

**LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000)
and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Revised Results**

Rick Weil, LSU Sociology, December 15, 2011

This is a draft report on the results of a survey of neighborhood association leaders in New Orleans in 2009-2010. It describes their efforts to help their communities recover from Hurricane Katrina.¹

Data and Methods

The LSU/NPN Survey.

- The LSU Sociology Department partnered with the Neighborhoods Partnership Network to conduct a survey of neighborhood association leaders, which was carried out from spring 2009 to autumn 2010, with a couple more responses trickling in in early 2011.
 - There are 67 completed responses in the survey, of which:
 - 48 are pure neighborhood associations
 - 8 are neighborhood Community Development Corporations
 - 5 are neighborhood disaster recovery centers
 - 4 are umbrella organizations
 - 4 are neighborhood economic or business associations
- and
- 47 are in flooded areas, of which 36 are pure neighborhood associations in flooded areas.

I merged the LSU/NPN Survey with several other data sources:

- The LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (DRS) (N=7,000) of New Orleans residents, conducted from spring 2006 to spring 2011, including:
 - Indicators of social capital & civic engagement,
 - Other disaster recovery indicators, both physical/objective and subjective, emotional, and religious.

¹ I made an earlier, initial report on the survey merged with other data. While the results seemed broadly to make sense, some of the details didn't seem right to me. Thus, I rebuilt the data set from the ground up, from the raw data, and have reanalyzed them. The results now seem robust to me. The present report is a first pass at analyzing these reprocessed data.

LSU/NPN Survey: Draft Report

- Census variables from the decennials (2000 & the small bit of 2010) and the American Community Survey (ACS).
- USPS/HUD/Valassis/GNOCDC data on repopulation & blight.
- Flood-extent maps from the USGS,
- City data of storm damage, by address.
- Road Home decision data.
- Violent crime statistics from the NOPD.

These data are all aggregated to the boundaries of the neighborhood organizations and merged with the LSU/NPN dataset. In a few cases, geographical boundaries did not coincide precisely, so the best approximations possible were made.

Several unusual features of the LSU/NPN data and of the final merged dataset should be kept in mind:

- Unlike many geographical data, the neighborhood organizations often have competing or overlapping jurisdictions. This is unlike, say, census tracts or city-defined neighborhood boundaries, which are adjacent and do not overlap. The areas covered by our respondents often do overlap, and even sometimes coincide. That is, they are organizations with a geographic reference, but they may compete with each other to represent the same, or parts of the same, areas.
- As a result, data from other sources may be represented multiple times in the LSU/NPN survey. Individual community members from the LSU Disaster Recovery Survey may live in an area claimed by more than one neighborhood organization, and are thus averaged and merged to multiple LSU/NPN Survey responses. The same may be true of census tracts, crime statistics, and any other merged data. This is an unavoidable feature of the data, but it is fairly unusual to have this situation, and should be kept in mind in interpreting the data analysis.
- In the analyses that follow, different subsets, or subsamples, of the LSU/NPN survey are used, depending on the question that is being addressed. For instance, when we look at how organizations' actions may affect residents' opinions of their neighborhood associations, only pure neighborhood associations are used, and others (e.g., business associations, CDCs) are excluded, because they are not what residents presumably have had in mind. Or when we are looking at whether organizations can reduce blight caused by flooding, only flooded ("wet") areas are considered. Of course, blight also exists in "dry" areas, but if we are looking at disaster recovery, dry areas are not part of that story, strictly speaking. However, both pure neighborhood associations and other organizations may have an impact on blight reduction, so both are examined, but separately. The subsamples that might be used in various analyses include:
 - All neighborhood organizations in the sample, of all classifications,

- Neighborhood organizations, broadly defined, mainly excluding business associations, but including certain neighborhood centers that were established by outside organizations,
 - Only “pure” neighborhood associations, established and run by the neighborhood residents,
 - “Wet” organizations, that is, all organizations in flooded areas, and
 - “Wet” neighborhood associations, that is, “pure” neighborhood associations in flooded areas.
- In what follows, I will use the term “neighborhood association” to refer to the “pure” neighborhood associations, but will use the term “organization” (neighborhood or not) to refer to any of the organizations in the sample. In what follows, NBO will refer to the more generic neighborhood organizations, and NAs will refer to the pure neighborhood associations.

The main independent variables of interest concern the strategies, resources, and characteristics that organizations have used in disaster recovery. These include:

- The age of an organization, a rough indicator of how well established it is,
- The organization’s income, sources of resources, and budget,
- The organization’s staffing and its physical assets (offices, computers, database software, newsletters or websites, etc.),
- The organization’s use of volunteers,
- The organization’s structure and formal organization: for instance, its committees, its use of block captains,
- The issues the organization attempts to address or affect (e.g., blight remediation, economic development, zoning, etc.),
- The organization’s orientation toward other organizations, whether competitive, cooperative or partnering, participation in umbrella groups, and so on.

In almost all cases, I created scales or summary indexes, because there are a huge number of items on the questionnaire, and data reduction is desirable. The following are the variables or indexes that seem to be of greatest theoretical interest:

- Age of the Organization
- Estimated Organization Budget
- Cooperation w Other Organizations
 - A count of all cooperative relations
 - Cooperation w Umbrella Organizations
 - Cooperation w Adjacent NAs
- Organizational Activities: especially activities fighting blight, when blight is the dependent variable
- Organizational Assets
 - Material: Office, Database
 - Structural: Committees, Block Captains

Independent variables from other sources are used partly as control variables, and partly to provide a wider picture. However, the focus is on the neighborhood organizations. This has two implications: first, I tried to prioritize NBO variables in the regression models. Second, these analyses are not the best way to understand the effects of non-NBO factors because the units of analysis are not the most appropriate for that purpose and because the data do not give full geographical coverage to the city. Data analysis with census tracts as the units of analysis are more appropriate in that case.

Independent variables from the other sources include:

- Measures of social capital from the LSU DRS,
- Measures of citizen resources from the LSU DRS,
- Individual evaluations of recovery or community conditions from the LSU DRS,
- Individual feelings and subjective evaluations from the LSU DRS,
- Measures of economic and educational levels, race/ethnicity, family and structure, housing, and citizen status, all from the Census.

Dependent variables include:

- Subjective evaluations of NAs and community leaders, and awareness of neighborhood associations, from the LSU DRS,
- Subjective evaluations of citizen stress, and personal and city disaster recovery, from the LSU DRS,
- Measures of repopulation from the census and from the USPS/HUD mail-carrier data,
- Measures of blight and blight reduction from the USPS/HUD mail-carrier data.

The LSU/NPN questionnaire is available at <http://www.lsu.edu/fweil/lukatrinasyurvey/LSU-NPNOrganizationSurvey.pdf>, and the LSU DRS questionnaire is available at <http://www.lsu.edu/katrinasyurvey/lukatrinasyurvey-nolageneral.pdf>.

Scale construction and results of factor analyses are given in an appendix to this document.

The methods used here are quite simple: bivariate Pearson correlations and multiple regression. No attempt is made here to adjust for overlapping jurisdictions or to implement any kind of spatial auto-correlation. Possibly, these more advanced methods will be introduced in future analysis.

Findings

Correlations

Correlations show the basic relationships among variables, even variables that have weak effects, or whose effects really work through the intermediation of other variables – that is, even variables whose effects disappear in multiple regression analysis.

Different aspects of organizations are relevant for different dependent variables; and they also sometimes differ according to which subsample is used.

One result deserves special mention – for its absence. The budget of the neighborhood organizations never correlated significantly with any of the dependent variables. Whatever one might hypothesize about the impact of money, one important factor may confound predictions. There are a fair number of extremely well-funded organizations working in low-income areas and/or areas with low levels civic participation; while at the same time, some well-to-do neighborhoods with high levels of civic participation take it as a point of pride that their organizations are all-volunteer with no paid staff and almost no budget. Thus, even if one might hypothesize that high-resource organizations work indirectly through high-resource communities to produce desired outcomes, even that precondition does not seem to hold here: there is evidently no strong correlation between organizational wealth and neighborhood wealth.

Other results are organized here by dependent variable.

- Evaluation of neighborhood leaders.
 - Age of the organization has a universal positive effect. People in neighborhoods with old, well-established neighborhood associations approve of them more and know their names more.
 - A cooperative orientation is also very important: both the overall count of cooperative ties, and also cooperation with umbrella and with adjacent NAs. While strong in most cases, these correlations are occasionally weak or insignificant.
 - Use of block captains also encourages good evaluations among citizens, though again, some correlations are weak.
 - Blight fighting activities often improves NBO's reputation and visibility, but again, somewhat irregularly.
 - Other factors have a spottier effect, few consistently. Active business committees and enforcement activities raise NBOs' profiles, but somewhat inconsistently.

- Subjective feelings and evaluations about disaster recovery.
 - Generally speaking, characteristics of neighborhood organizations do not correlate strongly or consistently with subjective feelings and evaluations about disaster recovery: not with citizens' feelings of stress, nor with their personal recovery, nor with their impressions of the city's recovery. The correlations that do emerge generally do not form a strong or consistent pattern.
 - Virtually no aspect of neighborhood organizations has an impact on citizens' feelings of stress. One slight exception is that stress levels are lower where the NBOs are older and more well-established. One might suppose that this is because older NBOs are in richer neighborhoods, but economic factors seem to have little impact on stress in these data. Rather, stress is lowest in areas with high social capital or social solidarity. (Again, this is not the ideal dataset to investigate these latter correlations: these factors are included here mainly as control variables in the regressions.)
 - The relatively few NBO effects on recovery tend to be somewhat inconsistent and are even often reversed for personal and city recovery.
 - There is one main exception here. Organizational cooperation correlates well with citizen evaluations that the city is recovering. The cooperation indexes all come from the same series of questions (Q. 63); and we see its influence whether the index is a count of all items on cooperation, or whether it is cooperation on fighting blight, cooperation with neighboring NAs, or cooperation with umbrella organizations.
- Disaster Impact: Repopulation and Blight levels.
 - Notably, NBOs have virtually no correlation with the effects of the storm where the storm hit, namely, in the wet (flooded) areas. The correlations that emerge across wet and dry areas seem to reflect more the old advantages of the dry areas.
 - Thus, areas with older NBOs have better repopulation and less blight. And organizations that did a better job of general mobilization also had better repopulation and less blight, as did those with active business committees. Since these correlations emerge across the wet/dry divide (they are insignificant in the wet-only areas), they probably reflect the longer-term advantages of the dry areas. The (dry) areas where people had better organizations were the same (dry) areas where people were able to return and there was less blight to begin with. Those areas are richer.

