027
Political	.774	.598	.004
Total R = .774	R Square = .598	p < .05	

purposes-goals-objectives, had skillful and committed leaders, and used a variety of means for funding showed higher unit costs for each youth served each day service was provided than organizations with low ranking on these variables. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which used residents and non-residents with a variety of professional backgrounds as volunteers, had an informed community based board, provided open communication with the community, had community oriented and defined programs, had neighborhood oriented staff, and had political contacts with a variety of public officials and funding agencies showed lower unit costs to serve each youth each day service was provided than organizations which ranked low on these variables.

Cost per Hour of Service

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Cost per Hour of Service."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .60 with a F-ratio of 0.69. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.48$, $df\ 12,15$). The null

hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected. "Cost per Hour of Service" cannot be predicted by any subset of the organizational variables.

Percent of Grant for Salaries

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Percent of Grant for Salaries."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, board, leader, staff, community, political, funding, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .72 with a F-ratio of 2.62. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.48$, $df\ 8,19$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.5. As shown, the correlation between the criterion, Percent of grant for salaries, and the selected subset of organizational variables is 0.724 with a goodness of fit of 0.525.

Within the selected predictor set the organizational variables purposes-goals-objectives, community, leader, activities and staff correlated positively; board, political, and funding correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided well defined and manageable

Table 5.5.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Eight Organizational Arrangement
Predictor Variables for Percent of Grant for Salaries.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Purposes-goals-objectives	.387	.151	.151
Board	.479	.229	.078
Political	.527	.278	.048
Community	.615	.378	.101
Leader	.685	.470	.091
Activities	.700	.489	.020
Staff	.711	.506	.017
Funding	.724	.525	.019
Total R = .724	R Square = .525	p < .05	

purposes-goals-objectives, open communication with the community, skillful and committed leaders, involvement of residents in operational activities, and neighborhood oriented staff showed a higher proportion of grant funds used for salaries than organizations ranking low on these variables. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided an informed community based board, had political contacts with a variety of public officials and funding agencies, and used a variety of means for funding showed lower proportions of grant funds used for salaries than organizations ranking low on these variables.

Percent of Service Cost for Salaries

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Percent of Service Cost for Salaries."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .78 with a F-ratio of 2.61. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.6. As shown, the correlation between the criterion, Percent of service cost for salaries, and the selected subset of organizational variables is 0.778 with a goodness of fit of 0.606.

Within the selected predictor set the organizational variables purposes-goals-objectives, controls, community, inter-organizational, volunteers, and activities correlated positively; leader, political, staff, and funding correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided well defined and manageable purposes-goals-objectives, operational controls through documentation, evaluation, and dissemination of services and policies, had open communication with the community, had inter-organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and associations, used resident and nonresidents with a variety of professional backgrounds as volunteers, and involved residents in the operational activities of the organization showed a higher proportion of the cost for the summer program spent for salaries than organizations ranking low on these variables. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided skillful and committed leaders, political contacts with a variety of public officials and funding agencies, had neighborhood oriented staff, and used a variety of means for funding showed lower proportions of the costs for the service spent for salaries.

Table 5.6.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement
Predictor Variables for Percent of Service Cost Salaries.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Purposes-goals-objectives	.510	.260	.260
Controls	.608	.370	.110
Leader	.653	.427	.057
Political	.682	.465	.039
Community	.731	.534	.069
Staff	.745	.555	.021
Inter-organizational	.758	.574	.020
Volunteers	.765	.586	.011
Activities	.768	.590	.004
Funding	.778	.606	.016
Total R = .778	R Square = .606	p < .05	

Percent of Manpower Paid by Funder

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Percent of Manpower Paid by Funder."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, board, leader, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, controls, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .72 with a F-ratio of 2.51. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.48$, $df\ 8,19$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.7. As shown, the correlation between the criterion, Percent of manpower paid by funder, and the selected subset of organizational variables is 0.717 with a goodness of fit of 0.514.

Within the selected predictor set the organizational variables activities, purposes-goals-objectives, leader, volunteers, and controls correlated positively; inter-organizational, board, and community correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided well defined and manageable purposes-goals-objectives, skillful and committed leaders, used residents and nonresidents from a variety of professional backgrounds as volunteers, and had operational

Table 5.7.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Eight Organizational Arrangement
Predictor Variables for Percent of Manpower Paid by Funder.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Activities	.450	.202	.202
Purposes-goals-objectives	.540	.292	.090
Inter-organizational	.610	.372	.080
Leader	.676	.457	.085
Board	.696	.484	.027
Volunteers	.702	.492	.008
Community	.711	.506	.014
Controls	.717	.514	.008
Total R = .717	R Square = .514	p < .05	

controls on services and policies through documentation and evaluation showed a higher proportion of the manpower used in provision of the summer service to be paid by the funding grant for the summer program. Organizations ranking high on organizational arrangements which provided inter-organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and associations, an informed community based board, and open communication with the community showed lower proportions of the manpower paid by the funding grant for the summer program.

Percent Manpower Paid by Other Sources

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Percent of Manpower Paid by Other Sources."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, leader, staff, volunteers, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .80 with a F-ratio of 2.98. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.45$, $df\ 10,17$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.8. As shown the correlation between the criterion, Percent of manpower paid by other sources, and the selected

Table 5.8.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Ten Organizational Arrangement
Predictor Variables for Percent of Manpower Paid by Other Sources.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
Purposes-goals-objectives	.441	.195	.195
Inter-organizational	.676	.457	.262
Leader	.729	.532	.075
Political	.751	.564	.032
Volunteers	.766	.586	.022
Controls	.781	.609	.023
Activities	.786	.618	.009
Staff	.795	.633	.014
Programs	.796	.634	.002
Funding	.798	.636	.002
Total R = .798	R Square = .636	p < .05	

subset of the organizational variables is 0.798 with a goodness of fit of 0.636.

Within the selected predictor set the organizational variables inter-organizational, political, controls and funding correlated positively; purposes-goals-objectives, leader, volunteers, activities, staff, and programs correlated negatively. Organizations with high rankings on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided inter-organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and associations, political contacts with a variety of public officials and funding agencies, used operational controls through documentation, evaluation and dissemination of services and policies, and used a variety of means for funding showed a higher proportion of their manpower paid by other sources than organizations with low rankings on these variables. Organizations with high rankings on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided well defined and manageable purposes-goals-objectives, skillful and committed leaders, use of residents and nonresidents from a variety of professional backgrounds as volunteers, involve residents in operational activities, have neighborhood oriented staff, and community oriented and defined programs showed a lower proportion of their manpower paid by other sources than organizations with low ranking on these variables.

Percent of Manpower Voluntary

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Percent of Manpower Voluntary."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including a subset of the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, staff, community, inter-organizational, political, controls, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .76 with a F-ratio of 2.72. This was significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.46$, $df\ 9,18$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected.

The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.9. As shown the correlation between the criterion, Percent of manpower voluntary, and the selected subset of organizational variables is 0.759 with a goodness of fit of 0.576.

Within the selected predictor set the organizational variables purposes-goals-objectives, activities, programs, staff, board, and community correlated positively; inter-organizational, controls, and political correlated negatively. Organizations ranking high on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided well defined and manageable purposes-goals-objectives, involvement of residents in operational activities, community defined and oriented programs, neighborhood oriented staff, an informed

Table 5.9.--Stepwise Regression of a Subset of Nine Organizational Arrangement
Predictor Variables for Percent of Manpower Voluntary.

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	R Square Change
purposes-goals-objectives	.428	.183	.183
Inter-organizational	.569	.324	.141
Controls	.631	.398	.074
Political	.678	.460	.062
Activities	.709	.503	.043
Programs	.731	.534	.031
Staff	.741	.549	.015
Board	.749	.561	.011
Community	.759	.576	.016
Total R = .759	R Square = .576	p < .05	

community based board, and open communication with the community showed a higher proportion of voluntary manpower than organizations ranking low on these variables. Organizations with high ranking on the possession of organizational arrangements which provided inter-organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and associations, use of operational controls by documenting, evaluating, and disseminating information on services and policies, and had political contacts with a variety of public officials and funding agencies showed a lower proportion of voluntary manpower than organizations ranking high on these variables.

Ratio Youth to Worker

Null Hypothesis: The twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities nor any subset of these variables will not be significantly related to the dependent variable "Ratio of Youth to Worker."

A stepwise regression analysis was conducted. The multiple regression equation including the organizational variables of purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities gave a multiple correlation coefficient of .70 with a F-ratio of 1.23. This was not significant at $\alpha = .05$ ($F = 2.48$, $df\ 12,15$). The null hypothesis of no significant relationship was not rejected.

"Ratio of Youth to Worker" cannot be predicted by any set of the organizational variables.

Research Question 2

The second research question focused on the distinguishing characteristics of effective neighborhood organizations. The performance measures Rating of success by external agent, Cost per youth, and Percent of manpower paid by other sources were used to determine a rank of effectiveness for organizations. These three measures were used for determining effectiveness because within the six sectors of performance under study these three measures were best explained by the organizational variables. Also, Rating by external agent was considered an unbiased estimate of success since it was provided by an outside observer, the higher the rating of success the more effective; Cost per youth was considered an objective measure and provided a measure of judicious use of resources in efforts to serve neighborhood youth, the lower the cost per youth the more youth could be served the more effective in reaching the target population; Percent of manpower paid by other sources was an objective measure and provided an indication of organizations success in acquiring multiple resources, the higher the percent of manpower paid by other sources the more effective. Effective neighborhood organizations were considered as those organizations with the total highest ranked values resulting from the sum of their ranked position on the above mentioned performance measures. Based upon their rank from high to low the twenty-eight organizations were

divided into two groups, high in effectiveness and low in effectiveness.

A stepwise discriminate analysis procedure was used because it looked for the set of variables accounting for the most differences between the two groups. The F statistic based on a one-way analysis of variance test was used to choose variables which significantly contributed to the discrimination between the two groups with appropriate degrees of freedom.

To test the null hypothesis, the means for the twelve variables were computed for both groups; low performers and high performers. The test determined if the means were all the same or significantly different.

Null Hypothesis: There will be no differences in the twelve organizational variables: purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, leader, staff, community, inter-organizational, political, funding, controls, and activities among the two levels of performance.

A stepwise discriminate analysis was conducted. The variables political, controls, and inter-organizational as a subset gave an F-value of 4.40. This was significant at $\alpha = .025$ ($F = 3.72$, $df\ 3,24$). The null hypothesis of no difference in any of the organizational variables among the two levels of performance was rejected. The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 5.10. The results of the analysis show that the three variables, political, controls, and inter-organizational as a subset of the twelve variables significantly contribute to the discrimination between the two levels of performance as well as using all twelve of

Table 5.10.--Summary of Stepwise Discriminate Analysis.

Variable	F to Enter	Degrees of Freedom	Mean	
			High Performers	Low Performers
X_9 = political	6.10	1,26	1.68	1.37
X_{11} = controls	4.69	2,25	8.40	7.38
X_8 = inter-organizational	4.40	3,24	1.86	1.43

the variables for discrimination. On each of the three variables the means of the high performing group were higher than the means of the low performing group. Organizations with high rankings on the possession of organizational arrangements which show political contacts with a variety of public officials and funding agencies, controls on services and policies through documentation, evaluation and dissemination of such information, and have inter-organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and associations will be more effective than organizations with low rating on these variables.

Summary

In this chapter the results of the study were presented and analyzed to test hypotheses related to the research questions. Multivariate statistical procedures were used to test the statistical hypotheses.

Multiple regression was used to test nineteen statistical hypotheses. Significance was determined by using the F ratio at .05 with appropriate degrees of freedom. Six sectors of post-performance representing nineteen measures were tested for correlation with twelve pre-performance measurements.

Discriminate analysis was used to test for differences in the twelve pre-performance variables on a combined ranking of selected post-performance measures which divided the organizations into high and low in effectiveness.

Summary of the Relationship
Between the Organizational
Arrangements and Performance Measures

Perceived Success of Service.--A subset of the organizational variables was found to correlate significantly with one of the two performance measures pertaining to program perceived success. Rating of success by external agent was found to significantly correlate positively with programs, board, staff, community, and activities; and negatively with purposes-goals-objectives and inter-organizational. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and Rating of success by external agent as the criterion was $R = .70$. No set of the predictor variables was found to correlate significantly with the performance measure Rating of success by internal agent. However, a simple correlation was found between rating of success by internal agent and leader, $r = .34$.

Quantity of Service Provided.--No significant correlations were found between any set of the organizational variables and the two performance measures pertaining to program service. A significant simple correlation was found between program hours and purposes-goals-objectives, $r = -.36$.

Quantity of Service Received.--No significant correlations were found between any set of the organizational variables and the five performance measures pertaining to

to quantity of service received by youth. A significant simple correlation was found between number served and board, $r = .34$.

Cost of Service.--Subsets of the organizational variables were found to significantly correlate with five of the performance measures pertaining to service cost. Cost per youth was found to significantly correlate positively with purposes-goals-objectives, leader, and funding; and negatively with programs, board, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational and activities. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and cost per youth as the criterion was $R = .79$. Cost per day was found to significantly correlate positively with board, leader, and funding; and negatively with programs. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and cost per day as the criterion was $R = .58$. Cost per youth per day was found to significantly correlate positively with purposes-goals-objectives, leader, funding, and activities; and negatively with programs, board, staff, volunteers, community and political. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and cost per youth per day as the criterion was $R = .77$. Percent of grant for salaries was found to significantly correlate positively with purposes-goals-objectives, leader, staff, community, and activities; and negatively with board, political, and funding. The multiple correlation between these

variables as predictors and percent of grant for salaries as the criterion was $R = .72$. Percent of total service cost for salaries was found to significantly correlate positively with purposes-goals-objectives, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, controls, and activities; and negatively with leader, staff, political, and funding. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and percent of total service cost for salaries as the criterion was $R = .78$.

No significant set of the variables was found to correlate with the cost per hour of service measure. A significant simple correlation was found between cost per hour of service and community, $r = .34$.

Supporters of Service.--Subsets of the organizational variables were found to significantly correlate with all three of the performance measures pertaining to resource utilization. Percent manpower paid by funder was found to significantly correlate positively with purposes-goals-objectives, leader, volunteers, controls, and activities; and negatively with board, community, and inter-organizational. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and percent manpower paid by funder as the criterion was $R = .72$. Percent of manpower paid by other sources was found to significantly correlate positively with inter-organizational, political, funding, and controls; and negatively with purposes-goals-objectives, programs,

leader, staff, volunteers, and activities. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and percent of manpower paid by other sources as the criterion was $R = .80$. Percent of manpower voluntary was found to significantly correlate positively with purposes-goals-objectives, programs, board, staff, community, and activities; and negatively with inter-organizational, political, and controls. The multiple correlation between these variables as predictors and percent of manpower voluntary as the criteria was $R = .76$.

