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The principle aim of this research is to generate a theoretical construct of rural-urban differences based on local citizen organizations concerned with disaster issues. Ancillary objectives of the study involve the development of a practical analytic framework for the study of organizational cultures at the community level, and the introduction of empirically-based hypotheses on behavioral aspects of rural and urban emergent collective organizations.

The study was initiated with the employment of the "grounded theory approach" methodology. Data were collected over a three-year period (1981-1984) and "constantly compared" to formulate both a framework of study and substantive hypothetical statements. Longitudinal data collection and a follow-up survey was conducted to examine for change and explore the strengths and weaknesses of the generated hypotheses. The research cases involved four rural local
grass roots organizations, all concerned with local disaster-related issues.

The framework evolving from the comparative analysis process adhered to a modified social systems model with two major components of classification: 1) the socio-cultural system of traditional customs, and 2) the system of values. Within this analytical structure over fifty empirical factors were examined in relation to characteristics of differentiation between the rural and urban organizations. Eleven of the factors were selected to construct a Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft typology between the rural and urban phenomena as it occurred during the initial organizing phase of development. The assessment of the longitudinal data collected during the operation and maintenance period of the local grass roots organizations indicated significant changes in two of the rural organizations which, in turn, produced inferences regarding the diffusion of social urbanization. In sum, it is suggested that new residents, the mass media, the type of disaster agent, and outsider interests contribute to introduction of characteristically-urban organizational norms. Further, these norms are adopted without conflict by a rural community public who perceive the change as necessary for problem resolution.

The exploratory follow-up survey was conducted to examine selected attitudinal and socio-demographic differences between the rural and urban organizations. One
socio-demographic factor and three attitude scales considered statistically significant in the step-wise discriminant model: length of residence, community spirit, ruralism, and local government orientation. In this model, the higher the score per item, the higher the probability that the respondent will be categorized in the rural context. Within the study sample, 77.5 percent were correctly grouped by the predictive statistics.

The results of the study in terms of chief practical implications implies a workable and feasible means to incorporate empirical methodologies for the study of organizational cultures at the community level, and the recognition that the development of polar constructs provide a worthwhile approach to explain fundamental differences in social phenomena. Additionally, the results indicate the importance of studying both behavioral and attitudinal characteristics as a complete process for explanation and understanding of comparative social differences.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The recent availability of cross-national, community case level data on emergent citizen groups in disaster-related situations has generated the opportunity to develop this study around the concept of rural-urban organizational differences. As such, this work will represent a continuation of two established research traditions. The first being a contribution to the 20 years of research conducted in the field of disaster and disaster organization. The second constituting a work which fits into the 60-year line of research conducted on rural-urban differences in the United States. The end product of this effort hopefully will contribute to both of these substantive areas of social research.

From the historic foundations of sociology, the roots of sociological inquiry can be traced to the "organismic" concept of society, introduced by Compte and Spencer. However, the

1The research titled "Emergent Citizen Groups in Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Activities" was conducted by the Disaster Research Center, The Ohio State University, under the National Science Foundation's Grant Number CEE-8113191.
conduct of sociological inquiry stems from the fundamental questions of Hobbes in the seventeenth century. His simple observations concerning the "problems of order" were developed from his everyday exposure to quantities of prevailing differences among and between individuals and/or entire social units. The questions of differences as a problematic factor of social order maintenance in society has persisted over three centuries, and is as germane today as it was then.

Dynamic and accelerated change, and the many problems introduced by change, have characterized many aspects of twentieth century society in the United States. The phenomenon of urbanization has been credited with leading the way in establishing new patterns for living in contemporary society, to which, rural areas have undergone pathway adjustments. The staggering rates and faceted areas of change introduced to rural societies in the recent decades have truly challenged the rural scientific community in its quest to explain, define, determine, and/or predict such occurrences.

Two fundamental considerations of rural change are disposed in the questions of: "Change as compared to what?" and "What are the institutional causes of rural change?" With regard to the first question there has been some variation in response, but the primary focus or implication of rural change study has been in the comparison of rural
conditions to urban demographic and lifestyle characteristics. Since the American society as a whole has been considered urban since at least the last decade of the nineteenth century, the logic for the urban standard as a measure of directed change in compared rural settings seems plausible.

The second question or part of consideration dealing with the issue of rural change appears more complex than the first. Background research establishes a number of theories or notions of change. Substantiated evidence has been generated from general disciplinary fields such as economics, geography, communications, education, cultural anthropology, and, of course, sociology...just to mention a few. Not many academicians today would disagree that rural change is caused by one or, even more likely, a combination of the assumptions brought forth by the disciplinary collage. Thus, rural change is recognized as a situational occurrence (in time and locality) which may be caused by a variety of independent factors.

Acknowledgement that there is a comparative standard generally accepted to measure the extent and direction of rural change, and an index of multi-dimensional or multi-disciplinary factors to determine the cause of such change does not necessarily complete the circle of understanding with regard to the issue of change as social phenomena. The fact that there still remains some disagreement on the two points may be reason enough to undertake further
investigation, but, more importantly and more pervasively, a third consideration should be examined: "How does rural social change become implicated and reflect or represent the social order process?"

With some degree of speculation, the social order perspective of change may be viewed as something which reduces the lifestyle differences among social sectors in the mass society into qualifiable and quantifiable characteristics. The primary forces which tend to increase homogenization in the American society are the organizations which constitute a dominant feature of the society's structure and systems. Although there is a vast range of difference between the kinds of organizations in the society, it is generally acknowledged that such entities contribute significantly, and in a measurably greater extent, to the ideology of social order. This research is concerned mainly with contemporary organizations which emerge randomly when a number of independent persons form groups to mitigate the effects of a shared problem or issue arising from the potential or actual experience of disaster.

The sociological view of organization generally infers a specific human technology (the organization or group) as an approach to resolve problems, institute change, or accomplish common tasks. Fundamentally, the organization represents a concentration of power entrusted to make decisions and take actions in order to achieve specific
purposes (Stinchcombe, 1968). The emergent or grass roots group may be perceived as either a proactive or reactive organizational structure. The emergence of citizens to form groups for any number of reasons or causes is a salient feature of American society. Previous research verifies the fact that such groups are evidenced in disaster-related situations with specific concern toward some shared special interest within the community.

In the main, these organized interests tend to create or access channels of communication between various parts of the public and relevant decision makers (Lang and Lang, 1961). It can be said that the success or goal attainment of these organizations is dependent upon their effectiveness to influence decisions or actions in their favor by impacting the normative community social structures and systems. The notions of conflict, consensus, and/or social control have little bearing on the basic interactive process as it is practiced in the American society, but such factors can play an important part in the attainment of success in a given situation and in a particular setting where the disaster situation exists. In the organizational context, conflict and/or consensus becomes a strategy orientation, and social control is viewed as a legitimized entity of order, with manifest authority and responsibility.

The organizational strategic dichotomy not only represents a measure of difference between social organizations
within a selected societal unit, but also offers a measure of difference in the human factors that participate in the social nature of the organization itself. Traditional organizational research has invested a great deal of attention to the relationships between the human element and the social nature of organizations as related to basic value, norms, and belief tenents of sociological theory. It has been established that there are clear and basic relationships between discrete organizational and participant characteristics. Without elaboration, the organization in many ways reflects not only the patterns of social interactions and complexity of societal structure or community, but also the underlying dominant socio-cultural orientations of the community populations as well.

Research Background

The process of institutional socialization and the experiences of social exchange or networking provide the basis from which people orient their relationships and behavioral principles. Such relationships and principles constitute the normative order of society. How people form, sustain, amend, dissolve, and evade social relationships is the grist from which substantive sociology emerges, and a primordial complement to the formal discipline. The fundamental research problem implied in this study is the (1) delineation of the relationship entity (organization)
from which social action and/or change is initiated, and
(2) a comparison of the entity's characteristics as influenced
by rural and urban social factors.

The contemporary community in America represents
a predominant locality-oriented social structure which may be
treated as a "social field."2 This social structure, as such,
is recognized as the principle unit for managing or insti­
tuting needed and demanded services to its constituent
population. In general, the services needed or demanded by
a community are influenced by a number of relative factors
like its size, location, age, and so forth. Most communities
attend to the service issues by establishing formal entities
like local governmental bodies, public agencies, special
districts, quasi-governmental utilities, and other kinds of
public associations. In the same context, an array of other
services is provided in communities by religious and economic
institutions, business establishments, civic organizations,
social organizations, and private or public non-profit service
organizations. Although it may appear that a developed
community is structured or systematized to respond to any
given situation or issue, history provides empirical evidence
that any given amount or kind of change may introduce new
demands or needs, and the concomitant new or adapted organi­
zations to deal with them.

---

2 Social field is "a process of interaction through time,
with direction toward some more or less distinctive outcome
and with constantly changing elements and structure;" see
Research on the organizations and institutions which exist in the community setting is an established feature of the sociology discipline. From this tradition specific areas of organizational research have emerged and become developed as sub-disciplines. For example, specific research interests have produced an abundance of literature on topics such as public safety organizations, social welfare organizations, community development organizations, local government organizations, civil defense/disaster preparedness, response organizations, and others. Basically, the ultimate intent of this great body of literature in organizational studies is to produce assessment methods and theories of social behavior that can be utilized to improve the efficacy of such entities in addressing their societal objectives.

During the course of such studies the phenomenon of the "emergent citizen group" became loosely connected with the sociological paradigm of collective behavior and social movements. Perhaps unintentionally, this organizational sub-category has generated a plethora of conceptual delineation in similar proportion to the fertile academic pondering of other organizational types, as well as garnering the interests of those who concern themselves with spontaneous citizen activities. Thus, contemporary research literature is permeated by such terms as grass roots organizations, special interest groups, citizen coalitions, social movement organizations, citizen collectivities, ad hoc citizen groups,
and citizen action organizations—that more than likely share the same meaning.

With respect to disaster-related organizational studies, researchers have expressed and investigated similar concerns as those of other areas of organization research. To wit, they have identified the community as the primary social unit with the structure to accommodate a disaster-oriented service organization. What's more, these organizations are the targets for improvement and/or modification recommendations arising from the studies focused on them. Disaster organization research, however, differs in some respects from the other organizational sub-categories. The ideal time to study these organizations is generally during periods when the organization is in its fully operational state—either during the disaster, or during the emergency recovery period (a brief period after the disaster has passed). But over the years of study, the disaster organization researchers also recognized the presence of an ever-growing number of situations where citizen involvement impacted the community disaster service schema. Such occurrences were not just features which emerged during the emergency or emergency recovery period, but instead, were prominent in pre-disaster and post-disaster periods when the community was not in a state of stress or crisis.

In 1981, the Disaster Research Center at The Ohio State University initiated a study on the phenomena of emergent
citizen groups in disaster-related situations. Because, from the organizational research perspective, very little factual information had been documented on the phenomena, the research objectives were comprehensively structured to include:
1) Determination of the characteristics of selected emergent citizen group cases; 2) The identification of conditions or reasons associated with the actual emergence of the citizen group; 3) The ascertainment of manifest consequences or impacts the group caused; and 4) The career or evolitional morphosis the group experienced over time. Moreover, the conduct of this thirty-month investigation to learn and understand the processes of the emergent citizen group phenomena opened a new avenue from which to view the persistent issue of rural-urban differences.

The Aims and Significance of the Research

As previously mentioned, the fundamental research problems identified as foundation for this study include:
1) Delineation of the emergent local grass roots citizen organizations from which social action and/or change is instituted, and 2) The comparison of the emergent organizations' characteristics as influenced by rural and urban social factors. The approach selected to pursue these research issues is through the generation of a theory regarding rural/urban organizational culture. Initial research data and secondary resource information indicate that emergent
citizen groups or grass roots organizations concerned with a similar disaster issue may qualitatively differ from the rural to urban environ. The answers to questions arising from these differences should provide some insights and/or contributions to the community of social science interested in the domains of collective behavior/social movements, organization, and rural community.

In addition to contributing to the accumulated knowledge of these domains, a substantive construct of generated hypotheses dealing with the process of urbanization in the United States is intended. Though a scientific test of convergence theory will not be performed, the implications generated from the analysis of organizational differences will be examined in this sort of theoretical context. It is anticipated that such an exploration into substantive areas will produce a mechanism for observing and assessing social change through organizational structure patterns.

Practical benefits resulting from this study should be realized from the assessment of existing grass roots organizations concerned with disaster-related issues. The general areas of concern toward specific issues which are perceived by organizational members as unattended by the established social system may indicate a relative trend for increased or improved services at the community level, and inferences concerning the feasibility and/or capability of collective actions by citizens-at-large in such circumstances may provide a viable alternative for a number of activities in the community.
Outline of the Research

This chapter has stated the basic research problem, how the study was initiated, the topic under consideration, and has suggested probable contributions resulting from the research. Four additional chapters and supporting resource references to follow will constitute the remainder of this work.

Chapter II explains the study design and methodological approach employed in this research. This chapter's emphasis is placed on the application of the grounded theory approach and the specific sampling/data collection techniques that enabled the research. Also included are brief orientation descriptions of the sample cases.

Chapter III offers the review of selected background literature and relative concepts, or in effect, the contextual underpinnings of the study's approach to the formative processes of emergent or grass roots citizen organization. Emphasis will focus on propositions derived from general theories, construct types and concepts of rural-urban differences, and community social systems.

Chapter IV presents the data analysis for Stage I (the initial organizing period) and Stage II (the operation and maintenance period). The construct of the Rural-Urban Organizational Culture Typology and related hypotheses are discussed.
Chapter V is comprised of findings, summaries, and conclusions of this study, which focus upon the cases, the stages of analysis and the limitations of the research.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH AND STUDY DESIGN

This chapter presents the methodological processes used in this study. A discussion of the grounded theory approach sets the stage for the background discussion of the baseline study of emergent citizen groups in non-emergency period disaster-related situations. This is followed by a background statement on disaster-related grass roots organizations, and then, a specific overview of the design for this research. Finally, a set of eight descriptive cases of rural and urban grass roots organizations will be presented as the empirical basis for the analytic framework.

The primary objective of grounded theory research is to generate theory. The grounded theory methodology involves four basic processes: 1) collection of both qualitative and quantitative data on the phenomena under study, 2) comparative analysis of the data, with the development of tentative hypotheses through data definition of properties and data categorization, 3) the emergence of substantive theory or theories as a product of the first two steps, and 4) if the data corresponds, application to a formal theoretical model.
which attempts to generalize from the substantive theory or theories. Although these four points are termed "steps," Glaser and Strauss point out that "the notion of generating theory as a process requires that all operations be done together as much as possible" (1967:43). The "openness" of the approach serves several purposes, however, its major underpinning implies a balancing of the customary problems in sociological studies which Mills (1959) expressed as either the "fetishism of the Concept" or distortion by the "methodological inhibition."

The first step or element of the grounded theory methodology involves the inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative data. The advantages produced by employing qualitative data for the grounded theory approach is obviated by its effectiveness to provide the researcher with a flexible direction. Such data are gathered by questionnaires, interviews, non-participant and participant observations. The initial collection of data by qualitative means facilitates true exploration of a phenomena by providing an opportunity to gather an unknown quantity of facts (Komarovsky, 1962). In some instances, the respondent or informant often provides data which the research does not specifically inquire about, but, in doing so, provides new parameters for the guidance or refinement of the research issues.

Glaser and Strauss briefly discuss the role that quantitative data has in the generation of theory; however, their
elaborations are somewhat brief. In particular, they state that "if quantitative data is handled systematically by theoretical ordering of variables in tables, the analyst will indeed find rich terrain for discovering and generating theory" (1967:220). In addition, they caution that the stringent rules of quantitative methodology must be relaxed to accommodate the flexibility necessary for the theory generation conditions.

The second step or element of the grounded theory methodology involves the generation of tentative hypotheses during the course of comparative data analysis. The perspectives formulated by the analysis of data are the crux of the development of theory, and such perspectives can relevantly affect the theory or model up to the final day of the study (Glaser and Strauss, 1967:40). By allowing an open-ended process of data collection and comparative data analysis, a greater assurance that the generated substantive theory will fit the data is provided. A grounded substantive theory must be accountable to the data it purports to explain. The researcher should discover through exploration rather than impose an integrating schematic on the data since the data and their interrelations emerge from the comparative analysis. However, there is never, nor should there be, any insurance that the substantive theory that emerges will be applicable to other substantive areas or formal theories.
In essence, the grounded theory generated must meet four criteria for general usage: 1) It must fit (the categories of the theory must fit the data); 2) It must have relevance (production of problems and processes which emerge that are germane to the social scientific community); 3) It must work (the theory must be able to explain what happened, predict what will happen, and interpret what is happening in an area of substantive or formal inquiry); and 4) It must be modifiable (capable to adapt to changes in society) (Glaser, 1978:4-6).

As an example of how the grounded theory approach progresses in the developmental context of research, Glaser and Strauss (1967:42) compiled the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grounded Theory Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Social Loss of Dying Patients&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Theory</th>
<th>Type of Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social value of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td><strong>people</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social loss of dying patients</td>
<td>Calculating social values of persons on basis of learned and apparent characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculating social loss on basis of learned and apparent characteristics of patients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>The higher the social value of a person, the less delay he experiences in receiving services from experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The higher the social loss of a dying patient, the better his care and the more nurses develop loss rations to explain away his death</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three important considerations for operationalizing the grounded theory approach include the process of theoretical sampling, the constant comparative method, and the role of comparative analysis. The orientation of theoretical sampling focuses upon the group unit. Conceptually, this unit may represent the entire range of social behavioral phenomena and include non-comparable as well as comparable type groups.

The fundamental principle of theoretical sampling is to provide a process by which group comparisons will reveal substantive insights in terms of differences and/or similarities, which, in turn, will force the analyst to create generalized categories, properties, and relations with respect to understanding and explaining the phenomena under study (Glaser and Strauss, 1967:55).

The rationale for group comparison centers on three interrelated components: "Comparison groups provide control over the two scales of generality: first, conceptual level, and second, a population scope; third, comparison groups also provide simultaneous maximization of both the differences and the similarities of data that bear on the categories being studied" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967:55).

Sample selection is based on the criteria of theoretical purpose and relevance. In effect, the researcher begins only with a knowledge of what type of groups will be comparatively studied and the issues of investigation. This approach relies inherently on the logic that: "In science (as in everyday
life), things must be believed to be seen, as well as seen to be believed; and questions must already be answered a little, if they are to be asked at all" (Wallace, 1971:128).

Theoretical sampling, in brief, initiates a sampling generation process within itself. The term "ongoing inclusion" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) is used to describe the process of continually including groups in the study sample based on the analytic findings and directions provided by the group or groups already under investigation. This process is intended to continue throughout the time period of the study, and is only constrained by the time frame of the study and/or theoretical confirmation.

The next consideration, the constant comparative method, provides guidance for the processing of data in a manner that facilitates continual analysis and the development of substantive concepts. In application, an efficient ongoing coding system is devised (e.g., card files, check sheets, category files, and memory) from the beginning of the data analysis on the first group. As data generation increases, the findings are added to existing categorical incidents and new categories may be created. The comparison of findings within each category provides the opportunity to integrate certain categories into respective conceptual properties, and, in turn, the development of conceptual properties establishes the limits of the substantive theory.
Glaser and Strauss provide two simple rules of the constant comparative method:

While coding an incident for a category, compare it with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category (Rule #1) ... After coding for a category perhaps three or four time, the analyst will find conflicts in the emphases of his thinking. He will be musing over theoretical notions and, at the same time, trying to concentrate on his study of the next incident, to determine the alternate ways by which it should be coded and compared. At this point, the second rule of the constant comparative method is: stop coding and record a memo on your ideas (Rule #2) (Glaser and Strauss, 1967: 106-107).

Discussion of the role of comparative analysis pertains to the context of theory, rather than methodology (since the grounded theory methodology is basically a comparative process). From the theory development perspective, comparative analysis should be unrestricted in terms of its application to the examination of social units, either in terms of size, function, geographic scope, structure, or any other constraints normally associated with descriptive and verification studies. "Weeding out spurious factors is not important in generating since they are just one more theoretical idea to be included in the theory... (such processes) diverts attention away from the important sets of fundamental differences and similarities among groups which, upon analysis, become important qualifying conditions under which categories and properties vary" (Glaser, 1978).
Background and Methodological Introduction to the Study of Emergent Citizen Groups in Disaster Situations

The development of a field research is heavily dependent upon the scientific adequacy of the methods employed in gathering information, and the validity of the conclusions drawn from the information with respect to the phenomenon. The relatively new field of social research into disasters (approximately 45 years old) provides a good focus for the development of social theories and methods. Twenty-eight years ago, when the topic of disaster was just garnering collective interest in the social scientific community, Killian stated: "There is probably no area of human behavior about which so many untested stereotypes and so much work-magic exists as the area of human behavior in disaster" (1959: 8). Over the following almost 33 years, researchers in the field of disaster have consciously attempted to alleviate the semantic confusions and pursue the greater task of theory construction. A great deal of research has taken place and a number of efforts to derive a theoretical model of human behavior in disaster have been made.

While much of the early work in disaster research was considered applied field work, it was, nonetheless, work which was necessary for the development of social science interest in the phenomena. Through the evolution of disaster research a pattern of development necessary to undertake the processes of theory generation emerged. First, a refinement of the definition of disaster evolved which accommodated the
sociological domain. And from that definition, emerged the implication that society responds to the social disruptions caused by the disaster phenomena (Quarantelli, 1978:3). As such, Quarantelli states: "this response could be analyzed at four different levels: the societal, the community, the organizational, and at the mass aggregate or individual level" (1978:3-4).

Within the past ten years a certain amount of attention has been focused on the development of theory or theories within the different levels. Particular attention has been on the organization, community, and individual perspectives. Illustrations of some of the most recent works in disaster theory are offered in a 1978 publication titled, Disasters: Theory and Research (Quarantelli, E. L., editor). As the book indicates, not all of the theoretical propositions of the phenomena are formalized; nor are all of the areas within the definitional parameters of disaster addressed. Taylor (1978:277) recognizes the necessary condition to attend to research at the societal level; Wenger (1978:25-47) points out several specific topics of needed studies; and Stallings (1982:8-12)\(^1\) eludes to some specific abstraction problems in the attempts to deduct theory. In summary, work has begun in the development of disaster theory, but the issue of the perspective and orientation of theory remain undetermined.

\(^1\)Stallings provided a review of "An Organizational Theory of Disaster Response" by Gary Kreps.
In the Fall of 1981, the Disaster Research Center at The Ohio State University initiated a national study of emergent citizen groups in disaster-related situations (hereafter referred to as the NSF/DRC study). For the sponsor of the study, the National Science Foundation, the aim of the research was to provide a better understanding of citizen group behavior in disaster preparedness and recovery activities. However, in the process of conducting the study, the social scientific community became interested in studying the specific conceptual categories and properties that were identified in the data analysis. Although the end products of this study are not yet analyzed, there is little doubt that both the sponsor and the scientific community will be beneficiaries of the research results.

The underlying premise of the NSF/DRC study is based on the knowledge that the emergence of citizens to form groups for any number of reasons or causes is a salient feature of American society. Previous research verifies the fact that such groups are activated by disaster-related situations. In a rather recent publication on disaster response, Quarantelli cites several studies which have substantiated the notion that: "disaster situations tend to be peopled by emergent groups, entities that had no existence prior to the crisis...but their functioning may be crucial to the whole

\[\text{National Science Foundation project number CEE-8113191: Grant awarded to the Disaster Research Center, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.}\]

In prior studies attention has been focused extensively upon the description of linkages between social attributes or group members, and the influences such attributes have upon emergent citizen group characteristics (Form and Nosow, 1958; Dynes, 1968; Forrest, 1968; Barton, 1969; Parr, 1970). In addition, many studies have investigated the broader context of the citizen group in terms of organizational behaviors (Dynes, 1968, 1974; Barton, 1969, 1970; Wolf, 1975). Without doubt, research on disaster events has brought forth the awareness of non-institutionalized citizen group behavior.

