1984

Discrimination of Leaders Members and Non-Members in Neighborhood Block Organizations

Marc S. Mednick
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Mednick, Marc S., "Discrimination of Leaders Members and Non-Members in Neighborhood Block Organizations" (1984). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1670.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1670>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

DISCRIMINATION OF LEADERS
MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS IN
NEIGHBORHOOD BLOCK ORGANIZATIONS
BY
MARC S. MEDNICK

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
IN
PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

MAY 1984

ABSTRACT

Three sets of variables, including a set of traditional demographic variables (Set A), a set of cognitive social learning variables (Set B), and a combined set of demographic and cognitive social learning variables (Set AB) were used to discriminate among leaders, members, and non-members in neighborhood block organizations. Each set was analyzed using both the stepwise and direct methods of multiple discriminant function analysis (Wilk's-Bryan Method). These analyses were first performed on an initial sample (n=216), then applied to a classification analysis (Geisser Method) for both the initial sample and a cross-validation sample (n=205). Subjects were 421 adult residents, 18 years or older, on 17 blocks with active block organizations, living in a transitional neighborhood in Nashville, Tennessee in 1978. Subjects were randomly assigned to either the initial or cross-validation samples. Data were collected in 45 minute interviews with each respondent. Set A analysis revealed that age, education, and homeownership were the most significant discriminators of leaders, members, and non-members. In the Set B analysis, perception of personal skills, block importance, and block satisfaction were the most significant. The combined AB Set showed age, education, block importance, block satisfaction, and personal skills, respectively, to be the most efficient discriminating variables. There was a high degree of consistency in percent correct classification between samples and across methods.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	i
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	2
METHOD	8
Subjects	9
Variables	10
Procedures and Instruments	12
Data Analysis	15
RESULTS	18
DISCUSSION	43

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients for Set A: Demographic Variables	18
Table 2 Means and Standard Deviation: Demographic Variables	20
Table 3 Significant Discriminant Functions at Group Centroids: Demographic Variables	22
Table 4 Discriminant Analysis Results: Cognitive Social Learning Variables . . .	23
Table 5 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients: Cognitive Social Learning Variables	24
Table 6 Means and Standard Deviations: Cognitive Social Learning Variables . . .	26
Table 7 Tukey-A Comparisons: Cognitive Social Learning Variables	27
Table 8 Group Centroid Analysis: Cognitive Social Learning Variables	28
Table 9 Discriminant Function Analysis Results: Combined Set AB	29
Table 10 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients for Set AB: Combined Demographic and Cognitive Social Learning Variables	30
Table 11 Omega Squares for Set A, Set B, and Set AB	32
Table 12 Comparison of Classification Analysis for Set A: Initial and Cross- Validation Samples	34
Table 13 Comparison of Classification Analyses for Set B Variables: Initial and Cross- Validation Samples	36
Table 14 Predictive Accuracy of Classification Analyses Based on the Direct Method . . .	39
Table 15 Predictive Accuracy of Classification Based Upon the Stepwise Method	39
Table 16 Classification Analyses for Set AB: Initial and Cross-Validation Samples . .	42

DISCRIMINATION OF LEADERS, MEMBERS AND
NON-MEMBERS IN NEIGHBORHOOD BLOCK ORGANIZATIONS

Participation in neighborhood block associations, among the range of voluntary organizations, has been linked to increases in neighborhood cohesion and favorable attitudes towards the community (Carr, Dixon & Ogles, 1976; Litwak, 1961). In addition, these units have been identified as a means of preventing crime, improving the delivery of government services, upgrading the neighborhood's physical surroundings, increasing neighboring behavior and reducing feelings of alienation (Altshuler, 1970; Hallman, 1974; Kohfield, Salert, & Shoenberg, 1981; Morris & Hess, 1975; and Yates, 1976). Yates (1976) investigated "several types of decentralized community structures such as block organizations, advisory boards, multi-service centers, model cities programs, community corporations and community school boards. He found that block organizations had a higher overall impact on the upgrading of communities than did the other structures, strongly advocating further study of these units and their contribution to neighborhoods. Yates also determined that leadership was the key variable in the success or disintegration of these units. Unsuccessful blocks had fragmented or poorly skilled leaders. Effective blocks were characterized by shared, continuous, and skilled leadership. The importance of the leadership function has been cited by others (Wandersman & Florin, 1983; Spergel, 1969; Lassey & Fernandez, 1976; and Rich, 1980).

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature reveals that little empirical base exists for identifying leaders in voluntary organizations. Past research efforts have focused primarily on the factors that differentiate between individuals who participate and those who don't participate in voluntary organizations (Wandersman & Florin, 1981, Wandersman et. al., 1981). Commonly used sets of demographic variables such as race, sex, education, occupation and marital status have been used to study characteristics of participants in voluntary organizations. (Alford & Scoble, 1968, Smith, 1975). These variables, as well as others, have not yet been used to differentiate leaders in these organizations from those who comprise the general membership, as well as how these groups differ from those who decide not to participate at all. In short, there are few sources of data regarding levels of participation in voluntary organizations.

In addition, no published studies of leadership specific to neighborhood block organizations exist in the literature. Related sources of information were found in studies of community leaders as well as in the generic leadership literature.

Lassey and Fernandez (1976) described community leaders as individuals committed to community progress who had advanced education, former leadership experience, historic family roots in the community and a value base

consistent with their peers. Stouffer (1965) found leaders of voluntary associations to be more socially and politically tolerant than the majority of individuals in their community. Devereux (1960) delineated among formal, informal, and influential leaders, while Miller and Dirksen (1961) made the distinction between visible, concealed, and symbolic leaders. Formal and visible leaders tended to be older persons with an elected office within the local government. The other leader types were often younger, with professional status, or were from influential families. Rose (1962) discovered leaders to be more woven into the social fabric of the community. Leaders in this study also reported more friends than non-leaders and fewer feelings of alienation. Spergel (1969) espoused a more cynical view of community leaders, claiming that many are individuals with high needs for domination, attention, and status, yet who are without demonstrated competence or skills. Isolates were more introverted, preferred philosophical, independent thought, and fell between the other two groups on self ratings of emotional development.

Several leader studies have used structured group tasks as a means of differentiating between leaders, followers, and isolates. In these studies (Martin, Gross & Darley, 1952; Gibb, 1954; Holmes et. al., 1960), leaders were found to be extroverted, to act on the spur of the moment, and to identify with middle class standards and

norms. Followers were generally less extroverted, more reflective, conservative, and pragmatic. Isolates were more introverted, preferred philosophical, independent thought, and fell between the other two groups on self ratings of emotional development.

In Stogdill's (1948) review of the generic leadership literature, he found leaders to score higher than members of their referent group on indices of responsibility, self confidence, reliability, self sufficiency, assertiveness, persistence, intelligence, scholarship, socioeconomic status, extent of social participation, extroversion, persuasiveness, and knowledge and expertise in a particular subject area. Since Stogdill's review, similar findings have emerged. Gordon (1952) found leaders to be more trustworthy than non-leaders, while Cattell and Stice (1953) asserted that leaders scored higher on measures of super ego strength and adventurousness. Other researchers have reported findings which link leaders to the ability to resist conformity pressure (Blake and Mouton, 1961), as well as a history of past successful group influence (Hollander 1974). The Ohio State Leadership Study Series utilized the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire as an instrument to select leaders. Leaders were found to score higher on dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure referred to behaviors that organized, set limits, and regulated work flow, whereas consideration was indicative of behaviors that

engendered warmth and respect between leader and follower (Schreisheim, 1982).

In spite of the volume of leadership studies (Stogdill reviewed over 3,000 books and journal articles in 1974), many authors conclude that findings should be viewed guardedly. Leadership, from this vantage point, is a highly situational, complex, and contextual variable, with strong contraindications for generalizability (Darley, Gross, & Martin, 1952; Hemphill, 1950; Stogdill, 1948; Pfeffer, 1977). Gibb (1954) and others (Frew, 1977; Nelson, 1964) go on to indicate that effective group members all have leadership potential which can be realized as situational demands change. These authors challenge the notion of clear cut traits or attributes as indigenous to leaders and followers).