Supervision of Service.--No significant correlations were found between any set of the organizational variables and the one performance measure pertaining to guidance youth received in the provision of the service.

Summary of the Distinguishing Characteristics of Effective Organizations

Discriminate analysis was used to test the statistical hypothesis of differences. Significance was determined by using the F statistic for one-way analysis of variance at .05 with appropriate degrees of freedom. Performance described by high and low ranking on a combined measure for performance effectiveness was found to be best distinguished by the organizational variables political, controls, and inter-organizational. On each of these three variables the mean of the high in effectiveness group was higher than the means of the low in effectiveness group. This

subset of organizational factors was found to significantly discriminate between the two groups at a .025 level of confidence.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter a summary is given of the research project. Following the summary, the findings are discussed and some conclusions are stated. Based on the findings and conclusions suggestions are made about implications for practice in social welfare, adult education, and for further research.

Summary of Project and Procedures

Combining the goal model and the system model for investigating the determinants of organizational effectiveness this study was conducted to determine what organizational means are predictive of effective performance of neighborhood organizations. Effective neighborhood organizations are the local citizen-based organizations which achieve their goals without undue strain on resources. It is important to better understand what distinguishes or identifies effective neighborhood organizations as social policy strives to involve local organizations in more participation in the delivery of services. It will be helpful to know what characteristics are most consistent with effective performance in service delivery.

A review of the literature revealed that organizational effectiveness can be studied by the goal approach, system-resource approach, and an application of the two approaches through evaluation methods. There is consistent agreement in more recent literature that organizational effectiveness is multi-dimensional and as such no single approach to understanding effectiveness is all inclusive (Etzioni, 1960; Levinson, 1966; Zald, 1966).

Since this study focused on providing comprehensive guidelines for assessing a neighborhood organization's potentials for the successful delivery of a service to the neighborhood it was considered important to use a comprehensive approach drawn from the goal approach, system resource approach and applied evaluation methods.

Studies were reviewed which looked at organizational effectiveness by examining organizational goals. It was found that the more explicit an organization's goals the more effective the organization performs, for explicit goals provide clearer roles and consequent behavior for persons in the social system (Perrow, 1961; Stein, 1962; Zald, 1963).

Studies were reviewed which looked at organizational effectiveness from the system resource approach. It was shown that effective organizations adapt to their environment and do not deplete or strain resources (Seashore and Yuchtman, 1965; Katz and Kahn, 1966).

Studies were reviewed which looked at organizational effectiveness in social welfare by evaluation methods. The studies showed that a combination of the goal approach and system resource approach should be used in identifying and measuring clusters of variables to evaluate various program components of an organization (Zald, 1966; Rothman, 1974; Patillo, 1975).

Using a comprehensive approach to organizational analysis for effectiveness this study was conducted in two phases. The first phase developed a set of organizational arrangements describing administrative practices for effective neighborhood organizations. Organizational arrangements for goal attainment, resource utilization, and daily operations were identified and agreed upon by a panel of experts as antecedent to the successful performance of a neighborhood organization. The second phase of the study examined whether the organizational arrangements agreed upon by experts were, in fact, interdependent with subsequent performance.

In the first phase of the study a version of the Delphi technique was used to develop the organizational arrangements. A panel of nineteen persons with expertise in the development and growth of neighborhood organizations participated in the Delphi procedure. Two Delphi surveys were used. Each survey included statements for rating.

The data were analyzed by use of the mean for level of importance and the variance for consensus. The results

of the first phase of the study provided fifty organizational arrangements considered by experts as necessary for the successful delivery of a service by neighborhood organizations. Forty-nine of these arrangements were used as criteria in the second phase of the study. The one not used was considered an output measure rather than an input measure and was not useful for our purposes here.

Phase two of the study inquired into the relationship between the organizational arrangements selected by experts as necessary for the successful delivery of a service and the actual performance of an organization in the delivery of a service. To this end, the study selected a group of neighborhood organizations providing a summer service to youth and evaluated the organizations' performance in the provision of the service to the community. The provision of the summer service was a goal for each of the organizations. How well the organizations adapted to the environment in use of resources in providing the service contributed indicators of performance which could be measured.

To collect the first set of data for the second phase of the study a total sample of thirty organizations meeting prescribed criteria was chosen. Twenty-eight organizations participated. Selecting organizations providing a similar service was deemed desirable because of the need to be able to utilize uniform measures of performance.

A research instrument was designed representative of the organizational arrangements selected from expert consensus to have importance for a neighborhood organization's success in the provision of a service. Using the research instrument, interviews were held with the head or designated representative of the sample of organizations funded for provision of a summer service to youth. The interviews asked for responses to questions designed to determine if the organization possessed the organizational arrangements under examination. Using the results of the interviews the criteria selected from expert consensus were applied to the organizations. Each organization received values for each of the forty-nine organizational arrangements examined representing the extent to which the criteria were observed in the organization's practices.

The values on the forty-nine organizational arrangements were classified into twelve clusters for analysis. The twelve clusters in turn were classified under the major categories of goal achievement, resources, and operations. Goal achievement was represented by subarea measurements on practices for purposes-goals-objectives and programs. Resources was represented by subarea measurements on practices for board, leader, staff, volunteers, community, inter-organizational, political, and funding. Operations was represented by subarea measurements on practices for controls and activities.

Supervision of Service, was represented by one measure: ratio of youth to worker.

These two sets of data served as the independent and dependent variables. Organizational arrangements served as the independent variables and were measured by rating the organization on the items selected from expert consensus. Performance served as the dependent variables and were measured by values on service statistics. These data were analyzed by multivariate statistical procedures. A series of hypotheses were tested to answer the research questions.

Hypothesis Testing

The first question focused on the correlation between the experts' selected organizational arrangements as predictors of effective performance and actual performance results. Organizational arrangements were analyzed as twelve clusters known before performance and could be known before funding, with each of nineteen post performance measures to see if they were associated with one another. Multiple regression was used to test the nineteen statistical hypotheses. Significance was determined by using the F ratio at .05 with appropriate degrees of freedom. Testing the hypotheses enabled answering the first research question: Can the organizational arrangements selected by experts predict performance?

The results of the multiple regression analyses revealed the following:

1. The clusters or organizational arrangements are significantly associated with measures of performance in the sectors of Perceived success of service, Cost of service, and Supporters of service. The clusters of organizational arrangements are not significantly associated with measures of performance in the sectors of Quantity of service provided, Quantity of service received, and Supervision of service.
2. Some subsets of the clusters of organizational arrangements are significantly associated with some of the performance measures, but not all twelve clusters of the organizational arrangements are significantly associated with any one of the performance measures.
3. The clusters of organizational arrangements found most useful in predicting the performance measures are purposes-goals-objectives and activities. Both of these clusters were found to be included in the multiple regression equations for eight of the nine performance measures showing significant associations. The cluster found least useful was controls. It contributed to predicting only four of the nine performance measures showing significant associations.
4. Where subsets of the clusters of organizational arrangements were significantly correlated with measures of performance, it was found that the subsets included clusters of arrangements representative of goal achievement, resources, and operations with the exception of the measure Cost per day. Cost per day showed significance only with clusters of organizational arrangements representing goal achievement and resources.
5. The performance measures best associated with the organizational arrangements relate to costs. Four of the nine performance measures were found to be significantly associated with ten of the twelve clusters of organizational arrangements. The four performance measures are Cost per youth, Cost per youth per day, Percent of service cost for salaries, and Percent of manpower paid by others.

The second question focused on organizational arrangements which could distinguish the performance of neighborhood organizations. Discriminate analysis was used to look for differences in the organizational variables between high and low performing neighborhood organizations. Significance was determined by using the F test for one way analysis of variance at .05 with appropriate degrees of freedom. Testing the hypothesis enabled answering the second research question. Can the organizational arrangements distinguish overall performance? The results of the analysis revealed the following:

1. Of the twelve clusters of organizational arrangements, the clusters inter-organizational, political, and controls were found to significantly distinguish between high and low overall performance.

Discussion of Findings

In Chapter IV of this study fifty organizational arrangements selected from expert consensus through a version of the Delphi procedure were presented. These fifty organizational arrangements received consensual agreement from experts that they were descriptive of the effective neighborhood organization. In Chapter V findings were presented which related clusters of the organizational arrangements to a number of statistical hypotheses to test their actual validity in explaining the successful delivery of a service to the community. This section presents a discussion and interpretation of those findings.

The statistical analyses tested certain key administrative practices as organizational arrangements identified by experts that could be known before performance against a predetermined number of possible post performance result measures. Then, the administrative practices identified by the experts were tested for their power to distinguish between a combined index of high and low effectiveness among neighborhood organizations.

Administrative Practices as
Relevant Measures for Deter-
mining Organizational Results
in Service Delivery

The results of this study revealed that administrative practices agreed upon by experts have a relationship to the performance of an organization in the delivery of a service as defined and measured in this study, and the study identified performance measures that can be explained by the administrative practices. By administrative practices we mean the consistent methods used by neighborhood organizations in the operation of the organization and its programs, i.e., the manpower of the organization includes community residents; program determination is made by residents; the organization maintains external relationships with other organizations. Significant relationships were found between nine of the ten measures in the performance sectors of Perceived success of service, Cost of service, and Supporters of service. No significant relationships were found between the experts recommended practices as a set and any of the

measures in the performance sectors of Quantity of service provided, Quantity of service received, and Supervision of service.

A discussion of the ways of looking at performance and the administrative practices associated with performance follows.

Perceived success of service.--This performance sector contained two indicators which were to provide an indication of success as perceived by a subjective observer, the organization's program director, and an objective observer, the funding agent's program monitor. Those organizations where the directors rated the organizations' services as successful were considered to have a high service rating for this indicator. Those organizations where the monitors rated the organizations' services as successful were also considered to have a high service rating for this indicator. The measure rating by director showed no significant correlation with the administrative practices. The measure rating by monitor showed a significant correlation with administrative practices for purposes-goals-objectives and programs in goal achievement; administrative practices in use of resources for board and staff, community relationships and relationships with other organizations; and administrative practices in activities for daily operations. This measure was found to be significantly dependent upon visible overt practices which

involve neighborhood people as board and staff members, participation in organizational activities and program definition, and less dependent upon covert administrative practices which provide for organizational relationships with other neighborhood organizations and written statements on clarity of the organization's purposes. This indicates that highly visible practices which project community involvement in the organization will tend to lead outsiders to judge programs as successful. Administrative practices which are not readily observed are less important in perceptions of success by outside observers.

Quantity of service provided.--Program days and program hours provided by the organization were used as the measure of service offered and was considered to be indicative of the amount of service available to the community. Neither of the measures program days nor program hours showed a significant correlation with the administrative practices as a set. It was expected that administrative practices for use of resources and daily operations would be associated with performance in this sector. This was based on the idea that program service is influenced by the organization's resources and operations. High scores on the resources and operations variables would lead organizations to provide more service to the community. Yet, this was not found. It would still seem logical that the quantity of service provided by an organization would be largely

influenced by an organization's resources and operations, but the elements of program days and hours as used in this study are inadequate measures of performance to be explained by the administrative practices examined in this study. The similarities of the programs provided, and the summer time constraint did not provide for much variation among programs on these two measures--they were short-run programs.

Quantity of service received.--This sector was comprised of five measures showing an indication of the amount of service received by participants. High values on the measures were relative to a high service performance for the organization. None of the performance measures in this sector showed a significant relationship with the administrative practices as a set. This was not expected. It was expected that the extent to which organizations showed a high amount of service received by youth would be associated with high ratings on organizational arrangements for goal achievement and use of resources. This was thought to be because, the performance measures counted the extent to which youth participated in the program. Specifically, the measure--percent utilization of program--measured the amount of youth participation achieved from the amount expected. Also, it seemed reasonable to assume that resource organizational arrangements which called for community participation in the structure of the organization

would be associated with the quantity of service received since the more involvement of the community in the planning and delivery of the service the more widespread would be the awareness of the program and the relevance for youth participation. While this study did not show a relationship between organizational arrangements and utilization of the organization's programs, it may be that the extent to which an organization's program is used by the community is, in fact, dependent upon appropriate internal arrangements for planning and community participation in that planning but not as defined and measured in this study.

Cost of service.--The measures in this sector of performance were indicators of the organization's use of available resources. Lower unit costs indicated a greater potential for providing more service to the community without overtaxing its resources. The measures cost per youth, cost per day, cost per youth per day, percent of grant for salaries, and percent of total service cost for salaries showed significant correlations with sets of the administrative practices. The measure cost per youth best describe the relationship between service costs and administrative practices. Low costs can be expected where community resources for manpower are used for board members, staff, volunteers, for program definition, and organizational relationships are established with people and other organizations in the community. High costs can be expected where

explicit and well-defined purposes are important, often paid leaders are employed, and where funds are available from multiple sources.

The significant correlations in this sector of performance are consistent with the literature when funds available to the organization are considered as resources. An organization must adapt its resources to the environment for effective performance. Resources are used to define goals and operations, and modified as required for short terms. Seashore and Yuchtman (1967) showed that maintenance and production cost aspects of performance have to be adapted to organizational life in response to environmental demands and opportunities.

Supporters of service.--This performance sector contained three indices which looked at the sources of support for the manpower involved in service delivery. A high manpower percent among sources of support indicated a high potential for success. This was an indication of the extent to which organizations and people were willing to support the provision of the program in the community. Each of the measures showed a significant correlation with administrative practices. The measure percent of manpower paid by other sources best describe the relationship between supporters of service and the administrative practices.

Organizations with high proportions of their manpower paid by other sources tend to show ability to gain multiple

sources for funds have strong external relationships with other organizations and political representatives and are strong in the documentation of their services. Internal practices for community orientation appear to be of lesser importance to the process of obtaining funds.

Supervision of service.--This sector contained one indicator, ratio of youth to worker. A low youth to worker ratio was indicative of a high potential for success. This measure showed no significant relationship with the administrative practices. While no significant relationship was found, ratio of youth to worker may be a valid indicator of performance, but the administrative practices identified in this study are not suited for explaining such performance. It may be that this measure is more appropriate for explaining outcomes in a qualitative manner.

Discriminating Value of Administrative Practices

Administrative practices for inter-organizational and political relationships in use of resources and practices for controls in daily operations were found to distinguish high performing from low performing neighborhood organizations. The first areas--inter-organizational and political relationships--are characteristic of the management of the organization's resources. Those organizations which are more "outwardly oriented" are more likely to be successful in the delivery of a service to its community.