- Yet some of the correlations seem to show the opposite. Organizations with more focus on investment and development saw less repopulation and more blight. Areas with more active block captain programs or more volunteers doing physical work have lower repopulation and more blight. These correlations might seem counterintuitive: shouldn't these organizational efforts be associated with better outcomes? Probably, in these cases, the causality is the reverse, namely, that the harder-hit areas are in the poorer areas with higher minority populations. (A glance at the census variables confirms this supposition.) Probably, those are among the areas with newer organizations, funded (often well-funded) and organized from outside the community, that are working hard to compensate for poor populations that were hit hardest by the storm.
- Blight Reduction.
 - This may be the most important dependent variable we are able to investigate; and the results are the clearest and strongest in our data. Subjective feelings are important. Yet reputations of organizations may be due to things besides results: for instance, leaders' charisma or past history. Citizens' feelings or their evaluations of the city's recovery may be beyond organizations' ability to influence, as may be their ability to influence repopulation or the level of blight they inherited. But reducing blight is an area of activity particular to each neighborhood, on which organizations may well be able to impact by their own efforts. This is probably the best test case in our data for the impact of neighborhood organizations. And happily, clear results show up most strongly here.
 - Blight reduction, as a variable, is most relevant in the wet areas, because those areas experienced the greatest increase in blight. Blight has existed in poor areas, whether wet or dry, and we could say it is more chronic in those areas and less amenable to improvement. Blight in the wet areas includes areas that had not previously experienced much blight and might be expected to work hardest to reduce it. Our ethnographic research supports this supposition.
 - The correlations show strongest blight reduction, especially in wet areas, where organizations put most effort into reducing blight. This is especially true for the questions that ask specifically about fighting blight. (The one exception, from Q. 44, asks which method is used, staff, committees, and so on. It doesn't seem to matter how the organization fights blight, only that it does so.) Similar questions seem to reflect the same thing. Thus, organizations that put effort into enforcement of codes or crime prevention saw a reduction in blight, as did organizations that put their volunteers to work on physical rebuilding.

- Besides working on blight reduction themselves, the main other way that organizations reduce blight is by working together. The overall count of cooperative relations is strongly related to blight reduction, especially in the wet areas, as is specific organizational cooperation on the issue of blight, and cooperation with neighboring NAs or umbrella organizations.
- Notably, relying on legislators or putting staff to work on publicity was associated with a failure to reduce blight – or even a rise in blight. Those organizations that did the work themselves, and especially those that cooperated with their fellow organizations, had the most effective strategy in fighting blight. This is one more instance where citizens achieved more by collectively pressing for it, themselves, rather than simply waiting for government to do it or devoting their efforts to publicity.

Regressions

Usually, only the strongest correlations survive in regression models, and sometimes anomalies emerge when some redundant variables cancel each other out or even reverse each others' effects (because their effect is net of each other). Thus, while regressions are more rigorous, I sometimes feel the results don't give as full a picture as do the bivariate correlations.

I followed several rules in developing the regression models.

1. I assembled a base set of demographic control variables that take into account storm damage, social class (income and employment status), race, family structure (married with children), and percent owner-occupied housing. These are in the top, unshaded panel of each table, and they are included in full in models 1 and 3 of each series.
2. I identified the strongest set of demographic control variables from the correlation tables. They might or might not include variables in the first rule. Model 4 in each series has these variables; they are shown in the top two panels of each table.
3. I identified the strongest social capital variables from the LSU Disaster Recovery Survey from the correlation tables. They are shown in the third panel of each table.
4. I identified the strongest organizational variables from the LSU/NPN survey from the correlation tables. They are shown in the bottom, shaded, panel of each table.
5. The models in each table are organized in this fashion:

- a. Model 1 in each table includes all identified variables, based on rule 1 controls.
- b. Model 2 in each table is reduced from model 1, with only the remaining statistically significant variables left in the model.
- c. Model 3 in each table is based on model 2, but adds back all the demographic controls from rule 1.
- d. Model 4 in each table includes all identified variables, based on rule 2 controls.
- e. Model 5 in each table is reduced from model 4, with only the remaining statistically significant variables left in the model.

The regressions tend to strongly support the picture we saw in the correlational analysis, though perhaps more focused. The results are also somewhat stronger and more impressive because, while some of the redundant variables do indeed cancel each other out, the strong ones survive controls for variables from other realms.

The regression models take into account the non-organizational variables that were listed in the correlation tables, but which I didn't discuss for reasons given above. The other variables come from two main realms: social structural factors (mostly from census data) and social capital indicators (mostly from the LSU Disaster Recovery Survey). Notably, in most cases, neighborhood organizations' strategies and resources still have strong effects, even when social structure and social capital are taken into account.

Some might suspect that some organizations think they hit a homerun, even though they were born on third base. That is, the communities where they are located already have so many social and economic advantages, that the organizations' efforts merely reinforce pre-existing advantages. The fact that we still find strong organizational effects when these other factors are taken into account means that (1) active organizations can compensate for or overcome disadvantages in their communities, (2) disadvantaged communities can sometimes overcome challenges if they engage in the most effective practices, and (c) as we'll see, communities and organizations often do best when they work together rather than going it alone.

I'll go through the regression results in roughly the same order as the correlations.

- Evaluation of neighborhood leaders.
 - Age of the organization still has an almost universally positive effect that is not washed away by controls for other variables.
 - A cooperative orientation also remains important, but its effect is weakened by controls. The overall "count" variable is only significant in knowing the name of your neighborhood association, but no longer significant in rating neighborhood leaders, but working with adjacent NAs is significant in many of the latter models. Working with umbrella

organizations does turn negative in one of the models, but this is undoubtedly an artifact of collinearity, since the bivariate correlation is positive.

- Among the control variables, associational involvement and/or civic engagement is consistently important in support of neighborhood leaders, and rootedness, faith-based engagement, and social trust sometimes so. Completing storm repairs promotes approval of neighborhood leaders, and blacks are more likely to know their neighborhood association, while being disadvantaged (poverty, unemployment, etc.) reduces people's support of neighborhood leaders. Family structure has inconsistent effects.
- Subjective feelings and evaluations about disaster recovery.
 - As in the bivariate correlations, age of neighborhood organizations and partnership with the administration help reduce stress levels in the regressions. But storm recovery, or lack of damage, and social trust most consistently reduce stress. African Americans and married families with children also express less stress. A few other factors are more irregular or even anomalous: faith-based engagement reduces stress in most models; but being employed and associational involvement increase stress in some models, while rootedness has an inconsistent effect. Since most of these effects differ from the correlations, they may be artifacts of collinearity.
 - Organizational cooperation is consistently, positively, related to storm recovery, whether individual or at the city level (but working with umbrella organizations has inconsistent effects). Recovery is stronger where neighborhood organizations work together. Age of the organization is positively associated with personal recovery in some models, and few other organizational variables have consistent effects.
 - Several of the control variables have the expected effects on recovery. Greater storm damage hinders recovery, while having resources for repair aids personal recovery. Social capital variables also tend to have a salutary effect. But many of the other control variables have inconsistent effects or effects that are hard to explain.
- Blight Reduction.
 - The regressions for blight reduction produce some of the strongest and clearest evidence for the importance of neighborhood organizations' efforts. Organizations that work on blight reduction do indeed help reduce blight, and cooperation among neighborhood organizations also generally helps reduce blight. Use of block captains is also helpful, but its effect is

only marginally statistically significant. These models are run only for “wet” areas, as explained above. Yet the results hold true whether the subsample includes all neighborhood organizations, or only “pure” neighborhood associations.

- The effect of the controls variables is also clear and consistent. Blight reduction is strongest in communities where there is strong citizen involvement in associations and – in many models – where families are strongly rooted in New Orleans. In most models, African American neighborhoods have better blight reduction (the effect is sometimes not statistically significant); and poverty or unemployment in neighborhoods weakens blight reduction, though the effects are not always statistically significant.
- Disaster Impact: Repopulation.
 - Two organizational characteristics consistently help repopulation: committees that focus on business development and volunteers engaged in the physical work of rebuilding. These factors make good sense. However, use of block captains is consistently related to weak repopulation. This mirrors the results in the correlational analysis, but is hard to explain.
 - Among control variables, mainly only the material factors had strong, consistent effects on repopulation, while social capital had little effect. Thus, unremarkably, repopulation was weakest where there was strongest storm damage and in poor areas. It was also stronger where people had good insurance and in areas where there were good retail or public amenities in the neighborhood.

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)

