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ABSTRACT
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The present study examined how citizens in Detroit Michigan work to promote social justice and individual well-being in their city. Detroit is a city with a history of serious social and economic problems that has been experiencing a revitalization through citizen participation in the past decade. Using a conceptual framework of “wellness as fairness” articulated by Priletensky (2012), the present study examined four psychosocial processes that are said to compel individuals to confront social justice: critical experiences (events that leave a strong impression), critical consciousness (the perception and critique of oppression), righteous comparisons (evaluating one’s own injustices while perceiving others as having better opportunities), and critical action (citizen participation to actively confront injustice). A sample of 128 adults who were members of non-profit organizations involved in Detroit’s social and economic revitalization completed an online questionnaire. Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used to examine the degree to which individual-level perceptions of injustice (self-reports of personal discrimination and righteous comparisons) can account for variance in adults’ views of critical consciousness beyond that of demographic characteristics. The study also investigated the relative contribution of demographic characteristics, individual-level perceptions of personal injustice, and sense of community and critical consciousness in accounting for variation in participants’ reports of perceived empowerment, well-being, and life satisfaction. Results suggest that higher scores of perceived personal discrimination and righteous comparisons best predicted adults’ scores on critical consciousness. Additionally, a greater sense of community was the best predictor of empowerment and well-being scores, while greater levels of critical consciousness predicted higher life satisfaction levels. Implications of findings for research and practice are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

The study of psychology is dedicated to studying and encouraging “behaviors that build wellness and emotional resilience” to promote human welfare (American Psychological Association, n.d.). Social justice, a concept that is integral to several definitions of community psychology (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010; Rappaport, 1981), is defined as the “fair and equitable allocation of bargaining powers, resources, and obligations in society in consideration of people’s differential power, needs, and abilities to express their wishes” (Prilleltensky, 2001, p. 754). Resources and procedures in society are often unequally allocated or implemented due to systematic discrimination, which creates unjust conditions such as poverty, homelessness, crime, un- or underemployment, and housing discrimination (Kloos, Hill, Thomas, Wandersman, & Elias, 2011; Prilleltensky, 2001). Community psychology is particularly interested in understanding issues of social justice, understanding how citizens work within their communities to promote social justice, and understanding the impact of positive social change for individuals and communities (Kloos et al., 2011). Ultimately, community psychologists aim to help to disrupt the social systems that perpetuate the inequitable distribution of resources in society (economic, social, educational and institutional) in order to promote individual well-being (Kloos et al., 2011).

The present study examines how citizens in Detroit, Michigan are working to promote social justice and individual well-being in their city. Traditionally, citizen participation is a process through which marginalized and oppressed individuals can create change in their own communities, and has been associated with positive outcomes such as empowerment and individual well-being (Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Maton, 2008). Detroit has been experiencing a movement in which citizens participate in grassroots efforts to revitalize and improve conditions in the city (Long, 2011). Participants in this movement are diverse in their characteristics,
including demographics such as race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and length of residence in Detroit; some participants belong to historically marginalized groups, and others belong to historically privileged groups (Abbey-Lambertz, 2014; Hill, 2014). The present study focuses on the participants of Detroit’s revival movement in order to understand the process of citizen participation in both marginalized and privileged populations and its relationship to psychological well-being.

**Social Justice and Psychological Well-being**

Although several fields of psychology are fundamentally concerned with the promotion of well-being, the construct of well-being itself has not been concretely defined (Dodge, Daly, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012; Ryff, 1989). Well-being is often described as the satisfaction of objective needs or socioeconomic indicators (e.g. personal income, access to food) and subjective needs (e.g. reported levels of happiness, life satisfaction) (Diener, 2009; Oswald & Wu, 2010; Veenhoven, 2007). One contemporary definition of well-being involves “when individuals have the psychological, social, and physical resources they need to meet a particular psychological, social and/or physical challenge” (Dodge et al., 2012, p. 230). Though the definition of well-being and what constitutes wellness is broad, social justice is rarely considered as an important factor in individual well-being (Prilleltensky, 2012).

In his seminal paper, “Wellness as Fairness,” Prilleltensky argues that social justice is a vital aspect of psychological well-being; one is likely to be psychologically unwell if he or she is living under pervasive conditions of social injustice (Prilleltensky, 2012). Justice, defined as “giving people what they deserve, giving each person his or her due” (Sandel, 2010, p. 187), includes distributive and procedural justice, both of which have implications for individual well-being. Distributive justice, also called economic justice, involves a “fair share” being given to all members of a society (Deutsch, 1975). Distributive justice and the fair allocation of resources are
crucial to the stability of a society and the well-being of its members. When valuable economic and social resources are inadequately distributed, societal conflict, such as the Occupy Wall Street movement (Kim, 2014), is a likely result (Deutsch, 1985). Procedural justice concerns the “fair treatment” of all members of a society in regards to making and implementing decisions according to processes that are fair, impartial, consistent, and unbiased (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Unjust processes can also result in social conflict, such as the Black Lives Matter movement (Garza, 2014).

Prilleltensky (2012) also describes how justice or injustice can lead to well-being outcomes through a series of psychosocial processes. According to Prilleltensky (2012), better or worse conditions of justice influence positive or negative well-being states for individuals. Different conditions of justice are hypothesized to promote different levels of well-being, indicating that individual wellness is connected with social fairness. Prilleltensky reviews several pieces of literature which suggest that differing conditions of social justice or injustice affect individual wellbeing differently. For example, conditions that are optimal and fair predispose individuals to achieve their full potential and feel a fulfilling satisfaction with life (Seligman, Parks, & Steen, 2004). The relationship between optimal justice conditions and thriving individuals has been shown to be reciprocal; individuals thrive when justice is optimal, and thriving individuals are likely to behave in ways that continue just conditions for themselves (Keyes, 2007). On the opposite end of the spectrum, persisting conditions of injustice predispose and perpetuate the suffering of individuals. Although some people are able to transcend severe adversity, it is likely that most people are strongly and negatively affected when exposed to unjust conditions that are severe and pervasive. For example, oppressed groups of people often internalize perceptions of inferiority (Prilleltensky & Gonick, 1996). Repeated failed attempts at improving unjust conditions may result in feelings of helplessness (Mikulincer, 2013). In this way, the relationship
between persistent conditions of injustice and suffering is also reciprocal; injustice inhibits self-determination, which perpetuates injustice (Prilleltensky & Gonick, 1996).

When faced with unacceptable conditions of injustice, some people adjust, compensate, and cope with injustice (Bäckman & Dixon, 1992), and others attempt to change these conditions by rebelling against them (Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2007). Prilleltensky (2012) proposes four psychosocial mechanisms which promote the confrontation and challenging of social injustice: critical experiences, critical consciousness, righteous comparisons, and critical action.

Critical experiences are events that leave a strong impression on individuals who experience them and often cause those individuals to question their beliefs about what is right and what is fair (Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2007). Events that can be considered critical experiences can be either historical moments, such as the attacks on September 11, 2001, or incidents in one’s own life. A person may experience one particularly salient critical experience in his or her lifetime, or many cumulative incidents over time, such as repeated experiences of discrimination (Barnett, Quackenbush, & Sinisi, 1995). These events can facilitate “critical consciousness” in which a person begins to criticize the status quo and believe that change is possible.

Critical consciousness occurs through the perception of social, political, and economic oppression, and a critique of these social injustices that often lead to suffering. Although people can come to critical consciousness through critical experiences, it can also be fostered by interacting with or learning about groups who suffer discrimination (Bizzell, 1992). Critical consciousness also involves the belief that it is possible to make a difference, that it is not necessary to passively suffer under conditions of injustice (Freire, 1973). This critique of injustice and belief that change is possible fosters action.
According to Prilleltensky, a similar concept that promotes the confrontation of injustice is righteous comparisons, which involves evaluating one’s own life and suffered injustices while considering that others have better opportunities (Prilleltensky, 2012). A comparison that is righteous in nature involves realizing that one suffers from injustice while others enjoy freedom of choice and political liberties. Similar to conflict that often results from distributive or procedural justice, people who notice that others have higher levels of justice demand change.

Critical action results from the process of experiencing, recognizing, and questioning whether injustice is unchangeable (Prilleltensky, 2012). In other words, critical action draws from critical life experiences and perspectives to understand and change conditions of injustice. This action to confront conditions of injustice does not intend to merely change oneself within the existing system, but to transform the system itself. In practice, the concept of critical action as part of confronting and changing the system is similar to that of citizen participation or community development, concepts that are fundamental to community psychology (Kloos et al., 2011).

**Citizen Participation and Community Development**

Citizen participation refers to the participation of individuals in organized activities to achieve a common goal (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Participating in these activities allows people to define community problems, find solutions, and have a voice in decisions that affect them and their communities (Kloos et al., 2011). Citizen participation is often studied in communities that are marginalized and disadvantaged by society as a tool for development and empowerment. In other words, the purpose of citizen participation is to encourage socially and economically oppressed individuals to evolve as citizen-leaders (Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Kieffer, 1984). Although citizen participation is often described as involvement in political or policymaking decisions (Heller, Price, Reinharz, Riger, & Wandersman, 1984), it can also include
broader organized activities that are not political in nature, including grassroots involvement in local community organizations and social-issue focused groups (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Community development, a similar concept, has been described as “a process where community members come together to take collective action and generate solutions to common problems” (Frank & Smith, 1999). The term ‘community development’ is often used interchangeably with citizen participation when used to describe grassroots (citizen) participation in local projects (Perkins, Crim, Silberman, & Brown, 2004).

Perkins et al. (2004) describes four categories of adversities that occur in communities, and which can be addressed through community development: economic, political, social, and physical environment. Economic adversity refers to the neighborhood decline that is often caused by poverty. Factors triggering neighborhood decline include the “four Ds”: disinvestment and redlining, deindustrialization, demagogues, and demolition and construction of redevelopment projects (Skogan, 1992). Paradoxically, large-scale redevelopment projects are often seen by politicians as a positive remedy for neighborhood decline, but often lead to the fifth and sixth Ds: displacement of those who can afford to leave or can no longer afford to stay, and discouragement of those who remain in communities that are destroyed by cycles of decline and urban renewal (Perkins et al., 2004). Community development or citizen participation activities that target economic adversity include support and training for small businesses, and microloans that assist small businesses or neighborhood restoration. Another type of adversity, political adversity, refers to the oppression and disempowerment of communities. Although government agencies may use community advisory boards and public hearings to gain community-member input on policy decisions that affect them, local voices are often marginalized and treated as not credible (Tauxe, 1995). Grassroots organizing is a form of political community development that aims to participate in the political process by advocating at every government level through
community organizations and coalitions and by creating nonprofit community self-help programs. A third type of adversity, social adversity, refers to social issues such as crime and discrimination. These social issues reduce community cohesion by engendering fear, hatred, and isolation. Community activities that address social development include civilian crime prevention programs and organizations that promote social cohesion (e.g. celebrating cultural diversity, planning block parties). Lastly, physical environmental adversity refers to the physical deterioration of a neighborhood. This form of adversity includes urban decay and blight, the disinvestment in urban neighborhoods, and the development of suburban neighborhoods. It also includes contamination of the ground, water, and air when facilities such as incinerators and toxic waste sites are located near poorer areas (Bullard, 1994). Community development activities that focus on physical environmental development include community gardens, neighborhood cleanup efforts, and blight restoration.

Participation in community development activities has been demonstrated to be beneficial at multiple levels. On the individual level, citizen participation in community organizations is associated with empowerment (Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Kieffer, 1984; Maton, 2008; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Empowerment, which has been proposed as the primary phenomenon of interest in community psychology, refers to the process by which individuals, organizations, and communities gain mastery and control over their own affairs (Rappaport, 1987). The long-term process of continued adult development and learning that occurs through citizen participation allows individuals formerly without political power to become assertive and effective grassroots activists, empowering them to take control over their own lives (Kieffer, 1984). Empowerment and citizen participation are closely related concepts. Empowerment is a broad process that may lead to citizen participation, accompany it, or result from it; people who are empowered may feel more capable to participate in grassroots efforts, which in turn fosters a
psychological sense of empowerment (Christens, Peterson, & Speer, 2011; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). One’s level of involvement in citizen participation efforts has also been shown to be associated with empowerment, with highly involved individuals scoring higher on measures of empowerment in comparison to their less-involved counterparts (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Citizen participation has also been shown to have protective effects on psychological well-being through the promotion of empowerment (Christens & Peterson, 2012; Zimmerman, Ramirez-Valles, & Maton, 1999) and social justice (Inglehart, Foa, Peterson, & Welzel, 2008; Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2007). Increasing the amount, scope, and impact of empowering settings such as those created through citizen participation and grassroots community development has been suggested as an approach to sustainably promote community-level changes through the achievement of social justice and to promote subjective individual well-being by improving the quality of life of the marginalized and oppressed in society (Christens, 2012; Maton, 2008).