Outwardly oriented activity consisted of an organization having relationships with community councils and associations, other neighborhood organizations, and contacts with municipal agencies, i.e., mayor's office, city hall, police precincts, and agencies handling funds and information on sources of funds. The second area--controls--consists of characteristics of the management of the organization's operations. Where organizations use more controls in documenting their operations, i.e., services, financial data, policies, the more successfully the organization performs. This is also linked with the organization's open vote by members on policies, dissemination of organizational reports and organizational evaluations. This suggests that overall the distinctive elements of success among neighborhood organizations are external relationships with relevant organizations and documentation and dissemination of the organization's policies and services. While the other administrative practices were not found to be significantly correlated with measures of success in short-run programs such as these, they obviously cannot go unattended in the long-run for they too are necessary as judged by experts and each may add a small degree to the probability of success.

Conclusions

As was indicated in the Review of the Literature, Chapter II, there is evidence to support the convergence

of the goal model and the system resource model to determining organizational effectiveness rather than the use of one model alone. This study concurs with converging concepts from both models. In fact, all of the performance indices which were found to correlate significantly with sets of the administrative practices showed a relationship to one or more of the practices for goal achievement, use of resources, and daily operations, with the exception of cost per day in the performance sector cost of service. This measure only showed significance with administrative practices for goal achievement and use of resources. Yet, this is still consistent with the multi-dimensional aspect to understanding organizational effectiveness, in that no single approach can be used to explain effectiveness, but rather, a comprehensive analysis of various aspects of the organization must be taken into account. Therefore, it makes more sense to look at both models for a fuller understanding of organizational effectiveness among neighborhood organizations.

Based upon the findings of the study and the answers to the research questions the following conclusions can be drawn.

1. Characteristics of effective neighborhood organizations can be identified and measured.
2. A neighborhood organization's performance is related to its administrative practices.
3. Administrative practices defined in this study can explain and can distinguish high and low effectiveness among neighborhood organizations.

Based upon the above conclusions some implications can be suggested for both practice in the fields of social welfare and adult education and further research.

Implications for practice.--As was stated in Chapter I, the major purposes for considering the characteristics of effective neighborhood organizations were:

- (1) To provide information on organizational effectiveness among small scale citizen-based organizations.
- (2) To provide information that will identify the effective neighborhood organization prior to performance and that can be used for rational decision-making to assist in the allocation of scarce resources.

Knowing that an association between a neighborhood organization's administrative practices and performance exist should lead those who allocate funds for social welfare to select neighborhood organizations for funding not merely on subjective opinions, protest strategies, community participation and the like but in conjunction with objective administrative practices used in the operations of the organization.

More importantly, funding agencies should be as clear as possible of what they want to look at in terms of effectiveness. As shown in this study, depending upon what you define as effectiveness you look at differing sets of administrative practices. Where it is important that a program is perceived as successful, funders should look for

organizations which have neighborhood members on their board, have neighborhood members as staff, involve neighborhood members in the planning, development, and implementation of organizational activities. Where it is important to minimize cost and maximize service delivery, funders should look for organizations that use community resources for their manpower, i.e., board members, staff and volunteers, and have working relationships with other organizations in the neighborhood. Where it is important that organizations are able to obtain additional funding, funders should look for organizations which have external relationships with other neighborhood organizations, municipal agencies, political representatives, and exercise control of their organization through documentation of their policies and services. Where it is important that all three of the above performances are achieved to some degree funders should look for organizations with external relationships, and that document, disseminate, and evaluate their policies and services.

Likewise adult educators should encourage and facilitate the development of neighborhood organizations along lines which will promote their use of the administrative practices identified.

Implications for further research.--The results of this study revealed that no significant relationship existed between the complete set of experts assessment of essential

characteristics and performance as defined and measured in this study. However, subsets of the characteristics did show significant relationships with some performance measures, and discriminating ability among high and low performance. These findings have the following implications for further research. All of the characteristics may indeed be representative of effective neighborhood organizations but have little relationship to some of the performance indicators as defined and measured in this study. Future research should seek other indices of performance for testing actual validity of the experts organizational arrangements as indicators of effectiveness.

Before the organizational arrangements are tested against other performance measures it may be necessary to increase the objectivity in applying the criteria to the organizations. This may be accomplished by use of a panel for judgment. This procedure may provide for greater degrees of variations among organizations in their administrative arrangements.

The study that was done here deserves replication--replication--with a larger sample size of organizations carrying on short-run programs such as these and of organizations conducting longer-run programs similar enough to each other with regard to services provided so as to make possible objective comparison of performance in relation to the organizational arrangements deemed by experts to be essential.

Attention should be called to the possibility that the limited dispersion of the performance data may have accounted for the failure to show significant relationships between some of the clusters of organizational arrangements deemed important to organizational success by experts and performance measures, arising in part from the necessary limitation on the programs under study and in part from the small sample size. Moreover, the techniques used may not have been sensitive enough to provide a wider spread of data within the sample used for study. Any replication should, therefore, involve a larger sample and an increased refinement of the performance measures rather than an outright elimination of the measures based on the results of this study.

A review of the significant correlations on pages 90-91 which show the single clusters of organizational arrangements which are the best predictors of performance measures provide for a series of hypotheses to be presented as a basis for further research.

1. Personnel of an organization perceive the organization's programs as successful when the leader of the organization is knowledgeable and committed to the organization and the neighborhood which it serves.

2. Personnel of agencies which fund neighborhood organizations perceive an organization's programs as successful when the staff of the neighborhood organization is community oriented.

3. Organizations which focus on being available long hours for service to the neighborhood focus less on using organizational resources for goal clarification.

4. Organizations with boards that are capable and representative of the neighborhood will attract more members of the neighborhood to participate in the organization's services.

5. Organizations which include representation from the neighborhood in their operations, have good relationships with the neighborhood, and utilize volunteers will attract more members of the neighborhood to participate in the organization's services which results in lower unit costs of services.

6. Organizations having a single source of funding have clear and specific purposes.

7. Organizations having multiple sources of funding have broad and unspecified purposes.

8. Organizations which obtain multiple funding sources deploy their resources toward outwardly activities, i.e., building relationships with political representatives and other organizations and use few resources for inwardly focusing on goal clarification.

9. Organizations dependent on multiple funding sources lose self-directness, while organizations with single funding sources tend to be self-directed and clear about their goals.

10. Volunteers serve in organizations which are clear and explicit about their goals and have few political contacts.

11. Organizations increase their operational controls by letting volunteers assist in the recording and documentation of the services provided.

Though there are many aspects of organizational effectiveness that could not be captured in the current research instruments and methodology, still the procedures did show differences in administrative practices and performance among neighborhood organizations. More trial and refinement of instruments and procedures should make it possible to identify even more consistent and explicit differences in characteristics and performance.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DELPHI INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX A

DELPHI INSTRUMENTS

June 2, 1977

Dear

United Community Services is presently engaged in research efforts to develop guidelines for assessing the potentials of neighborhood organizations for providing services. The aim of the research project is to develop a base of information which would serve as likely indicators of success for neighborhood organizations. If satisfactory guidelines can be determined, the information will be helpful to UCS in long-range planning.

You have been recommended as a person with knowledge and expertise in the area of organizational effectiveness and/or neighborhood organizations. We are asking you to participate in a version of the Delphi Approach to assist us in this policy analysis.

Our study is to be confined to those organizations which are legally constituted, autonomous, self-initiated groups or those initiated by a sponsoring organization, serving a neighborhood (beyond a single block) and engaging in several program areas. We do not wish to include in the study single-purpose block clubs, important as they may be to their neighborhoods.

The groups to be looked at are more commonly defined as voluntary associations or local neighborhood groups which are task oriented, who operate in the neighborhood, at grass-roots level, and whose prime objective is to improve the general welfare of the neighborhood. While these organizations are not very formalized in operations, they:

- (1) are state incorporated, with constitutions and by-laws, (2) possess a 501(c)3 Federal Tax-exempt status of a non-profit operation, and
- (3) operate in the field of social welfare or human services.

June 2, 1977

Page 2

We will be submitting to you a series of two questionnaires to determine through consensus, those elements judged to be crucial for the success of these organizations. We look forward to your participation in assisting us in this endeavor.

Thanking you in advance,

Forestina Warren
Research Associate

S. Sidney Newhouse
Associate Executive - Research

FW:dm

INSTRUCTIONS

The Delphi Approach is cumulative. The first round is largely exploratory and designed to open up new areas of thought. In the second round the areas of interest will be narrowed. On both rounds the reasoning of participants will be fed back to all respondents for their appraisal and information.

You may respond to any particular question, sub-question or alternatives presented in the following manner:

You may choose not to answer a question if you feel your judgement would be risky, or if you do not feel sufficiently knowledgeable.

You may choose to rewrite a particular question and answer your version if you feel the original is misleading.

You may suggest questions you would like to see in the next questionnaire if you feel they would clarify an issue or raise a new alternative that the group should consider.

You may express short arguments or comments on any judgement about which you feel confident.

When a consensus is obtained on an item it will be dropped from further exploration on the second questionnaire. If a polarization of views occurs, we will attempt to develop questions to highlight and hopefully resolve different perspectives and viewpoints.

Specific Instructions:

1. You have been provided two copies of the Delphi questionnaire. Return only one; the other you may keep for reference in responding to the second questionnaire.
2. Please return your response within three to five days after the questionnaire reaches you so that tabulations may begin for construction of the second questionnaire.
3. Enclosed is a stamped and addressed envelope for your return.
4. The second round questionnaire and a summary from the first questionnaire will be provided within a week after all responses from the first questionnaire have been received.
5. Do not hesitate to call the UCS Research Department if you have any questions on the instructions or the questionnaire. We may be reached on the following numbers: Forestina Warren (313) 833-0622, Ext. 48, and S. Sidney Newhouse, Ext. 49.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Organizational Characteristics

The attached questionnaire refers to information about the goals, resources and operations of an organization. Many of the items may or may not be crucial elements for the success of neighborhood organizations. We are asking you to respond to each item with an expression of your judgement as to the applicability of each item in assessing the potentials of neighborhood organizations.

WHAT WE ARE INTERESTED IN ARE THOSE FEATURES OF THE ORGANIZATION THAT ARE LIKELY TO GUARANTEE ITS SUCCESS.

Following is an explanation of the rating scale for judging each item:

Importance
(For organization's success)

Very Important - A most relevant point
First order priority
Has direct bearing on major issues

Important - Is relevant to the issue
Second order priority
Significant impact but not until other items are treated
Ought to be kept in mind

Slightly Important - Less relevant
Third order priority
Has little importance
Not a determining factor to major issue

Unimportant - No relevance
No priority
No measurable effect
Should be dropped as an item to consider

Return to:

Forestina Warren
Research Department
United Community Services of
Metropolitan Detroit
51 W. Warren Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48201

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

<u>Goal Achievement</u>	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
A. Purposes, goals, objectives:					
1. Well-defined statements of purposes and objectives.	()	()	()	()	
2. Evidence that purposes and objectives are congruent with community needs.	()	()	()	()	
3. Organizational objectives stated in quantifiable terms.	()	()	()	()	
4. Evidence of a periodic review of organization's objectives with adjustments and modifications as required.	()	()	()	()	
5. Evidence of long-range plans.	()	()	()	()	
6. Identification of the organization with a specific geographic area.	()	()	()	()	
7. Other (please specify)					
_____	()	()	()	()	
_____	()	()	()	()	
B. Programs:					
1. Objectives manifested in the programs of the organization.	()	()	()	()	
2. Programs determined by residents.	()	()	()	()	
3. Programs determined by a broad constituency.	()	()	()	()	
4. Short-range projects.	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
B. Programs (continued):					
5. Programs which provide immediate assistance to residents.	()	()	()	()	
6. Programs with high quantity outputs.	()	()	()	()	
7. Programs which are cost efficient.	()	()	()	()	
8. Programs with quality outputs.	()	()	()	()	
9. Other (please specify)					
_____	()	()	()	()	

Resources

A. Manpower:

Board members or steering group:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Elected to office by the membership. | () | () | () | () |
| 2. Appointed to office by a board. | () | () | () | () |
| 3. Selected from the "broader" community. | () | () | () | () |
| 4. Include representation of persons from the membership of the organization. (The members would include those persons who pay dues or clients.) | () | () | () | () |
| 5. Include representation of persons from the neighborhood. | () | () | () | () |

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
A. Manpower (continued):					
Board members or steering group:					
6. Include representation of persons from the business and corporate community.	()	()	()	()	
7. Include representation of persons with knowledge of the programs provided by the organization.	()	()	()	()	
Leader (president, chairperson, etc.):					
8. Trained in the area of the organization's program.	()	()	()	()	
9. Educational and experience background adequate to carry out the programs of the organization.	()	()	()	()	
10. Practical knowledge of the neighborhood in which the organization operates.	()	()	()	()	
11. Knowledge of the organization's impact in the neighborhood.	()	()	()	()	
Staff and Volunteers:					
12. Representative of persons served by the organization.	()	()	()	()	
13. Trained in the area of the organization's program.	()	()	()	()	
14. Educational and experience background adequate to carry out the programs of the organization.	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
A. Manpower (continued):					
Staff and Volunteers:					
15. Volunteers from neighborhood.	()	()	()	()	
16. Volunteers from the "broader" community.	()	()	()	()	
17. Professional volunteers from a variety of backgrounds (accountants, lawyers, educators, social workers, etc.).	()	()	()	()	
18. Other (please specify)					
_____	()	()	()	()	

B. Organizational Relationships:					
Community:					
1. Meetings open to neighborhood residents.	()	()	()	()	
2. Publication of organization's purposes, programs and achievements to neighborhood residents.	()	()	()	()	
3. Interpretation of organization's purposes, programs and achievements to neighborhood residents.	()	()	()	()	
Inter-organizational:					
4. Affiliation with a national organization in the area of the organization's program(s).	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks _____
B. Organizational Relationships (continued):					
Inter-organizational:					
5. Working relationships with other neighborhood organizations similar in program emphasis.	()	()	()	()	
6. Joint programs with similar operations.	()	()	()	()	
7. Participation in community associations or councils.	()	()	()	()	
8. Affiliation with another organization for base level funding.	()	()	()	()	
9. Association with another organization for technical assistance.	()	()	()	()	
Political:					
10. Contacts with political representatives on committees which relate to the organization's programs.	()	()	()	()	
11. Other (please specify)					
_____	()	()	()	()	

C. Funding:					
1. Membership fees.	()	()	()	()	
2. Grants from foundations, government, community councils, etc.	()	()	()	()	
3. Neighborhood based fund-raising activities.	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
C. Funding (continued):					
4. "Broader" community based fund-raising activities.	()	()	()	()	
5. Donations from individuals and/or groups.	()	()	()	()	
6. Other (please specify)					
_____	()	()	()	()	

<u>Operations</u>					
A. Controls:					
1. Evidence of adequate book-keeping.	()	()	()	()	
2. Evidence of operating on an annual budget.	()	()	()	()	
3. Audit of financial records.	()	()	()	()	
4. A required number of board meetings annually.	()	()	()	()	
5. Policies and issues voted on by group's members.	()	()	()	()	
6. Policies and issues voted on by small executive committee.	()	()	()	()	
7. Well defined statements of policies.	()	()	()	()	
8. The number and type of committees consistent with the organization's purposes, goals, and programs.	()	()	()	()	
9. Records of services provided.	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Remarks

A. Controls (continued):

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 10. Records of persons served. | () | () | () | () |
| 11. Evidence that records kept
are used to modify and
strengthen organization's
program. | () | () | () | () |
| 12. Reports which portray the
operating results of the
organization and its pro-
grams. | () | () | () | () |
| 13. Other (please specify) | | | | |
| _____ | () | () | () | () |
| _____ | | | | |

B. Activities:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Evidence of active recruit-
ment of members. | () | () | () | () |
| 2. Assessment of community needs. | () | () | () | () |
| 3. Information source for resi-
dents on matters which affect
the neighborhood. | () | () | () | () |
| 4. Facility open for use by the
community. | () | () | () | () |
| 5. Other (please specify) | | | | |
| _____ | () | () | () | () |
| _____ | | | | |

What do you believe are the key attributes of successful neighborhood organizations?