Correlations

	Rate Neighborhood Leaders					Rate The leadership of your NBH Assn					Able to name NBH association				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Age of the Org	.365**	.375**	.370*	.470**	.484**	.391**	.399**	.394**	.561**	.582**	.362**	.451**	.466**	.470**	.524**
Cooperation w Other Orgs: Count	-.056	-.015	-.053	-.042	-.092	.306*	.330*	.334*	.366*	.372*	.351**	.336*	.384**	.366*	.426*
Estimated Org Budget: Given + Regr Estimates:	-.107	-.117	.044	-.114	.063	-.153	-.159	.010	-.192	-.031	-.227	-.237	-.011	-.237	-.045
Special Mobilization of Membership	.173	.184	.213	.233	.285	.195	.213	.236	.244	.295	.034	.069	.079	.030	.041
General Mobilization of Membership	.158	.125	.121	.044	.023	.210	.212	.231	.190	.229	-.265*	-.226	-.204	-.183	-.130
Org Activities: Investment & Development	-.114	-.087	.000	-.082	.030	-.141	-.131	-.020	-.205	-.073	-.258*	-.361**	-.224	-.402**	-.283
Org Activities: Enforcement	.052	.055	.033	.074	.056	.168	.177	.168	.272	.278	.212	.265*	.282*	.407**	.459**
Org Activities: Participation	.209	.199	.216	.289	.330*	.176	.182	.195	.248	.287	.083	.176	.176	.108	.095
Org Activities: Crime Prevention	.028	.022	-.006	-.043	-.080	.197	.201	.201	.187	.187	.068	.081	.102	.146	.181
Committees Activity: Executive	-.051	-.025	-.034	-.129	-.175	-.070	-.062	-.052	-.212	-.254	-.122	-.214	-.192	-.203	-.206
Committees Activity: Business	.093	.085	.060	.108	.085	.051	.042	.009	.131	.113	.331**	.350**	.330*	.357*	.364*
Committees Activity: Participation	-.196	-.197	-.240	-.155	-.191	-.145	-.145	-.173	-.135	-.149	-.086	-.100	-.109	-.148	-.144
Effectiveness of Volunteers	-.124	-.193	-.232	-.256	-.277	-.175	-.208	-.273	-.281	-.320	-.058	-.073	-.181	-.163	-.255
Professional Volunteers	-.133	-.144	-.168	-.145	-.145	-.139	-.131	-.159	-.182	-.182	-.120	-.113	-.123	-.167	-.149
Office Work Volunteers	-.100	-.079	-.076	-.076	-.078	-.257*	-.257	-.273	-.294	-.341*	-.173	-.235	-.240	-.246	-.296
Physical Work Volunteers	.032	.044	.070	.094	.129	.160	.174	.231	.190	.272	.114	.102	.191	.109	.230
Organizational Activities: Info Sharing	.148	.155	.135	.284	.264	.182	.186	.195	.284	.290	.098	.136	.165	.157	.180
Organizational Activities: Staff	-.021	-.017	.051	-.040	.044	-.120	-.119	-.037	-.155	-.051	-.142	-.172	-.026	-.177	-.014
Organizational Activities: Database	.082	.115	.142	.137	.156	.173	.182	.237	.259	.324	.171	.106	.194	.108	.180
Organizational Activities: Block Captains	-.016	-.003	-.007	-.030	-.029	.002	.016	.006	-.015	-.026	.145	.197	.190	.213	.206
Organizational Activities: Committees	-.038	-.010	-.047	.037	.024	.157	.192	.153	.283	.286	.195	.272*	.211	.206	.165
Organizational Activities: All (q 41)	.000	-.023	.022	.007	.059	.088	.093	.180	.127	.228	-.066	-.008	.125	.016	.140
Organizational Activities: All (q 44)	.041	.072	.090	.112	.145	.115	.138	.181	.191	.259	.118	.134	.221	.106	.198
Organizational Activities: Blight	.020	.035	.012	.095	.091	.183	.199	.208	.280	.334*	.212	.244	.306*	.247	.353*
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 41)	-.027	-.035	-.034	.035	.052	.098	.103	.125	.194	.251	.123	.186	.261	.244	.365*
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 44)	.097	.108	.091	.177	.196	.122	.135	.142	.199	.264	.101	.135	.181	.083	.165
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 63)	-.044	.011	-.047	-.073	-.158	.271*	.306*	.275	.316*	.269	.366**	.293*	.274	.326*	.311
Org Activ/Blight: Info Share (q 44)	.129	.134	.104	.295*	.307	.086	.085	.079	.168	.209	.022	.033	.061	.022	.091
Org Activ/Blight: Staff (q 44)	-.013	-.001	.022	-.015	.022	-.094	-.090	-.044	-.123	-.054	-.059	-.098	.004	-.142	-.024
Org Activ/Blight: Database (q 44)	.139	.130	.127	.133	.138	.243	.249	.280	.314*	.402*	.152	.174	.246	.201	.307

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Correlations

	Rate Neighborhood Leaders					Rate The leadership of your NBH Assn					Able to name NBH association				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Org Activ/Blight: Block Captains (q 44)	.088	.108	.094	.092	.092	.078	.096	.072	.049	.030	.086	.121	.083	.122	.089
Org Activ/Blight: Committees (q 44)	-.029	-.023	-.051	.077	.081	.051	.063	.021	.179	.175	.088	.163	.094	.073	.024
Want Nonprofit Partnership (all)	-.197	-.184	-.134	-.214	-.170	-.155	-.150	-.094	-.131	-.067	-.059	-.133	-.082	.045	.089
Effective Partnership w Administration	-.060	-.077	-.023	-.096	-.045	-.018	-.018	.068	-.066	.017	-.051	-.022	.107	-.037	.069
Effective Partnership w Peer Orgs	.016	.028	.032	.032	.073	.201	.226	.241	.262	.343*	.193	.196	.152	.178	.175
Effective Partnership w Legislators	.020	-.009	.011	.077	.117	-.125	-.138	-.121	-.067	-.030	-.209	-.186	-.182	-.203	-.186
Org Material Assets (Database, Committees, C	-.148	-.140	-.097	-.094	-.033	-.043	-.032	.051	.026	.157	-.153	-.197	-.077	-.244	-.131
Org Structural Assets (Block Capts)	.231	.228	.199	.293	.260	.274*	.279*	.258	.434**	.421*	.310*	.368**	.369**	.439**	.439**
Worked w Umbrella Org	.140	.139	.136	.146	.132	.339**	.360**	.371**	.367*	.371*	.281*	.382**	.431**	.449**	.499**
Worked w Adjacent NAs	.065	.092	.066	-.010	-.016	.326**	.363**	.355*	.338*	.397*	.142	.197	.166	.236	.282
Staff Duties: Financial	-.047	-.022	.083	-.031	.081	-.104	-.091	.025	-.110	.014	-.071	-.105	.064	-.101	.042
Staff Duties: Publicity	-.021	.008	.047	.016	.103	-.042	-.048	-.012	-.113	-.040	.012	-.044	.033	-.216	-.106
Associational Involvement	.286*	.350**	.336*	.318*	.305	.627**	.666**	.661**	.689**	.692**	.621**	.602**	.595**	.678**	.692**
Civic Engagement	.319*	.513**	.515**	.557**	.568**	.459**	.606**	.600**	.649**	.654**	.732**	.657**	.638**	.681**	.678**
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	.112	.045	.053	-.061	-.072	.510**	.537**	.555**	.553**	.559**	.180	.407**	.428**	.552**	.564**
Faith-Based Engagement	.236	.191	.194	.088	.085	.448**	.486**	.490**	.448**	.451**	.128	.355**	.355*	.492**	.488**
Church member	.067	-.013	-.016	-.197	-.213	.419**	.457**	.465**	.433**	.445**	.099	.350**	.343*	.577**	.587**
Church service attendance	.248	.220	.218	.139	.131	.424**	.460**	.455**	.425**	.415*	.154	.366**	.361*	.494**	.484**
Social Trust	.454**	.595**	.591**	.656**	.658**	.370**	.431**	.405**	.606**	.594**	.410**	.292*	.230	.454**	.415*
Inter-Racial Trust	.087	.135	.139	.109	.114	-.041	-.036	-.044	-.073	-.082	.101	-.019	-.053	.013	-.008
Damage Assessment (City of NO 2007)	-.021	-.020	.034	-.096	-.039	.091	.094	.164	-.108	-.064	.073	.072	.153	.123	.203
Damage to Residence	.157	.118	.145	.101	.117	.192	.188	.221	.012	.003	-.051	.064	.103	.202	.192
Do-Will Have Resources for Repair	-.268*	-.167	-.207	-.235	-.279	-.127	-.104	-.150	.009	-.027	.310*	.061	.027	.123	.128
Storm Repairs completed, owners or renters	.149	.155	.126	.151	.125	.488**	.494**	.483**	.585**	.592**	.195	.226	.218	.364*	.390*
Source of \$ - Government Agencies	-.031	-.030	.001	-.109	-.091	.085	.079	.119	-.060	-.035	.032	-.001	.065	-.006	.043
Source of \$ - My own money	-.325**	-.228	-.251	-.123	-.153	-.360**	-.395**	-.416**	-.549**	-.590**	.001	-.306*	-.332*	-.451**	-.486**
Source of \$ - Insurance	.432**	.456**	.415**	.437**	.398*	.330**	.343**	.298*	.505**	.489**	.515**	.517**	.483**	.644**	.655**
Neighborhood Qualities	-.313*	-.323*	-.336*	-.403**	-.421*	.300*	.305*	.307*	.330*	.346*	.332**	.354**	.348*	.402**	.409*
Available Retail	.183	.319*	.307*	.349*	.346*	.061	.095	.080	.120	.110	.115	-.107	-.126	-.191	-.197

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Correlations

	Rate Neighborhood Leaders					Rate The leadership of your NBH Assn					Able to name NBH association				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Available Public	-.042	-.204	-.219	-.319*	-.339*	.200	.227	.250	.243	.299	-.329**	-.023	.012	.224	.335*
Alcoholic Drinks per Week Recently	-.129	-.171	-.173	-.107	-.114	-.149	-.162	-.166	-.098	-.114	-.148	-.083	-.097	-.213	-.247
Alcoholic Drinks per Week Pre-K	-.109	-.154	-.162	-.173	-.189	-.183	-.202	-.216	-.185	-.211	-.214	-.151	-.171	-.230	-.252
ACS 2005-09 Median household income	.324**	.350**	.323*	.312*	.282	.369**	.378**	.358*	.447**	.468**	.166	.164	.119	.315*	.328
ACS 2005-09 Pct Population 25+ HS or Less	-.198	-.254	-.209	-.210	-.153	-.491**	-.527**	-.516**	-.598**	-.607**	-.471**	-.447**	-.448**	-.564**	-.610**
ACS 2005-09 Pct Population 25+ BA or More	.233	.279*	.248	.301*	.281	.344**	.364**	.355*	.515**	.582**	.262*	.211	.203	.306*	.386*
Disadvantage Index (from ACS 2005-09)	-.291*	-.359**	-.325*	-.389**	-.358*	-.458**	-.492**	-.478**	-.597**	-.614**	-.466**	-.451**	-.442**	-.526**	-.564**
ACS 2005-09 Unemployed over Age 16	-.288*	-.357**	-.326*	-.379*	-.353*	-.374**	-.408**	-.396**	-.490**	-.503**	-.407**	-.413**	-.426**	-.391**	-.428*
ACS 2005-09 Pct Below Poverty level	-.244	-.313*	-.289*	-.306*	-.284	-.382**	-.426**	-.419**	-.483**	-.504**	-.464**	-.451**	-.482**	-.528**	-.604**
ACS 2005-09 Pct Below Poverty level: FHH w K	-.206	-.256	-.227	-.275	-.245	-.340**	-.370**	-.335*	-.439**	-.416*	-.437**	-.414**	-.379**	-.449**	-.443**
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic White	.165	.231	.197	.310*	.285	.233	.259	.228	.431**	.441**	.220	.139	.087	.170	.163
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic Black	-.171	-.236	-.202	-.293	-.267	-.230	-.254	-.227	-.383*	-.397*	-.202	-.120	-.079	-.124	-.132
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic Asian	.060	.070	.056	.035	.028	-.004	.003	-.008	-.036	-.038	-.066	-.069	-.076	-.103	-.103
ACS 2005-09 Pct Hispanic	.058	.062	.060	.040	.039	.067	.064	.098	.012	.056	-.005	-.034	.037	-.061	.045
ACS 2005-09 Median Age	.117	.189	.223	.308*	.374*	.188	.215	.241	.259	.322	.251*	.189	.206	.157	.196
ACS 2005-09 Pct Age 15-34	-.017	-.035	-.037	-.129	-.139	-.053	-.060	-.061	-.104	-.111	-.109	-.088	-.082	-.114	-.105
ACS 2005-09 Pct Married-couple family	.259*	.305*	.283*	.234	.217	.290*	.324*	.302*	.325*	.322	.182	.206	.170	.339*	.335*
Married with Children	.315*	.307*	.286*	.306*	.290	.463**	.473**	.451**	.673**	.669**	.218	.312*	.270	.447**	.426*
Have Minor Children	.044	-.044	-.054	-.137	-.148	.204	.201	.202	.335*	.355*	-.061	.120	.121	.271	.296
ACS 2005-09 Pct Households: Living Alone	-.157	-.146	-.159	-.024	-.038	-.053	-.064	-.087	-.009	-.050	.085	.008	-.042	-.081	-.151
ACS 2005-09 Pct Vacant Housing Units	-.132	-.074	-.035	-.032	.002	.015	.035	.105	-.031	.026	.082	-.018	.109	.033	.162
ACS 2005-09 Pct Occupied Housing Units	.132	.074	.035	.032	-.002	-.015	-.035	-.105	.031	-.026	-.082	.018	-.109	-.033	-.162
ACS 2005-09 Pct Owner Occupied	.380**	.411**	.402**	.391**	.397*	.356**	.388**	.364*	.422**	.429*	.265*	.338*	.282*	.441**	.421*
ACS 2005-09 Pct Renter Occupied	-.332**	-.406**	-.407**	-.385**	-.389*	-.405**	-.457**	-.459**	-.425**	-.438**	-.347**	-.366**	-.373**	-.475**	-.492**
ACS 2005-09 Median Home Value	.174	.199	.165	.238	.205	.255*	.265*	.236	.505**	.539**	.184	.142	.095	.344*	.378*
Census2000 Pct Foreign Born	.134	.134	.112	.134	.119	.076	.075	.060	.112	.115	-.022	-.012	-.011	-.044	-.022
Census2000 Pct Foreign Born: Not a Citizen	.242	.247	.218	.256	.234	.161	.157	.130	.193	.182	-.003	.012	-.026	-.028	-.046