On the community level, citizen participation has been shown to have a reciprocal relationship with the cohesion of the community; citizen participation efforts lead to higher levels of sense of community, and people who are highly invested in their communities are more likely to take action to solve a community problem (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990; Ohmer, 2007; Wandersman & Florin, 2000). Sarason (1974) argued that sense of community, which focuses on the experience of community rather than its structure or setting, should be considered a central and overarching concept for community psychology. Sense of community is an important concept to promote; it has been linked to life satisfaction (Prezza, Amici, Roberti, & Tedeschi, 2001), and a supportive sense of belonging and membership (Fisher, Sonn, & Bishop, 2002). A strong psychological sense of community has been found to shape the way that people perceive their environments, affect their relationships with others in their community, and promote confidence
that the community can achieve its goals, all of which lead to increased participation (Wandersman & Florin, 2000).

**Social Injustice in Detroit Michigan**

Detroit is an example of a system with an extensive history of distributive and procedural social injustice. Although it was a booming, prosperous city in the early 20th century, known to some as the “Paris of the West” for its lavish architecture (Woodford, 2001b), its population has steadily declined with each successive census since reaching a peak of 1.8 million in the 1950s (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Detroit’s steady decline in population compared to the relative stability of the population of the metropolitan Detroit area over the past 60 years can be attributed to a long history of racial tension in the city (Martelle, 2012). Several Northern cities, including Detroit, experienced a growing Black population from the 1910s to 1970s when Black people in Southern states moved north to escape Jim Crowe laws (Sugrue, 2014). Frustration stemming from institutional racial discrimination and social and economic inequality led to five days of riots in Detroit in 1967, resulting in several deaths and millions of dollars of damaged property (Woodford, 2001b). These riots also had serious social and economic implications as people and businesses moved to “safer” areas (Fine, 1989). Although White residents of Detroit had been relocating to the suburbs prior to the race riots of 1967, sociologists contend that the Detroit riots hastened this White flight (Young & Wheeler, 1994). When middle-class families fled to the suburbs, they took with them a significant part of the city’s tax base, and left behind people without the economic, social, or political ability to move or to advocate for themselves (Sugrue, 2014).

Today, metropolitan Detroit remains one of the most segregated areas in America (Darden, Rahbar, Jezierski, Li, & Velie, 2010). As of 2010, the racial composition of the city was predominantly Black/African American (85%), with 10% of the population of the city identifying
as White/Caucasian, and 6% identifying as Hispanic or Latino of any race (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). A stark contrast is apparent in the racial segregation between the city of Detroit and its predominantly White suburbs, with approximately 70% of the metropolitan Detroit population identifying as White/Caucasian on the 2010 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The dividing line of Eight Mile Road is both a literal and figurative boundary that separates counties and classes: Eight Mile separates the city from the suburbs, the Black from the White, Wayne County (which encompasses Detroit) from suburban, affluent Oakland County, and the rich from the poor (Goodman, 2005).

There seems to be evidence that the demographics of the city are slowly changing. The White population of Detroit has been recently increasing; according to the Michigan Metropolitan Information Center, the percentage of non-Hispanic White residents in Detroit increased from 8.4% in 2008 to 13.3% in 2009, while many African American residents have moved to the suburbs (Wisely, 2010). These new residents, often young professionals and older adults whose children have moved out of the home, are said to bring energy, enthusiasm, and economy to Detroit and have contributed to efforts at “revitalization” (Austen, 2014). The new residents, business investors, and community coalition members are predominantly White visitors from the suburbs or elsewhere (Hill, 2014).

Although it has been reported that there is enough vacant areas to avoid requiring displacement (Cohen, 2013), there are specific areas of Detroit that are experiencing a boom of newcomers and a demand for housing compared to other areas which are not as sought after by newcomers. According to a 2009 study by Social Compact, a not-for-profit organization that aims to stimulate private market investment in underserved communities, there was a sizable change in average income among new homeowners who purchased homes in 2008 in key Detroit neighborhoods (Social Compact, 2015). Although the average household income of new
homeowners citywide was $54,000, the average household income of new homeowners in certain neighborhoods that have been described as gentrifying was much higher; the Downtown Central Business District had an estimated income at $144,290, Indian Village at $117,883, and Midtown at $156,656. Some describe “gentrification” as good urban policy, resulting in affluence and areas relatively free from crime (Byrne, 2002; Lang, 1986). Some even directly advocate for Detroit’s gentrification, saying that it could “save Detroit” (Betancur, 2002). However, little attention is often paid to the victims of gentrification – the people who existed before revitalization efforts started, and who no longer can afford to live in the place that they know as home (Foley, 2014; Woods, 2014).

Although there have been several changes and select neighborhoods are benefiting from recent attempts at revitalization, the economic and social outlook in Detroit as a whole remain relatively grim. Detroit has a long history of financial troubles, culminating in the city being put under an emergency manager in 2013 who quickly declared bankruptcy, making Detroit the largest city to declare bankruptcy (Sugrue, 2014). More than half of the owners of Detroit’s 305,000 taxable parcels failed to pay their tax bills in 2011, resulting in about $246 million in uncollected taxes and fees (MacDonald & Wilkinson, 2013).

Detroit made headlines in 2014 after shutting off water to several thousand households with delinquent bills, causing the United Nations to denounce this action as “contrary to human rights” (Meshel, 2015). Detroit Public Schools has also come under significant public scrutiny involving trouble securing state funding, closing the majority of its schools, issues with paying teachers, schools in serious or dangerous status of disrepair, and corruption (Cwiek, 2016; Gregory, 2016; Kozlowski, 2016; Lurie, 2016). Redlining, a discriminatory housing practice, is reportedly blocking mortgages in the city even with the recent housing resurgence (Stamm, 2015). In fact, one resident reportedly works as a mortgage processor at Quicken Loans, but
“can’t get a mortgage” of her own (Austen, 2014). Several fundamental city services were targeted for improvement during the bankruptcy proceedings including inadequate streetlights, blight, delinquent taxes from residents and businesses, public transportation, and garbage collection ("Is Detroit getting better? Some key findings," 2015). Also identified as needing improvement were police response times, which were found to be 58 minutes on average (Wilkinson, 2015) and a technology funding issue in which the fire department received emergency alerts by placing a soda can filled with coins and screws on their fax machine which would fall from an incoming fax, alerting firefighters to an emergency (Sanburn, 2014).

Large-Scale Attempts at Revitalization

Revitalization efforts in Detroit date back to the 1970 and 80s with the completion of major urban development projects in hopes of retaining residents who were moving to the suburbs (Bachelor, 1998). Several developments were completed during the tenure of Coleman Young, the first Black mayor of Detroit (Young & Wheeler, 1994) including the Renaissance Center, a group of seven skyscrapers located on the riverfront in downtown Detroit, which was built in the 1970s as a way to trigger a renaissance in the city (Woodford, 2001a). The Detroit People Mover, a single-line public transportation system that circles downtown Detroit, as well as Joe Louis Arena, the downtown home of the Detroit Red Wings, two automotive industry assembly plants, and several downtown skyscrapers were also completed during this time (Young & Wheeler, 1994). The late 90s and early 2000s saw another period of revitalization efforts with the opening of three resort-casinos within the city limits (Wiley & Walker, 2011) and Comerica Park, a downtown baseball stadium that houses the Detroit Tigers (Trendafilova, Waller, Daniell, & McClendon, 2012).

Since around 2006, there have been several large-scale efforts to modernize or save the lavish art deco buildings from the 1920s and to turn them into luxury residential apartments. The
Griswold, a downtown building designed by the famed architect Albert Kahn, had been providing Section 8 housing to over one hundred residents when new owners provided notice to vacate to all residents in 2014 (Feeley, 2016). After an $8 million upgrade, the renamed building, The Albert, now holds 127 luxury apartments. Attempts have been made to rebrand Detroit as “America’s Greatest Comeback City” (Chakraborty, 2013). Detroit Future City, an organization led by a New York City project manager that seeks to serve as a resource for businesses, philanthropists, and the community, provided hundreds of recommendations to transform Detroit over the next 50 years. These efforts are funded largely by various philanthropic foundations such as the Kresge Foundation or the Ford Foundation, as well as partnerships between private foundations and public funds (Woods, 2013). Investment in Detroit’s infrastructure led to the development of M-1 RAIL in 2007, a non-profit organization that is led and funded by private businesses and philanthropic organizations in partnership with local, state, and federal governments to construct a 3.3-mile streetcar down the center of Detroit (Snell, 2016).

Dan Gilbert, the billionaire owner of Quicken Loans, appears to be the public face of Detroit’s revitalization; articles refer to him as a “lordly” “superhero” who has “come to Detroit’s rescue” (Alberta, 2014; Austen, 2014; Cramer, 2013). One newspaper article featured in The New York Times, *The Post-Post Apocalyptic Detroit* (Austen, 2014), described Gilbert in ways that suggest that the city’s revival belongs to Gilbert, using phrases such as “his campaign” or “Gilbert’s downtown”. In fact, when other investors were discussed in the article, they were described in reference to Gilbert, for example, “mini-Gilberts”, “[the Avenue of Fashion’s] Dan Gilbert”, “Dan Gilbert and others”, or were referred to as “Black Dan Gilberts”. These other investors quoted in the story seemed to appreciate Gilbert as their investment role model, saying, “I admire Dan Gilbert” or “Gilbert is way better at it”.

Although many articles seem to suggest that Dan Gilbert has good intentions and a positive influence for the city as a whole, not all residents seem to agree with this perspective. One man quoted in *The Post-Post Apocalyptic Detroit* (Austen, 2014) seemed to reject the notion of Dan Gilbert as the hero of Detroit, saying, “The city’s true heroes, its real saviors…were the African-Americans who had a chance to leave Detroit, who had the means, yet stayed. In spite of the public debacles, the racial insensitivities, the public transportation that goes nowhere, the taxes up the wazoo, the unfair auto-insurance costs, they still committed to making Detroit home.” The article suggested that many of Gilbert’s efforts have not helped the lifelong residents of the city.

One woman rejected the investment strategies favored by Gilbert and his followers, saying, “Detroiter are not respected as far as the value and dollars they bring, the obstacles they’ve overcome to still be here. It’s always looked at as if we’re not instrumental.” She went on to explain that “the city had a terrible track record of looking out for its residents, and that Detroiter, particularly blacks, had been ill served by state and local government, redlining lenders, and high-rolling private investors.” According to the perspective that was shared by the residents in this article, “the revival has yet to arrive”.

**Grassroots Revitalization and Citizen Participation in Detroit**

As theorized by Perkins (2004), the past fifty years of large-scale government-backed projects have not repaired Detroit’s longstanding social and economic injustice. There is evidence that residents have noticed revival through smaller, grassroots efforts including community initiatives and citizen participation (Long, 2011). Groups like Detroit Black Community Food Security Network, which teaches women urban farming techniques as a form of social resistance (White, 2011) or Building the Engine of Community Development in Detroit, an initiative which supports and enhances the capacity of community groups to work for change (Gallagher, 2016) are examples of grassroots efforts that were initiated by long-term residents to address issues that
directly affect them. Other community development efforts are led by the new residents, business investors, and community coalition members who are predominantly White, middle-class people from the suburbs or elsewhere (Hill, 2014).

Detroit offers a unique opportunity to study citizen participation in action. Revitalization efforts include both marginalized and oppressed individuals, and individuals with relative social, economic, and political power. The individuals who are involved in revitalization efforts in Detroit likely differ in many ways, including not only their race and social class, but also their relationship to the city, their attachment to Detroit, their life experiences, their motivations, and their worldview. The grassroots organizations that are involved in Detroit’s revitalization are similarly diverse, including the participants, the population served, and the goal or purpose of the group. Citizen participation is typically conceptualized as a tool to empower marginalized individuals and to give them a voice in what happens to their community (Florin & Wandersman, 1990). Given that the revitalization movement in Detroit includes diverse participants with diverse life experiences and goals, it is likely that these revitalization efforts will be experienced differently among individuals who are participating.