What information about neighborhood organizations can be deceptive in assessing their potentials for success?

General Comments:

July 26, 1977

Dear

Thank you for participating in our Delphi survey on neighborhood organizations. Of the selected respondents we have received a return of 86%. Tabulations on these returns are now complete.

Where a consensus was obtained on an item as likely to guarantee a neighborhood organization's success it was dropped from further exploration. Also dropped from exploration were those items which lacked consensus, or which by consensus was judged unimportant. Three items are being repeated due to polarization of views. In this instance we have made attempts to incorporate differing viewpoints. Thirty-seven new items are being added for exploration.

We are submitting to you at this time the following for your information only:

1. A summary table of the results from the first-round survey.
2. A copy of the first round survey designating items receiving consensus and items deleted for lack of consensus.
3. A listing of the remarks to the two open-ended questions about neighborhood organizations.

WE ARE ALSO ENCLOSING FOR YOUR RESPONSE A COPY OF THE SECOND ROUND SURVEY, WHICH IS BLUE.

Two copies of the second round Delphi questionnaire are being provided to you. Return only one; the other you may keep for reference.

Please return your response within three to five days after the questionnaire reaches you so that tabulations may begin for construction of the final report. Enclosed is a stamped and addressed envelope for your return.

The final report will be provided within two weeks after all responses from the second round questionnaire have been received.

July 26, 1977

Page 2

If you have any questions please call the UCS Research Department. We may be reached on the following numbers: Forestina Warren (313) 833-0622, Ext. 48 and S. Sidney Newhouse, Ext. 49.

Thank you for participating in this policy issue with us.

Sincerely yours,

Forestina Warren
Research Associate

S. Sidney Newhouse
Associate Executive - Research

FW:dm

Encl.

Questionnaire
Organizational Characteristics
(Second Round)

The study is confined to those organizations which are legally constituted, autonomous, self-initiated groups or those initiated by a sponsoring organization, serving a neighborhood (beyond a single block) and engaging in several program areas. We do not wish to include in the study single-purpose block clubs, important as they may be to their neighborhoods.

The groups to be looked at are more commonly defined as voluntary associations or local neighborhood groups which are task oriented, who operate in the neighborhood, at grass-roots level, and whose prime objective is to improve the general welfare of the neighborhood.

While these organizations are not very formalized in operations, they: (1) are state incorporated, with constitutions, and by-laws, (2) possess a 501(c)3 Federal Tax-exempt status of a non-profit operation, and (3) operate in the field of social welfare or human services.

The attached questionnaire represents items added by respondents to be considered for exploration by the group as crucial elements for the success of neighborhood organizations.

We are asking you to respond to each item with an expression of your judgement as to the applicability of each item in assessing the potentials of neighborhood organizations.

WHAT WE ARE INTERESTED IN ARE THOSE FEATURES OF THE ORGANIZATION THAT ARE LIKELY TO GUARANTEE ITS SUCCESS.

Following is an explanation of the rating scale for judging each item:

Importance
(For organization's success)

Very Important - A most relevant point
First order priority
Has direct bearing on major issues

Important - Is relevant to the issue
Second order priority
Significant impact but not until other
items are treated
Ought to be kept in mind

Slightly Important - Less relevant
Third order priority
Has little importance
Not a determining factor to major issue

Unimportant - No relevance
No priority
No measurable effect
Should be dropped as an item to consider

Return to: Forestina Warren, Research Department, United Community
Services of Metropolitan Detroit, 51 W. Warren Avenue,
Detroit, Michigan 48201

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
(Second Round)

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
<u>Goal Achievement</u>					
A. Purposes, goals, objectives:					
*6. Identification of the organization with a specific geographic area (service area and/or functional area).	()	()	()	()	
7. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to paid staff.	()	()	()	()	
8. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to volunteers who assist the organization.	()	()	()	()	
9. Member consensus as to purposes, goals and objectives.	()	()	()	()	
10. Visible goals that can attract support.	()	()	()	()	
11. Reachability of goals.	()	()	()	()	
12. Established milestones, or time period, for reaching goals and objectives.	()	()	()	()	
13. Ability to be measured.	()	()	()	()	
14. Specificity of objectives even though difficult to quantify, i.e., objectives of community cohesion, community morale.	()	()	()	()	

*Items repeated for clarification.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
(Second Round)

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
A. Purposes, goals, objectives (continued):					
15. Statements of goals and objectives, well-defined, but flexible enough to accommodate unanticipated action to be protective and reactive to community issues as they arise.	()	()	()	()	
16. Flexibility in long-range planning to accommodate unanticipated projects or programs.	()	()	()	()	
17. Leadership group which takes seriously the definition of the organization's mission and involves many factors in decision making.	()	()	()	()	
18. Leadership group which tries to differentiate the organization's role from the role of other organizations to which it may relate.	()	()	()	()	
19. Availability of resources for the implementation of organization's goals and objectives.	()	()	()	()	
20. Planning with, rather than for, community residents.	()	()	()	()	
B. Programs:					
9. Qualitative and quantitative programs that satisfy those who are to benefit.	()	()	()	()	
10. Programs vital to community development.	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
(Second Round)

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
B. Programs (continued):					
11. Programs by and for the community that meet well-defined needs rather than needs defined by others.	()	()	()	()	
12. Programs with physical (visible) results.	()	()	()	()	
<u>Resources</u>					
A. Manpower:					
*6. The Board includes representation of persons from the business and corporate community whether residents of the community or outside the community.	()	()	()	()	
18. Board members who are professionals from a variety of backgrounds who reside within or outside the community.	()	()	()	()	
19. A president or chairperson with knowledge of the organization and its programs with chair-type skills.	()	()	()	()	
20. A president or chairperson willing and able to learn, with commitment to the organization and its programs.	()	()	()	()	
21. Staff with technical competencies.	()	()	()	()	
22. Staff who identify with persons served.	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
(Second Round)

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
A. Manpower (continued):					
23. Staff able to relate to persons served.	()	()	()	()	
24. Professional volunteers as consultants from a variety of educational backgrounds.	()	()	()	()	
B. Organizational Relationships:					
*6. Joint programs with similar organizations.	()	()	()	()	
10. Coordination of programs and services with other organizations in the area.	()	()	()	()	
C. Political:					
11. Contacts with mayor's office, city council, neighborhood city hall, police precincts.	()	()	()	()	
12. Contacts with agencies handling revenue sharing funds, other financial grants, or sources of funds.	()	()	()	()	
13. Awareness of policies and projections regarding service trends and emphasis.	()	()	()	()	
D. Funding:					
6. "Broader" community based fund-raising activities which do not result in loss of local autonomy.	()	()	()	()	
7. Donations from individuals and groups committed to the organization's interest without strings attached.	()	()	()	()	

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
(Second Round)

	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Un- important	Remarks
D. Funding (continued):					
8. Incorporation into existing federal, state, or local projects.	()	()	()	()	
9. Funding from religious organizations or religious foundations.	()	()	()	()	
<u>Operations</u>					
A. Controls:					
13. Rotation of board members (a method for turnover among board members).	()	()	()	()	
14. Semi-annual and/or annual evaluations.	()	()	()	()	
15. External audit of financial records.	()	()	()	()	
16. Independent monitoring of the organization's programs and operations by a non-affiliated group.	()	()	()	()	

APPENDIX B

DELPHI PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX B

DELPHI PARTICIPANTS

Mr. William Hawkins
Director
Professional Skills Alliance
16500 John C. Lodge
Detroit, Michigan 48221

Mr. Paul Hubbard
Director
Self-Determination Groups
New Detroit, Inc.
719 Griswold Room 1010
Detroit, Michigan 48201

Mr. Thomas Stewart
Executive Director
Franklin Wright Settlements, Inc.
3360 Charlevoix
Detroit, Michigan 48207

Geneva Williams
United Community Services -
Detroit Division
51 W. Warren
Detroit, Michigan 48201

Professor John E. Tropman, Ph.D.
School of Social Work
University of Michigan
2545 Frieze Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Stanley Seashore, Ph.D.
Institute of Social Research
Room 2240
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Mr. Charles Eising
Director for Corporate Resources
YMCA of Metro Detroit
2020 Witherell
Detroit, Michigan

Ms. Barbara Mays
Director
Black Applied Resources Center
Suite 616
10 Peterboro
Detroit, Michigan 48201

Mr. William Finn
Executive Director
Family and Neighborhood Services
of Wayne
24365 Van Born Road
Taylor, Michigan 48180

Prof. Richard H. Price, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan
580 Union
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Mr. James L. Cox
Director
People's Community Services
412 W. Grand Blvd.
Detroit, Michigan 48216

Mr. Walter R. Tarpley
Director
United Community Council
137 E. State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Fred Cox, Ph.D.
 Director
 School of Social Work
 Michigan State University
 Baker Hall
 East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Mr. Orian Worden, Ph.D.
 Neighborhood Service Organization
 51 W. Warren
 Detroit, Michigan 48201

Mr. Kenneth Strazalka
 United Community Services -
 Wayne Division
 24321 Van Born Road
 Taylor, Michigan 48180

Professor Harold Johnson
 Co-Director
 Institute of Gerontology
 University of Michigan
 520 E. Liberty
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Mr. William Mills
 Director of Professional Development
 Education
 Office of Continuing Education
 University of Detroit
 4001 W. McNichols
 Detroit, Michigan

Mr. James F. Coughlin
 Director
 Catholic Youth Organization
 305 Michigan Avenue
 Detroit, Michigan 48226

Mr. Donald Roberts
 Executive Director
 Neighborhood Service Organization
 51 W. Warren
 Detroit, Michigan 48201

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

Detroit

A Family is Waiting
Operation Getdown
Northwestern/Goldberg Community Improvement Association
Jefferson-Chalmers Adults for Youth Association
Latino Mental Health Outreach Program
Concerned Citizens of Franklin-Wright
Chalfonte Community Council
Dav-Joy-Lin-Dex Community Council
Herman Gardens Community Council
Inner-City Sub Center
Virginia Park Citizens District Council
Project Child
Hubbard Richard Community Council
Cass Corridor Youth Advocates, Inc.
Detroit American Indian Center
Casa Maria
Fountain Court Cooperative - Consumer Housing
Ren Outreach Center
Moore Community Council

Wayne County - Excluding the City of Detroit

Growth Works Inc.
Children's Center for Social Change
Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services
Malcolm X Cultural Center

Oakland County

Community Advisory Council
Positive Options/Alternative Programs, Inc.
Gateway Crisis Center
Jefferson Community Advisory Council

Macomb County

Anchor Bay Community Council

APPENDIX D

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS FOR INTERVIEW AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

APPENDIX D

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS FOR INTERVIEW AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Interview Schedule

Date of Interview: _____

Time: _____

Section I: Background Information

Name of Organization: _____

Name of Summer Program: _____

Address: _____

Name of Interviewee: _____

Position of Interviewee: _____

1. When was _____ started _____ ?
(name of organization) (year)

2. Was the organization initiated by a group of citizens or another organization?

Group of citizens _____

Another organization (specify which one(s)) _____

3. Are you a branch or division of a larger organization? __No __Yes

If yes--When was your branch set up? _____
(year)

4. Does the organization have certain geographic areas to operate within or does it operate throughout the city?

Geographic area (specify boundaries)

North _____

South _____

East _____

West _____

Other _____

Throughout the city _____

5. Is the organization an independent organization, a sub-unit of a sponsoring organization, or a federation of groups?

Independent _____

Sub-unit of sponsoring organization (specify) _____

Federation of groups (specify) _____

- a. Is the organization a part of any coalition?

No _____

Yes _____ (specify) _____

6. Does the organization have a 501(C)3 tax exempt status? ___No ___Yes

When was it obtained? _____

(year)

- a. (If no), do you operate under some other organization's 501(C)3?

___No ___Yes (if yes) specify organization? _____

7. How many heads of the organization (i.e., presidents, chairpersons) have held office since the organization was started, or within the last 5 years?

Since the organization started _____

Within the last five years _____

8. What type of organization do you call _____?
(name of organization)

A. Clubs/Associations

1. _____ Block
2. _____ Civic (service)
3. _____ Social
4. _____ Special Interest
(specify interest) _____
5. _____ Other (specify) _____

B. Council

1. _____ Church
2. _____ Community
3. _____ Agencies/Organizations
4. _____ Other

C. Community Center

1. _____ Recreation
2. _____ Social Services
3. _____ Multi-Service
4. _____ Other (specify) _____

D. _____ Church

E. _____ Self-Help organization/association for community
development and/or improvement

F. _____ Other (specify) _____

9. Which years were you funded for the UCS supported summer program?
(Check all that apply)

1965 _____
1966 _____
1967 _____
1968 _____
1969 _____
1970 _____
1971 _____

1972 _____
1973 _____
1974 _____
1975 _____
1976 _____
1977 _____

Section II: Organizational Goals, Purposes, Objectives, and Programs

9. I would like to ask you about some goals for your organization and how you see the program of the organization relating to these goals. Of the goals listed on this card (hand respondent white card), which is most important to this organization? Check column A below). Which would be the next important one? Check column B below). The least important? Check column C below).