The synthesis of the body of research literature pertaining to emergent citizen groups strongly suggests that certain characteristics are worthy of attention in studying the disaster-related situation. The theory of collectivity asserts that during a small community disaster, grouping is often attributed to an aggregate of mutually-influenced individual responses to immediate needs: the propinquity aspect of non-complex social structures. However, such groups are considered secondary to institutionalized response organizations in larger-scale disaster situations (Barton, 1969: 316). Although this may be true in the emergency period of a disaster, the processes of organizing during non-emergency periods (pre- and post-disaster) have not been addressed. Hence, the specific intention of the NSF/DRC study was to generate an understanding of organizing behaviors resulting
from perceived or post-disaster impact assessments.

The methodological approach of study proceeded from the fact that there is no quantifiable universe of emergent citizen groups in disaster-related situations. The utilization of a group of social researchers rather than a single analyst accelerated the conceptual evolution of the study. In brief, the research was initially intended for the study of emergent citizen groups in earthquake situations with an estimated field study period from 12 to 14 months. The project evolved to include not only all types of natural disaster situations (e.g., earthquake, landslide, flood, tornado, and hurricane), but man-made or technological disasters (e.g., hazardous waste sites, hazardous materials handling, nuclear power plants, atomic reactors, and chemical pollutants) as well. In addition, the field study time period was extended to 27 months.

The resultant five situational categories selected for emergent group criteria included natural/technological disaster, pre/post disaster, rural/urban, single issue/multiple issue, and U.S. geographical regions. In total, 50 groups were studied in detail, yielding hundreds of observations within the four major conceptual categories.

Background on Local Grass Roots Organizations

The leap from the emergent citizen groups concept to the local grass roots organization concept is basically one of
slight adjustments in formalization processes. The assumptions of the emergent citizen group in a disaster situation are two-fold: 1) "emergence occurs when a social system experiences some crisis that creates an identifiable need; and 2) emergence occurs when existing forms of organized collectivities are not able and/or willing to fulfill the need" (Forrest, 1972:9). The assumption or condition for the operationalization of a local citizen organization is singular: Organization at the local level occurs when an emergent group successfully initiates and sustains some form of formal organizing behavior. This condition or assumption may be equally applicable for the designation of an array of collective classifications, like social movement organizations, and so forth (Olsen, 1968:87-90; Wilson, 1973:157; Hardert et al., 1977:251-253).

The terms "local" and "grass roots" were purposefully selected to denote two qualifying conditions in this organizational study. "Local" is intended to refer to the initiating circumstances of the organization, an autonomous local body of residents focusing on a specifically-local disaster issue. The term "grass roots" implies behaviorally-expressed activities of non-institutionalized individuals within a predominantly political domain. The domain of the citizen organization activities is manifest in the data analysis of cases; however, the concept of using this term in this manner stems from examples provided in the works of Selznick (1966),
Dorvee (1978), Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), and its common reference in political science research. Hereafter, the use of the initials, LGO, are meant to refer to the local grass roots organization.

The study of grass roots organizations, in general, has been the object of political science and, to a much lesser extent, political sociological studies. Selznick (1966) has produced the only recent major sociological study of a grass roots organization: TVA and the Grass Roots. However, his study and the majority of political science studies have mainly focused on phenomenon like the mobilization of constituency or confrontational grass roots lobbies, the politicization processes that grass roots organizations bring to bear on significant policy issues, and the diffusion and adoption of ideologies in grass roots movements. In contrast, the treatment of local grass roots organizations in this comparative case study tends to view the entity as a generic denominator, with little emphasis on the political consequences of its activities.

Disaster situations offer a unique comparative opportunity to study organized behavior in the rural-urban context. Actual or perceived disaster consequences precipitate a concept or realization of threat and loss which can permeate the fabric of any social environment. A disaster's naturally-pervasive dominance over the social order is common to rural and urban communities alike. It is this unique threat
manifest in disaster circumstances which enables the social scientist to apply substantive theories of organized behavior to explain rural-urban differences.

As a hypothetical example:

From a cultural anthropological perspective, the cultural behaviors of a population in Central Africa and another population in America toward a common disaster situation may provide substantive proof that primitive societies behave differently from modern societies. In response to a forest fire, the African population would make daily sacrifices to appease the fire god until the fire burned itself out. Whereas, the American population would bring in firefighting equipment, mobilize the national guard, evacuate communities, and take other responsive actions until the fire was controlled and extinguished.

Within a complex society the differences are much more subtle. The examination of rural and urban differences requires increased refinement and control. From an organizational and sociological perspective, the disaster situation provides a much more stable foundation for comparison than any other type of organized citizen behavioral activities. Again, this is due to the fact that disaster connotes a common psychic profile of threat and loss in those individuals who collectively respond, regardless of their place of residence.

Hence, the focus of differentiation is on how and why they collectively behave as they do in relation to their place of residence. In this context, the LGO is examined as a manifestation of behavior in the rural organizational or urban
organizational culture patterns. Although it is recognized that the patterned influences of individual socialization and interaction generate norms of organizational participation, it is also recognized that the organization creates a culture of its own in order to meet functional requirements. Metaphorically, the organization is greater than the sum of its parts, but its cultural greatness is dependent upon its ability to function effectively within the local social system.

**Study Design: Rural-Urban Grass Roots Organizational Differences**

The implications of the previous discussion fulfill two fundamental requirements for the grounded theory approach which this study addresses: 1) the type of groups being studied, which are local citizen groups, and 2) the conceptual level, which relates to the theoretical relevance issue, which is community. Although the NSF/DRC research specifically discusses the concept of emergent citizen groups with the intent of determining how and why such groups emerge, the fact that these groups were studied as functional organizations presents a more dynamic opportunity for research. In effect, the NSF/DRC study provides a model of theoretical convergence between collective behavior and organizational tenets which will be explored in this research. The grass roots organization merely represents that local citizen entity which emerged and has sustained itself as a structured organization.
The conduct of this study requires the clarification and operationalization of four key components: 1) the definitional parameters and time frame for the term "disaster," 2) the delineation of the organizational concept, 3) the elaboration of organizational culture, and 4) the descriptive framework for the collection of data.

The term "disaster" is operationalized to include both natural and man-made or technological agents. The inclusion of these categories is based on the evidence that such agents may precipitate significant disaster events in American society. In the agent-event context, the social-psychological premise that any perceived threat of a catastrophe and/or the experience of a catastrophe by individuals in a community setting constitutes a condition for the potential emergence of a citizen grass roots organization. Consequently, for this study, the generalized sociological definition of disaster (which reads, "A disaster is an event, or perceived threatening event, in which a society, or a relatively self-sufficient subdivision of society, undergoes severe damage and incurs such losses to its members and physical appurtenances that the social structure is disrupted and the fulfillment of all or some of the essential functions of the society is prevented" [Fritz, 1961:655]) has been amended by the underlined wording. Given this generalized definition, the phenomena of disaster can be examined in its entire context, from pre-disaster (preparedness), through the emergency period (response), and
In the domain of the disaster issue, the analysis of organizations has been approached from a typological or classification model which characterizes their structures and tasks at different periods in the disaster phenomena. The classification model not only provides a logical structure of organizationally-linked types, but also presents this phenomena of organization in a manner which is conducive to conceptualization and comparative analysis. This typology is illustrated in the following four-fold matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks:</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Non-Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Structure:</td>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>Type III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Structure:</td>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>Type IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where (under the conditions of the disaster period):

Type I are disaster organizations, institutions, or agencies conducting formalized tasks.

Type II are formal core organizations which have "planned" adaptive roles in disaster periods (e.g., use of volunteers, community education) predicated on demand-response needs.

Type III are formal organizations (e.g., churches, civic clubs) which assume non-normative and/or temporary tasks.

Type IV are ad hoc groups (e.g., grass roots, citizen collectivities) formed to achieve perceived or actual unmet needs or desires.

(Dynes, 1974:135)
Sociological theories of organization have logically explained much of what is understood about organizations of Types I, II, and III, their structures, functions, roles, networks, and so forth. However, Type IV organizations have not been extensively studied from the organizational perspective (Quarantelli and Dynes, 1977:32). While lack of research on emergent or grass roots organizations in the pre- and post-disaster situations is generally acknowledged, it is even more so evidenced in studies of the emergency period (Dynes, 1974: 158).

The recognition of the situation and the lack of concomitant research suggests that there is both a theoretical and methodological need for social research on the disaster-related grass roots organization. Focusing on such organizations in the pre- and post-disaster period as possible "subcultures" (Mileti et al., 1975:18) of individuals who share in their priorities of concern, as well as their norm and value structures, provides the opportunity to view the phenomena from a different perspective, but still within the organizational context. In this regard, the disaster-related grass roots organization is more identifiable as a localized entity which has formed to bring about selected and perceived needed changes within the parameters of socialized organizational behavior.

Mileti's subculture discussion is primarily rooted in the context of the social movement organization. However, the
general notion of subcultures is compatible from a social-psychological perspective with the concept of organizational cultures, which was generated from research on formal organizations and institutions. Hence, at the point or instance that a subculture becomes a task-oriented entity, it creates a unique organizational culture. "Once an organization has developed a unique set of cultural values, goals, norms, rules, and other ideas, the presence of this culture further delineates that organization from all other social phenomena" (Olsen, 1968:69). Analyzed in great or extensive detail, all organizations would differ in varying degrees from each other by their organizational culture. However, such analytic detail is not considered of major importance to the purpose of this research. Instead, the study of organizations' participants will be analyzed in terms of previous patterns of collective action within the social setting, and their social-psychological attributes. The development of the organizational culture construct for community action is illustrated in the context of the following chapter.

With respect to the descriptive framework for data collection, Quarantelli (1981) suggests that grass roots (emergent) citizen groups in disaster-related situations can be scrutinized from an organizational position. In application, the framework assumes that groups and organizations share components or features which are classified as:
1) Careers, 2) Characteristics, 3) Conditions, and
4) Consequences. The overall notion implies that all organizations have these components and that they are valid measures of differentiation between and within all organizational types.

The career of an organization basically entails the historic stages and nature of individuals' influences in formation of the entity, the composition of the entity over time, and the indicators of formalization or institutionalization.

The characteristics of a group or organization involve a description of the internal composition, structure, and function of the entity, along with its linkages or networks with other groups or organizations.

The consequences of a group or organization represent the impacts or effects which the organization has caused. This includes both intended and unintended results, perceptions of measurable success or failure, and the internalized assessment of need for the entity beyond the realization of successes or failures in the context of specified goals or objectives.

The conditions of a group or organization reflect its capacity and capability to access, manage, and mobilize resources (economic and non-economic) necessary for the entity's survival. In addition, the conditions include an assessment of the external environment and of opinions of the organization by non-members as related to its responsibility,
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conditions and a foundation from which comparative analysis can be viewed.

Eight cases were selected for the study, four rural and four urban. In the interest of maintaining the anonymity guaranteed to study organizations by the Disaster Research Center, fictitious name identifiers have been assigned to each case. Hereafter, the studied organizations will be referred to as Slide City LGO, Toxicity LGO, Nuclearopolis LGO, Flood City LGO, Hazardville LGO, Dumpburgh LGO, Atlantistown LGO, and Raging Rivertown LGO. Table I provides descriptive features of the sample cases in relation to the sample selection criteria.

Data Collection Sources

Data gathered on the sample cases were collected by a variety of means: interviews, survey questionnaires, follow-up telephone surveys, and the collection of artifacts. Initially, an interview guide was designed which generally covered the areas of organizational careers, characteristics, conditions, and consequences. This guide was pre-tested in pilot studies conducted in large metropolitan areas where several groups had been located. Some revisions were made on the interview guide as a result of the pilot studies. In addition, three influence-type scales were constructed to measure perceived organizational influences from outside officials, agencies, and institutions.
Table I: Descriptive Features of the Study Cases (N=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Rural/Urban Community</th>
<th>Disaster Agent</th>
<th>Disaster Period</th>
<th>Community Size</th>
<th>Organization Membership</th>
<th>Year Emerged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide City</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Post-</td>
<td>37,000*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>62,791*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclearopolis</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>51,000*</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood City</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Post-</td>
<td>31,000*</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardville</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpburgh</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Pre-</td>
<td>-10,422</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantistown</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Post-</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raging Riverton</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Post-</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Actual names withheld in accordance with anonymity guarantee to respondents.

2 Membership estimates are provided since most organizations do not keep membership rosters or records.

*Within a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.
The process of data collection from the study cases involved the utilization of field research teams from the Disaster Research Center. Members of these teams had received a minimum of three months project orientation, qualitative methodology instruction, and trial interviewing training. Each interview varied in time, but the average took approximately one hour. In an effort to acquire a comprehensive and cross-sectional data base for each case, field teams were required to interview leaders and general members of the organizations, non-members, local agency personnel, elected governmental officials, technical experts and members of the media—all within the locale.

The interview selections were classified on the basis of whether they were 1) informants or 2) respondents. Informants were non-members of the case study organization who had specific knowledge of either the organization or the disaster-related issue. Respondents, on the other hand, constituted any members of the organization. Many methods were used to identify potential interviewees. For example, a name associated with an organization or disaster-related event may have appeared in a newspaper article or on a news broadcast. This citing, from clipping files or broadcast tapes, would be pursued by a field team member. He or she would refer to the DRC telephone directory library, call directory assistance, call the reporting media source, or even the area's local governmental offices to secure a means of contacting the
individual. In other instances, only the name of an organization, its location, or news of a disaster-related issue was known. In these latter situations, calls would be placed to the local governmental agencies and/or local newspaper offices to acquire the names of local individuals known to be involved with the event. Once an individual was contacted, the field researcher would describe the nature and intent of the NSF/DRC project and follow-up the contact by sending informative materials to the individual. In addition, everyone talked to by the field team would be asked to refer it to other individuals who might be of importance as prospective interviewees, both with respect to the desired information needs of the study and the categorical interview criteria (e.g., leaders, non-members, public officials, etc.). The field team also collected a variety of community and organizational artifacts, such as community plans, maps, telephone directories, news clippings, organizational newsletters, organizational recruiting literature, fund-raising materials, promotional aids, legal documents, and community economic/industrial development profiles. Influence scales were administered at the conclusion of the interviews.

A minimum of 10 interviews was required for each case study; however, most of the 50 cases exceeded the minimum. As a matter of fact, one case study involved 23 interviews.

Upon returning to DRC, the field teams prepared field trip reports consisting of a formal compilation of conceptual
categories. On several occasions, return trips to the case site were required to investigate a particular issue or expand the initial data. In some cases this was accomplished by telephone interviews.

Follow-up interviews were conducted after a minimum of one year had lapsed from the initial visit. These interviews were conducted by telephone and were directed at a subsample of the original respondent group within each study case. The follow-up research also conformed to the original inquiry format which focused on the variables of organization careers, characteristics, conditions, and consequences. However, the intent of the follow-up research was to identify significant changes that had occurred since the initial interview.

Finally, a mail survey was designed to examine some specific issues of community solidarity and organizational participation as well as to measure the level of rural/urban values held by the LGO's membership. The community solidarity index (Fessler, 1952), organizational participation measure (Philips and Young, 1977), and rural ideology scale (Buttel and Flinn, 1976) have documented reliability and validity.

The mail survey was sent to 78 members of the case study organizations, previously identified in initial data sets. Respondents returned 41 usable surveys which represent a rate of return of 52.6 percent. These surveys were then incorporated into the study findings.
Samples of the interview guide, influence scales, follow-up interview guide, and mail survey are provided in the appendix to this study.

Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative techniques are included in this study's data analysis. Comparative analysis along categorical lines is conducted between the sample cases in an effort to generate substantive hypotheses, theories of rural/urban organizational differentiation, and indicators of urbanization.

The quantitative data, collected after the qualitative analysis, reveals some relevant categorical areas of the social-psychological and organizational behavior dimensions which are not of concern to the original NSF/DRC study. The data are statistically treated and discussed in Chapter V.

Summary

Figure 1 illustrates the research steps followed in this study. The initial step involved collection of data from the 50 emergent citizen groups in the NSF/DRC project. These data were examined in the context of the rural-urban definitional criteria and consequently used to begin the analytic framework process. The constant comparative method employed in step 2 provided the actual basis for a formalized analytic framework and the decision to specifically select the
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Figure 1: Research Design
eight cases for further study. The follow-up stage of data collection (step 4) provided the opportunity for longitudinal assessment of the initial induced analytic framework, whereby, modification of the framework resulted in step 5. The effect of time on the dimensional linkages generated in this step are analyzed and considered in terms of their conceptual properties. Step 6 involved the collection of new data in a quantitative format from the study cases. The data was analyzed to assess the framework's utility and to provide a partial test of emergent hypotheses.

Descriptive Overview of Study LGOs

This section of the chapter presents a brief introduction of the eight LGOs under study. The format of the descriptive overview organizes information under the four component subheadings discussed on pages 33-34. They are careers, characteristics, consequences, and conditions. Also, the following time symbols are used to clarify the dynamics of the organizations over time: T-1 represents data initially collected, T-2 represents data collected in the follow-up, and the absence of either T-1 or T-2 indicates that the information has not significantly changed from the T-1 period.

The Slide City LGO

The community in which the Slide City LGO members reside is one of many urban corporations concentrated within the
San Francisco-Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. This particular "bedroom" community is considered middle-to-upper-middle class on the basis of the residents' occupational status profile. The escarpment-type geographical setting and the established development pattern of residential structures, public facilities, and transportation systems constitute a situation of high disaster vulnerability. The inclination of threat, perceived from the level of an objective outsider, would at the very least include possible earthquakes, landslides/mudslides, brush fires, and potential hazardous materials transportation accidents. Nevertheless, under normative social conditions, there is little evidence of special concern about these probable threats, either on the part of the residents or their local public service agencies.

Slide City LGO Career

(T-1) This group emerged early in 1982 following a major landslide which destroyed a great deal of property, took two lives, and displaced a number of families. Data obtained from interviews and media accounts indicate that the seeds of organizing had already been sown when the local television news crew covered the disaster during the emergency period. The actual process being reported by the media coverage was that of collective voluntary activities in response to the disaster conditions that required immediate attention within the community. However, when the media interviewed one of the
volunteers, inferences were made that he was the leader and organizer of a "residential relief organization." Shortly after the emergency period, several of the resident volunteers informally mingled and discussed their resentment over that particular pseudo leader and their shared concern that the local disaster services were "pitifully inadequate." From this activity a number felt the need to form a long-term recovery organization with an elected leader. A meeting was called inviting all of the residents from the impacted area. A leader was selected by informal consensus and a name was created for the organization. The immediate aims of the organization were to effect structural changes in the local, governmental service agencies and to initiate a local ballot measure that would provide long-term recovery assistance through direct taxation.

(T-2) More than a year after the Slide City LGO was created, its leadership remained in the same person's hands. The general membership also had remained stable; however, most of the decisions were being made by a core group of members who would then seek ratification of their decisions through informal contact with the general membership.

Slide City LGO Characteristics

(T-1) The Slide City LGO did not formally incorporate, rather it relied heavily upon the core members to represent its interests in the community. The members of the
organization were predominantly upper-middle class, young-to-middle-age husbands and wives. Most couples were not acquainted with each other prior to the disaster. Meetings of the organization were held on an as-needed basis; they were informally run and generally concerned with strategizing activities in behalf of the organization's interests within the local governmental arena. Although the organization did not attempt to recruit members from outside the impact area, it did attempt to get every residence within the impact area to join.

(T-2) The follow-up data indicated fewer general meetings and a slight dwindling of interest on the part of a few members. Core members remained active and networked with another interest group within the community. The organization incorporated as a non-profit entity.

Slide City LGO Conditions

(T-1) The organization's primary resource was the professional expertise provided by its members, media personnel, and external individual advisors. This resource was compiled to sustain the organization; nevertheless, the determination of actual need for the organization was based on the disaster experienced by its members and their perceptions of response inadequacies by the local service agencies. Along a similar vein, pre-disaster residential agitation was emerging with regard to over-development of housing within
the community. Specifically, local zoning and subdivision hearings were becoming very controversial and an anti-growth organization had been active in promoting a no-growth political campaign.

(T-2) Follow-up information was gathered through interviews conducted immediately after another landslide disaster had occurred in the community. This time, though, the damage was not nearly as severe. But, the incident did provide an opportunity for the Slide City LGO to conduct a successful petition drive in support of securing recovery funding from the federal government. In addition, it was found that the organization had begun to charge a $10.00 membership fee. Much of its media support had been lost in the controversy with the local government over the tax measure, so the Slide City LGO had initiated its own newsletter.

Slide City LGO Consequences

(T-1) The Slide City LGO had been able to access the local and regional media very successfully in the period immediately following the landslides. As a result, it had mobilized many areawide activities geared at direct-recovery assistance. Most of these activities had been supported by area volunteer agencies, churches, and service organizations. Yet, it had had little success in getting special attention from the state and federal agencies.
The Slide City LGO's efforts to implement strategies to accomplish passage of a long-term recovery tax measure by ballot initiative had created distinct levels of controversy among its membership and within the community at large. Its failure to achieve community support for the tax measure resulted in some membership attrition; nevertheless, the core group remained intact. The organization's alignment with other community-interest organizations had effectively placed the Slide City LGO in the role of a campaign organization for two city council candidates.

The Toxicity LGO

The Toxicity LGO members represent a unique "social field" in that their community is formed from two incorporated entities. The fact that their political boundaries are contiguous is not as unique as the fact that one municipal corporation is a heavily industrialized blue-collar area, while the other is a distinctively residential white-collar community. The general area is located in the Boston Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. The primary disaster threats to the area are technological in nature, including toxic wastes and industrial pollution. For well over 150 years, industries using chemical processes had utilized the area.
Toxicity LGO Career

(T-1) For a period of time up until the fall of 1979, a concerned minister and a churchmember, who was the mother of a child with leukemia, had attempted to acquire records from official agencies indicating the number of incidents of childhood leukemia in the community. Failing to get a desired response, the two started a letter-writing campaign to the editor of the local newspaper. As a "shot in the dark," one letter called for a meeting of all community residents having knowledge of cases of children with leukemia. The meeting attracted approximately 60 people, some of whom cited other strange illnesses. Crude attempts at mapping the locations of illness incidents in the community produced evidence that there may have been a link between the disease and the community's industrial park. Early in 1980, eight persons from this first meeting emerged as core actors in the development of the Toxicity LGO. Within the first year of operation, the organization continued to access the media (both local and regional) to draw attention to its concerns. Additionally, its members confronted the city council with the demand that the industrial park be closed under the auspices of a health moratorium.

(T-2) The organization became a non-profit corporation in 1981 and pursued efforts to induce state and federal involvement in the situation, as well as to encourage research institutions to conduct studies on the issues of the
environment, public safety, and health. At last contact, its primary aim was to support public education as a means of attaining its original goal.

Toxicity LGO Characteristics

(T-1) Within the early organizational period, the membership rose to approximately 300 people. The core and most members were not acquainted prior to the Toxicity LGO's emergence. Very little direct recruiting took place, but the media exposure generated a lot of interest in the organization's activities which, in turn, attracted people to its meetings. The active core members numbered 11 and an inner core of five was also identified. Although officers were elected to formal positions within the Toxicity LGO, the general monthly membership meetings were conducted informally. One committee for publicity was all that was created.

(T-2) Meetings were being held bi-monthly with an average attendance of 20 members. Most of the activities were carried out by the original inner-core members; and such activities were directed at influencing policy directives by getting elected officials at the state and federal levels involved. Several networks and linkages were established with other local, regional, and national organizations. These affiliations sometimes caused members of the organization to divert attention away from the local issues.
Toxicity LGO Conditions

(T-1) At the first public meeting, the initiating conditions for the Toxicity LGO's emergence stemmed from the highly-emotional testimonies of individuals on the illness issue as a foremost focus, and secondarily, the association of these illnesses with the specific geographic location of the industrial park. Other initiating conditions included: the extensive local media coverage—both of the organization and emotionally-charged personal illness documentaries, and media support which set the stage for allegations that the city council was displaying a pro-industrial bias; the high level of technical and legal expertise provided by white-collar area members; the region's experience with incidents of roadside dumping of industrial wastes (which tended to garner media attention); and the known industrial dumpsite within the industrial park. This set of factors provided both the condition of threat and the means to articulate and diffuse the issues. There was enough uncertainty created from these conditions that even most non-participants in the Toxicity LGO recognized a need for some answers and/or actions.

