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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to identify the variables or types of variables that are possible predictors of organizational participation. Three categories of independent variables - ecological, situational, and individualistic variables are investigated. The sample consists of 442 rural community influentials from twelve counties in six southern states. Both the Spearman's test of correlation as well as multiple regression analysis are employed to assess the relationships among the independent and dependent variables.

The zero-order correlations show that ecological variables (population size, percent white, and urbanization) and situational variables (organization availability and organization diversity) are generally highly correlated with organizational participation ($p < 0.001$). On the other hand, individualistic variables (occupation, education, age, and length of residence) are generally not significantly related to organizational participation, particularly in membership in influential organizations.

The multiple regression analysis reveals that the three categories of variables account for about 20 percent of the variance in membership in influential organizations and about 15 percent of the variance in the general measures of participation (simple memberships in any set
of organizations, attendance at meetings and holding offices). Situational variables are found to have the most influence on membership in influential organizations, whereas population size (an ecological variable) is found to have the most influence on participation as indicated by the general measures of participation.

Situational variables account for about 13.5% of the variance in membership in influential organizations, although the percentage of explained variance in the general measures of participation is less than 2 percent. Ecological variables, on the other hand, account for about 9 percent of the variance in organizational participation.

One of the important tasks of the study is to examine whether organizational participation is related to community influence. Although there is some evidence that participation is associated with influence, the amount of variance explained by organizational participation is rather weak (less than 9 percent).

Overall, the study suggests that structural variables ( ecological and situational variables) are more important predictors of participation than individualistic variables. Hence, any explanation of the phenomenon of participation will be incomplete if structural factors are ignored.
INTRODUCTION

Social scientists have long been interested in the study of participation in local community organizations, particularly in voluntary associations. As Scott (1957) says, sociologists and students from other disciplines have observed and reported upon the proliferation of voluntary associations in the United States and upon the important influence of this phenomenon on American society. This rapid growth of voluntary associations has been ascribed to several factors which include: (1) the change of function of the family, church, and state; (2) the principle of individual freedom; (3) the articulation of minority groups; (4) the increased division of labor; and (5) secularization.

Whatever the reasons given for the multiplication of voluntary associations, certain central questions have occupied the minds of researchers: Who participates in the local community (in its politics, issues, programs, associations?) For what possible reasons are particular persons more active or influential than others in local action? Are actors' characteristics (personal assets or resources) more important than community characteristics in determining the actor's level of participation or influence in the
community?¹ In addition, while most research addressing these questions would focus on either micro-level analysis (e.g. concentrating on individual characteristics) or the macro-level (e.g. referring to community structure), few have attempted to synthesize the two.

In addition, while such discussions have largely taken place within the context of urban settings, there has been little reference to rural environments. Since rural places constitute a significant proportion of our population and are undergoing rapid changes, they should provide a relevant setting for examining the problems addressed above.

¹The local community is considered as an appropriate setting for the study organizational participation for a number of reasons. As argued by König (1968:3-4), "the local community is, together with the family, one of the most basic forms of society. .... in his development from childhood to youth and on to maturity, a man first comes into contact with all social relationships, which extend beyond the narrow limits of the family, in the community .... The community is that point at which society as a whole, as a highly complex phenomenon, is directly tangible, whereas without exception all other forms of society rapidly become abstract and are never so directly experienced as in the community.

This characteristic of the local community is also noted by Poplin (1979) who argues that as we examine the hierarchy that begins with the two-person group and ends with national societies, the community (as a unit of social organization) emerges as the first subsystem that can potentially meet the full range of people's physiological and social needs.
This study will, accordingly, focus on the relationship between participation in rural community organizations and the variables or categories of variables that account for variations in participation. More specifically, the emphasis is on determining the variable or variables that are the best predictors of participation. Toward this end, participation in community organizations will be examined relative to individual social characteristics, community characteristics, and influence in the community.

The Problem and Rationale

Previous research in organizational participation has shown that participation is related to community structure as well as to personal (individual) characteristics. For instance, it has been shown that participation is related to the location or type of neighborhood in which one lives (e.g. Young and Larson, 1970; Bell and Force, 1956). Bell and Force, in particular, have demonstrated that a neighborhood with a "high economic status index" is associated with a higher level of participation that one with a lower such index. On the other hand, individual characteristics such as socioeconomic status, age, length of residence, sex, and ethnicity have also been shown to be related to participation (e.g. Rank and Voss, 1982; Olsen, 1970; Booth, 1972; Williams et al., 1973). However, while most studies
would focus on the influences of either community characteristics or individual differences, few have tried to consider the relative and independent effects of the two kinds of variables.

Furthermore, while most researchers assume the importance of urbanization and the growth of different types of institutions or associations, few actually show how this growth is reflected in their research strategies. Specifically, little research has dealt with how increasing population size and urbanization are related to differentiation in community associations and how these developments are associated with participation.

In addition, most research not only approaches the study of organizational participation from a restricted number of dimensions, but also fails to specify or elaborate on the interrelationships between and among these dimensions. To be more specific, previous research efforts have either ignored or slighted the distribution or dispersion of organizations and how this influences participation. Also, the relationship between the availability or distribution of organizations and other dimensions of community such as population size and urbanization remain to be specified. Therefore, it is one of the objects of the present study to investigate these neglected areas and narrow the gaps found in the related literature.
Besides, previous research on community organizations, on the one hand, and those on community influence on the other, have proceeded on different lines. Most researchers have focused on either organizational participation or community influence.\(^2\) Few have tried to establish meaningful links between these two areas. Though hints at such links have been indicated, there have not been effective empirical demonstrations of such relationships. (see Merton, 1968; Hunter, 1953, 1980; Gilbert and Kahl, 1982).

Therefore, another task of the present study is to empirically examine the relationship, if any, between community organization participation and community influence. It is felt that there is a need for more rigorous studies on such topics as "who" or which groups are active in community organizations and whether membership or officerships in "influential" community organizations lead to community influence.

In order to provide a wider perspective on the above central concerns, this study will take into account community characteristics such as degree of urbanization,\(^2\)

\(^2\)Much effort has been spent on showing whether community power structure is elitist or pluralistic. However, more recent studies have begun to explore other areas. (see Lynds and Lynd, 1937; Hunter, 1953, 1980; Mills, 1956; Dahl, 1961; Rose, 1967; Domhoff, 1967; Liebert and Imershein, 1977).
population size, and racial composition, in addition to individual social characteristics. Through a subsequent analysis of the above relationships, it is hoped to integrate the findings of previous empirical studies and their theoretical explanations.

One of the most common assumptions about participation in local associations is its pervasiveness. As Scott (1957) has mentioned, astute students of the American scene have reported that "Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations, and that associations are created, extended, and worked in the United States more quickly and effectively than in any other country" (Scott, 1957:315). Scott also notes "it is a rare American who is not a member of four or five societies, and that he who does not participate in voluntary associations is defined as 'pariah' ........" (Scott, 1957:315-316). These assumptions about voluntary association participation have been called into question by subsequent studies (Wright and Hyman, 1958; Hyman and Wright, 1971). As Wright and Hyman's (1958) study shows, a sizeable group of Americans are not members of any voluntary associations and only a

---

3 A 'pariah' is a social outcast; a member of a low caste in Southern India.
minority belongs to more than one such association. In short, the assumed pervasiveness of participation is not necessarily true; it remains to be empirically demonstrated.

