1984

Understanding the Participation of Blacks in Voluntary Community Organizations

Eric T. Jones
University of Rhode Island

Understanding the Participation of Blacks in Voluntary Community Organizations

By Eric T. Jones

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

The University of Rhode Island
1984

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate levels of participation of blacks in community and block organizations. The subjects were 299 black residents, 18 years or older, on 29 blocks and living in a transitional neighborhood in Nashville, Tennessee in 1978. The data were collected through 45 minute interviews with each respondent. Three sets of variables were investigated in this study, in two settings, one Specific and one General. The first set of variables, Set A, consisted of traditional demographic and personality variables. The second consisted of cognitive social learning variables operationalized for this study (Set B) and, finally, a Set AB consisting of the combined Sets A and B. Each set was analyzed in a discriminant function analysis to discriminate between leaders and members in a block association (a Specific community organization) and to discriminate between high and low participators in community organizations (a more General question). Univariate analyses of the independent variables, chi-squares, and classification analyses were also performed. The analysis for the General community organization question was performed with an n of 299 while the analysis for the Specific block association question was performed with an n of 142 (all of whom were represented in

the other sample). An analysis of participation in block associations reveals that in using the Set A variables to distinguish between leaders and members, leaders were identified as more educated, higher in occupation level and did not perceive themselves as being controlled by others. The Set B variables characterized leaders as possessing organizational skills, a higher degree of satisfaction with their block, perceived their block as important, and a higher degree of political efficacy. The Set AB correctly classified a significant number of cases above chance. In the more general question, distinguishing between high and low participators in community organizations, high participators had higher self esteem, owned their own homes, were willing to stay longer, were older in age, and had lived in their residence longer, for Set A. In Set B, high participators are characterized as perceiving themselves as competent and their environment as important, were high in political efficacy, and a sense of citizen duty. A significant number of cases were correctly classified in the classification analysis.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....v

Introduction.....1

Community Organizations.....10

Method.....14

The Setting.....14

Subjects.....15

Procedure and Instruments.....16

Variables.....16

Results.....32

Discussion.....46

References.....58

List of Tables

Table 1 Items Comprising the Specific Dependent Variable.....18

Table 2 Items Comprising the General Dependent Variable.....20

Table 3 Composition of Set A Variables in Questionnaire.....22

Table 4 Factor Analysis of CSLV (Set B) Items.....23-24

Table 5 Items Within the Cognitive Social Learning Variables.....25-27

Table 6 Canonical Discriminant Functions of Sets.....36

Table 7 Independent Variables in the Specific Block Association Question.....40

Table 8 Independent Variables in the General Community Organization Question.....43

INTRODUCTION

The participation of black citizens in various types of community organizations is important because such participation is thought to facilitate access to resources and the political process of mainstream America. Such voluntary community organizations are considered a vital part of the social structure and play a crucial mediating role in the relations between social units in the community as well as provide a link between the individual and his or her community (Tomeh, 1973). Within such organizations, blacks have been identified as indicating greater participation than any other racial and ethnic group (Babchuk and Thompson, 1962; Orum, 1966; Olsen, 1970; Hyman and Wright, 1971; Williams, Babchuk, and Johnson, 1973; Tomeh, 1973; Antunes and Gaitz, 1975; Edwards and Klobus, 1976; McPherson, 1977; Cohen and Kapsis, 1978).

The need for voluntary associations can be derived from a number of factors which characterize the Afro-American social condition in the United States. These conditions include: 1) discrimination and segregation, 2) poverty and the matrifocal family, 3) conditions of ghetto living, 4) the national civil rights movement in the late sixties and

seventies and the resulting sense of deprivation and frustration. Disfranchisement basically describes blacks' social and political condition from the 1800's to the middle of the twentieth century. Consequently, blacks were excluded from membership in labor unions and were denied the right to participate in public and private social institutions. Racial discrimination affected blacks at all socioeconomic levels. In response to this condition of disfranchisement, black Americans organizations to tend to their needs for power, affiliation, and esteem (Warren, 1975). Some of the functional roles of these organizations included: 1) to confer status or power, 2) provide a mechanism for the socialization of members with prevailing values or ideologies, 3) provide a sense of security for the individual because in conformity there is comfort and in union there is strength, (real or fancied), 4) a ladder for upward or downward mobility, 5) dissemination of information and ideas, and 6) link the individual with the outer world (Warren, 1975). In short, participation in voluntary organizations was and remains an important social behavior for meeting some of the needs of the Afro-American polity in the United States.

The initial literature on participation focused on differences in the amount of participation between blacks and whites in voluntary organizations. Hyman and Wright

(1971) studied trends in voluntary organization membership for adults from 1955 to 1962 and found blacks generally participated less than whites though there was a substantial increase in their membership between 1955 and 1962. This conflicted with Babchuk and Thompson's (1962) finding that blacks were more likely to be affiliated with formal voluntary organizations than whites. The authors found greater voluntary membership among blacks at all socio-economic levels, which is of particular interest because, previously, the participation level of people from lower socio-economic levels was found to be low. When Olsen (1970) controlled for socio-economic status, something not done in earlier studies, he found blacks' participatory behavior across a variety of social and political settings (fifteen dependent variables) to be higher than whites.

The focus of the literature then addresses a consideration of theories about why blacks as a group participated more than whites in voluntary associations. The most important of these being the pathological, compensatory, and ethnic community theories. Babchuk and Thompson's explanation for the participation of blacks is similar to that proposed by Gunnar Myrdal, Richard Sterner, and Arnold Rose in their book, An American Dilemma (1944). Myrdal proposed that black's participation was somewhat pathological in nature. Their organizations were generally

seen as expressive groups, providing immediate gratification for the individual, and as non-utilitarian in nature. Babchuk and Thompson (1962) further proposed that the structure of the black family is such that it does not provide a good resource for interpersonal satisfactions which may help account for their greater affiliation and participation in voluntary organizations. This, according to the authors, helped explain the higher participation of lower class blacks than lower class whites, who were seen to associate more with kinsmen. Orum (1966) was the first to label the exaggerated tendency for blacks to affiliate as compensatory in the more general sense of fulfilling needs not readily available in the larger society. He contends that those in lower status positions affiliate and participate in voluntary organizations for prestige, ego enhancement, and achievement restricted or denied them in the larger society. This interpretation differs from Myrdal's in that participation among blacks is not seen as pathological and groups were seen to have both instrumental and expressive purposes. Olsen (1970) offered an alternate explanation, the ethnic community theory which held that those in a given ethnic community develop a conciousness of each other and hence cohesiveness, because of pressures exerted against them by outsiders. To test the compensatory and ethnic community theories, Olsen first identified those blacks who are ethnic identifiers as supporting the ethnic

community theory, while those designated as non-identifiers would function in support of the compensatory theory. He also sought to find which group, ethnic identifiers or non-identifiers, participated more. Identifiers, as a group, scored higher than the non-identifiers on participation rates. Olsen suggested that the compensation argument was most salient up until the mid-50s when the civil rights struggle provided the atmosphere supporting the ethnic community theory. Though Antunes and Gaitz (1975) found that black identifiers report higher voluntary association membership, they did not find, as indicated by Olsen (1970), any significant difference in general participation levels (i.e., social and political activity) between identifiers and non-identifiers.