**Summary**

Community psychology is interested in understanding social justice, and helping to disrupt systems that perpetuate social injustice (Kloos et al., 2011). Social justice has been described as an integral, but often overlooked, aspect of individual well-being; an individual who is truly well probably enjoys societal conditions of fairness (Prilleltensky, 2012). Prilleltensky (2012) describes how better or worse conditions of justice or injustice can influence well-being states through a series of psychosocial processes. For example, when faced with unacceptable conditions of injustice, some people attempt to change these conditions by rebelling against them (Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2007). One way in which individuals can confront an unjust system is through
citizen participation, which traditionally allows marginalized or oppressed individuals to participate in activities or decisions that directly affect them and their communities (Florin & Wandersman, 1990).

Citizen participation has been associated with positive outcomes such as empowerment, sense of community, and psychological well-being. Detroit is an example of a community that has a long history of social injustice, and is experiencing citizen participation through a revival movement (Austen, 2014). Participants in this social movement come from diverse backgrounds, including those who belong to historically marginalized groups and those who belong to historically privileged groups (Abbey-Lambertz, 2014; Hill, 2014). The present study examines differences in Detroit’s citizen participants opinions about social justice, and factors that are related to variation in these opinions. The present study also examines whether wellness and fairness are related for individuals who are participating in citizen participation efforts in Detroit. Specifically, the present study explores whether there are individual, organizational, community, or social factors that account for differences in empowerment, psychological well-being, and life satisfaction.
THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study examines the relative contribution of factors relevant for citizen participation for individuals that are committed to the revitalization of Detroit, Michigan. The present study uses both quantitative and qualitative methods to examine the psychosocial processes proposed by Prilleltensky’s (2012) theoretical model that can compel individuals to confront conditions of social injustice. Specifically, the study examines factors that may be associated with confronting an unfair system, including critical consciousness and righteous comparisons.

To better understand factors relevant for critical consciousness for individuals engaged in critical action, the present study examines the relative contribution of demographic variables, sense of community, and individual-level perceptions of injustice that are associated with differences in participants’ critical consciousness. It is expected that individual-level perceptions of injustice (i.e. perceptions of discrimination and righteous comparisons) will account for variation in participants’ reports of critical consciousness beyond that of demographic variables and adults sense of community.

The present research then examines psychosocial processes involved in confronting injustice by examining whether community- and social-level variables are relevant for the individual well-being of adults who are actively involved as Detroit citizens. Specifically, the present study examines the relative contribution of demographic variables, individual-level perceptions of personal injustice, and community- and social-level variables (i.e., sense of community and critical consciousness) in accounting for individual variation in participants’ reports of perceived empowerment, well-being, and life satisfaction.
METHOD

Participants and Procedures

The present sample consists of 128 participants (81 women; 47 men) who are involved in Detroit’s revitalization. To be eligible for the study, participants needed to be at least 18 years of age and to self-identify as being actively involved in an organization that contributes to Detroit’s revitalization. Descriptive statistics about the sample demographics are presented in in detail in Table 1.

Participants ranged in age from 20 to 77 years old, with an average age of 44 ($SD = 15$). Most participants identified as White (74; 58%), with 46 people (36%) identifying as Black, and 8 people (6%) identifying as People of Color who are not Black. When asked about their estimated current socio-economic position, 50 people (39%) identified as upper-middle class, 54 people (42%) reported being middle class, and 24 (19%) reported being as working class. The sample was very highly educated, with half of the sample (64; 50%) stating that they have attended at least some graduate school and half of the sample (64; 50%) with a Bachelor’s degree or less. When asked about their current residency and their native residency, half of the sample (64; 50%) identified as native Detroiters. The majority of these native Detroiters (52; 41% of the entire sample) still live within the city limits, while 12 people (9%) have since moved elsewhere. Half of the sample (64; 50%) were not native to Detroit, with 28 (22%) identifying as newcomers who were raised elsewhere but currently reside in the city, and 36 (28%) who have never lived in Detroit.

Individuals were recruited through study announcements placed through multiple organizations that are involved in Detroit’s revitalization efforts, as well as personal emails sent to individuals who were identified as participants in Detroit’s revitalization efforts. Organizations representing the four types of community development proposed by Perkins et al. (2004) were
contacted for recruitment including economic development (e.g. Prosperus Detroit), political development (e.g. Detroit People’s Platform), social development (e.g. Grandmont Rosedale Crime Prevention Task Force), and physical environmental development (e.g. Motor City Blight Busters). Study announcements were also placed on Facebook using posts on group pages or ads targeting people who claim that they live in Detroit.

The current sample consists of 55 people (43%) who are working in an organization that targets economic development, 19 people (15%) who are working in political development, 31 people (24%) who are working in social development, and 23 people (18%) who are working in physical environmental development. The majority of the sample participates in Detroit’s revitalization through a paid position (81; 63%), with 47 (37%) indicating that they volunteer. Additionally, most people who responded to the survey have a leadership position (86; 67%) within their organization. Participants were involved in this organization for an average of 5 years, 7 months (SD = 6 years, 7 months). Table 2 presents descriptive statistics about characteristics of the participants’ organizational involvement.

The study received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Bowling Green State University. A link to the online survey was provided to participants in study announcements. Participants were asked to complete an online survey about their thoughts, feelings, and activities related to their work with Detroit’s revitalization. As an incentive to participate, participants were given the opportunity to provide their email address upon completion of the study to receive a $5 Amazon.com gift card.
Measures

Individual-Level Measures

Demographics

Participants were asked to provide demographic information that included gender, age, race/ethnic identity, religious affiliation, marital status, housing status, education level, current socioeconomic position, childhood socioeconomic position, student status, and employment status. In order to clarify questions asking about socioeconomic position, anchors and descriptions were provided for participants according to guidelines set by William and Hickey (2005). The present study provided anchors of upper class, upper-middle class, lower-middle class, working class, and lower class. Due to a low representation of upper and lower class participants, data was aggregated to represent three SES groups: upper-middle class, middle class, and working class. Participants were asked about their current residency by asking if they are a resident of Detroit, and for their current home zip code. Their home residency was assessed by asking participants which zip code they have lived in for most of their life.

Everyday Discrimination Scale and Righteous Comparisons

Personal experiences with social injustice were measured through a self-report measure, the Everyday Discrimination Scale (Williams, Yu, Jackson, & Anderson, 1997). This scale originally included nine items including “You are treated with less respect than other people are” and “People act as if they are afraid of you”. A tenth question (“People follow you around in stores”) was added to the scale in Williams et al. (2008). Participants rated the frequency with which these experiences occur on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “Never” to “Almost every day”. Each time a participant endorsed an item occurring “A few times per year” or more, they were prompted to answer a follow-up question, “What do you think is the main reason for these experiences?” Participants were provided a checklist including race, gender, physical
appearance, and others, and were instructed to select one category. This measure is
conventionally scored by counting the number of situations for which participants reporting
having experienced unfair treatment for an Overall Discrimination Score. The present sample
demonstrated an acceptable internal consistency reliability coefficient (α = .76).

One question (“You see other people enjoying freedom of choice and freedom of
expression, but you and your people suffer injustice”) was added to this measure to assess for
righteous comparisons. The question was scored separately and as a continuous variable.

**Organizational-Level Measures**

*About You and Your Work in Detroit*

A questionnaire was created for the present study to solicit information about the
revitalization organizations in which participations are involved. Specifically, this questionnaire
asked for the name of the organization that the respondent is currently involved with or has spent
the most time with, the type of work that the organization does, and the nature of the
respondent’s role or activities involved in participation. This information was used to categorize
the type of organization according to the four types of community development proposed by
Perkins et al. (2004) (i.e., economic development, political development, social development, and
physical environmental development). Participants were asked about their role in the organization,
including whether the position is paid or volunteer, the length of their involvement, and the
frequency of their involvement. Participants were also asked one question to assess their sense of
community with the organization that is scored on a 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Completely) scale.

**Community-Level Measures**

*Sense of Community Index II*

Psychological sense of community with Detroit at the individual level was measured by the
Sense of Community Index II (Chavis, Lee, & Acosta, 2007) with “your community” specified as
“Detroit” in the introductory text due to the authors’ suggestion to specify the type of community. This 24-item self-report measure is widely used in the social sciences to measure psychological sense of community. The preliminary question, “How important is it to you to feel a sense of community with other community members?” was responded to on a 6-point Likert scale with low scores indicating low importance, and is intended as a validating question to help in interpreting results from the 24 items of the measure. Participants rated their agreement on the 24 statements composing this measure on a 4-point Likert scale, with low scores indicating a low sense of community with Detroit, and high scores indicating a strong sense of community. This measure was scored by summing all 24 items, resulting in a Total Sense of Community Score, and by summing items that correspond to four subscales. The four subscales include Reinforcement of Needs (“Community members and I value the same things”), Membership (“Being a member of this community is part of my identity”), Influence (“I have influence over what this community is like”), and Shared Emotional Connection (“I feel hopeful about the future of this community”). The total score resulting from summing all 24 items has been shown to be very reliable in the present sample ($\alpha = .91$) The present sample’s four subscales also showed acceptable reliability according to coefficient alpha scores (Needs $\alpha = .78$; Membership $\alpha = .76$; Influence $\alpha = .68$; Emotional Connection $\alpha = .78$).

Social-Level Measures

Critical Consciousness Inventory

Critical consciousness was assessed using the Critical Consciousness Inventory (CCI), a nine-item scale that uses a Guttman scaling (Thomas et al., 2014). This measure was designed to assess the development of critical consciousness. Items were written to reflect four stages of development: 1) pre-critical (issues of inequality and oppression are not recognized; “I believe that the world is basically fair”) 2) beginning critical (individuals begin to recognize oppression
and inequality; “I believe that the world is basically fair but others believe that it is unfair”), 3) critical (the person has a solid sense of critical consciousness; “I believe that the world is unfair for some people”), and 4) post-critical (includes some form of personal or social action in response to oppression or inequality; “I believe that the world is unfair, and I make sure to treat others fairly”). The developmental perspective of critical consciousness is important to measure, as by definition critical consciousness includes not only awareness of oppression and inequality, but also action. Critical consciousness is measured by scoring each anchor on a one to four scale, with higher scores reflecting a more developed sense of critical consciousness in the respondent. The measure is scored by calculating the mean score of the measure. This measure demonstrated acceptable reliability in the present sample ($\alpha = .74$).

**Well-being Correlates**

*Perceived Control Scale (Empowerment)*

Perceptions of empowerment or influence at multiple levels of analysis was measured by the Perceived Control Scale (PCS) (Israel, Checkoway, Schulz, & Zimmerman, 1994). This 12-question self-report measure was designed to assess individual perceptions of empowerment at the individual level (e.g. “I have control over the decisions that affect my life”), the organizational level (e.g. “This organization is effective in achieving its goals”), and the community level (e.g. “By working together, people in my community can influence decisions that affect the community”). Each item is measured using a four-point response scale, ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 4 (agree strongly). Higher scores indicate higher levels of empowerment or perceived control. The measure is scored by summing items in each of the subscales (individual empowerment, organizational empowerment, community empowerment), and calculating a total score that represents multilevel empowerment. This measure has shown acceptable levels of reliability; reliability for the multilevel scale that includes all 12 items in the present sample was
Reliability was also shown for subscales in the present study corresponding to perceived control at the individual level ($\alpha = .68$), the organizational level ($\alpha = .68$), and the community level ($\alpha = .68$).

**I COPPE Scale (Well-being)**

The I COPPE Scale, a multidimensional scale of well-being, was used to measure perceptions of well-being in key life domains (Prilleltensky et al., 2015). This scale includes seven subscales to assess well-being (Overall, Interpersonal, Community, Occupational, Physical, Psychological, and Economic). Each subscale includes three questions anchored by a 0 (worst) to 10 (best) scale: 1) Where do you stand now? 2) Where did you stand one year ago? and 3) Where do you think you will stand one year from now? The measure can be scored in several different ways, depending on the aims of the study (Prilleltensky et al., 2015). The present study scored this measure by calculating an average score across each domain for each of the three time points, resulting in three mean scores, Past Well-Being, Present Well-Being, and Future Well-Being. The present sample demonstrated high internal reliability consistency across each of these three scores (Past $\alpha = .83$, Present $\alpha = .79$, Future $\alpha = .84$).