(T-2) Confrontation and conflict with the local government was reduced when outside agencies on the state and federal levels and individuals in highly-placed elected positions brought attention to bear on the matter. The organizations also acquired significant assistance from research institutions.
including, the Harvard School of Public Health, Tufts Department of City Planning and Emerson College's Department of Public Administration.

Toxicity LGO Consequences

The Toxicity LGO had generated a substantial amount of attention and direct action with respect to the community's toxic waste problem, but had not caused the industrial park to cease operations. Nevertheless, the industrial waste dumping site is no longer in use. The perceived threat of contamination and resulting illnesses still remained. The organization had definitely effected an increase in the Environmental Protection Agency's prioritization of the local dumpsite for clean-up "superfunds." Although the city council still refused to support the organization, it had appointed a commission to monitor the matter. In addition, the local chamber of commerce had hired a full time director of environmental affairs.

The Nuclearopolis LGO

This LGO is located in the Newark Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. The community is considered upper-middle class on the basis of its annual per-capita income. Although there is some commercial activity, the general classification of the community is that of a residential suburb. The area's perceived disaster threats include flooding, blizzards,
hurricanes, hazardous materials handling, and nuclear waste disposal.

Nuclearopolis LGO Career

In 1982 a national press release issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) stated that it intended to conduct aerial surveys and radiation checks over the study community. A resident who had read the account contacted a city councilperson to find out the reason for this proposed activity. The resident was informed that nuclear industries had been operating in the region since 1940 and that there had been some past incidents of radioactive waste leakages and seepages. Two months after the press release, the NRC presented a report of findings at a public hearing before the City Council.

Disturbed by the lack of information provided by the NRC and the lack of general awareness of the residents with regard to nuclear industries in the region, the original inquiring resident asked people during the NRC hearing to attend an open meeting on the issue. At the first open meeting, attendees were asked to sign a petition which was to be submitted to the City Council with respect to the group's intention of organizing in response to two key factors: the historic ambivalence the City Council had exhibited toward the issue and the group's concern for the children in the community. The initial goals of the organization were
twofold: 1) to force the development of more-detailed historic and current information on radioactive substances in the community; and 2) to have known radioactive wastes removed from private dumpsites in the area.

Nuclearopolis LGO Characteristics

(T-1) The principle core of the Nuclearopolis LGO consisted of five persons who did not know one another prior to the public hearing. Two core members had particular knowledge of technology and political activism. The group did not elect officers, however, the originator became the consensus leader. The majority of the members are considered in the "upper" of the upper-middle class of the community according to income levels.

(T-2) One core member withdrew from participation in the Nuclearopolis LGO because she felt it was too confrontational to the local government. Another core member expressed disappointment that he had not been consulted frequently enough, though he remained with the organization. In the main, the evolved organization pretty much reflected its original characteristics.

Nuclearopolis LGO Conditions

The upper-class derivation of the membership facilitated the organization's needs for funding its activities. The internal availability of technical expertise and media access
made possible by specific members provided further resources. Because this perceived threatening incident was availed during an election year, most resources were allocated to the support of political campaigns for candidates who agreed with the organization's positions.

(T-2) Two local candidates supported by the LGO were elected to office. They provided an additional resource for the organization's future activities. The organization was also successful in developing a beneficial relationship with an authority figure at the NRC. Moreover, it was able to access regional and national news media attention. This expose of the radioactive waste situation in the community tended to increase the organization's support as well as boost perceptions of the level of threat in the community.

Nuclearopolis LGO Consequences

(T-1) The Nuclearopolis LGO has directly initiated a number of community activities focused on the radioactivity issues. Specifically, four additional radiation surveys have been conducted and a playing field located near a private dumpsite has been closed—as the result of an extensive petition drive. The organization has used the media effectively which, in turn, has caused a great amount of unanticipated stress in the community. Claims against the organization have pointed to its responsibility for reducing real estate values, creating local governmental dysfunction, and placing economic
hardships on local businesses.

(T-2) The Nuclearopolis LGO was still adding pressure to the area's radioactive waste removal issue, but realization of this goal appeared distant.

The Flood City LGO

Members of the Flood City LGO reside within the Cincinnati/Covington Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. The community's location basically poses only two possible disaster threats: tornadoes and floods which would affect only a portion of the total area.

Flood City LGO Career

(T-1) Four days after a major flood had occurred, residents in the impacted area received leaflets distributed by one of the victims. The information extended an invitation to meet and discuss the possibilities of forming a mitigation organization. At the first gathering nearly 200 people came together to discuss the needs for such an organization.

Twenty individuals offered to help develop the organization (e.g., draft a charter, design committees, and so forth); and at a second meeting, the steering group's tasks had been accomplished and a name was agreed upon. The following week, members confronted the City Council and blamed it for the flooding. Over the next six months, the organization grew in numbers and diversified tasks were performed by its committees.
By the spring of 1982 the Flood City LGO had become inactive, but the core members continued to monitor the actions of the local government and various agencies that it had influenced during its active period.

Flood City LGO Characteristics

The membership of the organization consisted of a majority of the homeowners in the impacted area. This upper-middle class residential area mainly consisted of new developments; and its residents, mostly young families, were considered newcomers to the community. Although the homes were relatively close together, until the first meeting the residents on the whole did not know one another beyond their next door neighbors. A core of six persons emerged from the first meeting, with the individual who had solicited the gathering assuming the LGO's leadership role. Interestingly, this leader utilized the flood problem as an issue for his campaign for a City Council seat. Although the community was not categorically a bedroom-type, most of the people in the area commuted to outside work. Many of the residents provided organizational and technical expertise and several had contacts with experts and influentials external to the community.

Flood City LGO Conditions

The one major conditional issue that brought the Flood City LGO together was the threatening aspects of
relocation. Most of the people in the area moved there because they perceived it to be a good location (based on the schools, shopping, parks, and large residential lots) in which to live and raise a family. Although there was no implication that a forced relocation would occur, most people felt that if the problem of persistent flooding was left unresolved, they would have no choice but to move.

At the time the Flood City LGO formed, the city had just completed a transition from a strong mayoral system of government to a "committee-of-the-whole" system. Leaders and members of the Flood City LGO read this changeover as an ideal opportunity to take an active part in city affairs and maneuver an action through government to resolve their problem. In doing so, however, the local media tended to play the role of arbitrator. Hence, the organization was only marginally effective in using a media-access strategy.

(T-2) Once commitments were made by various federal and regional agencies, most of the members saw no reason to participate actively in the organization. Even so, they continued to support the activities being implemented by the core group.

Flood City LGO Consequences

(T-1) The organization was successful in starting a chain of events aimed at resolving the flooding threat. Initially they confronted the City Council and got it to apply for funds to do a feasibility study on flood abatement. The
study was funded and resulted in some recommendations that would not only benefit the residents of the area, but also the community in general. The Flood City LGO's political activity, even without direct support of the local media, seemed to have caused some polarization between the oldtimers and newcomers in the community.

(T-2) The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had provided some temporary abatement measures within the flood impact area. These measures will reduce the likelihood of property damage from floods; however, funding for the major proposed project (to benefit the community) had yet to be approved.

The Hazardville LGO

The members of the Hazardville LGO reside in a lumbering and mining area of the south-central portion of the state, over 120 miles from any metropolitan area. The community is relatively free of natural disaster threats, though it does sometimes experience minor floods. Man-made or technological threats to the community, mostly related to mine disasters (e.g., cave-ins, gas explosions, reservoir failures, etc.) and toxic waste contamination, are the primary perceived disaster threats.

Hazardville LGO Career

(T-1) In 1980 two long-time neighbors who resided near a stream that flows through the northern sector of the
community were discussing noticeable changes in the water's quality and its general affects on their domiciles, from its strong odor and brackishness, to an absence of fish. These two individuals decided to investigate the cause of the problems. In their superficial digging around, they noticed that the source of pollution seemed to be a nearby tannery. Realizing that the tanning process employs caustic chemicals, they approached the tannery management with their findings and were informed that the company had permission to discharge wastes into the stream.

Since all of the people living in that area of the community were either old acquaintances or kin, the spread of the above event was epidemic, though informal. Equally expedient was the call for a meeting of the residents at the local library. At the first meeting, the 22 residents in attendance discussed the issues and then attempted to identify sources of assistance within the community. Additionally, a leader-spokesperson was chosen by consensus and he, plus three others, formed the core group. At the time, the people did not feel the need for an organization; they only wanted to aggregate their concerns over finding out what it was that had caused the stream's quality to deteriorate, if the pollutant was harmful to people, and how it could be abated.

(T-l+) The individuals who agreed to make inquiries and request assistance soon found out that there was both a lack of substantial information and a willingness to assist among
local agencies. At this point they held another meeting at which they decided to organize as a concerned citizens committee.

(T-2) After one year, the committee had become a full-fledged community action organization with a complement of officers and committees, a formulated goal set (either to get funding for a treatment facility or to get the tannery closed), and a strategy for action.

Hazardville LGO Characteristics

(T-1) The initial characteristics of the Hazardville LGO depicted a close-knit gathering of friends. These people, in terms of the community's SES standards, were largely lower-middle class. The age range of the participants spanned from young teenagers to individuals in their mid-seventies. A few had educations beyond high school, while the majority had not finished high school.

(T-2) With over three hundred members coming from all parts of the community, the characteristics had drastically changed since T-1. In addition to the obvious change effects on the SES make-up, age structure and education, a number of intercommunity linkages with civic, service, and church-related organizations had been attained. Moreover, linkages with similar organizations in other communities throughout the Appalachian region had been established.
Hazardville LGO Conditions

(T-1) As was mentioned in the Hazardville LGO career summary, the primary conditions focused on the efforts of a few individuals to gather basic information about the residents' concerns. In the process some of the ensuing encounters (with the mayor's office and the tannery management) proved quite abrasive, and somewhere along the line the process drew the attention of a local newspaper reporter.

(T-1+) At the second meeting of the residents, the reporter was in attendance. He offered some suggestions and made the decision to write a story on the issue. The story was published, but it eventually got him fired from the newspaper. He then joined the organization, wrote a feature article for the state's popular magazine (which included a photograph of a Mason jar filled with brackish water from the stream on the cover) and, from that point on, outside technical, political, and organizational expertise rained on the organization. The former reporter also initiated an organizational newsletter which was disseminated throughout the community. It proved to be a valuable recruitment and fund-raising vehicle. Because some of the resident members actually worked at the tannery, and unemployment in the area was extremely high, the organization did not pursue the goal to close down the company. Claimed incidents of gun fire exchanged between "hired guns" representing the tannery and a member of the Hazardville LGO tended to sway the members to
accept this alternative. The members were mainly concerned about the potential loss of jobs; whereas, the company, owned and managed out of Chicago, had little local empathy.

(T-2) The initial resident members and leaders were able to retain control over the organization primarily because of an Appalachian region community action training center which extended direct organizing and administrating services to them. The organization generated a great deal of support in the community, however, the local government continued to view it as an unnecessary advocacy organization.

Hazardville LGO Consequences

(T-1) As an organization within its first year of operation, the Hazardville LGO achieved three major outcomes (not goals): 1) it exposed the community to information on the workings of the local government, the background of the tannery owners, the public health risk for everyone with respect to the toxic waste pollutants in the stream, and highlighted the need for local action; 2) it brought a diverse cross-section of the local population together to work on a community problem; and 3) it forced the attention of federal and state politicians and agencies on the community's problem.

(T-2) With respect to the Hazardville LGO's goal of cleaning up the stream by means of a treatment facility (rather than a plant close down), it had acquired research support from three universities, two state agencies, and two
federal agencies. Plans and specifications for a treatment facility were being reviewed for funding. These funds, when approved, will be aggregated with the fines levied by the federal and state authorities against the local government and the tannery.

The Dumpburgh LGO

The Dumpburgh LGO is located in a rural farming area in central portion of the state. The community was founded by Quakers and traditionally has been considered a prosperous agricultural area. The location and history of the region indicates only a few potential disaster threats, including tornadoes, blizzards, and hazardous materials transportation. Of the three, only the latter has been of any direct consequence to the community.

Dumpburgh LGO Career

(T-1) In the Summer of 1981, a local farmer was informed that some neighbors had been offered contracts for the sale of the land, which was to be used as a dump site. Contacting friends by telephone he found that many were aware of similar situations in the county. From this information he asked neighbors to meet with him on September 2 to discuss the issue. Informally, word of this impending meeting spread to a broader audience and on the night of the 2nd, approximately 200 people from the community showed up. The informal meeting resulted in
a decision to publish a public notice and hold a general community meeting on October 13th. During the period of time from September 2nd to October 13th, another non-farming member of the community mobilized a rally at the county courthouse. This event was supported by approximately 75 people. On October 13th, the farmer and his constituency merged with the non-farmer and his constituency to form a local community organization. The adopted goal of the organization was to prevent the development of the dump site.

(T-2) One year later the farmer co-leader and most of the farmer members had withdrawn from active participation. The organization; however, retained a large number of members, and had become a non-profit corporation.

Dumpburgh LGO Characteristics

(T-1) The membership of the Dumpburgh LGO was comprised basically of two categorical types of residents. The first group was the established farmers and community business people, and the second group, newcomers to the community. The established residents were generally acquainted with each other, while most of the newcomers were not well acquainted with one another or the established residents. The aggregate of the members could be classified as middle-class, and most who participated in the organization were husbands and wives. The October 13th merger and meeting resulted in an organization with a name, a set of officers, and a number of committees.
In addition, several of the community's established organizations (including the county and city governmental bodies) had passed resolutions in support of the Dumpburgh LGO's goal. The organization did not seek, nor desire, any outside assistance.

(T-2) After one year the organization's composition mostly consisted of the newcomer residents, and some of the community's business people. On the whole, the wives were the active workers in the organization. In addition, the organization had become part of a state coalition.

Dumpburgh LGO Conditions

(T-1) Two key pre-formation events set the stage for both the issue within the community and the organization. First was the release of a 1978 study by a major research institute which suggested various chemical waste sites within the state with this community named as a possible location. Second, was the passage of a state legislative bill which created a state commission and stripped local government of the authority to provide or prevent hazardous waste disposal sites.

The actual condition that caused the organization to form was reports of land purchase offers to local farmers by a Dayton, Ohio real estate firm that had direct ties with a chemical disposal company. Initially, the farmers in the area thought the offer reports were simply jokes because the
prices offered were considerably higher than the land in the area usually sold for and the area’s land had not been selling very well for the past several years.

Two additional conditions which contributed to the organization's efforts included: 1) the fact that there was already a hazardous waste site in an adjoining county (which was under protest by a local citizen organization in that community); and 2) there was a general knowledge that another citizen organization within the state had actually prevented the development of a waste disposal site in its community.

Once the Dumpburgh LGO was formed, operating resources were provided in the forms of contributed services and technical expertise, and membership dues. The local media provided a great deal of support, and regional and national media also came to investigate the situation.

(T-2) The importance of the media support was negated when the president of Dumpburgh LGO told a reporter that he had used the newspaper to generate specific rumors in an effort to broaden the base of support and introduce grander issues of public concern. Many of the oldtimer residents continued to support the concept of the organization, but had withdrawn from providing direct support.

Dumpburgh LGO Consequences

(T-1) The Dumpburgh LGO was very successful in the areas of membership recruitment, media access, conducting
awareness programs, and sponsoring a petition drive to amend the state's legislative act. They were also marginally successful in getting some of the landowners to set up land trusts and/or deed restrictions on the lands within the proposed site.

(T-2) One year later nobody could produce documented proof that any land offer contracts had ever been made. However, the organization continued to be supported by the members in the community. The interests or goals of the organization had expanded to the point that many of the older established residents no longer could identify with the issues. The Dumpburgh LGO had become very active in statewide activities and had assisted many other communities in the development of similar organizations.

The Atlantistown LGO*

The members of the Atlantistown LGO live in an agricultural area that has had a long history of flooding. Like the Toxicity LGO, this organization is comprised of residents from two adjoining communities. The only perceived major disaster-threatening event recognized by the residents is flooding.

*Unlike the other seven recently formed LGOs, the Atlantistown LGO formed in 1973. Given its extensive history, the description of time-related events (T-1/T-2) are deemed unnecessary.
Atlantistown LGO Career

In 1972 Hurricane Agnes produced a high-damage flood within the community. At the time the community had no flood protection. Immediately after the flood the community approached the state government to inquire about getting support for a protection system, but were informed that it would be very unlikely that a flood of such magnitude would ever again occur within the next 100 years. In 1975, tropical storm Eloise produced an equally-damaging flood in the community. This time eight victims, brought together by the clean-up activities, proposed citizen action. Within one month after the flood, an organization was created to initiate a flood-protection project.

The organization intended to conduct the project itself rather than attempt to solicit aid from outside governmental agencies. For eight years the Atlantistown LGO pursued task-by-task operations using member and volunteer labor, equipment, and services.

In 1981, the City Council requested that the organization become an official commission of the local city governments of both communities. This request was discussed by the members of Atlantistown LGO and they decided to comply with the request. This action absorbed the officers of Atlantistown LGO in the commission and left the members without an organization.
Atlantistown LGO Characteristics

Since the organization was primarily a labor-oriented entity, its members were predominantly male. The membership included both white and blue collar workers, most in the 30 to 50 year age range. For several years the organization did not interact with any other authorities in or outside the community. However, in 1979 it began a dialogue with the City Councils and was established as an ad hoc advisory group to the local government.

Throughout its years of operation, the Atlantistown LGO formed several committees on an as-needed basis (e.g., fund raising, feasibility study, and volunteer organizing). It always operated with co-leaders, a secretary, and a treasurer; however, these positions were filled by informal consensus rather than formal elections.

Atlantistown LGO Conditions

The organization's initial members were mainly from the business community and were recognized by the public before they had organized. Each member had the personal resources to devote time and money toward the organizational goals.

The initiating conditions for the formation of the Atlantistown LGO included the impact of the floods, the failure of the city to acquire outside assistance in developing flood protection systems, and a meeting some of the members had attended with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers where they
were informed that if they wanted protection systems they might be better off developing them themselves.

The operational conditions stemmed from the overall support expressed by the community governments and residents. The concept of a group of individuals working evenings and weekends to construct devices to protect the community provided excellent community relationships.

Atlantistown LGO Consequences

The organization had been successful in a number of activities related to accessing services and equipment required in its labor efforts. In particular, it was instrumental in getting a design and feasibility study prepared for the flood protection system, and a study of the flooding patterns and forecasts for the area which enabled it to develop an evacuation plan and warning system. It removed an island which was thought to aggravate the flooding problems in the community. The organization solicited funds to help relocate some family residences which could not be protected. And finally, it was instrumental in educating the public and the local officials in many specific areas of flood plan management. In the end the organization became an official part of the governmental institution in the communities.
The Raging Riverton LGO

This isolated rural logging community is located in the foothills of the Cascade Mountain Range. Flooding is the community's primary disaster concern; however, there exists the possibility of earthquakes and blizzards. The community is very small and relies heavily on a company mill for services.

Raging Riverton LGO Career

(T-1) Although a major flood in December of 1980 had damaged a great deal of private property in the community, its greatest impact was the destruction of a diversion groin (a protection system for flood control). Recognizing that the absence of this groin would be devastating to the community in the wake of the anticipated spring floods, one of the residents contacted the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for assistance. Because of complex jurisdictional frictions, the Corps informed him that they could not intervene. By April of 1981 he had exhausted his personal attempts to find some source of aid and so he requested that a meeting be held among the residents located along the river. The meeting was held and attended by 30 residents. A leader was selected by consensus and a formal delegation committee was appointed to look into alternative solutions.

(T-2) After one year the organization had become relatively inactive, however, the core committee continued to
coordinate certain activities and keep the resident members informed.

Raging Riverton LGO Characteristics

The organization's members represent a close-knit group of persons whose families had migrated to the community from North Carolina after World War II. The term "Tar Heel" is frequently expressed throughout the community. There is a relatively high poverty level within the community, but the members of the Raging Riverton LGO would be considered high in the socio-economic order of the area. The leader of the organization was selected because of his occupational and political ties to outside institutions, which the members felt was a necessary condition for the attainment of their goal.

Raging Riverton LGO Conditions

The organization, its members, and the community had very few resources other than the volunteered time devoted to the physical problem of replacing the groin. The milling company could not take any direct action (although they had the equipment to do so) in replacing the groin because of the jurisdictional laws governing activities in the river. Consequently, the delegation committee felt that their only hope was direct contact with their congressman.

The meeting with their congressman and other officials he requested to be present resulted in two outcomes:
1) expedition of the permit process (14 permits were required), and 2) attendance of the local and regional media. The media coverage provided resulted in a feature story from which a number of resources emerged, including: $15,000 worth of rock, and an exercise of command by the local U.S. Army Reserve Engineering Company which provided manpower and some heavy equipment under the guise of a military training exercise.

Raging Riverton LGO Consequences

The primary goal of the organization has been realized with the rebuilding of the groin. In addition, the permit-issuing agencies of the federal, state, and regional governments have been exposed to a situation which has caused them to take stock of their bureaucratic processes. In turn, they are developing a better community assistance request processing system. Finally, the U.S. Army Reserves are considering these types of "exercises" as standard operating procedure for other communities in need of protection services.

Summary of the LGO Cases

The eight LGO cases presented on the previous pages reflect a sample which typically represents the kinds of organizations studied in the 50-case NSF/DRC project. Although there are a number of apparent factors of variation between the cases, there are also many factors of similarity.
Chapter IV will provide an elaboration of the factors which emerged in the initial empirical data and those factors which were selected to examine the rural-urban phenomena.

Table 2 provides a categorical summary of the eight LGO cases in the context of the previous overview. This table is provided as a quick-reference, general illustrative orientation to the study cases.
Table 2: Selected Summary Features of the LGO Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the LGO</th>
<th>Disaster Period</th>
<th>Disaster-Related Situation</th>
<th>Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Goal Attained</th>
<th>Current Activity Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide City</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Land &amp; Mud Slides</td>
<td>Retain land ownership &amp; promote local tax measure</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Toxic Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Close-down disposal site/industrial site &amp; force clean-up</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclearopolis</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Radioactive Wastes</td>
<td>Stop local waste disposal &amp; force clean-up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood City</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Stream Flooding in Residential Area</td>
<td>Access flood abatement assist.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes (Core only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardville</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Toxic Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Prevent industry from toxic disposal in stream</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpburgh</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Toxic Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Prevent the development of a landfill for toxics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantistown</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Stream Flooding in Residential Area</td>
<td>Conduct flood abatement project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (Restructured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raging River</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>River Flooding in Residential Area</td>
<td>Access flood abatement assist.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF BACKGROUND LITERATURE AND RELATIVE CONCEPTS

When Maurice Stein wrote a general essay on the evolution of American communities during the twentieth century, he called it *The Eclipse of Community*. Few people, so far as I know, found the title strange. Yet the actual evidence and argument in the book don't show us a process of decline. The book portrays American communities as experiencing urbanization, industrialization, and bureaucratization and consequently being drawn more and more decisively into national networks of power and communication. The closest it comes to displaying an eclipse is in suggesting that communities are becoming less autonomous than they used to be. That is a far cry from decay, decline, and disintegration.

An organization can easily become more active and influential in its own sphere as it loses autonomy. Industrial firms, for example, often go through that very cycle when they merge into conglomerates and cartels. A philosophy which values organizational autonomy for its own sake will treat that change as a loss. But the language of withering, of decay, is misleading when applied to a shift in the external relations of a group, if the group continues to function on its own ground (Tilly, 1973:210).

The preceding paragraph which serves as a preface to this chapter captures much of the logic which this study corroborates. The logic implies a characterization of grass roots organizational phenomena; in essence, that it provides a microcosmic perspective of social change in rural communities.
This chapter presents a discussion of concepts and elements of previous research and theories that relate topically to the study. The intention of the literature review is to develop a coherent, integrated conceptual framework for analysis of rural and urban LGOs in disaster-related situations. Given the fact that these entities are diverse from the standpoint of both the situational and theoretical contexts, the observations and concomitant explanations produced by this study require a conceptual framework that facilitates a unified comparative process.