 A B C All Important

Income security and economic opportunity

Provision of basic material needs

Health

Opportunity for the acquisition of
knowledge and skills

Environmental quality

Individual and collective safety

Social functioning

Assurance of the support and effec-
tiveness of services, through
organized action

10. More specifically, how would you state the main purpose of _____?
(name of the organization)

Main purpose:

- A. Are there other purposes? No Yes (specify) _____

11. What kinds of programs and services have been developed in order to carry out the purposes of the organization? _____

12. How are your programs determined?

By residents _____

By broader constituency _____

Other factors (specify) _____

13. Besides programs and services related to the specific purposes of the organization, has the organization done anything else during the past year because of other issues and problems that came up in the community? ___No ___Yes

What type of things has the organization done, and what was the reason for doing them? _____

14. Have there been any major changes in the purposes of the organization over the years? ___No ___Yes (specify) _____

- a. What about changes in terms of programs and activities?

15. What type of things have interfered most with the organization accomplishing its goals and objectives? _____

- a. Generally, is the organization very successful, successful, moderately successful, or not very successful in accomplishing its goal(s) and objectives?

very successful _____ moderately successful _____

successful _____ not very successful _____

16. How is your organization's role and services different from other organizations within this community? _____

17. What do you see this organization doing 5 years from now?

Section III: Resources

A. Manpower

Board or Steering Group:

1. Does the organization have a board of directors, advisory board or another type of governing body?

Has a governing body _____

Does not have a governing body _____

2. How many members does it have? _____

3. How are they selected? _____ Elected by membership

_____ Appointed by a board

_____ Other (specify) _____

4. How many are males? _____

5. What are the occupations of your board members?

- a. Are any of the board members lawyers, accountants, educators, social workers, corporate executives, bank officials?

6. How many of your board members would be representative of the membership of the organization, that is those persons who pay dues or clients and recipients of your services? _____

7. How many of your board members have training and experience in the programs provided by the organization? _____

8. Residence of board members: How many of your board members live:
- in the neighborhood, that is within the geographic boundaries of your service area? _____
 - outside the neighborhood but within the city? _____
 - outside the city? _____
9. How are your board members recruited? _____
-
10. How often does your board meet?
- | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|
| Weekly | _____ | Semi-annually | _____ |
| 2-3 times a month | _____ | Yearly | _____ |
| Monthly | _____ | Only on special occasions | _____ |
| Quarterly | _____ | Other (specify) | _____ |
11. About how many attend these meetings? Would you say all, most, about half, less than half, or only a few?
- | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
| All (100%) | _____ | Less than half (16-39%) | _____ |
| Most (70-99%) | _____ | Only a few (1-15%) | _____ |
| About half (40-69%) | _____ | | |
12. Generally what is the average length of time these board members have been with the organization? Would you say it's less than a year, 1-2 years, 3-4 years, 5-6 years, more than 6 years?
- | | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Less than a year | _____ |
| 1-2 years | _____ |
| 3-4 years | _____ |
| 5-6 years | _____ |
| More than 6 years | _____ |
13. Do you have a method for turnover among board members, such as a limited number of years in which they may serve?
- No___ Yes___ (explain) _____
-

Staff:

- Does the organization have paid staff members? ___No ___Yes
 - Are the paid staff members full-time or part-time?
- | | | | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Full-time | _____ | Part-time | _____ |
|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|
- How many are full-time? _____

4. How many are part-time? _____
5. How many of the paid staff members are male? _____
6. Generally in what area(s) do the paid staff have training and experience?
7. What is the average length of time the paid staff have been with the organization?

Less than one year _____

1-2 years _____

3-4 years _____

5-6 years _____

More than 6 years _____

8. What is the experience and training of the Director of your UCS supported Summer Program?

9. How many of your paid staff members live:

a. in the neighborhood (within the service area)? _____

b. outside the neighborhood but within the city? _____

c. outside the city? _____

Volunteers:

1. Does the organization have volunteers other than board members?
___ No ___ Yes
2. How many volunteers does the organization have excluding board members? _____
3. How many are males? _____
4. Generally in what area(s) do the volunteers have training and experience?

5. What is the average length of time the majority of the volunteers have been with the organization?

Less than 1 year _____

1-2 years _____

3-4 years _____

5-6 years _____

More than 6 years _____

6. In general what do the volunteers do? _____

7. How many of the volunteers live:

a. in the neighborhood (service area) _____

b. outside the neighborhood but within the city _____

c. outside the city _____

8. On the average how much time do they contribute to the organization? Would you say they contribute several hours a day, a couple of days a week, a couple of days a month, or mostly during special occasions?

Several hours a day _____

A couple days a week _____

A couple days a month _____

Special occasions _____

Other (specify) _____

9. In general what would you say the organizational commitment is among board members, paid staff, and volunteers? Would you say it is very high, high, could be better, low?

	<u>Board members</u>	<u>Paid Staff</u>	<u>Volunteers</u>
Very high	_____	_____	_____
High	_____	_____	_____
Could be better	_____	_____	_____
Low	_____	_____	_____

B. Organizational Relationships:

Community:

1. Are any of your organizational meetings open to neighborhood residents? ☐ No ☐ Yes (specify) _____

2. Do you publicize your purposes, programs and achievements to the neighborhood? ☐ No ☐ Yes (if yes, how is this done?)

Inter-Organizational:

1. Are you affiliated with a national organization? ☐ No ☐ Yes (specify which one(s)) _____

 2. Do you work closely with any local neighborhood organizations?
☐ No ☐ Yes (specify which ones) _____

 3. Have you had any joint programs with other organizations?
☐ No ☐ Yes (specify the organization and the joint program)
- | <u>Organization</u> | <u>Joint Program</u> |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| a. | |
| b. | |
| c. | |
| d. | |
4. Is your organization a participant in any community associations or community councils? ☐ No ☐ Yes (specify) _____

5. Have you received any assistance for the development of your organization or the programs provided by your organization from any of the following organizations listed on the white card?
Hand respondent white card.

Professional Skills Alliance (PSA)
Black Applied Resources Center (BARC)
New Detroit, Inc.
Area Service Association
Brightmoor Community Center
Catholic Youth Organization
Family and Neighborhood Services of Wayne County
Franklin-Wright Settlements
International Institute
LASED
Neighborhood Service Organization
People's Community Services
St. Peter Claver Community House
YMCA - Metropolitan Detroit
YWCA - Metropolitan Detroit

- a. What was the nature of the assistance you received? (record under the organization identified above.

Political:

1. Do any board members or staff have contacts with any persons in the following offices or positions?

Mayor's office _____
City Council _____
Neighborhood City Hall _____
Police Precinct _____
Political representatives on committees which relate to the organization's programs _____

C. Funding

1. Does the organization have any joining or membership fees?

___ No ___ Yes (specify) _____
(amount) (year)

2. Does the organization have sources of income other than dues or membership fees? ___ No ___ Yes

3. What are the sources and the type? (Check all that apply)

a. About what percent of the budget do these sources contribute?

<u>Source</u>	<u>% Contribute</u>	<u>Type</u>
Public: Federal	_____	_____
State	_____	_____
Local	_____	_____
Contributions from foundations	_____	_____
Fund drives	_____	_____
Donations: Individual	_____	_____
Group	_____	_____
Income from investments	_____	_____
Proceeds from sales	_____	_____
Neighborhood based fund raising activities	_____	_____
Broader community based fund raising activities	_____	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

4. Have there been any changes in the organization's major source of funding over the years? ___ No ___ Yes (specify) _____

Section IV: Operations

A. Controls:

1. Who keeps the organization's books (I mean who does the bookkeeping)?

2. What are their qualifications? That is what are their preparations and training? _____

3. Do you plan an annual budget from which you operate? ☐ No ☐ Yes

4. Do you have an audit of your financial record? ☐ No ☐ Yes

How often are your financial records audited? _____

Who performs the financial audit? ☐ Internal ☐ External
(specify who) _____

5. How are the organization's policies determined?

Voted on by a small executive committee _____

Voted on by group members _____

Both _____

6. Do you have any standing operating committees? ☐ No ☐ Yes

(Specify the number and type of committees): Number _____

Type

7. Do you keep a record of services provided to persons or groups?

☐ No ☐ Yes

8. Do you keep a record of persons and groups served? ☐ No ☐ Yes

9. Do you evaluate the records of persons and groups served, and services provided? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If yes, proceed with next question, if no skip to question 10.

a. For what purpose(s) are the records evaluated? _____

b. How often are the records evaluated?

Daily _____

Weekly _____

Monthly _____

Quarterly _____

Semi-Annually _____

Annually _____

On special occasions _____

Other _____

10. Do you prepare an annual report of the organization's operations?
 ___ No ___ Yes

(If yes) a. Who is the report distributed to? _____

B. Activities

1. Do you have a permanent facility? ___ No ___ Yes

If no, ask the next questions, if yes skip to question 2.

a. At what location(s) do you have your meetings? _____

b. At what location do you receive your correspondence? _____

2. What is the address of your facility? _____

3. What type of facility is it?

Office Space _____
 Building _____
 Other _____

4. Do you own, rent, lease the facility or is the space donated?

Own _____
 Rent _____
 Lease _____
 Donated by _____
 Other _____

5. What hours is the facility open? _____

6. Is the facility open for use by neighborhood residents? ___ No ___ Yes

a. If yes, for what purposes? _____

7. Do you see your organization as an information source for residents on matters which affect the neighborhood or your particular constituency? ___ No ___ Yes

Section V: Constituency of Organization (Memberships and Recipients of Services)

Now I would like to ask you some questions about the organization's constituency. By constituency I mean organizational members or recipients of the organization's services.

1. Does the organization have memberships? ☐ No ☐ Yes

(a. If answer is yes proceed with question 3. If answer is no skip to question 12.)

2. How many individual members or group members belong to the organization?

Members

Number

a. Individual

b. Group

3. Are the membership fees the same (if any) for individual and group members? ☐ No ☐ Yes

a. What are the membership fees annually?

Individual members

\$ _____

Group members

\$ _____

4. Are the members mostly males, mostly females, or equally mixed?

Mostly males _____

Mostly females _____

Equally mixed _____

5. Generally, what are the age groups of members? Are most of them under 25, between 26-35, 36-45, over 45, or all ages?

Under 25 _____

Over 45 _____

26-35 yrs. _____

All ages _____

36-45 yrs. _____

6. Are the members composed of mostly one race? ☐ No ☐ Yes

a. If yes specify race and percent. _____ (race) _____ (%)

b. If not 100% of one race ask question 7.

7. What would be the races of the other members and about what percent would they comprise? (Enter % next to those specified.)

Black_____	White_____
Spanish Americans_____	American Indians_____
Latinos_____	Oriental_____
Mexican Americans_____	Other_____
Arabic_____	

8. Have there been more, less, or about the same number of members joining the organization in the past few years?

More_____

Less_____

Same_____

9. Does the membership live mainly in the local community or generally throughout the city?

Local Community_____

Throughout the city_____

10. Generally, what is your major method of recruiting members?

11. Is this the membership who elects the board of directors?

___No ___Yes (If No explain) _____

Recipients

12. How many recipients of services are served by the organization annually? Approximately.

Individual recipients_____

Group recipients_____

13. Are the recipients of your services mostly males, mostly females, equally mixed?

Mostly males_____

Mostly females_____

Equally mixed_____

14. Generally, what are the age groups of recipients? Are most of them under 25, between 26-35, 36-45, over 45, or all ages?

Under 25_____	Over 45_____
26-35 yrs._____	All ages_____
36-45 yrs._____	

15. Are the recipients of services composed mostly of one race?
___ No ___ Yes
a. If yes specify race and percent. _____ (race) _____ (%)
b. If not 100% of one race ask question 16.
16. What would be the races of the other recipients and about what percent would they comprise? (Enter % next to those specified.)
Black _____ White _____
Spanish Americans _____ American Indians _____
Latinos _____ Orientals _____
Mexican Americans _____ Other _____
Arabic _____
17. Have there been more, less, or about the same number of persons receiving services from the organization in the past few years?
More _____
Less _____
Same _____
18. Do the recipients of services live mainly in the local community or generally throughout the city?
Local community _____
Throughout the city _____
19. Generally, what is the major method of recruiting persons for services? Explain _____

20. Do any of the recipients of services have a voice in the election of the organization's board members? ___ No ___ Yes
a. If yes, specify how? _____

21. Is the organization mainly serving members, non-members, or an equal number of both?
Members _____
Non-members _____
Both _____

22. What is the primary way the organization finds out about the needs and concerns of the community? Is it mainly from members, non-members, or recipients of services?

Members _____
 Non-members _____
 Recipients of services _____

- a. How is this achieved?

Surveys: Mail _____
 Door to door _____
 Telephone _____
 Other _____
 Meetings _____
 Individual contacts _____

23. Would you estimate the average income of most of the organization's members and/or recipients of services to be under \$3,000, between \$3,001-\$5,000, \$5,001-\$7,000, \$7,001-\$9,000, or over \$9,000?

- a. Column A Members, Column B Recipients of Services (circle below)

	A	B
	Members	Recipients of Services
Under \$3,000	1	1
\$3,001-\$5,000	2	2
\$5,001-\$7,000	3	3
\$7,001-\$9,000	4	4
Over \$9,000	5	5
Not applicable	NA	-

Leader Profile

1. What is your full-time occupation? _____
 If respondent states that leading his organization is his full-time job, ask A. If respondent states that his full-time occupation is something other than heading up his organization, omit A.
 - a. Do you have any other paid employment?

No _____

Yes _____ (specify) _____

2. How long have you been of _____
 (name of organization) - length of time
3. Have you held other positions in the organization?

No _____ Yes _____
 - a. If yes, what other positions have you held? (specify)

4. Do you receive any kind of pay for serving as the head of your organization? ___ No ___ Yes
5. How many hours a week would you say you work for _____?
 (name of organization)

1-10 hours _____	31-40 hours _____
11-20 hours _____	41-50 hours _____
21-30 hours _____	Over 50 hours _____
6. How long have you lived in this area? _____
 (area) (length of time)

If you don't live in this area, where do you live? _____

Where did you live when you were growing up? _____

7. Check race of respondent:

Black _____	Latino _____
White _____	Mexican American _____
American Indian _____	Other _____
Arabic _____	(specify) _____

8. How many years of school did you finish?

Some grade school _____
 Finished grade school
 (8 years) _____
 Ninth grade _____
 Tenth grade _____
 Eleventh grade _____

Twelfth grade (high school) _____
 Some college _____
 Graduated from college _____
 or more

9. What experiences have you had for your job with the organization?

10. How old are you?

19-25 years _____
 26-35 years _____
 36-45 years _____
 46-55 years _____

56-65 years _____
 66-75 years _____
 Over 75 years _____

11. How do you feel the community perceives this organization and its program(s)? _____

12. Which two officials of the organization do you work with:

Most frequently: _____

The best: _____

13. Does the organization have a constitution? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Does the organization have by-laws? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. Are there any written records kept of organization matters (i.e., minutes, reports, etc.)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Do you have a list of officers or any other literature on your organization? (If yes, may I secure copies if possible.)