Questions about specificity with a group, such as whether "identifiers" or "nonidentifiers" participated more, moved attention from analyses of groups as units to the identification of variables which distinguish persons within a minority who do participate from those within a minority who do not. Edwards and Klobus (1976) identified those persons in a minority group who participated most using the variables self-efficacy and system blaming. Self-efficacy was generally defined as the belief in one's own personal competence, while system blaming was defined as the tendency to attribute accountability for one's conditions to the

societal level. Blacks described as "compensators" (high self-efficacy/low system blaming) and "ethnic identifiers" (high self-efficacy/high system blaming) consistently had higher mean rates of participation than those characterized by isolation (low self-efficacy/ low system blaming or low self-efficacy/high system blaming). Also "ethnic identifiers" were found to participate to a greater extent than blacks characterized by compensation. These results were supported by McPherson's (1977) finding that self-esteem and political efficacy were highly correlated with voluntary participation for blacks. Finally, Cohen and Kapsis (1978) when failing to find "ethnic identifiers" participation higher across SES groups, suggested that the differential distribution of social interaction skills might influence participation. They also suggest that "ethnic identification" does not necessarily presuppose the development of activist norms for participation in a community and such norms may be a crucial variable in promoting participation.

The literature has thus suggested six specfic variables as differentiating black participants from non-participants in voluntary organizations:

1. self-efficacy
2. system blame

3. political efficacy
4. self-esteem
5. social interaction skills
6. norms for activism

Only the first four of these variables have been investigated empirically and these studies have only included a maximum of two of these four variables. This lack of multivariate analyses of variables related to participation in voluntary organizations was limited to attempts to structure an understanding of participation. Furthermore, the variables have often been treated as isolated constructs without their relationship with others considered. This indicates the need for a multivariate treatment of variables related to voluntary participation. However, a framework is also necessary to understand and interpret the analysis. Such a framework may be supplied by the cognitive social learning variables proposed by Mischel (1973).

Mischel synthesized the cognitive social learning person variables (CSLV's) from constructs about persons which were developed in the areas of cognitive psychology and social learning theory. He stressed that these person variables were not intended to be the equivalent of traits; they are not expected to accurately predict broad

cross-situational behavioral differences between persons. "But these variables should suggest useful ways of conceptualizing and studying specifically how the qualities of the person alter the impact of stimuli (environments, situations, treatments) and how each person generates distinctive complex behavior patterns in interaction with the conditions of his of her life" (Mischel, 1977, p. 341). The variables that Mischel identified can be briefly described as follows (for a more detailed description see Mischel, 1973):

1. construction competencies - refer to the individual's cognitive and behavioral capabilities which allow for the successful execution of a particular behavior.

2. encoding strategies - refer to the way the environment or situation is perceived, coded and categorized by each person. Through selective attention, interpretation and categorization, the person influences the impact which stimuli exert on his or her behavior.

3. expectancies - refer to the perceived consequences of different behavioral possibilities in the situation. In a given situation the person selects the response expected to most likely lead to a subjectively valuable outcome.

4. subjective stimulus values - refer to the values which the person assigns to expected outcomes. Two persons may have similar expectancies yet respond differently to a situation because the outcome has different values for them.

5. self-regulatory system and plans - refer to the person's regulation of his or her own behavior by self-imposed standards. In addition to externally administered consequences for action, the individual sets personal performance goals and reacts with self-criticism or self-satisfaction, depending on how well behavior corresponds to the criteria.

When the variables are taken together, they offer a coherent and systematic approach to understanding and predicting behavior. The operationalized cognitive social learning variables have demonstrated their utility in distinguishing members from non-members in block associations (Florin and Wandersman, in press) and also in distinguishing leaders from less active members (Florin, Mednick and Wandersman, 1983). In this study, the CSLV variables were examined in relationship to black participation in a variety of voluntary community organizations and compared to a larger set of more traditional demographic and personality variables usually used in participation research.

Community Organizations

It is necessary to clarify what is being referred to by the term "community organization". Participation in voluntary community organizations is a generic term. Participation in the community includes a variety of forms and has been studied in diverse literatures including community participation (e.g., Harding, Devereux, and Bronfenbrenner, 1960), voluntary action in voluntary associations (e.g., Smith, 1975), community power and decision-making (e.g., Clark, 1975), political participation (e.g., Alford and Friedland, 1975), and participation in community organizations (e.g., Perlman, 1979).

Level of participation was investigated in two types of situations - a "Specific" (whether persons function as members or leaders in a block association) and a "General" (whether a person is a high or low participator in community organizations). (Note: Future references to the "Specific" and "General" situation will be identified as such - Specific and General). Level of participation, in the General situation, consisted of a composite score across fourteen voluntary community organizations. However, under

the rubric "community organizations", there are a variety of subtypes. In order to insure that the fourteen organizations were sampled from relevant subtypes of community organizations, they were examined using a taxonomy developed by Politser and Pattison (1979). Politser and Pattison empirically created a community group scale to determine various types of voluntary community organizations and used cluster analysis to identify five group types. Four of the five group types were covered in this study, and the kinds of groups represented are indicated in parenthesis after the type description:

1. self interest groups advocate a cause or promote the interest of a defined population. Such groups characteristically provide a forum for members to support mutual viewpoints, while activities tend to include vigorous discussion (labor union, professional groups, political organizations).

2. social communion groups may have some organized activities and a general intent, but their main intent is to provide a setting for people to congregate and interact in a supportive fashion (church or synagogue group, community centers, youth groups, fraternal lodges or veterans organizations).

3. civic development groups are primarily aimed at developing the social skills of members through community service or other organized activities. A common quality of these groups is the goal of personal growth through service and/or experience (charity or welfare organizations, business or civic groups).

4. recreational groups are exceedingly action oriented (e.g. playing poker) and provide a casual, unregulated atmosphere for brief involvement (sport team, social or card playing group, country clubs).

Group types can, of course, sometimes overlap in function and a particular voluntary organization may represent aspects of all four descriptions to some degree. But the taxonomy provides a means of beginning to conceptualize differences among community groups and gives an indication that the composite participation score used in this study is representative of the variety of voluntary community organizations available.

In the present study, black participation was examined in both a "Specific" type of community organization - block associations, and also in a more "General" sense as

participation in a broad variety of voluntary community organizations. The following questions were addressed in relation to these two dependent variables:

1) could the set of operationalized CSLV variables successfully discriminate between groups of blacks who differed in their level of participation?

2) how would the set of operationalized CSLV variables compare to a larger set of traditional variables in discriminating between such groups?

