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This dissertation research applies the Political Process Model (a social movement framework) to community building initiatives to identify participant characteristics, levels of individual participation, and collective neighborhood social action processes. The methodology involves a case study of a private non-profit affordable housing developer in Franklin County, Ohio: the Columbus Housing
Partnership (CHP) an Enterprise Foundation affiliate. CHP participates in community building through a Community Safety Program utilizing AmeriCorps* members to organize and mobilize residents around community issues. Members and a program supervisor completed a questionnaire wherein the results were analyzed with multiple regression and path analysis techniques.

The results indicate higher levels of performance are associated with older female members who have higher levels of cognitive liberation. Faith and community based organizations had no greater nor worse influence on member participation than secular or non-indigenous organizations. The most influential variable was determined to be whether or not program partner missions were compatible with program objectives (mission agreement). Research results further indicate that faith and community-based organizations may have moved away from the roles that made them integral to the civil rights movement. Thus, there is a clear difference between an indigenous organization and a local movement center. The later is able to decrease fundamental attribution error and raise levels of cognitive liberation. By selecting local movement centers with mission agreement, more effective program partnerships can be developed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

As urban form evolves, cities are continually faced with the need to formulate effective community development initiatives to resolve urban problems. Shifting economic processes and consumer behavior have caused certain spatial units to prosper while others suffer from a declining quality of life. To address these quality of life concerns, development programs have been created to rectify the problems in these declining communities. The proliferation of faith and community-based organizations has inspired a national community development movement. As these indigenous organizations have played an integral role in social mobilization, this research explores social movement theory and its applicability to member participation within community development initiatives.

The existence of multiple methods to address social and infrastructure issues has caused the creation of many different types of programs. While these programs share the goal of revitalizing communities and addressing social concerns, their existence has
resulted in the term community development being utilized broadly as a term to
describe any activity that has an ultimate goal of improving quality of life. This
broadness have hampered the evolution of community development. Although
decreasing urban conditions has resulted in an increased interest in community
development, the field has not evolved into a particular specialization (Checkoway,
1995). The relatively small academic focus on community development has resulted in
a lack of city planning theoretical frameworks that specifically identify residents as an
integral component in the development process. A formalized community development
theory and model inclusive of resident participation is needed by planners and
community advocates as a means to elevate the social responsiveness of planning
processes.

Resident Participation

Community developers have generally focused on economic and infrastructure
improvement as the means to halt urban deterioration. However, research on the
process of community development proposes that more resident participation is required
in the neighborhood rebuilding process (Goetze & Colton, 1980). Increased resident
participation in development initiatives can lead to a heightened sense of community
that translates into healthier neighborhoods. Thus, long-term community improvement
is becoming associated with the direct participation of community residents.
A trend of increased resident participation can be observed through the formation of structured organizations throughout many urban communities. Resident mobilization to address community concerns has become prevalent as community based organizations have gained social and political influence (Van Til, 1980). Formal resident organizations benefit communities as it can lead to increased political and economic influence. Community influence can then be utilized to develop self-help initiatives or to attract intermediary, public and private, support in addressing identified community needs. The effective operation of community organizations is directly related to resident participation and organizational ability to address and document successful accomplishments. The need for community organizations to have an effective model on community development is further emphasized by the requirement of intermediary organizations for grantees to indicate actual impact and influence on community conditions. Effective administration of these programs requires a comprehensive understanding of community development. This understanding must account for resident participation in the development process.

Traditional Planning Processes

Traditionally, planning has supported macro issues in the dominant political, social, and economic order (Friedman, 1987). These plans have been developed through the comprehensive rational model. Planning rationality is the attempt to efficiently reproduce the social structure in contrast to planning communities that are responsive to resident needs (Thomas, 1982). Under this model, the planner is
primarily a mediator between development interest groups through the provision of the technical information utilized in the decision making process (Friedman, 1987; Faludi, 1973; Thomas, 1982). Planning rationality focuses on the planning process and emphasizes the formation of a rational decision making process with the decision being considered rational if it is made from a comprehensive set of potential courses of action (Thomas, 1982). Residents which are ultimately affected by these decisions are notably absent as the planning process is primarily driven by the political and economic interests which stand to benefit most.

Debate over the existence of rational decision making has increased as deteriorating urban conditions have exposed the flaws in the comprehensive rationality model (Yiftachel, 1989). Research on planning theory has identified comprehensive rationality as being bounded by several key characteristics of planning practice: the absence of clearly identified problems, an incomplete set of alternatives, unknown social consequences for each action, incomplete citizen participation, and organizational constraints (Forester, 1989). As planning theory continues to be focused on procedural, urban form, and analytical debates, planning remains a primarily technical process comprised of uniform standards regarding content, method, and purpose (Yiftachel, 1989). Although substantive theories have increased planner awareness of the social implications of actions (Thomas, 1982), the traditional focus on macro issues means that theoretical frameworks useful in the analysis of micro and community development processes are limited within the rational planning model.
Citizen Inclusive Planning

The formation of advocacy planning, an organizing structure where the planner is an agent for change, provides an orientation that encourages planners to represent the interests of those who are ultimately impacted by development plans (Beneviste, 1989). Developed by Paul Davidoff (1965), advocacy planning became an amendment to the American Institute of Planners code of ethics through the addition of this statement: “A planner shall seek to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons, and shall urge the alteration of policies, institutions, and decisions which militate against such objectives” (Checkoway, 1995). This type of planning attempts to include neighborhood participants in the planning process. While advocacy planning was developed in response to the social turmoil of the 1960s, the decline of the cities apparent at this time provided planners empirical examples of the limitations of the current planning ideology (Piven, 1975).

Although substantive theory and advocacy planning helped planners focus on the social impact of decisions and the need to include resident interests in the planning process, a gap still exists in formalized planning theory that accounts for resident participation. The closest attempt to bridge this gap has come with the development of Community Asset Building (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). This model functions by identifying assets within a community and developing strategies to develop these assets. Assets include the physical infrastructure along with human potential. Community
Asset Building has opened the door for other types of resident involved development: comprehensive community initiatives (Ewalt, 1998). Comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs) are attempts to interconnect social and physical planning activities. Although this can advance the comprehensiveness of rational planning, these models still need further development to identify the dynamics influencing resident participation in community development. Planning models can not actually be considered comprehensive if they do not include residents in the function of community development.

Increasing Planning Comprehensiveness

The lack of comprehensiveness in development models inhibits the examination of community participation processes and the identification and measurement of variables associated with productive development initiatives. If community development models are to approach comprehensiveness, then they should include theories on relationships amongst leaders and participants within community organizations along with their interaction with the institutional structure (Kelly & Van Vlaenderen, 1995). Knowledge of participation processes should also include the reasons why individuals participate in community development projects. How are these reasons related to the level of member participation? Is there a relationship between previous community organization affiliation and program participation?
Community Development and Social Movements

A direct parallel exists between community movement and social movement. Historically, large scale social movement has been facilitated through the mobilization of smaller communities. Consequently, analyzing movement patterns within smaller scale communities provides the opportunity to identify specific resident and community characteristics that facilitate mobilization. Social movement models may be applicable on a neighborhood scale, and could provide a framework to answer questions on resident participation in community development initiatives.

Social Movement Frameworks

The application of social movement theory to community development initiatives is not a new concept. Van Til (1980) suggests that a social movement approach facilitates the analysis of resident participation by identifying participant preferences, participation quality, and the conditions which precede collective neighborhood social action. Additionally, Van Til (1980) concludes that social movement approaches accentuate the impact of resident participation on neighborhood quality of life and provide effective models of the community development process. Social movement frameworks have previously been utilized in the field of city and regional planning by Capek and Gilderbloom’s (1992) research on a tenants’ movement. Research that effectively applies a social movement framework to explain resident participation in community development initiatives could result in the addition of a resident participation component to the comprehensive model. The implications of an effective
participation framework along with an effective application of a community transformation model can have profound impacts on city and regional planning as the search continues for ways to mobilize residents to participate in community transformation projects.

Objectives of the Study

The national movement towards neighborhood revitalization has been a consistently developing theme of United States public policy (e.g., VISTA, Model Cities, Citizen Participation within the Community Development Block Grant, and AmeriCorps*). These efforts have sought to develop communities through partnership development and resident involvement of which the AmeriCorps* program has been an underutilized method to achieve these objectives (Naparstek, Dooley, & Smith, 1997). A concurrent movement has occurred as the major non-governmental intermediary organizations work to build a national community development movement (Enterprise Foundation, 1999). These intermediaries have adopted the strategy of strengthening community-based organizations through the provision of technical assistance and resources, the recruitment of resident input through citizen participation in development processes, and promoting community organizing through direct resident contact. This strategy is identical to that which was used during the civil rights movement (indigenous organization formation, door-to-door campaigns, and community organizing, etc.) Research on the civil rights movement has indicated a direct association between social mobilization and the activation of community participation.
Consequently, exploring the applicability of social movement models to community development initiatives is a natural research topic.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate the applicability of the Political Process Model (a specific social movement framework) to a community development project through determining the strength of variable relationship and amount of variability explained in levels of member participation. The major objective is to:

Evaluate the Political Process Model as a method of explaining individual participation in community development initiatives.

The Organization of the Study

Chapter one is a review of the community development and social movement theory literature associated with this research. The literature review identifies subject's position in the planning literature and discusses the structure of neighborhoods and community development participation processes (Kelly & Van Vlaenderen, 1995; Schwirian, 1983; Mattessich, 1997). The participation process provides the context in which to discuss revitalization strategies (Checkoway, 1995; Goetze & Colton, 1980) and their comparable relationship to specific social movement theories (McAdam, 1982; Morris, 1984, Piven & Cloward, 1979).
Chapter two provides the research design, data collection strategies, and analytical methods to be used in this study. This research utilizes a questionnaire distributed to members of an AmeriCorps* Community Safety Program to assess member characteristics, attitudes, and opinions associated with participation. Levels of participation will be assessed through AmeriCorps* records, surveys of supervisors, and member responses. Multiple regression will then be utilized to measure the relationships amongst member characteristics and levels of participation. The questionnaire seeks to measure the contribution of suggested reasons for levels of member participation as presented by the Political Process Model. The methods utilized for univariate and multivariate data analysis are also provided. Chapters four and five include the results of the data analysis and a discussion of the implications on community development movement and public policy.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Throughout the history of community development policy in the United States, responsibility for the maintenance of community quality of life standards has been on individuals and communities. But, at times, this responsibility has gravitated back to higher levels of governments when community deterioration has reached a threshold. As the United States economy has prospered, socio-political processes have contributed towards the shifting of previously national responsibilities to local areas and, economic restructuring along with home-buyer preferences has resulted in the decline of the urban tax base and relocations of wealth concentrations to outlying communities. Combined with increased concentrations of poverty, deteriorating infrastructure, and growing political sentiment to reduce direct governmental subsidies, the health of many urban communities has eroded. These political, social, and economic dynamics are challenging communities to resolve their own issues with less dependence on external organizations (Checkoway, 1995). External organizations with the mission to improve the conditions of deteriorating communities are also challenged to increase the
sustainability of community development activities by effectively soliciting resident participation.

Rational Planning

A traditional method of facilitating community development has been through city planning processes. Theorists suggest, "planning is a process for determining appropriate future action through a sequence of choices" (Davidoff & Reiner, 1962), and "it attempts to link scientific and technical knowledge to processes of community development" (Friedman, 1987). Contained in this definition is a focus on process while the role of citizens and underrepresented groups is absent. Community development is generally suggested to be a process that results in the formation of solutions to resolve urban problems. These solutions most often take the form of housing construction or rehabilitation and ignore a key development component: citizens.

Citizen Participation

Planning effectiveness, as defined by Davidoff & Reiner (1962), is ultimately a result of the types of alternative choices available. Although it can be argued that rational planning has a socially inclusive component through the consideration of alternative choices, the capacity of these choices to further the public interest is a function of the representation of values of affected communities. Thus, the composition of values is representative of the community participating in the formulation process.
Certainly, the traditional forms of citizen participation favor the communities that have faith in them. These citizen participation processes are in the form of public hearings or resident committees. While minor changes may result from this process, the overall plan will generally promote the same values. Thus, the ability of a planning process to further the public interest is debatable if the values of all affected communities are not included in the choices of alternative plans.

The ability of citizens to support their values is a function of the economic, political, and social dynamics influencing variability in spatial prosperity or decline. This provides a contextual need for plans that address community concerns. As evident by suburban prosperity and urban decline, development plans can benefit and also ill affect specific communities. The sequence of choices in a planning process characterized by the norms of prosperous communities ultimately limits the effectiveness and sustainability of community development processes. Questionable effectiveness is illustrated through comparisons of planning theory and urban conditions. The social conditions of the 1960's caused general planning theory to be questioned as obvious social inequalities and disruption combined with the general decline of cities challenged the axiom that planning functioned in conjunction with the general public interest (Yiftachel, 1989; Piven, 1975). Based upon community location, condition, and social constraints, planning processes actually exacerbated the dichotomy of rich versus poor and non-minority versus minority. Due to the reliance on prosperous community values and resources, it can be argued that the rational planning
model functionally contributes to disparities between community conditions. The focus on rational processes of planning omitted the social impact of planning actions; consequently, the necessity for social accountability facilitated the development of planning principles that focused on the need to improve community conditions and resident quality of life.

Advocacy Planning

An alternative planning model that attempts to promote social accountability is advocacy planning. Concurrent with the planning paradigm breakdown of the 1960's (Yiftachel, 1989), the rise of advocacy planning was influenced by massive social unrest. The civil rights movement with its direct action techniques of marches, boycotts, and sit-ins focused attention on wide-spread social, political, and economic inequities (Checkoway, 1994). Davidoff (1965) stated, “the massing of voices protesting racial discrimination have roused this nation to the need to rectify racial and other social injustices.... The just demand for political and social equality on the part of the Negro and the impoverished requires the public to establish the basis for a society affording equal opportunity to all citizens” (Davidoff, Page 277). This identifies the need to devise a new role for the planner that would connect institutional resources to the issues of minorities, impoverished groups, and the communities in which they live.
Advocacy Planning Assumptions

While traditional planning theory can be said to have socially inclusive components, unitary plans that assume the existence of a single outcome beneficial to the whole community have discouraged full citizen participation in the development process (Davidoff, 1965). The formation of advocacy planning, a non-traditional model, represented a step towards increasing the participation of underrepresented groups in the planning process. Although an assumption of the advocacy model is that established citizen groups have access to the decision making process, the formation and strength of these groups are correlated to their position in the social, political, and economic strata (Greenberg, 1971). Schattschneider (1960) contends that a problem with the assumption of access is that citizen participation favors the upper-class due to its social, political, and economic resources and influence. Consequently, the existence of a single community interest has been debatable as unitary planning has historically resulted in further political, social, and economic exclusion for many groups.