**Satisfaction with Life Scale**

Subjective well-being was assessed using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), a short, widely-used, 5-item self-report measure that was designed to measure one’s perceptions of his or her life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). The SWLS was designed to assess global life satisfaction and does not assess satisfaction with specific areas of life, such as health, finances, or loneliness, which allows respondents to weigh problems with these specific areas in whichever way they choose. Items are assessed on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) scale, with higher scores indicating higher levels of life satisfaction. This measure is scored
by calculating a total sum score. The SWLS was shown to be psychometrically sound in the present sample, with a reliability estimate of 0.87.

Qualitative Questions

The present study also included qualitative questions to provide enriching context to the survey responses. Participants were asked, “Why did you become involved with Detroit’s revitalization?” The responses to this question were analyzed to assess the presence or absence of a critical experience that led the participant to confront injustice, as theorized by (Prilleltensky, 2012). Participants were also asked, “What do you like about Detroit? What positive aspects are there about the city?” and, “What do you think are the most important changes in Detroit that need to occur for the city’s revival?” Both of these qualitative questions were analyzed for overarching themes.
RESULTS

Intercorrelations Among Measure Subscales

*Multilevel Perceived Control (Empowerment).* Each of the subscales of the Perceived Control Scale were highly correlated. Total (multilevel) empowerment was correlated with individual empowerment ($r = .68, n = 128, p < .001$), organizational empowerment ($r = .83, n = 128, p < .001$), and community empowerment ($r = .83, n = 128, p < .001$). All subscales were also significantly correlated. Due to high subscale intercorrelations, the analyses in the present study using the Perceived Control Scale will use the multilevel (total) empowerment score.

*Sense of Community.* Similarly, each of the scales of the Sense of Community Scale were very highly correlated. Total sense of community was correlated with needs ($r = .82, n = 128, p < .001$), membership ($r = .87, n = 128, p < .001$), influence ($r = .83, n = 128, p < .001$), and emotional connection ($r = .89, n = 128, p < .001$). All subscales were also significantly correlated. The analyses in the present study that use the Sense of Community Scale will use the total sense of community score.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Relationships Among Main Study Variables

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations among main study variables are presented in Table 3. Overall, participants reported moderate overall discrimination as measured by the Everyday Discrimination Scale, with an average of 3.6 occurrences of discrimination occurring more than once per year ($SD = 2.5$). Righteous comparisons scores in the present sample were relatively low, with the average participant responding “Less than once a year” to “You see other people enjoying freedom of choice and freedom of expression, but you and your people suffer injustice” ($M = 1.6, SD = 1.8$). Participant scores of critical consciousness were high on average, as measured by the Critical Consciousness Inventory ($M = 3.4, SD = .42$), with the average score
relatively close to the maximum mean score of 4. Overall, participant reports of sense of community were moderate, as measured by the Sense of Community Index II, with a mean total score of 41.1 (SD = 10.4). Overall, participants reported a high level of multilevel empowerment on the Perceived Control Scale (Empowerment) (M = 36.8, SD = 4.2). On average, the sample also scored high well-being on the I COPPE, with a mean of 7.2 out of 10 (SD = 1.1), and high life satisfaction on the Satisfaction with Life Scale (M = 25.3; SD = 5.6).

As expected, participant reports of overall discrimination was significantly positively related to reports of righteous comparisons (r = .40; p < .001) and critical consciousness (r = .22, p < .05), and negatively related to reports of well-being (r = -.20, p < .05). Similarly, participant scores of righteous comparisons were positively correlated with critical consciousness (r = .28, p < .001) and negatively correlated with well-being (r = -.27, p < .01). Scores on sense of community were positively correlated with multilevel empowerment (r = .52, p < .001) and well-being (r = .23, p < .01). As expected from the literature, the three well-being correlates of multilevel empowerment, well-being, and life satisfaction were moderately correlated (multilevel empowerment and well-being r = .25, p < .01; multilevel empowerment and life satisfaction r = .21, p < .05; well-being and life satisfaction r = .42, p < .001). Although correlations among well-being variables were significant, the magnitude of correlations suggests that these variables assess related but not identical aspects of well-being. These aspects of well-being are considered separately in subsequent analyses.

The variable of critical experience was coded from the qualitative question, “Why did you become involved with Detroit’s revitalization?” The majority of the sample (93; 73%) did not report a critical experience in response to this question. Thirty-five participants (27%) described a critical experience that led to their involvement in Detroit’s revitalization. For example, a 21-year-old multiracial woman stated, “My final semester in college, I took a class on the history of
Detroit. I felt a personal call to the city and decided to help be a part of its revitalization, outside of just the downtown area.” Several others reported that a series of events are what drove them to become involved in Detroit. For example, a 69-year-old American Indian woman who is a lifelong resident of Detroit said, “Because of all the crime that was happening in our community.” T-tests were conducted to examine differences for the main study variables related to the presence or absence or a critical experience. No significant differences were found (all $p > .05$). Critical experience is not used as a variable in subsequent analyses.

**Demographic Differences**

T-test, chi square, and bivariate correlation analyses were conducted to examine demographic differences for the main study variables.

**Race.** Overall, People of Color reported more frequent experiences of discrimination (4.3 ± 2.5) than did White people (3.1 ± 2.4) $t(126) = .82, p < .05$. Participants who identified as People of Color generally reported a lower satisfaction with life (23.6 ± 6.6) compared to White participants (26.5 ± 4.4) $t(126) = 3.09, p < .001$. On average, People of Color also reported higher righteous comparisons (2.5 ± 1.8) than did White people (.95 ± 1.5) $t(126) = -5.37, p < .001$.

**Gender.** Women generally reported significantly more frequent experiences of discrimination (4.1 ± 2.4) than did men (2.7 ± 2.5) $t(126) = -3.13, p < .05$. Overall, women also reported a higher sense of righteous comparisons (1.86 ± 1.75) than did men (1.13 ± 1.7) $t(126) = -2.317, p < .05$.

**Age.** A significant positive correlation was found between age and reported well-being, which suggests that older people generally reported higher levels of well-being ($r = .22, n = 128, p < .05$). A significant negative correlation was found between age and frequency of experiences
of discrimination such that older participants in this sample on average reported fewer experiences of discrimination ($r = -.29$, $n = 128$, $p < .001$).

**Education.** Differences in education were examined using two groups composed of participants with a Bachelor’s degree or lower, and participants with at least some graduate training. No significant differences were found for any of the study variables.

**Current SES.** A significant difference was found between groups for frequency of experienced discrimination $F(2,125) = 4.90$, $p < .01$. Specifically, working class participants generally reported higher frequency of discrimination ($5.06 \pm 1.7$) compared to upper-middle class participants ($3.03 \pm 3.4$, $p < .01$). No differences were found for any groups when compared to middle class participants. Similarly, a significant difference was found for righteous comparisons $F(2,125) = 3.21$, $p < .05$ such that working class participants reported higher righteous comparisons ($2.39 \pm 1.58$) in general compared to upper-middle class participants ($1.24 \pm 1.65$, $p < .05$). No differences were found for any groups when compared to middle class participants. A significant difference was found for satisfaction with life $F(2, 125) = 12.04$, $p < .001$ such that upper-middle class participants generally reported higher life satisfaction ($27.5 \pm 4.56$) than middle class participants ($23.9 \pm 6.05$, $p < .001$) or working class participants ($21.3 \pm 4.72$, $p < .001$). No such difference was found between middle and working class participants.

**Detroit Residency.** Significant differences were found such that native Detroiter reported lower satisfaction with life ($23.67 \pm 5.6$) on average compared to people who are not native to Detroit ($26.34 \pm 5.4$, $p = .008$).

**Organizational Differences**

**Type of Organization.** Chi squares and t-tests were used to assess for differences in any of the study variables or demographic variables according to the type of adversity that the organization targets. Specifically, the present analysis looked for differences in race, gender, age,
current SES, education, frequency of discrimination, critical consciousness, righteous comparisons, sense of community, multilevel empowerment, satisfaction with life, and well-being. No significant differences were found (all \( p > .05 \)). Type of Organization is not used as a variable in subsequent analyses.

**Paid or Volunteer Participation.** A significant difference emerged such that people who participate in Detroit’s revitalization through a paid position generally reported higher life satisfaction (26.11 ± 5.48) than did people who participate through a volunteer position (23.6 ± 5.7) \( t(126) = 2.487, p < .05 \).

**Leadership Position.** A significant difference was found such that people who reported that they have a leadership position reported higher multilevel empowerment (37.44 ± 4.09; \( t(126) = -2.37, p < .05 \)) on average compared to participants who do not have a leadership position (35.6 ± 4.23). Additionally, a significant difference was found such that individuals who reported that they have a leadership position generally reported a higher sense of community (43.52 ± 10.07, \( t(126) = -3.94, p < .001 \)) when compared to people without a leadership position (36.21 ± 9.42). People in leadership positions also tended to report higher well-being scores (7.39 ± 1.14) compared to people without leadership positions (6.94 ± 1.03) \( t(126) = -2.14, p < .05 \).

**Length of participation.** There was a significant positive correlation between length of participation and critical consciousness (\( r = .20, n = 128, p < .05 \)).

**Frequency of participation.** No significant differences were found for any of the main study variables as a function of self-reported frequency of organizational participation.

**Sense of community with organization.** People who reported that their organizations “completely” fit in with them and their values reported higher multilevel empowerment (38.27 ± 4.27; \( t(126) = 4.83, p < .001 \)) on average compared to participants who reported that they “mostly” or “somewhat” fit in with their organization (34.93 ± 3.29). In general, people who
“completely” fit in with their organizations reported a higher sense of community (36.21 ± 9.42 $t(126) = 3.91, p < .001$) compared to people who “mostly” or “somewhat” fit in (37.2 ± 8.23).

**Differences Related to Race**

The present sample includes a sample of People of Color who are mostly Black (46, 85%) with 8 participants identifying as People of Color who are not Black. A series of ANOVAs were completed to evaluate whether the main study variables differ according to race among Black participants, People of Color who are not Black, and White participants. Significant differences were found between Black participants when compared to White participants and People of Color who are not Black, as presented below.

**Occurrences of Discrimination.** A significant difference was found for occurrences of discrimination $F(2, 125) = 4.01, p < .01$ such that Black participants reported more discrimination (4.41 ± .36) than did White participants (3.12 ± .28, $p < .01$). No difference was found in regards to occurrences of discrimination between People of Color who are not Black and Black participants or White participants. A significant interaction was found between race and gender for occurrences of discrimination ($F(1, 124) = 4.10, p < .05$) such that Black women reported more occurrences of discrimination ($M = 4.54$) than did White women ($M = 3.89$) or White men ($M = 1.79$).

**Righteous Comparisons.** A significant difference was found for righteous comparisons $F(2, 125) = 17.88, p < .001$ such that Black participants reported higher righteous comparisons (2.70 ± .23) than White participants (.95 ± .18, $p < .001$) or People of Color who are not Black (1.25 ± .55, $p < .05$). No difference was found between People of Color who are not Black and White participants.

**Satisfaction with Life.** Black participants reported significantly lower satisfaction with life $F(2, 125) = 6.5, p < .01$ (22.98 ± .79) compared to White participants (26.56, $p < .001$) or People
of Color who are not Black (27.25 ± 1.9, p < .05). No difference was found between People of Color who are not Black and White participants. A significant interaction was found between race and native Detroit status for satisfaction with life (F(1, 124) = 7.71, p < .01) such that White non-natives reported higher life satisfaction (M = 27.51) than White natives of Detroit (M = 23.7), Black natives of Detroit (M = 23.6), and Black non-natives of Detroit (M = 21.6).

No differences were found in regards to race for any other of the main study variables including well-being, multilevel empowerment, sense of community, or critical consciousness. No racial differences were found for any of the organizational variables including frequency of participation, leadership position, volunteer position, or type of organization.

As illustrated above, People of Color who are not Black did not significantly differ from White participants in regards to any of the main study variables, yet did differ from Black participants for several of the study variables. The remainder of the analyses in the present study will evaluate racial differences by grouping participants into race categories of Black and White/Other.