In addition, Pearce (1982) discovered many differences between paid employees and volunteers. These findings shed doubt on the practice of generalizing from studies involving formal organizations to voluntary organizations. For example, volunteers had greater variability in their performance than did paid employees. Volunteer leaders derived their authority from the organization's membership, not from a formal hierarchy, and had to rely upon whatever workforce was available, often without the benefit of institutional sanctions for inadequate performance.

To fully understand the context within which the current research is being conducted, a distinction must be made between "community organizations" and "organizations within communities." (Florin & Wandersman, 1983). The latter refers to voluntary civic and fraternal organizations (eg. Kiwanis, Lions) in which specific goals have been established by a pre-existing organizational charter. These norms, such as "providing charity to needy families," guide the behavior of the membership regardless of who the participants in the organization may be. In contrast, community organizations are established through the grass roots efforts of individuals within a given locale for the specific purpose of improving the quality of life for the membership. Their purpose is to accomplish specific tasks which change as the goals and composition of the membership change.

The current study proposes to address the following question: What variables discriminate among leaders, members, and non-members in neighborhood block organizations? It is hypothesized that the discrimination among these three groups is related to differences in demographic and personality characteristics. More specifically, it is predicted that:

1. a set of seven demographic variables will discriminate among the three groups;

2. a set of four cognitive social learning variables (Mischel, 1973) will be sufficient discriminators of leaders, members, and non-members of neighborhood block organizations;
3. the combined set of cognitive social learning variables and demographic variables will discriminate among leaders, members and non-members; and
4. the combined set of variables, of the three sets described above, will yield the most accurate classification of subjects into leader, member, and non-member groups.

This study is important for two reasons. From a methodological standpoint, this is the first use of a multivariate approach to discriminating among leaders, members, and non-members in this type of community organization. Second, the findings of this study will increase the body of knowledge potentially available to community organizers in determining how to best identify individuals with interest in participating as a leader or member in a block organization.

METHOD

This study is a secondary analysis of data collected as part of the Neighborhood Participation Project (NPP) in Nashville, Tennessee between May and September, 1978.

A block, as the unit of analysis in this study, referred to both sides of a resident's street with cross streets at either end serving as block boundaries. The NPP was a prospective longitudinal study designed to investigate the process of block organization participation in the Waverly-Belmont neighborhood of Nashville. Following a post World War II exodus to the suburbs by middle class residents, this neighborhood experienced urban decay--decreasing property values, increasing crime rate and deterioration of the physical environment. At the time of the NPP, a reverse middle class immigration back to this urban area persisted. The neighborhood was racially integrated with individual blocks more homogenous by race.

Under the auspices of Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS), the NPP study was conducted. NHS is a non-profit, cooperative organization of citizens, city officials, and local lending institutions designed to assist neighborhood residents in revitalizing their neighborhood. NHS is the single most widely employed model for neighborhood upgrading (Ahlbrandt & Brophy, 1975), with over 160 NHS programs in 140 cities across the United States. As in other cities, NHS employed community organizers to organize

block associations, a primary citizen action vehicle for upgrading communities. All the blocks in the NPP had been selected by NHS for community organization efforts.

Subjects

Respondents in this study were 421 adult residents, 18 years or older on 17 blocks with active block organizations. Interviews were requested with all adults living in each household on each block in the homes of the respondents--517 residents on the 17 blocks were interviewed. Ninety-six did not know there was a block organization on their block; therefore, they could not decide whether to participate or not to participate and were excluded from the study.

The respondents were primarily blue-collar and lower-middle class. Ages ranged from 18-91 with a mean of 43.9 years, a median of 44 years, and a standard deviation of 17.75 years. The majority of respondents. 61.4%, were black with 38.6% being white. Sixty-one percent of the sample were women and 39% were men. Forty-five point eight percent were married, 29.5% single, and 24.7% either divorced, separated, or widowed. Forty-three percent had at least one child living at home. In terms of the intended length of residence on the block--how long respondents would remain at their current address--the mean was 3.06 years. The median was 3 years, and the standard deviation slightly beyond 1 year. Approximately 19% of the

sample intended to stay one or two years. Twenty-eight percent said they would stay 3 years and 48.9% intended to stay 4 or more years--indicating a fairly stable block population. Twenty-one point four percent of the respondents had no active religious affiliation (i.e. attended synagogue, church services regularly) while 5% were members, but, not active, and approximately 72% were actively religious. Twenty-nine percent of the sample held a bachelor's degree, 37% completed high school, but had not attended or completed college, and almost 28% had or were completing advanced degrees.

Variables

One dependent variable and two sets of predictor variables were used for this study. The dependent variable was the level of participation in a block association. This variable was operationalized as the degree of self-reported involvement in the block association. Non-members were those individuals who knew about the block organization but chose not to join. Members were defined as those who attended meetings, talked at meetings, worked on committees, and worked for the association outside of meeting times yet who held no leadership position. Leaders were defined as those persons who headed a committee or held an office within the organization.

Two sets of predictor variables were proposed for this study. Set A consisted of demographic variables thought to

be relevant to making a distinction among leaders, members, and non-members. The second set of predictor variables, Set B, consisted of operationalized cognitive social learning variables (Mischel, 1973). Set A variables include religion, age, marital status, occupation, education level, intended length of residence and homeownership. Consistent with the findings of recent research on citizen participation (Wandersman & Florin, 1983), marital status and homeownership were ordered such that greater emphasis was given to those who were married rather than single or divorced as well as to those who owned, rather than rented, their homes.

Set B variables consisted of four variables which correspond to the cognitive social learning person variables (CSLV's) identified by Mischel (1973). Mischel asserted that individuals generate distinct patterns of behavior on the basis of how they subjectively perceive their interactions with the environment. These perceptions are subject to change across situations. Within the context of the block organization, these perceptions or cognitions may determine the level of individual participation. Mischel elucidated variables which he termed construction competencies, encoding strategies, expectancies, and subjective stimulus value. The variables used in this study which correspond to the cognitive social learning variables are labelled and discussed below:

- 1) Perception of personal skills (construction competencies)--this variable refers to the individual's

perception of his/her cognitive and behavioral abilities to successfully execute particular behaviors. Examples of these skills include the ability to lead a group, the ability to speak in front of others, and the ability to organize others to complete a task;

2) Satisfaction with the block (encoding strategies)--this variable refers to the way in which the individual perceives, codes, and categorizes information about a situation. In the context of the block, this variable refers to overall satisfaction with living conditions on that block;

3) Perception of power to influence (expectancies)--this variable generally refers to the individual's perception of his/her activities will lead to a valued outcome. In particular, this variable refers to the perceived expectation that individual and organizational activities will be able to improve block living conditions and the responsiveness of local government;

4) Importance of the block (subjective stimulus value)--this variable refers to the relative importance the individual places on the block as well as possible outcomes of participation;

The items comprising the CSLV's appear in Appendix A.

Procedure and Instruments

In the NPP study, trained interviewers called on all

the houses on the block. White interviewers conducted interviews on predominantly white blocks and black interviewers conducted interviews on predominantly black blocks. The interview was conducted by means of a questionnaire which was verbally administered by interviewers in the homes of the respondents. Administration took approximately 45-60 minutes, and residents were paid \$3.50 for the interview. For the current study, only those aspects of the interview which pertained to the variables under study were included in the analysis.