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)

Correlations

	Stress					Recovery - Personal					Recovery - City				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Age of the Org	-.285*	-.272*	-.254	-.216	-.208	.150	.184	.130	.066	.015	-.271*	-.238	-.255	-.100	-.142
Cooperation w Other Orgs: Count	-.039	-.131	-.132	-.258	-.271	.051	.010	-.062	.033	-.056	.322**	.293*	.325*	.382**	.416*
Estimated Org Budget: Given + Regr Estimates	.067	.093	.133	.048	.097	-.186	-.179	-.061	-.103	.047	.135	.140	.062	.048	-.046
Special Mobilization of Membership	-.014	.025	.026	.004	.016	-.114	-.113	-.095	-.130	-.133	-.279*	-.269*	-.283*	-.274	-.284
General Mobilization of Membership	-.177	-.177	-.196	-.019	-.051	.008	.023	-.015	-.124	-.199	-.037	-.055	-.085	.182	.151
Org Activities: Investment & Development	.153	.081	.035	.031	.016	-.198	-.286*	-.217	-.076	-.014	.240	.187	.169	-.086	-.103
Org Activities: Enforcement	-.210	-.234	-.258	-.265	-.297	-.076	-.093	-.152	.073	.010	.030	.019	.008	.020	-.009
Org Activities: Participation	.036	.089	.102	.053	.072	.066	.089	.103	-.053	-.057	-.250*	-.270*	-.247	-.181	-.130
Org Activities: Crime Prevention	-.115	-.123	-.145	-.100	-.123	-.004	-.009	-.049	-.022	-.073	-.034	-.012	.003	.078	.106
Committees Activity: Executive	.169	.140	.140	.082	.091	-.174	-.213	-.248	-.041	-.090	.179	.208	.210	-.021	-.042
Committees Activity: Business	-.105	-.096	-.100	-.017	-.039	.275*	.312*	.319*	.221	.254	-.184	-.113	-.120	.008	-.007
Committees Activity: Participation	.085	.094	.087	.103	.088	.100	.109	.099	-.042	-.082	.048	.039	.006	.208	.187
Effectiveness of Volunteers	.053	.052	.070	.113	.125	-.025	-.073	-.034	-.201	-.158	-.021	.003	.023	.017	.042
Professional Volunteers	.002	.038	.049	.006	.037	.019	.001	-.033	.141	.089	-.036	-.024	-.062	-.054	-.099
Office Work Volunteers	.156	.160	.159	.168	.203	.051	.024	.064	.123	.154	-.092	-.133	-.147	-.213	-.226
Physical Work Volunteers	-.126	-.170	-.225	-.172	-.294	-.264*	-.289*	-.280*	-.221	-.197	.038	.091	.137	.007	.048
Organizational Activities: Info Sharing	.022	.068	.033	-.005	-.056	.101	.133	.120	.146	.129	-.058	-.035	-.020	-.010	.009
Organizational Activities: Staff	-.023	-.070	-.132	.004	-.024	.017	-.025	.059	-.021	.026	-.013	-.065	-.141	-.053	-.095
Organizational Activities: Database	.009	-.039	-.067	-.053	-.074	-.058	-.078	-.080	-.132	-.171	.133	.150	.123	.090	.075
Organizational Activities: Block Captains	-.035	.003	.008	-.041	-.022	-.006	.007	.000	.221	.208	.046	.079	.084	-.104	-.108
Organizational Activities: Committees	.173	.198	.264	.130	.206	-.159	-.176	-.272	-.248	-.385*	.147	.127	.149	.141	.143
Organizational Activities: All (q 41)	-.028	.007	-.043	-.063	-.103	-.280*	-.292*	-.287*	-.160	-.168	.038	.047	.023	-.087	-.104
Organizational Activities: All (q 44)	.069	.057	.037	.032	.029	-.049	-.073	-.075	-.074	-.118	.091	.072	.041	.037	.017
Organizational Activities: Blight	-.004	-.043	-.063	-.235	-.275	-.024	-.058	-.107	-.002	-.094	.151	.113	.096	.147	.141
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 41)	-.039	-.039	-.054	-.290	-.318	-.095	-.107	-.126	.050	.002	.105	.083	.054	.044	.015
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 44)	-.009	-.009	-.034	-.083	-.114	.010	-.005	-.037	-.054	-.136	.054	.037	.016	.072	.069
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 63)	.088	-.065	-.060	-.173	-.189	.102	.026	-.061	.006	-.094	.251*	.190	.230	.351*	.388*
Org Activ/Blight: Info Share (q 44)	.070	.103	.054	.071	-.011	.036	.055	.048	.033	.013	-.135	-.126	-.132	-.103	-.094
Org Activ/Blight: Staff (q 44)	-.007	-.067	-.116	-.075	-.113	.109	.064	.106	.065	.066	-.015	-.066	-.107	.006	.006
Org Activ/Blight: Database (q 44)	-.114	-.093	-.132	-.105	-.158	-.161	-.154	-.191	-.288	-.390*	.118	.187	.164	.170	.170

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Correlations

	Stress					Recovery - Personal					Recovery - City				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Org Activ/Blight: Block Captains (q 44)	-.212	-.213	-.200	-.281	-.268	.151	.164	.143	.330*	.314	.099	.126	.141	.027	.033
Org Activ/Blight: Committees (q 44)	.157	.180	.236	.104	.166	-.045	-.057	-.122	-.136	-.226	.062	-.003	.001	.052	.031
Want Nonprofit Partnership (all)	.077	.070	.042	.070	.071	-.118	-.134	-.044	.062	.190	.158	.196	.190	-.042	-.033
Effective Partnership w Administration	-.088	-.091	-.202	-.203	-.335*	-.113	-.124	-.016	-.123	-.039	.114	.111	.118	.073	.131
Effective Partnership w Peer Orgs	-.190	-.202	-.197	-.147	-.137	.001	-.011	-.003	-.080	-.073	-.129	-.075	-.039	-.013	.029
Effective Partnership w Legislators	-.115	-.135	-.149	-.078	-.093	.214	.212	.263	.105	.165	-.092	-.136	-.152	-.042	-.048
Org Material Assets (Database, Committees, C	.111	.061	.042	.028	.030	-.115	-.167	-.125	-.223	-.238	-.008	-.088	-.130	-.040	-.027
Org Structural Assets (Block Capts)	-.211	-.192	-.205	-.229	-.256	.102	.137	.089	.204	.156	-.188	-.142	-.128	-.195	-.190
Worked w Umbrella Org	-.077	-.056	-.053	-.110	-.120	-.271*	-.254	-.317*	-.171	-.234	.277*	.331*	.348*	.220	.226
Worked w Adjacent NAs	-.091	-.092	-.069	-.146	-.133	.109	.115	.069	-.036	-.124	.157	.145	.174	.389**	.455**
Staff Duties: Financial	.137	.098	.070	.058	.066	-.121	-.176	-.083	-.005	.083	.185	.148	.123	-.038	-.056
Staff Duties: Publicity	-.022	-.098	-.126	-.039	-.082	.253*	.246	.322*	.065	.153	-.159	-.272*	-.364**	-.057	-.156
Associational Involvement	-.262*	-.396**	-.404**	-.450**	-.468**	-.111	-.172	-.221	-.264	-.310	.178	.190	.204	.349*	.353*
Civic Engagement	.004	-.262*	-.265	-.311*	-.326	.182	.082	.075	.023	.031	-.133	-.232	-.228	-.130	-.132
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	-.379**	-.263*	-.247	-.364*	-.347*	-.630**	-.608**	-.659**	-.567**	-.633**	.371**	.530**	.554**	.482**	.503**
Faith-Based Engagement	-.445**	-.338**	-.334*	-.485**	-.484**	-.437**	-.398**	-.436**	-.322*	-.379*	.207	.367**	.369**	.281	.281
Church member	-.329**	-.182	-.167	-.168	-.146	-.425**	-.383**	-.423**	-.261	-.305	.246	.426**	.437**	.401**	.405*
Church service attendance	-.438**	-.351**	-.348*	-.456**	-.454**	-.375**	-.329*	-.371**	-.232	-.291	.222	.360**	.364**	.255	.256
Social Trust	-.281*	-.531**	-.534**	-.482**	-.495**	.273*	.208	.185	.230	.229	-.197	-.291*	-.284*	-.255	-.262
Inter-Racial Trust	.176	.082	.101	.213	.226	.377**	.346**	.363**	.288	.332*	-.199	-.255	-.264	-.176	-.197
Damage Assessment (City of NO 2007)	.123	.195	.179	.055	.034	-.552**	-.549**	-.508**	-.305*	-.203	.168	.244	.286*	-.293	-.283
Damage to Residence	.042	.177	.157	.100	.087	-.466**	-.433**	-.409**	-.060	-.009	.190	.273*	.290*	-.190	-.162
Do-Will Have Resources for Repair	.023	-.250	-.231	-.106	-.088	.392**	.358**	.325*	.261	.233	.119	.030	.056	.215	.232
Storm Repairs completed, owners or renters	-.647**	-.724**	-.749**	-.713**	-.745**	.149	.154	.113	.243	.209	.008	.013	.035	.088	.108
Source of \$ - Government Agencies	-.019	-.020	-.052	-.301*	-.347*	-.183	-.181	-.132	.111	.186	.214	.225	.239	-.090	-.066
Source of \$ - My own money	.448**	.283*	.287*	.494**	.498**	.367**	.324*	.323*	.127	.119	-.190	-.428**	-.448**	-.361*	-.397*
Source of \$ - Insurance	-.153	-.157	-.139	-.055	-.036	.226	.223	.145	.356*	.283	-.115	-.094	-.061	-.034	-.012
Neighborhood Qualities	.149	.168	.182	.165	.175	-.094	-.093	-.107	-.114	-.123	.226	.251	.261	.326*	.331*
Available Retail	.141	-.080	-.075	.023	.018	.356**	.299*	.261	.009	-.050	-.222	-.405**	-.436**	-.254	-.310