Planners have been committed to city interests that benefit from the values of growth and development (Piven, 1975). These values are associated with benefactors who develop community development policies along with guiding and influencing the allocation of a great degree of city resources. Thus, planning has historically been an instrument of domination in the hands of actors who have the capacity to prevail in promoting their own interests (Friedmann, 1987; Beneviste, 1989). Advocacy planning, on the other hand, argues that planners have a responsibility to advocate for
those individuals excluded from the decision making process whose communities will be impacted by development initiatives. Davidoff (1965) considered the planning process to be a remedy for social maladies and inequalities by extending the decision making process to traditionally excluded groups thus supporting urban democracy. The furtherance of democracy through advocacy planning requires the equitable consideration of multiple project plans. These plans should include the evidence for supporting one plan over another while the social impacts are considered.

While advocacy planning has influenced the application of planning theory implementation, its basic assumptions need further debate in the development of a theory for community development activities. Clavel (1994) contends that the advocacy role helps planners contribute to the formation of community identities, develops coalitions amongst city neighborhoods, and enhances the technical analysis of community development. Consequently, the advocacy role is a model that extends the rational planning process to consider more alternatives for more communities.

Davidoff (1965) suggests the role of the planner should be to help communities take advantage of access to the public and private institutions promoting development. The assumption of equal access to the decision making process is essentially a pluralist concept. While the concept and influence of advocacy planning has been debated in the literature (Krumholz, 1994; Peattie, 1994; Hayden, 1994; Forester, 1994), its assumption regarding the nature of the political environment is potentially the most
contestable. Davidoff's (1965) contention that the political process is pluralistic assumes that all social groups have equal access to the decision making process. This contention implies that organized groups can utilize the institutional structure to improve their quality of life. It is clear, however, that different groups have differential abilities to bring about change. The debate regarding the distribution of power and its influence on the planning environment is discussed under the structure of the pluralist (Dahl, 1967) and elitist model (Mills, 1956) debate. Edward Greenberg (1971) discusses the pluralist and elite models within the context of social movement development. This is especially useful as advocacy planning, a means to facilitate resident involvement, can have a tendency to develop into community mobilization (Peattie, 1994). Once communities mobilize, the distribution of power influencing the decision making process can influence the achievement of movement goals as participants place pressure upon external agencies to support their efforts.

**Pluralism**

Proponents of the pluralist model maintain that power is widely dispersed amongst various groups in society. Greenberg (1971) notes that an essential characteristic describing the policy formulation process is that the presence of multiple interests groups balances participant influence as none of these groups exert control over another. Thus, neither political, social, nor economic interests have undue influence over the political process. The general example provided is the tripartite system of government: executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Each branch has
specifically designated roles while providing checks and balances to other branch powers. Politics is considered an essential aspect of this distribution of power as it represents a method to facilitate the formation of consensus amongst various groups. While each branch of government addresses specific aspects of the forces shaping urban form, this model fails to identify the influence of capitalist and economic interests. Elected officials are considered the means by which the electorate ensures that public policy fulfills social requirements. This assumes elected officials have the capacity to govern and influence economic dynamics and their affect on the social structure, and the electorate freely chooses its officials without institutional influence.

Another major component of the pluralist model is the bargaining process. Greenberg (1971) states, "bargaining usually implies that people are able to reach agreements because each participant has something of value that the other party desires, and that some manner of mutual trade is enacted" (Greenberg, Page 13). The process of political bargaining generally results in a mutually advantageous arrangement (Banfield, 1955). Bargaining suggests that the involved parties have something that the other desires. This assumption does not appear to take into account the depressed condition of deteriorated neighborhoods. A community must have identified something of value if it is to bargain effectively (see Kretzman & McNight, 1993). The traditional institutional position of the urban poor leaves them in a position where bargaining is not a pragmatic strategy, leading many to question the accuracy of the pluralist model.
Elitism

The basic assumption of the elite model concerns the distribution of power in the public policy formulation process. Proponents of elite models contend that the policy formulation process is not balanced by the presence of multiple interest groups. Elitists assert that political influence is concentrated in the hands of a few as opposed to a mass base of individuals. Specifically, power over community decisions is concentrated in the hands of a small group of business and financial leaders who have common interests and values (Greenberg, 1971). This causes the agenda of issues to revolve primarily around their needs and concerns, thus, dictating an environment that supports, maintains, and propagates status quo political, social, and economic arrangements: rational planning.

Bachrack and Baratz (1962) enhance the view of the elite model by discussing political agenda dynamics. While most research is placed on those who yield direct power, Bachrack and Baratz (1962) suggest that power is also contained by those who shape the context and agenda of the political process - those who allow issues to enter into the arena of political debate. This type of power is exemplified by the elite creating and reinforcing social and political values and institutional practices that limit the scope of the political process to public consideration of only those issues relevant to their concerns, thus, eliminating deliberation on issues needed to improve the quality of life of those who are less advantaged.
The realm of public politics is not a critical issue within the elite model as it contends that the base of power is not contained within the political structure. Those who yield the most power are the individuals or groups who control the economic interests, thus, making political officials subordinate to their decisions. This perspective has the effect of making participation in political activities a method of diverting attention away from pertinent issues and co-opting the public's attempts at self-empowerment. Elected officials, theoretically the voice of the electorate, are dominated by outside interests. These elected officials create policy that supports the individuals or groups responsible for maintaining their elected position. Subsequently, elected officials have a strong propensity to gain support for their activities from power brokers.

The dispersal of power and the subsequent bargaining and negotiation between those individuals or groups that comprise the base of decision-making allows entrance into the political process. This brings visibility to another primary component of the elite model. The elite model maintains that under-represented groups do not have access to the primary decision makers. It can be argued that the presence of each elite group or individual creates an environment wherein groups denied access to one venue can voice their concerns to another group. Pluralists suggest that many issues are outside the sphere of the political process and out of reach of the legal authority of government implying that concentrations of power do not have wide-spread influence (Greenberg, 1971). Contrarily, elitists argue that members of the power brokering groups have
shared interests and exercise their power in the service of those interests thus extending their power into the daily life of citizens (Greenberg, 1971). Alford and Scoble (1967) imply these shared interests influence community development by limiting the consideration of plans to those which support the values and interests of power brokering groups.

**Implications of Assumptions**

Evidence exists to support the contention that both the pluralist and elitist models are applicable to specific situations. Applicability would be based upon the prevalence of the specific issue and its level of importance to elitists and the electorate. It is possible that some issues indicate elitist tendencies and others demonstrate the presence of a pluralist structure. Consequently, advocacy planners can increase their probability of success if they understand the nature of the political environment and the category into which an issue can be classified.

The essential problem with accepting advocacy planning as a singular community development model is its pluralist assumption. While the pluralist argument states that all groups have the opportunity to address community issues at some point in the policy making process, a contradicting pluralist element is that many issues are outside the boundaries of the political process (Greenberg, 1971). This suggests that certain issues influencing urban form and quality of life (economic concerns) lack a venue where they can be addressed specifically through political mobilization. This contradiction results
in the pluralistic model lacking applicability to many urban concerns as underrepresented communities typically lack the political network, economic resources, and social mobility to impact the policy process through strategies characterized by simple pluralist assumptions. Abbot (1995) notes that the effectiveness of community development is influenced by the nature of the policy-making process as development initiatives typically function within the governing framework. Consequently, the distribution of political and economic power and the assumptions contained within development models should influence the formation of community planning strategies.

Planning and Community Development

One of the purposes of development strategies is to improve the living conditions in poor communities. Development strategies typically seek to improve communities through infrastructure development. Infrastructure development results in the improvement of roads and housing while ignoring other needs of community residents. A deteriorated infrastructure is a function of the decline in social, political, and economic connection of a community to the larger institutional system. Communities in decline are generally comprised of those individuals who lack the mobility to migrate to more prosperous areas. Communities that have declined are characterized by concentrated poverty, high unemployment, low relative household income, poor education and health care, inadequate access to social services, and the effects of social isolation (see Wilson, 1987). As a consequence of this condition, Ewalt (1998) asserts that community development initiatives require strategies “that
address the physical and economic conditions of neighborhoods as well as the social and cultural aspects” (Ewalt, Page 3). Sustainable community development, then, is not only the development of the physical infrastructure, it is the simultaneous improvement of social and cultural considerations to maintain physical community enhancements.

Because of access to information, stakeholders, funders, and governing processes, planners are in a unique position to formulate sustainable community development initiatives. However, this sustainability requires the addition of effective resident participation. The community development process should include the individual resident as a participant in the attempt to address local issues (Friedmann, 1987). These issues can include health, safety, code enforcement, municipal services, and housing among others. While macro level analysis addresses the issues that shape urban form, community level modeling must account for the relationship of individuals to the transformation process. Friedman (1987) notes, “it is meaningless to talk about self-reliant development without, at the same time, considering the need for collective self-empowerment, by which I mean a continuing and permanent struggle for the equalization of individual and community access to the bases of social power” (Friedman, Page 396). As individuals become involved in the development process, community mobilization increases the potential that community improvement objectives will be achieved. The presence of social inequalities along with a mobilizing community creates an arena where interest groups contend for benefits. Within this arena, planners can challenge the status quo of the social and political structure while
advocating for community transformation. This places the planner in a unique position to include input from community groups in the decision-making process. Thus a partnership can be formed between neighborhood residents and development advocates (e.g., planners, developers, and government agencies). To effectively form development partnerships, the planning advocate must ensure a commitment exists from community and institutional organizations while both the planner and community groups expands into the network of community development organizations (Friedman, 1987).

Community Planning

A general theoretical contention is that planning processes are driven by the goals of furthering the public interest and improving community quality of life through land use and economic development. While traditional plans still emphasize infrastructure improvement, Sites (1998) contends community development planning now considers the rebuilding of neighborhoods through strengthening community networks and internal resources: communitarian theory. According to Sites (1998), the focus on community networks and resource development has caused community development projects to be increasingly composed of self-help, integrative, and consensus formation activities. As the continued deterioration of communities indicates the inadequacy of traditional planning models, contemporary community development strategies attempt to integrate individual resident input into the planning process. These community development strategies include Comprehensive Community Initiatives.
Comprehensive Community Initiatives

Comprehensive Community Initiatives (CCIs) have developed as a result of recognizing that community social and economic decline is a function of many issues. These issues are interrelated and are generally compounded by their influence on one another (Ewalt, 1998). The existence of multiple problems highlights the inadequacy of simply developing the physical infrastructure as a means to combat community decline. Housing construction and rehabilitation may improve the aesthetics of a community; however, other issues that contributed to the decline are not addressed. Thus, comprehensive community initiatives contain programmatic attempts to combine physical development (housing and infrastructure) with social enhancement through “child-care, youth development, community safety, mental health care, family support, community planning, adult education, work force development, and other quality of life initiatives” (Ewalt, Page 3).

Although comprehensiveness is suggested as a strategy to address the multiple physical, economic, and social needs of communities, Bruner (1996) contends that few community development programs are actually comprehensive. The lack of comprehensiveness is a result of the limited resources of sponsoring organizations and the scarce opportunities that allow these initiatives to be developed. Bruner (1996) goes
on to question the effectiveness of CCIs as a strategy to improve the lives of residents living in deteriorated communities. This contention is based on the premise that comprehensiveness requires improving communities through developing individual residents, and the degree to which programs are able to address an aggregation of community residents is questionable.

**Community Asset Building**

Community Asset Building (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993) evolved out of the need to include community input as a component in the development process and is a framework that encourages the development of individual residents. It is more responsive to individual needs than traditional planning processes because asset building considers all items that can potentially be used to improve community conditions as assets - including human. These assets are then targeted under a strategic plan for development: thus the term community building is identified. Through the objective of combining physical and social development, this approach develops a holistic assessment of community dynamics that “acknowledges the interconnectedness of people, and recommends a course of action in which multiple solutions support one another” (Naparstek & Dooley, 1998, Page 11).

Community Asset Building can lead to comprehensive community initiatives as the opportunity is produced to combine resources external to communities with resident supported development plans. Although development plans utilizing Community Asset
Building model allow for resident input, these plans assume residents want to or will participate. This assumption can threaten the longevity and success of community development initiatives as widespread participation is not easily obtained. In fact, the difficulty of obtaining resident involvement in development initiatives is of such a degree that it is typically absent from project strategies and little discussion of it is found in the literature (Ross and Leigh, 2000). This lends support to the need to investigate and identify the attributes of individuals involved in community development activities so as to increase the ability to target prospective participants.

Although citizen participation has become a common term to describe community input in the planning process, it is an inconclusive strategy. Citizen participation is dependent upon the assumption that residents believe their participation in the process will influence change. The prevailing issue is how to increase resident faith in systemic change to facilitate increased participation.

Community Planning Goals

Another issue associated with community development efforts is the formation of goals: internally and externally. Competition amongst groups internal to the community as well as within an advocacy organization can hamper the mobilization of indigenous resources in development activities. Influences external to the community work to establish which goals are selected. Externally influenced goals are generally social in nature. The focus on social as opposed to political movement formation
directs participants to address issues acceptable to those who are external to the community in need. Some community development programs prohibit members and volunteers from participating in or promoting political activities (e.g., AmeriCorps*). These further limit the expansion of democracy to depressed communities and illustrate the need for a theory specifically targeting community development dynamics.

Community Development

As the subject of this study is community development, the spatial unit of analysis is the community. A major issue needing to be addressed in the evolution of the community development specialization is the ambiguity associated with the term. The definition of "community" adopted for this research focuses on residents within a geographic area who are socially and psychologically connected to each other (Mattessich, 1997). Community is generally considered as a place in which people live or a homogenous population group; however, community also includes the process of residents taking collective initiative to utilize internally developed problem solutions (Checkoway, 1995). Christenson and Robinson (1989) define community development as "a group of people in a locality initiating a social action process (i.e., planned intervention) to change their economic, social, cultural, and/or environmental situation." Community development objectives typically focus on many issues including housing, aesthetics, health, crime, economics, poverty, and political participation initiatives. The range of community issues creates ambiguity as development programs have become associated with the specific issues rather than the extensiveness of
community problems. Hays (1995, page 35) provides a broad definition of community
development as being “the total process by which a geographic or political entity
improves the quality of its physical structures, its economic life, and its social
relationships.” Based upon these constructs, community development is referred to as
a collective effort to resolve issues influencing the overall health of a community. The
focus of this research is on the participation behavior of residents in community
transformation projects.

While planning can be used as a process to improve community health, Feagin
(1986) asserts the planning process is hampered by the absence of a theory of urban
dynamics within the field of city planning. While the presence of a broad-based theory
of urban dynamics would provide a tool to be utilized in community improvement
planning, it would not guarantee successful development will take place: the problem is
addressed but not necessarily solved. However, the addition of a multi-disciplinary
approach can provide basic theoretical input to the development of this broader
theoretical hypothesis by modeling the attributes and participation of residents with
development programs. Capek and Gilderbloom (1992) attempted to model this
participation by applying a sociological framework to a tenants’ movement through the
resource mobilization model.
Community Development and Social Movement Theory

Resource mobilization theory contends that social/community movement development is dependent upon the provision of resources from sources external to the community (Morris, 1984; Piven & Cloward, 1979). This suggests that effective social mobilization is dependent upon productive management of these resources and without these provisions mobilization is absent. The resource mobilization perspective discounts classical theories that mobilization is more dependent upon collective social grievances and psychological dynamics. Classical movement theory maintains that the inability of the social system to provide equal opportunity for advancement precedes the development of structural strain and the subsequent evolution from individual to collective frustrations leads to social movement formation (McAdam, 1982). Both models address components of social movement applicable to community development projects; however, they discount factors that could explain individual member participation.