Date: _____

Study of OrganizationsFollow-Up Information

Name of Organization: _____

Person Responding: _____

Title of Person Responding: _____

Read each of the following questions carefully. Please check only one answer for each question.

1. Which of the following applies best to the 1977 summer program provided by your organization?

 ___ A program which served as many youth as possible

 ___ A program which served few youth with an excellent program

 ___ A program which served as many youth as possible with an excellent program
2. How did the youth enjoy the program?

 ___ Enjoyed very much

 ___ Enjoyed

 ___ Could have enjoyed more

 ___ Did not enjoy
3. How well did the staff paid by the organization relate to the youth served?

 ___ Very well

 ___ Could have been better

 ___ Not too well
4. Did the staff paid by the organization know as much about the organization's purposes and objectives as you would like for them to have known?

 ___ Yes

 ___ No

5. If volunteers assisted the organization during the summer program did they know as much about the organization's purposes and objectives as you would like for them to have known?

____ Yes

____ No

____ Did not use volunteers

6. Do you know as much about the organization and its programs as you would like?

____ Yes

____ No

7. How frequently do you have occasion to learn new information for furthering the organization and its program(s)?

____ Very frequently

____ Frequently

____ Seldom

____ Never

8. Do you feel your knowledge of parliamentary procedures and Robert Rules of Order are adequate for conducting meetings?

____ Yes

____ No

9. Would you be interested in learning information for the development of your organization?

____ Yes

____ No

10. How would you rate your commitment to the organization and its summer program?

Commitment to the Organization

____ High

____ Medium

____ Low

Commitment to Summer Program

____ High

____ Medium

____ Low

11. Which of the following best describes the manner in which your organization plans for achieving its goals?

☐ Plans its goals with target dates for completion

☐ Plans its goals with target dates for completing specific objectives to reach goal

☐ Plans its goals and works toward them until achieved

12. Are any of the organization's goals visible?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If "Yes"

- a. Could you give an example of one of the organization's visible goals?

APPENDIX E

FORMAT FOR ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL
ARRANGEMENTS

1.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating		Source of Indicator		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each Indicator		Organization's assessment	
	1 = Very Important	2 = Important	A - Interview schedule	B - Follow-up survey			0 = Yes	1 = Yes	Organization's assessment	Totals
Item	Total possible rating 71.0						Total possible rating 64.75		Grand total	
I. Goal Achievement: IA. Purposes, Goals and objectives IAC. Evidence that purposes and objectives are congruent with community needs	I. <u>24.0</u> IA. <u>13.0</u>				P.3, Q.12 How are your programs determined?	Programs determined by residents or needs assessment.	1		I. <u>21.97</u> IA. <u>12.97</u>	I. IA.
	2	A			P.16, Q.22 What is the primary way the organization finds out about the needs and concerns of the community?	Members.	1			
IAh. Evidence of periodic review of organization's objectives with adjustments and modifications as required.	1	A			P.4, Q.14 Have there been any major changes in the purposes of the organization over the years?	A Yes response. A No response if information provided which indicates there was no need for changes.	.5			
					P.4, Q.14a What about the changes in terms of programs and activities?	Additions or deletions of programs.	.5			

2.

APPLICATION OF HELPMI INDEXED TO AN ORGANIZATION

Helpful statement	Priority Rating		Source of Indicator	Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each Indicator		Organization's assessment	Totals
	Total possible rating	1 = Very Important 2 = Important				1 = Yes 0 = No	Organization Points		
Item	Total possible rating						Total possible rating		
IA7. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to paid staff.	2	B		P.1.Q.4 Did the staff know as much about the organization's purposes and objectives as you would have liked?	Yes response		2		
IA8. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to volunteers who assist the organization.	2	B		P.2.Q.5 Did volunteers know as much about the organization's purposes and objectives as you would have liked?	Yes response		2		
IA10. Visible goals that can attract support	1	B		P.3.Q.12 Are any of the organization's goals visible?	Yes response		1		
IA12. Established milestones, or time period, for reaching goals and objectives	1	B		P.3.Q.11 Which of the following best describes the manner in which your organization's plans for achieving its goals.	Yes response to: Plans its goals with target dates for completing specific objectives to reach goal.		1		

3.

APPLICATION OF INDIATOR RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Helpful statement	Priority Rating 2 = Very Important 1 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each Indicator		Organization's assessment 0 = No 1 = Yes		Totals
	Total possible rating						Total possible rating				
IA14. Specificity of objectives even though difficult to quantify, i.e., objectives of community	1	A			P.3, Q.10 & 10a. Main purpose and other purposes.	Realistic purposes which are attainable.	1				
IA15. Statements of goals & objectives, well defined, but flexible enough to accommodate unanticipated action to be protective and responsive to community issues as they arise	2	A			P.4, Q.13 Besides programs services related to the specific purpose of the organization has the organization done anything else during the past year because of other issues and problems that came up in the community.	Yes response with an example of what was done.	2				
IA16. Flexibility in long-range planning to accommodate unanticipated projects or programs.	1	A			P.4, Q.13 Besides programs services related to the specific purpose of the organization has the organization done anything else during the past year because of other issues and problems that came up in the community.	Yes with an example of what was done.	.33				

APPLICATION OF DEPTHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

4.

Relph statement	Priority Rating 2 = Very Important 1 = Important		Source of Indicator B - Interview schedule A - Follow-up survey		Indicator		Qualifier for a yes		Value for each indicator		Organization's assessment 0 = Yes 1 = No		Totals
	Total possible rating								Total possible rating				
Item													
1A16. Con.					P.4.Q.14 Any changes in the purposes of the organization.	Yes with an example No, if justified, no need			.33				
					P.4.Q.14a Changes in programs and activities.	Yes with an example			.33				
1B. Programs	1B. 11.0				P.3.Q.10 Main purpose of organization?	Compare purposes and services and programs. Yes if programs are reflective of organization and its purposes.			1B. 2.0				1B. _____
	2	A			P.3.Q.10a Other purposes of organization?				2				
					P.3.Q.11 Programs and services provided by the organization?								
1B3. Programs determined by residents.	1	A			P.3.Q.12 How are your programs determined?	By residents.			1				
1B4. Short range projects.	1	A			P.3.Q.11 Programs and services provided?	Programs and services that indicate some time frame for completion and would not be continuing and ongoing			.5				

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

5.

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 1 = Very Important 2 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each indicator 0 = No 1 = Yes		Organization's assessment Totals
	Total possible rating						Total possible rating		
184. Con.					P.4, Q.13 Besides programs and services related to specific purposes of the organization, has the organization done anything else during the past year because of other issues and problems that came up in the community.	Activities which indicate short period of time	.5		
185. Programs which provide immediate assistance to residents	1	A			P.3, Q.11 Services provided?	Services a person can receive immediately, i.e. food, transportation, information & referral, etc.	1		
186. Programs with quality outputs	(2) Not measured						Not measured		
187. Qualitative and programs that satisfy those who are to benefit.	2	B			P.1, Q.1 Which of the following applies best to the 1977 summer program provided by your organization?	A yes response to: a program which served as many youth as possible with an excellent program	1		
					P.1, Q.2 How did the youth enjoy the program?	A yes response to: enjoyed very much or enjoyed.	1		

6.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 1 = Very Important 2 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each indicator 0 = No 1 = Yes		Organization's assessment	Totals
	Total possible rating									
Item							Total possible rating			
IB11. Programs by and for the community that meet self-defined needs rather than needs defined by others.	2	A	P.3, Q.12 How are your programs determined?		By residents only	2				
II. Resources:										
IIA. Manpower	II. 22.0 IIA. 17.0									II.
IIA1. Board	IIA1. 6.0						IIA1. 6.0			IIA.
IIA1. Elected to office by the membership.	2	A	P.5, Q.3 How are the board members selected?		Elected by membership only. If a combination - no.	2				IIA1.
IIA4. Include representation of persons from the membership of the organization.	1	A	P.5, Q.6 How many of your board members would be representative of the membership of the organization those persons who pay dues or clients and recipients of your services?		At least 2/3 of total board members - Calculate percent (National program should be determined by residents) Item 1A5.	1				

7.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 1 = Very Important 2 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator		Qualifier for a yes		Weight for each indicator		Organization Points 0 = Yes 1 = No		Totals
	Total possible rating								Total possible rating				
IIA5. Include representation of persons from the neighborhood.	2	A			P.5, Q.8 Residence of board members.		At least 2/3 of total board members should live within geographic boundaries (Rationale: programs should be determined by residents) Item I.A.5.		2				
IIA7. Include representation of persons with knowledge of the programs provided by the organization.	1	A			P.5, Q.7 How many of your board members have training and experience in the programs provided by the organization.		At least 2/3 of total board members.		1				
IIA2. leader (chairperson)	IIA2. 5.0								IIA2 4.99				IIA2. _____
IIA11. (leader) Knowledge of the organizational interest in the neighborhood.	1	A			P.12, Q.7 Records of service provided.		Yes response only.		.33				
					P.12, Q.8 Records of persons served.		Yes response only.		.33				
					P.12, Q.9 Evaluation of record of service.		Yes response only.		.33				

B.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating		Source of Indicator	Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each Indicator	Organization's assessment		Totals
	2 = Very Important	1 = Important					0 = No	1 = Yes	
Item	Total possible rating					Total possible rating			
IIA19. A president or chairperson with knowledge of the organization & its programs with chair-type skills	2	B		P.2, Q.6 Do you know as much about the organization and its programs as you would like?	A yes response.	1			
				P.2, Q.8 Knowledge of parliamentary procedures and Robert's Rule of Order adequate for conducting meetings.	A yes response.	1			
				P.2, Q.9 Interested in learning information for the development of your organization?	Willing: A yes response.	.5			
IIA20. A president or chairperson willing and able to learn, with commitment to the organization and its programs.	2	B		P.2, Q.7 Frequency of occasions to learn new information.	Able: A yes response to very frequently or frequently.	.5			
				P.2, Q.10 Rating on Commitment to organization.	Response at high.	.5			
				P.2, Q.10 Rating on commitment to programs	Response at high.	.5			

10.

APPLICATION OF DEPTM RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Relph statement	Priority Rating 1 = Very Important 2 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Followup survey		Indicator		Qualifier for a yon		Weight for each Indicator		Organization's assessment 0 = Yes 1 = No		Totals	
	Total possible rating								Total possible rating					
IIom														
IIA14. Con.					P.7,Q.4 Areas of training and experience of volun- teers compared with P.8,Q.6 What the volun- teers do.	Look for adequate pre- paration of experience training and background of volunteers as it relates to the tasks they perform for the organization.			.33					
					P.19, Q.9 What experience have you had for your job with the organization?	Look for a congruence between experience, training and educational attainments in field related to the programs of the organization. (P.1, Q.11)			.33					
IIA23. Staff able to relate to per- sons served.	2	B			P.1, Q.3 How well did the staff relate to the youth served?	Response at very well			2					
IIA4. Volunteers IIA15. Volunteers from neighborhood.	IIA4. 2.0 1	A			P.8, Q.7 Residence of vol- unteers.	2/3 from neighborhood			IIA4. 2.0 1				IIA4.	

11.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 1 = Very Important 2 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator		Qualifier for a yes		Weights for each indicator 0 = No 1 = Yes		Organizational assessment 0 = No 1 = Yes		Total possible rating
	Total possible rating												
IIA17. Professional volunteers from a variety of backgrounds (accountants, lawyers, educators, social workers, etc.)	1	A			P.5, Q.5 Occupations of board members.		At least two different professional backgrounds represented.	.5					
					P.7, Q.4 General areas of training and experience of volunteers.		At least two different professional backgrounds represented.	.5					
IIIB. Organizational Relationships IIB1. Community meetings open to neighborhood.	IIIB. 8.0 IIB1. 4.0 1	A			P.9, Q.1 Are any of your organizational meetings open to residents?		All without qualification	1	IIIB. 7.92 IIB1. 4.0				IIIB. _____ IIB1. _____
IIC2. Publication of organization's purposes, programs, achievements to neighborhood.	1	A			P.7, Q.2 Do you publicize your purposes, programs and achievements to the neighborhood?		Yes any communication method specified.	1					

12.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI TECHNIQUE TO AN ORGANIZATION

Neighborhood statement	Priority Rating 2 = Very Important 1 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weights for each indicator 0 = No 1 = Yes		Organization's assessment	Totals
	Total possible rating						Total possible rating			
Item										
III3. Interpretation of organization's purposes, programs, achievements to neighborhoods.	2	A			P.9,Q.2 Do you publicize your purposes, programs and achievements to the neighborhood?	Yes only if a verbal method is specified.	2			
III2. Inter organizational	III2. 2.0						III2. 2.0			III2. _____
III5. Working relationships with other neighborhood organizations similar in program emphasis.	1	A			P.9, Q.2 Do you work closely with any local neighborhood organization?	Yes response	1			
III7. Participation in community association or council.	1	A			P.9,Q.4 Is your organization a participant in any community council?	Yes response with the specification of at least one association or council.	1			

13.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI INQUIRY TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 2 = Very Important 1 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Organization Points 0 = No 1 = Yes		Total possible rating	Organization's assessment 0 = No 1 = Yes	Totals
	Total possible rating										
Item											
11B3. Political	11B3. 2.0								11B3. 1.92		11B3.
11B1. Contacts with mayor's office, city council, neighborhood city hall, police precincts.	1	A		P.10.Q.1 Do any board members or staff have contacts with any persons in the following offices or positions?	A yes response to: 1) mayor's office 2) city council 3) neighborhood city hall 4) police precincts				.25 .25 .25 .25		
11B2. Contacts with agencies handling revenue sharing funds other financial grants; or source of funds.	1	A		P.10.Q.1 Revenue sharing local government contacts P.10.Q.5 Other financial grants P.10.Q.5 Source of funds.	A yes response to mayor's office, city council, neighborhood city hall (any 1 of 3) A yes response to New Detroit A yes response to PMA, BANC, New Detroit (any 1 of 3)				.33 .33 .33		

14.