Although those who participate in local voluntary associations comprise a relatively small minority, this group is important sociologically because of its potential for community action and influence. Even though this study is not concerned with proving the existence of elites with economic and political power who dominate across community issues, as is usual in the elitist tradition (e.g. Hunter, 1953, 1980; Miller, 1958), it is important to distinguish those who participate from those who do not. The political implication is obvious. In a democracy, the role of citizen participation and the opportunity to do so is always stressed (Gittel, 1980; Perrucci and Filisuk, 1970). Therefore, the differentiation of those who participate from those who do not participate in any stage of political decision-making becomes not only the concern of politicians but also of social analysts.

The more specific questions with which sociologists have dealt are: how can we explain this differential participation and what are its consequences for social action? To answer these questions, it is useful to address a number
of related issues.

First, as pointed out earlier, participation in voluntary associations is not a universal phenomenon. In other words, not everybody is a joiner. The assumption that participation in associations is the characteristic of most Americans, or that America is "a nation of join joiners" may be erroneous (see Lincoln, 1979; Booth, 1972; Cutler, 1976; Williams et al., 1973). This issue is important because a democratic polity assumes that its people are not apathetic but active participants in the political process.

Second, as also mentioned earlier, participation in community associations is related to perceptions of community influence (Perrucci and Pilisuk, 1970). However, an examination of such relationships in rural settings has failed to produce definitive conclusions (Beaulieu, 1982). New research strategies might bring more conclusive findings.

Finally, it is important to note that, in general, research on participation in voluntary associations has, through the years, produced mixed results. Some findings are fairly consistent (e.g. the positive relationship between socioeconomic status and participation), while others are contradictory (e.g. the relationship between community size and participation; see Dotson (1951),
Stark (1964), Curtis (1971). Hence, further research on these relationships is necessary.

The same applies to research on community influence, which has traditionally relied on case studies (e.g. Lowry, 1962; Wildavsky, 1964; Hunter, 1953, 1980; Presthus, 1953). Case studies of one or two communities cannot adequately examine the effects of variations in community structures. As Lincoln (1979) points out, urbanization, community age, and economic function of a community are related to differentiation in community organizations. To avoid the limitations of case studies, the present study will examine a wide range of communities.

Two ways of accounting for variations in participation have been predominant in the literature - the use of individualistic variables (e.g. sex, age, socioeconomic status, etc.), and the use of structural variables (e.g. economic status of community, community size, level of urbanization, etc.). The exclusive focus on either one or the other of these approaches has, therefore, produced an unbalanced picture of organizational participation.

Importantly, previous research efforts have failed to adequately examine the convergence of structural and individual factors associated with participation. There is thus a need to move toward a synthesis of levels of
sociological concerns. It is felt that such synthesis is not only a more realistic way of explaining social phenomena, but it also may lead to more meaningful research. Therefore, it is proposed that both individual as well as community structural characteristics be examined as possible 'determinants' of voluntary organization participation.

In short, the task of the present study is to empirically examine: (1) which variable or types of variables (i.e. ecological, situational, or individual) are the best predictors of organizational participation and how strong their relative effects are; (2) who or which groups (including their social and individual characteristics) are active in rural community organizations; or (3) whether membership/occupying important positions in influential rural organizations are associated with community influence; and (4) whether organization participation rates vary by the characteristics of rural counties. It is hoped that this study will not only help clarify some of the confusion about community organizational participation and community influence, but also contribute to a synthesis of previous research and findings.

Towards the objectives mentioned, the next chapter reviews the relevant literature after which a chapter on
the theoretical perspective and specific research hypotheses is presented. The fourth chapter is devoted to a discussion of the methods, data, and analytical techniques used in this study. Findings from the study are presented in the fifth chapter followed by a chapter on conclusions and implications.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature on voluntary organization participation is extensive and varied. The review presented here will begin with an overview of major theoretical approaches to voluntary organization participation. This will be followed by a more focused discussion of those factors (both structural and individualistic) that have been empirically examined as potentially influencing voluntary organization participation. Finally, what social scientists have seen as the consequences of voluntary organization participation, particularly in relation to interpersonal influence, will be summarized.

Theoretical Approaches

The literature on voluntary organization participation is characterized by theoretical diversity. Elements of structural, 'mass society', organizational analysis, interaction, conflict and exchange perspectives as well as some attempts at synthesis are found throughout the literature. Although it is not always possible to categorize studies according to clearly distinguishable perspectives, the following discussion is organized by what appears to be the authors' major orientations.
Structural Perspectives

According to Babchuk and Warriner (1965), the first and perhaps oldest of the theoretical perspectives in the study of voluntary associations is the one that focuses on the nature and structure of society. This is the focus of Tocqueville's (1945) view of America in which he emphasizes the role, function, and pervasiveness of voluntary groups. This approach studies the contribution of such groups to the total society, their function in integrating the society, and the role they play in societal processes such as decision-making, opinion formation, and socialization.

One of the earliest theoretical statements on voluntary associations which contained structural/functional ideas was made by Henderson (1895). Not exactly focused on any major perspective, he refers to the purposes served by voluntary associations. Though he does not talk in terms of "objective consequences" in the Mertonian sense (1968), Henderson refers to "the normal uses of this form of social organization" in terms of the "satisfaction of transitory wants of society or the needs of a local group or of a limited class" (p. 330). Implicitly referring to Durkheim, Henderson suggests that "differentiation carries with it variation of tastes. We must expect with higher civilization a growing unlikeness of aptitudes and inclinations. People who like the same things drift together" (pp. 330-331).
Henderson's views are stated in a more or less "informal" style, which is typical of articles of that period. He does not deal with any research problems or hypotheses.

The application of the structural approach to the community has been attempted by several researchers (e.g. Bell and Force, 1956; Fanelli, 1956; Laumann, 1973; Laumann et al., 1977). Bell and Force (1956), for example, hypothesize that certain positions in the social structure (e.g. residence in certain types of neighborhood) are related to certain types of interest groupings, as revealed by formal association membership. They argue that persons with similar interests are not found randomly occupying various social positions in the large society; rather, their similarity of interests seems to follow from the social statuses which they hold.

The point here is that position in the social structure influences organizational membership patterns. The major social roles which an individual occupies regulate the amount and nature of his participation in society. Bell and Force point out that if one knew a person's economic, and family, and ethnic status, his age and sex, his aspirations or expectations regarding the roles he might achieve, one should be able to predict closely that person's participation in the various activities of society. In addition, the social type of neighborhood is an efficient indicator
of his social participation and may be a significant factor in its own right in shaping his social participation. They hypothesize that neighborhoods having different configurations with respect to economic level, family characteristics and ethnicity will have different patterns of social participation.

The idea of structure as networks of interaction has been implied in the work of Fanelli (1956). He mentions that in small communities, those persons identified as community leaders tend to form a subsystem in which members are linked by a variety of ties ranging from kinship to membership in the same formal community organizations. In addition, he notes that differences in both influence and communication among types of leaders are accompanied by differences in the extent of association in the formal organizations of the community. The point is that community leaders seem to be linked to each other not only through membership in the same formal community associations, but also through other ties such as kinship and informal activities.

The concept of structure and its relevance to the local community has become more developed in the hands of Laumann (1973), and Laumann and his associates (1977). Laumann argues that 'structure' is frequently used together with various correlative descriptive terms such as hierarchy,
dominance, structural differentiation, and power or class structure. Despite the many nuances of the term 'structure,' the root meaning refers to a persisting order or pattern of relationships among some units of sociological analysis, be they individual actors, classes of actors, or behavioral patterns.