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Correlations

	Stress					Recovery - Personal					Recovery - City				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Available Public	-.218	.020	.025	.094	.100	-.238	-.153	-.180	-.102	-.130	.153	.339**	.338*	.397**	.391*
Alcoholic Drinks per Week Recently	-.121	-.018	.010	.091	.137	-.016	.041	.018	-.074	-.105	-.205	-.146	-.151	-.010	-.022
Alcoholic Drinks per Week Pre-K	-.087	.006	.021	.179	.197	.053	.109	.093	-.120	-.143	-.212	-.189	-.185	-.077	-.081
ACS 2005-09 Median household income	-.147	-.175	-.189	-.010	-.041	.119	.119	.063	.112	.033	-.244	-.244	-.251	-.081	-.094
ACS 2005-09 Pct Population 25+ HS or Less	.164	.253	.256	.240	.257	-.154	-.128	-.030	-.058	.072	.032	.010	-.002	-.142	-.151
ACS 2005-09 Pct Population 25+ BA or More	-.107	-.190	-.220	-.087	-.149	.265*	.242	.203	.051	-.020	-.208	-.224	-.243	.045	.035
Disadvantage Index (from ACS 2005-09)	.092	.190	.188	.158	.171	-.257*	-.230	-.146	-.137	-.025	.127	.160	.163	-.036	-.026
ACS 2005-09 Unemployed over Age 16	-.011	.063	.065	.041	.052	-.271*	-.249	-.159	-.184	-.061	.020	.070	.059	-.109	-.120
ACS 2005-09 Pct Below Poverty level	.115	.209	.207	.186	.194	-.201	-.178	-.119	-.201	-.127	.135	.133	.152	.034	.059
ACS 2005-09 Pct Below Poverty level: FHH w K	.210	.346**	.332*	.352*	.353*	-.264*	-.230	-.163	-.090	-.017	.258*	.301*	.323*	.157	.196
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic White	.017	-.097	-.100	.051	.025	.342**	.313*	.283*	.025	-.020	-.304*	-.382**	-.394**	-.070	-.084
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic Black	-.026	.079	.087	-.051	-.021	-.365**	-.339**	-.313*	-.098	-.060	.290*	.361**	.375**	.060	.074
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic Asian	-.044	-.035	-.043	-.048	-.055	.173	.183	.178	.254	.245	.023	.030	.034	.034	.041
ACS 2005-09 Pct Hispanic	.125	.133	.150	.128	.138	.028	.028	.017	-.006	-.032	-.105	-.104	-.153	-.049	-.089
ACS 2005-09 Median Age	.033	-.103	-.101	-.104	-.109	.061	.006	.044	-.146	-.097	-.073	-.175	-.185	.021	.032
ACS 2005-09 Pct Age 15-34	-.014	.040	.050	.034	.046	.080	.113	.117	.064	.065	-.037	-.005	-.008	-.078	-.097
ACS 2005-09 Pct Married-couple family	-.204	-.207	-.210	-.076	-.075	.042	.061	.023	.187	.147	-.125	-.072	-.053	-.084	-.062
Married with Children	-.544**	-.532**	-.536**	-.465**	-.471**	-.201	-.176	-.232	-.184	-.244	.046	.118	.137	.237	.249
Have Minor Children	-.324**	-.190	-.212	-.093	-.119	-.466**	-.434**	-.447**	-.413**	-.423*	.291*	.463**	.486**	.535**	.569**
ACS 2005-09 Pct Households: Living Alone	.088	-.039	-.005	-.164	-.145	.198	.157	.135	-.168	-.191	.033	-.100	-.106	.153	.119
ACS 2005-09 Pct Vacant Housing Units	.154	.066	.049	-.122	-.134	-.135	-.181	-.152	.081	.116	.309*	.278*	.265	-.015	-.040
ACS 2005-09 Pct Occupied Housing Units	-.154	-.066	-.049	.122	.134	.135	.181	.152	-.081	-.116	-.309*	-.278*	-.265	.015	.040
ACS 2005-09 Pct Owner Occupied	-.199	-.168	-.177	-.075	-.093	-.047	-.022	-.053	.001	-.021	-.243	-.173	-.154	-.086	-.057
ACS 2005-09 Pct Renter Occupied	.118	.143	.158	.137	.153	.139	.144	.152	-.041	-.033	.067	.008	-.002	.096	.074
ACS 2005-09 Median Home Value	-.186	-.260*	-.268	-.065	-.097	.331**	.312*	.277	.221	.175	-.217	-.230	-.237	.136	.134
Census2000 Pct Foreign Born	-.047	-.036	-.049	-.037	-.058	.187	.201	.180	.196	.170	-.046	-.048	-.058	.008	-.004
Census2000 Pct Foreign Born: Not a Citizen	-.021	-.025	-.028	-.036	-.055	.290*	.301*	.276	.206	.171	-.057	-.093	-.094	-.008	-.015

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)

Correlations

	Mean Rate of Return 2006-2010					Mean Blight 2006-2010					Blight Reduction, 6/06 - 9/10				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Age of the Org	.225	.252	.201	.196	.128	-.256*	-.302*	-.248	-.206	-.121	-.013	-.037	-.017	.236	.297
Cooperation w Other Orgs: Count	.070	.061	-.057	.123	-.027	-.059	-.028	.061	-.121	-.022	.316*	.377**	.379**	.523**	.502**
Estimated Org Budget: Given + Regr Estimates	-.158	-.160	-.071	-.022	.195	.164	.165	.057	.010	-.199	.064	.062	.126	-.182	-.064
Special Mobilization of Membership	-.112	-.094	-.042	-.138	-.069	.122	.097	.054	.140	.089	.070	.025	.043	.082	.092
General Mobilization of Membership	.338**	.290*	.262	.242	.152	-.359**	-.324*	-.311*	-.224	-.150	-.285*	-.228	-.258	-.085	-.105
Org Activities: Investment & Development	-.268*	-.361**	-.304*	-.141	-.014	.258*	.380**	.289*	.145	-.022	.097	.191	.214	-.156	-.128
Org Activities: Enforcement	.020	.009	-.093	-.024	-.181	-.013	.003	.120	-.020	.155	.245*	.267*	.281*	.517**	.532**
Org Activities: Participation	.168	.166	.255	.137	.333*	-.159	-.167	-.271	-.118	-.326	-.127	-.143	-.148	-.032	-.053
Org Activities: Crime Prevention	.095	.083	.057	.068	.026	-.144	-.138	-.126	-.133	-.111	.111	.137	.142	.303*	.340*
Committees Activity: Executive	-.144	-.165	-.264	.088	-.061	.164	.197	.297*	-.076	.080	.206	.262*	.275	-.049	-.022
Committees Activity: Business	.243	.320*	.301*	.212	.159	-.225	-.315*	-.271	-.200	-.118	-.050	-.114	-.133	.109	.110
Committees Activity: Participation	.220	.238	.180	.151	.020	-.242	-.262*	-.189	-.195	-.050	-.147	-.165	-.211	-.047	-.101
Effectiveness of Volunteers	.062	.021	.070	-.072	-.050	-.077	-.036	-.080	.076	.036	-.082	-.059	-.092	-.038	-.101
Professional Volunteers	-.038	-.019	-.048	.089	.120	.009	-.016	.041	-.142	-.142	.059	-.002	.029	.073	.066
Office Work Volunteers	-.098	-.078	-.182	-.075	-.189	.118	.114	.140	.109	.146	.046	-.002	-.101	.006	-.194
Physical Work Volunteers	-.238	-.295*	-.210	-.150	-.037	.246*	.300*	.187	.176	.016	.162	.256	.292*	.149	.350*
Organizational Activities: Info Sharing	.037	.069	-.028	.224	.128	-.055	-.098	-.029	-.281	-.216	.125	.095	.050	.130	.061
Organizational Activities: Staff	.018	-.016	.041	-.087	-.098	-.054	-.006	-.098	.093	.083	-.117	-.095	-.149	-.023	-.004
Organizational Activities: Database	.005	.040	.012	.141	.087	-.073	-.104	-.076	-.210	-.138	.100	.084	.087	.043	.104
Organizational Activities: Block Captains	-.323**	-.302*	-.344*	-.185	-.232	.313*	.286*	.334*	.151	.206	.370**	.335**	.357*	.234	.227
Organizational Activities: Committees	.131	.130	.041	.236	.206	-.116	-.111	-.015	-.230	-.198	.111	.133	.155	.170	.087
Organizational Activities: All (q 41)	-.197	-.231	-.228	-.065	-.018	.209	.240	.211	.029	-.053	.311*	.341**	.365**	.262	.305
Organizational Activities: All (q 44)	.024	.029	-.030	.127	.054	-.067	-.066	-.028	-.165	-.103	.123	.123	.100	.151	.122
Organizational Activities: Blight	.000	-.017	-.141	.100	-.097	.000	.032	.155	-.145	.041	.271*	.308*	.301*	.400**	.393*
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 41)	-.070	-.097	-.160	.061	-.046	.095	.128	.192	-.113	-.015	.350**	.391**	.397**	.474**	.518**
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 44)	.035	.044	-.079	.096	-.095	-.043	-.047	.072	-.110	.079	.058	.036	-.002	.080	.007
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 63)	.093	.075	-.041	.070	-.094	-.133	-.079	.034	-.114	.031	.177	.272*	.285*	.469**	.466**
Org Activ/Blight: Info Share (q 44)	-.002	.015	-.095	.073	-.134	.010	-.013	.084	-.101	.067	-.013	-.034	-.113	.017	-.078
Org Activ/Blight: Staff (q 44)	.054	.027	.008	-.015	-.124	-.072	-.027	-.034	.035	.132	-.089	-.069	-.119	-.005	-.019
Org Activ/Blight: Database (q 44)	.021	.066	-.023	.116	-.043	-.031	-.089	.008	-.139	.034	.166	.119	.099	.145	.139