APPLICATION OF DEPTW RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Helpful statement	Priority Rating		Source of Indicator	Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each Indicator		Organization's assessment	Totals
	2 = Very Important	1 = Important				1 = Yes	0 = No		
Item	Total possible rating					Total possible rating			
IIIC. Pending IIIC2. Grants from foundations, government, community councils, etc.	IIIC. <u>h.o</u> 1	A		P.11,Q.3 Sources and types of income.	Must presently be receiving funds from government, or community councils other than from MCS for summer program.	1			IIIC. <u>h.o</u>
IIIC3. Neighborhood based fund-raising activities.	1	A		P.11,Q.3a Sources and types of income.	Must identify specific type of fund-raising activity in the neighborhood.	1			
IIIC5. "Broader" community based fund-raising activities which do not result in loss of local autonomy.	1	A		P.11,Q.3 Broader community based fund-raising activities as a source of income.	A yes response indicating percent contributed and type of activity	1			
IIIC7. Donations from individuals & groups committed to the organization's interest without strings attached	1	A		P.11,Q.3 Donations from individuals and groups as a source of income	A yes response to individual. A yes response to group	.5 .5			

15.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI METHOD TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 1 = Very Important 2 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator		Qualifier for a yes		Weight for each Indicator 0 = No 1 = Yes		Organization's assessment 0 = No 1 = Yes		Totals	
	Total possible rating								Total possible rating					
f. Operations IIIA. Controls IIIAI. Evidence of adequate bookkeeping	IIII. 10.0 IIIIA. 11.0 2	A	P.12, Q.1 Who keeps the organization's books? P.12, Q.2 Qualifications and training of person keeping books.				If organization receives funds from government, state, etc., or other substantial sources qualifications of the person keeping the books must demonstrate some training. If organization only receives funds from membership dues and neighborhood based fund-raising activities qualifications of person can be daily life experience.		IIII. 17.0 IIIIA 11.0 .67				IIII. IIIIA.	
			P.12, Q.4 Do you have an audit of your financial records?		Yes				.67					
			P.12, Q.4a Who performs the financial audit?		External source.				.67					
IIIA5. Policies & issues voted on by group members	2	A	P.12, Q.5 How are the organization's policies determined?		Voted on by group members				2					

16.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI INQUIRY TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating		Source of Indicator		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each indicator	Organization's assessment		Totals
	1 = Very Important	2 = Important	A - Interview schedule	B - Follow-up survey				0 = No	1 = Yes	
Item	Total possible rating						Total possible rating			
IIIA7. Well-defined statements of policies.	1	A			P.19, Q.13 Does the organization have a constitution and by-laws.	Yes.	.5			
IIIA9. Records of services provided.	2	A			P.19, Q.13a. Are there any written records kept of organization matters (i.e., minutes, reports, etc.)	Yes	.5			
IIIA10. Records of persons served.	1	A			P.12, Q.7 Do you keep a record of services provided?	Yes unqualified.	2			
IIIA17. Reports which portray the operating results of the organization and its programs	2	A			P.12, Q.8 Do you keep a record of persons and groups served?	Yes unqualified.	1			
					P.13, Q.10 Do you prepare an annual report of the organization's operations.	Yes	2			

17.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 1 = Very Important 2 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interviewing schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each Indicator	Organization's assessment 0 = No 1 = Yes		Totals
	Total possible rating									
IIIAH. Seed-annual and/or annual evaluations.	1	A			P.12, Q.9b. How often are the records evaluated?	A yes response to semi-annually	1			
IIIB. Activities IIIB1. Evidence of active recruitment of members.	IIIB. 7.0 1	A			P.6 Q.12 Average length of time board members have been with the organization as board members?	Less than two years.	IIIB 6.00 .20			IIIB. _____
					P.6, Q.13 Do you have a method for turnover of board members?	Yes, must specify a limitation of years can serve.	.20			
					P.7, Q.5 Average length of time volunteers have been with the organization	Yes less than two years.	.20			
					P.15, Q.10 What is your method of recruitment?	Must be self-initiated activities rather than other (referrals from others) initiated activities.	.20			

10.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Input statement	Priority Rating		Source of Indicator		Indicator		Qualifier for a yes		Weight for each Indicator		Operations		Total	
	1 = Very important	2 = Important	A - Interview survey	B - Follow-up survey							0 = Yes	1 = No		
Item	Total possible rating								Total possible rating					
II101. Con.					P.16, Q.19 What is your major method of recruiting personnel for service?	Must specify self-initiated activities within the other role from others' initiated activities.			.20					
II102. Assessment of community needs	2	A			P.16, Q.22 What is the primary way the organization has made its needs and concerns of the community...	Numbers.			.33					
						Recipients of service			.33					
						Surveys			.33					
						Meetings			.33					
						Individual contacts			.33					
II103. Information sources for residents on anti-racism and its effect on the neighborhood	2	A			P.3, Q.11 Program and services provided by the organization	Other			.33					
						Yes if information and referral services provided.			1					

19.

APPLICATION OF DELPHI RESULTS TO AN ORGANIZATION

Delphi statement	Priority Rating 2 = Very Important 1 = Important		Source of Indicator A - Interview schedule B - Follow-up survey		Indicator	Qualifier for a yes	Weight for each Indicator 0 = No 1 = Yes		Organization's assessment 0 = No 1 = Yes		Totals
	Total possible rating						Total possible rating				
Item											
IIIB3. Con.					P.13, Q.7 Do you see your organization as an information source for residents on matters which affect the neighborhood or your particular constituency.	Yes	1				
IIIB4. Facility open for use by the community.	2	A			P.13, Q.6 Is the facility open for use by residents. P.13, Q.5 What hours is the facility open.	Yes	1				
						Yes if facility is open after 6:00 in the evening on any day or for special occasions.	1				

APPENDIX F

FORMS FOR COLLECTION OF PERFORMANCE DATA

Return to
 Forestia Service
 United Community Services
 of Metropolitan Detroit
 31 W. Warren
 Detroit, Michigan 48202

Year:	_____
Telephone No:	_____
Program Period:	_____

_____ Name of Organization
_____ Name of Summer Program
_____ Person Reporting

Date																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Director's Report of UCS Supported Summer Programs - 1977

Successfulness

Below are listed 13 items which commonly occur during the course of the summer program. Please circle the one number from the series of numbers beside each statement that best describes how successful your summer program was in each area.

	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Very Successful	Successful	Fairly Successful	Somewhat Successful	Un-Successful	Very Un-Successful	Not Applicable	
How successful was the summer program in:							
1. Accomplishing what was planned.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	
2. Use of public play parks, swimming pools, etc.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	
3. Use of school facilities, i.e., playgrounds, pools, equipment, etc.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	
4. Use of other community organizations' facilities, equipment, buses, etc.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	
5. Supervision and leadership of NYC and CETA staff.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	
6. Receiving assistance from adult volunteers.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	
7. Receiving assistance from youth volunteers.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	
8. Extent of youth participation in activities and programs planned.					6 5 4 3 2 1	NA	

6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Very Successful	Successful	Fairly Successful	Somewhat Successful	Un-Successful	Very Un-Successful	Not Applicable
How successful was the summer program in:						
9. Enthusiasm of youth participants in activities and programs planned.					6 5 4 3 2 1 NA	
10. City's provision of lunches to your program, i.e., number requested versus number provided.					6 5 4 3 2 1 NA	
11. Cooperation from other community groups or organizations.					6 5 4 3 2 1 NA	
12. Receiving assistance from UCS monitor.					6 5 4 3 2 1 NA	
13. Overall success of your summer program.					6 5 4 3 2 1 NA	

Director's Report
Summer Program
Page Three

1. Was there anything which interferred with the summer program proceeding as planned? (excluding lunch problems)

No _____

Yes _____ (Specify) _____

2. What, if anything, would you improve in your summer program next year? _____

* * *

1. Name of organization: _____
2. Name of summer program: _____
3. Signature of program director: _____

FW:mjv
7/21/77

Monitor's Report of UCS Supported Summer Programs - 1977

Successfulness

Below are listed 13 items which commonly occur during the course of the summer program. Please circle the one number from the series of numbers beside each statement that best describes how successful the summer program was in each area.

	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	Very Successful	Successful	Fairly Successful	Somewhat Successful	Un-Successful	Very Un-Successful	Not Applicable
How successful was the summer program in:							
1. Accomplishing what was planned.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA
2. Use of public play parks, swimming pools, etc.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA
3. Use of school facilities, i.e., playgrounds, pools, equipment, etc.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA
4. Use of other community organizations' facilities, equipment, buses, etc.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA
5. Supervision and leadership of NYC and CETA staff.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA
6. Receiving assistance from adult volunteers.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA
7. Receiving assistance from youth volunteers.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA
8. Extent of youth participation in activities and programs planned.						6 5 4 3 2 1	NA

6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Very Successful	Successful	Fairly Successful	Somewhat Successful	Un- Successful	Very Un- Successful	Not Applicable

How successful was the summer program in:

9. Enthusiasm of youth participants in activities and programs planned.

6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----
10. City's provision of lunches to your program, i.e., number requested versus number provided.

6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----
11. Cooperation from other community groups or organizations.

6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----
12. Receiving assistance from UCS monitor.

6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----
13. Overall success of your summer program.

6	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Monitor's Report
Summer Program
Page Three

1. Was there anything which interferred with the summer program proceeding as planned? (excluding lunch problems)

No _____

Yes _____ (Specify) _____

2. What, if anything, should be improved in this summer program next year? _____

* * *

1. Name of organization: _____
2. Name of summer program: _____
3. Signature of monitor: _____

FW:mjv
7/21/77

APPENDIX G

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO FREE-FORM QUESTIONS
FROM DELPHI SURVEY ON ATTRIBUTES AND
DECEPTIONS OF NEIGHBORHOOD
ORGANIZATIONS**

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO FREE-FORM QUESTIONS FROM DELPHI SURVEY ON ATTRIBUTES AND DECEPTIONS OF NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

What Do You Believe Are the Key Attributes of a Successful Neighborhood Organization?

1. Involvement and commitment of residents.
2. Local leadership.
3. Open membership.
4. Democratic decision processes.
5. Some local base funding.
6. Response to neighborhood needs as defined by residents.
7. Useful programs--offering a service.
8. Participating friendship.
9. Trained, well paid staff.
10. Services which relate directly to the people in the area.
11. Adequate decision making process (good working Board).
12. Staff competence.
13. Adequate budget for carrying out organizational goals.

14. Energetic, thoughtful leadership that generates ideas of mission and role, programs, and action yet listens carefully to community and stands for election periodically.
15. Leadership that identifies the real problems of such neighborhoods, selects those it can handle, works to get others to handle (or monitor others handling) problems beyond its means.
16. Leadership that can identify what it is impossible for an organization so constituted to do, as well as what it can do.
17. Shared sense and experience of ownership of the organization.
18. Clear purpose/mission clearly communicated and understood.
19. Energetic, competent leadership at policy and operational levels.
20. Good records.
21. Realistic measures of results.
22. Benefits, however defined, exceed costs, however determined.
23. Capable leadership.
24. Informed staff and a relevant program.
25. Good channels of communication linking the board, leadership, staff and program of the organization.
26. Effective planning.
27. Strong commitment.
28. Clear identification of needs.
29. Availability of significant staff consultation.
30. Full use of existing resources.
31. Availability of professional leadership training.
32. Exercise of residual authority as taxpayers to hold public and private agencies fully accountable for service availability.

33. Measurable, documented goals.
34. A community feeling that "this is our center."
35. Solidarity and diverse participation.
36. Continuity.
37. Competence of Board and staff.
38. Resourcefulness.
39. Results.
40. Viewed by the residents in a positive, enthusiastic, useful manner.
41. The leadership, volunteers and lay is not difficult to recruit and retain and the funding, either from individual or other resources if achieved in an orderly manner.
42. Acceptance of organization by community.
43. Program geared to suit needs of community.
44. Program facilities accessible to clients.
45. Allowance for direct input from clients served.
46. The quality of leadership of the board and the director, to identify the needs of the specific neighborhood and to translate those needs into programs of service.
47. The organization has the capacity to deliver the service and record those activities.
48. Inexhaustible fund of resourceful, knowledgeable, well-disposed trustees.
49. Easy access to services for neighborhood participants.
50. Visible, sensitive and resourceful leadership.
51. Organizational adaptability.
52. Organization strives consciously to become a part of the community and in the process makes the community a part of the organization. The delivery of services that are well thought-out, adequately funded and enthusiastically delivered.

53. Defined needs.
54. Community acceptance.
55. Commitment of memberships and staff to organizational goals.
56. Positive working relationships between Board members and staff members.
57. The ability to "stay in touch" with community needs and residents.
58. The ability to "make do" with limited resources, their creativity.
59. The ability to be realistic; the authority to provide what will work.
60. The ability to foster self-determination.
61. Focused political constituency and power.
62. Clear goals, explicit problem focus.
63. Community participation.
64. Technical competence.
65. Links to power centers outside the immediate locale.
66. Adequate, broad based, leadership to insure continuity.
67. Knowledgeable, involved membership.
68. Technical assistance available and appropriately used.
69. Paid staff is possible--not leading a puppet board.
70. Well defined mission/purpose.
71. Commitment to resolution of a problem or addressing a community need.
72. Capable of developing clout and constituency.
73. Leadership that can and does identify with the local community and articulate its interests, but at the same time has a capacity to understand and accommodate the interests of other (other neighborhoods, etc.) while maximizing its own.

What Information About Neighborhood
Organizations Can Be Deceptive in
Assessing Their Potentials
For Success

1. Rhetoric
2. Gossip
3. Spokesperson
4. Motives
5. Large external funding
6. Competition for leadership posts
7. Large size of membership roster
8. Much talk regarding community needs--little data.
9. Reports which are prepared by the organization for public consumption.
10. Most of the formal trappings--constitution, by-laws, etc.
11. Information in the form of positive or negative perceptions, impressions, subjective assessments by users of the organization's services, by providers of the service, and by the leadership--board and operational.
12. Staff qualifications
13. Quantity of people served
14. Written Public Relations material
15. One person leadership that dominates, vested interests that place securing jobs for themselves as sole or primary goal.
16. Crisis situations to which city-wide leaders over-react. Reaction to repressive tactics by police, etc.
17. Steering by professionals and politicians based on their own agenda.
18. Inability to move from single project to broader planning.

19. Inadequate analysis of human resources.
20. Paper organization with no substantive backing.
21. Probably the most deceptive is information relative to the number of people served.
22. Overabundance of promotional activity and vocal political participation.
23. Whether or not they really have the support of the community they claim to serve.
24. Criteria that does not reflect the kind of services that are offered, and is not a priority area of the funding source. All too often most groups and community based organizations have limited skills in reporting the specific nature of their programs, nor have they developed the kind of system that adequately captures the services that they provide. Most organizations only respond to the reporting system that is presented to them by the funding source that may not respond to the particular needs of the group or organization.
25. Information that deals with plans only and not with outcomes.
26. Information that confines itself to the letter of things but omits the spirit of matters at hand.
27. Extent of internal commitment of each member and staff.
28. Adequacy of needs assessment.
29. Willingness of community to support organization's goals.
30. Board composition, i.e., the "movers and shakers"
31. The physical facility.
32. Salary ranges of staff.
33. Membership size and diversity.
34. Sharp staff snoring a Board.
35. Verbal leaders--no backing.
36. Misreading potential, clout, and constituency.