3) which specific variables from both sets are most important in distinguishing between such groups?

METHOD

The Setting

This study is a secondary analysis of the data obtained as part of the Neighborhood Participation Project (Florin and Wandersman, 1983; Wandersman, 1978). The Neighborhood Participation Project is a longitudinal study designed to add to the understanding of the process of participation and its effects by systematically studying participation in block organizations in the Waverly-Belmont neighborhood of Nashville, Tennessee. The present formation of this neighborhood has its roots in a post-World War II exodus to the suburbs by white middle class residents and an in migration of blacks. During this interim, the neighborhood experienced urban decay--decreasing property values, increasing crime rate and a general deterioration of the physical environment. Recently, however, there has been a reverse migration to urban areas such as this one which offers spacious older homes at lower cost than than higher property areas, and with the conveniences and amenities of an urban location (Clay, 1979). Although the neighborhood is racially integrated, individual blocks tend to be more homogeneous, having primarily either white residents or black residents of varying socioeconomic status. Houses are

primarily one and two family dwellings with a few multiple (3-4) units interspersed. The Waverly-Belmont neighborhood, then, is typical of many American transitional urban neighborhoods.

Subjects

The respondents in this study were 299 adult residents (18 years or older) on 29 blocks in Nashville, Tennessee. In the Specific setting (participatien in block associations), only 142 adult residents from the 229 total were used. This lower number is due to the fact that not all blocks were organized into block associations and therefore a smaller number of residents participated in such associations. Interviews were requested with all adults living in each household on each block and were conducted during the period of May to September, 1978 in the homes of the respondents.

The residents were predominately blue-collar and lower-middle class. Ages of respondents ranged from 18-91, with a mean of 43.9 years. Sixty-three percent of the sample were women and 37% men. Forty-six percent of the sample were married and 54% either single, divorced, widowed or separated. Sixty percent of the sample were working outside the home while 40% were either homemakers, students,

unemployed or retired. Seventy-five percent of the respondents were homeowners while 25% were renters. The sample respondents were relatively stable in their tenure of residence with 66% having lived in their residences more than 4 years and only 9% less than 1 year.

Procedure and Instruments

Households on the blocks were initially contacted by mail and informed of the purposes and procedures of the Neighborhood Participation Project. Trained interviewers called on all the houses on the block. Black interviewers conducted the interviews on the predominantly black blocks. They identified themselves as part of the research team which had earlier contacted the residents by mail. Individual interviews were requested with all adults living in the household. If residents were unavailable at that time, appointments were scheduled for each person who agreed to be interviewed. The interview-questionnaire was verbally administered by interviewers in the homes of respondents. Administration required approximately 45-60 minutes. Residents were paid $3.50 for the interview.

Variables

Dependent variables. There were two dependent

variables investigated in this study. The first dependent variable was the level of participation of members in block associations - a Specific type of community organization. Level of participation in this specific setting distinguished between members and leaders of the block association. Such a distinction was chosen because leadership has been identified as a crucial level of participation in maintaining the viability of block associations (Yates, 1976). This variable was operationalized by asking the subjects six questions concerning their activities in the block association. 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. The operationalization of this is presented in Table 1.

The second dependent variable was the level of participation of an individual in a variety of General community organizations. High participators were distinguished from low participators. Level of participation was determined by a composite score which asked the individual to indicate membership and degree of

Table 1

Items Comprising the Specific Dependent Variable

Now, we'd like to know about what kinds of things you've done in the organization. Have you:

		Yes	No
1.	attended meetings?	1	2
2.	talked at meetings?	1	2
3.	done work for the organization outside meetings?	1	2
4.	worked on committees?	1	2
5.	acted as a committee leader?	1	2
6.	been an officer of the organization?	1	2

Note: Leaders responded yes to questions 5 or 6.
Members responded yes to questions 1, 2, 3, or 4, and no to 5 and 6.

involvement (number of meetings attended, whether they were a leader, etc.) in fourteen General community organizations. High participators were defined as those in the top one-third of the sample and the low participators as the bottom one-third of the sample. (See Table 2)

The following differences help to clarify the designations of "high" versus "low" beyond the mere fact of their being at the top or bottom of the sample distribution. On the average, high participators were members of four voluntary community groups whereas low participators were involved in far fewer groups. Thirty-seven percent of low participators were members of no organization, 59% were members of one organization and only 4% were members of two organizations. On the average, high participators perceived themselves as leaders in two of the organizations to which they belonged. Only 18% of the high participators did not perceive themselves as leaders in any organization whereas 99% of the low participators group did not perceive themselves as leaders in any organization. Finally, high participators on the average were more active (attended 1/2 or more of organizational meetings) than low participators (attended less than 1/2 of organizational meetings). This despite the fact that high participators belonged to more organizations. Clearly then, the groups of high versus low

Table 2

Items Comprising the General Dependent Variable

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.

	None	1-2	less than half	more than half	check if leader
___church or synagogue	1	2	3	4	____
___church/synagogue connected group	1	2	3	4	____
___labor union	1	2	3	4	____
___fraternal lodges or veterans organizations	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)	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	____
___charity or welfare organizations	1	2	3	4	____

participators had substantively different patterns of particpation in voluntary organizations.

Predictor variables. There were two sets of predictor variables applied to both dependent variables. Set A consisted of standard individual differences, demographic variables often used in participation studies (e.g., sex, age, socio-economic status, etc.), other demographic variables thought potentially relevant to participation (e.g. home ownership, length of residence, etc.) and psychological variables (e.g. locus of control, self esteem). Table 3 contains a list of this set of variables.

The other set of variables, Set B, were items designed as an attempt to operationalize the cognitive social learning variables. Items were chosen for each variable that seemed particularly relevant to participation in locally based voluntary organizations, especially in the block context (Florin and Wandersman, 1983). The factor analysis is presented in Table 4 and the items included under each factor are listed in Table 5.

A brief description of the variables and some assumptions used in the operationalization follows (for a more complete discussion, see Wandersman and Florin, 1982):

Table 3

Composition of Set A Variables in Questionnaire

1. Sex
2. Home ownership
3. Length of residence
4. Intended length of residence
5. Family size
6. Age
7. Marital status
8. Present activity (working, student, etc.)
9. Occupation (Hollingshead index)
10. Education
11. Internal locus of control (Levenson, 1974)
12. Chance locus of control (Levenson, 1974)
13. Powerful others locus of control (Levenson, 1974)
14. Self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1967)

Table 4

Factor Analysis of CSLV (Set B) items

Component	Factor Score Coefficient				
	Factors				
Variables	1	2	3	4	5
	Construction Competencies (1)				
A1	.494	-.053	-.066	-.002	.237
A2	.651	.058	.057	.043	-.015
A3	.808	.012	.049	.075	.058
A4	.762	.005	.104	.072	.053
	Encoding (2)				
B1	.007	.593	-.028	.137	-.000
B2	.010	.748	-.007	.074	.000
B3	-.006	.759	.010	.145	-.030
B4	-.046	.571	.014	.157	.004
B5	.043	.690	.065	.052	.011
B6	.043	.510	.070	-.235	-.013
B7	-.019	.580	.072	.262	.026
B8	.026	-.610	-.175	.260	.039