The social structure of a community, then, for Laumann, is defined as a persisting pattern of social relationships among social positions. Within this structural perspective, Laumann also includes the social network approach. This latter approach, according to him, refers to "a specific set of linkages among a defined set of persons, with the additional property that the characteristics of these linkages as a whole may be used to interpret the social behavior of the persons involved" (Laumann, 1973:7). With this combined perspective, Laumann considers memberships in voluntary associations as "involving people automatically in networks of secondary and higher order links between ego and any other member of the organization ....." (Laumann, 1973:7-8). In network terms, he says, voluntary associations bind set of persons among whom relationships are relatively dense or interconnected. By analyzing the "differential connectedness" of actors, Laumann is able to report remarkably consistent differences in their social characteristics, attitudes and behavior. For example,
interlocking networks should be associated with more localistic and ascriptive orientations of ego and should be rooted in long-term neighborhood associations, ties of kinship and ethnoreligious backgrounds. On the other hand, loosely knit networks may be formed on some specialized basis (e.g. common interest in chess). Thus, people in such networks are more likely to have lower affective involvements and commitment to their relations.

Carrying the idea of structure and social networks a little bit further, Laumann and his associates (1977:594) conceive of a community leadership structure as "...... a regularized pattern of communication and exchange of information pertinent to community affairs among members of a community elite ...." Laumann and his associates argue that a persistent focus of attention in community studies, from the classic studies of Hunter (1953) and Dahl (1961) to the recent comparative framework of Clark (1968a) and Grimes et al. (1976), has been on social structures in which community decisions are made. Unfortunately, they point out, a chronic weakness of these efforts has been their tendency to treat the concept of social structures metaphorically or only implicitly. However, Laumann and his associates (1977:596) admit that those writers who discuss decision-making "cliques" or "crowds" (e.g. Hunter, 1953; Miller, 1958) clearly imply some recurrent interaction
among members of such sub-groups, which they believe to be at least indirectly indicated by their common membership in social clubs or service on corporate boards of directors. The important idea is that by conceiving of leadership structure as a regularized pattern of communication and information exchange, Laumann and his associates could analyze the variations in participation and outcome preferences on community issues.

"Mass Society" Theories

Under this category, the theme that is stressed is the social disorganization aspects of society which are related to rapid population growth and urbanization. The socially disorganized individual will thus find himself participating in voluntary associations which are, in effect, social groups that perform integrative as well as economic, political, or cultural functions.

Bell and Boat (1957), using this perspective, study the relations between urban neighborhood types and informal social relations (socializing with neighbors, relatives, friends, and personal relations in formal associations). They point out that the distinctive characteristics of urban life have often been described sociologically as consisting of the substitution of secondary for primary relationships, the weakening bonds of friendship, the decline
of the family, and the disappearance of the neighborhood. From this perspective, Bell and Boat argue that urban settings may not be so impersonal and anonymous as often described. They also point out that there are differences between different sections of a city. Their main problem is therefore to determine such differences relating informal relations of urban residents to social types/neighborhoods. Specifically, the male residents of four different types of neighborhoods are compared with respect to their amount of socializing with neighbors, relatives, friends, and co-workers. Their main finding is that, in general, informal relations with neighbors, co-workers, when they exist, do represent primary, intimate and personal relationships. Also, most individuals find the formal association by no means as impersonal as often assumed.

Axelrod (1956) also approaches his study from this perspective. He addresses two views stressed in the sociological literature which have to do with the relation of urbanization to group membership. The first view stresses the impersonality of urban relationships, and the wide importance of formal and secondary groups. The other view, he says, gives informal group contacts a more important place. Admitting that the resolution of these different emphases is critical and fundamental, he does not attempt a definitive resolution, but chooses to design a study for
answering several related questions regarding participation: What is the extent of participation in formal groups in the large urban community? What are the patterns of participation of the various economic and social segments of the community? To what extent are kinship ties important in different segments of the community? In what way and to what extent is participation in formal groups related to other informal participation?

In his analysis, Axelrod resorts partly to stratification theory. He says, for example, that exclusive clubs are instruments for maintaining one's status. He refers partly to social psychological theory (e.g. relatives continue to be an important source of companionship and mutual support in urban settings).

Another study which implies a 'mass society' orientation is made by Goldhammer (1964), who argues that the growth of voluntary associations has been regarded as one of the major indices of the "disintegration" of American communal life. Goldhammer points out that the voluntary association flourishes in a social setting in which the community can no longer function as an all-inclusive social group. The family, for example, has increasingly lost many of its economic, protective, educational, and recreational functions. Those functions have in turn been taken up by other agencies such as the state, the school, and voluntary associations.
Goldhammer's main research interest is in exploring what types of men join what types of groups, to what extent and why. The major variables examined are age, education, and personality (neurotic score developed by Thurstone).

Goldhammer's approach is, in a sense, a combination of the theories of 'mass society' and 'social psychology'. To explain the emergence and growth of voluntary associations, Goldhammer resorts to the first theory. On the other hand, to explain individual participation in voluntary associations, he refers to "personality types" (e.g. shy, introverted personalities find it difficult to make social contacts).

The organizational participations of alienated people in mass society has also been investigated by Lopata (1964). Studying a Polish-American community ("Polonia"), she argues that the Poles, who came to the U.S. between 1880-1920, needed "services and activities" for satisfying the wants peculiar to the Poles, and this led to the growth of a service industry as well as a multiplicity of voluntary associations. Many of the Poles who migrated to the U.S. at that time were from the rural areas of Poland. Upon arrival, they settled mainly in urban, industrialized centers. Lacking knowledge and skills, they were bewildered in and confused. Differences/culture worsened their situation. Thus, as Lopata argues, Polish voluntary associations played
a vital role in problems of assimilation of the Poles into the local society.

One of the functions of the Polish voluntary associations was to preserve the identity of the Polish community as a distinct entity. For example, some of the early associations called for complete identification of the membership with the mother country. Other related functions included educational and cultural activities such as building and financing formal schools in which Polish children could learn their own culture. The associations also performed an economic function by giving economic aid to members. Besides, the voluntary associations also catered for special-interests such as sports, sewing or card-playing, as well as welfare needs such as caring for deviants.

Lópata is mainly interested in explaining the functions of voluntary associations for the Polish immigrants. Thus, her analysis centers on how the associations, through their activities, promote or hinder the assimilation and adjustment of the immigrants into the American society.

Combining mass society theory and networks theory, Cutler (1973) proposes that the existence of, and interaction in, a network of intermediate, secondary relations provide one of the major bulwarks against structural atomization of the individual, alienation, and divisive tendencies in the social system. With this idea as the theoretical
backdrop, Cutler examines whether voluntary associations play the integrative role ascribed to it. Beginning with the premise that mass man, or the individual/mass society, is said to be marked by a number of behavioral and psychological characteristics, Cutler formulates the research questions: Will voluntary association members manifest social-psychological characteristics associated with mass society to a lesser extent than non-members? Does the role of the voluntary organization differ under variable conditions of membership involvement and the existence within the organization of friendship networks?

Using three social-psychological variables consistent with the theory of mass society - powerlessness, dogmatism, tolerance of ideological nonconformity - , he finds no significant difference between members and non-members. Similar results prevail when he examines the presence of friendship networks in voluntary associations.

"Organizational Theory" (or Organizational Analysis)

The main focus in this category is on the association as the unit of analysis, the person becoming "one of a body of replaceable actors whose action is viewed as a function of organizational rather than personal processes" (Babchuk and Warriner, 1965). The research problems/become those of the structure of the association, the processes through
which it operates, and the internal effect of environmental changes, etc.

This perspective has been elaborated by Zald (1967). Calling his field "community organization practice," he defines it as the organizations and professions whose primary goals are to mobilize and coordinate members and agencies of communities to solve community problems. One of the foci of his analysis is on the way organizational processes give power to different groups and how, in turn, subgroup loyalties and power affect the operation and direction of the organization.

Zald's purpose in the article is to develop a theory of community organization practice. Arguing that there are not enough empirical studies of these agencies to develop firm propositions, he suggests that studies of sets of organizations will allow us to examine problems of mobilizing support and community consensus.