Factors Accounting for Variation in Critical Consciousness

Critical Consciousness. Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used to examine the relative contribution of demographic characteristics (gender, race, and current SES), sense of community, self-reported occurrences of discrimination, and righteous comparisons on critical consciousness. Specifically, gender, race, and current SES were entered into the first block of the model, sense of community was entered into the second block, and self-reported occurrences of discrimination and righteous comparisons were entered into the third block (Table 4). The full model of gender, race, current SES, sense of community, self-reported occurrences of discrimination, righteous comparisons to predict critical consciousness was statistically significant F(7, 120) = 3.12, p < .01, adjusted R² = .11. In the first block of the model, gender significantly
contributed to the equation such that women reported higher levels of critical consciousness than men (β = .18; p < .05); however, gender did not significantly contribute to the equation once the third block was added. In the full model, righteous comparisons contributed to the equation (p < .01) after accounting for demographics, sense of community, and occurrences of discrimination such that adults with higher righteous comparisons reported higher levels of critical consciousness (β = .34).

Relative Contribution of Community and Social Variables in Accounting for Variation in Well-being Correlates

*Multilevel Empowerment.* Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used to examine the relative contribution of demographic characteristics, individual-level variables of personal injustice, community-level variables, and social-level variables on multilevel empowerment. These variables are presented as involved in confronting conditions of injustice on well-being (Prilleltensky, 2012). Specifically, demographic variables of gender, race, and current SES were entered into the first block of the model, occurrences of discrimination and righteous comparisons were entered into the second block, sense of community was entered into the third block, and critical consciousness was entered into the fourth block (Table 5). The full model statistically predicted multilevel empowerment $F(8, 119) = 6.56, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .26$.

Sense of community contributed to the equation ($p < .001$) such that adults with a higher sense of community reported higher levels of multilevel empowerment (β = .53). No variables other than sense of community significantly contributed to the equation in any of the steps of the regression. A second hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with critical consciousness in the third block and sense of community in the fourth block, and results were not fundamentally different (Table 10). Switching the order of entry of sense of community and critical consciousness does not change the results, which suggests that regardless of demographics and individual-level
variables, sense of community and not critical consciousness is a better predictor of multilevel empowerment.

*Well-being.* Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used to examine the relative contribution of demographic characteristics, individual-level variables of personal injustice, community-level variables, and social-level variables on well-being. Specifically, demographic variables of gender, race, and current SES were entered into the first block of the model, self-reported occurrences of discrimination and righteous comparisons were entered into the second block, sense of community was entered into the third block, and critical consciousness was entered into the fourth block (Table 6). The full model statistically predicted well-being $F(8, 119) = 3.58, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .14$. In the first block of the model, SES significantly contributed to the equation such that upper-middle class participants reported higher well-being than participants in other SES categories ($\beta = .25; p < .05$); however, SES did not significantly contribute to the equation once variables in additional blocks were added. In the full model, righteous comparisons contributed to the equation ($p < .05$) such that adults with lower righteous comparisons reported higher levels of well-being ($\beta = -.26$). Additionally, participants with a greater sense of community reported higher levels of well-being ($\beta = .21, p < .05$). A second hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with critical consciousness in the third block and sense of community in the fourth block, and results were not fundamentally different (Table 11). Switching the order of entry of sense of community and critical consciousness does not change the results, which suggests that regardless of demographics and individual-level variables, sense of community is a better predictor of perceived well-being.

*Life Satisfaction.* Hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used to examine the relative contribution of demographic characteristics, individual-level variables of personal injustice, community-level variables, and social-level variables on life satisfaction. Specifically,
demographic variables of gender, race, and current SES were entered into the first block of the model, self-reported occurrences of discrimination and righteous comparisons were entered into the second block, sense of community was entered into the third block, and critical consciousness was entered into the fourth block (Table 7). The full model statistically predicted life satisfaction $F(8, 119) = 4.68, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .19$. In the first through third blocks of the model, race significantly contributed to the equation such that Black participants reported lower levels of life satisfaction than participants of other races (first block $\beta = .27; p < .01$); however, race did not significantly contribute to the equation in the full model. In the full model, SES was significant such that upper-middle participants reported higher life satisfaction than participants at other SES levels ($\beta = .36; p < .01$). Additionally, in the full model, critical consciousness contributed to the equation ($p < .01$) such that adults with higher critical consciousness reported higher levels of life satisfaction ($\beta = .23$). A second hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with critical consciousness in the third block and sense of community in the fourth block, and results were not fundamentally different (Table 12). Switching the order of entry of sense of community and critical consciousness does not change the results, which indicates that regardless of demographics and individual-level variables, critical consciousness, and not sense of community, is a better predictor of life satisfaction.

**Perceptions of Detroit and Its Revitalization**

Out of a total of 128 participants who completed the survey, 124 people provided a response to the question, “What do you like about Detroit? What positive aspects are there about the city?” Additionally, 125 participants provided responses to the question, “What do you think are the most important changes in Detroit that need to occur for the city’s revival?” Using content analysis techniques (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014), the principal investigator read participants responses to each question multiple times. Participants’ responses were then
categorized by themes to describe their views about positive aspects of Detroit and what adults thought needed to change. Overarching themes for both qualitative questions are summarized below.

**Positive Aspects of Detroit.** Based on their experiences, 124 adults who are involved in Detroit’s revitalization provided insight into their favorite parts of the city (“What do you like about Detroit? What positive aspects are there about the city?”). Themes that characterize their responses about positive aspects of Detroit and representative quotes from participants are summarized below and presented in Table 8.

When asked what they like about Detroit, 54 people (42%) described Detroit as a place that is abundant with **opportunity**. In their responses, participants said that changes in Detroit are exciting, that Detroit has many resources (e.g., water access, low rent), and that it is a place where hard work is rewarded. For many people, the revitalization itself was the most positive aspect of Detroit. For example, a 58-year-old White man who is the president of a nonprofit that promotes economic development said, “Detroit is alive with excitement! There are so many entrepreneurs -- both social and single bottom line, profit only -- who are filled with passion for finding the solutions we need.” Similarly, a 67-year-old White man who has volunteered for twelve years with a political organization said, “Detroit is a movement city. Detroit is a city of ideas and imagination. For decades Detroiter have worked to create a way out of no way. New concepts of revolution emerge from Detroit.”

Several participants (26; 20%) said that Detroit feels like **home**, and that what they like about Detroit is a sense of belonging and identity with the city. For example, a 46-year-old White man who is a lifelong resident of Detroit and works in social media outreach simply stated, “It's my home. I could go on a long diatribe about other things, but that's what it all boils down to.” A 61-year-old Black woman who cofounded an organization focused on education and outreach
was seemingly frustrated by the question: “I can't give an answer to this. It is my hometown. I was born, raised, and educated in Detroit. It's like asking which of your children you love the most and what is it about them that you love. I love the good, the bad, and the ugly. Only a newcomer can quantify or specify what's good about my city.”

Over half (72; 56%) of the participants responded that Detroit’s greatest strength is its **people**. These participants spoke about Detroiter themselves, who display grit, determination, and perseverance. A 55-year-old Black woman who is a lifelong resident of Detroit stated, “Detroit is a city filled with dedicated citizens who take pride in the city of Detroit at every level.” Similarly, a 41-year-old Black woman who has been involved in Detroit’s revival for 14 years stated, “The spirit that Detroiter have. Detroit has a sense of community. It's like a big boat and Detroiter tend to have the mentality that we are all in this together, sink or swim. Revitalization is happening throughout the city. Despite what people say, I see changes all throughout the neighborhoods. I see more block clubs and Detroiter are looking out for their neighborhood and not waiting to be saved.”

Over half (75; 59%) of the participants referred to **culture** as their favorite thing about Detroit, in terms of its attitude, diversity, restaurants, activities, and other unique offerings. For example, a 32-year-old White woman who has lived in Detroit for eight years and serves as the executive director for a political neighborhood block club stated, “I like the diversity of Southwest Detroit. I like that there are lots of businesses within a short distance of my house. I like that there are many festivals, and free programs. I like that we have parks and recreation centers.” Similarly, a 35-year-old White woman who has wrote grants for a nonprofit that focuses on youth employment for six years stated, “The city has wonderful art and architecture, a strong nonprofit and foundation community, and rich history and culture.”
**Needed Changes.** Additionally, 125 adults provided insight into their perspective about Detroit’s needed changes (“What do you think are the most important changes in Detroit that need to occur for the city’s revival?”). Themes that characterize their responses about changes that are needed in Detroit and representative quotes from participants are summarized below and presented in Table 9.

Several participants (31; 24%) stated that changes need to occur within Detroit’s economy. These people spoke of the need for increased jobs, investments, and businesses in the city. For example, a 31-year-old Black man who works as a coordinator for a nonprofit focused on environmental justice stated that Detroit needs “Employment: many of the issues the city has is due to concentrated poverty and unemployment.”

Most of the participants (83; 65%) spoke of a need for changes in policies or services that the government provides. Several participants spoke of a need for increased public transportation, tax and insurance reform, improved public education, and modernized infrastructure. A 44-year-old Black woman who is a lifelong resident of Detroit stated, “Infusion of policies that ensure equity and inclusion including community benefits agreement, local control, school stabilization, home rule, job development and investment, investment in neighborhoods, blight reduction, water affordability plan, repeal of emergency manager law, equitable revenue sharing with state of MI, management of gentrification process, community policing, affordable housing, lower taxes, end to red lining in insurance rates.” Several participants (54; 42% of total sample) who spoke about changes to government changes spoke specifically about improving Detroit Public Schools. A 26-year-old White woman who moved to Detroit four years ago said, “Schools need to be invested in both as physical spaces in need of repair and as environments of learning. Teachers should be paid much higher than their suburban counter parts to reflect the fact that teaching in Detroit is more challenging and requires more time and effort, and parents need to be engaged.”
Half (64; 50%) of the participants spoke of a need for social change within neighborhoods. A 30-year-old Black man who is a lifelong resident of Detroit stated, “I believe the most important change should first start within our neighborhood. Blight is a real concern of mine. Too many abandoned houses, businesses and vacant lots with debris. Having official block clubs and concerned residents in the community to help out with clean up and board up our vacant homes is important in building our neighborhood successfully.” A 70-year-old white woman who is a lifelong resident of Detroit stated, “We need to attract good neighbors to the outlying, lower socio-economic areas like ours. Ones that respect others and want to live in a clean, safe environment. Our area is full of vacant houses and lots. Homes are being lost to foreclosure and being bought out by investors who let the properties deteriorate. The Riffraff, for lack of a better word, are ruining our neighborhoods, however, where can they go? They also need a place to reside.”

Several other people spoke about broader social change that needs to happen in Detroit. Some participants (17; 13%) discussed a need for improved racial equity. For example, a 53-year-old White man who works as the executive director of a nonprofit that creates greenspaces called for “a greater regional understanding of race and how it affects the environment we have today.” Several participants (54; 42%) spoke of a need for inclusion of community members in Detroit’s revitalization. A 36-year-old White woman who has worked at a philanthropic organization for two years warned, “Investment in neighborhoods that happens WITH current residents - and not TO them. If swaths of Detroit residents are economically (or otherwise) forced out, the city's soul will be lost. Grassroots leaders must be included at decision-making tables.” Similarly, a 63-year-old Black woman who is a lifelong resident of Detroit said, “Inclusion of all the people and all the areas we live in not just the chosen neighborhoods. We count and vote, what about us?”
DISCUSSION

The present research investigated issues of wellness and fairness in a sample of adults who are citizen participants in Detroit’s revitalization. The research used both quantitative and qualitative data to examine factors that are relevant in accounting for perceived well-being in a sample that is actively working to confront social injustice. Main research questions included 1) the relative contribution of demographic variables, sense of community, and individual-level perceptions of injustice that are associated with differences in participants’ critical consciousness, and 2) the relative contribution of demographic variables, individual-level perceptions of personal injustice, and community- and social-level variables in accounting for individual variation in participants’ reports of perceived empowerment, well-being, and life satisfaction.