(table continues)

(Table 4 continued)

			Expectancies (3)		
C1	.081	-.005	.684	.058	.155
C2	-.041	.098	.401	.178	-.127
C3	.230	.045	.534	.028	.365
C4	-.018	-.059	.526	.108	-.103
C5	-.033	.113	.595	.168	-.246
C6	-.090	-.064	.696	-.010	-.237
C7	-.038	.019	.636	.008	-.081
			Subjective Stimulus Value (4)		
D1	.246	.165	.051	.597	-.020
D2	.147	.292	.145	.332	.026
D3	-.094	.136	.050	.542	.302
D4	.005	.002	.002	.743	.156
D5	.066	.104	-.017	.767	.007
D6	.045	-.022	.019	.428	.188
			Self-Regulatory Systems and Plans (5)		
E1	.159	.048	.116	-.063	.686
E2	.032	-.039	.171	.035	.672
E3	.083	.041	.029	.191	.652
E4	.085	-.043	.021	.084	.355

Table 5

Items Within the Cognitive Social Learning Variables

A. Construction Competencies (Range 1-4; Strongly disagree--Strongly agree)

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

A2. Other people usually follow my ideas.

A3. I am often a leader in groups.

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

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 hood 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)

(table continues)

C. Expectancies (Agree-Disagree)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. Subjective Stimulus Value

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 impor-

(table continues)

tant. How important is what your 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

E. Self-regulatory systems (Agree-Disagree)

E1. It isn't important to get involved in local issues when you know your side doesn't have a chance to win.

E2. A good many local elections aren't important enough to bother with.

E3. So many other people are active in local issues and organizations that it doesn't matter much to me whether I participate or not.

E4. If a person doesn't care how a local issue is decided, he shouldn't participate in the decision.

1. Construction competencies needed to represent the cognitive and behavioral capabilities that might be relevant to the act of participating. Items under construction competencies were generated using a framework of requisite skills for effective participation in citizen advisory committees developed by Wireman (1977). These items measured the individual's perceived competencies in such areas as leading a group, influencing others and ability to organize people for action. These subjective perceptions were also seen as reflecting a self-efficacy expectation (Bandura, 1977). Bandura distinguishes between "outcome" expectancies or a person's estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes (identical to what is described below under "expectancies") and "efficacy" expectancies or the person's belief in his or her capability to produce and successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes. This distinction may be crucial in a person's decision of whether or not to participate.

2. Encoding strategies to reflect the perception and categorization of the block as an environment. The assumption here was that the individual's present view ("encoded" view) of the block might influence the probability of participation. People who were more satisfied with the block as is, might be less likely to participate. Items were created which measured satisfaction

with the block as a whole and satisfaction with Specific aspects of the block (e.g., housing conditions, street conditions, safety, quietness, neatness, etc.). Also included under this variable was an item which asked people to indicate from a list of 20 items (e.g., condition of houses, lighting of streets, traffic, crime, noisy neighbors, rats, vacant lots, fire protection, etc.), the degree to which each was (or was not) a problem. A composite score was used with the assumption that more perceived problems would be related to less satisfaction and visa versa.

3. Items created for the expectancies variable needed to deal with the way people might view the consequences of different actions they might take. Assuming that an expectancy for the kind of self-help action represented by block organizations might be influenced by generally held beliefs, items were included which focused on expectancies concerning grass-roots political organizations in general. Selected items from political efficacy (Campbell, Gurin and Miller, 1954) and political cynicism (Agger, Goldstein and Pearl, 1961) scales were modified by substituting words like "city" and "local government" for words like "country" and "government" to increase the specificity of the local focus. Agreement or disagreement with items such as "People like me don't have any say about what the local government does" and

"It doesn't matter which party wins the elections, the interests of the little person don't count" were thought to capture the kinds of expectancies relevant to the content investigated.

4. Subjective stimulus value attempted to assess the degree to which the individual might value the outcomes of participation in community development efforts on the block. People differ with respect to how important the block is to them, and naturally, the more important, the more probable participation. Items were directly asked concerning the importance of the block as an environment in general to the person, the importance of a sense of community on the block to the person, perceived sense of community, the importance of participation in neighborhood organizations, and the perceived influence a person felt they had on their block.

5. Self-regulatory systems and plans was the most difficult variable to operationalize. Since this variable was to reflect the individual's self-imposed standards for behavior, many possible reference systems came to mind. Some individuals might have a standard of needing to be involved in anything going on around them, simply from an interest in having control over their environment. Others might have a standard of being very helpful or sociable and find it hard to refuse to help a neighbor. The concept of

"citizen duty" was chosen as the type of self-regulatory system appropriate to this research. Sense of citizen duty (Campbell et al., 1954) is defined as the feeling that one (and others) ought to participate in the political process, regardless of whether such political activity is seen as worthwhile or efficacious. Items from the sense of citizen duty scale were modified for local relevance. The goal in operationalizing this variable was to obtain an indication of the individual's personal standards with regard to participation in the public sphere.

RESULTS

The first question of the study was whether the set of CSLV variables could discriminate among groups of blacks which differed in their level of participation. This question was examined in both a Specific setting (could the CSLV variables discriminate between members and leaders in block associations?) and in the more General sense of participation in a variety of community organizations (could the CSLV variables discriminate between high participation and low participation?).

Set B. The set of CSLV variables were entered into a discriminant function analysis to answer both of these questions. In the Specific setting, the set of CSLV variables had an index of discrimination (R) of .39, $(5,137)=22.63$; $p<.001$ which accounted for approximately 15% of the variance in type of participation (leader or member). A classification analysis was performed which allows one to see how many cases can be correctly classified. Here, a "percentage of cases correctly classified" statistic is produced whereby the discriminant function equation is used to assign each case to a group membership based upon the individual's score on the discriminant function equation.

This classification can be compared with the actual known group membership of the individual. A comparison of the results against the chance rate of 50% (two groups) supplies an estimate of the discriminant equation's classification ability.

In the classification phase of this analysis, for the Specific setting, the set of CSLV variables correctly classified 71% of the members, 63% of the leaders, and overall correctly classified 68% of the cases (18% over chance).

In the General setting of level of participation in various community groups (high versus low participation), the CSLV variables had an index of discrimination (R) of .51, $(5,294)=88.03$; $p<.001$ which accounted for approximately 25% of the variance in level of participation. In the classification phase of the analysis, the set of CSLV variables correctly classified approximately 74% of the low participants, 77% of the high participants, and 75% of the cases overall (25% over chance). Thus in both the Specific and the General settings, the set of CSLV variables were able to significantly discriminate between the two sets of dependent variables (members vs. leaders and high vs. low participants) and correctly classify cases significantly

more than chance.