One study that may be placed under the rubric of organizational analysis is that conducted by Warriner and Prather (1965). Using data from over 60 voluntary associations, they describe four types of associations which are differentiated according to basic structural and organizational features. The basic assumption is that if one could understand participation from an intra-organizational point of view, then one could have a better basis for interpreting
the different rates of participation by the several seg-
mants of the community. Their findings suggest that the
of four types/associations examined — performance, sociable,
symbolic, and productive — are quite distinct species of
social organization, and each represents a distinct form of
social organization. Each species of organization provides
different kinds of rewards and interests for membership.
In addition, there is evidence that there are strong class
influences on participation in type A (performance) and
type C (production) associations, which may be explicable
in terms of the general culture of the class levels.

Another study using this perspective is that of
Motz and his associates (1965). These researchers focus
on the patterns used by associations in selecting various
types of leaders. By showing variations in the styles of
leaders selected by different regional societies, they
indicate how social setting influences the voluntary
association as an organization.

It is seldom that any one study would claim to be
using solely one perspective. This applies also to organ-
izational analysis. A study may include organizational
analysis under the larger context of political decision-
making, while at the same time utilizing a class analysis
to explain the differences in the behavior of organizations
(e.g. Gittel, 1980).
Political Process/Community Power Perspectives

As Babchuk and Warriner (1965) have rightly stated, the analysis of associations as part of the leadership and power systems of communities constitutes a quite distinct approach in itself. As part of a political process, participation in community voluntary associations is studied for its influence on public policy initiation, formulation and execution. What is implied is how effective are such associations in these stages of the political process.

Gittel (1980), for example, argues that the range of participation and its influence on public policy are determined by how the process is defined. If the definition is broad enough to include the initiation, formulation, implementation, and evaluation of policy, then at any or each stage, the role of organizations and public participation is influential. Government policy, he says, can encourage and support voluntary organizations, or undermine and discourage them. Thus, for those who see citizen participation as the basis of effective participation in a democratic system, the functioning of organizations, their internal operations, and the external forces influencing their role can provide a better understanding of their potential for fulfilling their goals.

Within the above perspective, Gittel examines sixteen organizations' leaderships and memberships, including
the political, economic, and social subsystems in which they function and analyzes the relationship of these variables to political influence. His study identifies the constraints of economic class, limited networks, and the preoccupation of the poor with staying alive. Also, the increasing external dependency of organizations is cited as a major influence on the strategies, structure, and leadership of community organizations.

No study of community and community organizations is considered complete without some reference to Floyd Hunter's 'Regional City' (1953). Hunter regards the community as a primary power center. It is a place in which power relations can be most easily observed. In his study, Hunter notes that 'men of power' belong to certain clubs where they discuss major community issues. Interviews with twenty Regional City leaders concerning club membership reveal the interlocking nature of these memberships. He thus argues that organizations may serve as training grounds for many of the men who later become power leaders. Most of the leaders had 'graduated' from a stint in the upper positions of the more important organizations.

Hunter points out that organizations are not a sure route to sustained community prominence. However, membership in the top brackets of one of the stable economic bureaucracies is the surest road to power, and this road is entered by only a few.
In his recent follow-up study of Regional City, Hunter (1980) argues that participation in associations is one of the means of broadening the base of political participation. Also, it is only in cooperative behavior that one can find the hope of correcting imbalances of power and economic injustice. Hunter feels that associations can and should be made into viable instruments for policy definition, promotion, and execution.

Despite his overall political orientation, Hunter relies quite heavily on structural/functional arguments. For example, he makes use of concepts such as social structure, institutions, power structure and power roles. He defines institutions as "categories of behavior" which deal with value and belief systems in society; the function of the belief system is the maintenance of these systems and the survival of society. A power structure is defined as a coordinated system, public and private, formal and informal, of learned and repeated power roles and relationships, the function of which is the maintenance of any prescribed, differentiated social order. From this definition, Hunter asserts that a community power structure is one such order linked by its "power functions" to larger societal power systems, which include organized labor, partisan political blocs, etc., which, in turn, are linked to larger parent, national, and international systems of power. It
is with this comprehensive notion of power configuration that he discusses the dominant influence of economic organizations in the community.

The relationship between community leadership and organizational "interlocks" attendant upon multiple officerships in associations by the same person has also been noted by Laskin and Phillett (1965). The theory implied here is that where there is overlap between reputational influence and officerships, it could mean that office holding leads to 'visibility' or that 'visibility' leads to desirability as office holder, or it could be both ways, which is more likely. This perspective also means that if no overlap can be demonstrated to exist between reputational influence and officership in associations, then no \textit{a priori} assumptions can be made about the role of voluntary groups in the general leadership of any given community.

Associations, with their interlocks, may thus be regarded as channels to community influence. This perspective is precisely the way Merton uses in his study of Rovere. Merton (1968) shows that participation in local organizations varies according to different orientations of community actors, who utilize organizations as channels to influence. Specifically, 'local' actors tend to join those for organizations which are largely designed/"making contacts", for example, secret societies (Masons), fraternal organizations
(Elks), and local service clubs (the Rotary, Lions, and the Kiwanis). On the other hand, "cosmopolitan" actors tend to belong to those organizations through which they can express their special skills and knowledge, for example, professional societies and hobby groups. Stated in other terms, participation in local organizations is seen as a stepping stone to community power and influence.

Using Merton's concept of "local-cosmopolitan" actors, Lowry (1962) supports the former's observation that locals exercise their power through social groups and clubs such as Eastern Star and County Historical Societies, while their business and professional affiliations are minimal. As Lowry (1962:137) puts it: The local leader looks upon his function as protecting and maintaining the traditional patterns of community action and belief because, as he often says, "I have to live in this town."

and associational behavior, therefore, reflect this attitude.

The influence of interorganizational ties on community influence has also been investigated by Perrucci and Pilisuk (1970), who argue that organizational interconnections are resource networks, which represent an important type of circumstance influencing participation. Perrucci and Pilisuk's focus is on the organization rather than the person, the latter's influence being mainly dependent upon organizational resources - people, money, and jobs - which
are mobilized for the purpose of participating in and influencing community affairs.

Building on the above approach, Beaulieu (1982) argues that as an alternative to looking at resources in the form of personal assets, one may choose to consider resources which reside in community structure. These resources may be looked upon as circumstances (as opposed to personal attributes or possessions) which increase the ability of individuals to control or have influence over other individuals. Beaulieu's main problem is to ascertain whether persons occupying executive positions in several local formal organizations are more often identified as participants and as key influentials in community decisions. Among the variables dealt with are education, age, and length of residence. Organizational membership is divided into three categories: "Interorganizational leaders" are those who belong to three or more organizations, "Organizational leaders" belong to one or two or organizations, while "non-organizational leaders" are those who held no executive level position in any organization.

Mixed Approaches

An example of what might be termed a mixed approach is Babchuk and Gordon's (1962) study. These researchers are interested in an area quite different from those usually investigated. Their focus is on the process of incorporation of persons/voluntary associations. Questions asked
included: How do members become incorporated into voluntary organizations? Do persons join a group through personal contact and because of a primary association or through impersonal media such as public advertisements and announcements and mainly as a result of a special interest? To pursue these questions, they rely on a framework that combines small group and mass communication research. According to this framework, personal influence is one of the most important intervening variables in explaining consumer choice in marketing and fashions, movie going, and in opinion formation on public affairs. From this perspective, Babchuk and Gordon argue that personal influence, as a variable, might be of critical importance in the process of incorporating persons into voluntary associations.