The structured interview utilized a questionnaire (see Appendix B) requiring respondents either to answer direct questions by the interviewer or to respond to several Likert-type scales. Most of the demographic variables' data were gathered with the question-answer format. For example, for the variable education, respondents were asked, "How many years of formal education do you have?" For this variable, categories were coded such that higher numbers were inversely related to years of education. There were seven categories ranging from the category advanced degree--M.A., Ph.D., etc., coded as one (1), to the category less than six years of education which was coded as a seven (7). The variable, intended length of residence, was addressed by the question, "How long do you plan to live here?" There were five possible responses: less than one year (coded as one (1); one to three years (coded as (2)); four to six years (coded as (3)); six or

more years (coded as (4)); and, don't know (coded as (5)). The variables homeownership, and marital status, were coded as a function of the percentage of individuals in the sample who either were married or non-married and either homeowner's or renters. For example, 45% of the sample were married, so .45 was entered for each married subject in the analysis. Similarly, .55 (55%) was entered for each of the unmarried subjects. In addition, 75% of the subjects were homeowners (coded as .75) and 25% were renters (coded as .25). The variable, age, was assessed with a simple, "How old are you?" with the respondents age being inserted directly into the analysis of data. For the variable religion, respondents were asked about the extent to which they were involved in their church or synagogue. Data on this variable were coded as the composite of: member (coded as (1)), or non-member (coded as (0)) status; whether respondents were leaders in their church or synagogue (coded as (1)) or non-leaders (coded as (0)); and level of activity--no meetings attended, 1-2 meetings attended, less than half the meetings, and more than half, coded as (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively. A total of six was possible. Finally, the variable, occupation, was assessed through the use of a Hollingshead Index of Occupations. The categories were: high status executives or major professionals; business managers or less professionals; administrative personnel, small independent business owners or minor professionals; clerical sales

workers or technicians; skilled manual employees; machine operators and semi-skilled employees; unskilled laborers; and housewives, students, unemployed, and retired persons. These categories were coded (1) through (8), respectively.

While this level of inquiry was used to gather demographic information, data for the cognitive social learning variables were extracted differently. For each of these variables, respondents were asked to choose a point on a summated, Likert or Likert-type scale, which best described their position. Several items were collapsed to yield a score for each variable. For example, for the satisfaction with the block variable, subjects were first asked to rate block characteristics on a five point scale, including items such as dangerous--safe, noisy--quiet, messy--neat, and houses need repair--in good condition. They were also asked questions like, "all things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with this block as a place to live?" Responses range 1 to 5, very dissatisfied--very satisfied. Cronbach alpha coefficients were computed for each cognitive social learning variable (Florin, 1983), yielding an index of internal consistency. The results were as follows: perception of personal skills, .71; satisfaction with the block, .71; importance of the block, .72; and perception of power to influence, .70.

Data Analysis

The direct and stepwise methods of multiple dis-

criminant function analysis were conducted for each of the three variables sets. In all cases, the Wilk's likelihood ratio and the Bartlett's V statistic were used to determine statistical significance. SPSS-X was the statistical package of choice (Nie et al, 1983) utilizing the DISCRIMINANT program. The direct method of multiple discriminant function analysis considers all variables in a set simultaneously, regardless of each variables' potential contribution to the discriminant function. This is in contrast to the stepwise method, in which each variable is entered into the analysis separately, contingent upon its' ability to contribute significantly to the discriminant function. An F to enter specification of $p < .05$ was used in the stepwise analysis to ensure that only those variables making a significant contribution to the separation among groups would be retained.

In order to improve power of this analysis, the total sample ($n=421$) was randomly split into an initial sample ($n=216$) and a cross-validation sample ($n=205$). The discriminant analyses were conducted using the initial sample only. The resultant functions were then applied to both samples in the classification analysis (Geisser method). In doing this, the relative accuracy in prediction of group membership based upon the discriminant functions could be interpreted comparing independent samples. Prior probabilities for group membership were set at 33% for the classification analysis, based on Gibb's (1954) assertion

that expected differences between leaders and followers may be unclear under certain conditions.

For each of the sets of variables, a separate direct method and stepwise method analysis was conducted. The results of each analysis are reported in the order in which they were conducted.

RESULTS

Set A: Demographic Variables

The first hypothesis, that demographic variables discriminate among leaders, members, and non-members in neighborhood block organizations, was confirmed by the analyses. The direct method yielded two discriminant functions ($\lambda_1 = .81077$, $\lambda_2 = .95853$), accounting for 80.8% and 19.2%, respectively, of the between group variability. Of these, only the first function was significant (14df, $p < .05$; Bartlett's $V = 44.049$). In the stepwise analysis, the first discriminant function ($\lambda_1 = .83943$) accounted for 86.4% of the between group variability and was statistically significant (6df, $p < .05$; Bartlett's $V = 37.105$). The second discriminant function accounted for the remainder of the between group variability and was not significant. Table 1 compares the standardized discriminant function coefficients for the significant direct method and stepwise method discriminant function.

Table 1

Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients for Set A: Demographic Variables

Variable	Direct Method	Stepwise Method
Age	.79320	.91618
Education	-.71704	-.89162
Homeownership	.43550	.49452
Marital Status	.23823	*
Religion	.17001	*
Intended Residence	-.16948	*
Occupation	-.12818	*

Note. *Insignificant discriminating variables were dropped from the analysis. Functions were significant $p < .05$.

For both methods, age, education, and homeownership contributed most to maximizing the separation among groups. Age and education were the most significant contributors, whereas homeownership made a more modest contribution to group separation. It is evident from Table 1 that the variables marital status, religion, intended length of residence, and occupation did not contribute much to the discriminant functions. In the stepwise analysis, the discriminative ability to these variables was so low that they were not retained in the analysis. In other words, the results of this analysis indicate that these variables do not adequately discriminate leaders, members, and non-members.

In an analysis of means, it becomes clearer which of the group differences made the most profound impact. For example, leaders were more frequent homeowners (mean=.69) than were members (mean=.66), yet individuals in both of these groups were far more likely to be homeowners than those comprising the group of non-members (mean=.57). Members tended to be older (mean=49.03 years) than either leaders (mean=46.08 years) or non-members (mean=39.41 years). It is clear that participants tended to be older. Within groups, however, there was a wide dispersion in age, with standard deviations for each group ranging from 15.6 years for leaders to 19.05 years for non-members (See Table 2). Leaders, on the average, had a higher proportion of individuals who attended some college (mean=3.4) than did

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviation: Demographic Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Leaders</u>		<u>Members</u>		<u>Non-Members</u>	
	<u>M</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Age	46.08	15.66	49.03	17.55	39.41	19.05
Education	3.43	1.75	4.20	1.42	4.06	1.43
Homeownership	0.69	0.17	0.66	0.20	0.57	0.23
Marital Status	0.50	0.01	0.50	0.01	0.50	0.01
Intended Length of Residence	3.15	1.02	3.05	1.01	2.91	1.13
Occupation	4.90	2.48	3.43	2.02	4.40	2.09
Religion	4.40	1.70	3.81	1.78	3.59	1.88

Note. All entries coded differently for data analysis. Age is coded in years.

Education: (1) = advanced degree (M.A., Ph.D., etc.); (2) = 4 years of college; (3) = some college or two year technical training; (4) = high school graduate; (5) = some high school; (6) = 7-8 years of school; (7) = less than 6 years. Homeownership: (.75) = owner of home; (.25) = renter. Marital Status: (.55) = single; (.45) = married; Intended length of residence: (1) = less than one year; (2) = 1-3 years; (3) = 4-6 years; (4) = 6+ years; Occupation: (1) = high status executives or major professionals; (2) = business managers or lesser professionals; (3) = administrative personnel, small independent business owners; (4) = clerical or sales workers or technicians; (5) = skilled manual employees; (6) = machine operators and semi-skilled employees; (7) = unskilled laborers; (8) = housewives, students, unemployed, and retired persons.

Religion: Coded as the composite of member (1) or non-member (0), leader in church or synagogue (1) or non-leader (0) in church or synagogue group, and level of activity--none (1), 1-2 meetings attended (2), less than half (3), more than half (4). A total of six is possible.

non-members (mean=4.04) or members (mean=4.2). (Higher mean scores indicate fewer years of education.)

For those variables that made minor contributions to separation among groups, there were similarly low mean differences between groups. For example, leaders (mean=.503), members (mean=.502), and non-members (mean=.49), were similar in their marital status. Leaders were more likely to have an active religious affiliation (mean=4.4) than either members (mean=3.8) or non-members (mean=3.6). Leaders were also more likely to be engaged in blue collar occupations (mean=4.78) than members (mean=5.5) and non-members (mean=5.6). (When measurements were made with a Hollingshead index, higher mean scores were indicative of a shift to white collar occupations.) Non-members, on the average (mean=2.9 years) intended to reside in their neighborhood fewer years than either members (mean=3.05 years) or leaders (mean=3.14 years).