McAdam (1982) brings together major components of these models by accounting for political and individual psychological dynamics. The relationship between personal characteristics (family income, father's education, household structure, and size of residence) and movement participation have been shown to lack statistical significance while individual level of integration into a social network has been found to be the best distinguishing characteristic between participants and non-participants (Orum, 1972). The emphasis by the Political Process Model on the
function of political dynamics focuses on collective community efforts to cooperate with various organizations while contending with the status quo (Banfield, 1955). The Political Process Model is based upon the elite interpretation of power distribution; however, the application of the model allows for pluralist dynamics to be analyzed. The lack of significant contributions by personal variables in the explanation of movement participation highlights the need to analyze member involvement in relation to other factors.

Communities and Social Action

Social movement analytical approaches can facilitate the consideration of other factors as models have been developed to explore individual participation dynamics. This approach begins by considering the community to be essential to the social action process (Van Til, 1980). The social and psychological structure of a community is identified through the terms neighborhood and social area. A neighborhood is distinguished from a residential area by its social character (Schwirian, 1983). The sociological literature on neighborhood change identifies the concept of neighborhood as a natural area distinguished by:

1) a geographic area physically distinguishable from other adjacent areas;

2) a population with unique social, demographic, or ethnic composition;

3) a social system with rules, norms, and regularly recurring patterns of social interaction that function as mechanisms of social control; and,

4) aggregate emergent behaviors or ways of life that distinguish the area from others around it (Park, 1952).
Contemporary community dynamics (gentrification and suburbanization) support Parks’ (1952) outline of neighborhoods as community sections in close proximity may be typified by substantially different social and economic characteristics. This heterogeneity results in communities with specifically identifiable areas called neighborhoods but little social interaction despite the close proximity. Rusk (1995) notes prosperous and depressed areas, despite proximity, are formed by the same political, economic, and social processes. Thus, within a given community there are areas in which residents naturally interact. A natural area is differentiated by social status (education/income), familism (family structure), and ethnicity (Schwirian, 1983). Social status factors facilitate the identification of specific residential communities characterized by homogenous life style indicators.

Dependent Communities

The lack of internal institutional strength within a poor community results in dependence upon wealthier communities and constrains attempts at self-empowerment. “Dependency refers to an asymmetrical structural relationship between social formations such that the dependent community is shaped to a large extent by the social dynamics and interests generated in the dominant community”; additionally, future relationships are tempered by the historical dependency structure as dominated groups remain dominated and dominant groups remain dominant (Castells and Laserna, Page 57). This is exemplified by new forms of dependency emerging under conditions
shaped by the previous form. Poor regions do not just happen haphazardly, rather they are produced through their relationship with wealthier regions or institutions. This development of underdevelopment takes place as wealthier regions make poor regions economically dependent by controlling the amount and uses of capital investment. As profits generally do not remain in these areas, the poorer regions remain dependent on the dominant society for jobs and markets forming a relationship characterized by permanent dependence. As neighborhoods change and develop, the ability of residents to coalesce and mobilize on issues affects the overall health of the community (Schwirian, 1977). Kahn (1994) contends that community mobilization in response to the forces that shape urban form is even more important in poor neighborhoods. Kahns' (1994) contention is based upon the formation of community-based organizations by mobilizing residents. This accentuates the need to have community development frameworks that assist planners and residents in the quest to understand community dynamics and build policies/programs that address quality of life issues.

Community residents can play a major role in neighborhood transformation efforts; however, collective responses are limited as external economic, political, and social forces are primary determinants of neighborhood form (Downs, 1981; Mattessich, 1997). Although limited, options do exist.
Community Response Options

The response option under analysis in this research is the participation process.

Resident participation is a central tenet in community-based approaches to neighborhood transformation (Kelly & Van Vlaenderen, 1995; Goetze & Colton, 1980). The literature on strategy development for resident participation (Booth, 1977; Checkoway, 1995) identifies six specific methodologies of community change:

1) mass mobilization aims to create change by amassing individuals around issues; visible public actions can generate power and compel concessions from targets;

2) citizen participation aims to involve citizens in policy planning and program implementation of government agencies; people should take part in their government, and agencies should involve them in the public matters that affect them;

3) public advocacy is the process of representing group interests in legislative, administrative, or other established institutional arenas. This strategy assumes that any group should have influential representation regardless of its wealth and power;

4) popular education aims to create change by raising critical consciousness of common concerns; people are able to participate but may be unwilling to do so because they may lack consciousness, competence, or confidence;

5) local services development is a process in which people provide their own services at the community level; problems in communities have local solutions and residents can take local initiative and help themselves;

6) social action aims to create change by building powerful organizations at the community level. This belief assumes that organizing can win improvements in people’s lives while making them more aware of their own power and altering relations of power within the community.
The variability in the specific goals of organizations promoting community transformation indicates these methodologies can be utilized alone or in combination. In the context of program development and implementation, each methodology can be characterized by similar components therefore they are not mutually exclusive. Some social action strategies develop from protest to program, as protest groups work to establish sustained service organizations, programs, and community-based resident groups (Checkoway, 1995; Naparstek, 1982). Resident involvement in social action also facilitates the development of grassroots leaders who experience an empowering transformation in response to their participation in community organizing activities (Checkoway, 1995). This empowerment has been identified as a crucial element in the development of grassroots leadership (Kieffer, 1984).

The Participation Process and the Civil Rights Movement

The civil rights movement is an empirical example of the development of grassroots transformation efforts. The civil rights era demonstrates the most visible social insurgency and disruption by a minority population group in United States history. Insurgency has the potential to take many forms. The form is determined by the aggrieved populations' institutional position in society and their collective perception of opportunities available (Piven & Cloward, 1979). Consequently, insurgency activities by aggrieved populations generally take the form of social protest due to the lack of viable institutional accessibility. In response to long-term racial oppression, the 1950s saw the extension of the indigenous structure (Black Churches
and Student Groups) into formal protest organizations. The basic form of insurgency was protest. Protest was considered a direct action technique whereby the use of public demonstrations, sit-ins, civil disobedience, and institutional response focused attention on the racial issues and social inequalities within the United States. Through activities of social disruption, insurgents sought to attract federal attention to address the disparity in quality of life between majority and minority groups. The late 1960s noted a collective shift in the form of insurgency from protest to politics. The shift is illustrated by the transformation of protest into community organizing for the purpose of using the electoral system to change the Black institutional position in United States society. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 and a renewed focus of Blacks on insurgency marked by electoral expression preceded the shift in protest strategy.

Bayard Rustin, a long-time civil rights organizer and advisor to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., accurately predicted in 1965 that the civil rights movement would evolve into formal institutionalized party politics as direct action techniques would be subordinated to the strategy of building political power (Lawson, 1991). While the structure of the civil rights movement was traditionally an outreach of the Black church with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) functioning as the political arm (Morris, 1984), the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress for Racial Equality (CORE) actually facilitated the transformation from direct action protest techniques to mass base political involvement (Tate, 1993). These organization activities included street-level community organizing, Black voter
registering, and door-to-door canvassing subsequently resulting in increased electoral participation rates and the proliferation of Black community-based organizations (Tate, 1993). A concurrent theme in the development of public policy during this time frame (1960s) is the establishment of community development corporations as a primary poverty fighting mechanism in “The War on Poverty” (Rohe, 1998; Koebel, 1998). Sullivan (1993) goes on to note that contemporary community development is an outgrowth of attempts in the 1960s to address the needs of individuals living in poor neighborhoods rather than just attempting to rehabilitate the physical infrastructure. While the existence of empirical evidence to support Sullivans’ (1993) contention is debatable, support does exist for the idea that Black community mobilization to address civil rights concerns was also utilized in the attempt to improve the quality of life of impoverished communities. Black community organizing efforts were part of a national movement to mobilize individuals to become politically and socially active and proved to be successful as the plight of the Black political agenda became visible on a global scale.

Socio-Economic Processes and Neighborhoods

Neighborhood health and resident involvement in community mobilization is greatly influenced by broader social and economic factors. Naparstek, Dooley, and Smith (1997) state:

“a well-functioning community, regardless of socioeconomic level, provides an environment within which its members are able to establish standards of acceptable behavior that reflect the values of the group and
promotes resident achievement of common goals. This provides the linkages that form the groups and organizations that support and transmit values shared by the community" (Page 9).

This statement appears to overlook the fact that poor communities generally do not function well, members of poor communities are not successful in achieving common values or goals, and broad social and economic processes can undermine the ability of residents to fulfill their values. Thus, a more in depth description is required.

Resident Apathy

Piven and Cloward (1979) note that resident acquiescence is based upon the broadness of the social, political, and economic order. This broadness combined with minimal individual mobility and resident isolation from participation in the institutional structure contributes to the perceived inability to influence socio-economic processes.

Wilson (1987) contends there are primarily three issues contributing to resident apathy, fatalism, and community quality of life:

1) The shift to a service based economy has decreased the number of quality blue-collar jobs and increased the number of low wage low skill jobs,

2) Increased joblessness results in increased poverty and undermines family values,

3) Increased mobility and exodus of middle-class families from central city neighborhoods has resulted in increased concentrated poverty and deterioration of community-based resources and institutions.
Socio-Economic Influence on Resident Apathy

Wilson (1987) further contends that these issues are compounded by the social isolation experienced by residents living in poor communities as they have low levels of interaction with people or circumstances outside their neighborhoods. The primary premise of Wilson’s research contends that the major influence on deteriorating communities is unemployment as a result of economic restructuring. The key implication for community development is that widespread joblessness results in residents with an underdeveloped work ethic and a lifestyle not conducive to stabilized employment patterns. The inability to acquire gainful employment influences daily life by facilitating emotional depression, decreased expectations, and minimizes self-efficacy ultimately contributing to a sense of hopelessness, fatalism, and apathy (Wilson, 1987).

The effect of joblessness also influences the acquisition and quality of one of the most integral aspects of family and community: affordable housing. Myrdal (1944) asserts housing provides the setting for the whole life of the family as it indicates family organization and community demographics because of the strong correlation between poor housing and poor health, juvenile delinquency, and crime. All of which contributes to the overall health of the community. As the drive to transform individual lives with welfare to work programs increases, housing is the primary cost burden for families in transition from welfare to work (State of the Cities, Page xviii). According the National Low Income Housing Coalition (1999), there exists a gap of nearly $6.00
per hour between the present federal minimum wage and the hourly wage needed to afford a two-bedroom apartment at the median fair market rent. This gap increases with the number of required bedrooms. Thus, many residents must work more than 40 hours per week. With the emergence of single parent female-headed households as a major demographic trend, the amount of time necessary to acquire the basic necessities of life reduces the time available to participate in community building activities.

Consequently, many communities in need of development are characterized by socially isolated, under and unemployed residents who are socially, politically, and economically disadvantaged. These disadvantages in combination with community organizations that typically lack the resources to address the magnitude and complexity of community problems result in an aggregation of residents lacking the tools and initiative to improve community quality of life. Thus, organizations face a monumental task of initiating the involvement of residents who are doubtful about the benefits of participation in development activities.

The Political Process Model

Community Mobilization

Assuming that community mobilization functions by the interaction of many social, political, and economic factors, this analysis borrows from theoretical frameworks developed empirically from the civil rights movement. This development is explained
within the context of the Political Process Model (see Figure 2.1) of social movement development as formulated by McAdam (1982). The Political Process Model identifies three sets of factors that are believed to be crucial in the generation of social insurgency (McAdam, 1982).

"The first is the level of organization within the aggrieved population; the second, the collective assessment of the prospects for successful insurgency within that same population; and third, the political alignment of groups within the larger political environment" (McAdam, 1982).

The level of indigenous organization is the extent to which community groups are interconnected with residents and each other. In conjunction with overall community perception of positive results from transformation activities, the opportunity for political advancement provides an institutional avenue for the achievement of community transformation goals. The three sets of factors identified in the Political
Process Model place focus on the dynamics residents experience as they participate in the community transformation process.

**Participant Recruitment**

With any mobilization project, a primary determinant of success is the recruitment process for potential members. McAdam (1982) asserts that participation in social transformation activities is characterized by three key attributes. First, participants are recruited through established community networks; secondly, individuals can be recruited by their previous affiliation with community organizations; third, community organizations facilitate member recruitment by providing an arena to interact with potential participants (McAdam, 1982). The interaction of these attributes suggests that existing community groups and organizations can serve as the primary source of member recruitment through what is termed as bloc recruitment (Oberschall, 1973). Bloc recruitment describes the recruitment of a collective group as opposed to specific individuals. Thus, community mobilization occurs more from bloc recruitment than from the collective involvement of participants not previously involved in the organization process (Oberschall, 1973). McAdam (1982) concludes that mobilization is the result of merging community groups. These groups provide leadership, existing organizational structure, resources, and participants (discussed under Indigenous Structures) to the overall community transformation process. The application of the Political Process Model to community transformation processes has three implications:
1) Residents without previous affiliation with neighborhood organizations are generally absent from the community development/empowerment process;

2) Communities with low levels of indigenous organizational strength will experience high levels of difficulty in the attempt to mobilize residents (consequently, the implications for unorganized communities are bleak);

3) Community institutional advancement is dependent upon the ability of communities to take advantage of the structure of political opportunities.

Morris (1984) has described social movements as being facilitated through the structure of a local movement center. A local movement center is a component of social organization specifically developed by members of a dominated group that produces, organizes, coordinates, finances, and sustains community transformation initiatives (Morris, 1984). A dominated group is one that is excluded from the decision-making processes that determine the quantity and quality of social, economic, and political benefits acquired from participating in the governing structure (Morris, 1984). Contemporary examples of potential movement centers include community development corporations, community-based and grass-root organizations, religious institutions, block watch organizations, and youth groups among others.

Cognitive Liberation.

Piven and Cloward (1979) suggest that political, economic, and social institutions greatly influence the composition of society by shaping the beliefs and daily patterns of life of the citizenry. This influence also maintains the rules of interaction
amongst communities while relegating insurgency to episodic events supporting the historical relationship between specific dominated communities and the status quo. Piven and Cloward (1979, Page 6) go on to assert that “however hard their lot may be, people usually remain acquiescent, conforming to the accustomed patterns of daily life in their community, and believing those patterns to be both inevitable and just.” While it is debatable whether individuals in a dominated community believe the social structure is just, the lack of insurgent activity indicates support for collective feelings of acquiescence and apathy. The presence of these collective feelings provide insight into the difficulty experienced in initiating resident participation in community development activities. Kretzmann and McNight (1993) suggest traditional planning practices of forming development strategies based upon needs assessments increase resident apathy and fatalistic tendencies. The suggestion is that needs-driven planning results in residents who are dependent upon social provision programs, thus, impeding the development of residents able to take an assertive attitude towards community development. Consequently, needs driven plans exacerbate the problems of apathy and fatalism negatively influencing resident participation.