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)

Correlations

	Mean Rate of Return 2006-2010					Mean Blight 2006-2010					Blight Reduction, 6/06 - 9/10				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Org Activ/Blight: Block Captains (q 44)	-.264*	-.251	-.326*	-.184	-.272	.254*	.238	.311*	.164	.248	.243	.210	.225	.131	.087
Org Activ/Blight: Committees (q 44)	.138	.131	.070	.202	.187	-.127	-.110	-.029	-.205	-.170	-.045	-.044	-.026	-.032	-.107
Want Nonprofit Partnership (all)	-.273*	-.241	-.175	-.039	.152	.280*	.253	.182	.042	-.136	.255*	.220	.224	.092	.111
Effective Partnership w Administration	-.132	-.165	.042	-.151	.126	.105	.138	-.051	.080	-.176	.122	.154	.207	.032	.172
Effective Partnership w Peer Orgs	-.057	-.017	.039	-.121	-.020	.006	-.044	-.156	.097	-.104	.122	.068	.086	.331*	.326
Effective Partnership w Legislators	.203	.142	.189	.085	.133	-.232	-.171	-.223	-.083	-.127	-.394**	-.354**	-.380**	-.317*	-.324
Org Material Assets (Database, Committees, C	.081	.041	.164	.084	.256	-.114	-.058	-.218	-.084	-.290	-.166	-.127	-.154	-.109	-.081
Org Structural Assets (Block Capt)	.011	.065	.006	.068	.001	.008	-.061	.012	-.093	-.008	.280*	.235	.258	.406**	.448**
Worked w Umbrella Org	-.183	-.222	-.269	-.061	-.085	.187	.215	.275	.047	.086	.305*	.379**	.435**	.266	.339*
Worked w Adjacent NAs	.196	.248	.194	.115	.038	-.184	-.233	-.198	-.113	-.085	.136	.090	.080	.412**	.347*
Staff Duties: Financial	-.205	-.251	-.203	-.086	.016	.203	.271*	.196	.099	-.009	.152	.203	.225	-.036	.004
Staff Duties: Publicity	.244*	.282*	.376**	.127	.224	-.295*	-.316*	-.421**	-.098	-.190	-.273*	-.311*	-.368**	-.088	-.088
Associational Involvement	.167	.168	.129	.147	.099	-.200	-.185	-.130	-.170	-.111	.278*	.333*	.347*	.594**	.609**
Civic Engagement	.094	.093	.090	.003	-.005	-.164	-.122	-.104	-.022	-.004	.067	.178	.187	.444**	.448**
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	-.199	-.188	-.199	-.023	.009	.271*	.224	.232	.031	-.011	.609**	.598**	.639**	.590**	.646**
Faith-Based Engagement	-.207	-.189	-.221	-.046	-.067	.255*	.196	.250	.012	.058	.556**	.530**	.573**	.498**	.553**
Church member	-.104	-.078	-.079	.109	.161	.154	.081	.112	-.134	-.147	.443**	.404**	.455**	.366*	.425**
Church service attendance	-.222	-.199	-.247	-.085	-.137	.269*	.209	.277	.055	.127	.593**	.567**	.605**	.554**	.602**
Social Trust	.296*	.305*	.319*	.137	.144	-.365**	-.344**	-.339*	-.178	-.169	-.200	-.144	-.136	.165	.166
Inter-Racial Trust	.210	.201	.218	.092	.112	-.247	-.217	-.226	-.080	-.087	-.361**	-.325*	-.328*	-.264	-.270
Damage Assessment (City of NO 2007)	-.877**	-.872**	-.867**	-.822**	-.782**	.892**	.883**	.865**	.828**	.755**	.665**	.637**	.719**	.157	.315
Damage to Residence	-.719**	-.736**	-.753**	-.688**	-.708**	.771**	.769**	.791**	.665**	.686**	.700**	.690**	.728**	.355*	.443**
Do-Will Have Resources for Repair	.347**	.415**	.429**	.261	.286	-.361**	-.375**	-.394**	-.201	-.236	-.389**	-.379**	-.394**	-.191	-.237
Storm Repairs completed, owners or renters	.235	.251	.217	.262	.232	-.251	-.271*	-.242	-.281	-.262	.023	.010	-.003	.211	.178
Source of \$ - Government Agencies	-.553**	-.539**	-.531**	-.280	-.227	.591**	.581**	.559**	.305*	.219	.522**	.503**	.530**	.109	.158
Source of \$ - My own money	.165	.170	.119	.050	-.069	-.260*	-.220	-.186	-.019	.098	-.468**	-.464**	-.504**	-.450**	-.542**
Source of \$ - Insurance	.335**	.370**	.306*	.298*	.192	-.329**	-.366**	-.287*	-.299*	-.182	.068	.046	.049	.403**	.367*
Neighborhood Qualities	.248	.256	.291*	.332*	.421*	-.212	-.225	-.245	-.316*	-.387*	-.038	-.042	-.034	-.108	-.114
Available Retail	.463**	.494**	.435**	.316*	.176	-.537**	-.528**	-.485**	-.302*	-.175	-.390**	-.332*	-.374**	-.033	-.066

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Correlations

	Mean Rate of Return 2006-2010					Mean Blight 2006-2010					Blight Reduction, 6/06 - 9/10				
	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO	ALLNBO	NBHOrg	NBO2	Wet	WetNBO
Available Public	.240	.313*	.301*	.446**	.460**	-.145	-.270*	-.260	-.429**	-.455**	.078	-.017	-.038	-.084	-.129
Alcoholic Drinks per Week Recently	.198	.229	.250	.141	.175	-.120	-.173	-.183	-.083	-.094	-.247	-.315*	-.308*	-.375*	-.368*
Alcoholic Drinks per Week Pre-K	.200	.206	.241	.077	.132	-.156	-.182	-.210	-.031	-.067	-.261*	-.294*	-.287	-.302	-.288
ACS 2005-09 Median household income	.420**	.439**	.409**	.421**	.349*	-.444**	-.468**	-.415**	-.474**	-.363*	-.189	-.197	-.215	.035	-.013
ACS 2005-09 Pct Population 25+ HS or Less	-.376**	-.405**	-.321*	-.438**	-.338*	.405**	.431**	.334*	.464**	.345*	-.078	-.102	-.120	-.374*	-.386*
ACS 2005-09 Pct Population 25+ BA or More	.539**	.560**	.525**	.505**	.409*	-.566**	-.582**	-.534**	-.526**	-.413*	-.263*	-.251	-.303*	.072	.008
Disadvantage Index (from ACS 2005-09)	-.522**	-.540**	-.458**	-.576**	-.474**	.546**	.554**	.464**	.567**	.447**	.084	.049	.065	-.247	-.197
ACS 2005-09 Unemployed over Age 16	-.529**	-.546**	-.465**	-.583**	-.512**	.533**	.538**	.447**	.577**	.484**	.091	.063	.090	-.168	-.076
ACS 2005-09 Pct Below Poverty level	-.333**	-.349**	-.269	-.402**	-.282	.347**	.357**	.271	.359*	.225	-.016	-.063	-.061	-.281	-.270
ACS 2005-09 Pct Below Poverty level: FHH w K	-.345**	-.337**	-.308*	-.248	-.197	.418**	.402**	.353*	.285	.215	.179	.122	.095	-.135	-.162
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic White	.528**	.543**	.536**	.390**	.344*	-.589**	-.589**	-.565**	-.406**	-.328	-.463**	-.442**	-.478**	-.154	-.212
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic Black	-.549**	-.570**	-.548**	-.451**	-.382*	.591**	.597**	.569**	.435**	.352*	.431**	.418**	.473**	.144	.243
ACS 2005-09 Pct Non-Hispanic Asian	.114	.140	.107	.168	.138	-.080	-.107	-.083	-.124	-.102	-.006	-.039	-.065	-.038	-.104
ACS 2005-09 Pct Hispanic	.210	.236	.159	.264	.115	-.149	-.174	-.159	-.161	-.100	-.008	-.027	-.152	.003	-.185
ACS 2005-09 Median Age	.043	.010	.118	-.081	.086	-.109	-.049	-.142	.107	-.018	-.320**	-.272*	-.252	-.296*	-.225
ACS 2005-09 Pct Age 15-34	.100	.127	.106	.186	.154	-.095	-.136	-.149	-.214	-.258	.148	.120	.097	.199	.157
ACS 2005-09 Pct Married-couple family	.170	.213	.209	.178	.179	-.152	-.208	-.180	-.173	-.139	.010	-.020	-.006	.142	.146
Married with Children	.121	.159	.131	.084	.040	-.130	-.190	-.151	-.127	-.077	.242	.205	.221	.577**	.589**
Have Minor Children	-.020	.001	.040	.013	.063	.069	.005	-.016	-.043	-.081	.233	.189	.196	.297*	.329
ACS 2005-09 Pct Households: Living Alone	.174	.151	.120	.131	.112	-.250*	-.199	-.177	-.147	-.139	-.208	-.158	-.156	-.115	-.146
ACS 2005-09 Pct Vacant Housing Units	-.525**	-.560**	-.646**	-.249	-.364*	.486**	.546**	.586**	.287	.351*	.446**	.526**	.546**	.186	.250
ACS 2005-09 Pct Occupied Housing Units	.525**	.560**	.646**	.249	.364*	-.486**	-.546**	-.586**	-.287	-.351*	-.446**	-.526**	-.546**	-.186	-.250
ACS 2005-09 Pct Owner Occupied	.141	.178	.210	.004	.031	-.105	-.163	-.148	.005	.037	-.049	-.090	-.075	.142	.153
ACS 2005-09 Pct Renter Occupied	.190	.178	.190	.119	.138	-.205	-.187	-.218	-.146	-.199	-.240	-.254	-.270	-.237	-.265
ACS 2005-09 Median Home Value	.563**	.586**	.567**	.587**	.522**	-.590**	-.610**	-.578**	-.612**	-.528**	-.287*	-.291*	-.322*	.203	.148
Census2000 Pct Foreign Born	.305*	.331*	.287*	.309*	.247	-.274*	-.304*	-.265	-.274	-.221	-.113	-.146	-.190	-.064	-.151
Census2000 Pct Foreign Born: Not a Citizen	.383**	.399**	.336*	.351*	.251	-.372**	-.387**	-.324*	-.335*	-.244	-.177	-.196	-.245	-.078	-.185