The mean differences reported above reveal information about how each group differs from the others when one variable is considered at a time. A Tukey A analysis was conducted to determine if statistically significant mean differences occurred in any pairwise comparisons. No significant differences were found ($p < .05$). Therefore, any reference to differences between groups on any given variable must be made by clarifying that statistically significant differences of means did not exist. These results of the discriminant function analysis represent the

linear combination of variables, not each variable considered as a distinct and separate entity.

In terms of practical significance, only 18.1% of the variance (w^2 ; Tatsuoka, 1970) was explained by the significant direct method discriminant function. The percent of variance accounted for when the stepwise method was utilized, was lower ($w^2=15.22$). This can be interpreted as meaning that the vast majority of variance in separation among groups was left unexplained by the linear combination of demographic variables.

An analysis of discriminant functions at group centroids demonstrated that there was considerable overlap among the groups. The results appear in Table 3.

Table 3

Significant Discriminant Functions at Group Centroids:
Demographic Variables

<u>Group</u>	<u>Method</u>	
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Stepwise</u>
Non-member	-.38976	-.36640
Member	.22488	.21594
Leader	.63874	.59885

The table values indicate consistency in the magnitude of dispersion of centroids among groups. As previously indicated, low practical significance supports the view that a high degree of overlap among groups existed. In the

centroid analysis, the least amount of overlap existed between leaders and members, whereas the most overlap occurred in the comparison of leaders and members.

Set B: Cognitive Social Learning Variables

The second hypothesis, that a set of cognitive social learning variables would discriminate among leaders, members, and non-members, was confirmed by the analyses. In the direct method analysis, only the first discriminant function was significant ($\lambda_1 = .78766$, $\underline{V} = 50.459$; 8df, $p < .05$). The second discriminant function ($\lambda_2 = .97045$) was not significant. In the stepwise analysis, both discriminant functions were significant. The first function accounted for 87.76% of the available discriminant space ($\lambda_1 = .80098$, $\underline{V} = 47.045$, 6df, $p < .05$). The second discriminant function accounted for the remainder of the accountable discriminant space, yet was still significant ($\lambda_2 = .97121$, $\underline{V} = 6.1926$, 2df, $p < .05$). The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Discriminant Analysis Results: Cognitive Social Learning Variables

<u>Method</u>	<u>Eigenvalue</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Bartlett's V</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
Direct	.23190	.78776	50.459	8	.05
Stepwise					
Function 1	.21252	.80098	47.045	6	.05
Function 2	.02964	.97121	6.1926	2	.05

In all three significant discriminant functions, perception of personal skill and importance of the block contributed most to maximizing the separation among groups (see Table 5). In addition, low satisfaction with the block made a more moderate contribution to this separation.

Table 5

Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients:
Cognitive Social Learning Variables

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Direct Method</u>	<u>Stepwise Method</u>	
	Function 1	Function 1	Function 2
Personal Skills	.56296	.64604	.42931
Block Importance	.55124	.55927	-.74231
Block Satisfaction	-.48559	-.45637	.42931
Power of Power to Influence	.20746	*	*

Note. All functions significant $p < .05$

*Variable did not meet F to enter specifications.

Power to influence, a low discriminating variable in the direct method analysis, was not retained in either significant function in the stepwise analysis due to the failure of this variable to meet F to enter specifications ($p < .05$). Stepwise discriminant function 2 differs from the others in the configuration of its relative weightings. For this function, separation among groups was

achieved primarily by low block importance amongst respondents and a higher level of satisfaction with the block. These would be characteristics more associated with non-members than members or leaders.

The practical significance of the cognitive social learning variables is higher than existed for the demographic variables, yet still fairly low. In the case of the direct method discriminant function, approximately 20.4% of the variance was accounted for (w^2 , Tatsuoka, 1970). When the stepwise method was employed, the discriminant functions accounted for 19.08% and 3.34%, respectively, of the variance, for a total of 22.42% (w^2).

An examination of mean scores (Table 6) reveals that leaders (mean=23.36) exceeded both members (mean=22.24) and non-members (mean=20.09) in their perceptions of block importance. Insofar as perceptions of personal skill were concerned, leaders (mean=36.08) perceived themselves, on the average, to have greater skills (ie., for group leadership) than members (mean=30.40) and non-members (mean=29.88). Members and non-members appeared to have perceived themselves similarly along this dimension. Leaders (mean=61.01) and members (mean=62.27) were far less satisfied, on the average, with conditions on their block than were non-members (mean=66.22). This supports the contention that level of participation varies inversely with block satisfaction (Florin & Wandersman, 1983). In terms of perceived power to influence living conditions on

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations: Cognitive Social Learning Variables

Variables	Leaders		Members		Non-Members	
	<u>M</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Block Importance	23.36	3.70	22.24	3.76	20.69	3.81
Block Satisfaction	61.07	14.84	62.28	14.57	62.23	15.29
Personal Skills	36.09	9.56	30.41	5.71	29.88	5.88
Power to Influence	10.61	1.68	10.09	1.91	9.82	2.04

the block, mean scores for leaders, members, and non-members displayed a lack of demonstrable differences. Mean scores were 10.61, 10.09, and 9.82, respectively for leaders, members, and non-members.

Tukey A tests of pairwise comparisons were made for each of the social learning variables. On block importance, leaders had significantly higher mean scores than non-members $q(df=213, p < .05)=2.66891$. No significant member/non-member differences were found on this variable. Leaders also had significantly different mean scores on perception of personal skills. They exceeded both members, $q(df=213, p < .05)=5.67821$, and non-members $q(df=213, p < .05)=6.20222$ on this variable. No other significant mean differences emerged for any other group pair. A summary of Tukey A results is presented below in Table 7.

Table 7

Tukey-A Comparisons: Cognitive Social Learning Variables

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Comparison</u>		
	Leader- Member	Leader- Non-member	Member- Non-member
Personal Skills	*	*	ns
Block Importance	ns	*	ns
Block Satisfaction	ns	ns	ns
Power to Influence	ns	ns	ns

Note. * $p < .05$. ns=non-significant.

Table 8 compares group centroids for the significant discriminant functions.

Table 8

Group Centroid Analysis: Cognitive Social Learning Variables

<u>Group</u>	<u>Method</u>		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Stepwise 1</u>	<u>Stepwise 2</u>
Non-members	-.38741	-.36572	-.09484
Members	.06791	.04951	-.28157
Leaders	.83115	.80262	.12349

The values in Table 8 indicate that the magnitude of dispersion among group centroids is not very high. The greatest centroid differences occur between leaders and non-members, with considerable overlap between non-members and members. The proximity of the centroids to one another suggests that the cognitive social learning variables, by themselves, do only a minimally acceptable job in discriminating among the three groups.

Set AB: Combined Demographic and Cognitive Social Learning Variables

The third hypothesis was that the combined set of variables would be sufficient discriminators among leaders, members, and non-members. This hypothesis was confirmed by the direct and stepwise methods. The direct

method yielded one significant discriminant function which accounted for 85.12% of the accountable discriminant space ($\lambda_1 = .68554$, $\underline{v}=78.529$, $df=22$, $p < .05$). The other discriminant function was not significant. Based upon the stepwise analysis, both discriminant functions were statistically significant. The first function accounted for 85.09% of the available discriminant space ($\lambda_1 = .71558$, $\underline{v}=70.614$, $df=10$, $p < .05$), and the second function accounted for the remaining 14.9% of the available discriminant space ($\lambda_2 = .94684$, $\underline{v}=11.605$, $4df$, $p < .05$). The table below summarizes the results.

Table 9

Discriminant Function Analysis Results: Combined Set AB

<u>Method</u>	<u>Eigenvalue</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Bartlett's V</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
Direct	.37004	.68554	78.529	22	.05
Stepwise					
Function 1	.32668	.71558	70.614	10	.05
Function 2	.05654	.94648	11.605	4	.05

Table 10 presents the standardized discriminant function coefficients for each of the significant discriminant functions.