The level of resident apathy and fatalism about community conditions ultimately influences the success of development efforts. Successful community development efforts are more likely to occur when the motivation to begin a community building process is self-imposed (Mattessich, 1997). This type of movement initiation provides an additional benefit for planners as community participation and the internal
identification of goals by residents increases the probability for the achievement of participation goals and community transformation objectives (Mattessich, 1997).

While the presence of community organizations and political opportunities provides the structure for potential transformation initiatives, the process of cognitive liberation has been identified as the underlying construct that converts this potential into community mobilization (McAdam, 1982). This conversion potential is the ability of a population to convert a favorable structure of political opportunities into an organized campaign of community transformation (McAdam, 1982; Katz & Gurin, 1969). The emergence of a social movement campaign results from both a transformation of consciousness and of behavior (Piven & Cloward, 1979). The process of cognitive liberation is comprised of three distinct aspects:

1) First, the system, or those aspects of the system that people experience and perceive, loses legitimacy. Large numbers of men and women who ordinarily accept the authority of their rulers and the legitimacy of institutional arrangements come to believe in some measure that these rulers and these arrangements are unjust and wrong;

2) People who are ordinarily fatalistic, who believe that existing arrangements are inevitable, begin to assert rights that imply demands for change; and,

3) There is a new sense of efficacy; people who ordinarily consider themselves helpless come to believe that they have some capacity to alter their lot (Piven & Cloward, Page 3-4).

Another study concluded that grass-root participants who became community leaders experienced a similar empowering transformation (Kieffer, 1984). This study
concluded that these individuals had a collective feeling of powerlessness and alienation ("You feel powerless, you feel helpless"), then an immediate threat or violation of their integrity had sufficient force to spark initial participation ("No! I’m going to stay here and fight"). Initial participation was followed by the development of supportive relationships with organizers and community counterparts that provided skills and a structure for community transformation. This process facilitates the development of empowerment as individuals began to view themselves as leaders capable of transforming their communities (Kieffer, 1984).

**Fundamental Attribution Error**

An additional consideration to the characteristics influencing member participation is the degree of fundamental attribution error: the tendency of individuals to explain their social condition as a function of personal characteristics as opposed to factors beyond their control (Ross, 1976; McAdam, 1982). This consideration allows the following implications to be identified:

1) participants who attribute their condition to larger system factors are likely to have higher levels of member participation;

2) conversely, participants who attribute their condition to individual factors are likely to have lower levels of member participation.
Structure of Indigenous Organizations

As residents coalesce to form community-based social groups and organizations, local movement centers are formed. In Morris' (1984) assessment of the civil rights movement, entitled Black Communities Organizing for Change, local movement centers are identified as a primary means for the growth and development of community transformation. Morris (1984) maintains that a movement center is established when a community has developed an interrelated set of leaders, organizations, and followers who collectively define group goals, devise strategic plans and training, and participate in activities to attain these goals (Morris, 1984). The social structure produces centers of activity wherein group goals can be identified and future potential members can be introduced to the mobilization process; thus, providing a local community base that facilitates the mobilization of residents into collective action. The presence and prevalence of local movement centers (e.g., churches, community, and youth groups) throughout many urban areas provides a principle source for the recruitment of movement leaders and members.

Kelly and Van Vlaenderen (1995) maintain that where two communities exist and there is a lack of parity in power and wealth, there is a breakdown in dialogue. This breakdown in communication and exclusion from the decision making process results in the formation of an alternative community structure to facilitate resident interaction and communication. The inability to identify this alternative community structure can in part explain some of the past failures in public policy initiatives (urban
renewal). As public policy initiatives provide expanding political opportunities, the existence and extent of community organizations provides the functional structure for community mobilization.

**Faith and Community Based Organizations**

An empirical example of the development of indigenous organizations is the faith-based organization. Within Black communities, the primary faith-based organization is the Black church. Because of the historical lack of social, political, and economic opportunities afforded to Blacks and their communities, the Black church evolved as a means of facilitating community interaction. This historical community infrastructure then provided an organizational foundation for the formation of the civil rights movement (McAdam, 1982; Morris, 1984). Contemporary activities include the evolution of the Black church into faith-based organizations taking on an active role in community organizing and providing social services to their constituency. As communities have required advocacy to address various issues, community-based organizations have also emerged as a means to acquire development resources. Many churches have established Community Development Corporations or Community-Based Organizations as a means to facilitate further development activities. Social movement theorists generally suggest that indigenous structures provide the organizational base for social movement formation (McAdam, 1982; Oberschall, 1973). Freeman (1973) maintains that social movement is dependent on the presence of an indigenous infrastructure to link residents with organized political action. Existing faith and
community-based organizations are integral to the functioning of all community building initiatives as they provide a governing structure for effective program operation (Chaskin & Abunimah, 1999). McAdam (1982) theorizes that the significance of an indigenous organizational structure is a function of four crucial resources:

1) **Members**: The presence of indigenous organizations provides access to residents as the higher the degree of community integration the more likely they will participate in transformation activities (Pinard, 1971).

2) **Established Structure of Incentives**: The interpersonal rewards that provide the motive for participation. The structure of incentives refers to the need of convincing participants to pursue goals whose benefits they would receive even if they did not participate.

3) **Communication Network**: The presence of an indigenous organizational structure provides an established system of information interchange of which determines the extent of movement expansion.

4) **Leaders**: The need for centralized direction and coordination can be provided through the indigenous structure by individuals who can lend prestige, credibility, and organizing skills to the initiative.

Although Sites (1998) contends that one of the weaknesses of current community development theory is that communities are dependent upon indigenous organizations to provide a social basis for the formation of political demands, the existing organizational structures of communities provide the primary resources facilitating community mobilization (McAdam, 1982). The presence of political opportunities and indigenous organizations provide structure and potential for community mobilization, and indigenous organizations provide the setting and the leadership to facilitate the process of cognitive liberation (McAdam, 1982).
Community Development Corporations and Intermediaries

Concurrent with the development of the Civil Rights Movement was the expanding political opportunity provided by community development corporations (CDCs). CDCs were formed during the 1960’s to address inner city decay and political, social, and economic depravation within target communities (Keating & Krumholz, 1988). CDCs generally act as a point of contact with organizations external to communities while coalescing community resources for productive development use. CDCs are differentiated from other development organizations by their primarily indigenous structure, physical location in distressed communities, comprehensive program development, and focus on tangible results (Koebel, 1998). They generally participate in four functions: housing development and rehabilitation; community organizing and advocacy; commercial real estate development; and business development (Rohe, 1998; Koebel, 1998). While housing development has been the most consistent activity, the need to pair social programs with housing development to increase long-term sustainability has led to an increase in community organizing activities around issues such as neighborhood safety. CDCs also function to increase the resource, organizational, programmatic, network, and political capacity of target communities and their organizations (Glickman and Servon, 1998). Although initiated out of the “War on Poverty” era, CDCs did not experience high levels of initial success due to the environment in which they functioned. CDC constituencies were not consistently politically active and still did not have great influence upon the governmental funding appropriation process. However, the development of
Intermediary organizations resulted in a significant increase in CDC viability as they were a major component of intermediary strategy for community development.

Intermediaries began in 1968 through the initiation of the Cooperative Assistance Fund (CAF) through the collaborative efforts of the Ford Foundation and several private corporations (Liou and Stroh, 1998). One of the most well known intermediary organizations is the Enterprise Foundation. This organization acts on behalf of groups with an interest in the future development of communities by functioning as a medium between neighborhoods, political entities, and capital markets to improve the quality of life in poor communities (Liou and Stroh, 1998; and Baily, 1993). The primary roles of intermediaries include mobilizing capital, providing technical assistance, and enhancing non-profit operation by reducing the risk associated with their operation (Walker, 1993).

The Enterprise Foundation

In conjunction with the founding of the Enterprise Foundation in 1982, intermediaries increased their role in affordable housing development and subsequently moved into the process of community development. The Enterprise Foundation mission is “to see that all low-income people have the opportunity for fit and affordable housing along with moving up and out of poverty” (Enterprise Foundation, 1999). The primary organizations utilized to facilitate the achievement of this mission are Community Development Corporations (CDC) and Community Based Organizations (Liou & Stroh,
1998). Many examples of these organizational types can be observed as having faith-based organization ties. As many faith-based organizations form CDC’s when venturing into the community development arena, many Community Based Organizations have some type of faith-based affiliation. When these organizations participate in development activities they typically form a non-profit organization. The technical requirements of government funding regulations force them to acquire technical assistance from intermediaries. This is to ensure programmatically appropriate use of funds. Many faith and community based organizations have benefited from the Enterprise Foundation through technical assistance or resource allocation. Since many faith-based organizations utilize members recruited from faith congregations, the need for this research is further justified to determine whether or not these individuals provide higher quality participation in development activities.

Enterprise primarily utilizes three approaches: establishing and developing CDCs; developing partnerships amongst, non-profit, public, and private sectors to increase non-profit organization capacity; and, creating Neighborhood Development Centers as models to strengthen local community development networks (Liou & Stroh, 1998). The benefits of Community Development Corporations are their primarily indigenous relationship to target communities; the application of comprehensive approaches to resolve neighborhood issues; the production of clearly measurable results; and, the ability to gain access to a multitude of funding sources (Koebel, 1998). As a contributor to the development of communities, the formation and expansion of
intermediary organizations proposes further opportunity for neighborhood transformation activities as a stated objective of the Enterprise Foundation is "to build a national community development movement" (Enterprise Foundation, 1999). This provides the context for wide scale analysis as intermediaries and their affiliates strengthen community organizations, develop indigenous leadership and technical skills, and facilitate the empowerment of individuals to become actors in local decision-making processes.

The Need for Research

In the formation of community development programs, resident participation is a crucial legitimizing component (Marris, 1994). Resident participation also legitimizes the public objective of planning to provide a more inclusive pluralism (Clavel, 1994) that has an additional effect of enhancing urban democracy (Davidoff, 1965). Although advocacy and equity planning are focused on the format of general neighborhood development, as opposed to downtown, corporate, and industrial development, they are far less a formal practice than they are a general orientation or planning perspective (Forester, 1989). Consequently, there is a lack of frameworks to guide resident mobilization in the community development/revitalization process. Krumholz (1990) suggests that professional planning schools and practitioners alike develop the practical and methodological side of equity planning - the attempt to redistribute power, resources, or participation away from local elites and toward poor and working-class city residents. As the identification of formalized advocacy planning is relatively young
(1950's - 1960's), the dearth of development specific theoretical frameworks is expected. Never-the-less, the importance of developing and transforming decaying urban communities and protecting residents from gentrification remains a vital issue as the trend continues to develop revitalization programs to inclusively address social ills.

The Research Problem

Although community development plans have been established to redistribute power, wealth, and municipal services, the effects are questionable as inner city development projects have generally not stopped the process of urban deterioration. Even with the citizen participation component of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), citizen participation in relation to fund expenditures remains debatable as a component of successful neighborhood revitalization. Thus, planners and public policy formulators face the task of attempting to develop solutions to effectively resolve neighborhood ills. If planning can be used as a process of social transformation and can be used as a framework to involve residents in this transformation process, what is the methodology that can be used to facilitate this process? Since resident participation is a crucial characteristic of the community building process, how do we explain the relational nuances involved in participation processes and the relation between coordinators and participants so as to maximize civic participation in the community transformation process?
Although models exist that provide specific methodologies for the community building process (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993; Mattessich, 1997), we still need to formalize the function of community development within a specific theoretical framework. Many factors within the community building process have been identified; however, these factors need to be confirmed and quantified so as to increase the understanding of what makes community development successful (Mattessich, 1997). This research contributes to the formation of community development models by expanding the identification and measurement of the variables influencing member participation in development programs. The specific objective is to:

- determine the relationships between level of member participation and source of member recruitment, previous program affiliation, level of cognitive liberation, attitude towards the program, and fundamental attribution error (all variables are derived from the Political Process Model.)

Summary

The study of community development organizations and the individuals that participate in them has many implications for the development of new neighborhood transformation activities. Steinberg (1998) suggests that the study of non-profit organizations and their non-traditional provision of community-building activities could provide valuable information to promote continued evolution of the traditional community-development focus on housing. Steinberg (1998, Page 21) goes further by asking the question, "What kinds of tasks do we wish to assign to non-profits, for
profits, and governments, and how should we structure relations between these three sectors?" The influence of local community-service organizations is determined by the participation they garner from their target communities. A key to determining the organizational tasks assigned is to understand the processes guiding the nuances of member participation.

The use of social mobilization models on the neighborhood spatial scale provides an opportunity to gain insight into why residents participate and what explains the variability in levels of participation. Social mobilization also contributes to the literature by identifying if a nexus is present between social movement theory and the many components of community development.

The application of the Political Process Model can serve as a base to formalize and expand the community development specialization and advocacy/equity planning by providing a theoretical framework encompassing the function of community building. Community-based research of this model also serves to identify ways to mobilize residents and volunteers to participate in the community development process. The major variables identified in this literature have been formed into a questionnaire to measure and determine their contribution to member participation in community building activities.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The general purpose of this research is to investigate relationships amongst the variables identified in the Political Process Model (McAdam, 1982) in the context of a community transformation program. The investigation of the relationships involves determining how some of the variables identified in the Political Process Model literature are associated with the level of member participation. Using surveys of individual participants and site supervisors, this study will utilize multiple regression techniques to determine model goodness-of-fit by regressing level of member participation on source of member recruitment, previous program affiliation, level of cognitive liberation, fundamental attribution error, and attitude towards the program.

The results of this study can be used to gain a clearer understanding of the dynamics of civic participation with the potential of developing specific methodologies of transformation. If the results are supportive, further application of social mobilization models to community mobilization projects is justified. The results of this
study may also be used to assist planners in developing plans and policies that account for community resident dynamics.

Program Characteristics

This chapter describes the procedures used to develop and implement a questionnaire to acquire data on member participation characteristics in a community development program (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was distributed to members of an AmeriCorps* Community Safety Program, sponsored by the Columbus Housing Partnership. Members participate in this program by serving one to two terms of service, each term lasting approximately one year, where they volunteer up to 1,700 hours of community service. The members surveyed are located in the city of Columbus, Ohio and function within several inner-city neighborhoods. All of these areas are characterized by similar urban issues (high crime, poor housing, and weak municipal services) that negatively affect community health. The primary objective of the program is to provide community service through crime victim assistance, to conduct surveys, and to educate/motivate residents to become active in physical improvement activities. Members also solicit neighborhood volunteers to participate in projects resulting in community transformation, and establish relationships with city officials to enhance neighborhood safety. AmeriCorps* is similar to the Peace Corps with the exception that members function within the United States. Members are encouraged to participate in all activities contributing to the community building process (with the exception being political organizing). Members are also provided
training to enhance their community organizing skills and to facilitate career advancement. Full-time members receive a living wage ($814/month, approximately 20% of the area median income for a family of three), health insurance, and the opportunity to receive an educational grant ($4,700) for each term of service. The results of the survey instrument will be used to acquire information on member profiles and their attitude associated with service experience.