Set A. The second question of the study was the strength of the set of CSLV variables relative to that of a larger set of more traditional demographic and personality variables usually used in participation research. The results for the Specific setting, using the Set A standard variables, were as follows: an index of discrimination (R) of .44, $(14,128)=28.80$; $p<.01$ which accounted for approximately 19% of the variance in the prediction of leaders and members. For the classification phase, 70% of the members, 68% of the leaders, and 69% of the cases overall were correctly classified. The results for using the traditional Set A variables in a General setting are as follows: an index of discrimination (R) of .48, $(14,285)=76.21$; $p<.001$ which accounted for approximately 23% of the variance in level of participation. The Set A demographic variables correctly classified approximately 71% of the low participants, 77% of the high participants, and 74% of the cases overall.

Set AB. Having investigated the strength of prediction for the separate Sets A and B in both the Specific and General settings, the sets were then combined to form a Set

AB, composed of traditional and CSLV variables, and was used in a discriminant function analysis for both Specific and General settings. In the Specific setting, Set AB yielded an index of discrimination of (R) .52, (19,126)=40.58; $p<.002$ which accounted for approximately 27% of the variance in the discrimination of leaders from members. Using the Set AB variables in the classification phase, 75% of the members, 72% of the leaders, and 74% of the cases overall were correctly classified. In the General setting, Set AB yielded an index of discrimination of (R) .57, (19,280)=115.03; $p<.001$ which accounted for 32% of the variance in level of participation. The Set AB variables were able to correctly classify 75% of low participators, 81% of high participators, and 78% of the cases overall. The results of the three discriminant analyses performed for both the Specific and General settings are presented in Table 6.

The reason for creating a combined set, Set AB, was to ascertain the unique variance in the dependent variable that could be attributed seperately to Set A and to Set B. Unique variance in each set would indicate that such variance could only be estimated by that particular set. For a combined set, it was necessary to use Cohen and Cohen's (1975) procedure for estimating unique variance

Table 6

Canonical Discriminant Functions of Sets

Specific Setting

	Index of Discrimination (R)	R^2	Cases Correctly Classified
Set A	.44	.19	69%
Set B	.39	.15	68%
Set AB	.52	.27	74%

General Setting

	Index of Discrimination (R)	R^2	Cases Correctly Classified
Set A	.48	.23	74%
Set B	.51	.25	75%
Set AB	.57	.32	78%

attributable to sets (by subtraction of R of opposite set from R of combined sets). For the Specific setting, the results indicated 12% unique variance for Set A (AB-B) and 8% unique variance for Set B (AB-A). Therefore, using only Set A as predictor variables would lack the 8% of the variance accounted for uniquely by Set B and using only Set B as predictor variables would lack the 12% of unique variance accounted for by Set A. To test whether their differences were statistically significant, the F ratio formula for sets provided by Cohen, and Cohen, (1975, p.136) was used. The increase in R attributable to the addition of Set A to Set B was F=2.35. The increase in R attributable to the addition of Set B to Set A was F=3.90. Since the criterion F at $p<.05$ for df (14,122) and (5,122) is 2.19 and 3.17 respectively, both of these F's were significant. This indicates that in seeking to predict type of participation in block associations, significant variance would be lost by using either set alone.

In the General setting, the results indicated 7% unique variance for Set A (AB-B) and 9% unique variance for Set B (AB-A). Therefore, using only Set A as predictor variables would lack the 9% of the variance accounted for uniquely by Set B and using only Set B as predictor variables would lack the 7% of unique variance accounted for by Set A. Again, to

test for statistical significance, the F ratio formula for sets was used. The increase in R attributable to the addition of Set A to Set B was F=2.79. The increase in R attributable to the addition of Set B to Set A was F=11.72. The criterion F at p<.05 for df (14,279) and (5,279) is 2.10 and 3.02, respectively. Both of these F's are significant.

As indicated also by the results of the Specific setting as well as by the results of the General setting, the CSLVs can make a significant addition to those traditional demographic variables frequently used in participation research. Taken together, to answer the second question of the study, the results indicate the relative strength of the set of CSLV variables. The set of CSLV variables was comparable to the larger set of traditional demographic and personality variables. When examined separately, the variance accounted for and cases correctly classified were approximately equal for the two sets in both the Specific and General settings. Moreover, when examined in a combined set, the set of CSLV variables made a significant addition to the set of traditional demographic and personality variables frequently used in participation research.

The third question of this study was which specific variables from each set were best able to discriminate between different levels of participation. That is, what is the relative importance of the individual variables within each set. Three types of statistics provided information about individual variables: pooled within-group correlation and univariate F's and chi-squares. The pooled within-groups correlations between the canonical discriminant function and discriminating variables provides an indication of the contribution of individual variables to the discriminant function equation. Univariate F's and chi-squares supply a second and third way to identify the relative strength of the variables in discriminating levels of participation. All pooled within-group correlations and univariate F's and chi-squares for both sets of independent variables in the Specific setting are presented in Table 7. One should be cautioned in interpreting the univariate F's because the large N increases the chance for significance. From Set A, those variables which significantly discriminated between leaders and members at the $p<.05$ level included education, occupation, powerful others, and total self esteem. From Set B the only variable which was significant at the .05 level was construction competencies.

The results of Set A indicated that individuals were

Table 7

Structure Coefficients and Strength of Association Scores for Independent Variables in Specific Block Association Question

	Structure Coefficient	Strength of Association Score	Significance Level	Type of Test
Set A				
ED	.56	10.70	.001*	F
OCC	.53	9.66	.002*	F
POWERO	.46	7.17	.008*	F
TOTSE	.45	6.87	.009*	F
HOMEOR	.28	1.17	.279	Chi-square
CHANCE	.23	1.86	.175	F
AGE	.22	1.57	.212	F
INTCON	.13	.56	.455	F
WILSTAY	.12	.48	.491	F
WORK	.10	.06	.805	Chi-square
MARR	.06	.05	.819	Chi-square
RESDTME	.06	.13	.71	F
HOUSHN	.02	-	.87	F
SEX	.01	-	1.00	Chi-square
Set B				
CONCOM	.84	18.06	.001*	F
ENCOD	.34	2.92	.089	F
SUSTVAL	.34	2.89	.091	F
EXPEC	.34	2.85	.093	F
SRSYS	.33	2.69	.103	F

*Indicates a statistically significant relationship of $p<.05$

more likely to be leaders in their block associations if they were more educated (members $\bar{X}$=4.64 and leaders $\bar{X}$=3.86, lower number indicates more education), higher in occupation level (members $\bar{X}$=6.38 and leaders $\bar{X}$=3.52, lower number indicates higher occupation level), felt less controlled by powerful others (members $\bar{X}$=9.21 and leaders $\bar{X}$=7.44), and were higher in total self esteem (members $\bar{X}$=31.09 and leaders $\bar{X}$=32.93). From the structural coefficients in Table 7, it can be seen that education and occupation were approximately of equal importance in the equation (31% and 28% of the shared variance, respectively). Perception of others as more powerful and one's total self esteem also contributed a significant amount of unique variance, but somewhat less shared variance (21% and 20% respectively). The chi-squares performed on the dichotomous variables of homeownership, marriage, sex, and work revealed no significant differences between members and leaders in terms of these characteristics.