The research on the LGOs was initiated from an atheoretical perspective since it was essential to the NSF/DRC study to learn more about the emergence of the organizations, their conditions, characteristics, careers, and consequences, before any concepts for an interpretative theoretical framework could be derived. As the data on the cases were consistently compared, attempts were made to identify patterns suggesting empirical confirmation of any one of the major sociological constructs. Although this was not a particularly rigorous data-coding exercise, the pattern-search inferences suggested that the phenomena to be explained (at least in this study) would not be subsumed by a singular theoretical orientation. Consequently, the analytical framework relies on a constructed conceptual schema of interrelated concepts.

In effect, a simplified model of reality or constructed types (Poplin, 1979:121) will be generated from the discussion
of key variables and empirical propositions. Two additionally significant factors of the research influenced the decision not to force specific data from the cases into a singular theoretical orientation. The first of these factors has to do with the fact that the topic and nature of the study are complementary to the basic aspects of constructed types, also referred to as typologies. Notably, there are four utility aspects to consider: 1) a good constructed type should provide insights on the characteristics of the various social systems or subsystems if they ever were encountered in a pure state; 2) type construction can be a powerful instrument in the generation of needed generalizations on the social system or subsystems; 3) constructed types, particularly when they expose the extreme limits of a continuum, can be very useful in making comparisons between two or more social systems or subsystems; and 4) constructed types are generally valuable in the study of relative social change and in formulating predictions about the path of development that a changing social system or subsystem may follow (Poplin, 1979:123).

The second factor is associated with the choice of the grounded-theory approach. The "theoretical sampling" concept introduced by Glaser and Strauss (1967) is a strategy that closely resembles the process of analytical induction. Though analytical induction, per se, has been criticized for its inability to extract categories or variables (Robinson,
1951), and its frequent failure to produce predictive hypotheses (Turner, 1953), specific modifications and conceptual evolutions in present methodologies have tended to mitigate the deficiencies (Lindesmith, 1952, Becker, 1958; Glaser and Strauss, 1965).

_constructed types used in the study of social systems or processes require vigilant evaluation of the adequacy of fit between the construct and data set. Although by its very nature the typology can never yield a perfect fit to any data set, the better the fit, the greater the probability that it will be useful in the subsequent analysis (Weber, 1949).

In a comparative study with social action systems as the frame of reference, the constructed-type theory assumes that: 1) the units of analysis are stabilized; 2) the construct will facilitate a comparative study of diverse groupings; 3) the perspective for viewing the social phenomena is standardized; 4) the construct will expose general structural regularities in the social phenomena; and 5) the construct will expose general functions of these structures in diverse settings (McKinney, 1966:134).

**Development of the Construct Type**

This study's research problem is specifically structural in that the emphasis is on understanding the fundamental differences or similarities in characteristics in the
formation of rural and urban disaster-related LGOs. In an attempt to understand how differences or similarities occur, existing sociological concepts were turned to for guidance. Considering the structural emphasis of the research, attention was initially directed toward processing analytical components of structural-functional thought. The structural-functional manifest is expressed by five descriptive components: "1) the value of theory in research, 2) the significance of the concept of system and the potential of 'system analysis,' 3) the necessity of the comparative study of social systems, 4) the need of motivational theory and the instruments by means of which it can be tested, and 5) the necessity of giving attention to the qualitative aspects of research" (McKinney, 1966:79-80).

The causal loop or linkages between structure and function consists of three key variables: "1) a structure or structure activity which has as a consequence the maintenance of 2) a homeostatic variable, which in turn would not be maintained without the structure because of 3) tension which tends to disturb it" (Stinchcombe, 1968:59). The explanation of a social phenomenon which takes into account these variables is commonly described as functional, in that the consequences of some behavior or social arrangement are considered required elements of the causes of that particular behavior. Stinchcombe (1968:80) posits that whenever observations reveal uniformity of the consequences of action, but variation of
the behavior causing those consequences, a functional explanation in which the consequences serve as a cause is recommended.

The context in which the functional explanation is leveled principally considers the concept of a social system: "the interaction of a plurality of individual actors whose relations to each other are mutually oriented through the definition and mediation of a pattern of structured and shared symbols and expectations (Loomis, 1969). This definition does not significantly deviate from other derived presentations of social systems that have been broadly acclaimed (e.g., Parsons, 1951; Arensberg and Kimball, 1965).

Given the notion that the social system is an inherent feature of all types of groups and organizations within a society, the systemic concept of interrelated and interdependent social systems must be concerned with how social action and change occurs in the functional image. Parsons reviews three categorical systems within society and formulates his proposition of functional integration (Turner, 1974: 34). His systemic synthesis of society produces two action systems (personality and social) and one cultural system (cultural patterns) which integrate and form social systems when two functional requisites are met: "1) A social system must have 'a sufficient proportion of its component actors adequately motivated to act in accordance with the requirements of its role system;' and 2) social systems must avoid
'commitment to cultural patterns which either fail to define a minimum of order or which place impossible demands on people and thereby generate deviance and conflict'" (Turner, 1974:34). Social system development by functional integration is enhanced by processes of institutionalization which provide stable patterns of social interaction and a vehicle for the evolution of action and change.

Thus, of consequence to this study are the assumptions of the structural-functional perspective that address the processes of organizing or "systematizing" within society and the assumptions which accommodate social action and change. Six assumptions of the theory provide guidance for this research:

1) Integration is the action of subsystems that tend to create and maintain cooperation among groups and organizations.

2) All systems are integrative in nature.

3) A system must have potential for differentiation.

4) The propensity for social differentiation and social organization increases with size or level of institutionalization, and as such accommodates an increased propensity for social change.

5) The inducements of change are exogenous.

6) Change efforts themselves will induce change.

The behavioral component model was introduced by Arensberg and Kimball (1965) and applied to a problematic study of community organization. In brief, their functional approach to the community-social systems examined three
required elements (similar to Parsonian synthesis of systems integration) that are unique and different in every social system; namely, 1) the relational system, 2) the system of customary behavior, and 3) the system of values (Arensberg and Kimball, 1965:268-273). All three of these components are interdependent and influenced by the tangential environment.

Relational systems are both formal and informal interaction patterns or networks which are caused by cultural norms and/or institutional systems. Customary behavior systems represent tradition and patterns of controlled behavior. The system of values represents the manifestations of individual behavior under the influence of a personal value structure...a manner of response.

Each system in a manifestation of and gives expression to the universal categories of culture: space, time, age, sex, status, and class. These categories are a necessary framework for the functioning of any social system (Arensberg and Kimball, 1965:269).

The approach laid out by the structural-functional perspective provides numerous avenues for the formulation of a social system construct. The systemic logic of interplay between personality, social and cultural systems (Sorokin, 1951) presents an analytical framework enabling specific aspects of social change, especially related to differentiation and complexity, to be attributed to given systems. These systems adapted to the behavioral component model in a rational manner. However, a unique characteristic of
this transposition to a cultural-ideal type is that it seemingly provides the opportunity in empirical analysis to compare the Parsonian proposition of integration with the concept of "cultural fiction" (Williams, 1960).

In Williams' concept the mechanisms of integration within the boundaries of social systems imply minimal levels of social control. Williams does not concur with Sorokin; instead, he argues that the cultural system should be held constant. As a consequence, Williams states:

A cultural fiction exists whenever there is a cultural description, exploration, or normative prescription that is both generally accepted as a norm and is typically followed in conduct but is at the same time markedly at variance with the subjective conceptions or inclinations of participants in the pattern, or with certain objective scientific knowledges (1960:391).

Integration as a concept becomes a central issue in this study. The process of integration represents both the tendencies for social structural diffusion within the hierarchy of social systems and the trend for the social system to move in the direction of functional specialization. In the "nature" of Sumner's "strains for consistency" in human culture, integrative processes introduce changes which ultimately result in increased amounts of complexity at any level within the social system (Mercer, 1956:20-22).

On the conceptual level, integration represents a foundation for patterned behaviors in social systems. "Without an institutionalized value orientation consistent with
cultural tradition, a collectivity would possess no integration;—would, in fact, not be a collectivity. Commitment to value orientation, built into membership status-roles, is thus a prerequisite of all social systems. Ideological beliefs are thus basic: ...there must be a set of beliefs, subscription to which is in some sense and obligation of collectivity membership roles, where cognitive conviction of truth and the 'moral' conviction of rightness are merged" (Loomis, 1961:360). As an example, the choice between change-directed action and community solidarity, when only one may be chosen, must invoke the ideological position. In essence, the ideological position provides the rationale for the choice behavior.

There are two conventions of the integration concept predominant in the literature. The first, termed "normative integration" (Parsons et al., 1961), states that "a social organization becomes normatively integrated as norms based on common values are imbedded within it and internalized by its members." The second, termed "functional integration" (Hawley, 1950), states that a social organization becomes functionally integrated as complementary relationships among specialized and interdependent subparts are established and maintained through unified cooperation.

In a behavioral context, normative integration would be representative of the vertical pattern of social system linkage in that its processes are characterized by the observance of established rules of behavior; whereas, functional
integration is representative of the horizontal pattern of social system linkage in which its processes are characterized by the development of exceptions or new rules (Warren, 1972:283). These integration concept formulations provided the foundation for Durkheim's construct of mechanical solidarity (normative integration) and organic solidarity (functional integration) as dichotomous social typologies (Olsen, 1968:161).

In summarizing this section on selected theoretical components and their contributions to the development of this study's constructs, it should be noted that the appearance of the functional perspective as a dominant source of concepts is somewhat of an empirical illusion. This is not only in the sense of manifest biases, but also as an outcome of a process whereby the concepts seem to fit best with the study data. The arguments opposing the functionalist perspective and concomitant concepts of social systems, social action processes, integration and institutionalization, as well as construct-type typological theories are many. Perhaps, given different data inputs from the phenomena under study, the perspectives of conflict, symbolic interaction or other forms of interpretation would prevail. Indeed, the final analysis and evolution of the analytical framework may suggest a rationale for the employment of other perspectives.
The Organizational Frame of Reference

Referring to the descriptive framework in Chapter II on page 35, one notices the higher status of the "condition" component. Two limiting factors in this model have also influenced the choice of theoretical orientation. First, the model (as presented)\(^1\) represents a closed system. Analytical induction and functional theories receive their strongest criticisms from this approach; however, the criticisms are mitigated by the constant comparative method (see page 19). Keeping in mind that this model's primary focus is upon the "emergence process," the initial research question dealt with the explanation of the process in local community (non-networked) collectivities. It was considered proper to isolate the organization as much as possible, generate an analysis, and then assess the relevance of exogenous or intervening factors. Previous studies of disaster-related groups have indicated a general reluctance of the local groups toward direct interdependent interactions with other organizations or subsystems—especially during the early phases of the organizing process (Walsh, 1981).

Second, the elevated stature of the "condition" component signifies its unique properties in relation to the social phenomena. There is little doubt that the "condition" relative

\(^1\)This model is a simplified illustration of Quarantelli's proposed analytical model, "An Interim Report: Emergent Citizens Groups in Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Activities," January, 1983.
to collectivities is the key to actual realization of the LGOs and their operational "characteristics," "careers," and "consequences." The meeting of certain "conditions" has provided the sample of cases, which by default would not have existed otherwise.

Enough has been said or implied concerning the theoretical bases of social systems. The literature abounds with terms of applicable usage in construct types, much of which should be considered synononomous. In fact, the entire vocabulary of the functional legacy is seemingly overgrown and in need of drastic pruning. Nevertheless, the concepts provide some stable points from which the differences in behaviors, values, and other attributes can be determined. Although categorical groupings of social variables necessarily concern this study, of equal importance is the tracing out of the systems in terms of the presence or absence of interactions in the disaster-related situational event, and the definition of those systems of interaction, associated values, and customary or cultural behaviors.

Synthesis of the Construct Components

The first construct component is the "relational system." This system is characterized principally by integrative properties inherent in the individual and manifested by the LGO's behavior. Relational systems are interactive with the customary behavior system (cultural interest) and the value
system in that the relational system represents both the structural network within a community and the functional requirements which sustain the entity within a community.

LGOs tend to behave within the framework of normative actions based on the consensus of the participants' beliefs which are a function of their socialization and cultural backgrounds. Hence, a generic goal- or task-driven activity being conducted by a particular type of organization may exhibit extreme differences from the pre-established normative community organizational patterns. A specific example of this might include senior citizen meals, community mental health programs, banking services, or industrial development activities, whereby in one community the responsible organization is relatively autonomous, while in another the organization is quite dependent upon other organizations to accomplish it tasks.

The purpose of meeting functional requirements through the relational system is to prevent disorganization. Such disorganization is effectively admonished in a community or society by means of institutional sanctions or social control. Although specific functional-requirement compliance is likely to influence and limit the LGO's activities at any given point in time within the larger social setting, such compliance (or concern about compliance) indicates the influential impact that the community has upon the organization and/or the interpersonal relationships that its members have with other social entities.
Inherent in this concept are the normative survival and functional requirement rules of behavior necessary to gain entry into the social setting and reduce propensities toward disorganization (Olsen, 1976:75-76). Such specific requirements are likely to influence and limit the subsystem's organizational form and activities at any given point in time in the larger social system. The dynamics of this principle are extended throughout the phenomena of organization, but they are particularly manifest in the traditions of bureaucracies, economic organizations, and other types of complex organizations. Nevertheless, social organizations and less complex structures must rely to some extent on the same normative criteria even though they enjoy greater flexibility. In general, the degree of flexibility increases in societies where there are higher levels of differentiation (heterogeneity), specialization, and stratification. As a consequence, flexibility is at its widest spectrum in the urban place (Olsen, 1976).

The pre-organization conditions constitute an important feature of the LGOs at the community level. The invention of such entities is not based on radically new modes of organizational structures, rather on the event that necessitates collective action. The mode of organization is simply an instrument of interaction that meets the functional requirements within its culture. Thus, the conceptual hypothesis predicts differences in the modes of organization between
rural and urban social settings based on specific preorganizational and social behavioral conditions within the community.

The second notion of the relational system component includes the form characteristics of the LGO in context of the community's organizational environment. Basically, Evan discusses this perspective in the context of structural reference. The structural referent pertains to the normativeness of the organization's form in relation to the forms of other organizations with which it interacts.

Two types of reference organizations may exist in the social environment. The first type is termed the "comparative" reference organization. These are organizations operating in similar realms of activity. In such instances, the form of the extant organization is adopted by the emerging or developing organization. Thus, the norms of organizational form are transmitted by model-types. For example, fire departments, planning departments, 4-H clubs, school systems, and so forth are generally manifestations of other model-types. In terms of the LGO, reference organizations may be shaped by the past experience or knowledge of similar organized events pertaining to community action either derived from internal or external community sources. Various forms of media may also contribute to the model-type or form that an organization takes. Many public and private agencies, the Sierra Club for one, provide "cookbooks" for
the development of community action organizations, and the
mass media routinely provides accounts of such organizations
in action from which formulative ideas can be generated.

The second type of reference organization is termed the
"normative" organization. This category is similar to the
functional requirements aspect of the relational system;
however, it specifically refers to those organizations that
are directly interactive and interdependent with other commu-
nity organizations. Specifically, the interaction is norma-
tive between two or more dissimilar organizational forms,
regardless of whether or not the interaction is conducted by
means of coercion, persuasion, or utilitarian exchange.
This type of normative reference is meant to infer that the
members orient themselves to the norms and values of their
own organizations and exhibit greater loyalty to them when
interfacing with outsiders. The degree of normative
reference tends to increase proportionately in relation to
increases in the dialectic composition of the members. For
instance, the complex of multidisciplinary expertise con-
tained in hospitals, R & D institutions, universities, and
industrial design organizations tends to produce entities
that are more dialectical than hierarchical in structure.
These entities often produce an environment of diverse
activities and accomplishments, but often at the cost of
goal displacement of the organization's main mission. For
the LGO, a normative reference format might include commitment
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of social systems interacting; while in another community the economic or political structure might be sovereign. The conduct of community action in either community could be equally important, but the organization which institutes such actions would reflect the influences of the sovereign domain.

The traditional perspective of community action and change process links the change organization with its level of community spirit, or its ability to compromise interests and act collectively for the common good. Customary behavior is very much akin to the idea of "cultural lag" in certain sections of society. This concept implies that the material culture (technologies) advances at a more rapid rate than non-material culture (social institutions). Social problems are created until the values of the culture, or changes in customary behaviors, catch-up with the values of materials. From the LGO perspective, this notion would imply that organizations entrenched in customary behaviors--other than technologically value-oriented systems--are constraining opportunities to maximize their goal attainment. Such situations exist where community ethics and spirit are revered and interrelated.

Systems of Values

Value systems are the specific manifestations of values held by the individual. They correspond with the individual's
behavior in the relational systems with which he interacts. The value systems may be differentiated on the basis of the type of relational systems with which they are associated. Commonly, the values of an individual are psychological constructs involved the person's past experiences and emotional ties. They affect the individual's choices of behaviors and those things which he selects to act upon.

In the context of organizational behavior, the individual must perceive that his personal values are in harmony with the collective values active within the functional system. Values in relation to community action organizations and an individual's perceptions of common good activities may be expressed in terms of the individual's attitudes toward how decisions are made at the community level. The critical test of differentiation within the social normative concept of democracy lies in the pluralistic and elitist views of local power. Additionally, the factor of time, either in terms of an individual's age and/or experience, connotes relative perceptions of values which may be differentiated. And finally, the relationship between an individual's values and his interests may reflect the level of commitment he extends to the collective action.

From the viewpoint of the individual in society, values which are learned are not internalized in the sense of their being self-maintaining; rather, they must be continually reinforced and maintained by inputs from the social setting
in which the individual is located. In the complex social setting, the maintenance and transmission of values is a fairly specialized function of various institutions, including the legal, educational, and economic systems. However, an important link between the "root values" in America, namely democracy, freedom, and equality, and specific interests, is the institution of the media. The relationship between the system of values and the media may be drawn where an individual perceives the media as an indirect socialization instrument that can be employed to influence a segment of the population. Likewise, organizations which share this perception may consider themselves to be in complex, highly competitive and/or adversarial situations.

The Rural-Urban Variable Under Consideration in the Social Setting

The structural approach to the rural-urban construct-type for this study's analytical framework is delineated in the context of the socio-anthropological cultural component model of Arensberg and Kimball (1965). Again, these components include the relational, customary behavior, and values systems. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of the rural-urban variable concluding with those variables related to the contextual premises of the cultural components.
Rural and urban differences, rural community change, and rural social organization have been traditional topics of considerable research in the domain of rural sociology (Sims, 1940; Nelson, 1955; Copp, 1964; Stokes and Miller, 1975). The chronicle of general research interests in rural sociology dates prior to the 1930's when early studies focused on the social problems manifested in isolated, agriculturally-based communities. With the incentive of generating reform (from a predominantly Functionalist's perspective), many of these initial problem-identification studies substantiated their findings in a comparative process juxtaposed to the conditions of urban social life (Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929; Nelson, 1955). Consequently, the research format implied a negativity and general disparity for the rural resident, that of good people living in an ideal social/natural environment, yet being exploited by the "dependent" urban masses. In the period from the late 1940's to the late 1960's, the rural sociology emphasis turned to applied means of improving rural conditions (Bertrand, 1982). Contemporary studies since the early 1970's have focused on concerns such as, the rural turnaround in migration patterns, environmental quality, and the changing structure of agriculture. Yet, throughout the entire span of rural sociological studies, the theme of rural-urban differences has persisted.

The conceptualization of cognitive, behavioral, and structural levels of differentiation generated by the works
of Wirth (1938) created the ground for the accommodation of construct-type theoretical perspectives like the "mechanic-organic" schema (Durkheim), "status-contract" schema (Maine), and "Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft" schema (Tonnies). Throughout the first half of the twentieth century the research generally substantiated the disparity of features between the rural and urban social setting in the United States (Tremblay and Dunlap, 1978). Working from primarily an ideal-type schema, polar extreme models of urban and rural society came into the forefront of scholarly activity. Wirth (1938) established the characteristics of rurality as having a low population density, homogeneous social groupings, informal social organization, a customary or traditional orientation, and highly integrated social roles. Assigning urbanity the opposite characteristics provided the basis for a rural-urban continuum.

Fundamentally, it has been the application of this continuum in generating typologies that has caused the persistent debate on rural-urban differences. The precise differences that exist in specific rural-urban situations are not necessarily characteristic in other rural-urban situations. Hence, the validity of the continuum has been brought into question in many instances (Duncan, 1957; Dewey, 1960; Willits and Bealer, 1967). As a result, the employment of the continuum as a generalized model has diminished significantly; however, the pursuit of rural-urban differences
has remained viable from a number of other perspectives.

Although there are several examples of viable rural-urban perspectives, two areas of rural studies emanating from sociology are of particular concern to this research: 1) rural social systems, and 2) values and attitudes research. The first area, rural social systems, emerged early in the rural-urban differences domain and focused on the community aspect of society. The social system perspective denotes patterned interactions or networks of individuals within the societal context "whose relations to each other are mutually oriented through the definition and mediation of a pattern of structured and shared symbols" (Loomis, 1951, 1960). The social system performs goal-oriented tasks and maintenance functions which include both external and internal controls of social behavior (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). Sociometric methods of studying social systems provide the opportunity to assess social systems in the range of simple-to-complex social environments. To wit, ideal-types may be construed on the basis of simplicity/complexity among social systems (e.g., the analysis of several social systems within a city, or simplicity/complexity between social settings, or the comparison of social systems in rural and urban communities). Loomis and Beegle (1950) and Loomis (1950) concentrating on the rural community (the "ideal-type"/ Gemeinschaft system) identified high levels of particularistic value interactions within the social system networks
and between the subsystems of the community (Sanders, 1977). One major assumption derived from the social systems approach qualitatively implied that many of the problems facing rural communities were directly related to the lack of more complex systems of social organization.

In the decade of the 1950's, social systems theory (Parsons, 1951; Parsons, Shils, and Olds, 1951; Loomis, 1953) provided the framework for models of social action in the community. This theoretical approach suggested that rural communities could solve a multitude of social problems through processes of planned change. The link between the theory and its application was enhanced by the amendment of the Hatch Act in 1955 which enabled a national comprehensive research and extension institution to be developed for the improvement of rural life. The diffusion of community-oriented action processes was rapidly carried out by county agricultural extension offices and with the support of land-grant university systems. Prior to this time, extension services were primarily focused on assisting the farmer and the individual rural resident through the introduction of new technologies and practical education, with the ultimate aim of increasing agricultural productivity and improving the quality of life.

The introduction of a "community fix" social action approach by rural sociologists through extension practitioners necessitated a strategy that would not threaten the latter's traditional role in the community. Although the
The conflict approach to social change (Alinsky) was generally known to the profession, most rural sociologists of the time argued that such an approach was not suitable in the rural sector (Powers, 1971). On the other hand, the widespread, favored approach adopted by the extension service was designed to maximize utility, minimize the impact between the change agent (extension) and the means of change, and mitigate or abate controversial issues—all within the context of the existing normative social structure.

The typical strategy employed is expressed succinctly in the following "community fix" objectives:

1. Awareness of the need, definition of the situation, and tentative selection of project objectives.
2. Some form of organization—likely committees—and analysis of the situation.
3. Analysis of alternatives until the first acceptable alternative is researched.
4. Gaining of support and participation by the necessary target systems.
5. Completion of action and observation of results.

(Powers, 1971:189)

Although there has been criticism of the processes and strategies practiced in rural communities from within the rural sociology profession, extensive documentation of community-based activities generally supports its effectiveness. The employment of models such as "Beal's social action construct" and "Loomis' social system typology" within
the "Gemeinschaft" system context has proven to facilitate community needs for organized problem resolution, a gradual evolution toward universalistic value media. It also has maintained a reduced level of community tension (Powers, 1971) with a minimum of interorganizational conflict.