Organizational Description (Columbus Housing Partnership)

This research involves a case study of a local community development organization: Columbus Housing Partnership (CHP), an affiliate of the Enterprise Foundation. CHP is a private non-profit organization formed through the efforts of Columbus' local church leadership, the Board of Realtors, the City of Columbus, the Enterprise Foundation, and private sector leaders committed to providing low-income, working families a decent, safe place to live within Franklin County. CHP was established in response to studies conducted by the Columbus City Council, the Franklin County Commissioners and the Mayor's Office indicating an intensive shortage of affordable housing within the City of Columbus. Since its founding, CHP has operated a variety of housing development, community revitalization and youth employment programs.

Since its founding in 1987, CHP has developed or assisted in obtaining financing for housing units for over 3,000 families seeking affordable housing in
greater Columbus. The Columbus Housing Partnership is one of a few non-profit housing partnerships that participates in community development and expands the capacity of other community-based organizations. In 1995, CHP was awarded the Pillar of Industry Award by the National Association of Homebuilders for its’ Raspberry Glen Apartments. This award recognized CHP as being one of the best affordable multi-family housing developers in the country.

CHP has been nationally recognized as a not-for-profit, affordable housing developer which is able to produce a high volume of housing units. CHP builds organizational capacity by partnering with for-profit developers and community based organizations, including local churches, settlement houses and neighborhood development organizations. Furthermore, CHP has also partnered with organizations such as Lutheran Social Services to provide residents of several CHP sponsored housing developments with a direct link to a variety of human service programs.

While housing development serves as the foundation of CHP’s community improvement and revitalization efforts, community-building programs are also utilized to address the social needs of residents. These community-building efforts have been implemented through a Community Safety Program that develops partnerships with community based organizations and utilizes AmeriCorps* members to organize community residents around identified issues. AmeriCorps* member activities have been based upon building and strengthening the social network within target
communities while developing partnerships between residents and service providers, city departments, and local government. This takes the form of implementing needs assessments, developing programs, recruiting volunteers, holding community festivals, volunteering with other organizations, and many other community building activities. This program has received national recognition from the Enterprise Foundation as a community-building model and as a method to improve the quality of life of participants.

Research Design

The research begins with correlational methods. Correlational research is the determination of relationships among variables by quantifying and ascertaining the extent of co-variability leading to the investigation of relationships between or amongst variables (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). It describes relationships between variables and predicts future associated values (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). As correlational studies are primarily exploratory, acquired information provides assistance in understanding complex constructs and theories (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Consequently, the variables analyzed in a correlational study should be selected for their theorized importance to a conceptual framework (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). The variables selected for analysis in this research were identified from the Political Process Model (McAdam, 1982). Selection was based upon the presumption that the variables can be associated with community development initiatives.
This study used a directly administered questionnaire to collect member participation data in reference to the selected variables. In correlational research, one of the most widely utilized methods of data collection is the questionnaire, and direct administration is a valid mode of data collection when there is access to the majority of participants in one place (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996; Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996).

"The primary advantage of direct administration is the high response rate although other benefits include: low comparable cost, short data collection times, an opportunity to explain the study and answer respondent questions, and the standardization of responses is comparatively easy" (Fraenkel & Wallen, Page 371; Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996).

The primary disadvantage is the restrictiveness of administering opportunities due to group availability. Members unavailable at the time of the survey administration were contacted through mailing, telephone, or direct interviews. Participants were asked to respond to questions regarding their program participation. These responses are numerically scaled to measure their personal level of association with theorized variables. Scales in questionnaires are useful in measuring respondent attitudes, values, and opinions, and the Likert scale is the most commonly used method (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Participants were given questions to which the answers were to be marked: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). These responses were given numerical values from which data can be analyzed through univariate and multivariate techniques.
Subject Selection

The population frame for the survey is the 124 members of the AmeriCorps* Community Safety Program (of which 95 were available for contact) administered in the Central Ohio area by the Columbus Housing Partnership (CHP). These members participated in AmeriCorps* activities from October 1995 to September 2000. Members served up to three terms (one term equals a 10 month period). The names were identified from the directory of members maintained by CHP. The AmeriCorps* Community Safety Program is a model program that has been duplicated in several cities across the United States. The program structure comprises a central administrating site (CHP) that recruits members to serve in the AmeriCorps* program and solicits participation from organizations to collaborate on community transformation projects. Each site is assigned AmeriCorps* members who are directed by a site supervisor in the application of program activities. Members attempt to develop solutions to urban problems by recruiting local resident volunteers as a means of community mobilization. As members work with universities, public-private institutions, businesses, government, and residents to formulate development partnerships, collaborating partners exemplify the connection between political opportunities and the indigenous organizational structure attempting to rectify problems produced by the effects of broad social and economic processes. Surveying this population provides direct information from those who are highly involved in the community mobilization process. Due to the small size of the population, the attempt was made to survey the entire population. When the research population has a small
size, the efficiency increase provided by sampling rather than studying an entire population is not a primary concern nor benefit (Salant & Dillman, 1994).

Survey Design

Two different surveys were circulated to the population. One survey was circulated to Site Supervisors, and another was given to actual members. Site supervisors generally work with the contracting agency as an AmeriCorps* partner and provide direct oversight to member activities. AmeriCorps* members actually enroll in the program to directly participate in community building activities in neighborhoods. The surveys of members were composed of questions designed to acquire participant responses on profiles, opinions, and attitudes on program participation. The questions were derived from the literature as a means of ascertaining applicability to member participation in community building programs (refer to Chapter 2). The questions pertain to source of member recruitment, previous local movement center affiliation, cognitive liberation, and attitude towards the program (see Figure 3.1).

Reliability

Additionally, a major issue in the gathering of information is the reliability of the instrument. Measurement of reliability is the process of identifying the influence of random or systematic errors in the variable measurement process (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). This process is also known as the measurement of internal consistency. Internal consistency refers to the concept that an individual having a
specific score on one test will have a similar score placement on another test. The most common method of internal consistency measurement is the calculation of the Cronbach alpha coefficient. The Cronbach alpha is calculated where appropriate and has a general lower level limit of .70 (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). However, research on human behavior makes the acceptance of lower values, ranging from .50 to .60, appropriate (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Lower coefficient values indicate the test item measures more than one respondent attribute; conversely, higher coefficient values (up to 1) indicate high levels of reliability as only one respondent attribute is being measured (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Where appropriate the Cronbach alpha coefficient is included with the operational definition of the variables to address measurement error.
Level of Member Participation

Table 3.1 provides the questions utilized to measure the level of member participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Level of Member Participation (Supervisor Survey)

Constitutive Definition. Level of Member Participation: “The capacity to take initiative in developing society and being in a position to benefit from a project” (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977; Moulik, 1989; Kelly & Van Vlaenderen, Page 372).

Operational Definition. The dependent variable, level of member participation, was quantified by a Likert-scale questionnaire provided to program supervisors (see table 3.1). A five point Likert-scale of 0-4, 0 = Poor to 4 = Excellent, was used to measure the level of member participation. The scores for each question were added together.
resulting in a total possible summed score of 40. A higher score indicates higher levels of member participation. The data collected were analyzed as summed continuous interval data.

**Source of Member Recruitment**

Source of member recruitment was identified with the following question (see table 3.2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was the source by which you first came into contact with this AmeriCorps* Community Service Program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Source of Member Recruitment (Member Survey)

*Operational Definition.* Source of member recruitment is a categorical nominal variable. Respondents indicate by checking the appropriate category indicating the source by which they came into contact with the program (see table 3.3). The response should state the single most representative source by which they came into contact with this program: Faith-Based Organization, Community Based Organization, Walk-in, Member Referral, Public/Private Agency, or Educational Institution, other. Frequencies and percentages are used to describe the member source of contact with this program.
Previous Local Movement Center Affiliation

The question used to acquire information on previous affiliation is located in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Previous Local Movement Center Affiliation

Operational Definition. Individuals respond yes or no to the question of previous affiliation (see table 3.3). Program participants were asked whether or not they were previously involved with community activities at their assigned site prior to enrollment in this program. Because the variable is categorized as nominal, frequencies and percentages are used as a description of pre-program activities.

Level of Previous Affiliation with Local Movement Center

Table 3.4 contains the summated questions measuring the level of previous affiliation with local movement centers.
Table 3.4: Level of Previous Affiliation with Local Movement Center

**Operational Definition.** Four questions were developed (by researcher) and grouped to determine the level of previous affiliation (see table 3.4). Affiliation regards the participation of members with a program site prior to involvement with this service program. Respondents were asked to indicate (yes or no) to indicate if they participated and their type of participation. Data was coded and summed to facilitate treatment as a summed interval variable. The summation of the responses allows for the data to be categorized as interval. The minimum score is zero and the maximum is four. Higher numbers indicate high levels of affiliation and lower numbers indicate low levels of affiliation. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of .74 falls well within the lower limits and indicates and indicates acceptable reliability in measuring level of member affiliation.
Cognitive Liberation

The questions provided and summated to tabulate level of cognitive liberation are provided in Table 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>I believe the conditions in the community in which I live are created by a society that is fair.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>I participate in service activities which result in positive community change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>Through my community service, I can improve the condition of the community in which I work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: Cognitive Liberation

Constitutive Definition. Level of Cognitive Liberation: "The subjective transformation of consciousness from hopeless submission to oppressive conditions to an aroused readiness to challenge those conditions" (McAdam, Page 49; Piven & Cloward, Page 3-4).

Operational Definition. The questions are based upon the literature identification of the cognitive liberation process (see literature review). A four-point Likert-scale was used in the questions on cognitive liberation. Data from the questions were summated and analyzed at the interval level. The summed scores for the three questions totaled a
possible score of 12 points. A mean was calculated based upon the following scale ranging from 1 - 4, 1 = Strongly Disagree to 4 = Strongly Agree. A higher mean score indicates higher levels of cognitive liberation. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of .52 falls within the theoretical lower limits.

Attitude Towards Program

Table 3.6 provides the questions utilized to measure member attitude towards the AmeriCorps* program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>The AmeriCorps* program has benefited its intended communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>The AmeriCorps* program has helped solve community problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>The AmeriCorps* program provides training that prepares members to transform communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: Attitude Towards the Program

Constitutive Definition. Attitude towards Program: "A relatively stable and enduring predisposition to behave or react in a certain way toward persons, objects, institutions, or issues" (Chaplin, 1985).

Operational Definition. Three questions, using a four-point Likert-scale, were developed to determine the type of attitude members maintained about the program (see
Data were analyzed at the interval level. Summed scores (interval) were calculated to determine a member's attitude towards the program. The scores ranged from three to twelve. A higher score indicates a positive attitude towards the program. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of .82 indicates high reliability in measuring member attitude.

**Fundamental Attribution Error**

The questions utilized to measure member fundamental attribution error are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>My level of education is influenced more by social opportunity than personal desire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>My level of income is influenced more by how society views me rather than by my personal qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>My advancement in society is greatly influenced by my race or ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
<td>My family has a great influence on my ability to advance in society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7: Fundamental Attribution Error

**Constitutive Definition.** Fundamental Attribution Error: “The tendency of individuals to explain their social condition as a function of personal as opposed to factors beyond their control” (Ross, 1977; McAdam, Page 50).
Operational Definition. Fundamental attribution error questions for each member are based upon social status indicators: education, income, family structure, and race. Four-point Likert-scale data (interval) were summed to determine the level of fundamental attribution error. Scores ranged from four to sixteen. A mean was calculated based upon the Likert-scale. Higher scores indicate fundamental attribution error towards the social system, and lower scores indicate attribution of social position toward individual characteristics. The Cronbach alpha coefficient (.46) is below the theoretical lower limit of .50; however, this is expected as fundamental attribution error can be considered a component of cognitive liberation.

Threats to Validity

"Validity refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences that are made based on the data collected, and it is the most important idea to consider when preparing or selecting an instrument for use" (Fraenkel & Wallen, Page 153). The types of validity specifically referenced for this study are internal validity and external validity (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). In any study that describes or tests relationships, the presence of an alternative reason that may actually be associated with variation in the dependent variable poses a threat to internal validity (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

Of the identified threats to internal validity, correlational studies are not impaired by implementation, history, maturation, attitude of subjects, or regression;
however, consideration needs to be given to location, instrumentation, testing, and mortality (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). History refers to any issues affecting the variable between multiple measurements; maturation is passage of time factors influencing the respondents; attitude of subjects is how the respondent views participation in a study may influence responses; and, regression refers to the function of a group being selected on the basis of an extreme score generally moving closer to the population mean (Miller, 1998). Location refers to how the differences in environment could be the producer of variability in the dependent variable; instrumentation is the variability in scorers influencing a change in measurements; testing is the influence of taking multiple tests on the dependent variable; and mortality is the loss of respondents during the study process (Miller, 1998).

The nature of this study minimizes the threat of these problems as testing is not applicable, no treatment is being applied, observers are not required, and sampling is not being used. As the method of data collection is a questionnaire, measurement error must also be considered as a threat to internal validity. Measurement errors take place when answers to questions are inaccurate, imprecise, or cannot be compared in any useful way to other respondents’ answers (Salant & Dillman, Page 17).

Along with measurement error, two important issues greatly influencing the validity of a questionnaire include the importance of the topic to the respondent and respondent anonymity (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). These issues are primarily
resolved through procedures implemented to establish content-related (including face) validity. The validation of content is performed by ascertaining if the information sought by the instrument represents the relative subject matter (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Content validity was established through a panel of experts who determined if the questions were representative of the subject matter (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). The group of judges (five) was a panel of experts who reviewed the instrument and provided feedback to ensure the questions accurately represented the subject matter.

Field-testing was also utilized as means to identify unclear questions, misunderstandings, or other instrument inadequacies (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). The field test of the instrument was performed on five community service members who participated in other community development programs. Feedback from this group was used to identify ambiguous wording and questions along with increasing instrument usability. The field test resulted in the modification of question wording and clarity to reduce measurement error.

External Validity

Along with internal validity, another criterion of research design is that it have external validity: “the generalizability or representativeness of the findings” (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, Page 324). Generalizability is not a relevant issue to this study as the entire population of this particular case study is being examined. Additionally, the absence of variable manipulation (the dependent variable under observation has already
taken place) minimizes the impact of external validity issues: interaction effect of testing, interaction effects of selection biases, reactive effects of experimental arrangements, and multiple-treatment interference (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Although sampling error, selection error, and non-response error are issues which influence external validity, the use of a population and direct assessment implementation techniques minimizes their influence.