Besides the above framework, the researchers also include other theoretical approaches, one of which is Burgess' Theory of the City. In addition, another framework provided by Social Area Analysis is also utilized. Within this latter framework, census tracts are classified according to indices of 'economic status', 'family status', and 'ethnic status.' Thus, the researchers claim, they have

---

3 This theory views the city as a series of concentric circles. If one moves from outer circles toward the center, social disorganization increases (high delinquency rates, high mobility, etc.).
a general framework which makes it possible to define more explicitly the slum neighborhood studied and also facilitates comparison of their study with previous/future ones.

An approach that combines structure and actor's interpretive capacities has been attempted by Deseran (1980). He suggests that the structural approach focuses on phenomena such as roles, institutions, norms, etc. The interpretive approach stresses how actors define their situations. Close­ly following Berger and Luckmann (1966), Deseran emphasizes the interrelatedness of the two approaches. Under this approach, social structure is seen as a product of human behavior. Since the bases of structure are in human actions the definitions of actors who are in the structural realm must be taken into account.

Applying the approach to the community, Deseran suggests that the structural characteristics of a community result primarily from individual and collective aspects of conceptualization. That is, from the interests, beliefs, and tasks of community actors emerge the behavioral patterns and regularities which are holistically perceived as "objective" community structure. In the course of actors' day to day activities, patterns of interaction become discernable.

---

4 This particular approach by Deseran is applied to community power and decision-making rather than to voluntary organization participation. However, it can be usefully applied to the understanding of the latter.
and provide the basis for the actors' ability to "view" the structure, and thus, enable each actor to appropriately orient his or her behavior relative to other actors in the pursuit of personal or collective goals (Deseran, 1980:26).

Albert Hunter's (1974) approach to the study of community and community organizations encompasses ecological, cultural and social dimensions of community. The ecological dimension considers community differentiation in terms of economic, family and racial ethnic status. The cultural and symbolic elements refer to the varying ability of people to define and identify local communities and neighborhoods in terms of meaning/sentiment. Hunter argues that for meaningful social action to take place, individuals need some organizing principle, some "definition of the situation," which includes a spatial referent. Specifically, this proposition suggests that for local urban communities to operate as objects and arenas of meaningful social action, their residents must possess some conceptual image of them. Furthermore, it suggests that these symbolic images must be shared or "collective representations."

Applying the above theoretical considerations to the analysis of membership in voluntary associations, Hunter examines residents' varying social status and characteristics of the local communities concerned. He stresses that membership in such associations is itself an important
local social status. Therefore, when discussing the relationship of membership to other local social statuses, the question of causal direction is problematic, and it is probably best to view the relationships as joint interaction between the variables, or simply as concomitant variations.

One of Hunter's main concerns is to explore local organization membership and awareness in relationship to the general social statuses of race and class as well as the more local social statuses such as age, sex, family status, friendship patterns, and length of residence. His second concern is to examine the relationship between participation and two dimensions of the symbolic community - clarity of the "cognitive image" and "evaluation-attachment."

One of the more thorough syntheses of theories in organizational participation has been attempted by Galaskiewicz (1979). Galaskiewicz combines elements of structural and functional, interactional, conflict, exchange perspectives. He begins by discussing the features of social structure vis-a-vis community actors. Institutionalized relationships, he says, are often difficult to change because of their complexity and the vested interests which they support, and individuals often become frustrated with those structures which supposedly exist to serve their needs and do not. How does the individual response to this? The response may be either outright rebellion, the establishment of alter-
native institutions, or acquiescence. There might be repression or minor structural change. Most of the time, he argues, it is a little of each. Though this sounds as if Galaskiewicz is using a conflict perspective, his approach is really one of a synthesis between individual social choice and macro social structure.

Galaskiewicz points out that traditionally, a social structure is characterized as a persisting pattern of social relationships among social positions. This conception of structure is used both by Laumann (1966, 1973) and implicitly by Blau (1977) and borrows from the work of Parsons (1951). Galaskiewicz argues that supposedly these positions and the relations between them evolve over time in response to conditions in the society and exist independent of the particular incumbent. The structure is institutionalized as roles are defined for the different positions. However, he says, there is a growing consensus among sociologists that this conception of social structure is inadequate for studying the behavior of different types/social actors. For example, the behavior of corporate actors cannot be explained in reference to the roles that these actors assume. Galaskiewicz therefore feels that an alternative model of social structure is needed. Viewing structure as both an emergent and a cultural phenomenon, he suggests that positions in the social structure (i.e., networks) "emerge" from the interaction one observes. Social structures emerge out
of the purposive action of social actors (whether they be individuals or organizations) who seek to realize their self-interests and will negotiate routinized patterns of relationships that enhance these interests.

The assumption of actor's self-interests leads Galaskiewicz to exchange theory and models of purposive action. Thus, he assumes that social interaction follows microeconomic behavior, the only constraints being norms of reciprocity and power dependency. Under the former, actors are expected to play fair with one another, exchanging goods and services, while under the latter, actors are expected to maximize their autonomy while making others dependent on them (Galaskiewicz, 1979:16).

How is this conception of social structure related to community influence? Galaskiewicz says that social structures persist in order to maintain the power differentials among actors in the social order, which, in turn, increase the life opportunities of some actors/ reducing the opportunities of others. Social stability, for instance, is rooted in the interests of certain actors to maintain structural arrangements in order to protect their own positions of power. On the other hand, social change is rooted in the interests of less powerful social actors to displace those in dominant positions and put themselves in these positions instead.
The hierarchy of established influence relationships defines the probability that any one actor can influence another. However, change can be traced to the interests of some actors to increase their power, or to seek a redistribution of power in the system.

Rather than viewing innovators, intellectuals and revolutionaries as "prophets" of a new age, Galaskiewicz says that his perspective is much more cynical. He views change agents as actors who are interested in amassing as much power as they possibly can and will use whatever means available to do that.

In short, Galaskiewicz’s synthesis is derived from both interactionist theory and functional theory. On the one hand, he assumes that social actors have certain goals and that they will act in a purposive manner in order to accomplish those goals. Their common strategy is to establish exchange/dependency relations with others in the social organization. Motives of actors are primarily selfish with rare acts of altruism.

On the other hand, from functionalist theory, he assumes that individual actors have certain needs (economic, problem-solving, moral support). However, Galaskiewicz says that he departs from traditional functional analysis in some ways. He does not assume that social organization must return to a state of equilibrium or that it was in a state of equilibrium to begin with. Also, he does not refer to social
values or their overriding importance in shaping cultural patterns. Galaskiewicz claims that his approach can handle social conflict among interest groups and can help explain the emergence of institutional networks and the generation of collective power.

Despite the variant theoretical perspectives in the study of voluntary associations, the common interest is the phenomenon of participation. Crucial to each of the approaches are the pertinent questions on participation: What are the rates of participation in various types of associations, and how do they/among different sectors of the population? The questions of 'who'participates and 'why' also remain one of the main interests in most of these approaches. Having discussed/different variations in theoretical perspectives, the writer now turns to the more specific factors or variables that researchers have shown to be related to, or considered in their study of, voluntary organization participation.

Factors That Influence Participation
(a) The various forms of structural or ecological factors
   (i) Level of complexity of community
community age, and economic function of community as sources of differentiation in community organizations. Urbanization, for example, is related to a community's capacity to support a diversified population/organizations. A community's age is also related to types of organizations present in it. Communities also exhibit a division of labor. In cities where manufacturing is a key function, other industries tend to be under-represented, that is, the pattern of organizational differentiation in the community is affected.