Thus, in conjunction with the democratic ideologies and functional theories of community action, the extension service has had a very visible role (Cochrane, 1965; Sanders, 1977; Christenson and Robinson, 1980) in planned social change activities. Its institutional involvement in the local agricultural efforts and community development programs over the past 70 years has seemingly established an organizational behavior imprint which, in turn, has diffused into nonextension-related matters in the majority of rural communities. Implications of this behavioral pattern are illustrated in several passages of an evaluative report on Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (Madden, 1977). In this Act, Title V provides federal support for direct research and program development by the land grant universities or other qualified institutions in the area of nonfarm rural development. Many of the 50 states reported in their programs' evaluations that the most important lesson they (the state institution) had learned was to involve local citizens in all stages of program development. "The consensus of opinion among nearly half the states was that when local people identify the need and set priorities, projects are
more likely to be carried to completion. Further, involving citizens enhances the likelihood that local rural development capabilities may increase" (Madden, 1977:63-64).

Although rural social systems and their concomitant social organizations or subsystems will vary to degrees with respect to goal-oriented tasks and socio-environmental maintenance functions, their "structural-functional" characteristics are quite similar. Strictly in terms of rural community action, there is very little evidence of deviation in the organizational behavioral norm.

The second area of discussion involved with the "Rural-Urban perspective" is that of values and attitudes. The notion of separate sets of values and attitudes for rural and urban inhabitants garnered early attention by those interested in the problems of rural society (Bailey, 1905; Bernard, 1917; Galpin, 1924; Groves, 1922; Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929). In conjunction with the spatial, behavioral, and social attribute parameters of rurality, conceptualized by Wirth (1938), (namely; low density population, homogeneous social groupings, integrated roles, and so forth), the introduction of social-psychological assumptions provided additional construct types for rural-urban differences. The attitude and value concepts introduced by individuals like Bernard (1917), Groves (1922), W. C. Smith (1927), and Zimmerman and Anderson (1927), not only provided an additional perspective on the phenomena but also employed a methodology
which was to have major impacts on research. Specifically, survey research and scales of attitudinal measurement provided an efficient and effective means to examine all kinds of populations and social situations within a relatively short period of time—and at reasonable costs. From the early years to present, attitude and value scale measurements have been applied to almost every conceivable research area with the objective of identifying differential characteristics along the ideological lines of the rural and urban actor.

The attitudes and value constructs investigated during the first half of this century mainly focused upon the idea of agrarian-urban differences. Fundamentally, the value differences indicated a strong rural emphasis on work, the land, and the family, while the salient urban emphasis was centered on pleasure, consumption, and status (Landis and Hatt, 1954). However, a subsequent synthesis of the literature on agrarianism produced a much more detailed value structure for agrarian society, one which elaborated basic differences between regions of the agrarian society (Smith, 1981). Specifically, Inge (1969) postulated eight categories of pro-agrarian values: Christian stewardship, moral excellence from labor, self-sufficiency and individual freedom, opposition to the increasing scale of government, the identification of farm roles with holism, hostility to the urban sector, centrality of small community and peer groups, and social interaction in brotherhood and cooperation.
The linkages between value ideologies and attitudinal characteristics in the historical context of agrarian-rural differences have been examined by sociologists in many areas, including: unionism, price supports, welfare programs, social security, government regulations, international relations (Beers, 1953); familialism (Reiss, 1959; Key, 1961; Straus, 1969); education (Beers, 1953; Slocum, 1967); occupation, modernization, adoption of technologies, organizational participation, political participation, mobility, fertility, and so forth (see Glenn and Alston, 1967; Napier, 1973; Glenn and Hill, 1977).

Although mentioned as early as 1905 (Bailey), it was not until just after the 1950's that the notion of a "rural" (rather than "agrarian") ideology gained momentum. In essence, Bailey had discussed the country lifestyle values in terms of "more room, less racket, better health, more freedom, and closer relations with sun and sky--but not for farming" (Buttel and Flinn, 1977; with reference to Schmitt, 1969). Within the social research arena, the works of individuals like Nelson (1954), Gladden and Christiansen (1956), Dewey (1960), and Greer (1963) leveled extreme challenges to the concept of traditional agrarian-urban values/attitude differences. Undeniably, rural America was converging with the urban sector, or coming under ever-increasing levels of metropolitan or urban dominance (Bogue, 1950; Anderson and Collier, 1956; Duncan, 1956; Goldsmith
and Copp, 1963; Stoeckel and Beegle, 1966). In effect, logical recognition of changes in the rural social setting, along with empirical convictions by rural social scientists that there were indeed still differences between rural and urban, led to greater utilization of differentiation measures in the sense of the neo-rural value ideology (Miller and Kallich, 1979). In this more contemporary thinking, issues like attitudes toward various community services, industrial and economic development, conservation of natural resources, housing development, mass transportation, environmental quality, and energy conservation were assessed to measure differences between the rural and urban populations (Green, 1981).

In the mid-1970's the rural population turnaround, coupled with the fact that issues in the rural communities were becoming more and more complex (as predicted by Greer and others) (Green, 1981), provided impetus for the argument that rural-urban attitudinal and value differences are not relatively significant. Van Es and Brown concluded that attitude measures were not good predictors of place of residence when they examined political and religious orientations in rural and urban communities of western Illinois (1974). They did, however, comparatively examine the attitude variables against behavioral variables and determined that the behavioral variables (or a behavioral approach) was more discrete and predictive. Three years later, one of the most
Important studies on this issue were conducted at the University of Wisconsin when Buttel and Flinn (1977) analyzed a statewide survey on environmental concern utilizing reliable measurement scales for the agrarian and rural value ideologies. In effect, their findings failed to confirm that these values were unique to a specific loci, given assignments of place of residence in terms of population size (Buttel and Flinn, 1977:553-554).

Presently, studies of rural-urban differences are drifting away from theoretical paradigms based on fundamental attitude and value ideologies. Ambiguity has been heightened within this area of interest by conflicting empirical research and substantiated differences based on situational criteria. For example, Tremblay and Dunlap (1978) find rural-urban differences toward concern for the environment, but attribute such differences to physical exposure to pollution situations; while Miller and Crider (1979) find differences of actual economic and interpersonal community satisfaction between specific rural and urban communities, a pattern which, nevertheless, can be reversed given other sample communities to compare.

A reasonable summary of the research on rural-urban values and attitudes differences seems to support the findings of Buttel and Flinn which, when generalized, describe a mass American society from which a portion embraces the agrarian/rural ideology, regardless of their place of residence.
On the other hand, it also seems likely that rural sociologists, social ecologists, and others will continue to conduct comparative studies of specific phenomena between rural and urban social-geographic environments. Those particularly interested in the development of theory may find new grounds from the examination of behavior components and axioms of systems and organizations, locations, and technologies.

The discussion of the social systems perspective and attitude/value differences in the context of the rural-urban dichotomy provides the historic oversimplification that rural society is a non-complex, non-conflict amalgamation whose individual actors share common conservative values. Such an assessment is probably more true when made in strictly comparative terms with the urban or mass society. It is much less accurate when such an assessment is conducted within the community frame of reference. This, perhaps, is the dilemma of the rural-urban perspective, particularly when the objectivity of the research concerns the nature of social change. In a similar vein Gusfield has stated:

The linear theory of evolutionary change perceived social change as moving away from one set of conditions and toward another: from community to society. The coherence of both forms and the problematic relation between them in specific, empirical cases makes the theory unacceptable as a scientific description of how social change occurs or is occurring today. In positing "community" as opposite "society," "tradition" opposite "modernity," both the
evolutionary sociologists and the modernization theorists have given an overly simplified and distorted picture of how and in what direction change takes place in contemporary life (1975: 80).

Summary

The recognition that the agrarian/rural ideology is no longer unique to non-urban places or that social systems simply become more complex as population densities increase does not leave all questions answered with respect to social change. Basically, neither the processes nor their implication are completely understood, particularly with respect to the structurally non-urbanized areas that may be impacted in the future. To dismiss social systems and values as nonrelevant to the phenomenon of social differentiation, social change, and social order would be totally illogical and dysfunctional to any efforts to construct models of community or society (Warren, 1969).

The sum and substance of the rural-urban perspective seems to rest, at this point in time, on the questions of whether there are real differences, and, if there are, how important could they be in terms of truly understanding the society? Clearly, some believe the issue is moot and relatively unimportant; while others believe the opposite. In addition, some have claimed that differences are unique and isolated; while others have claimed that differences are normative and generic. From an objective stance, the
literature has not convincingly refuted either the importance or the existence of rural-urban difference, and most arguments have been levied from the attitudinal research domain, rather than from behavioral observations. This assessment, therefore, leaves open the argument that differences may be manifest in behavioral aspects of rural and urban social activities. Furthermore, should differences exist between the rural and urban social settings, the relative existence poses challenges for understanding such phenomena, and, ideally, relating the social situation to processes which could be problematic or non-problematic to social order in a massing society. Until all predominant institutional arenas of social phenomena have been examined and principally understood in the context of rural-urban social difference, the application of the rural-urban typology or concept poses defendable logic.

In this comparative study, rural locations and concomitant LGOs will be operationalized as stated in the definitional criteria presented in Chapter II. Specifically, a rural LGO is one which emerged and developed in a community that is not located within a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA); where the community's dominant economic base activity is agricultural production, natural resources extraction, or recreation; and where the community's population does not exceed 20,000 residents. The operationalization of the dichotomous rural-urban variable follows the
implicative path of social activity differences which Loomis and Beegle explore with the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft typology. In brief, the Gemeinschaft relationship signifies the traditional, sentimental, general, informal, personal, and simple types of relationships common to the rural community; whereas, the Gesellschaft relationships are signified by the extreme opposites of the former characteristics and are found primarily within the urban or metropolitan community.
CHAPTER IV

THE COMPARATIVE STUDY: DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the data collected on the eight disaster-related LGOs under study. The objective of the analysis is to present empirical patterns of the behaviors and attributes of the LGOs, or in effect, describe their focal organizational cultures.

The development of "core categories"\(^1\) procedurally generated from the induced analytical framework provides a best-fit source of guidance for the selective coding of data, ordering of process concepts and variables, and positing of properties and hypotheses on the differences in the basic social processes of the organizations.

The method advocated by the grounded theory approach for development of construct types is reviewed briefly here to clarify the data analysis techniques. As previously covered, Glaser (1978:65) states, "all typologies are based on a differentiating criteria...the criteria used in grounded

\(^1\)Glaser refers to core categories as the main themes, concerns, or problems associated with social patterns of behavior (see Theoretical Sensitivity, 1978, Chapter III).
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theory are earned distinctions, not received distinctions."
By "not received" he means that the purpose of using grounded
theory is to generate empirically-based hypotheses to develop
new theories or to fit into existing ones, not to test
abstract hypotheses from theoretical assumptions. The
approach, however, condones the use of whatever means are
available, including abstract concepts or models, for
"selective coding" purposes (Glaser, 1978:61).

In this study, the first stage of the analysis will
delineate the organizational differences of the LGOs at the
point of initial organizing and as related to the rural or
urban community environs. Since, for the most part, the LGOs
were already at some level of formal organization when they
were originally examined, the first stage of analysis will
focus on the descriptive-historic data relevant to the LGOs' emergence and organizing processes. This approach attempts
to control for the factor of time; however, it must be
recognized that: time plus circumstances cannot be controlled in field research. The preliminary process of categorizing empirical features from the "constant comparative" method of analysis produced an extensive list of condition, characteristic, career, and consequence components for the eight cases. A working table was constructed which displayed empirical generalizations for 47 non-discrete component categories in each LGO case. Appendix E provides the list of component categories. From this working table, the component features
which were dichotomous between the rural and urban cases were retained for analysis. The variables of differentiation that emerged are described under the headings of the socio-cultural dimensions and the system of values dimensions that are derived from the social systems analytical framework.

The second stage of the analysis will assess the qualitative longitudinal and quantitative follow-up data. This assessment provides the opportunity to evaluate the construct model and discuss empirical factors of stability and/or change in the collectivity phenomena.

Stage I: The Initial Organizing Period

Dimensions of the Socio-Cultural Systems: Participants and Organizational Norms

The normative pattern of development of the LGOs under study exhibited characteristic processes that differed consistently on the basis of rural and urban settings. Previous experience of this researcher in the field of rural and urban community development has provided an extensive background on these processes, experience which corroborates the study's findings that these behaviors are unique and predictive on the basis of their social setting.

The general mode of grass roots organizing behavior in the rural socio-environmental setting, as substantiated by the data analysis, is conservative and simple in terms of meeting functional requirements. Using the generalized rural LGO as an example, one perceives that the processes of
organizing mirrored those aspects of action that participants
had previously experienced. They had obviously been
influenced by similar modes of "institutionalized methods." Notably revealing was the high incidence of rural partici-
pants with a prior history of community involvement, either
with the county extension service or other governmentally-
related community action or development agencies. Indeed,
many of the leaders and participants of the rural LGOs had
had direct experience with institutionalized community
improvement programs.

Characteristically, the rural organizing process hinged
on the formulation of roles and responsibilities that were
identified as necessary by the initial collectivity. In the
initial gathering, the selection of a formal leader or leaders
was usually the first action. This was commonly followed by
the development of a goal or set of formalizing objectives.
Next, the activity focused on the establishment of working
committees which were generally directed toward liaison tasks
within the community, such as contacting existing organiza-
tions for support, finding out where the problem fit into the
planned arenas of community government responsibility, and
so forth.

On the other hand, in the urban organizing process, the
participants at the initial gathering usually accepted the
organizer or organizers as the leader(s); however, persons
with specific kinds of expertise (e.g., technological or
political) would autonomously state what they were going to do in behalf of the organization and indicate the resources they would need (if any) to carry out their stated tasks. Then the leader(s) would usually ask for volunteers to help these self-selected individuals. Goals were generally discussed at the initial gathering, but the common outcome was a "wait and see until we get some more facts" type of decision.

The interpersonal-relationship patterns of the rural and urban LGOs reflected obvious differences as illustrated by the organizing processes described above. The interpersonal relationships of the rural LGO members were generally pre-established. A majority of the membership either had kinship or other primary kinds of social ties with one another. In addition, most rural members had some kind of social linkage with significant others within the community. Many of the latter types of ties were evidenced by the high levels of LGO-member participation in other organizations and/or community activities. Another rather salient characteristic of the rural organizing behavior was the location of meetings. In the rural settings the organizations commonly used community facilities, including the Sportsman's Club, the city library, the community activities center, or even the city hall.

By contrast, the urban LGO members, outside of a small core group, were generally not acquainted with one another prior to the initial meeting. The common ties between
members at the initial organizing phase were those of husband and wife, immediate neighbors, or in some cases, simply an ability to recognize someone else and associate him or her to a particular home or business. Likewise, the urban participants' ties to the community generally were not close. Most individuals did not know by name who their local official agency directors were or even the names of their local elected government representatives. In the initial stages, though, there were individual-member ties with outside experts, such as people known through work or other associations, a relative in another community, or a political linkage derived from extra-community activities. Additionally, even though there existed as equal an opportunity for the urban LGOs to use community or public facilities for meetings as for their rural counterparts, the urban organizers opted to meet at someone's residence during the initial organizing stages.

The goal- and task-formulation processes of the rural LGOs centered chiefly upon the development of general community-oriented topics. For example, when rural LGO respondents were asked about the intention of their organization's goal, they often would respond with statements like: "We want to help the community...; It's in the best interest of the community...; or We have to help protect the community from..." The articulated goals of the rural LGOs could be considered less sophisticated than their urban counterparts. By this it is meant that none of the rural LGOs' goals were
tied to processes of litigation or legislation. The rural organizations were basically concerned with either abatement or mitigation activities. For the most part, they expected these intended results would come from the Establishment (through cooperation) or else they would have to take direct project development action themselves. In two of the rural cases, the respondents made comments that if appropriate action was not taken in their behalf by the responsible parties (public and private), they would take some kind of vigilante-type of action.

Goals generated within the urban LGOs were initially quite specific and seemingly difficult to articulate; however, they were internally-oriented to the task or problem. The responses commonly elicited from members on their goal or task intentions reflected sentiments like: "We're going to hold someone accountable for the problem...; We're going to do everything we can to close down something (or prevent something)...; We need to do something to protect our investments and future." Invariably, the goal/task-related actions, though laden with intentions to mitigate or abate a specific problem, took the form of litigation or legislation (or the externally-directed threat thereof), and their responses implied the confrontational expectations of such actions.

The cultural aspects of the local community setting and how individual participants in the LGOs related to such aspects represents another condition that affects
organizational-behavioral characteristics. In turn, these types of characteristics provide points of differentiation between the rural and urban LGOs. In general, the prior cultural milieu discussion in Chapter III (wherein rural-urban typologies reflect rural tradition and urban cosmopolitanism respectively) infers the properties of behavior flexibility and institutionalized controls. As mentioned before, in the small rural setting traditional customs and community values tend to provide narrow parameters of flexibility in normative behaviors. Cultural change, as it is introduced to such settings, has generally been associated with dynamic diffusion and adoption of material values originating from external forces or sources (Ogburn, 1922; Mercer, 1956; Rogers, 1962; Evan, 1978).

In the rural LGO context, the constraints of traditions and customs on organizational behavior are manifested in the members' beliefs in the democratic system and the concept of cooperation. To clarify, the democratic process is to them a fundamental ideal that accommodates and affords their values and ways of life. Cooperation, on the other hand, is the means of protecting the democratic process.

Cosmopolitanism essentially provides a cultural arena that offers something for everyone, regardless of their basic belief structures. Consequently, what might be regarded as culturally deviant in a rural community would be considered culturally normative in an urban community. Thus, the
complete range of local grass roots organizational types, from hierarchically- to dialectically-structured entities which are integrated within all institutional spheres in the social environments, may be found in the urban community.

Characteristically, the rural LGOs preferred to be an integral part of the stable community structure and to garner support from it. As an internalized concept of the rural setting, the influencing structure is the community. From the sociological concept, the community, in these cases, was the institution. To facilitate integration many activities performed by the rural LGOs were oriented to their communities, but governed to some degree by other community organizational entities. For instance, some rural LGOs organized community picnics, educational programs, speakers bureaus, and volunteer work days, but many of these activities were coordinated with other social organizations in the community. In addition, they tended to pass certain rewards of accomplishment on to the local public officials or to the community in general. But in exchange for these rewarding behaviors, they expected and generally received certain services and/or supports from the community. Overall, there wasn't any covertness exhibited in the rural LGOs' activities; nearly everyone in the community was aware of these organizations and most supported their goals.

The urban LGOs had little initial regard for their communities' organizational environment. Most could not even
identify their communities' organizational systems. Their local organizing activities focused mostly on perceived (or actual) unattended disaster-related issues which involved their playing on specific emotions and attracting sympathizers from the at-large community population. Although members of the urban LGOs also embraced the concept of democracy, both in their organizational concepts and in the general governance processes, their interpretation of the democratic operating concept was quite different from that of the rural LGOs. Essentially, the urban members felt a much stronger need to promote a public-interest issue and freely advance that issue in a highly politicized and resource-competitive environment. To win at any cost symbolized a successful exercise in democracy to them. Establishment of a supportive following for their issues from the general public provided the necessary conditions for the urban LGOs to integrate with other social systems in the community. Nevertheless, the means of access to established organizations and institutions was often through confrontation and contemptuous behavior.

The role that the local media played to the eight LGOs was fundamental with respect to their development of resources, integration processes, and issue articulation. Generically speaking, the media was found to be a key factor in providing saliency, legitimacy, and respectability to the LGOs. Although the local media proved very important in many common
areas of the organizations' development, operations and maintenance, initial behaviors of the LGO members toward the media differed between the rural and urban communities.

In the rural communities the media attended the organizations' activities and covered the issues on their own initiative in order to gather local news. Initially, members of the rural LGOs did not recognize any particular advantage of the media coverage, but on the other hand, members of the local news media felt it a career opportunity to disseminate information on the issues.\(^2\) The local newspaper reporters tended to pursue and provide technical information to the rural LGOs on their issues, and the LGOs reciprocated by establishing an open-door policy to the local reporters. In this relationship, the local media acted as a "booster"\(^3\) and a buffer between the outside world. In other words, the local reporters verified, legitimized, and identified the entities and their territories, helping to establish concrete LGOs with which entities outside the community would have to reckon.

The urban LGOs initially felt that a necessary condition for their success was access to media attention. Even in the

\(^2\) A discussion of this phenomena is presented in "A Case Study Analysis of the Relationships of Local Newspapers and Disaster-Related Citizen Groups," Preliminary Paper #86, Disaster Research Center, The Ohio State University, 1983.

case of Slide City, where the media was indirectly responsible for its creation, the perceived need for a media strategy was expressed. In all the urban LGO cases, the local medias were involved. However, unlike the rural LGO cases, the urban LGOs intentionally had contacted their local medias and strategized their activities in as newsworthy a fashion as they could so to encourage coverage. Although media personnel knew how they were being used, they also tended to pursue the LGO events with the same career expectations as those of the rural community media. In terms of establishing proprietary rights and territories, the urban LGOs shared the same concerns as their rural counterparts; however, the manifest logic of the urban LGOs was to generate as much visibility and exposure of their issues as possible.

Overview of the Socio-Cultural Construct Type

From the core category of socio-culture, six substantive variables of differentiation were obvious. These include: 1) pre-established local organizational patterns for community action/development, 2) interpersonal relationship ties among the LGO members and ties between LGO members and significant others in the community, 3) goal sophistication, 4) behavioral action attributes of the LGOs, 5) local institutional influences, and 6) the role of the media relationship to the LGO.
Differentiating terms used for classification of each variable are operationalized as follows:

1) Pre-established local organizational patterns express the initial "organization format" for the LGO's roles and responsibilities. When an LGO models itself on other social subsystems, either extant or part of past community experience, the functional requirement norms are expressed by the term comparative. When an LGO pays little regard or has minimal knowledge of or experience with reference-type organizations and is solely interested in serving a specific function within the community, the functional requirement norms are expressed as normative.

2) Members' interpersonal relations represent the level of local "community awareness" as established by prior social linkages within the LGO membership and between the members of the LGO and significant others outside the LGO. Previous patterns of social interaction tend to influence the characteristic behavior of the organization (Forrest, 1972). The designation of community internal or community external signifies the generalized patterns of social interaction in the respective LGOs.
3) "Goal-oriented sophistication" indicates whether or not the goal of an LGO infers simple or complex actions for its attainment.

4) The manifest organizational or "perceived action behavior" attributes are expressions of the anticipated actions which members feel are necessary to accomplish their goals. Confrontational implies that the members feel they would have to "fight" the system; whereas, accommodative implies that the members expect cooperative action responses from responsible parties.

5) Local institutional influences refer to the elasticity of the communities' institutional establishment with regard to influencing the kinds of behavior of the LGOs, or the allowance of "operational freedom." The term flexible refers to those conditions where sanctions are not perceived by the LGO members, and the term inflexible refers to the opposite condition.

6) The local news media relationship with the LGO reflects the "level of need perceived" by the organization to socialize a diffuse public to the values inherent in the disaster issue. The designation of the term unimportant implies that the LGO did not perceive any value differences regarding the issue within the community. The
term important implies that the LGO did perceive such value differences.

Table 3 on the following page illustrates the classification of the eight LGOs in terms of the socio-cultural variables.

Dimensions of the System of Values

In the study of organizations and systems, the analysis of interactions based on values focuses on what has been termed "value homophily" (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955). The thrust of this research was to determine what common values people share or appear to share in particular disaster-related situations. The fact that personal value structures play an important part in the survival of a social system is not problematic, but it is often quite difficult to determine whether the common values precede or follow the organizational interactions.

In this comparative study of LGOs, the assessment of personal values during the initial organizing period was dependent upon inferential interpretations and researcher observations which could be categorized for each case. One of the first steps in the data-collection process was a basic assessment of the local areas and the LGO memberships in terms of overall socio-economic status (SES). Although the rural and urban localities differed considerably in such lifestyle manifestations, each case had to be considered in
Table 3: Socio-Cultural Differentiating Characteristics of Selected Rural and Urban Local Grass Roots Organizations in Disaster-Related Situations: The Initial Organizing Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGO</th>
<th>Organizational Format</th>
<th>Community Awareness</th>
<th>Goal Sophistication</th>
<th>Perceived Action Behavior</th>
<th>Operational Freedom</th>
<th>Perceived Media Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide City</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclearopolis</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood City</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardville</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community Internal</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpburgh</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community Internal</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantistown</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community Internal</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raging Riverton</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community Internal</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the context of the community's socio-economic attributes. The general conclusion of this analysis is that the membership composition of the LGOs under study represents a middle- to upper-middle class strata within their respective communities. In addition, the members within the individual LGOs generally were homogenous in terms of their socio-economic status.