Factors Influencing Post-Katrina Outcomes in Greater New Orleans, 2006-2011

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67) Regressions (with Fixed Controls)

Rate The leadership of your NBH Assn

	NBOs only (narrowly defined)					Wet areas: NBOs only				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Damage Assessment	.317+	.328**	.383**			-.139	-.199*	-.123		
Median household income	-.232		-.031			-.282		-.204		
Unemployed	-.200	-.247*	-.235+			-.100		-.112		
Pct Black	-.236		-.117	.002		-.101		-.147	-.222	-.258**
Married with Children	-.153		.094	-.530**	-.558**	.128	.261*	.262*	-.344	-.473**
Pct Owner Occupied	-.025		-.090	-.034		.097		-.001	.014	
Storm Repairs completed, owners or renters				.257	.215+				.494**	.495**
Disadvantage Index				-.049					-.116	
Neighborhood Qualities				.027					-.037	
Associational Involvement	.394	.463**	.446**	.099		.289			-.234	
Civic Engagement	-.031			.263	.340**	.046			.630*	.493**
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	.231			.133		.399	.382**	.383**	-.019	
Faith-Based Engagement	.025			.194	.284**	-.253			-.054	
Social Trust	.337			.549*	.610**	.421*	.327**	.326*	.038	.122
Age of the Organization	.159	.252*	.232+	.331+	.301*	.220	.330**	.344**	.443*	.395**
Cooperation with Other Organizations: Count	.058			.139		.007			.226	.110
Organizational Activities: Blight	-.078			-.047		-.059			-.098	
Effective Partnership with Peer Organizations	.080			-.069		.070			-.018	
Organization Structural Assets (Block Capts)	.042			-.034		.024			-.040	
Worked with Umbrella Organization	.081			-.059	.010	.055			-.189	-.216**
Worked with Adjacent NAs	.235	.292**	.295**	-.010		.134	.146+	.142	-.070	
Adj R-Sq	.513	.587	.553	.615	.704	.767	.810	.798	.838	.896

Factors Influencing Post-Katrina Outcomes in Greater New Orleans, 2006-2011

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67) Regressions (with Fixed Controls)

Able to name NBH association

	NBOs only (narrowly defined)					Wet areas: NBOs only				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Damage Assessment	.135		.066			.160	.203+	.201		
Median household income	-.531*		-.328*			-.208		-.184		
Unemployed	-.495**	-.364**	-.430**			-.463*	-.484**	-.484**		
Pct Black	.228	.506**	.304+	.394+	.464**	.295	.367*	.282	.305	.251+
Married with Children	-.267+		-.117			-.334+	-.335*	-.354*		
Pct Owner Occupied	.126		.077	-.143		.086		.078	-.047	
Disadvantage Index				-.403+	-.286+				-.320	-.300+
Neighborhood Qualities				.082					.054	
Associational Involvement	.421+			.063		.500+	.574**	.596**	.136	
Civic Engagement	.249	.503**	.545**	.425+	.483**	.111			.256	.374*
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	.059			.144		.109			.180	.181
Faith-Based Engagement	-.216			-.183		-.142			-.137	
Social Trust	.299+			-.080		.395*	.309*	.346*	.150	
Age of the Organization	.334*	.405**	.441**	.303+	.374**	.185	.218+	.238*	.225	.308*
Cooperation with Other Organizations: Count	.282+	.271**	.292**	.206	.280**	.205	.233*	.243*	.222	.239*
Organizational Activities: Blight	-.183			-.074		-.107			-.184	
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 41)	.126			.115		.068			.113	
Organization Structural Assets (Block Capts)	.028			.031		.122	.180+	.153	.000	
Worked with Umbrella Organization	.112			.113		.162			.172	
Adj R-Sq	.727	.689	.721	.566	.634	.735	.781	.772	.594	.692

Factors Influencing Post-Katrina Outcomes in Greater New Orleans, 2006-2011

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67) Regressions (with Fixed Controls)

Stress

	All Organizations					NBOs only (narrowly defined)					Wet areas: NBOs only				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Damage Assessment	.422**	.418**	.395**			.331*	.294*	.268+			.286	.249+	.261		
Median household income	.112		.085			.221		.227			.202		.235		
Unemployed	-.353*	-.390**	-.330*			-.291+	-.354**	-.253			-.307	-.364*	-.317		
Pct Black	.066		.022	-.455*	-.244+	.023		.052	-.352+	-.455**	.045		.063	-.386+	-.412**
Married with Children	-.349*	-.335*	-.391**	-.105	-.319*	-.269	-.272+	-.331*	-.109		-.036		-.095	-.176	
Pct Owner Occupied	.100		.136			.077		.095			-.073		-.098		
Storm Repairs completed, owners or renters				-.719**	-.630**				-.756**	-.697**				-.917**	-.699**
Source of \$ - Govt Agencies incl Road Home				.075					-.016					.029	
Source of \$ - My own money				.015					-.042					-.057	
Disadvantage Index				-.037					.038					.081	
Pct Below Poverty level: Female HH w Kids				.080	-.164				-.034					-.193	
Have Minor Children				.026					-.026					-.029	
Associational Involvement	.272+	.222+	.229+	.155	.325**	.021			.149		-.060			.090	
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	-.193			.212+	.171	-.161			.204	.349**	-.180	-.472**	-.406*	.076	
Faith-Based Engagement	-.458*	-.529**	-.560**	.102	-.189	-.169	-.250+	-.239	.119		-.200			.124	
Social Trust	-.306*	-.208+	-.252+	-.424*	-.128	-.544**	-.451**	-.561**	-.386*	-.501**	-.495*	-.611**	-.619**	-.285	-.412**
Age of the Organization	-.271*	-.262*	-.290*	.011	-.229*	-.142			.037		-.107			.007	
Cooperation with Other Organizations: Count	-.036			.068	.078	-.065			.045		-.149			.107	
Effective Partnership with Administration	-.168	-.150	-.133	-.012		-.220+	-.210+	-.184	-.054		-.281+	-.294*	-.295*	-.058	-.148
Adj R-Sq	.486	.503	.492	.698	.616	.446	.478	.473	.729	.765	.366	.481	.437	.657	.748

Factors Influencing Post-Katrina Outcomes in Greater New Orleans, 2006-2011

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67) Regressions (with Fixed Controls)

Recovery - Personal

	All Organizations					NBOs only (narrowly defined)					Wet areas: NBOs only				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Damage Assessment	-.252+	-.225*	-.284*	-.176	-.397**	-.119	-.218*	-.239+	-.010	-.216*	-.036	-.220+	-.192	-.014	
Median household income	-.199		-.051			-.182		-.135			.153	.219	.148		
Unemployed	-.236		-.146			-.210	-.207*	-.314*			-.217		-.142		
Pct Black	.093		.174	-.209		-.016		.026	-.236		.267	.403+	.456+	-.056	
Married with Children	-.161		-.153			-.212		-.020			-.165		-.061		
Pct Owner Occupied	.036		.050			-.064		.001			-.023		.051		
Do-Will Have Resources for Repair				.383**	.111				.360*					.312+	.242*
Source of \$ - My own money				-.243+					-.027					.126	.194
Disadvantage Index				-.075					-.131					-.169	
Have Minor Children				-.199	-.384**				-.209	-.262*				-.113	
Median Home Value				-.046					-.146					.235	.307*
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	-.731**	-.880**	-.873**	-.387+		-.800**	-.638**	-.627**	-.268	-.524**	-.874*	-.786**	-.798**	-.232	-.505**
Faith-Based Engagement	.351+	.359*	.377*	.178		.317			-.030		-.009			-.272	
Social Trust	.109			-.352+		.235			-.124	.161+	.333	.248+	.263+	.000	
Inter-Racial Trust	.044			.252	.171+	-.023			.180		-.246			.053	
Age of the Organization	.238+	.204*	.268*	.072		.194			-.036		.092			-.188	
Cooperation with Other Organizations: Count	.329**	.305**	.297**	.249*	.131	.400**	.258*	.246*	.358*	.236*	.528*	.269*	.279*	.466*	.505**
Committees Activity: Business	-.009			.039	.170+	.080			.097	.258**	.253	.315**	.273*	.210	.274*
Physical Work Volunteers	-.033			-.136		.049			-.084		.125			.007	
Organizational Activities: Committees	-.201			-.155	-.160+	-.212	-.317**	-.339**	-.178		-.105			-.250	-.225+
Organizational Activities: All (q 41)	-.222+	-.240*	-.237*	-.173		-.263+			-.178		-.200			-.066	
Worked with Umbrella Organization	-.080			-.034		-.142			-.119		-.260			-.194	-.293*
Staff Duties: Publicity	-.012					-.009					-.053				
Adj R-Sq	.557	.582	.575	.620	.532	.587	.593	.571	.631	.624	.430	.559	.522	.577	.703

Factors Influencing Post-Katrina Outcomes in Greater New Orleans, 2006-2011

LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000) and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67) Regressions (with Fixed Controls)