Table 10

Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients for Set AB:
Combined Demographic and Cognitive Social Learning Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Method</u>		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Stepwise 1</u>	<u>Stepwise 2</u>
Age	.66020	.69214	-.62690
Education	-.56263	-.64521	-.04617
Block Importance	.54009	.58937	-.27328
Block Satisfaction	-.39035	-.39927	.29003
Personal Skills	.29663	.33261	.71290
Power to Influence	.25330	*	*
Homeownership	.23657	*	*
Intended length of Residence	-.16134	*	*
Marital Status	.14923	*	*
Religion	-.11537	*	*
Occupation	.03519	*	*

Note. All functions significant $p < .05$.

*Variable failed to meet F to enter specifications
 $(p < .05)$.

In the combined set of variables, only five of the original pool of eleven could be viewed as sufficient discriminators of leaders, members, and non-members. These variables, in decreasing order of contribution to the discriminant functions, were: age, education, block importance, block satisfaction, and perception of personal skills. Of these, age, education, and block importance were the most significant in maximizing separation among groups, whereas block satisfaction and personal skills made moderate contributions. These findings were true for the

first discriminant function in both methods of analysis. The second discriminant function using the stepwise method, although statistically significant, explained a small proportion of the total variance ($w^2=5.8\%$). Consequently, this function has less interpretive value than the other functions. In contrast to the other significant functions, high perception of personal skill, lower age, low block importance, and moderate satisfaction with the block were the variables determining separation among groups. Perhaps this function is characterized by young, single, transient professionals, without a stake in the future of their block--a subgroup among the non-members.

The combined set of variables accounted for a larger percent of variance than did either Set A or Set B alone. The linear combination of variables represented in the direct method analysis accounted for 30.71% (w^2) of the variance. Using the stepwise method, the two discriminant functions accounted for 27.68%, and 5.8%, respectively, of the variance. While this means that other variables not included in this study account for a larger share of the variance among groups, the results are more favorable than using just the standard set of demographic variables traditionally used in studies of participation (Smith, 1975). A comparison of all multivariate Omega squares used in this and the preceeding analyses is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Omega Squares for Set A, Set B, and Set AB

<u>Method and Function</u>	<u>Set A</u>	<u>Set B</u>	<u>Set AB</u>
Direct			
Function 1	.181	.204	.307
Function 2	NA	NA	NA
Stepwise			
Function 1	.152	.191	.277
Function 2	NA	.034	.058

Note. NA=not applicable, not a significant function

Classification AnalysisSet A: Demographic Variables

The classification results based upon both methods of multiple discriminant function analysis were quite similar. This was true for the initial as well as cross validation samples. In the direct method initial sample, the percent of individuals correctly classified was 52.51%, as compared to 50.99% for the direct method cross-validation sample (see Table 12). For each sample, chi squares for observed frequencies were statistically significant. For the initial sample

$\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 39.29388$, and for the cross-validation sample $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 39.15905$, indicating that this classification system exceeded chance in its' ability to predict group membership accurately.

The percent correct classification for each respective group was also better than chance (33%). Yet, the results are also indicative of a moderate degree of misclassification that must be accounted for.

For example, 56.6% of the non-members were correctly classified in the initial sample utilizing the direct method. This represents an improvement of approximately 24% over what was expected by chance alone -- a substantially higher rate of predictive accuracy. Yet, 26.5% of the non-members were misclassified as having been members, and 16.8% were misclassified as leaders (see Table 12). The rate of predictive accuracy for leaders under this analysis was almost the same as for non-members (56.3%), indicating that the demographic variables could discern leaders at a rate of approximately 23% over chance for these individuals. 25% were misclassified as members while 18.8% were misclassified as non-members. In addition, 41.4% of the members (approximately 8% over chance) were correctly classified. 32.8% were misclassified as leaders and 25.9% were erroneously classified as non-members.

Table 12 displays the comparisons of classification analysis results for both samples based upon both the direct and stepwise methods of discriminant analysis. Examining the diagonal and off diagonal elements of each quadrant, a highly consistent pattern of predictive accuracy emerged between samples and across methods. For example, the percent of cases accurately classified in the

Table 12

Comparison of Classification Analyses for Set A: Initial and Cross Validation Samples

Sample	Actual Group	Prior Probability	Predicted Group					
			Direct Method			Stepwise Method		
			1	2	3	1	2	3
Initial n=216	1	33%	<u>56.6</u>	26.5	16.8	<u>56.6</u>	24.8	18.6
	2	33%	25.9	<u>41.4</u>	32.8	29.3	<u>39.7</u>	31.0
	3	33%	18.8	25.0	<u>56.3</u>	18.8	25.0	<u>56.3</u>
	Percent Correct Classification		52.51%			52.05%		

Cross Validation N=205	1	33%	<u>57.9</u>	21.5	20.6	<u>56.1</u>	27.1	16.8
	2	33%	19.0	<u>38.1</u>	42.9	19.0	<u>42.9</u>	38.1
	3	33%	15.6	31.3	<u>53.1</u>	21.9	28.1	<u>50.0</u>
	Percent Correct Classification		50.99%			50.99%		

Note. Percent of cases correctly classified for each group are underlined.
 1=non-members, 2=members, 3=leaders

initial sample was 52.51% for the analysis based upon the direct method and 52.05% for the analysis based upon the stepwise method. For the cross-validation sample, the direct and stepwise methods were identical in predictive accuracy (50.99%). In a comparison between samples, the predictive accuracy of classification was slightly better for the initial than the cross-validation sample, yet the practical significance of both were the same.

Set B: Cognitive Social Learning Variables Classification Analyses

The predictive accuracy of classification systems exceeded chance regardless of the method of analysis the classification was based. For the direct method, the classification analyses for the initial sample $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 51.86717$ and the cross-validation sample $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 48.92240$, were better than chance. Utilizing the stepwise method, the classification analyses for the initial sample, $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 33.56752$ as well as the cross-validation sample $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 30.19250$ exceeded the predictive accuracy due to chance alone.

For the initial sample (direct method), 55.71% of the individuals were correctly classified. Of the three groups, 64.6% of leaders were accurately classified, followed by members (58.4%) and non-members (43.1%) (See Table 13).

Table 13

Comparison of Classification Analyses for Set B Variables:Initial and Cross Validation Samples

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>Prior Probability</u>	<u>Predicted Group</u>		
			<u>Direct Method</u>		<u>Stepwise Method</u>
			<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Initial n=216	1	33%	<u>58.4</u>	26.5	15.0
					<u>60.2</u>
				21.2	18.6
	2	33%	32.8	<u>43.1</u>	24.1
					<u>27.6</u>
				37.9	34.5
	3	33%	14.6	20.8	<u>64.6</u>
					<u>16.7</u>
				29.2	<u>54.2</u>
	Percent Correct Classification			55.71%	55.45%

Cross- Validation n=205	1	33%	<u>58.9</u>	27.1	14.0
					<u>59.8</u>
				19.6	20.6
	2	33%	15.9	47.6	36.5
					<u>19.0</u>
				36.5	44.4
	3	33%	18.8	21.9	<u>59.4</u>
					<u>18.8</u>
				40.6	<u>40.6</u>
	Percent Correct Classification			52.97%	55.71%

Note. Percent of cases correctly classified for each group are underlined.
1=non-members, 2=member, 3=leaders.

Stated another way, the cognitive social learning variables were the most effective in determining leader group membership. Given established prior probabilities, leaders were predicted accurately at a rate of approximately 32% beyond the expectation of chance alone. This classification system was able to correctly classify members at a rate of approximately 25% over chance and non-members at a rate of approximately 10% over chance.

Almost 45% of the individuals in this analysis were misclassified. The most salient occurrence of misclassification existed for the member group. Approximately thirty-three percent of the individuals in this group were erroneously classified as belonging to the non-members groups, while 24.1% were misclassified as leaders. Of the non-members, individuals were more likely to be misclassified as members (26.5%) than as leaders (15.0%). When misclassified, leaders were inaccurately predicted to be members in 20.8% of the cases and non-members in 14.6% of the cases.