Educational and occupational components of the SES factors were also considered whenever possible. But the analysis of the individual case data did not reveal any specific behavioral patterns that would differentiate within a particular LGO or between the rural and urban entities. Further, the sex of members and leaders in all LGOs did not differ particularly between social settings. Yet, the organizational behaviors of each case illustrated to a significant extent that women did most of the routinized activities within the organization, but less of the decision making which was controlled by the male members. To wit, only one of the eight cases had a female leader at the onset.

The personal value one placed on an organized event may be reflected in his/her conformity to the internal activities of the entity involved (Webb et al., 1981). The LGOs were analyzed in terms of internal conflict among the membership. When asked this question directly, most respondents inferred that no conflict existed in their LGO. However, other informants and/or probing questions often revealed that such was not the case. For the eight selected cases, the
data indicated perfect differentiation between the rural and urban LGOs. Each of the four urban LGOs experienced incidents of internal conflict which resulted in either forms of compromise between antagonistic parties or alienation of certain members. In one particular situation the local media published information about the internal-conflict scenario from the point at which the conflict erupted to the time when the alienated member formed a local chapter of a regional organization also dealing with a disaster-related issue. This, of course, created further change in the LGO's interorganizational behavior. In contrast, the rural LGOs did not experience any internal conflict according to the data acquired by the researchers.

Another source of value expression is manifested in the assessment of the individuals' efforts and/or investments on behalf of the LGO. Such expressions may be seen in varying degrees in such forms as members' willingness to drive long distances to meetings or activities, their assuming personal expenses connected with LGO efforts, their providing personal technical/professional services to the organization, and their expenditure of personal time to further the organization's objectives. Members of the rural LGOs in comparison with their urban counterparts consistently demonstrated a greater willingness to lend themselves to their LGOs' activities. The urban LGO members, by contrast, were much more likely to be amenable to letting others (mainly the
leaders) do most of the active tasks. Most of the members of
the urban organizations said that their lives were too busy
to devote a lot of time to the LGO.

Yet another aspect of values could be gleaned from the
intended formalization behavior of the LGOs. Formal incor-
poration as a non-profit entity is generally done for iden-
tity solidification and legal reasons, such as collecting
donations and acquiring grants. But, it is also done for tax
shelter and personal liability purposes. Since the eight
LGOs had indicated minimal needs for direct funding, and
their identities had been fairly well established by the
media, there are grounds for the argument that individuals in
the LGOs perceived the needs to protect their actions from
liability and perhaps also realize the personal benefits of
gaining tax deductions from their financial investments into
the organizations. Though the occupational status (white
collar/blue collar) seemed consistently distributed between
the rural and urban organizations, the urban LGOs had access
to more professional counsel from attorneys, CPAs, and other
professionals. This may account for the disparity between
their formalization sophistication and that of the rural
organizations. While the exact reason for incorporation
remains open to conjecture, the differentiating pattern is
clearcut. All of the urban LGOs indicated intentions of
incorporation within their formulation stages, while their
rural counterparts did not consider such action.
Along with this formalization dimension, it should be mentioned that members' personal vested interests were considered in the system of values component. There appears to be little doubt that individuals are willing to exchange personal investment in an organization to maximize benefits of other vested interests (i.e., property, health, safety, etc.). However, the vested-interest assumption is a common condition to both the rural and urban LGOs. (Note: priority expression of vested interests are indicated in the goal implications discussed on pages 118 -119).

Finally, two other dimensions of values were indicated in the data comparisons. The first concerns the age of the participants in the LGOs. Age basically represents an investment of life experiences and exposure to various conditions. In turn, these experiences and conditions can affect the perceptions of social life and appropriate behavior. Visual estimations of the age structures of the LGOs led to the conclusions that the rural organizations' members were on the whole approximately 10 to 15 years older than the average ages of the urban organizations' members. Thus, the average age of the LGO members provided another point of differentiation between the rural and urban LGOs.

The second and last dimension relates to the length of residence in the community. Increased length of residence, along with age, provides a situation whereby specific reasons and/or resistances to change may be manifested in organizational
behavior. For instance, there is a greater likelihood that older residents have learned to accept or live with persistent disaster-related problems, such as flooding. Similarly, their properties are usually better protected from the disaster threat by location (e.g., a hilltop building site) or other safeguards; whereas, the newcomer may have recently purchased a new tract home in a development next to the flood-potential creek. Or, for example, the longtime resident may exhibit the attitude in becoming aware of a toxicity problem that if it was going to kill him, it would have done so by then. In essence, the older resident just might not be as willing to initiate change or react to certain disaster-related stimuli. The analysis of length of residence indicated that members of the rural LGOs had lived longer in their respective communities than the members of the urban LGOs.

In relation to the examination of age and length of residence variable, it was discovered that three of the rural LGOs had members who were referred to by some of the members as "kids" or "new folk." These references meant that the classified members were newcomers to the community, but were not considered transients or outsiders. In the initial organizing process, these individuals tended to offer assistance and support in conformance with the customary traits of the organization.
Overview of the System of Values Construct Type

From the core category of the system of values, five substantive variables of differentiation were identified. They include: 1) personal sentiments of conformity, 2) sentiments of investment and effort, 3) organizational incorporation, 4) age composition, and 5) length of residence.

Differentiating terms used for classification of each variable are operationalized as follows:

1) Strong personal sentiments of conformity toward the LGO by its members are exemplified by a lack of "internal conflict tendencies." The less that a member values the organization, the less his or her manner of behavior will conform; thus, there exists a greater propensity for internal conflict. The term dissent refers to those LGOs that have experienced conflict in their organizing processes. The term conform refers to those LGOs that have not experienced or exhibited conflict in their organizing processes.

2) Sentiments of personal effort and investment by "general member involvement" reflect the degree of commitment which is shared by the membership. LGOs whose members (including the core group and leaders) shared the desire or demonstrated a fairly equal distribution of personal efforts and investments to LGO activities are termed participant
active. LGOs that did not meet these criteria are termed participant passive.

3) If a LGO's members expressed intentions to "formalize" by incorporation, it is termed chartered. Those LGOs that expressed no intention of formally incorporating are termed unchartered.

4) The characterization of age composition represents the perceived age average for a particular LGO's membership. The dichotomous terms of younger or older simply infer a directional relationship between compared cases.

5) The "length of residence" expresses the average community tenure of the general membership of a particular LGO. It is indicated by the dichotomous terms of long-term and short-term, inferring a directional relationship between compared cases.

Table 4 on the following page presents the classification of the eight LGOs in terms of the system of values variables.
Table 4: System of Values Differentiating Characteristics of Selected Rural and Urban Local Grass Roots Organizations in Disaster-Related Situations: The Initial Organizing Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban LGO</th>
<th>Internal Conflict Tendencies</th>
<th>General Membership Involvement</th>
<th>Formalization</th>
<th>Age Composition</th>
<th>Length of Residence Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide City</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclearopolis</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood City</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural LGO</th>
<th>Conform</th>
<th>Participant Active</th>
<th>Unchartered</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>Long-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardville</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Participant Active</td>
<td>Unchartered</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpburgh</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Participant Active</td>
<td>Unchartered</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantistown</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Participant Active</td>
<td>Unchartered</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raging Riverton</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Participant Active</td>
<td>Unchartered</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Hypotheses of the Construct

The factors of differentiation constitute approximately 50 percent of the initially identified factors of commonality among the LGOs (refer to Appendix E). Although the fact that the levels of variance between the LGOs based on the factors of differentiation cannot be exacted because of lack of control over the timing for each case phenomena, there are, nonetheless, substantiating properties which merit a testable construct. The following section presents those properties and hypotheses as generated for the construct of rural-urban differences in emerging disaster-related LGOs.

In sum, the first stage of analysis provides a descriptive rural-urban construct of the comprehensive organizational culture characteristic differences within the social system's frame of reference. Table 5 provides an overview of the construct model. In the "ideal" sense, the patterns of the eight LGO cases provide a typology which distinguishes clear rural and urban differences when assessing local grassroots organizations during the initial organizing period.

Organizational Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Property:</th>
<th>The rural and urban LGOs in disaster-related situations that were examined in this study tend to differ in their organizational formats.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Property:</td>
<td>The primordial organizational format in rural and urban communities is based on comparative likeness or the norms of conformity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Property:</td>
<td>The range or parameters of conformity are much greater in the urban setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Rural-Urban Organizational Culture Typology for Local Grass Roots Organizations in Disaster-Related Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Gemeinschaft)</th>
<th>(Gesellschaft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural LGOs</td>
<td>Urban LGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Sophistication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Action Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Media Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Conflict Tendencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Membership Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchartered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is hypothesized that as emergent citizen groups in disaster-related situations begin to organize formally, those collectivities in the rural communities will attempt to maintain conformance by modeling their organization on pre-existing or existing community action entities.

Community Awareness

Observed Property: The rural and urban LGOs in disaster-related situations that were examined in this study differed as a result of their level of local community awareness.

- a) The LGOs in the rural communities were knowledgeable about and respectful of the norms of acceptable organized behavior within their communities.
- b) The LGOs in the rural communities perceived their effectiveness and efficiencies as an organization as dependent upon their conformance to the norms of behavior.
- c) The LGOs in the urban communities perceived their needs to be effective and efficient in dealing with community-external institutions or competitive with other entities within the community.

It is hypothesized that as the level of community awareness increases in an organizational population, the behavior of that organization will conform to the perceived or actual expected norms of the community, and such phenomena will be directly related to the rural community setting.

Goal Sophistication

Observed Property: The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study reflect differences on the basis of their goal orientations.

Generalized Property: Goal sophistication is largely dependent upon how the organizationally-related problem is defined.

Generalized Property: The more complex a social environment, the more likely the definition becomes complex, and the more likely that perceived needs for a sophisticated problem-solving goal exists.
It is hypothesized that the less complex a social or community environment, the less complex the goal; given identical problems, the rural community organizational goal(s) will be simpler than the urban community organizational goal(s).

**Perceived Action Behavior**

**Observed**

The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study differ with respect to their norms of perceived action behavior.

a) LGOs in rural communities felt that their goals would be best attained by cooperation and accommodation with other organizations in the communities; however, LGOs in urban communities felt that they had to confront and compete for the supports necessary for goal attainment.

It is hypothesized that beliefs in support of the need to act in a confrontational manner for goal attainment are attributed to LGOs in an urbanized social structure; whereas, beliefs in support of the need to act in an accommodating manner for goal attainment are attributed to LGOs in a rural social structure.

**Operational Freedom**

**Observed**

The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study differ in their expressions of operational freedoms or alternatives.

**Generalized**

Latent perceptions of social controls in terms of responsibility territories or organizational domains are much greater in the rural local organizations; thus, certain operational alternatives are eliminated by strong beliefs concerning these controls.

It is hypothesized that given similar disaster-related problems, rural LGOs will assume stricter social controls and derive fewer alternatives of organizational operations than their urban counterparts.

**Perceived Media Needs**

**Observed**

The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study differed in their assessments of the role of the local media.
a) The rural LGOs did not envision any goal-related benefits from the media; whereas, the urban LGOs believed the media's attention was a necessary condition for the success of their organizations.

Generalized Property: The local media represents an important institution of support for the development, operation, and maintenance of organizational phenomena in both rural and urban communities.

Generalized Property: Automatic linkages between the local media and organizations occur because of the nature of the organizational event and the normative behavioral and professional characteristics of the media organization.

It is hypothesized that the initial level of perceived importance in the role relationship between the LGO and the local media will be greater in the urban community setting.

Internal Conflict Tendencies

Observed Property: The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study indicate differences in relation to their leader-and-member-interaction behaviors.

a) Rural LGO leaders-and-members-interactions appear more accommodative and personal; whereas, such urban LGO interactions appear more constrained, conflictive, and impersonal.

Observed Property: In general, the rural LGO participants were interactive prior to the disaster-related event, and conflicting relationships between parties were effectively screened-out before individuals decided to participate. In contrast, urban participants were relatively unknown to one another and their personal screening processes occurred within the activity of the LGO.

It is hypothesized that higher incidents of internal conflict are directly related to LGOs located in urban settings.
General Membership Involvement

Observed Property: The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study revealed differences in their levels of general membership involvement in the organizations' routine operations.

a) In general, rural LGO members expressed the willingness to share work in various organizational task activities which had to do with the maintenance functions of the organization; whereas, only certain members of the urban LGOs expressed willingness to do so.

b) Rural LGO leaders generally accepted all volunteers for various tasks; whereas, urban LGO leaders generally delegated responsibilities to specific individuals.

It is hypothesized that there is a direct relationship between a greater percentage or proportion of the members' direct involvement in the maintenance functions of the LGO and the ruralness of the organization's setting.

Formalization

Observed Property: The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study differed in their intentions and considerations for formally incorporating or chartering their organizations.

a) Urban leaders agendized the topic of incorporation early in the initial organizing stages; whereas, rural leaders did not formally consider incorporation as a necessity.

b) Urban LGOs tended to have individuals with legal or corporate experience and expertise.

c) Rural LGOs tended to have individuals with previous community committee experience which did not involve formal charter or incorporation requirements.

It is hypothesized that the relationship between rural and urban LGOs in disaster-related situations is inverse in terms of consideration of formal chartering or incorporation during the initial organizing period; urban LGOs will tend to consider such action; whereas, rural LGOs will not consider such action.
Age Composition

Observed Property: The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study differed in terms of the age compositions of the initial groups involved in the organizing processes.

a) Leaders and members of the rural LGOs were slightly older than their urban counterparts.

Generalized Property: In the rural environment age-linked networks tend to reflect higher levels of respect and authority as the age levels increase; whereas, in the urban environment, age tends to be a non-relevant factor.

It is hypothesized that the age structure of LGOs will be higher in rural settings, and that age will be a more important consideration of successful organizational development in the rural setting. As the setting becomes more urban, the age factor will reflect a younger comparative structure, and the concept of age as it relates to the organizing process will be less important.

Length of Residence

Observed Property: The rural and urban LGOs that were examined in this study differed in terms of the members' lengths of residence in the community.

a) In the rural setting, association among individuals appeared more dependent upon previous interaction patterns than had developed over time from both formal and informal institutional integration processes, and such pattern development appeared directly related to the amount of time an individual has spent within a given location.

b) In the urban setting, association among individuals appeared more dependent upon proximity of residence and the disaster-related factor as a vehicle for association. In general, the disaster-related situation in the urban area was at a place where new residential development had occurred. Thus, the urban organization was less influenced, and less likely to be membered by long-term residents.
It is hypothesized that length of residence has a greater influence, and will be measureably greater in the emergent rural LGOs. As the level of urbanism increases, the level of influence and length of residence will decrease.

Stage II: The Operation and Maintenance Period

This stage of the analysis is based upon data pertaining to the post-initial organizing period, or what might be termed the operational and maintenance period of the LGOs. The data collected for this stage of analysis was dependent upon the actual age of the organization when it was initially approached for study. In most cases the LGOs had been in existence long enough so that when they were selected for study they had already established some level of operational and maintenance history. However, some of the cases were just emerging when first approached, and as such, required a waiting period in the research schedule in order to allow them time to develop a pattern of operation and maintenance.

The procedure selected for all cases (whether established LGOs or emergent LGOs) was to wait at least twelve months after the first stage of data collection on the emergent group phenomena. In effect, this waiting period provided the opportunity to assess changes and/or establishments of the operational and maintenance patterns for all of the cases in the study. This assessment was accomplished by utilizing the same data collection topics (as in the initial interviews) in a longitudinal fashion, however, by interviewing only a representative number of respondents for each case. In
addition, a follow-up mail survey was implemented shortly after the longitudinal interviews to acquire quantitative data concerning individual socio-demographic characteristics, perceptions, and attitudes on community solidarity, community behavior in official activities, and organizational participation. Appendixes C and D provide examples of the longitudinal and mail survey instruments.

The overall purpose of analyzing the longitudinal data is to provide an opportunity to strengthen the generated hypotheses with further empirical support. A failure of the findings to support any of the generated hypotheses at this point in time allows for the reconsideration of the construct properties, and the possible generation of new concepts. On the one hand, the research problem may be taken to identify characteristic differences between the community settings of the LGOs, but on the other hand, the research problem can focus on the identification of change conditions as they relate to the study cases over a set period of time.

**Stability and Change in the Comparative Dimensions of Socio-Culture and Value Systems**

Telephone interviews were conducted with three previously interviewed respondents from each LGO. Tables 6 and 7 illustrate the response patterns of the representative interviews with respect to the dimensions of rural and urban difference. The descriptive analysis indicates that of the eight LGOs, two of the rural cases had experienced significant change from
Table 6: Socio-Cultural Differentiating Characteristics of Selected Ruran and Urban LGOs in Disaster-Related Situations: The Operational and Maintenance Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGO</th>
<th>Organizational Format</th>
<th>Community Awareness</th>
<th>Goal Sophistication</th>
<th>Perceived Active Behavior</th>
<th>Operational Freedom</th>
<th>Perceived Media Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide City</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclearopolis</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood City</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Community External</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardville</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community External*</td>
<td>Complex*</td>
<td>Confrontational*</td>
<td>Flexible*</td>
<td>Important*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpburgh</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community Internal</td>
<td>Complex*</td>
<td>Confrontational*</td>
<td>Flexible*</td>
<td>Important*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantistown</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community Internal</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raging Riverton</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Community Internal</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates major change from the initial organizing period.
Table 7: System of Values Differentiating Characteristics of Selected Rural and Urban LGOs in Disaster-Related Situations: The Operational and Maintenance Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGO</th>
<th>Internal Conflict Tendencies</th>
<th>General Membership Involvement</th>
<th>Formalization</th>
<th>Age Composition</th>
<th>Length of Residence Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide City</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclearopolis</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood City</td>
<td>Dissent</td>
<td>Participant Passive</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardville</td>
<td>Dissent*</td>
<td>Participant Passive*</td>
<td>Chartered*</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpsburgh</td>
<td>Dissent*</td>
<td>Participant Passive*</td>
<td>Chartered*</td>
<td>Younger*</td>
<td>Short-Term*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantistown</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Participant Active</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raging Riverton</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Participant Active</td>
<td>Chartered</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates major change from the initial organizing period.
their initial characteristics and behaviors, while the remainder of the sample cases were relatively unchanged. With only minor exceptions, the two rural cases that had undergone change emulated the urban LGOs. The following passages will discuss those two cases in the context of the dimensions reflecting change from the initial period to the operational and maintenance period. In sum, the discussion focuses on those dimensions that changed, and the reasoning for such change as experienced in Hazardville and Dumpburgh.

**Another Look at Hazardville and Dumpburgh**

The operational and maintenance period data collected indicate that Hazardville and Dumpburgh underwent radical change with respect to the dimensions of rural-urban LGO differences as manifested in the data collected for the initial organizing period. For both cases change was indicated in seven of the eleven dimensional categories; no change was indicated by either case in one dimensional category; and in the three remaining categories, one or the other LGO indicated change. Although these changes were not quantitatively measured, significant change is illustrated by tendency shifts from one polar loci of the continuum to another, as described by the respondent.

In general, the discovery of dramatic change in these cases could be problematic with respect to differentiating predictive behaviors and characteristics between rural and
urban LGOs. However, the grounded theory approach accommodates or affords the luxury of continued analysis which might help to explain what occurred without significant damage to the theoretical construct. Factors which influence the change in the Hazardville and Dumpburgh LGOs may indeed be associated with new social phenomena at the community level.

The common factors of change experienced by the two LGOs included "community awareness orientation," "goal sophistication," "perceived action behavior," "operational freedom," "perceived media needs," "internal conflict tendencies," "general membership involvement," and "formalization." It should also be pointed out that both cases were concerned with technological disaster-related situations, and both have had higher than average population increases within their communities during the past decade. Whereas, the other two rural cases were involved in natural disaster-related situations and had a relatively stable population census during the past decade.

The factors of the technological disaster-related situation and the population increases are particularly important to the understanding of the change that took place in the Hazardville and Dumpburgh LGOs, changes which altered (over a brief period of time) the descriptive typological findings to the point that these two initially rural cases became, in effect, two urban cases. Respondents discussing the component changes (careers, conditions, characteristics, and
consequences) that had occurred in their respective LGO most often cited new members (or new residents) and outsider influences as specific reasons for the changes in the organization. Both categories of reasons appeared in responses for both cases.

New members and/or new residents became a factor of change for a number of primary reasons, and they became disseminators of organizational innovations as a result of yet another set of primary reasons. In both LGO cases there were a small number of new residents present during the initial period. Their role, however, was very passive because they were less acquainted with the normative organized behavior patterns in the community and because they were strangers within a group which appeared to have long-standing interactions between the older residents. The older residents welcomed them into the organizing process with the perception that they were equally concerned about the issue and desired to become active citizens of the traditional community. Over a brief period of time the new residents began to interact with other new residents whom they did not know prior to the organizing event. Many even went out and specifically recruited new residents for membership into the LGO. As a sub-group developed within the LGO, the new residents' dialogue of what should be done about the problem was introduced, in contrast (not conflict) to the manifest dialogue of action being formally presented by the LGO. In some
instances, the point of change with respect to specific dimensional categories took place when the normative manifest actions of the LGO failed to attain the expected results. This process was particularly evident when the LGO attempted to define the technological problem in the context of the local governmental areas of responsibility. As examples, the alternative actions supported by the new members/residents were to go outside of the community to state and federal authorities or to bring the problem to the attention of institutionalized advocate organizations. Older residents tended to disfavor these alternatives, but many felt there were no other choices. Although some of the older residents immediately discontinued their activities within the LGO once decisions were made to implement some of the alternative ideas, many chose to support the effort and experience the consequences. The adoptiveness of the older residents was not limitless. Rather, by the end of one year of activity of the Dumpburgh LGO nearly every old resident had resigned from activity because the organization was getting "too radical." Although there were no community sanctions placed on any of the Dumpburgh LGO members, the old resident members felt that the local problem was the only one requiring their time and interests and they wanted to avoid becoming involved in regional, state, and national toxic waste problems...an expanding direction the new resident members actively pursued.
The process in Hazardville was somewhat different. Shortly after the initial organizing process, the leadership of the Hazardville LGO was contacted by an outside advocacy organization that offered to help them in their efforts. Initially, the LGO rejected such offers because they felt the problem was a local one and that bringing in outsiders would only alienate them from the community. However, after experiencing a similar failure to Dumpburgh's in locally defining the problem and getting cooperation from local authorities, the LGO decided to seek advice from the outside source. This source, a type of advocacy action training center for community development, provided the LGO leaders with strategies and alternatives in the action process. In turn, the leaders became the disseminators of organizational innovations. In effect, the leaders became the experts in whom the members placed their trust, and the activities of the organization became much less democratic. Within the realm of the organization's community activity, corruption was disclosed within the local governmental organization and confrontations became common for the Hazardville LGO. Its initial membership was closely tied and dedicated to the solution of the local problem; thus, they were much more willing, as a total body, to accept new organizational strategies and found during the height of their confrontation a great deal of support and new members from within the community.
In summary, the primary factors contributing to the change in the dimensional categories of the LGOs are essentially organizational innovations adopted within communities which had long-standing traditional norms of organizational behavior pertaining to community action. The important aspect of this phenomena, however, concerns the introduction of these innovations. The new member/new residents tended to be younger, more cosmopolitan, more concerned about healthier and safer environmental quality of life, and less sentimental toward the traditional community norms. Additionally, although almost all the LGO members were aware of the more radical means of organizational action which take place in American society, the new members/residents were less inhibited toward practicing or participating in such entities. Where outside influences were concerned, the data indicate that the local membership must be willing to accept new ideas and take the risks involved in adopting the innovations. Two key features of introduction and adoption of organizational innovation in the rural community setting appear to be the experience of failure to accomplish goals or objectives by the traditional or normative means and the general belief that the risk is worth taking with respect to high convictions toward problem resolution. The cases studied are examples in which for the first known time in the communities' histories of local public issues, a radical form of organizational behavior was generally
supported and viewed as legitimate by the communities' residents. Since the time of this data collection, the author has learned that other similarly-structured grassroots organizations focused on various local issues have emerged within the case communities and in regions close to Hazardville and Dumpburgh.