Bell and Force (1956) have argued that the complexity and heterogeneity of modern urban society have fostered a social organization highly differentiated in interests. People having similar interests in society tend to organize formally into groups for the pursuit of mutual goals. The researchers' study attempts to determine the relationship between membership in certain types of interest groupings as revealed by formal association membership, and certain positions in the social structure, as revealed by residence in certain types of neighborhood. Four census tracts are chosen. Those tracts vary according to economic (educational, occupational, and income) and family characteristics (single, divorced, separated, or widowed).

Bell and Force note that the differences between the neighborhoods with respect to the types of formal associa-
tions to which their residents belong are quite striking. In two low economic status neighborhoods, the labor union ranks first in relative number of memberships. The percentage of members who belong to fraternal associations are much larger in high economic status neighborhoods. Also memberships in recreational, patriotic, church connected, nationality, welfare and charitable, civic, political, hobby and neighborhood improvement associations occur more frequently in the high economic status neighborhoods than in low economic status neighborhoods at each level of family status.

Classifying formal associations based on types of interest (general, special-stratum, and individual), Bell and Force find that the largest percentage of memberships in each of the neighborhoods is in the special-stratum interest type of association. Less than 1/3 of the memberships are in general interest groups in each of the neighborhoods. Also, high economic status neighborhoods tend to have larger percentages of memberships in the general interest associations than do the low economic status neighborhoods.

In their research, the researchers have, however, not raised the question of the relative independent effect of unit (neighborhood) and personal (individual) measures of economic and family status on associational behavior, but they have suggested interpretations of the findings based on the assumption that the neighborhood measures represent the individual measures.
From a cross-national, comparative approach, Curtis (1971) studies the patterns of voluntary association participation in the U.S., Canada, Gt. Britain, Germany, Italy and Mexico. For each nation, findings on the relationship of membership to social class, sex, age level, and marital status are in essential agreement with earlier on American findings. Based on Wright and Hyman's (1958:289-291) conclusion (from national data) that affiliation is higher in more urbanized counties, Curtis puts to the test the hypothesis that the extent of association membership in "democracies" is directly related to a society's "urbanism", "democratization" of social and political life, and "equality". The results do not show a clear-cut cross-national pattern for either union-included or union-excluded rates. In each instance for the U.S. there are somewhat higher rates in communities of 20,000-50,000, but beyond this there is no consistent overall trend. The latter is also true for all data from the other countries.

(b) Individual factors (personal characteristics or assets)

(i) Socioeconomic status

Dotson (1957) says that research by Komarovsky (1946) and others has shown that formal voluntary associations are unevenly distributed among the various social strata of the population. In general, the higher a person's income and
class status, the greater his social participation. In his research on urban working-class families, Dotson notes that 3/5 of the men and 4/5 of the women and children in the families studied do not participate at all in formally organized associations. This finding agrees with Komarovsky's which pertains to large cities (Komarovsky, 1946).

Studying the relationship between SES and religious participation, Mueller and Johnson (1975:785-800) find that the relationship is stronger for males than females, and is positive and weak for Protestants, but is essentially zero for Catholics and negative in sign for Jews and unaffiliated Whites. In addition, the examination of interactions with marital status and the presence of children under 16 indicated that the SES - religious participation relationship is strongest for those who are married and responsible for young children. Nevertheless, Mueller and Johnson note that, even with these significant variations by relevant subpopulations, the explanatory power of SES in predicting religious participation is small both in absolute terms and in comparison with other possible determinants. The researchers say that it might be argued that lower status persons are less likely to participate in all organizational activity, religious and non-religious. However, the appropriate test of this contention, controlling for non-religious participation has produced contradictory findings. The SES-
participation relationship has been found to persist (Stark, 1964) while Goode (1966) found it attenuated. Mueller and Johnson, however, note that the modest SES-religious participation relationship, positive or negative, is not primarily a function of general social participation.

(ii) Ethnicity

One of the factors that have been found to be related to social participation is ethnicity. Antunes and Gaitz (1975), for example, study ethnic differences in levels of participation among Blacks, Mexican-Americans and Whites after the effects of social class are controlled. Drawing on the findings of previous studies, they hypothesize that a compensation/ethnic identification process would result in higher levels of social and political participation among members of minority groups which were the targets of discrimination than among the members of the dominant group. Analysis of the data, however, only partially supports the hypothesis. Black participation exceeds or equals that of Whites for nine of the eleven participation variables. Among Mexican-Americans, however, participation is generally lower than that of Whites. The differences, the researchers argue, may be attributed to the existence of ethnic differences in the value of participation.

Williams and his associates (1973) studying minorities and their involvement in voluntary associations, also find
that ethnicity proves to be an important variable in predicting social participation. Surprisingly, Black men and women have higher rates of participation than their Anglo counterparts. On the other hand, Mexican-Americans, regardless of sex, have lower rates of participation than either Anglos or Blacks. These findings, the researchers argue, do not support the 'social isolation' theory which suggests that minority peoples rarely participate in voluntary associations because they are set off from society. Rather, the findings support either the 'compensatory theory' or the 'ethnic community' theory, or both.\(^5\) Several other studies also report that Black people are more likely to participate than Whites (Mayo, 1950; Babchuk and Thompson, 1962; Olsen, 1970).

Findings contrary to the above have been made by others. For example, Greely (1974) finds that Irish Catholics and Jews are the most active groups; Irish Protestants and Blacks, the least active. He also notes that the impact of religioethnic background on political participation does not go away when social class is held constant. Similar findings are made by Hyman and Wright (1971) who show that Black Americans are less likely to

\(\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\)Compensatory theory' argues that lower-status persons participate in associations for prestige, ego enhancement, and achievement, restricted or denied them in the larger society. On the other hand, 'ethnic community theory' suggests that those in a given ethnic community develop a consciousness of each other and hence cohesiveness because of outside pressure. They thus form groups to deal with these pressures (Williams et al., 1973:638).
belong to voluntary organizations than Whites.

Another study (Vrga, 1971) examines the differential associational involvement of successive ethnic immigrants. Vrga finds that, contrary to the thesis that isolation is characterized by "few memberships in lodges and fraternal organizations," the immigrant's feeling of isolation may lead to the organization of associations in which he finds comfort, a feeling of acceptance, and in which he may be actively involved.

(iii) Age

Using data from the 1972 CPS American Election Study and the 1974 NORC General Society Survey, Cutler (1976) studies age differences in voluntary association membership. After removing the effects of income and education, the resulting patterns show increasing levels of membership through the age range 35-44 and then either generally stable or increasing levels through the age range 75+. Similar findings are noted for both males and females, although males have higher association membership at all age levels.

Scott (1957), in a case study of a town in New England, finds that the general influence of age upon membership is not significant. However, there is a slight tendency for an increase in/of persons 40-54 years of age.

Curtis (1971) notes that affiliation per se and multiple memberships (minors included or excluded) tend
to be lower for young adults; memberships rise gradually with age, reach its peak and level off in the late forties, and gradually decline in the fifties and later years. The relationship between age and participation may be explained by Hausknecht (1962) who, in his analysis of two United States national samples, concludes that the relationship may be an illustration of the integration of the young American into his society as he assumes career and family responsibilities, and a gradual detachment from society as he approaches old age.

(iv) Type and length of residence are somewhat inconsistent. Edwards and his associates (1973) studying type of residence and social participation, find that when socio-demographic characteristics are controlled, mobile home residents participate less in voluntary associations, but more in some forms of informal activities (e.g. neighboring and kin visitation). The researchers feel that in so far as participation in voluntary associations reflects integration into a community, mobile-home dwellers are less socially integrated than single-family residents. But when considering integration into an informal network of neighbors, mobile-home residents have a substantially greater number of ties.
Starting with the hypothesis that long-time residents in the community are more likely to be involved in formal organizations, Wright and Hyman (1957) note that in one of the towns they studied, persons born in the town are hardly more likely to belong to voluntary associations than those who arrived more recently. However, Zimmer (1955), in a study of married men in a mid-western community of 20,000 finds that membership/formal organizations increases directly with length of residence in the community. Further, the relationship persists when age, occupation and education are controlled.