The significant performance of construction competencies (members $\bar{X}$=30.97 and leaders $\bar{X}$=36.19), of Set B, indicates that leadership is associated with a higher perceived sense of self efficacy and competency in skills relevant to participation (e.g. ability to organize others and speak before a group of people). From the structural

coefficients presented in Table 7, the large contribution of construction competencies (71% shared variance) in comparison to encoding, subjective stimulus value, expectancies, and self regulatory systems (12%, 12%, 12%, and 11% respectively) is apparent.

The same statistics used to understand members and leaders in block associations, were also used to understand low and high participation in the more General community organizations. In the general setting (Table 8), unlike the Specific setting, quite a number of variables revealed significant differences between the two categories represented (high and low participators). Nine variables from Set A reached the significance level of $p<.05$, including total self esteem, home ownership, willingness to stay, age, residence time, occupation, internal control, marriage and education. From Set B they include construction competencies, subjective stimulus value, expectancies, and self regulatory systems.

The results of Set A indicated that individuals were more likely to be high participators if they had a high sense of self esteem (high $\bar{X}=34.42$ and low $\bar{X}=31.66$), were willing to stay in their neighborhood (high $\bar{X}=3.24$ and low

Table 8

Structure Coefficients and Strength of Association Scores for Independent Variables in General Community Organization Question

	Structure Coefficient	Strength of Association Score	Significance Level	Type of Test
Set A				
TOTSE	.83	28.09	.001*	F
HOMEOR	.52	22.32	.001*	Chi-square
WILSTAY	.42	15.54	.001*	F
AGE	.39	13.29	.001*	F
RESDTME	.37	12.37	.001*	F
OCC	.37	12.24	.001*	F
MARR	.23	16.15	.001*	Chi-square
INTCON	.28	7.14	.007*	F
ED	.23	4.73	.030*	F
WORK	.20	2.43	.119	Chi-square
POWERO	.19	3.38	.069	F
CHANCE	.15	1.98	.160	F
HOUSHN	.13	1.45	.230	F
SEX	.03	.59	.442	Chi-square
Set B				
CONCOM	.83	70.72	.001*	F
SUSTVAL	.64	42.44	.001*	F
EXPECT	.36	13.19	.001*	F
SRSYS	.32	10.34	.001*	F
ENCOD	.02	.60	.800	F

*Indicates a statistically significant relationship of $p<.05$

$\bar{X}$=2.79), higher in age (high $\bar{X}$=48.39 and low $\bar{X}$=40.96), had lived in their residence longer (high $\bar{X}$=3.53 and low $\bar{X}$=3.11), higher in occupation level (high $\bar{X}$=5.41 and low $\bar{X}$=6.24), perceived themselves as controlling events (high $\bar{X}$=13.69 and low $\bar{X}$=12.79), and were more educated (high $\bar{X}$=4.07 and low $\bar{X}$=4.43). The chi-squares analysis revealed that 88% of the high participators were home owners, while 12% were not. Of the low participators, 63% of them were home owners while 37% of them were not. The chi-squares analysis was also significant for marriage where it was found that 42% of high participators were not married and 58% of them were. For low participators, 66% of them were not married and 34% of them were. A chi-squares analysis was also performed to investigate whether a significant number of members and leaders of the block associations were classified as either low or high participators. The results proved non-significant. From the structural coefficients in Table 8, it can be seen that total self esteem and home ownership were approximately of equal importance in the discriminant function (31% and 27% of the shared variance, respectively). Willingness to stay, age, residence time, and occupation were rather similar in their contributed unique variance, as well as shared variance (18%, 15%, 14%, and 14%, respectively). Finally, contributing somewhat less, but still a considerable amount of shared variance, are internal control (8%), marriage (5%), and education

(5%).

Looking at the Set B variables, one finds that higher participation in community organizations is associated with a) cognitive and behavioral capabilities relevant to the act of participation (construction competencies, high $\bar{X}$=12.09 and low $\bar{X}$=9.50); b) placing more value on the local community (subjective stimulus value, high $\bar{X}$=23.20 and low $\bar{X}$=20.27); c) higher political efficacy and lower political cynicism (expectancies, high $\bar{X}$=10.42 and low $\bar{X}$=9.65); d) a higher sense of citizen duty (self regulatory systems, high $\bar{X}$=6.74 and low $\bar{X}$=6.27). Construction competencies contributed 69% of the shared variance, while subjective stimulus value contributed 41%. Expectancies, self regulatory systems, and encoding, were relatively low in comparison (13%, 10%, and 4%, respectively).

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this research was to explore the potential of the cognitive social learning variables in discriminating between leaders and members in block associations (Specific) and discriminating between high and low participants in community organizations (General). The first question addressed the CSLV's on a Specific and General level: a) could the CSLVs discriminate between leaders and members in a block association (Specific), and b) could the CSLVs discriminate between high and low participants in community organizations (General). In both cases, the CSLVs accounted for a significant proportion of variance (15% in the Specific and 25% in the General) and were able to discriminate between leaders and members in block associations (68% correctly classified) and between high and low participators in community organizations (75% correctly classified). These results indicate the predictive ability of the CSLVs, above chance, to perform in two different settings.

The second question of the study investigated the strength of the Set B (CSLVs) relative to a larger set of traditional demographic variables (Set A). Specifically,

how did the set of CSLVs perform in comparison to the traditional set. Furthermore, how useful would this set of CSLVs be in discriminating between leaders and members in block associations and high and low participators among community organizations. For if the set of traditional demographic variables performed a great deal better, there would be less reason to pursue a CSLV approach to predicting and understanding participation. The results, however, clearly indicate marginal differences between the discriminative strength of the sets, their ability for correctly classifying cases, and their unique variance. This, despite the fact that statistically one would expect Set A to do better than Set B because of its larger number of variables (14 versus 5). These two sets of variables are different ways of attempting to approach the elements involved in the phenomena of black participation. Since there are minimal differences between the sets, in terms of the most parsimonious procedure, the CSLV set is preferable because of its fewer variables. Furthermore, the CSLVs can provide a theoretical framework for understanding the processes involved in participation that is lacking with the Set A variables. How this framework might be used to understand and promote black participation will be considered later.