One other prevalent factor of change merits some attention, and that is the role of the media. The local, regional, state, and national news and popular media served three basic functions which directly affected the LGOs' processes of change. First, the media prepared the population, say of a rural community, by illustrating social activities that were taking place at other focal points throughout society. Second, at the rural community level, they exposed a problem or issue which garnered the attention of concerned persons outside the area. Third, the media (particularly the local media) provided legitimacy and saliency to the LGO.

In Hazardville and Dumpburgh had the initially-structured LGOs been able to attain their goals effectively, it is likely they would not have changed or parted from traditional organizational norms. It is also probable that a few new members/residents, or outside sources, would not have successfully introduced effective change without some sort of latent belief structure in the communities toward the concept of organizational action being introduced. Hence, in all
The likelihood the latent belief structure can be attributed to the media. Most rural residents are very well aware of what is taking place in the rest of the society: Most are made aware by the news media. And although rural residents may have contrary value perceptions toward many of the social activities that go on in more cosmopolitan places, over time and exposure, they come to recognize that behavioral differences between their community and other social settings are not necessarily a matter of the right way and the wrong way of life, but rather, a variation of means necessary to effectively function in society. Given the fact that the disaster-related problems were recognized by the general publics in each community, and the realization that the local community could do little to resolve those specific problems from within (factors that the local media pointed out to the publics), the introduction of a new means of problem resolution was not met with sanctions or social controls.

The Follow-Up Assessment

The follow-up step taken in this study was designed to explore some selected aspects of social-psychological factors which may relate to differentiation between LGOs in rural and urban communities. Additionally, this step provided the opportunity to gather some social background information on the respondents which could be aggregated to generalize the membership characteristics within and between the LGO cases.
There are two major limitations associated with this survey which should be pointed out before the general discussion and analysis. First, the sample population was not all inclusive of the LGO membership rosters. Instead, only persons who were previously contacted or specifically referred to in previous interviews were included. This action was taken to reduce the cost of the follow-up, and was judged appropriate on the basis that those specific persons were most knowledgeable and influential in the phenomena under study. Second, the total response size is relatively small (N = 40). This size restricts the possibilities for reliable multivariate statistical analysis, but it is suitable in the context of exploratory inferences. In sum, this section of the analysis is intended to make comparative suggestions or inferences, but one must be cognizant that the data set is less than ideal in terms of being representative and proportional to the study population.

The survey instrument employed in this data collection process was designed to be self-administered and was coded to facilitate identifying the respondent to the LGO in which he/she belonged. A letter addressed to the respondent and a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope accompanied the instrument. A follow-up effort to increase the response rate was not conducted. Pre-testing was not performed because all questions pertaining to the measurement of attitudes and participation behavior had been previously used in studies,
and had verified acceptable levels of reliability and validity.

The independent/characteristic variables selected for this survey included: age, sex, length of residence in the community, education, occupation, organizational participation, and orientation to local government. The variables were measured as follows:

Respondent's age was measured in years of age as of his/her last birthday.

Respondent's sex was indicated as either male or female.

Length of residence in the LGO community was measured in years (rounded to the nearest whole number).

Education was measured in terms of years of formal education completed by the respondent.

The occupational status question was open-ended and asked the respondent to indicate his/her current occupation. The occupation responses were categorized on the basis of: Professional, White Collar, Blue Collar, General Laborer, Agricultural, Homemaker-Student, and Retired/Disabled.

Organizational participation was measured by asking the respondent to indicate on a list of organizational types, the kind of organizations he/she is or had been a member of, the kind of organizations in which he/she has held a position of leadership, and the number of organizations in which he/she is currently an active member.
Orientation to local government was measured by asking the respondent to indicate (yes or no) if he/she is personally acquainted with and/or has personally worked with various local government offices (provided on a list).

Table 8 (Sample Frequencies and Summary Statistics for the Independent Variables) presents the descriptive characteristic statistics for the total sample, and the sample broken down by rural and urban resident respondents.

The attitude variables focused on the measurement of rural community sentiments and ruralism. These attitudinal areas have been often used by social scientists to examine differentiation in community populations using the concept of the rural-urban or Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft dichotomies. The community sentiment index involved a 19-item/four-component scale construct. The components of the construct included: community spirit, interpersonal relations, local government perceptions, and areas of community tension. Ruralism was measured by a three-item scale. All items were randomly placed within the body of the survey instrument and a standard five-category response scale was employed to record attitude orientations. Response categories included: (VT) Very True, (T) True, (ND) Not Decided, (U) Untrue, and (DU) Definitely Untrue. Responses were weighted from one to five, with higher values indicating a negative orientation toward the phenomena being evaluated.
Table 8: Sample Frequencies and Summary Statistics of the Independent Variables (N=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample Data</th>
<th>Rural (N=19)</th>
<th>Urban (N=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>Mean . . . . 43.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Dev. . . . 10.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Percent Male . . . 60.0%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Female . . . 40.0%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (in years completed)</td>
<td>Mean . . . . 15.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Dev. . . . 2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence (in years)</td>
<td>Mean . . . . 25.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Dev. . . . 14.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Status (in percent by category)</td>
<td>Professional . . . 10.0%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Collar . . . 55.0%</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Collar/Farmer/General Laborer . . . 12.5%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housewife/Student . . . 12.5%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired/Unemployed/Disabled . . . 7.5%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Participation</td>
<td>Mean number of organizations respondents have experienced in lifetime . . . . 5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean number of organizations respondents have held positions of leadership . . . . 3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Active (by category and percent of sample)</td>
<td>Civic . . . . 35.0%</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraternal . . . 12.5%</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veteran . . . 12.5%</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm . . . 7.5%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political . . . 32.5%</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational . . . 12.5%</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious . . . 42.5%</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community . . . 42.5%</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth . . . 22.5%</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional . . . 27.5%</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Interest . . . 97.5%</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to Local Government</td>
<td>Mean orientation score of various local offices/officials . . . . 13.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean personal experiences with local government officials . . . . 12.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristic or conceptually generalized expectations must be formulated in order to assess the value of examining community sentiments and ruralism in the context of the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft or rural-urban construct. Although the literature offers an extensive number of measurable factorial areas, the five chosen are deemed adequate enough to explore the phenomena in relation to the LGO case respondents.

In general, the attitudes toward community spirit examine feelings or beliefs of individuals with regard to alienation, cohesiveness, levels of public caring, individualism perceptions, and the expression of the community in terms of its aesthetic qualities. Theoretically, community spirit is a positive feeling of wholesomeness shared by the majority of a population within a defined area. More often than not, previous studies conducted in American society indicate that higher levels of community spirit are perceived and/or exhibited in smaller community places. In relation to the measurement scale, the higher the response score, the higher the respondent's attitude toward spirit in his/her community, and the more likely that the respondent resides in a smaller, less urbanized, or more rural place.

Interpersonal relations represent perceived levels of friendliness, openness, accessibility to interact with members of the community, the sense of belonging, and the perceptions an individual has about the integrative processes within the
community. Accordingly, the previous studies done on this area of interest suggest that established interpersonal relation patterns are more nuclear within the rural community, and extended within the urban community. Since the questionnaire directed the respondent to respond in the context of his/her community, the expectation of findings was that the higher the score, the more likely the respondent resides in a smaller, less urbanized, and more rural place.

The scale on attitudes toward local government focuses on the notion of norms of authority. Levels of fairness, association/disassociation, effectiveness and status symbology provide the opportunity to assess a respondent's normative tendencies in regard to the authority system in his/her community. Rural societies have been depicted as being more respectful and less alienated toward their local governments. Consequently, the higher the scale score, the more likely the respondent resides in a smaller, less urbanized, or more rural place.

Tension areas within a community are fundamentally a function of social complexities like stratification and social differentiation. Conditions ranging from crime, transportation problems, cost of living, pollution, and so forth, generally increase in magnitude as population densities increase. Simpler lifestyle patterns, lower rates of disruption, and less expectations provide a sense of security which previous studies indicate is more prevalent
in rural communities. With respect to the measurement scale, the higher the score, the more likely the respondent resides in a smaller, less urbanized, or rural place.

The scale on ruralism essentially measures an individual's attitudes concerning rural or urban community stereotypes. These items were presented as the best predictors of ruralism attitudes from an extensive set of items tested by Buttel and Flinn (1975). As measured, the higher the scale score, the more likely the individual has negative feelings toward rural community life.

The following items (listed by scales or component groups) measured the respondent's attitudes as a function of the total rural community sentiment concept. Those items with an asterisk (*) were recoded in reverse order to conform to the intended direction of concept-tendency measurement.
Attitudes constituting the community spirit scale included:

1. A lot of people here think they are too nice for you.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. People won't work together to get things done for the community.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Too many people are apathetic about the real problems here.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The people as a whole mind their own business.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. No one seems to care much how the community looks.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes constituting interpersonal relations included:

1. *Almost everyone is polite and courteous to you.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. People give you a bad name if you insist on being different.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. *I feel very much that I belong here.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. *New residents bring a lot of new and helpful ideas when something needs to be done to improve the community.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. People are generally critical of others.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes constituting local governmental perceptions included:

1. Some people here "get by with murder" while others take the rap for any little misdeed.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. This community lacks real leaders.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The local elected officials run the community (or county) to suit themselves.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. A few have the local politics well sewed up.  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>DU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The local elected officials get very little done.

Attitudes constituting community tension areas included:

1. *The community is very peaceful and orderly.

2. You must spend lots of money to be accepted here.

3. You are out of luck here if you happen to be a new resident.

4. *People around here show good judgement.

Attitudes constituting the ruralism scale included:

1. I personally like the constant flow of exciting events that only a city can offer.

2. *Life in a small town is too slow for me.

3. City life is too rushed and formal for me.

Item Analysis and Scale Reliability

Reliability addresses the question: If the same subject or referent objects are repeatedly measured with the same or comparable measurement techniques, will the same or similar results be obtained (Kerlinger, 1973:459)? Even though the scales employed have established acceptable levels of statistical reliability, these scales have not been previously applied to examine differentiation factors between population samples in the context of LGOs. Therefore, alpha reliability
coefficients were calculated to assess the capabilities of the scales in the analysis of the study's sample. Reliability of the scales are expressed as a positive number between 0.0 and 1.0. Simply, the higher the number, the greater the reliability of the scale. The minimum acceptable level of statistical significance for a scale is 0.3. Respectively, the alpha reliabilities for the five scales were as follows: Community Spirit Scale (0.615); Interpersonal Relations Scale (0.679); Local Governmental Perceptions Scale (0.855); Community Tension Scale (0.968); and the Ruralism Scale (0.764). The coefficients of reliability were high enough to justify formation of component indexes from the scale responses. The correlation matrixes and scale reliabilities are presented in Tables 9 through 13.

Step-wise discriminant analysis was employed to explore the notion that differences between the rural and urban LGO members would emerge in terms of the concepts of community sentiments and ruralism. Discriminant analysis was chosen for this task because the statistic is an effective method for determining the extent to which two or more groups can be separated on the basis of selected predictive variables (attitude scales). The step-wise procedure enters the most powerful discriminating variables in order of their importance until no significant improvements can be made by addition of any of the remaining variables included in the analysis. Two cases were excluded from the analysis because response data was missed on one or more of the measured items.
Table 9: Correlation Matrix and Scale Reliability Coefficient for Attitudes Toward Community Spirit (N=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>-0.277</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Reliability Coefficient* = 0.615

Table 10: Correlation Matrix and Scale Reliability Coefficient for Attitudes Toward Interpersonal Relations (N=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Reliability Coefficient* = 0.679
Table 11: Correlation Matrix and Scale Reliability Coefficient for Attitudes Toward Local Government (N=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Reliability Coefficient* = 0.855

Table 12: Correlation Matrix and Scale Reliability Coefficient for Attitudes Toward Community Tension Areas (N=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td>-0.324</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>-0.547</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Reliability Coefficient* = 0.968
Table 13: Correlation Matrix and Scale Reliability Coefficient for the Ruralism Attitudes (N=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
<td>-0.498</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Reliability Coefficient* = 0.764

*Alpha Reliability Coefficient is computed as:

$$\alpha = \frac{k\bar{r}}{1 + (k-1)\bar{r}}$$

where $k$ equals the number of items in the scale and $\bar{r}$ equals the average correlation between items.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, SUMMARIES, AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary aim of this study has been to examine the relationship between delineated local grassroots organizations in disaster-related situations within the context of rural and urban organizational culture characteristics. The research design involved a grounded theory approach which facilitated an "open-ended" process to inductively arrive at differentiating dimensions between the rural and urban LGOs. However, it also resulted in some surprises with respect to the social action phenomena. The development of the framework of study enabled the generation of hypotheses based on the empirical data from the eight cases in the study. Finally, the analysis presented in the previous chapter provided the foundation from which the findings can be discussed.

Summary of Findings on the Case Studies

Stage I of the analysis of issue-comparative LGOs in the initial organizing period revealed that patterns of organizational cultures between rural and urban community
settings had differentiating characteristics. When examined within the study framework, it was determined that these characteristics could be classified from a modified social systems perspective under two major categories: a) the socio-cultural system characteristics, and b) the system of values characteristics. Constant comparative analysis of the cases (as organizational units of analysis) uncovered a total of 11 organizational culture characteristic factors which could be related to the social environments described as rural and urban. The analysis enabled the generation of a typology construct (Table 5, page 138) and 11 tentative hypotheses (pages 139 through 144) as related to the study objectives. However, the analysis process was continued in the tradition of the constant comparative method to see if the phenomena were affected over a period of time extending beyond the initial organizing period.

Phase II of the analysis (termed the "operation and maintenance period") looked at the data collected after a minimum of 12 months from the initial date of contact with the LGO respondents. This phase was primarily concerned with the factor of change which might have occurred in the organizational culture patterns once the LGO was established and operating. In general, the analysis revealed that two of the rural LGO cases had undergone significant change over time. The characteristic which these two LGOs displayed were very similar to the characteristics of the urban LGO
cases (Tables 6 and 7, pages 146 through 147).

Since six of the LGO cases had not experienced any significant change over time, efforts were directed to discover what factors may have caused the two changed LGOs to deviate from the rural model. The data on this issue indicated six interrelated factors which probably contributed to the change. First, and probably foremost, the LGOs experienced failures in the early period of their organizations with regard to defining the disaster-related problem in the context of the local governmental areas of responsibility. Second, the disaster-related problem was technological rather than natural (as is the situation for the other two rural LGO cases). Although the traditional local institutions generally sympathized with the LGOs, the issues appeared either too complex or too political to merit the kinds of action support normally distributed in rural community action activities. Third, the local media tended to be much more persistent in reporting and following the issues. This action resulted in outsider attention directed at the communities and the LGOs. The pressure and appeal of this attention seemed to demand organizational changes which could produce some manifest action results. Fourth, new residents within the communities bonded and began to take active parts in the LGOs' activities. Their background experiences and lack of socialization to the rural community organization norms tended to result in the introduction and adoption of
alternative forms of organizational structure and behaviors. Fifth, in direct relation to the previous factor, both of the rural community LGOs which underwent change were in areas that had undergone higher than normal rates of population growth. Consequently, there was a relatively new segment of the population which could potentially become involved in and introduce new ideas. It was also possible that complexities (resulting from greater numbers of problems) in the communities could have reduced the potential for effectiveness through traditional organizational behaviors. The sixth, and final factor disclosed, entails the general willingness of the rural communities and the older resident members of the LGOs to accept the risk in adopting new organizational behaviors. Many respondents were unsure and skeptical of undertaking radical changes within a local community organization; however, the absence of social sanctions and presence of broad support within the two communities encouraged the LGOs to pursue their courses of change.

Summary of Findings on the Follow-Up Assessment

The findings presented on the data collected by the attitude measurement instrument are not stringent indicators of organizational culture, but instead, exploratory examinations of the case study respondents. This step was taken to enhance the interpretation of the overall data and to test for the general corollaries of rural LGO culture/rural
attitudes, and urban LGO culture/urban attitudes.

The descriptive sample data presented in Table 8 (page 159) provides general frequency differences between the rural and urban respondents in the independent characteristic variables. The comparative statistics between the rural and urban respondents are generally consistent with expectations involving the variables' tendencies to describe the different social populations. However, the range of difference for several of the characteristic features is not as great as one would expect, particularly in the context of previous research and census reports which have compared rural to urban population groups. The tendencies, however, are indicated in the following manner:

a) Rural LGO members tend to be older than urban LGO members (45.0 years versus 41.7 years).

b) Rural LGO members tend to be less educated than urban LGO members (15.1 years versus 16.1 years).

c) Rural LGO members' length of residence in the community was significantly longer than the average length of residence for urban LGO members (35.0 years versus 18.7 years).

d) Rural LGO members have a slightly higher level of organizational participation experience (5.7 memberships per respondent versus 4.7 memberships per urban respondent), but slightly less experience in leadership positions (3.4 leadership positions for rural residents versus 3.9 leadership positions for urban residents).

e) Rural LGO respondents indicated a greater proportion of current activities in various other organizations (all categories except religious and special interest) in comparison to the urban LGO respondents.
f) Rural LGO respondents expressed a greater level of orientation and personal experience with their local governments.

g) In terms of occupational status there was very little difference between rural and urban respondents. One interesting point, however, is the higher proportion of professionals represented in the rural sample. This factor may appear unusual, but professional-status individuals in rural areas are often expected, and traditionally respond, to participate and perform leadership roles in community activities.

In summary, the statistical comparative data on the selected characteristic variables generally reinforce many of the dimensions of the organizational culture typology as it was developed and presented in Chapter IV. Direct confirmations are obvious with respect to the factors of age and length of residence. Also, closely associated with the dimensions of "community awareness" and "general membership involvement" are the characteristic statistics for orientation/experience with local government, and current organizational activities. These variables suggest that people who are more familiar with, or active in their local governments, would be more attuned or conscientious about their involvement and actions in relation to the immediate community environment, and those who express a greater overall activity level in various organizations are probably inclined to participate in organizations that offer positive recognition for their involved members.

Undoubtedly there are many factors of a demographic and social-psychological nature that enter into the processes of
organization and the normative constructs of organizational culture in specific social settings. As a follow-up addition to this basically qualitative study of cases, a few selected social-psychological factors were related to the generated construct to explore the attitudinal (rather than behavioral) aspects of the rural-urban LGO phenomena. Statistical findings generated from the discriminant analysis on the demographic and attitudinal measures are presented in Table 14.

Four of the 13 variables or scales entered the step-wise analysis: length of residence, community spirit, ruralism, and orientation to local government. These results show that the rural LGO respondents differed significantly from the urban LGO respondents. The direction of differentiation indicates that the rural LGO members are longer-term residents within their communities; have a more positive attitude concerning community spirit; a more favorable attitude toward the rural lifestyle stereotype; and express a higher level of exposure and experience to their local governments. The predictability of the statistical model is modestly strong, as indicated by the Wilk's Lambda. In addition, the Eigenvalue indicates that the model is viable in terms of its ability to explain a logical grouping phenomenon.
Table 14: Step-Wise Discriminant Analysis of Rural (N=19) and Urban (N=22) Local Grass Roots Organization Members Using Selected Measures of Social and Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discriminators in order of Importance:</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Community Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spirit</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>-0.409</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruralism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Enter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.7507</td>
<td>0.6548</td>
<td>0.5712</td>
<td>19.041</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Centroids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Group Membership:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural (N=19) 73.7%(14) 26.3%(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (N=21) 19.0%(4) 81.0%(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Cases Correctly Classified: 77.5%
Synopsis of the Study Findings

The study of eight local grass roots organizations in disaster-related situations revealed that differences were manifest between rural community-based collectivities and urban community-based collectivities. Utilizing a modified social systems framework, the study was able to determine that differences in rural and urban organizational cultures can be attributed to differences in socio-cultural and value-system norms that prevailed in the rural and urban social milieus, conditions of community socialization, tradition, and proven effectiveness. Although there was no resolution concerning the argument that behavior conditions attitudes, or attitudes condition behavior, the study was able to interrelate behavioral and attitudinal factors with the phenomena of rural and urban differentiation among the LGOs. In addition, one particular demographic characteristic, length of residence, indicated prominence as an explanatory factor of differences between rural and urban LGOs.

The topic of change was introduced when longitudinal analysis revealed that two of the rural LGOs have undergone substantial modification. The analysis revealed that several factors seemed to contribute to the changes that took place in the organizations. Although these factors are discussed in relative detail, the aggregate interpretation suggests that the cause for change could be attributed to the fact that these LGOs could not resolve their disaster-related
problems in the same organizational manner that had worked within their communities in the past. The alternatives or innovations were not unfamiliar to the members from a knowledge point of view, but the alternatives were not normative to the communities' organizational culture. In addition, the alternatives or innovations of organization were distinctively urban. In effect, when the members adopted these innovations, and the tangential community accepted and supported them, the communities took one uniquely social step toward urbanization.

Conclusions: An Evaluation of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

One of the primary purposes of this study was to explore the possibilities of examining organizational cultures as indicators for a broader, community-based social classification typology. Recognizing that two major inherent problems existed at the onset—organizational research was not very well-established to serve this purpose and the concept of organizational culture is relatively new—the research had to depend upon an organizational phenomena that posed the highest levels of controls possible in comparative circumstances. The fact that disaster-related situations and collectivity organizations present possibly the most ideal set of conditions may be construed as either fortunate or unfortunate, depending upon whether one is evaluating the research at hand or the implications for future research.
With respect to this study, some definite contributions have been made along several lines. First, as a research effort undertaken in the field of rural sociology, the study sets forth a methodology (the grounded theory approach) which is at best scarce, if not non-existent, within the disciplines. More than just a new methodological approach, the process has meritorious potential in the "applied" realm that rural sociology embraces. Areas such as community development, social change, adoption and diffusion of innovations, and social impact assessment could, in all probability, benefit from the grounded theory approach.

Second, in terms of social theory, the study has provided dimensions of the social systems perspective which have, to a limited extent, bridged some concepts of collective behavior and organization. In this respect, the study contributes to efforts being made by collective behaviorists in contemporary research to formulate organizationally-related assumptions using collective behavior phenomena. The 11 hypotheses generated from the study may be examined in future research and verified within established theoretical constructs at the middle-range or grand-theory levels.

The rather functionalist conclusion on social-related urbanization may open up opportunities for future research to explore in greater detail the urbanizing process from a demand-side diffusion of innovation perspective. In general, the sociological questions of urban process and rural
change become rather intriguing when such things as population densities, public services, economic diversities, and technological levels of communities are set aside. In relation to this subject, an important contributing factor to its disclosure is the conduct of a longitudinal data collection process. This particular finding verifies the importance of follow-up in the research effort, and the major affects that time has on social phenomena.

The third contribution that this study has made concerns the findings of the research. Initially, a case is made that rural and urban differences do exist, can be determined, and represent important aspects of the social order processes at the community level. From this point the findings based on differences suggest that change does not simply occur for the sake of change, that people are willing to accept change if they internalize the need for change in relation to the need to resolve a problem. The study presents this situation in terms of specific disaster-related agents (the natural disaster and the technological disaster). Findings indicate that the rural LGOs ultimately followed different paths to achieve their goals. One such path, relating to the technological agent, required the adoption of organizational innovation and the introduction of a new organizational culture into the community. Two general conclusions may be suggested by this observation: 1) Behavior changes as a function of need overcomes the constraints of existing norms and attitudes
change as a function of behavioral outcomes. Recognized in the rural change cases, the behaviors radically changed within the organizations, but the attitude measurements of the member samples retained the rural characteristics. 2) The technological agents are not, or should not be, defined in the context of disaster. These issues will remain for future studies.