In the cross-validation (direct method) group, similar findings emerged. 55.45% of the total sample were accurately classified. 59.4% of the leaders, 47.6% of the members, and 58.9% of the non-members were accurately classified. However, the same pattern of misclassification persisted, with members even more likely to be assigned incorrectly. For example, 36.5% of the members were misclassified as leaders and 15.9% as non-members.

The classification systems based upon the stepwise analyses were slightly less accurate. A comparison of classification analyses in Table 13 compares the systems between samples and across methods. For the initial sample (stepwise method), 52.97% of the individuals were accurately classified, as compared to 55.71% of the individuals in the direct method analysis.

Differences between the two classification analyses need further explanation. Of particular note is the finding that leaders were classified accurately less often by the analysis based upon the stepwise method. In addition, comparison between the original and cross-validation samples' classification systems (stepwise method) reveals nearly a 14% difference in predictive accuracy. This finding suggests caution in the use of the cognitive social learning variables as sole predictors leader group membership.

Set AB: Combined Demographic and Cognitive Social Learning Variables Classification Analyses

As predicted, the combined set of variables was more accurate in predicting group membership than either of the variable sets alone. Tables 14 and 15 compare classification analyses for Set A, Set B, and Set AB based upon the two methods of discriminant function analysis.

Table 14

Predictive Accuracy of Classification Analyses Based on
the Direct Method

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Set A</u>	<u>Set B</u>	<u>Set AB</u>
Initial	52.51%	55.71%	58.45%
Cross Validation	50.99%	52.97%	58.91%

Note. Entries are percent correctly classified.

Table 15

Predictive Accuracy of Classification Analyses Based Upon
the Stepwise Method

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Set A</u>	<u>Set B</u>	<u>Set AB</u>
Initial	52.05%	55.45%	54.79%
Cross Validation	50.99%	55.71%	56.93%

Note. Entries are percent correctly classified.

In comparing the entries in Tables 14 and 15, Set AB had greater predictive accuracy when the analyses were based upon the direct method. When based upon the stepwise method, the predictive accuracy of the classification systems was better than Set A, yet only better than Set B in the cross-validation sample. In any case, the differences between Set B results and Set AB results were not significant.

When Set AB is considered, the percent of cases correctly classified for all classification analyses, regardless of method (direct or stepwise) exceeded chance. For the initial sample (direct), $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 61.56854$, and for the cross-validation sample (direct), $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 56.34639$. In the analysis for the initial sample (direct), 58.45% of the individuals were accurately predicted as belonging to their actual group. 62.5% of the leaders (approximately 33% over chance), 53.4% of the members (approximately 20% over chance), and 59.3% of the non-members (approximately 26% over chance) were correctly classified. Leaders were misclassified with the greatest frequency as members (22.9%) and to a lesser extent as non-members (14.6%). When members were misclassified, they were just as likely to be identified as leaders (22.4%) as they were as non-members (24.1%). For non-members, 25.5% were misclassified as members and 14.2% as leaders.

In the cross-validation sample (direct), the overall accuracy of the prediction was similar, with 58.91% correct classification. The distributions of correct and incorrect classifications was slightly different. For example, the highest "hit" rate occurred for non-members (65.4%), followed by leaders (59.4%) and members (47.6%). In addition, leaders were more likely to be misclassified as non-members (21.9%) than as members (18.8%). Members were more likely to be misclassified as leaders (33.3%) than as non-members (19.0%).

A similar pattern emerged for the classification analysis based upon the stepwise method of multiple discriminant function analysis. For the initial sample, 54.79% of the participants in the study were accurately classified. The cross-validation correct classification rate was 56.93%. In both instances, the predictive accuracy of classification exceeded chance. For the initial sample, $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 28.45549$, and for the cross-validation sample, $\chi^2(4, p < .05) = 47.99648$.

Table 16 compares the classification analyses results for set AB. Differences between samples and across methods were negligible.

Table 16

Classification Analyses for Set AB: Initial and Cross Validation Samples

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>Prior Probability</u>	<u>Predicted Group</u>					
			<u>Direct Method</u>			<u>Stepwise Method</u>		
			1	2	3	1	2	3
Initial n=216	1	33%	<u>59.3</u>	26.5	14.2	<u>55.8</u>	29.2	15.0
	2	33%	24.1	<u>53.4</u>	22.4	27.6	<u>46.6</u>	25.9
	3	33%	14.6	22.9	<u>62.5</u>	18.8	18.8	<u>62.5</u>
	Percent Correct Classification			58.45%			54.79%	

Cross- Validation n=205	1	33%	<u>65.4</u>	22.4	12.1	<u>62.6</u>	23.4	14.0
	2	33%	19.0	<u>47.6</u>	33.3	19.0	<u>47.6</u>	33.3
	3	33%	21.9	18.8	<u>59.4</u>	21.9	21.9	<u>56.3</u>
	Percent Correct Classification			58.91%			56.93%	

Note. Percent of cases correctly classified for each group are underlined.
1=non-members, 2=members, 3=leaders.

DISCUSSION

The results of the multiple discriminant function analyses provided information regarding variables which determine level of participation in neighborhood block organizations. When Set A variables were entered into the analyses, age, education, and homeownership emerged as the most viable discriminating variables. Contrary to earlier research on leadership (Devereux, 1960; Miller & Dirksen, 1961), the community leaders in this sample were not older than the general membership. On the average, members were approximately three years older than leaders. Consistent with earlier findings (Stogdill, 1948), leaders were better educated. On dimensions of "rootedness" to a neighborhood (Florin & Wandersman, 1983), it is expected that variables linked to these dimensions would have contributed highly to separation among groups. Only one of these variables, homeownership, made a significant contribution to the discriminant functions, with weightings of .43350 with the direct method, and .49452 for the stepwise method analysis. Leaders (mean=.69) and members (mean=.66) were more likely to be homeowners than were non-members (mean=.57). Other variables indicative of rootedness were not as useful. Marital status (.23823) and intended length of residence (-.16948) made negligible contributions to the direct method discriminant function, and were not retained by the stepwise method analysis. These results suggest that aside from homeownership, other demographic variables thought to

be of significance in determining commitment to a neighborhood may not be as important in discriminating levels of participation.

The linear combination of variables comprising Set A produced statistically significant discriminant functions. In terms of practical significance, only 18.1% of the variance was accounted for by the direct method analysis, and only 15.22% by the stepwise method analysis. This raises questions about the usefulness of the variable set. It also provides limitations relative to generalization of the results. One explanation for the low variance accounted for is that Set A did not consist of a sufficient number of demographic variables. Other variables, such as income level, sex, and length of residence may have improved the results. This is doubtful, since overlapping variables such as occupation and intended length of residence were of no significance in the analyses that were conducted. A second explanation is that other demographic variables not included in the analysis and not part of the existing data base were better discriminators of the three groups. A third explanation, related to the second, has to do with the variable "opportunity cost," which may have had suppressor effects on the other variables. This refers to the possibility that individuals already committed to other voluntary organizations (i.e. Kiwanis, Lions, Parent-Teacher Association) decided either to 1) not participate in block organization activities at all, or 2) participate

minimally, in which case individuals with positive qualities as leaders labeled themselves as "members." This phenomenon would have blurred true distinctions between the groups, as evidenced by overlapping group centroids. The fourth explanation is that few demographic variables are effective discriminators of leaders, members, and non-members. The fifth explanation has to do with the variables homeownership and marital status. As used in this study, both variables were discrete, not continuous. The inclusion of such variables in the analysis not only reduced the total variance explained by contributing so little unique variance of their own. It also raises the question that the discriminant function coefficients might have been artifacts of discrete variables included in the variable set. In other words, a purely continuous variable set may have yielded a different configuration of discriminant weightings.

The low variance accounted for suggests that any reporting of age, education, and homeownership as effective discriminators of the groups be made with a caveat--that the linear combination of these variables is limited in practical significance.