Critical Consciousness

In *Wellness as Fairness*, Prilleltensky (2012) suggests that when people are faced with injustice, people who are critically conscious are motivated to confront injustice through critical action. When people are critically conscious, they are aware of social, political, and economic oppression, and they take action against it (Freire, 1973). The present study examined the relative contribution of demographic variables (i.e., gender, race, and SES), sense of community, and individual-level perceptions of injustice (i.e., occurrence of discrimination and righteous comparisons) in accounting for variation in critical consciousness. As expected, the present study found that perceived individual-level injustice significantly predicted critical consciousness, even after variance from demographics and sense of community was accounted for. This suggests that the development of critical consciousness is not related to who someone is (i.e., demographics) or where they are (i.e., sense of community) but rather, one’s life experiences.

Prior research on social dominance orientation, which refers to the attributions that people make for groups’ positions within society (e.g., “It’s probably a good thing that certain groups are
at the top and other groups are at the bottom.”) (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) has suggested that people who reject ideologies that favor social inequality score higher in measures of critical consciousness (Diemer, Kauffman, Koenig, Trahan, & Hsieh, 2006). This is consistent with the present study, which suggests that personal experience with social inequality predicts the development of critical consciousness. In the present study, righteous comparisons, a concept introduced by Prilleltensky (2012) that refers to realizing that other groups enjoy social justice while one’s own group suffers from injustice, was the best predictor of critical consciousness. Although demographic variables are certainly relevant in identifying groups that have been historically marginalized and are likely to suffer from injustice, the development of critical consciousness involves the personal perception that one’s group is oppressed. In other words, the present study suggests that critical consciousness does not just exist inherently in oppressed populations, but rather is developed in people that understand oppression through their personal life experiences. This suggests that, despite the well-established history of social injustice in Detroit, critical consciousness is not inherent for all people who are participating in Detroit’s revival; people who recognize how oppression has personally affected them show the highest levels of critical consciousness.

**Sense of Community in Understanding Multilevel Empowerment and Well-Being**

*Multilevel Empowerment.* The present study found that sense of community was significant in predicting multilevel empowerment, even after variation from other factors such as demographics and individual-level perceptions of injustice were accounted for in the model. Citizen participation and empowerment have been linked in the literature such that people who are involved in citizen participation efforts report higher perceived empowerment when they see that they can make a difference in their communities through participation (Zimmerman, 1990). Additionally, prior research has suggested a reciprocal relationship between citizen participation
and sense of community; people who are involved in citizen participations efforts are likely to develop a strong sense of community, and people with a strong sense of community are more likely to become involved in their communities (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990; Ohmer, 2007). The majority of the sample in the present study had a leadership position in their organizations, and when compared with participants without a leadership position, leaders reported higher levels of empowerment and a higher sense of community. This suggests that the people who are in leadership positions also tend to feel the most connected with Detroit and feel as though they can make the most change. Given that most of the sample had a leadership position, it is not surprising that sense of community was a significant predictor of empowerment in the present study. In fact, the literature suggests a relationship between sense of community and empowerment such that people with a strong sense of community feel compelled to act against perceived threats to their communities (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). Given that the present study involved a sample of people who are acting against perceived threats to their community (i.e., Detroit), it is possible that sense of community was the strongest predictor of empowerment in the present study due to a greater sense of purpose to combat injustice in Detroit. In other words, the people who feel the most empowered in Detroit are the ones who feel the most connected to Detroit, perhaps because of their strong commitment to their community.

*Well-Being.* Similarly, sense of community was the best predictor of well-being in the present study. Overall, adults’ reports of sense of community were significant in predicting their reports of personal well-being, regardless of demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, race, and SES) and individual-level perceptions of injustice (i.e., occurrences of discrimination and righteous comparisons). The results from the present study are highly consistent with the extant literature on citizen participation, well-being, and sense of community. The literature suggests a correlation between sense of community and well-being such that people who report a higher
sense of community also tend to report higher well-being, particularly in regards to subjective happiness (Davidson & Cotter, 1991). In other words, people are happier when they feel connected with their communities. Research also indicates that people report high well-being when they are actively involved in their communities (Albanesi, Cicognani, & Zani, 2007).

In the literature, the relationship between citizen participation and well-being has been established as reciprocal such that people who participate report higher well-being, and people who report high well-being are more likely to participate (Thoits & Hewitt, 2001). This is particularly evident when participation efforts directly affect the lives of citizen-participants (Christens, 2012; Maton, 2008). In other words, the literature suggests that citizen participation leads to improved well-being when the focus of citizen participation efforts results in actual improvements in a participant’s life. This suggests that the people who benefit from citizen participation in terms of well-being are the ones who are working to improve issues that directly impact them. Overall, the extant literature suggests that well-being is related to both the process of citizen participation and the result of citizen participation when participation efforts directly affect a participant’s life. It is possible that sense of community predicted well-being in the present study because those who are acting to improve their beloved communities feel happy because of the process of citizen participation (i.e., they feel connected with their community regardless of the outcome). It is also possible that citizen participation efforts in Detroit are related to higher well-being for those who are strongly connected with their communities because the outcome of their efforts can have a direct impact (i.e., the changes and improvements that result from citizen participation efforts).

*Qualitative Results.* Similarly, the qualitative results in the present study suggest that many people feel a strong sense of belonging in Detroit. For example, one of the themes that emerged when participants were asked about their favorite aspect of Detroit was that Detroit is
simply “home”. Participants shared that they love the city because it is part of their identity and their past. The qualitative results are highly consistent with quantitative results in the present study. Many of the study participants in Detroit are passionate about their city and about their revival work because they feel such a deep sense of belonging with Detroit. Additionally, when asked about changes that need to happen for Detroit’s revival, a common theme emerged in regards to a need for the revival to be seen in neighborhoods. Participants stated that they would like to see improvements in their neighborhoods including removing blight, creating safer communities, and strengthening the power of block clubs. As a whole, the qualitative results demonstrate a desire for community action and a common love for Detroit among adults who are participants in Detroit’s revival.

Critical Consciousness as a Predictor of Satisfaction with Life

Satisfaction with Life. Contrary to the other two well-being correlates included in the present study, critical consciousness, not sense of community, was the best predictor of satisfaction with life, regardless of basic demographics and individual-level perceptions of injustice. This result conflicts with the literature, which suggests that sense of community is associated with life satisfaction (Prezza et al., 2001). The literature does suggest that well-being is an ill-defined construct in psychology (Dodge et al., 2012; Ryff, 1989) but has been described as “when individuals have the psychological, social, and physical resources they need to meet a particular psychological, social and/or physical challenge” (Dodge et al., 2012, p. 230). In the present study, it appears that life satisfaction and well-being are related yet different constructs. This is consistent with the literature, which suggests that life satisfaction involves a deeper cognitive appraisal of one’s life, while well-being involves whether subjective and objective needs are met (Diener, 2000). The present study suggests that, for Detroiter's who are active in the revival of the city, sense of community is predictive of empowerment and well-being, yet people
who are more critically conscious have a more satisfied cognitive appraisal of their life. People who are high in critical consciousness understand oppression on a social level and are moved to act to confront injustice. Given that the entire sample in the present study is composed of people who are confronting social injustice, but have varying levels of critical consciousness, it is likely that the people within the sample have differing motivations to participate in Detroit’s revival. It is possible that the people who are high in critical consciousness are involved in Detroit because they see social injustice and feel compelled to do something about it. In other words, it is possible that their participation does not necessarily have any immediate impact on their personal well-being, but helps them feel satisfied with their life because they feel as though they are helping society as a whole.

**Qualitative Results.** In the present study, people spoke about the need for social change in Detroit. A common theme of inclusion emerged in the present study, with many people concerned that the revival of Detroit was synonymous with the oppression of Detroiter. Some participants spoke about the need for racial equity in Detroit, given that many powerful people who are involved in Detroit’s revival are White (Hill, 2014). Others spoke more generally about the need to include Detroiter in changes that affect them and their city. Many participants expressed worries that citizens of Detroit will be left out, forgotten, or displaced as a result of the revival movement. Notably, respondents in the present study said that Detroiter themselves are the city’s biggest strength, yet were concerned that the decision-makers in Detroit were ignoring Detroit’s biggest asset, its people. This is consistent with prior research by the principal investigator which examined the ways in which the media, as a proxy for the dominant cultural narrative, reported about Detroit (Greenberg, 2015). The dominant culture creates narratives to tell society’s stories about who or what has value (Rappaport, 2000). This research found that the stories of people who are lifelong residents of Detroit and who are working to revitalize their own
neighborhoods are not being shared; instead, the people whose stories are shared and are celebrated the most are people whose demographics do not reflect the vast majority of Detroit residents (Greenberg, 2015). It is not entirely surprising that stories about Detroit’s “value” as a city involves the efforts of actors who largely reflect the demographics of the dominant culture. It is also not surprising that many Detroiter feel disrespected by the revitalization movement of White male investors, and raise concerns that these efforts will not positively affect them (Abbey-Lambertz, 2014; Austen, 2014). The research literature supports these concerns; according to Perkins et al. (2004), large-scale development is often supported by policymakers as the solution to urban decay, yet it frequently only serves to perpetuate the cycle of renewal and decay. Overall, participants in the present study appear to be passionate about participating in Detroit’s revival in a socially conscious and equitable manner.

Study Limitations

One major limitation of the research that is likely to impact the results of this study is the principal investigator’s identity as a White outsider to Detroit. This information was apparent to potential participants in the study announcement (Appendix A), as the principal investigator has a traditionally White name and is affiliated with a university in a different state from Detroit. Several potential participants responded to the study announcement with questions, skepticism, and critiques, for example, questions regarding who is running the study or how the results will be used. Given the history of social injustice in Detroit that has been perpetuated by people with similar characteristics to the principal investigator, this skepticism was not unexpected. The principal investigator spoke with several potential participants via email and phone about the study and the theory that drives the present research, and with few exceptions, these conversations ended cordially. This response to recruitment efforts was indicative of how deeply
Detroiter care about their city and how important it is to complete this research in a respectful, sensitive fashion.

These challenges are limitations because of the self-selection involved in recruitment. In other words, the present sample is composed of people who were not skeptical of the research in the first place, people who were willing to suspend their skepticism, and people who had a conversation with the researcher and were then willing to participate. The degree to which findings represent the views of citizen participants in Detroit as a whole, or Detroiter as a whole, is unclear. It is likely that the worldviews of the people who chose to participate are different from the worldviews of the people who chose not to participate due to the nature of the study.

Another limitation of the present research is that it considers each participant to be confronting social injustice, per Wellness as Fairness (Prilleltensky, 2012). According to this theory, people who are confronting social injustice are personally faced with injustice, and decide to rebel against it. The decision to focus on confronting rather than thriving, coping, or suffering was made because citizen participation efforts traditionally help marginalized people gain power in their communities (Florin & Wandersman, 1990). Given the diversity of participants in Detroit’s revival efforts, it is likely that some participants have experienced more or less hardship than others, and may fall better into other categories. For example, people who are thriving are often active in their communities, but because they do not feel a personal sense of injustice, their actions serve to perpetuate their own thriving rather than serving to confront an unfair system (Prilleltensky, 2012).

The present study relied exclusively on citizen participants’ self-reports of their experiences and worldviews, and may be affected by participants’ memory, effort or motivation, and social desirability. The present study used a cross-sectional research design and cannot address issues of causation among study variables. Additionally, the overall amounts of variation
accounted for by main study variables in statistically predicting criterion variables of multilevel empowerment, well-being, and satisfaction with life were relatively low. This suggests that, while it was demonstrated in the present study that sense of community and critical consciousness are important in regards to well-being correlates, other variables at the community- or social-level that were not assessed may also be relevant.

**Future Directions for Research and Practice**

The present study demonstrated that community- and social-level variables are relevant for well-being; future research should continue to examine variables other than individual-level variables that are related to personal well-being. Continued investigation of the ways in which citizen participants act to confront social justice is necessary to understand how the confrontation of injustice is related to citizens’ perceptions of well-being. Such research could highlight the personal, organizational, community, and social benefits in including stakeholders in decisions that directly affect them. One approach to research that directly involves stakeholders is participatory action research, a community-driven approach to advancing both research and practice in regards to community action (Whyte, 1991). This approach to research provides stakeholders with the tools to systematically investigate issues that directly affect their own lives, and to establish plans for change to address these issues (Stringer, 1996). It is important to actively involve participants in research efforts, particularly when studying groups that have historically been marginalized, in order to avoid perpetuating the silencing of their voices.