Univariate Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics presents and describes information while providing a set of tools to summarize basic information about large amounts of data (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996). A prerequisite to the effective description of data is the need to identify the appropriate scale of measurement. This scale of measurement is essential to the proper interpretation of data sets. As these scales relate to this study, nominal measurement is categorization of data into groups, and interval measurement is a method of using consecutive numbers on a scale to mark equal intervals of variable quantities being measured (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996). The two most important statistical characteristics of a data set are the central tendency and the variability: central tendency identifies the typical representative score and the variability identifies the size of the differences among scores while quantifying the degree of dispersion (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996). The single most important description of a data distribution is the measure of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) as
these are used to summarize the data with a single number (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

Levels of Measurement

Nominal scale and interval scale data will be collected on the individual member characteristics. While it can be argued that Likert scale data are ordinal instead of interval, the difference between ordinal and interval level data classification is not clearly distinguished as summated scales result in scores that are only mildly distorted versions of interval scales (Warmbrod, 1998). The measure of central tendency for the nominal scale data is the mode (the most frequently occurring observation) (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996). The measures of central tendency for the interval scale data will be the median (most frequently used as it provides the 50th percentile); however, the mean will also be used as it is more applicable to further statistical analysis (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996).

Measures of variability are utilized to complement measures of central tendency as together they provide a picture of the data dispersion and distribution (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996). Since the nominal data represents categorization, a histogram will be used to depict the percentages of respondent classifications. The variability of the interval level data will be described through the use of measures of standard deviation which is used to give a metric description of quantitative data.
Further descriptive analysis is facilitated by ascertaining the degree of relationship between two variables. The coefficient of correlation is derived to provide a statistical summary of the degree of relationship or association between two variables: the most common being the Pearson r (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996). When calculating the Pearson r, it is assumed the data utilized are continuous interval or ratio level data. In cases where a dichotomous nominal variable (with categories being dummy coded) and an interval variable are being compared, a point-biserial correlation coefficient is utilized: Pearson r (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996). The point-biserial coefficient is a method to quantify nominal level data for further data analysis. “The Pearson r ranges in value from -1.0 perfect inverse relationship, to 0 for no relationship, to the maximum value of +1.0 for a perfect direct relationship” (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, Page 89). The closer the coefficient number is to the maximum or minimum values, the greater the degree of relationship (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

The results of the univariate statistical analysis will be reported in Chapter 4.

Multivariate Analysis

While univariate descriptive analyses provide summary information on the data sets, multivariate analysis facilitates in-depth analysis of the relational nuances between variables. An appropriate method of further data analysis is multiple regression. Multiple regression is an extension of correlational research as the relationship between the dependent variable and multiple independent variables can be identified. The objective of multiple regression is to predict the changes in the dependent variable in
response to changes in the independent variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). In this study, multiple regression will be used to measure the relationship in the population between level of member participation and source of member recruitment, previous affiliation with local movement centers, level of previous affiliation with local movement centers, level of cognitive liberation, attitude towards program, and fundamental attribution error.

Multiple Regression Assumptions

Multiple regression is based upon four assumptions:

1. "Linearity of the Phenomenon,
2. Constant Variance of the Error Term,
3. Independence of the Error Terms (Auto Correlation),
4. Normality of the Error Term Distribution" (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, Page 172).

"The concept of correlation is based on a linear relationship and is observed through the development of partial regression plots between a single independent variable and the dependent variable" (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, Page 173). The linear relationship assumption is measured by plotting each specific independent variable and dependent variable relationship. The variables that violate this assumption can be visually identified through plot observation. The linear relationship is also determined through testing the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) for statistical significance. The constant variance of the error term is measured by plotting the residuals and observing
the pattern to determine if homogeneity exists (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The points will have a random distribution (null plot) indicating no correlation exists. The independence of error terms indicates that the predicted value is not related to any other variable (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). To measure this assumption, a plot is developed comparing the residuals to other variables. A random pattern indicates the residuals are independent. Independence is determined by observing the calculated Durbin-Watson statistic (Possible range from 0 – 4). The common variable associated with this variable is time (Norusis, 1982). If the variation is associated with sequences in time as opposed to the stated independent variables, then the Durbin-Watson statistic will indicate auto correlation is present. The Durbin-Watson statistic specifically tests the hypothesis that the residuals are not correlated, and a score of approximately two indicates little, if any, correlation exists (Warmbrod, 1998). As the nature of this research is not influenced by time or sequence, auto-correlation should not be a significant factor. The normality of the error term distribution is measured through developing normal probability plots and comparing the standardized residuals with the normal distribution (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black, 1998). The plot of the residuals should be closely aligned with the straight diagonal line of the normal distribution.

Another issue of concern in multiple regression analysis is multicollinearity: substantial correlation between or among independent variables or an independent variable that is actually a linear combination of other variables (Warmbrod, 1998).
This is determined by calculating the Tolerance \((1 - R^2)\) and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) (Warmbrod, 1998). Tolerance represents the portion of variance not explained. Consequently, higher values near one desired while lower values indicate multicollinearity can be an issue. The Variance Inflation Factor is an indicator of whether or not a specific independent variable is a linear combination of other independent variables. An approximate VIF score of one indicates multicollinearity is not a problem while values exceeding 10 suggest linear combinations exist (Warmbrod, 1998).

Multiple regression can be utilized through three different analysis strategies: simultaneous, stepwise, or hierarchical (Warmbrod, 1998). Simultaneous regression is used when all independent variables are treated simultaneously and there is no logical or theoretical basis for considering a variable prior to another. Stepwise regression is utilized when theory is not a guiding principle and the purpose is to select the one independent variable at each step that makes the largest contribution to \(R^2\). This study will use multiple regression analysis based upon the hierarchical model as the variables will be entered cumulatively based upon specific theory and logic. This model allows for the calculation of \(R^2\) and the identification of the increased variance in the dependent variable caused by the addition of an independent variable (Warmbrod, 1998).
Path Analysis

The use of correlational and regression techniques allows for further sensitivity testing through the use of path analysis. Path analysis tests whether causal relationships exist amongst variables (Romney & Bynner, 1992), and it can be utilized to expand on multiple regression by analyzing variables in relation to specific theoretical considerations (Frankel & Wallen, 1996). Variable selection is based upon theoretical considerations with standardized partial regression coefficients, beta-weights, being calculated. This provides an opportunity to assess the co-variability and dependency of one variable with another. The objective is to display the variables with the path coefficients to determine the nature and magnitude of relationships. Lines and arrows are placed with the path coefficients to illustrate types of relationships.

Summary

This chapter serves as a description of the research design, data collection and analysis procedures utilized in this correlational research. Community transformation project members were asked to identify characteristics of their participation in an effort to assess the goodness-of-fit of the Political Process Model of social movement development. Utilizing multiple regression, as a multivariate analysis technique, the purpose is to assess how variables identified in the Political Process Model are associated with member participation in transformation programs. The results of this analysis are discussed in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate the applicability of the Political Process Model (a specific social movement framework) to a community development program as a means of exploring determinants of individual participation levels in community development initiatives. The procedures utilized to collect and analyze the data were discussed in Chapter III. Using surveys of individual participants to measure member attributes and program supervisors to measure member performance, this study utilized multiple regression techniques to determine model goodness-of-fit. Level of member participation was analyzed as a function of source of member recruitment, previous program affiliation, level of cognitive liberation, fundamental attribution error, and attitude towards the program. In addition, member age, gender, site type, and organizational mission agreement were examined as ways to explain member performance rating.

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis through descriptive statistics and multi-variate techniques. The descriptive statistics include group demographics and variable correlations to member performance. Exploration of the
contribution of each variable towards explaining variability in level of member participation is conducted through multiple regression techniques (hierarchical strategy).

Summary of Data

124 individuals were identified as members of the AmeriCorps* Program over a five-year period. Of the 124 members, 95 were surveyed. The remaining members (29) were unable to be contacted. To determine if a difference in performance existed between the surveyed and non-surveyed group, an analysis of variance was performed. A one-way analysis of variance revealed there is no statistically significant difference between levels of member performance between both groups (F-value = 1.041; p < .05). Thus, the surveyed group accurately reflects the performance characteristics of all participants.

Demographic data representing the research group was acquired through the questionnaire. Ninety-five percent of the respondents are Black with five percent being White or other. Forty-four percent of respondents were single, 38 percent were married, and 18 percent were divorced. The following represents relevant demographic data and descriptive statistics describing the research group and their relationship to levels of member participation.
Demographic Characteristics

Group Age

The mean age for the research group was 37 years of age with the youngest respondent being 19 and the oldest 73 (see table 4.1). The distribution of age is positively skewed (.84).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Group Age

Gender

For the questionnaire respondents, 77 percent were female and 23 percent were male (see table 4.2) with the mode being female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Gender Characteristics
Education

84 percent of the respondents classified themselves as having some college experience or as having received some level of a college degree (see table 4.3). The modal category was some college experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Level of Education

Housing Tenure

As the perception exists that home-owners make better residents and participants than renters, the relationship of housing tenure to levels of member participation is explored. For the questionnaire respondents, 69.5 percent were renters and 30.5 percent were home-owners (see table 4.4). The modal category was renters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-owner</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Housing Tenure
Political Process Model Variables

Cognitive Liberation

The mean statistic for cognitive liberation was 8.58 (standard deviation = 1.88) with a median of nine, and a mode of eight (see table 4.5). The range was eight with a low score of four and a high score of 12. The distribution of scores is slightly negatively skewed (-.17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Cognitive Liberation

Previous Community Service

68 percent of respondents had previous service experience and 32 percent had no previous experience (see table 4.6). The modal category was those individuals who had previous experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Service</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Previous Service</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Previous Community Service
Affiliation Level

The mean statistic for affiliation level was 1.75 (standard deviation = 1.47) with a median of two, and a mode of zero (see table 4.7). The range was four with a low score of zero and a high score of four. High levels of affiliation are represented by a zero and low levels of affiliation are represented with a four. The distribution of scores is slightly positively skewed (.08).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Affiliation Level

Source of Member Recruitment

34.7 percent of respondents entered the program through member referral, 22.1 percent from faith-based organizations, and 20 percent from community-based organizations (see table 4.8). The modal category was member referral as the source of program contact.
Table 4.8: Source of Member Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Member Recruitment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith-Based Organization</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Organization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Agency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Referral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fundamental Attribution Error

The mean statistic for fundamental attribution error was 10.20 (standard deviation = 2.63) with a median of 10, and a mode of 11 (see table 4.9). The range was 12 with a low score of four and a high score of 16. Low scores represent member attribution of individual life condition to personal characteristics. Higher scores indicate attribution of conditions to social causes. The distribution of scores is slightly positively skewed (.03).

Table 4.9: Fundamental Attribution Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitude Towards Program

The mean statistic for member attitude was 9.02 (standard deviation = 2.12) with a median of nine, and a mode of nine (see table 4.10). The range was nine with a low score of three and a high score of 12. A positive member attitude towards the AmeriCorps program is represented by higher scores. Lower scores indicate a negative attitude towards the program. The distribution of scores is negatively skewed (-.52).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Member Attitude towards AmeriCorps

Member Rating

The mean statistic for member rating was 12.82 (standard deviation = 5.41) with a median of 14, and a mode of 20 (see table 4.11). The range was 19 with a low score of 1 and a high score of 20. High levels of member performance are represented by higher scores, and low levels of member performance are represented by lower scores. The distribution of scores is negatively skewed (-.435).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: Member Rating
Descriptive Relationship Analysis

Age

Descriptive analysis included exploration of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (see Table 4.12). A Pearson product moment correlation was calculated to assess co-variability of member age with levels of participation. The Pearson $r$ is .24 with a probability of .02. The null hypothesis of the relationship between age and level of member participation was tested at an alpha level of .05 resulting in a rejection of the null hypothesis. Thus, a statistically significant relationship exists between age and levels of member participation. Older participants tend to have higher levels of member participation than younger members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pearson $r$</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Tenure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Liberation</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Community Service</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Level</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Member Recruitment</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Attribution Error</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Towards Program</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: Dependent Variable Relationships
Gender

The pearson product moment correlation of .24 with a probability of .02 represents the co-variability with member participation. Testing of the pearson r (alpha = .05) resulted in a rejection of the null hypothesis, thus the relationship between gender and levels of member participation is statistically significant. Female participants tend to have higher levels of member participation than the male participants.

Cognitive Liberation

Of the Political Process Model variables, cognitive liberation was the only one to test statistically significant (alpha = .05). The pearson product moment correlation is .27 with a probability of .01, thus participants with higher levels of cognitive liberation tend to have higher levels of member participation.

Non-Statistically Significant Variables

The importance of the research findings is highlighted in the statistical significance of the independent and dependent variable relationships. However, the underlying theoretical implications indicate that the lack of statistical significance between variables is also salient. A review of non-significant variables in Table 4.12 has the following implications:

1) Members tend have similar levels of participation regardless of education level
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2) No difference in member performance between renters or home-owners

3) Previous community service has no statistically significant influence on participation

4) Affiliation level does not significantly influence member participation.

5) Source of member recruitment lacks statistical significance with member participation.

6) Fundamental Attribution Error does not significantly influence member participation.

7) Member attitude has no statistically significant relationship with member participation.

Additional Variables

As previously mentioned, the only variables initially found to be statistically significant with levels of member participation were age, gender, and cognitive liberation. The notable non-significance of the political process model variables with levels of member participation led to further pursuit in identifying other influential factors. Analysis of the program partners indicated variability in the types of organizations involved as program partners. This variability was in the form of organizational mission and the types of organizations involved. Mission agreement potentially influences member participation as program managers whose missions coincide with programmatic goals are more inclined to guide members to fulfill program objectives. Conversely, organizations without mission agreement are more likely to utilize members to fulfill their specific organizational needs as opposed to program objectives. The conflict in goals ultimately leads to members not fulfilling
their basic program requirements. As one of the objectives of this research is to assess the influence of indigenous organizations on member participation, a variable was added to determine whether or not assignment to a faith or community-based organization, community development corporation, intermediary, or housing community property management firm influenced levels of member participation. Consequently, organizational mission agreement and site type were added as additional research variables.

Mission Agreement

Mission agreement was determined by identifying the mission of each particular organization and determining if it was comparable to the objectives of AmeriCorps* program. Sixty-two percent of respondents had positions with sites whose mission coincided with the objectives of the AmeriCorps* program (see table 4.13). 38 percent had positions with organizations whose mission did not coincide with the AmeriCorps* program. The modal category was those individuals who worked with agencies with coinciding missions.