- 37. Lack of bureaucratic sophistication/polish.
- 38. Over-reliance on quantity.
- 39. Lack of track record.

APPENDIX H

LISTING OF EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE
PRACTICES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD
ORGANIZATIONS

APPENDIX H

LISTING OF EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

I. Goal Achievement

A. Purposes-goals-objectives

1. Evidence that purposes and objectives are congruent with community needs.
2. Statements of goals and objectives, well-defined, but flexible enough to accommodate unanticipated action to be protective and reactive to community issues as they arise.
3. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to paid staff.
4. Communication of the organization's purposes and objectives to volunteers who assist the organization.
5. Evidence of a periodic review of organization's objectives with adjustments and modifications as required.
6. Specificity of objectives even though difficult to quantify, i.e., objectives of community cohesion, community morale.
7. Established milestones, or time periods, for reaching goals and objectives.
8. Visible goals that can attract support.
9. Flexibility in long-range planning to accommodate unanticipated projects or programs.

B. Programs

10. Objectives manifested in the programs of the organization.
11. Programs with quality outputs.
12. Qualitative and quantitative programs that satisfy those who are to benefit.

13. Programs by and for the community that meet self-defined needs rather than needs defined by others.
14. Programs determined by residents.
15. Short-range projects.
16. Programs which provide immediate assistance to residents.

II. Resources

A. Manpower

Board

17. Elected to office by the membership.
18. Include representation of persons from the neighborhood.
19. Include representation of persons from the membership of the organization. (The members would include those persons who pay dues or clients.)
20. Include representation of persons with knowledge of the programs provided by the organization.

Leader (president or chairperson)

21. A president or chairperson with knowledge of the organization and its programs with chair-type skills.
22. A president or chairperson willing and able to learn, with commitment to the organization and its programs.
23. A president with knowledge of the organization's impact in the neighborhood.

Staff

24. Staff able to relate to persons served.
25. Staff representative of persons served by the organization.
26. Staff with educational and experience background adequate to carry out the programs of the organization.

Volunteers

27. Volunteers from the neighborhood.
28. Professional volunteers from a variety of backgrounds (accountants, lawyers, educators, social workers, etc.)

B. Organizational Relationships

Community

- 29. Interpretation of organization's purposes, programs, and achievements to neighborhood residents.
- 30. Meetings open to neighborhood residents.
- 31. Publication of organization's purposes, programs, and achievements to neighborhood residents.

Inter-Organizational

- 32. Participation in community associations or councils.
- 33. Working relationships with other neighborhood organizations.

Political

- 34. Contacts with mayor's office, city council, neighborhood city hall, police precincts.
- 35. Contacts with agencies handling revenue sharing funds, other financial grants, or sources of funds.

C. Funding

- 37. Neighborhood based fund raising activities.
- 38. "Broader" community based fund raising activities which do not result in loss of local autonomy.
- 39. Donations from individuals and groups committed to the organization's interest without strings attached.

III. Operations

A. Controls

- 40. Evidence of adequate bookkeeping.
- 41. Policies and issues voted on by group members.
- 42. Records of services provided.
- 43. Reports which portray the operating results of the organization and its program.
- 44. Well-defined statements of policies.
- 45. Semi-annual and/or annual evaluations.
- 46. Records of persons served.

B. Activities

- 47. Assessment of community needs.
- 48. Information source for residents on matters which affect the neighborhood.
- 49. Facility open for use by the community.
- 50. Evidence of active recruitment of members.

APPENDIX I

Correlation Matrix of Organizational Arrangements and Performance Measures

	X ₁	X ₂	X ₃	X ₄	X ₅	X ₆	X ₇	X ₈	X ₉	X ₁₀	X ₁₁	X ₁₂
Y ₁	.065	.019	-.222	.338	.315	-.123	-.049	.050	-.202	-.246	-.162	.075
Y ₂	-.198	.228	.043	.298	.354	.194	.220	-.015	.130	.118	.193	.100
Y ₃	-.018	.297	-.220	-.028	.096	.153	.001	.105	.161	-.083	-.233	-.220
Y ₄	-.360	.179	-.322	-.002	.031	.051	.152	.047	.233	.113	-.107	-.076
Y ₅	-.115	.035	.335	-.111	.039	.079	.012	.177	.231	.110	-.074	.074
Y ₆	-.037	.040	.185	-.164	.055	-.045	-.042	.192	.114	.095	-.154	-.020
Y ₇	-.041	-.039	.195	-.181	.038	-.049	-.050	.179	.102	.088	-.124	-.034
Y ₈	.053	.187	-.127	-.147	-.001	-.014	.017	.102	.057	.054	-.094	-.091
Y ₉	.022	.085	-.111	-.195	-.084	-.044	-.011	.031	-.018	.112	-.023	.072
Y ₁₀	.198	-.192	-.349	.178	.056	-.424	-.452	-.074	-.356	.008	.037	-.014
Y ₁₁	-.140	-.210	.264	.196	.122	.002	-.202	.042	-.009	.313	.138	.260
Y ₁₂	.221	-.263	-.226	.157	.010	-.434	-.427	-.069	-.348	.106	.119	.152
Y ₁₃	.045	-.125	.283	.204	.132	.025	-.342	.042	-.111	.089	.021	.078
Y ₁₄	.389	-.016	-.156	.134	.174	.182	.113	.047	-.361	-.118	.143	.219
Y ₁₅	.510	-.073	-.040	-.332	-.250	.230	.136	.066	-.321	.010	.263	.193
Y ₁₆	.371	.205	-.092	.231	-.082	.165	-.230	-.264	-.242	.026	.153	.450
Y ₁₇	-.441	-.120	-.064	-.100	.110	-.102	.247	.404	.423	.158	.181	-.287
Y ₁₈	.429	.138	.255	.016	-.084	.087	-.228	-.278	-.396	-.173	-.349	.191
Y ₁₉	-.086	-.013	.131	-.009	.064	.152	-.240	-.093	-.035	-.093	.174	-.136

CORRELATION MATRIX OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES

	Y ₁	Y ₂	Y ₃	Y ₄	Y ₅	Y ₆	Y ₇	Y ₈	Y ₉	Y ₁₀	Y ₁₁	Y ₁₂	Y ₁₃	Y ₁₄	Y ₁₅	Y ₁₆	Y ₁₇	Y ₁₈	Y ₁₉
Y ₁	1.000																		
Y ₂	.400	1.000																	
Y ₃	.122	.042	1.000																
Y ₄	.008	.094	.749	1.000															
Y ₅	.297	.465	.276	.170	1.000														
Y ₆	.288	.289	.548	.353	.848	1.000													
Y ₇	.289	.299	.409	.229	.899	.974	1.000												
Y ₈	.234	.188	.676	.487	.404	.770	.700	1.000											
Y ₉	.146	.150	.411	.268	.341	.657	.652	.926	1.000										
Y ₁₀	-.030	-.547	-.101	-.137	-.602	-.380	-.413	-.162	-.132	1.000									
Y ₁₁	.236	.196	-.542	-.419	.307	.046	.160	-.278	-.164	-.015	1.000								
Y ₁₂	-.070	-.487	-.350	-.300	-.576	-.416	-.425	-.281	-.195	.947	.138	1.000							
Y ₁₃	.210	.096	-.422	-.642	.305	.087	.218	-.218	-.092	.049	.840	.126	1.000						
Y ₁₄	.230	.278	.038	-.033	.027	.041	.014	.023	-.007	-.081	-.188	-.056	-.129	1.000					
Y ₁₅	.200	-.028	.100	.042	.045	.086	.038	.045	-.021	-.003	-.226	.012	-.206	.696	1.000				
Y ₁₆	.257	.168	.213	-.036	.015	.214	.121	.263	.159	.182	-.052	.195	.069	.459	.417	1.000			
Y ₁₇	-.148	.012	.136	.428	.013	.088	.099	.120	.122	-.347	.016	-.369	-.297	-.232	-.209	-.590	1.000		
Y ₁₈	.086	-.008	-.055	-.345	-.100	-.003	-.037	-.066	.112	.241	.016	.253	.235	.083	.133	.425	-.929	1.000	
Y ₁₉	.325	.169	-.052	-.331	-.427	.287	.380	.082	.149	-.182	.369	-.163	.547	-.119	.014	.212	.200	.119	1.000

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Afifi, A. A., and Azen, S. P. Statistical Analysis a Computer Oriented Approach. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Austin, David M. "Poverty and Organizations of the Poor." Encyclopedia of Social Work. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1973, 906-915.
- Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1966.
- Caplow, Theodore. Principles of Organization. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1964.
- Cornfield, Jerome, and Tukey, John W. "Average Values of Mean Squares in Factorials." The Annals of Mathematical Statistics 27(1956), 907-949.
- Dalkey, Norman, and Helmer, Olaf. "An Experimental Application of the Delphi Method to the Use of Experts." Management Science 9(April, 1963), 458-467.
- Dressel, Paul L. Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1976.
- Etzioni, Amitai. "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique and a Suggestion." Administrative Science Quarterly 5(September, 1960), 257-278.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Friedlander, Frank, and Pickle, Hal. "Components of Effectiveness in Small Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly 13(September, 1968), 289-304.
- Georgopoulos, Basil S., and Tannenbaum, Arnold S. "A Study of Organizational Effectiveness." American Sociological Review 22(1957), 534-540.

- Gibson, James L.; Ivancevich, John M.; and Donnelly Jr., James H. Organizations: Structure, Processes, Behavior. Texas: Business Publications, Inc., 1973.
- Gurin, Arnold. "Social Planning and Community Organization." Encyclopedia of Social Work 2(1973), 1324-1337.
- Johnson, Harold R. "Neighborhood Services." Encyclopedia of Social Work 2(1973), 865-872.
- Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Levinson, Perry. "Evaluation of Social Welfare Programs: Two Research Models." Welfare in Review 10(1966), 5-12.
- Lipsky, Michael. "Protest as a Political Resource." American Political Science Review 62(December, 1968), 1144-1158.
- Lipsky, Michael. "Rent Strikes: Poor Man's Weapon." Trans-Action 6(February, 1969), 10-15.
- Marris, Peter, and Rein, Martin. Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.
- Martin, Don T.; Overholt, George E.; and Urban, Wayne J. Accountability in American Education: A Critique. Princeton Book Company, 1976.
- Mogulof, Melvin B. "Neighborhood Service Centers." Encyclopedia of Social Work 2(1973), 857-865.
- Mott, Paul E. The Characteristics of Effective Organizations. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.
- Patillo, Roger W. "Guides for Assessing the Administrative and Management Capabilities of Social Service Agencies." Vancouver Planned Program Budgeting Systems Project, United Way of Greater Vancouver (September, 1975).
- Perrow, Charles. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations." American Sociological Review 26(December, 1961), 854-866.

- Price, James L. "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness." The Sociological Quarterly 13(Winter, 1972), 3-15.
- Price, James L. Organizational Effectiveness: An Inventory of Propositions. Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.
- Ross, Murray G. Community Organization: Theory, Principles and Practice. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967.
- Rothman, Jack. Planning and Organizing for Social Change: Action Principles from Social Science Research. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Seashore, Stanley E. "Criteria of Organizational Effectiveness." Michigan Business Review 4(July, 1965), 26-30.
- Seashore, Stanley E., and Yuchtman, Ephraim. "Factorial Analysis of Organizational Performance." Administrative Science Quarterly 12(December, 1967), 377-395.
- Simon, Herbert A. "On the Concept of Organizational Goal." Administrative Science Quarterly 9(June, 1964), 1-22.
- Stein, Herman D. "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness," in David Fanshel, ed., Research in Social Welfare Administration: Its Contributions and Problems. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1962, 22-32.
- Stein, Herman D.; Hougham, George M.; and Zalba, Serapio R. "Assessing Social Agency Effectiveness: A Goal Model." Welfare in Review 2(1968), 13-18.
- Suchman, Edward A. Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.
- Tatsuoka, Maurice M. Multivariate Analysis: Techniques for Educational and Psychological Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.
- Turoff, Murray. "The Design of a Policy Delphi." Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2(1970), 149-171.

- Van De Ven, Andrew H., and Delbecq, Andre L. "The Nominal Group as a Research Instrument for Exploratory Health Studies." American Journal of Public Health 62(March, 1972), 337-342.
- Van De Ven, Andrew H., and Delbecq, Andre L. "The Effectiveness of Nominal, Delphi, and Interacting Group Decision Making Processes." Academy of Management Journal 17(December, 1974), 605-621.
- Vanecko, James J.; Orden, Susan R.; and Hollander, Sidney. Community Organization Efforts, Political and Institutional Change, and the Diffusion of Change Produced by Community Action Programs. Report #3: Final Report of Phase I of a National Evaluation of Urban Community Action Programs. University of Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, NORC Report #122, April, 1970.
- Warner, W. Keith. "Problems in Measuring the Goal Attainment of Voluntary Organizations." Adult Education 18(1967-68), 3-14.
- Warriner, Charles K. "The Problem of Organizational Purpose." The Sociological Quarterly 6(1965), 139-146.
- Weiss, Carol H. Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Evaluation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.
- Weiss, Carol H. Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Wechsler, Henry; Reinherz, Helen Z.; and Dobbin, Donald D. Social Work Research in Human Services. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1976.
- Yuchtman, Ephraim, and Seashore, Stanley E. "A System Resource Approach to Organizational Effectiveness." American Sociological Review 32(December, 1967), 891-902.
- Zald, Mayer N. "Comparative Analysis and Measurement of Organizational Goals: The Case of Correctional Institutions for Delinquents." The Sociological Quarterly 4(1963), 206-230.
- Zald, Mayer N. "Organizations as Politics: An Analysis of Community Organization Agencies." Social Work 11 (October, 1966), 56-65.

Evaluation and Accountability in Human Service Programs.

Eds., William C. Sze and June G. Hopps. Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1978.

Emerging Developments in Mental Health Program Evaluation.

Eds., William Neigher, Roni J. Hmnmer, and Gerald Landsberg. New York: Argold Press, 1977.

Evaluating Social Programs: Theory, Practice, and Politics.

Eds., Peter H. Rossi and Walter Williams. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Health Sciences Computing Facility Department of Biomathematics School of Medicine University of California, Los Angeles. BMD Biomedical Computer Programs, ed. W. J. Dixon. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977, 305-330.

Health Sciences Computing Facility Department of Biomathematics School of Medicine University of California, Los Angeles. BMDP Biomedical Computer Programs P-Series, eds., W. J. Dixon and M. B. Brown. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979, 711-733.

Readings in Evaluation Research. Ed., Francis G. Caro.

New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1977.