Future research should further explore the relationship between wellness and fairness in groups of people with varying degrees of social justice and injustice. The present study included a heterogeneous group in regards to experiences of fairness or unfairness, which provided an opportunity to compare people with varying levels of well-being and varying levels of justice. A larger sample size that would allow for the division of the sample based on placement along a
well-being or justice continuum would further allow for more robust statistical analysis. Researchers should strive for a diverse sample that is reflective of the population that is being studied.

Future research should also focus on developing constructs that are relevant for well-being and social justice, particularly in regards to righteous comparisons. There does not yet appear to be a psychometrically sound way to measure righteous comparisons that exists in the literature since it was first described in Prilleltensky (2012). A single question formulated by the researcher was used to evaluate for righteous comparisons in the present study, which yielded significant results. It is important to develop more comprehensive assessments for righteous comparisons given its important relationship between well-being and citizen participation in the present study.

In terms of practice, present findings highlight factors such as sense of community and critical consciousness for community interventions. Given the link between sense of community and well-being that has been demonstrated in the present research and in the extant literature (Maton, 2008; Thoits & Hewitt, 2001), it may be helpful for practitioners to consider how the community may promote or obstruct individual well-being, and to design interventions that focus on fostering a sense of community. Similarly, the present research suggests that people who report high critical consciousness also report high levels of life satisfaction. Given that highly developed critical consciousness involves action to confront social injustice, practitioners may find it helpful to focus interventions on developing critical consciousness. Interventions to develop critical consciousness would focus on making people aware of oppression, particularly the ways in which they or their group personally have suffered from or contributed to social injustice (Bizzell, 1992; Freire, 1973). It may be helpful for practitioners to emphasize one’s personal experiences with oppression; the present research indicates that righteous comparisons are a better predictor of critical consciousness above and beyond demographics alone. This suggests that practitioners
should attend to the lived experiences of their population when developing critical consciousness and encourage action to confront social injustice.
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### Table 1

**Sample Individual Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
<th>Age M (SD)</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81 (63.3)</td>
<td>Current SES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47 (36.7)</td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
<td>Lower-middle class</td>
<td>49 (38.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2 (1.6)</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>18 (14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>43 (33.6)</td>
<td>Lower class</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>2 (1.6)</td>
<td>Family of Origin SES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>74 (57.8)</td>
<td>Upper-middle class</td>
<td>45 (35.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one race</td>
<td>6 (4.7)</td>
<td>Lower-middle class</td>
<td>51 (39.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>43 (33.6)</td>
<td>Lower class</td>
<td>7 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or partnered</td>
<td>65 (50.8)</td>
<td>Student Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>15 (11.7)</td>
<td>Currently a student</td>
<td>13 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5 (3.9)</td>
<td>Not a student</td>
<td>115 (89.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
<td>Owns home</td>
<td>88 (68.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma/GED</td>
<td>3 (2.3)</td>
<td>Renting</td>
<td>34 (26.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td>Staying with friends/relatives</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Tech/Voc Training</td>
<td>2 (1.6)</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>7 (5.5)</td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>42 (32.8)</td>
<td>Works full time</td>
<td>85 (66.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>11 (8.6)</td>
<td>Works part time</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>45 (35.2)</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>12 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>7 (5.5)</td>
<td>Unemployed; looking for work</td>
<td>5 (3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>2 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic/Atheist</td>
<td>23 (18)</td>
<td>Unable to work</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>73 (57)</td>
<td>Relationship with Detroit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>2 (1.6)</td>
<td>Native Detroiter</td>
<td>52 (40.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
<td>Native but living elsewhere</td>
<td>12 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual, not religious</td>
<td>2 (1.6)</td>
<td>Newcomer to Detroit</td>
<td>28 (21.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>19 (14.8)</td>
<td>Never lived in Detroit</td>
<td>36 (28.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Indicates missing data for one or more individuals.
### Table 2.

**Sample Organizational Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months of Involvement M(SD)</strong></td>
<td>67.1 (79.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Adversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>55 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>19 (14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>31 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environmental</td>
<td>23 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid/Volunteer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>81 (63.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>47 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86 (67.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42 (32.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times/year or less</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every other month</td>
<td>3 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td>8 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice per month</td>
<td>8 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times/month or more</td>
<td>105 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you/your values fit with this org?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>8 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>47 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>73 (57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for All Study Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall Discrimination</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critical Consciousness</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sense of Community*</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Multilevel Empowerment*</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Well-Being</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Satisfaction with Life*</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* ≤ .05, **p** < .01. *Measure is scored using a total score, rather than a mean score.
Table 4

Hierarchical Regression of Critical Consciousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Chg</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Adj ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Consciousness</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper-mid SES vs. other</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle SES vs. other</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sense of Community</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Discrimination</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p ≤ .05, **p < .01.
### Table 5

*Hierarchical Regression of Multilevel Empowerment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$R^2$ Chg</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multilevel Empowerment</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper-mid SES vs. other</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle SES vs. other</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discrimination</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sense of Community</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Critical Consiousness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *$p \leq .05$, **$p < .01$.***
**Table 6**

*Hierarchical Regression of Well-being*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Adj ( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper-mid SES vs. other</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle SES vs. other</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discrimination</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sense of Community</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Critical Consciousness</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p ≤ .05, **p < .01.
Table 7

*Hierarchical Regression of Satisfaction with Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper-mid SES vs. other</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle SES vs. other</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discrimination</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sense of Community</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Critical Consciousness</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  *p* ≤ .05,  **p** < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Representative quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Changes in Detroit are exciting, abundant, and possible. The revitalization itself is the most positive aspect.</td>
<td>54/128</td>
<td>“Detroit is a movement city. Detroit is a city of ideas and imagination. For decades Detroiters have worked to create a way out of no way. New concepts of revolution emerge from Detroit.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>A sense of belonging and identity with the city</td>
<td>20/128</td>
<td>“I can’t give an answer to this. It is my hometown. I was born, raised, and educated in Detroit. It’s like asking which of your children you love the most and what is it about them that you love. I love the good, the bad, and the ugly. Only a newcomer can quantify or specify what’s good about my city.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Detroiters themselves are the most positive aspect</td>
<td>72/128</td>
<td>“Detroit is a city filled with dedicated citizens who take pride in the city of Detroit at every level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Detroit’s unique offerings: its attractions, activities, diversity, and attitude</td>
<td>75/128</td>
<td>“The city has wonderful art and architecture, a strong nonprofit and foundation community, and rich history and culture.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

_Needs Changes in Detroit Themes, Operational Definitions, and Representative Quotes_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Representative quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Increased jobs, investments, and businesses in the city</td>
<td>31/128</td>
<td>“Employment: many of the issues the city has is due to concentrated poverty and unemployment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Changes and improvements in government services and policies</td>
<td>83/128</td>
<td>“Infusion of policies that ensure equity and inclusion including…repeal of emergency manager law, equitable revenue sharing with state of MI, management of gentrification process, community policing, affordable housing, lower taxes, end to red lining in insurance rates.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Development within the neighborhoods and communities of Detroit (i.e., outside of the downtown area)</td>
<td>64/128</td>
<td>“I believe the most important change should first start within our neighborhood. Blight is a real concern of mine. Too many abandoned houses, businesses and vacant lots with debris. Having official block clubs and concerned residents in the community to help out with clean up and board up our vacant homes is important in building our neighborhood successfully.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change</td>
<td>An increased understanding of social injustice, particularly regarding racial equity, and how revitalization without citizen participation may perpetuate inequality</td>
<td>17/128</td>
<td>“Investment in neighborhoods that happens WITH current residents - and not TO them. If swaths of Detroit residents are economically (or otherwise) forced out, the city's soul will be lost. Grassroots leaders must be included at decision-making tables.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Hierarchical Regression of Multilevel Empowerment with Blocks 3 and 4 Switched

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$R^2$ Chg</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multilevel Empowerment</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper-mid SES vs. other</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle SES vs. other</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discrimination</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Critical Consciousness</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Sense of Community</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *p ≤ .05, **p < .01.*
### Table 11

*Hierarchical Regression of Well-being with Blocks 3 and 4 Switched*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$R^2$ Chg</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj $R^2$</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper-mid SES vs. other</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle SES vs. other</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discrimination</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Critical Consciousness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Sense of Community</td>
<td>.04*3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* ≤ .05, **p** < .01.
Table 12

*Hierarchical Regression of Satisfaction with Life with Blocks 3 and 4 Switched*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper-mid SES vs.</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle SES vs. other</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discrimination</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Righteous Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Critical</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Sense of</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* ≤ .05, **p < .01.
APPENDIX B. RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Subject: Participate in research about Detroit’s revitalization

Are you currently involved in an organization that supports Detroit’s revival or revitalization?

My name is Sarah Greenberg, and I am a doctoral student at Bowling Green State University, Clinical Psychology program. I am interested in learning more about the recent revival movement in Detroit from adults that are currently involved in Detroit’s revitalization. If this describes you, please consider following the survey link below to begin a brief online survey. If you know someone who might be interested, please share this email with them.

As a token of my appreciation, each person who completes the questionnaire will be offered one $5 Amazon.com gift card upon completion of the study.

The survey can be reached at: (link)

Some basic information:

- The survey will take approximately 15 to 30 minutes to complete. It can be completed online at a time that is convenient for you.
- Your name or identifying data will not be associated with any of your responses.
- You will have the chance to share your perspectives about participating in Detroit’s revitalization as well as other experiences that you may have had
- Participation is completely voluntary.
- You will be able to learn more about the project before you decide to participate. If you have any questions about the study, please email me at sgreenb@bgsu.edu.

If you know someone else who might be interested, please feel free to send along this message.

Thanks in advance for your help!

Sarah Greenberg, MA
APPENDIX C. FACEBOOK RECRUITMENT

Participate in Research about Detroit’s Revitalization!

(link)

Are you currently involved in an organization that supports Detroit’s revival or revitalization? Please complete an online survey about your experiences.
APPENDIX D. INFORMED CONSENT

Department of Psychology
Boise State University
Department of Psychology, Psychology Building, Bowling Green, OH 43403
Phone: (419) 372-2301, Fax: (419) 372-6013

Informed Consent

Purpose
You are invited to participate in a study about citizen participation in Detroit’s revitalization. I am interested in learning more about the recent revival movement in Detroit from individuals that are committed to Detroit’s revitalization. I am also interested in ways in which individuals can work on changing unfair conditions, and how this work is related to a sense of how individuals feel about themselves and their lives.

The research study is being conducted by Sarah Greenberg, a psychology graduate student at Bowling Green State University (BGSU), to satisfy her degree requirements for dissertation research and supervised by Dr. Catherine Stein, a Professor in the Psychology Department.

Eligibility Requirements
You are eligible to participate if you are at least 18 years old and you are currently involved in a non-profit organization that supports Detroit’s revitalization or renewal.

Activities
You will be asked to complete an online survey about your participation in Detroit’s revival. The survey should take you about 15 to 30 minutes to complete.

Risks and Benefits
The benefits of participating in this project include helping us understand how citizen participation may be related to the revival movement in Detroit and a sense of individual satisfaction and well-being. By participating in the research, you can also learn more about your personal involvement in Detroit’s revitalization. Additionally, you be offered one $5 Amazon.com gift card upon your completion of the study. The anticipated risks to you are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

Confidentiality
Your answers to the survey are confidential. Your organization will not have access to any of your responses. No name or identifying information will be directly associated with your
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responses. Any contact information you provide to receive the gift card will be kept in a secure database separate from your responses. Your responses to the survey will be kept on password protected, secure computer server. Only the PI of this study will have access to the study data. Since some employers use software that tracks websites visited and keystrokes made, you may wish to complete the questionnaire on a home or public computer in order to safeguard your confidentiality.

Since the internet is not 100% secure in terms of privacy, please remember to not leave the partially completed survey open or unattended if completing it on a public computer, and to clear the browser history of cache when finished with the survey.

The results of this study will be used in the principal investigator’s dissertation research. We also hope to publish an article summarizing the overall results of this study. In both of these cases, no one person’s answers will be presented – only a summary of data from many participants.