Set B, Cognitive Social Learning Variables (CSLV's), were also able to significantly discriminate among groups. Of these, perception of personal skill, importance of the block, and low satisfaction with the block made the most significant contributions to separation among groups. The

results were consistent with past research in determinants of block organization participation (Wandersman & Florin, 1981). The significant Tukey A tests of pairwise comparisons were able to provide additional information regarding how the three groups could be differentiated from one another. Insofar as block importance was concerned, significant mean differences were found between leaders (mean=23.36) and non-members (mean=20.09), but not between members and any other group. Leaders exceeded both members and non-members with regard to the level of skills they perceived themselves to have. These differences were also statistically significant. No significant mean differences between groups were found on either block satisfaction or perceived power to influence. The composite profile of a leader based upon this analysis would be an individual who perceives the block as important, yet doesn't like the living conditions there and possesses the requisite skills to lead organizations that could change those conditions. This is also an individual who does not exceed any other members of the community in terms of an expectation that his/her activities will necessarily bring about a desired change. In other words, the expectation of potential success, on the basis of this analysis, was not a prerequisite for an individual assuming a leadership role. This analysis also indicates that leaders and members do not differ on measures of block satisfaction and expected power to influence. The significant differences between

these two groups, on block importance and personal skills, may be explained in two ways. First, Mischel (1973) argues that the CSLV's are dynamic, not steady state or trait variables. As such, they are subject to change as an individual's transactions with this environment change. By this definition, individuals who are leaders are simply those who, as a consequence of their experiences within the community (block), perceive it as being more important and perceive themselves as having the skills necessary to function as a leader. According to this view, these perceptions will continue as long as the individual continues to view his transactions within that community in similar ways. In other words, the variables determining leadership for one individual may cause that person to desire member or non-member status should the perceptions shift enough. Similarly, a member's perceptions of self and environment may shift sufficiently for that individual to assume a leadership role. The second explanation (Gibb, 1954; Frew, 1977) simply espouses the idea that all effective group members have leadership potential which can be realized as situational demands change.

As with Set A, the percent of variance accounted for by Set B was relatively low. This variable set accounted for more variance than Set A (20.4%, direct method; 22.42%, stepwise method), suggesting that operationalization of the CSLV's is useful in attempting to discriminate among the three groups. These results also urge caution in

generalizing the community organization contexts. While the variables were sufficient discriminators, they may not be the most important, as indicated by the percent of variance explained.

The Set AB analysis also produced significant results, with age, education, block importance, block satisfaction, and personal skills contributing most to the discriminant functions. Homeownership, a significant variable in the Set A analysis, was a less important variable in Set AB. Of particular significance is the fact that this set accounted for more variance than either of the other sets alone. The direct method discriminant function accounted for approximately 31% of the variance, and the stepwise method analysis almost 34% of the variance. The combined set provided a more useful means of discriminating among the groups. Moreover, this set would be more useful in any attempts to identify potential leaders in block organizations. Although caution must be exercised in generalizing these results to a leader identification technology, the findings are highly encouraging.

In terms of the classification analyses, there was a high degree of consistency in prediction across sets, methods of analysis, and samples. The percent correctly classified ranged from 50.99% for Set A (direct method, initial sample) to 58.91% for Set AB (direct method, initial sample).

When compared to the expected percentage of correct classification due to chance alone (33%), all three variable sets were able, with a fairly high degree of accuracy, to predict leader and non-member group membership. This predictive efficiency was less noteworthy for non-members. These findings support the expanded use of demographic and cognitive social learning variables as part of a leader selection process in community organization efforts. However, it is to be cautioned that the distinctions between members and leaders were not so distinct in any of the variable sets, and that the sole use of these variables in attempts to differentiate the two groups would be contraindicated.

Although leaders and non-members were predicted with greater accuracy than non-members, the overall misclassification rate ranged from 42% to 49%. When misclassified, members were just as likely to emerge as either non-members or leaders. Several explanations are offered. First, it is possible that the true differences between members and the other two groups were not extensive. If so, then the analysis was an accurate reflection of group overlap. Second, the opportunity cost hypothesis may have been operative. In this schema, individuals who were committed to leader or member positions in other organizations could have limited participation in block organizations due to time constraints. For example, individuals who were active members of the Rotary Club or Parent-

Teachers Association (PTA) may have decided not to participate. In spite of the fact that they had attributes similar to other members, they would have been classified as non-members by this analysis. Individuals holding leadership positions in other organizations may have presented themselves as interested, yet overcommitted members, with similar attributes to leaders in the study. It is unclear to what extent this phenomenon was being measured in the analysis of the data. If operative, there would have been a reduction in the robustness of the discriminant analyses, and a decline in the predictive accuracy of the classification analyses.

This study was, admittedly, limited in scope. It was conceived as the initial step of an incremental empiricism -- the first of several studies concerned with identifying, and ultimately selecting, leaders in neighborhood block organizations. Future study in this area must go beyond the boundaries of the approach reported upon here, focusing on other variables or methodologies.

Several potential directions include examination of the opportunity cost hypothesis, situational variables, and group dynamics variables.

These suggestions for study are intended to fill a gap left by the results of this study. Namely, to understand how several variables may interact to foster or restrict leader emergence.

The opportunity cost hypothesis was explained earlier. It reflects the concern that individuals with leadership skill often do not choose to hold leadership positions in neighborhood block organizations because their personal resources have already been committed to other voluntary organizations. Further research could explore the relationship between extent of commitment to other organizations and level of participation in block associations.

Group dynamics are a probable determinant of who will assume a leadership position. Variables such as group size, role taking within the work group, attributions of group members to each other, talking time, extent of interruptions, and even choice of seating at meetings, may influence who emerges as a leader.

In addition, situational variables such as the task specificity of block organization efforts, can be considered as viable contributors to members' decision to seek a leadership position.

REFERENCES

Ahlbrandt, R., & Brophy, P. (1975). Neighborhood Revitalization: Theory and Practice. Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts.

Altshuler, A.A. (1970) Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities. Pegasus. New York.

Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1961). Perceived characteristics of elected representatives. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62, No. 3, 693-695.

Carr, T., Dixon, M., & Ogles, R. (1976). Perceptions of community life which distinguish between participants and non-participants in a neighborhood self-help organization. American Journal of Community Psychology, 4, 357-366.

Cattell, R.B., & Stice, G.S. (1953). Four Formulae for Selecting Leaders on the Basis of Personality. University of Illinois Laboratory for Personality Assessment and Group Behavior, Urbana, Illinois.

Coopersmith, S. (1967). The Antecedents of Self-Esteem, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, California.

Devereux, E. (1960). Community participation and leadership. Journal of Social Issues, 16, 29-35.

Florin, P. (1983). Unpublished Manuscript, University of Rhode Island.

Frew, D.R. (1977). Leadership and followership. Personnel Journal, 56, 1 90-96.

Gibb, C.A. (1954). Leadership In G. Lindzey (Ed), Handbook of Social Psychology. Addison-Wellesley, Cambridge, Mass. 877-920.

Hallman, H.W. (1974). Neighborhood Government in a Metropolitan Setting. Sage. Beverly Hills, California, 70-134.

Hemphill, J.K. (1950). Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of superior leaders. Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 11-32.

Hollander, E. (1974). Processes of leadership emergence, Journal of Contemporary Business, 3, 19-34.

Kohfield, C., Salert, B., & Schoenberg, S. (1981). Neighborhood associations and urban crime. Journal of Community Action, 1, 37-44.

Lassey, W. & Fernandez, R. (Eds.) (1976). Leadership and Social Change, University Associates, La Jolla, California. 10-15, 238-246, 345-363.

Levenson, H. (1974). Activism and powerful others: distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. Journal of Personality Assessment, 38, 377-383.

Litwak, E. (1961). Voluntary associations and neighborhood cohesion. American Sociological Review, 26, 257-258.

Martin, W., Gross, N., & Darley, J. (1952). Studies of group behavior: leaders, followers, and isolates in small organized groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, 565-569.

Miller, D.C. & Dirksen, J.L. (1965). The identification of visible, concealed, and symbolic leaders in a small Indiana city. Social Forces, 43, 548-555.

Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 80, 252-283.

Morris, D.W., & Hess, K. (1975). Neighborhood Power: The New Localism. Beacon Press, Boston, Mass. 3-78.

Nelson, P. (1964). Similarities and differences among leaders and followers. Journal of Social Psychology, 63, 161-167.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., & Brent, D. (1983). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences - X. (Revised). McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Pearce, J. (1982). Leading and following volunteers: implications for a changing society. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18, 3, 385-394.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership, In M. Lombardo and M. McCall, Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Duke University Press, Durham, N.C. 13-44.

Rich, R. (1980). The dynamics of leadership in neighborhood organizations. Social Science Quarterly, 60, 570-587.

Rose, A.M. (1962). Alienation and participation: a comparison between group leaders and the "mass". American Sociological Review, 27, 834-838.

Smith, D.H. (1975). Voluntary action and voluntary groups. In: A. Inkeles, J. Coleman, and N. Smelser (Eds.), Annual Review of Sociology (Vol. 1). Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Spiegel, I.A., (1969). Community Problem Solving: The Delinquency Example. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 131-152.

Stogdill, R. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.

Stogdill, R. (1974). Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. Free Press, N.Y., N.Y.

Stouffer, S.A. (1965). Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. Doubleday, Garden City, New York. 56-67.

Tatsuoka, M. (1970). Selected Topics in Advanced Statistics, #6: An Elementary Approach. IPAT, p. 38.

Wandersman, A. & Florin, P. (1981). A cognitive social learning approach to cognition, social behavior, and environment. In J. Harvey (Ed.) Cognition, Social Behavior and the Environment. Ehlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Yates, D. (1976). Political innovation and institution building--the experience of decentralized experiments. In Theoretical Perspectives in Urban Politics. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 17-98.

VARIABLESSet A: Demographics

1. Age
2. Homeownership
3. Intended Length of Residence
4. Religion
5. Occupation
6. Education
7. Marital Status

Set B: Cognitive Social Learning Variables

1. Perception of Personal Skills
2. Perception of Power to Influence
3. Importance of the Block
4. Satisfaction with the Block

APPENDIX A

Items Within the Cognitive Social Learning Variables

A. Construction Competencies (Perception of Personal Skills)

A1. I find it very hard to talk in front of a group.

Range 1-4; Strongly disagree -- Strongly agree

A2. Other people usually follow up ideas.

Range 1-4; Strongly disagree -- Strongly agree

A3. I am often a leader in groups.

Range 1-4; Strongly disagree -- Strongly agree

A4. I can usually organize people to get things done.

Range 1-4; Strongly disagree -- Strongly agree

B. Encoding (Satisfaction with block qualities)

B1 - B6. Six items asking respondent to rate block characteristics: Range 1-6;

B1 dangerous -- safe

B2 unattractive -- attractive

B3 messy -- neat

B4 noisy -- quiet

B5 houses need repair -- in good condition

B6 streets/walks need repair -- in good condition

B7. All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with this block as a place to live?

Range 1-5; Very dissatisfied -- Very satisfied

B8. Index of block problems: For each item, I'd like you to tell me whether it is a problem on your block and how serious a problem it is:

Range 1-4 for each problem;

Not a problem -- Major problem

(20 items given e.g., traffic, crime, rats, vacant lots)

C. Expectancies (Power to Influence)

C1. I don't think public officials in this city care much about what people like me think.

Agree --- Disagree

C2. The way people vote decides how things are run in this city.

Agree --- Disagree

C3. People like me don't have any say about what the local government does.

Agree --- Disagree

C4. Money is the most important factor influencing public policies and decisions.

Agree -- Disagree

C5. Political leaders can generally be trusted to serve the interests of the citizens.

Agree --- Disagree

C6. It doesn't matter which party wins the election; the interests of the little person don't count.

Agree --- Disagree

C7. Political leaders usually represent the special interest of a few powerful groups and rarely serve the common needs of all citizens.

Agree --- Disagree

D. Subjective Stimulus Value (Importance of the Block)

D1. How much influence do you feel you have in getting the block the way you want it to be?

Range 1-5; No influence -- Much influence

D2. If there was a problem in receiving some service from the city, do you think people on the block could get the problem solved?

Range 1-5; Definitely not -- Definitely

D3. Some people care a lot about the kind of block they live on. For others, the block is not important. How important is what you block is like to you?

Range 1-5; Not important -- Very important

D4. How important is it to you to feel a sense of community with people on your block?

Range 1-5; Not important -- Very important

D5. Do you feel a sense of community with other people on this block? (For example, do you share interests and concerns with them?)

Range 1-5; Not at all -- A great deal

D6. Participation in neighborhood organizations is important no matter how much or how little is accomplished.

Agree -- Disagree

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE

Interviewer Name _____

Date	Time	Notes	Call back Time	Interview completed ()

How many adults in household need to be interviewed? _____

Introduction should include:

1. Your name
2. From Peabody College research team studying neighborhoods
3. We would like to ask you some of your opinions about this neighborhood and how you like living here.
4. Names will not be put on questionnaire.
5. At the end of the interview we will arrange for you to be paid by Peabody for the time you have given us.
6. Do you have some time to talk now or could I make an appointment to come back when it is more convenient?

(Interviewer note without asking):

1. _____ (1) White _____ (2) Black _____ (3) Other
2. _____ (1) Male _____ (2) Female
3. Is your home
_____ (1) owned _____ (2) rented
4. How long have you lived at this address?
_____ (1) less than one year _____ (3) 4-6 years
_____ (2) 1-3 years _____ (4) 6+ years
5. How much longer do you plan to live here?
_____ (1) less than one year _____ (3) 4-6 years
_____ (2) 1-3 years _____ (4) 6+ years
_____ (5) D.K.
6. How many people live in this household? _____
(i.e., how many generally take meals together?)
7. I'd like to ask a few questions about each of the persons
18 or over living here. Let's start with you first.

Age	Sex	Marital Status	Rel. to respondent	Activity	Occupation	Education
-----	-----	-------------------	-----------------------	----------	------------	-----------

Respondent						

How many people in household under 18? _____
What are their ages? _____

MaritalStatus

1=S=Single
 2=M=Married
 3=D=Divorced
 4=W=Widowed
 5=SP=Separated

Activity

1=Working
 2=Homemaker
 3=Student
 4=Retired
 5=Disabled
 6=Unemployed

Education

1=Advanced degree (M.A.; PhD, etc.)
 2=4 years of college (B.A., B.S.)
 3=some college or 2 year college
 or technical/vocational training
 4=high school graduate (12 years)
 5=some high school
 6=7-8 years
 7=less than 6 years

Relationship

1=Respondent
 2=Husband
 3=Wife
 4=Mother
 5=Father
 6=Son or brother
 7=Daughter
 8=Other relative
 9=Unrelated (friend, roommate, lover, etc.)

Sex

1=Male
 2=Female

CARD 3

I.D.

17. (Now look at line D).

Now I would like to ask you about any organizations that you might belong to. I'll read you a list of organizations and ask you to tell me whether or not you are a member. (Interviewer: for those organizations that the respondent belongs to, ask how many meetings or activities are attended and whether the respondent perceives him/herself to be a leader in the organization).

	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>less than half</u>	<u>more than half</u>	<u>check if leader</u>
					0.1
_____ church or synagogue	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ church or synagogue connected group	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ labor union	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ fraternal lodges or veterans organ- izations (Kiwanis, American Legion, Elks, etc.)	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ business or civic groups	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ professional groups	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ parent-teacher associations	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ youth groups (Scout leaders, little league managers)	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ community centers	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ social or card playing group	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ sport team	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ country clubs	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ political clubs or organizations	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ issue or action oriented groups	1	2	3	4	_____

	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>less than half</u>	<u>more than half</u>	<u>check if leader</u>
_____ charity or welfare organizations	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ Sunnyside Community Citizens	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ Waverly Belmont Neighbors Assoc.	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ Citizens for Better Neighborhoods	1	2	3	4	_____
_____ Others? _____					