A pearson product moment correlation was calculated to assess co-variability with levels of member participation. The pearson r is -.65 with a probability of < .000. This represents a substantial level of association. Testing (alpha = .05) of the relationship between mission agreement and level of member participation resulted in a rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a statistically significant relationship between
mission agreement and levels of member participation. Participants working at sites with comparable organizational missions have higher levels of member participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Agreement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Disagreement</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Organizational Mission Agreement

Site Type

35 percent of respondents served at faith-based organizations, 31 percent served at community-based organizations, and 24 percent served at intermediary type organizations (see table 4.14). The modal category was faith-based organizations. The Pearson product moment correlation of .13 (probability = .22) represents the covariability with level of member participation. Testing (alpha = .05) of the relationship between site type and level of member participation resulted in failing to reject the null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant relationship between site type and level of member participation.
Hierarchical Multiple Regression

The data were analyzed utilizing hierarchical multiple regression techniques. Level of member participation (dependent variable) was explained by the independent variables of gender, age, mission agreement, site type, previous service, affiliation level, attribution, source of recruitment, cognitive liberation, and member attitude. The strategy of hierarchical multiple regression is beneficial as it allows for variables to be analyzed in sequence with theoretical considerations. Entry into the regression equation follows the theoretical order, thus allowing the determination of variable contribution to explaining variance in the dependent variable.

Table 4.15 illustrates the summary data and results for the regression model. The hierarchical method of regression resulted in a statistically significant (alpha = .05) multiple correlation coefficient of .70 (strong relationship) with a probability < .001. Testing at an alpha level of .05 determined the model is statistically significant. The coefficient of determination (R²) is .49 (standard error = 3.95). Thus,
Table 4.15: Results of Regression Analysis of Member Participation on Gender, Age, Previous Service, Affiliation Level, Site Type, Fundamental Attribution Error, Source, Cognitive Liberation, Attitude, and Mission Agreement. N = 95 (Hierarchical Entry)

Hierarchical regression enters variables into the regression equation based on the criteria that they are statistically significant (alpha level .05 in this case). In order to distinguish those variables that make a significant contribution to dependent variable variance, variables not accepted at alpha level .05 level are then tested at the .10 level. This additional testing allows for those variables to be included that make a statistically significant contribution to dependent variable variance although at a less stringent criteria. Variables not fulfilling significance of .10 are removed from the regression
equation. The hierarchical strategy resulted in the variables gender, age, cognitive liberation, and mission agreement being utilized in the regression equation. The variables of previous service, affiliation level, fundamental attribution error, source of recruitment, site type, and attitude did not meet the criteria of statistical significance; thus, they were excluded from the regression equation. Hierarchical regression is a method specifically utilized to test theories. Consequently, it focuses on those variables making a statistically significant contribution to dependent variable variance. Thus, the discussion centers around the theoretical variables considered statistically significant.

Relative Importance

Identification of the importance of independent variables in explaining variance in dependent variables is determined through the calculation of standardized partial regression coefficients (see Table 4.16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Standardized Partial Regression Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Liberation</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Agreement</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16: Relative Importance
Of the four statistically significant variables the standardized partial regression coefficients indicate mission agreement (-.59) is the most important variable. This is followed by cognitive liberation (.17), gender (.15) and age (.13). This importance is also identified through the correlation of each independent variable to the dependent variable when other linear effects are removed (partial correlations). The partial correlations support the existence of association between mission agreement (-.63), cognitive liberation (.22), gender (.20), and age (.17).

As a further means of illustrating the findings of this regression analysis, the semi-partial correlation ($R^2$ Change) and unstandardized partial correlation coefficients are listed in Table 4.15. The semi-partial coefficient, a product of the hierarchical method, identifies the contribution of the independent variable to an explanation of dependent variable variance. As indicated by table 4.15, the addition of each variable to the regression equation results in increasing amounts of variance explained with the largest being mission agreement (.33).

The partial regression coefficients indicate the expected change in member participation as a result of a one-unit change in the independent variable. Testing at an alpha level of .05 indicates that the partial regression coefficients of mission agreement and cognitive liberation are statistically significant ($p < .05$). The expected change caused by the variables age and gender are not statistically significant ($p > .05$). This indicates that for every one-unit change in mission agreement (.86) level of member
participation will change by -6.53. For every unit change in cognitive liberation (.23), level of member participation will rise by .48. This analysis indicates that members with higher levels of cognitive liberation who are members at sites with missions that agree with goals and objectives have higher levels of member participation.

Simultaneous Regression

As hierarchical regression is a strategy that constructs a linear equation based on variables testing statistically significant, the simultaneous method was utilized to further assess the contribution of each variable (see table 4.17). The overall model remains statistically significant (alpha = .05). The multiple correlation coefficient rose .04 to .74, and the amount of variance explained (R^2) increased by .05 to 54 percent.

Similar to the hierarchical results, the variables gender, cognitive liberation, and mission agreement tested statistically significant. However, member age and all other variables were determined to lack statistical significance. Observation of the variables indicated that fundamental attribution error could receive further exploration as it narrowly fails the .05 test of significance. This exploration is theoretically and empirically justified as a relationship exists between fundamental attribution error and cognitive liberation.
Table 4.17: Results of Regression Analysis of Member Participation on Gender, Age, Affiliation Level, Source of Recruitment, Previous Service, Site Type, Fundamental Attribution Error, Cognitive Liberation, Attitude, and Mission Agreement. N = 95 (Simultaneous Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Level</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Recruitment</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Service</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Attribution Error</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Liberation</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Agreement</td>
<td>-6.73</td>
<td>-7.76</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Correlation Coefficient = .74  
$R^2 = .54$  
Standard Error = 3.88  
Adjusted $R^2 = .49$  
For model: $F = 9.936; p < .001$
The additional consideration of the variables determined not significant in the hierarchical method only resulted in a marginal increase of the multiple correlation coefficient (.04) and the variance explained (.05). However, the linear combination created by simultaneous consideration resulted in age lacking significance at the alpha level of .05 or .10 while fundamental attribution error gained significance at the .10 alpha level. The significance of fundamental attribution error can be expected because of its theoretical relationship with cognitive liberation. The relationship amongst fundamental attribution error, cognitive liberation, and levels of member participation is further explored in the section on path analysis.

Regression Assumptions

The concept of multiple regression is based upon four assumptions: linear relationships, constant variance of residuals, auto correlation, and normality of residual distribution. Violation or adherence with these assumptions can be determined through statistical tests, plot observations, and examination of the residuals. The statistical significance of the regression model indicates the presence of a linear relationship. Examination of the residual plots indicates a random pattern exists, thus, there is constant variance of the residuals. A histogram of the standardized residuals and a probability plot of the expected and observed probability determined the assumption of normality of the error term distribution was present. The durbin-watson statistic (2.1) was near two, thus, the auto correlation assumption is not violated.
**Multicollinearity**

High levels of multicollinearity can distort the effectiveness of the regression equation. Therefore, measures have been utilized to detect the presence of multicollinearity (see table 4.18). The statistical significance of two of the three independent variables discounts the presence of multicollinearity. An inspection of the correlation matrix (table 4.18) indicates the only variables showing a strong relationship are cognitive liberation and attitude. This relationship is theoretically justified. Removal of either variable could result in specification error thus undermining validity of the theoretical framework.

Included in the regression analysis is the calculation of the tolerance and variance inflation factor. Tolerance represents the proportion of variance not explained when regressing an independent variable on all other independent variables (Warmbrod, 1999). This statistic ranges from zero to one. The tolerance statistics are .95 for mission agreement, .92 for cognitive liberation, .96 for gender, and .92 for age. Values close to one indicate that multicollinearity is not a problem because high levels of variance are not explained by variability in other independent variables. Variable inflation factors are calculated to determine if an independent variable is a linear combination of other independent variables (Warmbrod, 1999). High values (over 10) indicate multicollinearity is a problem. The variance inflation factors are 1.05 for mission agreement, 1.09 for cognitive liberation, 1.04 for gender, and 1.08 for age.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$X_1$</th>
<th>$X_2$</th>
<th>$X_3$</th>
<th>$X_4$</th>
<th>$X_5$</th>
<th>$X_6$</th>
<th>$X_7$</th>
<th>$X_8$</th>
<th>$X_9$</th>
<th>$X_{10}$</th>
<th>$Y$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender ($X_1$)$^a$</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ($X_2$)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Level ($X_3$)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source ($X_4$)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Service ($X_5$)$^b$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type ($X_6$)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution ($X_7$)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog. Liberation ($X_8$)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude ($X_9$)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Agreement ($X_{10}$)$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Rating ($Y$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$0 = Male; 1 = Female
$^b$0 = Yes; 1 = No
$^c$0 = Mission Agreement; 1 = Mission Disagreement

Table 4.17: Summary Data: Correlation Matrix of Member Performance on Selected Variables
Ideal values are equal to or near one. The tolerance statistics and variable inflation factors indicate multicollinearity is not a problem.

Path Analysis

The absence of statistical significance amongst many of the theoretical variables suggests alternative methods may provide further insight into the participation process. This further analysis is based upon functional considerations as many of the variables lacking direct statistical significance theoretically influence levels of member participation through interaction with other variables. Consequently, the regression results are not surprising.

To further enhance the data analysis and examine variable relationships, a path diagram has been constructed to illustrate how political process model variables interact and influence levels of member participation (see figure 4.1). The theorized functional relationships were discussed in Chapter II. The path analysis was performed by calculating the standardized partial regression coefficient for each variable relationship (independent and dependent). The coefficients were compared and the variables were grouped in relation to statistical significance and their strength of relationship. This diagram depicts the statistically significant variables with standardized regression coefficients. Those variables found to be statistically significant have direct arrows to levels of member participation. Those variables found to be statistically significant with each other are connected by arrows.
Figure 4.1: Path Diagram with Model Variables.
Member Organization Affiliation

The political process model (McAdam, 1982) considers an individuals' level of affiliation a key component in the movement process as the institution should influence individual participation characteristics. Thus, member levels of affiliation, the source by which an individual joins a program, whether or not they have previously served in some capacity, and the type of site at which they are functioning should functionally influence the cognitions determining levels of participation. Statistical testing indicated that these four factors had a statistically significant relationship with each other. However, their relationship to influencing levels of participation lacked statistical significance. Thus, the statistically significant variable relationships allows us to categorize them as member organization affiliation variables.

Member Cognitions

While neighborhood organization provides a structure for movement activities, McAdam (1982) contends that cognitive liberation is the process that transforms this structure into a vehicle for actual movement participation. Thus, theory indicates that cognitive liberation is related to levels of member participation. The data supports this contention; however, those variables that are closely associated with cognitive liberation (fundamental attribution error and member attitude) lacked statistical significance with levels of member participation. The path analysis does indicate that fundamental attribution error and member attitude share statistical significance with cognitive liberation. These variables can be grouped as member cognition variables.
Indigenous Organization Characteristics

As mentioned, the lack of statistically significant variables initiated the identification and addition of variables to the data analysis: organizational mission agreement and site type. The social, economic, and political isolation characterizing the living conditions of deteriorating communities typically result in the formation of indigenous organizations. As programs are developed to address community conditions, indigenous groups tend to serve as program partners; however, the path analysis indicates organizational mission needs to be considered in the selection process. The data analysis indicates organizational mission agreement is a key component to overall program success, thus whether or not an indigenous organizations mission is compatible to the goals and objectives of the development program is critically influential.

Age and Gender

The path diagram illustrates the additional salient findings of the influence of age and gender on levels of member participation. Member age was found to be statistically significant with levels of member participation. Thus, older members tend to have higher levels of participation. Although member organizational affiliation variables lacked significance with member participation, age was determined to be significant with previous service. As age increases members were more likely to have previous service experience. This indicates an indirect functional relationship exists
and gives support to a connection between member affiliation and levels of member participation when considered in regards to age.

An additional salient finding is the influence of gender on levels of member participation. The relationship between gender and levels of member participation was found to be statistically significant indicating females had higher levels of member participation (further data review found gender was not statistically significant with any of the other variables). This is consistent with the literature on early tenants' rights movements wherein women were found to be major participants in movement organizing. There is also a growing body of literature that contends women were the primary organizers behind the civil rights movement (Nelson, 1999). Future community development movements could benefit from faith-based participation as women are known to have high levels of participation in these organizations. The benefit is realized when high levels of female participation are associated with participating organizations that have mission agreement.

The absence of a statistically significant relationship between affiliation level, source of recruitment, previous service, site type and either levels of member participation or cognitive liberation reveals interesting implications for faith and community based organizations. The implications of these findings are discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This application of social movement frameworks expands the knowledge required to construct a resident participation component in a theory of community development. In this research, McAdam's (1982) empirically formed Political Process Model is used to analyze member participation in a community development program. The research results provide insight and direction into how participation can be accounted for and enhanced within the community development movement.

Development Framework Considerations

The research highlights the following participant and indigenous organization dynamics:

1) Levels of member participation are influenced by the individual's affiliations with community organizations,

2) Organizational affiliation affects levels of member participation by influencing the individual’s cognitive liberation, fundamental attribution error, and attitude,
3) Degree of affiliation with an organization is measured with the source of recruitment, previous service activities, and the type of site where the member is assigned (site partners also recruit members).

4) The functional interaction of the individual with the indigenous organizations influences the level and quality of participation in organization sponsored development activities.

An objective of this research was to compare the political process model (McAdam, 1982), an empirically developed social movement model, with an actual community development initiative to gain an understanding of the influences on member participation. The statistically significant relationships provide insight into direct influences; however, the insignificant relationships indicate indirect influences on member participation. As indicated in the path analysis (see figure 4.1), the research variables can be grouped into categories based on the statistical significance of standardized regression coefficients. These categories include member organization affiliation, member cognitions, and indigenous organization characteristics. Each category is discussed below.

**Member Organization Affiliation**

Member organization affiliation includes measurement of the affiliation level of members with community organizations, the type of site where members were assigned, whether or not members had previous community service experience, and the source by which the individual was recruited into the program. Although each variable in this group tested statistically significant with the others, there was no statistically
significant influence on levels of member participation. Member age tested to be significant with levels of member participation and previous service experience, thus supporting a connection based on age. Older individuals are more likely to have participated in some form of community service (see figure 4.1), and older members are more likely to have higher levels of member participation ($r = .24$). As member organizational affiliation should influence member cognitions, another key theoretical issue is the absence of statistical significance for member cognitions with levels of participation.

**Member Cognitions**

The variables making up member cognition include measurements of cognitive liberation, individual fundamental attribution error, and attitude towards the program. While cognitive liberation tested to have a statistically significant influence on levels of member participation, fundamental attribution error and member attitude tested non-significant. However, non-significant variables correlated with cognitive liberation, thus they have an indirect influence on levels of member participation (see figure 4.1). Included in the variable analysis was an exploration of the relationship amongst the variables included in the theoretical discussion: site type (including faith and community-based organizations), source of recruitment, and member cognitions. The results were not reported because statistical significance was absent thus indicating faith or community-based organizations were not any better than other organizations at influencing individual cognitions. Faith or community-based organizations participating
in this program had no direct advantage over secular or non-indigenous organizations in
influencing levels of member participation through indigenous connections.

Indigenous Organization Characteristics

The indigenous organization characteristic utilized for this research is
organizational mission agreement. Although site type could be considered an
organizational characteristic, it was grouped with member affiliations because affiliation
is based on individual choice. No statistically significant relationship exists between
site type and mission agreement because similar types of sites may have different or
similar types of missions.