Your Rights as a Participant

Your participation is completely voluntary and you are free to skip any questions you do not want to answer. You are free to change your mind and stop participating at any time without penalty or explanation, even if you begin to complete the online survey. Choosing to participate, not participate, or withdraw from the study will not affect your relationship with your organization or with BGSU. You may click on the X at the top right hand corner of your computer window to exit the survey. Your responses will not be saved until you click the “Complete Survey” button at the end of the survey. If you exit and then decide later that you would like to participate, you can visit this web address again by clicking on the same link again.

If you have any questions about the study, you may contact the principal investigator, Sarah Greenberg, at (419) 372-2301 or sgreenb@bgsu.edu.

This research is being completed for the principal investigator’s dissertation research. If you have any questions about the study, you may contact the faculty advisor, Catherine Stein, Ph.D, at (419) 372-2301 or cstein@bgsu.edu.

You may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Review Board at Bowling Green State University, (419) 372-7716, (hsrb@bgsu.edu), if any problems or concerns arise during the course of the study or if you have questions about participant rights.

Your completion of this online survey indicates your voluntary consent to participate in this research investigation. You may refuse to participate in this investigation or withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in this study. If you are eligible to participate and wish to give your consent and continue, please select the response option below and click on the “Agree” button; you will then be directed to the survey. If you prefer not to participate, please close this browser window.

I have been informed of the risks and benefits of participating in the project. I certify that I meet eligibility requirements for this study.
APPENDIX E. ABOUT YOU AND YOUR WORK IN DETROIT

1. Are you currently involved in an organization that supports Detroit’s revitalization or renewal?
   a. Yes (please answer the following questions)
   b. No (stop here)
2. What is the name of the organization that you are currently involved in, or that you have worked the most with? ____________________________________________________
3. What type of work does this organization do? ____________________________________________________
4. Is your role paid or volunteer?
   a. Paid
   b. Volunteer
5. What is your role/what activities are you involved in? ____________________________________________________
6. Do you have a leadership position within your organization?
   a. Yes
   b. No
7. How long have you been involved? ______ years/ months
8. How often are you involved?
   a. Four times per month or more
   b. Twice per month
   c. Once per month
   d. Once every other month
   e. Four times per year or less
9. How much do you feel as though you and your values fit in with this organization?
   a. Not at all
   b. A little
   c. Somewhat
   d. Mostly
   e. Completely
10. Why did you become involved with Detroit's revitalization?
11. What do you like about Detroit? What positive aspects are there about the city?
12. What do you think are the most important changes in Detroit that need to occur for the city’s revival?
APPENDIX F: PERCEIVED CONTROL SCALE ITEMS: MULTIPLE LEVELS OF EMPOWERMENT INDEX

Please answer the following questions thinking about your life, your community, or the organization that you identified as most important to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I can influence the decisions that this organization makes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This organization has influence over decisions that affect my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This organization is effective in achieving its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This organization can influence decisions that affect the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am satisfied with the amount of influence I have over decisions that this organization makes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have control over the decisions that affect my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My community has influence over decisions that affect my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am satisfied with the amount of control I have over decisions that affect my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I can influence decisions that affect my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. By working together, people in my community can influence decisions that affect the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. People in my community work together to influence decisions on the state or national level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am satisfied with the amount of influence I have over decisions that affect my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G. SENSE OF COMMUNITY INDEX II

1. How important is it to you to feel a sense of community with other people in Detroit?
   a. Prefer not to be part of this community
   b. Not important at all
   c. Not very important
   d. Somewhat important
   e. Important
   f. Very important

The following questions about community refer to Detroit. How well do each of the following statements represent how you feel about this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I get important needs of mine met because I am part of this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community members and I value the same things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This community has been successful in getting the needs of its members met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Being a member of this community makes me feel good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I have a problem, I can talk about it with members of this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People in this community have similar needs, priorities, and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can trust people in this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can recognize most of the members of this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most community members know me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This community has symbols and expressions of membership such as clothes, signs, art, architecture, logos, landmarks, and flags that people can recognize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I put a lot of time and effort into being part of this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Being a member of this community is part of my identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fitting into this community is important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. This community can influence other communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I care about what other community members think of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I have influence over what this community is like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If there is a problem in this community, members can get it solved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>This community has good leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>It is very important to me to be a part of this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am with other community members a lot and enjoy being with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I expect to be a part of this community for a long time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Members of this community have shared important events together, such as holidays, celebrations, or disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I feel hopeful about the future of this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Members of this community care about each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H. CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS INVENTORY

On this questionnaire are groups of four statements; read each group of statements carefully and choose the one statement in each group that best describes you.

1. a. I believe that the world is basically fair  
   b. I believe that the world is basically fair but others believe that it is unfair  
   c. I believe that the world is unfair for some people  
   d. I believe that the world is unfair, and I make sure to treat others fairly

2. a. I believe that all people are treated equally  
   b. I believe that some people don’t take advantage of opportunities given to them and blame others instead  
   c. I believe that some groups are discriminated against  
   d. I work to make sure that people are treated equally and are given equal chances

3. a. I think that education gives everyone an equal chance to do well  
   b. I think that education gives everyone who works hard an equal chance  
   c. I think that the educational system is unequal  
   d. I think that the educational system needs to be changed in order for everyone to have an equal chance

4. a. I believe people get what they deserve  
   b. I believe that some people are treated badly but there are ways they can work to be treated fairly  
   c. I believe that some people are treated badly because of oppression  
   d. I feel angry that some people are treated badly because of oppression and I often do something to change it

5. a. I think all social groups are respected  
   b. I think the social groups that are not respected have done things that lead people to think badly of them  
   c. I think people do not respect members of some social groups based on stereotypes  
   d. I am respectful of people in all social groups and I speak up when others are not

6. a. I don’t notice when people make prejudiced comments  
   b. I notice when people make prejudiced comments and it hurts me  
   c. It hurts me when people make prejudiced comments but I am able to move on  
   d. When someone makes a prejudiced comment, I tell them that what they said is hurtful
7. a. When people tell a joke that makes fun of a social group, I laugh and don’t really think about it
   b. When people tell a joke that makes fun of a social group, I laugh but also feel uncomfortable
   c. When people tell a joke that makes fun of a social group, I realize that the joke is based on a stereotype
   d. I tell people when I feel that their joke was offensive

8. a. I don’t see much oppression in this country
   b. I feel hopeless and overwhelmed when I think about oppression in this country
   c. I feel like oppression in this country is less than in the past and will continue to change
   d. I actively work to support organizations which help people who are oppressed

9. a. I don’t feel bad when people say they have been oppressed
   b. I feel sad or angry when experiencing or seeing oppression
   c. I often become sad or angry when experiencing or seeing oppression, but I find ways to cope with my feelings
   d. I work to protect myself from negative feelings when acts of oppression happen
### APPENDIX I. EVERYDAY DISCRIMINATION SCALE

In your day-to-day life, how often do any of the following things happen to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
<th>At least once a week</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>A few times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You are treated with less courtesy than other people are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You are treated with less respect than other people are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You receive poorer service than other people at restaurants or stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People act as if they think you are not smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People act as if they are afraid of you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People act as if they think you are dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People act as if they’re better than you are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. You are called names or insulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You are threatened or harassed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You are followed around in stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You see other people enjoying freedom of choice and freedom of expression, but you and your people suffer injustice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(If the respondent answered “A few times a year” or more frequently to any question, they will be prompted to respond to a follow up question)

What do you think is the main reason for this experience?

1. Your Ancestry or National Origins
2. Your Gender
3. Your Race
4. Your Age
5. Your Religion
6. Your Height
7. Your Weight
8. Some other Aspect of Your Physical Appearance
9. Your Sexual Orientation
10. Your Education or Income Level
11. Other (specify) _______________
APPENDIX J. I COPPE

On this scale, the number ten represents the best your life can be. The number zero represents the worst your life can be. When it comes to the best possible life for you, on which number do you stand…

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Now?
A year ago?
A year from now?
```

This set of questions pertains to relationships. The number ten represents the best your life can be. The number zero represents the worst your life can be. When it comes to relationships with important people in your life, on which number do you stand…

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Now?
A year ago?
A year from now?
```

This set of questions pertains to your community. The number ten represents the best your life can be. The number zero represents the worst your life can be. When it comes to the community where you live, on which number do you stand…

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Now?
A year ago?
A year from now?
```

This set of questions pertains to your main occupation. The number ten represents the best your life can be. The number zero represents the worst your life can be. When it comes to your main occupation (employed, self-employed, volunteer, stay at home), on which number do you stand…

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Now?
A year ago?
A year from now?
```
This set of questions pertains to your physical health and wellness. The number ten represents the best your life can be. The number zero represents the worst your life can be. When it comes to *your physical health and wellness*, on which number do you stand…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A year ago?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A year from now?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This set of questions pertains to your emotional and psychological well-being. The number ten represents the best your life can be. The number zero represents the worst your life can be. When it comes to *your emotional and psychological well-being*, on which number do you stand…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A year ago?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A year from now?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This set of questions pertains to your economic situation. The number ten represents the best your life can be. The number zero represents the worst your life can be. When it comes to *your economic situation*, on which number do you stand…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A year ago?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A year from now?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K. SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE

Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

- 7 - Strongly agree
- 6 - Agree
- 5 - Slightly agree
- 4 - Neither agree nor disagree
- 3 - Slightly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 1 - Strongly disagree

In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
The conditions of my life are excellent.
I am satisfied with my life.
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
APPENDIX L. DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your current gender identity?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Another gender identity (please specify): _____

2. Age ______

3. What is your racial or ethnic identification? (select all that apply)
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native
   b. Asian
   c. Black/African American
   d. Hispanic or Latino
   e. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   f. White/Caucasian
   g. Other: _______

4. Religious affiliation
   a. Agnostic/Atheist
   b. Buddhist
   c. Christian
   d. Hindu
   e. Jewish
   f. Muslim
   g. No religious affiliation
   h. Other: ______

5. Current marital status
   a. Single, never married
   b. Married or in a domestic partnership
   c. Separated or divorced
   d. Widowed
   e. Other: _____

6. Current housing status
   a. Owns home
   b. Renting
   c. Staying with friends/relatives
   d. Homeless
   e. Other: ______

7. Current home zip code _______ (If you don't know the zip code, please specify the city and state)

8. In which zip code did you live for the majority of your life? _______ (If you don't know the zip code, please specify the city and state)

9. Do you live in Detroit? Yes/No
   a. If yes, how long have you lived in Detroit? _____ years/months

10. Highest level of education achieved
    a. No schooling completed
b. Nursery school to 8th grade
c. Some high school, no diploma
d. High school diploma/GED
e. Some college, no degree
f. Trade/technical/vocational training
g. Associate degree
h. Bachelor's degree
i. Some graduate school, no degree
j. Master's degree
k. Professional degree
l. Doctorate degree

11. Your current household socioeconomic position
   a. Upper class (top-level executives, celebrities, heirs; income of $500,000 or more common)
   b. Upper-middle class (highly-educated (often with graduate degrees) professionals and managers with household incomes varying from the high 5-figure range to commonly above $100,000)
   c. Lower-middle class (semi-professionals and craftsmen with some work autonomy; household incomes commonly range from $35,000 to $75,000.)
   d. Working class (clerical, pink- and blue-collar workers with often low job security; common household incomes range from $16,000 to $30,000.)
   e. Lower class (those who occupy poorly-paid positions or rely on government transfers.)

12. Socioeconomic position of your family of origin when you were growing up (e.g., your parents or the adults who raised you)
   a. Upper class (top-level executives, celebrities, heirs; income of $500,000 or more common)
   b. Upper-middle class (highly-educated (often with graduate degrees) professionals and managers with household incomes varying from the high 5-figure range to commonly above $100,000)
   c. Lower-middle class (semi-professionals and craftsmen with some work autonomy; household incomes commonly range from $35,000 to $75,000.)
   d. Working class (clerical, pink- and blue-collar workers with often low job security; common household incomes range from $16,000 to $30,000.)
   e. Lower class (those who occupy poorly-paid positions or rely on government transfers.)

13. Are you a student?
   a. Yes
   b. No

14. Are you currently employed out of the home?
   a. Yes
      i. What type of work do you do?
      ii. What is your job title?
      iii. Do you work full or part time?
   b. No
      i. Which best describes your current employment situation?
         1. Self employed
2. Unemployed; Actively looking for work
3. Unemployed; Not actively looking for work
4. Homemaker
5. Student
6. Unable to work
7. Retired