Both sets of predictor variables performed better when

the criterion variable was at the more General level (high and low participators in a variety of community organizations). This is not surprising if we consider that the variability involved in General participation is greater than that in the Specific setting (e.g., member or leader of a block association). That is, in terms of participation in the General sense, individuals vary a great deal, some being very active and others much less so as demonstrated by the very different profiles of high and low participators described earlier. In the Specific setting, on the other hand, the entire sample had already chosen to participate in the particular setting of the block association and the potential difference was only whether an individual chose to be a leader. It would be natural, therefore, to expect there to be less difference between the members and leaders in this Specific setting than between the high and low participants in the General setting. More surprising, however, was the fact that the Set A variables performed slightly better than the Set of CSLVs in the Specific setting while the reverse was true in the General setting. This is surprising because the Set of CSIVs had been operationalized specifically for the block setting. Here again the question of the variability initially present in the setting emerges. Mischel (1973) has indicated that "strong" and "weak" environments could differentially effect the degree of individual differences within the CSLV

variables. A "strong" environment would contain demand characteristics that would produce more similarity among individual CSLVs than a "weak" environment where more of the individual's unique construction, interpretation, and valuing of the situation would be present. Certainly the self-selection of members into the block association creates a human aggregate environment where "demands" exist to construe, interpret, and value the block situation in a certain way. The setting is "strong" and individual differences in CSLVs restricted. In the "weak" setting of General participation, more individual differences in the individual's construction, interpretation, and valuing of the situation emerge. Support for this interpretation is found in that in a study distinguishing between non-members and members in block associations (where more variability in CSLVs could be expected), the CSLVs did perform better than the Set A variables (Florin and Wandersman, in press).

The third question of the study sought to identify Specific variables from both sets which distinguish between the groups (leaders vs. members and high vs. low participators). This information may be found when looking at the individual variables. In the Specific setting, construction competencies is the only significant variable from Set B for distinguishing between leaders and members.

From Set A we find occupation level, education level, powerful others, and total self esteem as significant variables in distinguishing between leaders and members. Conceptually, the results reflect a higher level of social status and a higher sense of self esteem for black leaders in block associations. Leaders' formal training therefore contributed to their sense of self efficacy and provided them with the background necessary for them to assume a leadership role. In Warren's (1975) study of black neighborhoods and organizations, leaders in the community were described by others as possessing similar characteristics.

In the General setting, the variables from Set B which best describe high participators are construction competencies, subjective stimulus value, expectancies, and self regulatory systems. From Set A they include: home ownership, length of residence, willingness to stay, age, marriage, occupation, education, internal control, and total self esteem. High participators in community organizations tend to be more skillful in organizing others, place a greater value on their environment, felt themselves to be more politically efficacious and lower in political cynicism, and felt a greater sense of citizen duty and responsibility to participate in community organizations.

In considering the results of the significant variables in Set A, we find that high participators were more "rooted", were of a higher social status, and felt more self confident than low participators. Being "rooted" in terms of being older and married, having resided in one's own home for several years and expecting to stay there both provides increased opportunities for participation as well as investment or incentive to act on those opportunities (Riger and Lavrakas, 1981). The work of a number of investigators (e.g., Hyman and Wright, 1971; Warren, 1975; Milbrath and Goel, 1977) suggests that the more middle class and educated a person is, the more he or she is likely to participate. Similarly, the finding that higher self esteem and internal locus of control are related to high participation makes sense in terms of individuals feeling comfortable with getting involved in a group and confirms the finding of McPherson (1977) that self esteem is correlated with voluntary participation for blacks.

In both the Specific and General settings, <u>construction competencies</u> emerged as the most significant variable for understanding leaders in block associations and high participation in community organizations. Such persons perceive themselves as competent, are able to influence others, and are able to organize others for action. The

importance of construction competencies and expectancies in Set B and total self esteem of Set A clearly make sense given the results of the Edwards and Klobus (1976) study. High participators in community organizations are characterized as perceiving themselves to be efficacious, competent, and feeling good about themselves. They also perceive themselves as capable of affecting the political system and perceive the political system less cynically. This parallels the Edwards and Klobus finding in which two groups of high participators were identified. One group can be identified as high in self efficacy/high in system blaming (ethnic identifiers), and a second group high in self efficacy but low in system blaming as compensators. Consistently discriminating variables between high and low participation in voluntary community organizations, are a sense of competency and high self esteem. Construction competencies also reflect the social interaction skills referred to by Cohen and Kapsis (1978) as possibly influencing participation because the construction competency items in the questionnaire reflected the framework of requisite skills for effective participation developed by Wireman (1977) and were significant in both the Specific and General settings. Therefore, leaders and high participators probably possess similar skills which would be important for either situation.

Cohen and Kapsis (1978) also speculated on the role activist norms in a community may play in promoting participation. Sense of citizen duty (self regulatory systems and plans) was a significant variable in discriminating between high and low participators in community organizations and was less successful in discriminating between leaders and members. The low showing of encoding strategies in the General community organizations question is explained by the fact that its questions were specifically operationalized to reflect satisfaction with the block's environment which would clearly be less pertinent in the General community organization analysis.

The most valuable contribution of the CSIVs may be that they are organized in a coherent framework that can aid in the understanding of level of participation and type of participation in a specific community organization. Though the two sets of predictor variables were generally equal in their discriminative and classificatory ability, there are compelling reasons to pursue the CSLV approach. Demographic and personality variables can provide an extensive description of participators and clearly provide necessary information about the community you are dealing with. But how important or useful this is depends on what we want to

know. For example, it may be useful if we want to know whether the participators are demographically representative of the community. Yet, if we are interested in what gets people to participate and how to increase participation, this information is inadequate. Smith (1975) indicated that the traditional demographic variables do not supply such a framework. While knowing that age, home ownership, or marital status are associated with participation, such data does not help us to understand the various elements involved in characterizing a leader or a high participant in community organizations. Even if some of these variables do well in prediction, they are discrete and unorganized in any systematic framework. The CSLV approach, on the other hand, provides a framework that examines several variables that are more directly tied to the processes involved in a decision to participate or assume the role of a leader. We know, therefore, in the Specific setting, that perceived self-competencies (construction competencies) is associated with being a leader in block associations. In the General setting, we find ccnstruction competencies, subjective stimulus values, expectancies, and self regulatory systems (sense of citizen duty) as most strongly associated with high participation. The particular variables identify processes which one can address through interventions to respond to the needs of the individual. It provides the opportunity to not only identify effective participants

(i.e., leaders and high participators), but to respond to the needs of the uninvolved or the peripheral members.

As described in the introduction, blacks have participated so actively in voluntary community organizations because of their feelings of alienation and historical disfranchisement. If lack of power is identified as an important concept in explaining the motivation behind participation in community organizations, then empowerment is a primary goal of participation in such organizations. Empowerment refers to a set of activities aimed at reducing institutional powerlessness, the powerlessness stemming from the experience of negative valuation and discrimination. However, the sense of empowerment which participation in community organizations may help realize, can not be realized for those persons who do not participate or who are not an active participant. Therefore one must respond to the needs of the low and non-participant. Utilizing construction competencies as part of the empowerment process, one would help the low participant to perceive "self" as a causal agent in solving the problems of the neighborhood and community. These persons would be helped to perceive themselves as causal forces capable of exerting influence in a world of other people and capable of bringing about some effect which they desire. Community mental

health centers might consider block associations as a particularly appropriate community organization for instilling this sense of empowerment. One will find that most everyone has some definite opinion of their block and are, possibly, more likely to be receptive to productive interventions on a block level as opposed to a community level. It is predicted that if people could be made to realize their ability to effect change and were trained in the skills to do so, they would become more active members (perhaps leaders) and participate in a greater number of community organizations. Another appropriate intervention which might respond to the needs of members and low participators would be an assertiveness training workshop or a workshop to develop leadership skills in individuals. In addition to the development of specific skills, such workshops might include modeling from similar organizations in other areas and testimonials from members of successful organizations.