Mission agreement and level of member participation had the highest correlation
coefficient in this study with a pearson r of -.65 and the highest relative importance
with a standardized regression coefficient of -.59. Thus, organizational mission
agreement tested to have the most influence of all the variables on member
participation. This lends indirect support to the finding that members at secular and
non-indigenous organizations performed just as well as members at faith and
community-based organizations with indigenous connections. The most important
influence on member participation is mission agreement amongst site partners while the
type of site involved tested inconsequential to member performance.
This finding is all the more relevant in light of the absence of statistical significance between member organizational affiliation and member cognitions. The substantial influence of mission agreement on member participation is indicative of the influence organization management can have on member productivity. Analysis of the data determined that there was no statistically significant relationship between mission agreement, site type, and cognitive liberation. Even though indigenous organizations appear to lack influence over member cognitions, well organized and effectively managed groups provide the leadership necessary to bring about high levels of member participation. This indicates that even in instances where member cognitive liberation and fundamental attribution error are low, participants can still be influenced by an effective management approach. Mission disagreement does not necessarily equate to ineffective management. However, partnering with an organization with different goals can lend to members being exposed to management practices promoting the organization's goals as opposed to programmatic goals.

Faith and Community-Based Organizations

The social, economic, and political isolation characterizing the living conditions of deteriorating communities have historically resulted in the formation of indigenous organizations. Morris (1984) contends indigenous organizations (faith and community-based) are significant because they facilitate the local formation of goals, strategies, and activities influencing community mobilization. The historical context of indigenous organizations is significant because social movement, in many instances, has been
facilitated through the intermingling of movement objectives with movement rhetoric and faith liturgy. This intermingling has been an effective method of mobilizing member participation because it addresses issues important to communities.

The absence of a statistically significant relationship between member organization affiliation and member cognition variables indicates indigenous organizations may have moved away from the strategies that strengthened the historical civil rights movement. McAdam (1982) contends that organizations initiated from movement activities tend to develop a culture that supports the survival of the organization as opposed to the goals and values that spawned its existence. This contention is supported in this research by the insignificant influence of site type on member cognition and levels of member participation and the absence of a relationship between member cognition and member affiliation variables. Faith and community based organizations have no more influence on member cognitions than secular or non-indigenous organizations.

Individual cognitive processes primarily result from two sources: organizational affiliation and social experience. Of primary concern in this research is the influence of organizational affiliation on individual cognitions. The importance of this concern is evident due to the historical context of indigenous organizations inspiring activism in previously non-active communities. The data analysis indicates members serving at faith or community-based organizations performed no better and no worse than
members from other types of organizations. The absence of significant variability in member performance is potentially problematic because it indicates that faith and community-based organizations are not taking advantage of indigenous networks to mobilize their constituency to address community problems. This supports the contention that the same mobilization problem existing for non-indigenous groups also constrains indigenous community development activity. The absence of a connection between individual member organizational affiliation and cognition explains some of the difficulty associated with mobilizing individuals. Although faith and community-based groups have historically provided an indigenous organizational structure, great difficulty is still experienced in the attempt to increase community participation in planning and development processes.

These issues become even more significant when we consider the implications of shifting economic dynamics in deteriorated communities. The shifting economic base (manufacturing to service, globalization and job relocation, etc.), has exacerbated the weak opportunity structure for residents of depressed areas. Consequently, social mobility becomes more dependent on the ability to take advantage of economic opportunity. Individual attribution can lead to low-levels of self-efficacy. As apathy and fatalism are prevailing social characteristics of deteriorating neighborhoods, local movement centers are in a prime position to raise member consciousness about the broader dynamics influencing urban form and individual opportunity. The lack of faith and community-based influence on member cognition and member participation
indicates these organizations are not fulfilling their historical role in mobilizing communities. This accentuates the importance of indigenous organizations addressing member cognitions and promoting individual social and economic advancement in addition to working towards achieving organizational goals.

Programmatic Considerations

As development programs (public or private) are formulated and implemented to address community conditions, indigenous organizations seek to participate to acquire resources. Alternatively, they may be recruited due to their connections to the local community. Depending on the program, these organizations then receive technical assistance to facilitate effective participation. Technical assistance can shift the strategic and operational goals of an indigenous organization by making them focus on technical competency. A situation can arise where an indigenous organization becomes more aligned with non-indigenous institutions and loses its local social base. Thus, the question remains: what happens when indigenous organizational goals no longer reflect the needs of a local community? The problem arises when organizations no longer act as local movement centers but begin to focus on organizational goals not driven by community needs.

When organizational goals lack connection with local issues, community mobilization difficulties are experienced by the indigenous organizations. This difficulty is generally experienced due to adherence to these false assumptions:
1) Individuals and groups want to or will participate,

2) Participating organizations have mission agreement, and

3) Convened groups and individuals represent the community.

Failure to recognize and address the above assumptions can result in programmatic failure or the development of policy that does not match the community organizational structure. As deteriorating communities are typically targeted for many programmatic opportunities, community organizations are formed and/or developed to take advantage of these expanding opportunities. The resulting programs developed from public policy are generally administrated by an intermediary organization (public or private) which implements a selection process to identify and acquire program partners. One of the crucial findings of this research spotlights the crucial relationship between member performance and organizational mission agreement. A group will submit an application to acquire resources; however, if its mission is not compatible with the program, the acquired resources are not effectively utilized to achieve program objectives though they may be used to achieve organization objectives. Consequently, recruiting program partners with established compatible mission objectives substantially increases the chances of program success. Assuming that all organizations (whether indigenous or faith/community-based) will be good partners is counterproductive to achieving community development objectives.
A stated goal of intermediary organizations is the formation of a community development movement. This requires the transformation of indigenous organizations into actual local movement centers. An indigenous organization is simply a group within the community. However, a local movement center is an indigenous organization that coalesces community resources into an organized body to set strategy and goals while acquiring resources to develop the local area. This includes the mobilization of volunteers, affiliated members, and local area residents. A movement center is more likely to influence member cognitions that positively influence member participation. The partial regression coefficients indicate that manipulation of cognitive liberation (.23) alone will only achieve limited changes in member participation; however, increasing participation of those organizations with mission agreement (-6.53) substantially improves member participation. The stimulation of member cognition along with selecting program partners with mission agreement can significantly improve member levels of participation.

Implications for Community Development

Traditional planning models primarily focus on physical development with little discussion of or effort toward including residents in the development process. Attempts at social inclusion have been made through the development of substantive theory and through citizen participation requirements. However, this has done little to extend the decision making process to deteriorated communities or to increase intermediary capacity to mobilize residents on development issues. The difficulty of mobilizing
residents is widely known throughout the community development arena; it is not uncommon to distribute 500 fliers and have only five residents attend the meeting.

This research provides insight into the dynamics influencing member participation. One of the effects of broad socio-economic processes on local neighborhoods is the perceived lack of self-efficacy of residents. Collective lack of self-efficacy results in a profound sense of apathy and fatalism in depressed communities. Faith and community-based organizations have historically demonstrated the capacity to challenge resident apathy if they can become local movement centers. Intermediary organizations are challenged to identify indigenous organization partners that can negotiate the regulations of development programs but can also demonstrate the potential to mobilize residents.

Effective program management and organizational mission agreement have great influence over levels of member participation. However, a program partner who can raise the level of member cognitive liberation and address fundamental attribution error issues can tap into a motivational source that has been historically demonstrated to produce high levels of member performance. Given the difficulty associated with community mobilization, it follows that a program partner that can not mobilize its own members can not be expected to effectively mobilize a community. As indigenous organizations become more proficient in the technicalities of development programs, care must be exercised to ensure an organizational climate is not developed that...
promotes unrelated group objectives over the asset-development of a community. This can be achieved by choosing partners that have:

1) Mission agreement between program partners and program objectives,
2) Indigenous organizations functioning as local movement centers, and
3) Residents with high levels of affiliation with local movement centers.

Integration of this framework into the community development process addresses the assumptions required by the asset-building model. It also helps to bridge the gap between traditional and contemporary planning models and to expose residents in depressed communities to broader decision making dynamics. The asset-building model consists of building community assets and mobilizing residents. The crucial point is to connect the development of community assets with resident mobilization. With the substantive quality of rational planning being driven by the consideration of alternative problem solutions, the mobilization of residents to participate in community planning processes can expedite and improve the potential for sustainable development because residents can bring important, otherwise ignored, alternative solutions to the process. Bringing consideration of organizational characteristics, member cognitions, and member affiliations into the community development policy formulation process can also improve the potential for effective programming.
Implications for Future Research

This research served as an initial attempt to analyze community development processes in the context of established social movement models. The application of this model to an AmeriCorps* program provided a structured framework through which member attributes could be assessed and measured thus providing an opportunity to build on this research for further framework development. The addition of focus groups could be utilized to identify the characteristics of successful and unsuccessful programs along with illustrating the attributes of a local movement center within the community development context. Local movement center analysis provides an opportunity to identify those faith-based and indigenous organizations that effectively mobilize their constituencies to participate in community development while also providing insight and direction into how these dynamics may contribute to community improvement. Further consideration should be given to how movement centers are actually formed. It should also explore age and gender differences in participation levels and analyze why older members perform better than younger members and why females have higher ratings than male participants.

As the hierarchical regression model explained 49 percent of the variance in levels of member participation, 51 percent of the variance remains to be explained. Thus, the need exists to identify other influential variables. The theoretical relationship between cognitive liberation, fundamental attribution error, and member organization affiliation suggests further analysis of these specific variables would be beneficial to
improving the understanding of their contribution towards member participation. This identification also should include the influence of work ethic on participation levels. The addition of work ethic to the regression model could enhance the viability of exploring the influence of broad socio-economic processes on residential life in depressed communities. A comparative analysis of resident social activities between prosperous communities and depressed communities would also advance the attempt to model successful resident participation activities thus providing further information on the development of resident inclusive development frameworks.

Conclusion

This empirical analysis using the social movement literature and framework allows us to conclude that indigenous organizations and local movement centers are different. This difference is identified through the role an organization has in a community and the influence it exerts over member cognitions. Level of integration becomes an important issue in the community context as organizations within deteriorated communities also have class-based issues. A faith or community-based organization in a low-income neighborhood may be comprised of middle-class members living outside the local community and have few if any neighborhood connections. Thus, there are indigenous organizations whose members only resemble local residents and there are movement centers comprised of local area residents. A movement center is an indigenous organization, but it is characterized by neighborhood integration and addresses apathy and fatalism by positively influencing member cognitions.
The research findings indicate additional emphasis on model specifications is warranted. Although cognitive liberation is identified as the construct that actualizes potential social action, the importance of organizational characteristics may provide a need for further specification of the role of social cognitions. In the case where cognitive liberation is high, it can be manipulated to advance programmatic objectives. Where cognitive liberation is low, management characteristics increase in importance because participants may be more open to supervisory direction. Management dynamics are a viable consideration in the program partner selection process since they can be utilized to overcome the influence of individual apathy and fatalism. Thus, indigenous organizations with a strong management team, mission agreement, and high levels of community integration are positioned to implement productive development initiatives. Increased organizational integration increases the likelihood that individuals can be exposed to situations that can initiate the process of cognitive liberation. However, if indigenous organizations do not create an environment within which to address community issues, they can fail to be transformed into local movement centers.
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRES
Community Service Member Rating Sheet

Instructions: Of the following statements, please rate the performance of the member.

0 = Poor; 1 = Unsatisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Above Satisfactory; 4 = Excellent

1. Rate the members’ adherence to your attendance and timeliness to work schedule.

   0 1 2 3 4

2. Rate the members’ level of effort in developing community mobilization initiatives.

   0 1 2 3 4

3. Rate the members’ effort in developing partnerships with other organizations.

   0 1 2 3 4

4. Rate the members’ participation in community mobilization initiatives.

   0 1 2 3 4

5. Rate the members’ participation in service training activities.

   0 1 2 3 4
Community Service Questionnaire

Instructions: Please check the one answer in each question that most applies to your service. Please answer all questions and read the instructions for each section.

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree

1. The AmeriCorps* program has benefited its intended communities.
   1  2  3  4

2. I believe the conditions in the community in which I live are created by a society that is fair.
   1  2  3  4

3. Through my community service, I can improve the condition of the community in which I work.
   1  2  3  4

4. I participate in service activities which result in positive community change.
   1  2  3  4

5. The AmeriCorps* program has helped solve community problems.
   1  2  3  4

6. My level of education is influenced more by social opportunity than personal desire.
   1  2  3  4

7. My level of income is influenced more by how society views me rather than by my personal qualifications.
   1  2  3  4

8. My advancement in society is influenced greatly by my race or ethnicity.
   1  2  3  4

9. My family has a great influence on my ability to advance in society.
   1  2  3  4

10. The AmeriCorps* program provides training that prepares members to transform communities.
    1  2  3  4
Instructions: Use Questions 11 – 15 to rate your performance. Please check the answer in each question that most applies to your service. Please answer all questions.

11. I put forth a great degree of effort to develop community building initiatives.
   1  2  3  4

12. I worked to develop partnerships with other organizations.
   1  2  3  4

13. I regularly participated in community building initiatives
   1  2  3  4

14. I regularly participated in the AmeriCorps* training activities.
   1  2  3  4

15. I met attendance and timeliness expectations at my site.
   1  2  3  4

Instructions: Please check the one answer in each question that most applies to your service. Please answer all questions.

16. Please indicate the total number of months you have participated in the AmeriCorps* Community Service Program.
   # of months ______

17. What was the source by which you first came into contact with this AmeriCorps* Community Service Program.
   _ Faith-Based Organization
   _ Community-Based Organization
   _ Public Agency
   _ Member Referral
   _ Educational Institution
   _ Walk-in
   _ Other, Please Specify ____________

18. Please indicate the highest level of education you have completed.
   _ Less Than High School
   _ Some High School
   _ High School Diploma
   _ Some College
   _ Associate Degree
   _ Bachelor Degree
   _ Graduate School
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19. Did you have any previous affiliation with community service organizations before enrolling in the AmeriCorps* program.
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

20. Did you have any previous affiliation with your current site before enrolling in the AmeriCorps* program.
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

21. Did you regularly participate in activities at your site previous to your involvement with AmeriCorps*.
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

22. Did you previously serve as a community volunteer prior to involvement with AmeriCorps*.
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

23. I utilized community services or attended events at this site prior to involvement with AmeriCorps*.
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

24. Please indicate your Gender.
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

25. Please indicate your age during the time you started your AmeriCorps* service term.
   ___ #__ Years of Age

26. Please indicate your Marital Status.
   ___ Single
   ___ Married
   ___ Divorced
27. Please indicate your Race/Ethnicity.
   __ Black (African-American)
   __ White
   __ Hispanic/Latino
   __ Other, Please Specify

28. Are you a Renter or Homeowner?
   __ Renter
   __ Homeowner

29. Were you registered to vote before you AmeriCorps* service?
   __ Yes
   __ No

30. Did you vote in the last general election prior to your AmeriCorps* service?
   __ Yes
   __ No

31. Are you currently registered to vote?
   __ Yes
   __ No

32. Did you vote in the last general election?
   __ Yes
   __ No
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