(v) Sex

Evidence on the relationship between sex and social participation is rather contradictory. For example, in Scott's (1957) study, male affiliation is 75 percent compared to 56 percent for female. However, in Hausknecht's (1962) study, there are only slight differences between the sexes. In another study, Booth (1972) claims that his data suggest a more complex pattern than the above findings. He examines the influence of sex/voluntary organization participation, friendship dyads and kin relations in two urban communities. Classifying voluntary organizations into "instrumental" and "expressive" types, he finds that more men (44%) than women (13%) belong to one or more instrumental groups. Men
dominate the leadership of instrumental groups as well. In expressive groups, however, women are more active than men. However, men exceed women in the number of voluntary association memberships, though not in terms of commitment of time to group activities. When female memberships exceed the males' (among the unmarried, unemployed and disabled), their monthly time in associations far exceeds the males'. When job and marital-status variables are introduced as controls, each control variable influences male participation in the same way: namely, blue collar, unemployed and unmarried men are less active in both instrumental and expressive groups than white collar, employed and married men. While the three variables influence (in the same directions) the female's activity with instrumental groups, they do not affect her ties with expressive groups.

The Consequences of Organizational Participation

Social participation (which includes participation in voluntary associations, community affairs, and church organizations) has been found to be markedly correlated with voting turnout in elections (Olsen, 1972). In addition, Olsen points out that the relationship between social participation and voting remains moderately strong after controlling for age, education, political contacts, political interests and party identification. This relationship is
supported by Williams and his associates (1973) who note that participation enhances the likelihood of voting and actively participating in the polity.

Some evidence for the influence of interorganizational ties on community influence is provided by Perrucci and Pilisuk (1970), who note that interorganizational leaders (those who hold high "upper-executive" positions in four or more organizations) are more likely than those who hold less number of such positions to be identified as having a general reputation for power as well as having involved in past crucial community issues. In addition, these interorganizational leaders are also shown to be more likely to be similar in their views on community issues, and more likely to see each other socially.

Using Perrucci and Pilisuk's perspective, Beaulieu (1982), in a study of nine southern counties, notes that in some of the counties, a moderate association between organizational status and level of influence is clearly documented even when controlling for personal assets. However, considering all the nine counties studied, his study fails to provide consistent evidence of the positive role of organizational leadership status on level of reputed influence. One of the explanations offered for the finding is that counties may have different degrees of "openness" (the access that individuals have to the decision-making process).
Beaulieu points out that in some counties, the leadership structure may not be accessible to most individuals regardless of their positions in the resource network. That is, decisions are made by people who are formally elected. Consequently, access to the decision-making process may well be available through this formal channel only.

**Some Psychological Correlates of Participation**

Participation in associations has been found to be related to a more favorable self-image and decreased feelings of powerlessness and isolation (Williams et al., 1973). This is probably because participants learn how to present grievances, and acquire knowledge of how government agencies operate.

Rogers (1971) has noted that participation is also associated with "dynamic" factors such as degree of understanding about the organization, having a say in running the organization, personality traits and perceived influence.

Participation is also found to be related to community attitude. Freeman and his associates (1957), for example, have shown that positive feelings about community progress, leadership and willingness to work are significantly associated with membership in voluntary associations.

**General Trend in Organizational Participation**

After having discussed the different studies and their findings, it is felt that an examination/trends in
organizational participation would be worthwhile. Hyman and Wright (1971), for example, have noted that a small but noteworthy increase in the percentage of American adults who belong to voluntary associations has occurred since the mid-1950's. Replications also confirm a major generalization of the earlier study that such membership is not characteristic of the majority of American adults. The 1962 findings show that 57% of adults in the nation have no memberships and that only 4% report memberships in four or more associations, excluding unions. For 1967, the corresponding figures are 46% with no memberships and 6% with four or more memberships. It is noted that one's current economic status appears to have more effect upon membership than one's station of origin. In addition, the trend toward increased membership applies to both Black and White adults but is somewhat more evident among the former.

In his review of previous research, Rogers (1971) summarizes that besides the strong influence of positive community attitudes on participation, social background factors such as income and education are strongly related to affiliation. Rogers also argues that membership involvement in voluntary associations has, for many years, been investigated by sociologists interested in social participation and by practitioners interested in how to motivate members to participate. However, there has been little attempt to
integrate the findings of the several empirical studies into a theory of membership involvement. As a result, he feels that "...... the many independent investigations of the relationship between involvement and factors associated with it have not materially increased our understanding of involvement ......" (Rogers, 1971:341).

The review of the literature has revealed that the findings are as divergent as there are differences in study designs and objectives. However, some findings seem to be common to most studies: voluntary association participation is strongly related to income, education, and ethnicity. Also, participation in formal organizations in general is associated with influence in the community. What is needed now is, therefore, a theoretical framework that will synthesize the divergent concepts into a more comprehensive theory of associational participation.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

All theories proceed from one or more assumptions about the nature of man or the nature of reality. Thus, whether it is the consensus model, the conflict model, or symbolic interactionism (or whatever isms men may invent), what one chooses as one's theoretical perspective depends on those assumptions.

The consensus model assumes that society is a natural boundary-maintaining system of action. It is transcendent, an entity sui generis, greater than and different from the sum of its parts. Man is seen as homo duplex, i.e., half egoistic (self-nature), half altruistic (socialized nature), ever in need of restraints for the collective good. The dominant values are those for the social good: balance, stability, order, and "moving equilibrium" (Horton, 1966:701-13).

The conflict model sees society as a contested struggle between groups with opposed aims and perspectives. Change is looked upon with a positive attitude. Man is

---

The word 'reality' here refers to "social reality" and not to Ultimate Reality or the "real" reality, the latter being outside the scope of this research. The former lays no claim to ultimate validity; it refers only to what is generally "thought" or "known" as "real" in a particular social setting (Berger and Luckmann, 1967:1-3). An Islamic Sociology, for instance, may approach the idea of social reality from the all-embracing concept of Ultimate Reality, but again this is outside the domain of this research.
homo laborans - existential, the active creator of himself and society through practical and autonomous social action (Horton, 1966: 701-13; Olsen, 1970: 60). On the other hand, symbolic interactionism concentrates on social processes and tries to keep the individual at the center (Blumer, 1969). It is the argument of symbolic interactionists that the core of social reality is the active human being trying to make sense of a social situation and give it meaning. In other words, actors define the meaning of situations. Also, "the definition of the situation is not merely where the interaction is, but a piece of the action itself" (Ball, 1972: 63).

Each of these theories (not to mention several others) has been used to explain human social behavior. As is commonly agreed, the task of science, or rather the science of sociology include describing, explaining, as well as predicting human behavior. Now, it is felt that each of the above mentioned models does not and cannot adequately explain human behavior for a number of reasons. While one model may make unrealistic assumptions about the nature of man or social reality and thus distort reality, to another might be theoretically inadequate/handle certain events that occur in the particular social organization concerned. For example, it is often mentioned that the consensus model cannot handle (or adequately handle) such events as revolutions or social change.
With regard to the understanding of participation in voluntary associations, it is believed that some form of synthesis of the above mentioned models would be helpful in increasing our knowledge of associational behavior. This means that there is a need to put together the different slices of reality which have been exaggerated by each of these models.

The questions one asks about voluntary associations or other community organizations depend on one's research interests. The research question(s) will influence the approach one takes, and will probably define the model one will utilize.