In terms of limitation, the study presents a rather awkward design. Eight cases are almost too unmanageable for an intricate case study research, but too few for a survey research project. Thus, the compromise for such a situation is to design an exploratory study. But the undertaking of an exploratory effort should not be solely based on an awkward sample situation. The reader should be aware that such was not the determining factor in this study, for many concepts of social phenomena and research methodology have been intentionally introduced in this study to justify its classification as exploratory. In addition to the topic of limitations, one could easily recognize that to carry-out a large sample study in the context of this research problem, the costs would be exorbitant. The collection of case-level data by interviews from LGOs across the nation involves a great deal of time and money. Added to that, the cost of follow-up interviews and mail surveys results in even larger sums of time and money. In this vein, perhaps the greatest limitation for future research will be associated to its costs.
Setting aside the long range recommendations for an extended study of the phenomena examined in this research, an additional step of inquiry should probably be performed to strengthen the generated assumptions of rural-urban LGO differences. Namely, a field experiment is suggested which would investigate attitudes and perceived behavioral actions of sample populations located in defined rural and urban communities. In this study, selected communities would be controlled for in terms of behavioral stimulus; in other words, these samples would not be (or have not been) exposed to disaster-related situations. The first stage of data collection would focus upon normative attitude and organizational culture structures for the establishment of baseline data. The second stage would involve the administration of a designed situational vignette or strategy from which new response data can be collected. The analysis of such a designed field experiment could yield important information with respect to the relative significance of each of the 11 construct components, and indicators of situationally-modified behavior changes in the sample populations.

Hopefully, social scientific research in the future will advance the notion that organizations in society have a much broader and viable domain in terms of explaining and understanding the attitudes, behaviors, and general workings of social beings and social conditions. This study was a small endeavor to project this notion and any contribution it makes toward this end will render the effort worthwhile.
APPENDIX

A. Interview Guide: NSF/DRC Project
DRC INTERVIEW GUIDE

Introduction—Handout information sheets on DRC and on study.
Give very brief background on DRC and on study.
Whatever we learn is CONFIDENTIAL (explain).
We will eventually provide feedback to all who cooperate.
If there are no questions, let's get started...you don't mind
being tape recorded, do you?
There are about 10 general questions and two checklists I
would like to ask you about.

CAREER OF THE GROUP:

1) Would you tell me the history of your group, from the very beginning?

Points to look for:
--Date of origin.
--Who was involved (names).
--Place of conception.
--Origin of idea.
--Initial leaders.
--Other significant dates.

--Influence, prior organizing exper.
--Influence, prior social networks.
--Influence, precipitating event.
--Early stages activities, including aborted activities.
--Early stages, signs of disagreements.
--Early stages, clarity of goals and means.

2) Has the group changed or pretty much stayed the same since it started?

--Changes in size.
--Change in composition.
--Change in division of labor.
--Change in hierarchy.
--Change in recruitment.

--Adoption of a name.
--Reasons for changes.
--Any problems from changes.
--Any advantages from changes.
--If group very stable, what accounts for the stability?

3) (If incorporated) What led to the formal incorporation of the group?

--Reasons it was done.
--When it did occur.
--What actually was done.

--What does charter say (get copy)
--What difference it made; advantages.
--What difference it made; disadvant.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUP

Internal Features—composition

4) What's the makeup of this group...who is involved?

--Any membership roster (copy).
--Current size.
--# and % of active members.
--Sex, age, % minorities.
--Any full-time paid members.

--Localized or diffuse in community.
--Nature of dues, if any.
--Criteria for membership.
--If formalized; officer's names.
--Use of group symbols.
Internal Features—structure

5) Who does what in the group?
   — Division of labor, horizontal (get chart).
   — Hierarchy, vertical (chart) formal and informal leaders.
   — Degree of formalization.
   — Presence of internal networking.
   — Presence of active core.
   — Control of resources.
   — Decision making process.

Internal Features—functions

6) What are the main activities of the group?
   — What does the core do.
   — Attention paid to:
     recruitment,
     autonomy maintenance,
     record keeping,
     intragroup conflicts.
   — Nature, frequency, place of meetings (get minutes).
   — Internal communications.
   — Core contacts with other members.
   — Publications (get copies).
   — How episodic/everyday are the group's actions.

7) With what other groups does your group interact?
   — Who (local and extra-local).
   — Reasons, purposes.
   — Nature of interaction.
   — Duration, persistence.
   — Major contacts.
   — Mobilization of ECG in relation to other groups (i.e., demonstrations, rallies, petition drives).
   — Relationship to other ECGs, local and extra-local.
   — Relationship to mass media.

CONSEQUENCES FROM THE GROUP

8) In what way(s) has this group had any effect?
   — Intended and unintended effects.
   — Positive/negative outcomes.
   — Results in political, legal, governmental areas.
   — Perceived points of influence.
   — Definition of success.
   — Perceived failures.
   — Reasons advanced for success or failure.
   — When would group be unnecessary.

CONDITIONS FOR THE GROUP

9) What resources does your group have?
   — What is perceived as resources (material and nonmaterial).
   — Availability of material resources (copy budget).
   — Perception of nonmaterial resources.
   — How are resources mobilized and used.
   — Any internal conflict over resource uses.
   — Local and non-local sources of resources.

10) How is you group perceived by outsiders?
    — Perceptions of: respectability, legitimacy, personnel, resources.
    — Is group seen as ideological.
    — Other operative factors.
CONCLUSION

Let me ask a final question: If you were doing our study, and you wanted to understand your group, what is the most important thing about your group which you would concentrate on?

OK, is there anything else important about your group which we should know, but have not talked about?

Give out first, disaster probability scale; second, influence scale.

TERMINATION

--Turn off tape recorder.
--Thank respondent/informant.
--Listen to what person is saying at the end.
--Indicate you/we may be back.
--Ask if any other important person we should talk to.
--Copy all materials that may be possible to copy.
--Obtain any documents which may be available or find out how you can get them.
--Remember to record all relevant participant observations.
--Be sure scale instruments have all relevant information on them.
--Do you have all information about the person you should have?
APPENDIX

B. Probability and Influence Survey Scales:
NSF/DRC Project
Disaster Research Center
National Survey
Disaster Probability Ratings

Directions: We would like to know what you consider the probability of certain kinds of disasters occurring in your community in the next ten years. Would you please circle the number which corresponds to the probability that the disaster listed will occur in your community in the next ten years. Rate the events listed in terms of the following six point scale.

0 - Not applicable to my community
1 - Not probable
2 - Low probability
3 - Moderate probability
4 - High probability
5 - Nearly certain

How do you rate the probability of: (circle number)

AVALANCHE.................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
DAM BREAK.................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
DROUGHT OR WATER SHORTAGE.................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
EARTHQUAKE................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
EXPLOSION IN CHEMICAL PLANT.................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
FLASH FLOOD................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
FOREST OR BRUSH FIRE........................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
HURRICANE.................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
MUD OR LANDSLIDE.............................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
NUCLEAR WAR................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
PIPELINE EXPLOSION............................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
PLANE CRASH IN COMMUNITY....................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
RADIATION FROM NUCLEAR PLANT ACCIDENT....... 0 1 2 3 4 5
RIVER FLOOD.................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
SLOW TOXIC CHEMICAL RELEASE OR CONTAMINATION.. 0 1 2 3 4 5
SMOG EPISODE............................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
SUDDEN TOXIC CHEMICAL RELEASE OR SPILL....... 0 1 2 3 4 5
TORNADO...................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5

TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT—RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL... 0 1 2 3 4 5
TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT—TOXIC CHEMICALS...... 0 1 2 3 4 5
WATER POLLUTION............................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
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Code Number 1 9 8
Disaster Research Center  
National Survey  
Influence Scale

**Directions:** We would like to know how important you think each of the following officials and groups is in influencing what will happen to the goals and objectives of your own group. Would you please circle the number which corresponds to what you think is the degree of influence each has. Please circle according to the following six point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Little influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Much influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very great influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you rate the degree of influence of: (circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official / Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY COUNCIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY MANAGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY MAYOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY COMMISSIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL COURTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL DISASTER SERVICE AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE COURTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE DISASTER SERVICE AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE EPA (or equivalent agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE GOVERNOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE LEGISLATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL COURTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL EPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER FEDERAL REGULATORY AGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CONGRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL BUSINESS INTERESTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL CHURCHES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL MASS MEDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL CITIZEN GROUPS IN GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PUBLIC UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR OWN GROUP OR ASSOCIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

C. Longitudinal Assessment: NSF/DRC Project
ECG LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENTS

Event #: _______________ Date: _______________

Person Contacted: _______________________________

Group Nomenclature (name, location, disaster-agent): ___

Contact's Role: ________________________________

Interviewer: ___________________________________

Tape #: ____________________________

NOTE: Familiarize or Re-Familiarize Yourself
With the Case Before Calling

INTRODUCTION:

This is a follow-up interview to collect information
about the group since we last visited. In addition, there
may be some primary data needs that we did not get when we
were studying the group. All information will be kept
CONFIDENTIAL (with respect the identity of the contact).
I. Have there been any CAREER changes of the ECG?

A. With respect to ECG's goal(s):
1) Yes (expanded on the same issue)
2) Yes (contracted)
3) Yes (diversified into other disaster issues)
4) Yes (diversified into other non-disaster issues)
9) No

B. With respect to ECG size:
1) Yes (increased by at least 20%)
2) Yes (increased by less than 20%)
3) Yes (decreased by less than 20%)
4) Yes (decreased by at least 20%)
9) No

C. With respect to the Organization Table (Do L/Hierarchy):
1) Yes (more complex: vertically)
2) Yes (more complex: horizontally)
3) Yes (more complex: both)
4) Yes (less complex: vertically)
5) Yes (less complex: horizontally)
6) Yes (less complex: both)
7) Yes (more complex: vertically; less complex: horizontally)
8) Yes (less complex: Vertically; more complex: horizontally)
9) No

D. With respect to FORMAL leadership:
1) Yes (new slate of officers)
2) Yes (created new officer position(s))
3) Yes (reduced number of officer positions)
4) Yes (deleted all officer positions)
9) No

E. With respect to INFORMAL leadership:
1) Yes (new member(s) with expertise, time charisma, etc.)
2) Yes (old members dropping out)
3) Yes (old members taking charge)
4) Yes (power cliches, social group developments, etc.)
9) No

F. With respect to INCORPORATION:
1) Yes
5) No
9) N/A
F. If yes, who decided?
   1) Core leader
   2) Core group
   3) General membership
   4) Legal advice
   5) Other: specify _______________________
   9) Not applicable (answered NO to F)

II. Have there been any CHARACTERISTIC changes of the ECG?

   A. With respect to % of active membership:
      1) Yes (increased from 1 to 20%)
      2) Yes (increased more than 20%)
      3) Yes (decreased from 1 to 20%)
      4) Yes (decreased more than 20%)
      5) No (remains about the same)

   B. With respect to staffing:
      1) Yes (increased volunteers)
      2) Yes (increased paid staff)
      3) Yes (decreased volunteers)
      4) Yes (decreased paid staff)
      5) Yes (increased both)
      6) Yes (decreased both)
      7) Yes (increased volunteers/decreased paid staff)
      8) Yes (decreased volunteers/increased paid staff)
      9) No

   C. With respect to new "expert" members:
      1) Yes
      5) No
      9) N/A

   C. If yes, specify________________________

   D. With respect to the meeting schedule of the general membership:
      1) Yes (more often - regular)
      2) Yes (more often - irregular)
      3) Yes (less often - regular)
      4) Yes (less often - irregular)
      5) No (about the same)

   E. With respect to the meeting schedule of the Core:
      1) Yes (more often - regular)
      2) Yes (more often - irregular)
      3) Yes (less often - regular)
      4) Yes (less often - irregular)
      5) No (about the same)
F. With respect to networking with other disaster groups:
   1) Yes (Extra-community groups)
      14 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Yes (Statewide groups)
      15 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Yes (Regional groups)
      16 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Yes (National groups)
      17 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A

G. With respect to networking with other non-disaster groups:
   1) Yes (Extra-community groups)
      18 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Yes (Statewide groups)
      19 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Yes (Regional groups)
      20 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Yes (National groups)
      21 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A

H. With respect to working relations with extra-community groups:
   1) Information exchange
      22 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Activities exchange
      23 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Political advocacy exchange
      24 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Issue advocacy exchange
      25 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
   1) Task dependent exchange
      26 - ____  5) No
      9) N/A
I. With respect to working relations with statewide groups:
   1) Information exchange
      5) No
      9) N/A
   2) Activities exchange
   3) Political advocacy exchange
   4) Issue advocacy exchange
   5) Task dependent exchange

J. With respect to working relations with regional groups:
   1) Information exchange
      5) No
      9) N/A
   2) Activities exchange
   3) Political advocacy exchange
   4) Issue advocacy exchange
   5) Task dependent exchange

K. With respect to working relations with national groups:
   1) Information exchange
      5) No
      9) N/A
   2) Activities exchange
   3) Political advocacy exchange
   4) Issue advocacy exchange

1) Task dependent exchange
41 - _____
5) No
9) N/A

III. Have there been any CONDITION changes in the ECG?

A. With respect to resources:

1) Yes (monetary increase - internal sources)
42 - _____
2) Yes (monetary decrease - internal sources)
5) No

1) Yes (manpower increase - internal sources)
43 - _____
2) Yes (manpower decrease - internal sources)
5) No

1) Yes (monetary increase - external sources)
44 - _____
2) Yes (monetary decrease - external sources)
5) No

1) Yes (technical, political, media, etc. increase - external)
45 - _____
2) Yes (technical, political, media, etc. decrease - external)
5) No

B. With respect to election impacts (favorable to the ECG):

1) Yes (local election)
46 - _____
5) No

1) Yes (state election)
47 - _____
5) No

1) Yes (national election)
48 - _____
5) No

C. With respect to election impacts (unfavorable to the ECG):

1) Yes (local election)
49 - _____
5) No

1) Yes (state election)
50 - _____
5) No

1) Yes (national election)
51 - _____
5) No

D. With respect to legislation enacted by government (favorable to the ECG):

1) Yes (local legislation)
52 - _____
5) No

1) Yes (state legislation)
53 - _____
5) No

1) Yes (national legislation)
54 - _____
5) No
E. With respect to legislation enacted by government (unfavorable to the ECG):
   1) Yes (local legislation)
   5) No
   1) Yes (state legislation)
   5) No
   1) Yes (national legislation)
   5) No

IV. Have there been any CONSEQUENCE changes of the EOC?

A. With respect to group activities:
   1) Yes (increased recruitment)
   5) No
   1) Yes (decreased recruitment)
   5) No
   1) Yes (increased fund raising)
   5) No
   1) Yes (increased political type activities)
   5) No
   2) Yes (decreased political type activities)
   5) No

B. With respect to group newsletter:
   1) Yes (initiated one since last interview)
   5) No
   1) Yes (discontinued the one they had)
   2) Yes (increased circulation of the one they had)
   4) Yes (decreased circulation of the one they had)
   5) No
   3) Yes (decreased circulation of the one they had)

C. With respect to issue involvement:
   1) Yes (increased technologically)
   5) No
   2) Yes (increased in social scope)
   5) No
   3) Yes (increased in both)
   4) Yes (decreased technologically)
   5) Yes (decreased in social scope)
   6) Yes (decreased in both)
   7) Yes (increased technologically/decreased in social scope)
   8) Yes (decreased technologically/increased in social scope)
   9) No

D. With respect to areas of influence:
   1) Yes (political with positive impact)
   5) No
   2) Yes (political with negative impact)
   3) Yes (both)
   5) No
   1) Yes (media with positive impact)
   2) Yes (media with negative impact)
   3) Yes (both)
   5) No
1) Yes (private institutions/organizations with positive impacts)
2) Yes (private institutions/organizations with negative impacts)
3) Yes (both)
5) No

E. With respect to perceptions of overall successes or failures:
1) Yes (more successful)
2) Yes (more failures)
3) Yes (less successful)
4) Yes (less failures)
5) No

F. With respect to numbers of citizen groups in the community:
1) Yes (more)
2) Yes (less)
9) No

G. With respect to the kinds of groups in the community:
1) Yes (same issue)
2) Yes (other disaster issue)
3) Yes (non-disaster issue)
4) Yes (mixed)
9) No
APPENDIX

D. Follow-Up Survey
-COMMUNITY SURVEY-

PART I: Respondent Information

Please provide the following information about yourself.

A) What is your age? ____ years (as of your last birthday).
B) How long have you lived in this county or community? ____ years.
C) How many years of formal education have you completed? ____ years.
D) What is your occupation? _____________________________________
E) What is your sex? ___ Male  ___ Female

PART II: Think of each of the statements below as relating to the people of your entire community area. If you think the statement fits your community very well, after the statement circle vt (for very true); if it applies only partially, circle t (for true); if you cannot see how it relates one way or another to your particular community, circle nd (for not decided); if you think it is not true, circle u (for untrue); and if it definitely is not true, circle du (for definitely untrue). PLEASE RECORD THE IMPRESSION THAT FIRST OCCURS TO YOU. Do not go back and change your answers.

EXAMPLE:
People respect each others property.     vt  t  nd  u  du

1. The community is very peaceful and orderly.     vt  t  nd  u  du
2. A lot of people here think they are too nice for you.     vt  t  nd  u  du
3. Some people here "get by with murder" while others take the rap for any little misdeed.     vt  t  nd  u  du
4. Almost everyone is polite and courteous to you.     vt  t  nd  u  du
5. People around here show good judgement.     vt  t  nd  u  du
6. People won't work together to get things done for the community.     vt  t  nd  u  du
7. This community lacks real leaders.     vt  t  nd  u  du
8. Too many people are apathetic about the real problems here.     vt  t  nd  u  du
9. People give you a bad name if you insist on being different.     vt  t  nd  u  du
10. The local elected officials run the community (or county) to suit themselves.  
11. I feel very much that I belong here.  
12. I personally like the constant flow of exciting events that only a city can offer.  
13. You must spend lots of money to be accepted here.  
14. The people as a whole mind their own business.  
15. New residents bring a lot of new and helpful ideas when something needs to be done to improve the community.  
16. Life in a small town is too slow for me.  
17. A few have the local politics well sewed up.  
18. People are generally critical of others.  
19. You are out of luck here if you happen to be a new resident.  
20. No one seems to care much how the community looks.  
21. City life is too rushed and formal for me.  
22. The local elected officials get very little done.  

23. Indicate by checking (✓) Yes or No if you are personally or professionally acquainted with the following person or persons associated with the offices listed below.

Mayor: ___Yes  ___No
City Manager/Administrator: ___Yes  ___No
Any member of City Council or the County Commission: ___Yes  ___No
Any member of the County Agricultural Extension Office: ___Yes  ___No
Planning or Zoning Director/Officer: ___Yes  ___No
Civil Defense or Emergency Services Director: ___Yes  ___No
Health or Environmental Office Director: ___Yes  ___No
Chief of Police/County Sheriff: ___Yes  ___No
Local Fire Chief: ___Yes  ___No

(Turn for last page.)
Indicate by checking (√) Yes or No if you have ever contacted or worked with the person or persons associated with the offices listed below (either on a community issue or in discussion of a particular community problem).

Mayor: __Yes__ No
City Manager/Administrator: __Yes__ No
Any member of City Council or the County Commission: __Yes__ No
Any member of the County Agricultural Extension Service: __Yes__ No
Planning or Zoning Director/Officer: __Yes__ No
Civil Defense or Emergency Services Director: __Yes__ No
Health or Environmental Office Director: __Yes__ No
Chief of Police/County Sheriff: __Yes__ No
Local Fire Chief: __Yes__ No

PART III: Participation in Organizational Activities
Below is a list of Types of Organizations common to communities in the United States. If you are or ever have been an active member in any of the types listed (regardless of how many in each type) place a check (√) on the appropriate line in Column A. If you hold or have ever held a leadership position (officer, committee chair, etc.) place a (√) on the appropriate line in Column B. If you are currently active in any of these types of organizations: indicate the actual number of organizations in Column C. A sample list of the kinds of organizations/clubs/associations/groups is provided to assist you in determining the type of organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL TYPES</th>
<th>COLUMN A (√)</th>
<th>COLUMN B (√)</th>
<th>COLUMN C (actual #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Voluntary Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLES OF ORGANIZATIONAL KINDS

The following list of organizations are classified by types. This list is just a representation of the kinds of organizations and does not include all of the possible kinds that actually exist.

Civic Organizations: Kiwanis, Rotary, Active Club, Ruritan, Lions, Business & Professional Women, J.C.'s, Chamber of Commerce, Garden Club, Junior League.

Fraternal Organizations: Elks, Eagles, Moose, Knights of Columbus, Masons, Eastern Star.


Farm Organizations: Farm Bureau, Grange, N.F.O., Farmer's Union, American Agricultural Movement.

Political Organizations: League of Women Voters, Young Republicans, Young Democrats, City Council, County Commission.

Recreational Organizations: Country Club, Hunting and/or Fishing Clubs, Ducks Unlimited, Boating Clubs, A.A.U..

Religious Organizations: Church, Interfaith Groups, Missionary Organizations.

Voluntary Organizations: P.T.A., C.C.L., Red Cross, Heart Association, Search and Rescue, Crime Watch Groups, Adult Adviser to Youth Groups.


Professional Organizations: American Medical Association, Bar Association, Law Enforcement Association, Realtor Associations, Dealer Associations.

Community Organizations: Planning Commission, Community Task Forces, Neighborhood Improvement Associations, Downtown Business Associations.

Special Interest Organizations: Sierra Club, N.R.A., Greenpeace, Walton League, Consumer Organizations, Save the Whales, N.O.W.
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E. Table of Component Categories
Table of Component Categories

1) General Organizational Type: personal task oriented/general community oriented
2) Organizational Behavior Pattern: conflict/consensus
3) Participant Structure: core/semi-core/general members
4) Non-member Participation:
   A) Condoned: Yes/No
   B) Actual: Yes/No
5) Leadership Hierarchy: evident/not evident
6) Salient Activity of Participants: core explicit/all members involved
7) Decision-making Process: core explicit/all members involved
8) Sex Majority: male/female
9) Class Majority: upper/middle/lower
11) External Network Approach: targeted/shotgun
12) Organizational Size: large/small
13) Goal Orientation: socially defined/economically defined/politically defined
14) Record Keeping:
   A) Membership roster
   B) Meeting minutes
   C) Financial accounts
15) Types of Non-member Participants:
    A) Public officials: Yes/No
    B) Technical experts: Yes/No
    C) Media personnel: Yes/No
    D) Other organizational representatives: Yes/No
16) Devotion of Time by Core: highly functional/highly symbolic
17) Perception of Organization by Outsiders and Non-members:
    A) Level of saliency: High/Low
    B) Perceived legitimacy: Yes/No
    C) Need for organization: Yes/No
18) Activity by Males Versus Females: males more active/males less active
19) Racial Composition: homogeneous/heterogeneous
20) Membership Origin: site specific/geographically diffused
21) Division of Labor:
    A) Based on personal skills or expertise: Yes/No
    B) Allocated to volunteers without skill criteria: Yes/No
    C) Determined by external needs: Yes/No
22) Leadership: charismatic/founders/reputational/experts/winners
23) Manifest Democracy: Yes/No
24) Outside Image Identity: core related/issue related/symbol related
25) Recruiting Activity: systematic/not systematic
26) Meeting Formalities: formal procedure/information procedure
27) Newsletter: Yes/No
28) Public Information Person: Yes/No
29) Social Linkages in the Community: pre-established/not pre-established
30) Access of Organizational Representatives to Key Outsiders: blocked/open
31) Early Adoption of a Name: Yes/No
32) Length of Residents: oldtimers/newcomers
33) Recognition of the Organization's Issue by Outsiders: obvious/obscure
34) Formalization: incorporated/not incorporated
35) Trend of Operations: more complex/stable/less complex
36) Organizer's Prior Experience: past experience/no past experience
37) Identified Jurisdictional Responsible Entity: easy/difficult
38) Goals and Means Relationship:
   A) Uncertainty of goals and means
   B) Certainty of goals, but uncertainty of means
   C) Uncertainty of goals, but certainty of means
   D) Certainty of goals and means
39) Goal Articulation: expanding/constricting
40) Membership Stability: high/moderate/low
41) Initial Strategy: generate questions/generate demands
42) Media Conscientiousness: high/low
43) Media Value: high/low/indifferent
44) Issue Oriented: singular/multiple
45) Location of Meetings: public facility/private facility
46) Internal Conflict Expressed: Yes/No
47) Manifest Ideals: ideological/pragmatic
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