Generalizability of these results is limited because such results are so closely associated with the characteristics of the sample used. The type of association an individual encounters is related to the organizational structure of the local community. The community is, among other things, the locus for the function of providing

opportunities for social participation of various kinds. In this respect, communities differ greatly in the pattern of associational activities which they afford. For example, a community with a long history of varied formal groups as well as a large organizational membership may facilitate the formation of new voluntary organizations, whereas the presence of a community in which formal groups are less important may be a factor in their dissolution or a barrier to membership participation. Communities also vary with respect to type of voluntary organization. In some communities economic and political groups are likely to predominate, whereas in others, interest groups and recreational clubs are prevalent, hence the taxonomy presented earlier (Politser and Pattison 1979). This suggests that communities differ with regard to sources of affiliation, which in turn may affect participation rates and roles and the value of individual CSLV variables. The merit of the CSLVs then, is that they allow one to respond differentialy to block associations and community organizations using the theoretical constructs as a framework from which to make the appropriate interventions.

REFERENCES

Affer, R. E., Goldstein, M., and Pearl, S. (1961). Political cynicism: Measurement and meaning. Journal of Politics, 23, 477-506.

Ahlbrandt, R., Jr. & Cunningham, J. (1979). A New Public Policy for Neighborhood Preservation. New York: Praeger.

Alford, R., & Friedland, R. (1975). Political participation and public policy. In A. Inkeles, J. Coleman, & N. Smelser (eds.), Annual Review of Sociology, 1, Annual Reviews, Inc., Palo Alto, California.

Alford, R., & Scoble, A. (1968). Community leadership: Education and political behavior. American Sociological Review, 33, 259-272.

Antunes, G., & Gaitz, C. (1975). Ethnicity and participation: A study of Mexican Americans, Blacks, and Whites. American Journal of Sociology, 80, 1192-1311.

Babchuk, N. & Thompson, R. (1962). The voluntary associations of Negroes. American Sociological Review, 27, 647-655.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Towards unifying theory of behavior change. Psychological Review, 89, 191-215.

Berger, P. & Neuhas, R. (1977). To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.

Campbell, A., Gurin, G., & Miller, W. (1954). The Voter Decides, Row Peterson and Co., Evanston, Illinois.

Clark, T. (1975). Community power. In A. Inkeles, J. Coleman, & N. Smelser (eds.), Annual Review of Sociology, 1, Annual Reviews, Inc., Palo Alto, California.

Clay, P. (1979). Neighborhood Renewal, Lexington Books, Lexington, Massachusetts.

Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1975). Applied Multiple

Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Cohen, S. & Kapsis, R. (1978). Participation of blacks, Puerto Ricans, and whites in voluntary associations: A test of current theories. Social Forces, 56, 1053-1071.

Downs, A. (1981). Neighborhoods and Urban Development. Brookings, Washington, D.C.

Edwards, J. & Klobus, P. (1976). Ethnicity and participation: A commentary. American Journal of Sociology, 82, 423-427.

Florin, P., Mednick, M., & Wandersman, A. (Nov. 1983). Following the leaders: Leadership in grassroots organizations. Presentation at the Conference on Non-Profit Leadership and Management. Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University.

Florin, P. & Wandersman, A. (in press). Participation in community development: A comparison of standard and cognitive social learning

variables. American Journal of Community Psychology.

Guterman, S. (1972). Black Psyche. The Glendessary Press, Inc., Berkeley, California.

Harding, J., Devereux, E., & Bronfenbrenner, U. (1960). Leadership and participatien in a changing rural community. Journal of Social Issues, 16.

Hyman, H. & Wright, C. (1971). Trends in voluntary association memberships of American adutls: Replication based on secondary analysis of national sample surveys. American Sociological Review, 36, 191-206.

Langton, S. (1978). Citizen Participation in America. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts.

McPherson, J.M. (1977). Correlates of social participation: A comparison of the ethnic community and compensatory theories. The Sociological Quarterly, 18, 197-208.

Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality.

Psychological Review, 80, 252-283.

Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson & N.S. Endler (eds.), Personality at the Crossroads: Current Issues in Interactional Psychology. L. Erlbaum Associates.

Munoz, F. & Endo, R. (1982). Perspectives on Minority Group Mental Health. University Press of America, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Myrdal, G., Sterner, R., & Rose, A. (1944). An American Dilemma. Harper, New York.

Nisbet, R. (1962). Community and Power: A Study in the Ethics of Order and Freedom. Oxford University Press, New York.

Olsen, M. (1970). Social and political participation of Blacks. American Sociological Review, 35, 682-697.

Orum, A. (1966). A reappraisal of the social and poltical participation of Negroes. American Journal of Sociology, 72, 32-46.

Perlman, J. (1979). Neighborhood research: A proposed methodology. South Atlantic Urban Studies, 4, 43-63.

Pollister, P. & Price, R. (1980). Evaluation and Action in the Social Environment. Academic Press, New York.

Rothman, J. (1970). Three model of community organization practice. In F.M. Cox, J. Erlich, J. Rothman, & J. Tropman (eds.), Strategies of Community Organization. Peacock, Itasca, Illinois.

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

Tomeh, A. (1973). Formal voluntary organizations: Participation, correlates, and interrelationships. Sociological Inquiry, 43, 89-122.

Tomeh, A. (1981). The value of voluntarism among minority groups. Phylon, 42, 86-96.

Trotter, S. (1981). Neighborhoods, Politics, and

Mental Health. In Joffe, J. & Albee, G. (eds.), Prevention through Political Action and Social Change. Published for the Vermont Conference on the Primary Prevention of Psychopathology be University Press of New England, London.

Warren, D. (1975). Black Neighborhoods. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Williams, J., Babchuk, N., & Johnson, D. (1973). Voluntary associations and minority status: A comparative analysis of Anglos, Blacks, and Mexican Americans. American Sociological Review, 38, 637-646.

Wireman, P. (1977). Building good advisory committees: Some important considerations. In P. Marshall (ed.), Citizen Participation Certification for Community Development: A Reader on the Citizen Participation Process. NAHRO, Washington, D.C.

Yates, D. (1976). Political innovation and institution building: The experience of decentralization experiments. In, Theoretical Perspectives on Urban Politics. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.