Recovery - City

	All Organizations					NBOs only (narrowly defined)					Wet areas: NBOs only				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Damage Assessment	.079		.043	-.372*		-.062		-.090	-.364+		-.543*	-.412**	-.535**	-.542**	-.178
Median household income	-.258		-.177			-.135		-.246			-.324	-.389**	-.177		
Unemployed	-.263	-.264+	-.279+			-.122		-.129			.154		.224		
Pct Black	.041	.313*	.182	.295		.207		.176	.325		-.026		.147	.492*	
Married with Children	.058		.055			.208		.086			-.100		.102		
Pct Owner Occupied	-.378*	-.458**	-.423*			-.247	-.373**	-.267			.108		.007		
Source of \$ - My own money				-.079					-.115					.088	
Pct Below Poverty level: Female HH w Kids				.647**	.538**				.570**	.543**				.468**	.511**
Have Minor Children				-.142					-.001					.170	
Neighborhood Qualities				-.168	.351**				-.212					-.122	.458**
Available Retail				-.188					-.360*					-.605**	
Available Public				-.359*					-.168					-.081	
Associational Involvement	.197	.216+	.196	.428*	.307*	-.035			.323+		.375			.769**	.520**
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	.001			.015		.089	.418**	.259	-.042		.026				
Church member	.355	.303*	.317*	.191		.500*	.327*	.443*	.392	.565**	.408	.541**	.586**		
Social Trust	.064			.353+		-.179			.140		-.146			.266	
Age of the Organization	-.085			-.044		-.020			-.058		.149			-.098	
Cooperation with Other Organizations: Count	.013			.353	.209+	.113			.319	.284**	-.248			.163	.299*
Special Mobilization of Membership	-.131			-.002		-.079			.084		-.083			.234	
Org Activities: Participation	-.121	-.185+	-.185	-.091		.084			.222		-.152			.100	
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 63)	.149	.167	.174	-.218		-.126			-.396+		.492			-.161	
Worked with Umbrella Organization	.051			.194	.214+	.084			.188		-.136			-.102	
Worked with Adjacent NAs	.022					.126					.207	.330*	.325*	.111	
Adj R-Sq	.222	.321	.291	.371	.346	.300	.395	.384	.547	.483	.355	.461	.433	.766	.545

Factors Influencing Post-Katrina Outcomes in Greater New Orleans, 2006-2011

**LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000)
and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Regressions (with Fixed Controls)**

Blight Reduction

	Wet areas: all					Wet areas: NBOs only				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Damage Assessment	.277+	.189	.328*			.259+		.318*		
Median household income	.006		.074			.021		.101		
Unemployed	-.457*	-.302+	-.442*			-.438*	-.222	-.433*		
Pct Black	.324	.308*	.302	.260	.344*	.394+	.383*	.384+	.294	.409*
Married with Children	.328+		.341*			.333+		.364*		
Pct Owner Occupied	-.276		-.316+			-.281		-.327+		
Disadvantage Index				-.168	-.243				-.149	-.262
Associational Involvement	.271	.411**	.260+	.291+	.407**	.199	.437**	.222	.218	.401**
Family is Rooted in New Orleans	.179			.254		.268			.341+	
Church service attendance	-.215			-.090		-.248			-.083	
Cooperation with Other Organizations: Count	.090	.274*	.180	.160	.281*	.025	.202	.144	.047	.215+
Organizational Activities: Blight (q 41)	.321*	.240*	.242*	.295*	.223+	.361**	.308*	.262*	.353**	.267*
Organization Structural Assets (Block Capts)	.117			.157		.148			.217+	
Adj R-Sq	.602	.567	.607	.560	.553	.658	.577	.641	.621	.582

Factors Influencing Post-Katrina Outcomes in Greater New Orleans, 2006-2011

**LSU Disaster Recovery Survey (N = 7,000)
and LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Regressions (with Fixed Controls)**

Mean Rate of Return 2006-2010

	All Organizations					NBOs only broadly defined)					Wet areas: NBOs only				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Damage Assessment	-.792**	-.844**	-.824**	-.805**	-.849**	-.784**	-.782**	-.790**	-.815**	-.857**	-.710**	-.821**	-.697**	-.636**	-.681**
Median household income	.268*	.176*	.262*			.219		.272*			.201	.202*	.255		
Unemployed	-.220*	-.202**	-.208**			-.237*	-.230**	-.212**			-.176		-.178		
Pct Black	.185	.179+	.195+	.134	.183*	.152		.144	.104	.175*	.050		.061	.037	
Married with Children	.001		.007			-.036		.006			.034		.075		
Pct Owner Occupied	-.138		-.119			-.163		-.169+			-.166		-.194		
Do-Will Have Resources for Repair				.033					.026					.229+	.101
Source of \$ - Government Agencies				.130	.107				.146	.128+				.091	
Source of \$ - Insurance				.141	.145*				.149	.146*				-.041	
Disadvantage Index				-.272**	-.269**				-.245*	-.262**				-.225	-.270**
Pct Vacant Housing Units				-.033					-.017					-.064	
Median Home Value				-.008					-.006					.128	
Neighborhood Qualities				.014					.010					-.009	
Available Retail				.166*	.125*				.171*	.139*				.217+	.138
Available Public				.139*	.120*				.147*	.126*				.176	.057
Social Trust	-.007			-.058		.060			-.057		.065			-.082	
General Mobilization of Membership	.034			-.020		.058			-.010		.039			-.029	
Org Activities: Investment & Development	-.048			-.007		-.048			-.021		-.079			-.121	
Committees Activity: Business	.143+	.102+	.137*	.029		.158*	.111+	.164*	.051		.185+	.182*	.205*	.060	.128+
Physical Work Volunteers	.117+	.105+	.109+	.101	.097+	.163*	.126*	.144*	.137+	.117*	.193*	.198*	.170*	.183+	.137+
Organizational Activities: Block Captains	.039			.018		.054			.013		.048			.112	
Organizational Activities: Blight: Block Captains (q 44)	-.167+	-.110*	-.117*	-.163+	-.141**	-.196*	-.131*	-.142*	-.177+	-.153**	-.249+	-.161*	-.194*	-.384*	-.191*
Want Nonprofit Partnership (all)	.071			.080		.056			.078		.098			.138	
Worked with Adjacent NAs	.071			.016		.046			-.004		.070			.144	
Staff Duties: Publicity	-.006			.022		-.019			.004		.036			-.009	
Adj R-Sq	.810	.833	.830	.846	.873	.814	.824	.829	.841	.872	.741	.772	.769	.778	.819

LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Factor Analyses

	Component	
	Special Mobilization of Membership	General Mobilization of Membership
Largest number mobilized Now	.935	
Number at General meetings Now	.915	
Number at Special-Topic meetings Now	.860	
Freq of general NBH meetings Now		.987

	Component		
	Committees Activity: Executive	Committees Activity: Business	Committees Activity: Participation
NBH Zoning Committee	.841		
Membership/Communications Committee	.827		
Historic Preservation Committee	.769		
Community Activities/Beautification Committee	.687		
Executive Board	.670		
Economic Development Committee		.879	
Business Committee		.832	
Finance & Development Committee	.410	.652	
Outreach Committee		.570	.513
Block Captain Committee			.882
NBH Safety/Crime Watch Committee	.407		.710

LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Factor Analyses

	Component			
	Org Activities: Investment & Development	Org Activities: Enforcement	Org Activities: Participation	Org Activities: Crime Prevention
Org Seek investment from outside the region	.820			
Org Seek Government grants	.783			
Org Seek partnership/investment from NBH/city businesses	.777			
Org Seek Foundation grants	.758			
Org Have or coordinate volunteer housing for your NBH projects	.743			
Org Develop marketing strategy to encourage commercial development & repopulation	.734			
Org Provide Assistance in applying for Road Home & other home rebuilding grants	.708			
Org Created a Community Development Corporation (CDC)	.701			
Org Track Blighted properties		.791		
Org Interact Directly w City Agencies to pick up Abandoned vehicles		.785		
Org List Abandoned vehicles		.781		.417
Org Track condition of public properties, streets, etc		.777		
Org Interact Directly w City Agencies to Remediate Blight		.770		
Org Provide Active Committees			.808	
Org Hold regular NBH town hall & information meetings		.448	.697	
Org Maintain an up-to-date website			.633	
Org Provide Formal Partnering w Police Department				.781
Org Provide NBH Safety/Crime Watch		.410		.762

LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Factor Analyses

	Component Effectiveness of Volunteers
Faith-based & church volunteers effectiveness	.722
Business and/or Company Groups effectiveness	.709
Other Nonprofits effectiveness	.690
Government volunteers effectiveness	.597
Local Students effectiveness	.566
Non-Local Students effectiveness	.414
Other Local Community Groups effectiveness	.409

	Component		
	Professional Volunteers	Office Work Volunteers	Physical Work Volunteers
Volunteers: Medical assistance (trained)	.897		
Volunteers: Legal assistance (trained)	.827		
Volunteers: Conducting resident interview surveys	.666		
Volunteers: Damage & recovery assessment surveys (incl mapping)	.522		
Volunteers: Help residents apply for grants		.888	
Volunteers: Clerical & office assistance		.801	
Volunteers: Skilled construction work			.896
Volunteers: Unskilled or semi-skilled physical work			.869

LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Factor Analyses

	Component
	Want Nonprofit Partnership
Helpful partner for you: Housing Non-Profits	.847
Helpful partner for you: Volunteer Management Orgs	.813
Helpful partner for you: Education Non-Profits	.808
Helpful partner for you: Economic Development	.762
Helpful partner for you: National Retailers	.732
Helpful partner for you: Local Businesses	.672

	Component	
	Organization Material Assets (Database, Committees, Office)	Organization Structural Assets (Block Capts)
Org use database program	.775	
Org have a committee structure	.656	.434
Org have office Now	.609	-.462
How successful is block captain program (R w None)		.850

LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Factor Analyses

	Component Worked with Umbrella Organization
Lobby City Council: Umbrella Org	.907
Blight & Code Enforcement: Umbrella Org	.897
State Legislators: Umbrella Org	.884
City Agencies: Umbrella Org	.850
Area Economic Development: Umbrella Org	.837
Street/Infrastructure Repairs: Umbrella Org	.824
Changing Adjusting Zoning: Umbrella Org	.740
Manage Volunteer Projects: Umbrella Org	.736
Improve Parks & Common Spaces: Umbrella Org	.731

	Component Worked with Adjacent Nas
Lobby City Council: Adjacent NBHs	.891
Improve Parks & Common Spaces: Adjacent NBHs	.783
City Agencies: Adjacent NBHs	.747
Blight & Code Enforcement: Adjacent NBHs	.739
State Legislators: Adjacent NBHs	.737
Street/Infrastructure Repairs: Adjacent NBHs	.728
Area Economic Development: Adjacent NBHs	.716
Manage Volunteer Projects: Adjacent NBHs	.685
Changing Adjusting Zoning: Adjacent NBHs	.654

**LSU/NPN Survey of Neighborhood Association Leaders (N = 67)
Factor Analyses**

	Component	
	Staff Duties: Financial	Staff Duties: Publicity
Foundation Grants: Staff	.859	
External Investment: Staff	.833	
Marketing Strategy: Staff	.818	
Government Grants: Staff	.792	
Local Investment: Staff	.726	
Create CDC: Staff	.693	
Surveys, Mapping: Staff	.648	
Coordinate Vols: Staff	.621	
Goals Plan: Staff	.541	.458
Up-To-Date Website: Staff		.840
Publish Newsletter: Staff		.837