Two of the more important questions or areas of concern in the sociology of associational behavior are "who" participates in voluntary associations and "why?" Why are some individuals or community actors more active than others in participation? The "who" question is important because there might be certain groups or strata in society which are excluded from participation due to some reasons. For example, these groups may feel powerless to change the world and therefore, remain inactive (Hausknecht, 1962). The "why" question on the other hand, would seek to explain/phenomena. Thus, it would be useful to know if certain individuals are active because of their personal resources or because they happen to be located in a certain resource networks that
properly belong to organizations (Perucci and Pilisuk, 1970; Beaulieu, 1980). The answer or answers to these questions again depend on one's perspective.

This study argues that participation in voluntary associations must be explained by reference to both personal assets or characteristics as well as structural or ecological factors, rather than by exclusive reference to either one of these factors. In other words, social reality is the result of both the volition of actors as well as the constraints of structure.

"Structure" and Patterns of Behavior

The notion of structure is central to sociological analysis. Because of this, it would be useful to dwell on the concept for a moment. According to Blau (1974:615) social structure carries a wide variety of meanings. It may refer to social differentiation, relations of production, forms of associations, value integration, functional interdependence, statuses and roles, institutions, or combinations of these and other factors. However, for Blau, social structure consists of component parts/their interrelations, the parts consisting of groups or classes of people, such as men and women, ethnic groups, or socio-economic strata. More precisely, he says, the component parts refer to the positions of people in different groups.
and strata. In short, by social structure, he refers to population distributions among social positions along various lines—positions that affect people's role relations and social interaction.

Connected to structure is Blau's idea of 'parameters'. A structural parameter is any criterion implicit in the social distinctions people make in their social interaction. Age, sex, and socioeconomic status illustrate parameters. Such differences are assumed to affect people's role relations. For example, as Blau points out, research has shown that (though this sounds obvious) social intercourse is less frequent between blacks and whites than within each group, and that differences in socioeconomic status inhibit friendships. In this connection, Laumann (1973:5) has suggested that in order to understand "the underlying dimensionality of macrostructures," one must accept a crucial postulate:

Similarities in status, beliefs, and behavior facilitate the formation of intimate (consens-ual) relationships among incumbents of social positions; the more dissimilar two positions are in status, attitudes, beliefs, and behavior of their incumbents, the less likely the formation of intimate (or consensual)

7The pattern or structure of relations among individual actors is termed microstructure (Laumann, 1973:4). Laumann uses this term when referring to an individual actor as the focal point of structure and his pattern of social relations. By aggregating into appropriate categories individual actors who share similar social positions one can determine the characteristic pattern of relationships among these categories of social positions and thus be in a position to describe the macrostructure of a large community or society.
relationships and, consequently, the "farther away" they are from one another in the structure.

In other words, position in the social structure has great influence for group formation, as well as for patterns of behavior, attitudes and aspirations (Rothman, 1978; Gilbert and Kahl, 1982; Laumann, 1973). As Laumann points out, social scientists, following the early formulations of Weber and Marx, have been concerned with demonstrations of the myriad implications of man's socio-economic position for his other objective and subjective experiences and characteristics.

Weber (1971) referring to class, 'status' and 'party' speaks of "life chances", "life fates", and "style of life". The typical chance for a supply of goods, external living conditions and personal life experiences refers to one's "class situation", which is economically determined. In contrast to "class situation", Weber designates as "status situation" every typical component of the "life fate" of men that is determined by a specific social estimation of honor. A specific style of life is expected from all those who wish to belong to a circle of status honor. Linked with this expectation are restrictions on 'social' intercourse. For example, these restrictions may confine normal marriages to within the status circle.
'Parties' according to Weber, live in a house of 'power'. Parties may exist in a social 'club as well as in a state. They may aim at an ideal and/or personal power, honor for the leader and followers of the party. Importantly, parties are only possible within communities that are 'societalized', that is, which have some rational order and a staff of persons available who are ready to enforce it (Weber, 1971:196-201). The point to be stressed here is that Weber's scheme permits individuals to be located on at least three hierarchies of inequality.

The idea of how position in the social structure affects behavior is also reinforced by Veblen's (1971) Theory of the Leisure Class. Veblen argues that the owners of wealth, having freed themselves from the need to work, made abstention from work a characteristic of decency. Stated otherwise, through conspicuous leisure, the rich demonstrates that the upper class is exempt from productive labor.

In other words, social classes, races/ethnicity, occupations, and sexes are socially defined positions - which sociologists call a social division of labor. More importantly, "the division of labor means that all members of a society are not expected to know the same things, perform the same tasks, have the same responsibilities" (Rothman, 1978:41; emphasis added). This introduces us to the concept of roles - distinctive patterns of duties and rights through which socially defined positions are
distinguished. On the micro-level, as Rothman says, there are the slave and monarch, husband and wife, mother-child, etc. On the macro-level, for example, there is the occupational interdependence between urban dwellers and agricultural producers. In this regard, the question that logically arises is how are individuals allocated or assigned to different positions? Two mechanisms have been identified: ascription and achievement (see Linton, 1936; Parsons, 1951; Mayhew, 1968). Ascription and achievement are then said to 'determine' membership in such groups as political parties, gangs and cliques, clubs, trade unions, or special interest groups.

Recalling Weber's concept of 'life chances', it may also be asserted that membership in voluntary associations is just one of several life chances related to birth, education, health care, life and death, etc. As Rothman (1978) says, life chances are events and/or experiences in the life cycle with the potential of altering (enhancing or diminishing) the quality of life. Thus, life chances are, in effect, probability statements linking the probability of experiences to positions in the system of stratification.

The correlates of structural inequality with regard to education, health/mortality, divorce rates, etc. are well documented (see Broom and associates, 1981:304; Rothman, 1978:103-107).
Thus, by examining a group's access to a certain life-chance or experience (e.g. associational participation), one can know its life-chances vis-a-vis other groups.

Life chances are also linked to "life styles" - patterns of thinking, acting, feeling. Under these patterns one finds differences in language usage, consumption patterns, clique and friendship patterns, including membership in formal associations. According to Gilbert and Kahl (1982), such differences in life styles and values emerge and are maintained through two important variables: socialization and association. When people of similar prestige or class associate more often with one another than with persons of other classes, they create identifiable strata that generate their own special subculture. Through socialization, the patterns of association are passed on to succeeding generations. Thus, as Warner and his associates (1949a) show, most associations draw their membership from only one or two strata, and the prestige of the association matches that of its members.

Referring to the Jonesville study, Warner and associates point out that the upper class patronized the county club, three exclusive women's clubs, and certain professional and business groups. The lower-middle class joined civic clubs - the Rotary, women's clubs, educational and health groups. The white-collar workers, on the other hand, tended
to join either civic clubs or associations catering for the "little fellows" (Lions, Masons, Eastern Star, Church groups). For the foreman and skilled workers, associations do not seem to hold much hope. Being less active in formal associations, they might belong to a church or a lodge or a labor union, but in general, they prefer to stay at home (Gilbert and Kahl, 1982:146).

The differential association involvement with regard to sex, ethnicity, age, or length of residence, etc., can now be seen as natural consequences of certain values, beliefs, stereotypes, expectations or practices that are generated, maintained or institutionalized in social structure. It is in this light that the findings as discussed in the review of the literature can be understood. For example, by way of summary, persons with high SES characteristics are expected to be more active in voluntary associations. This is probably due to a number of reasons. It may be that they are more conscious of their upper class status and thus may utilize associations to perpetuate their life styles, or to gain influence. In addition, they may also become involved because they think they are more aware of social events and thus feel responsible for improving social conditions through their membership and active participation in voluntary associations.
As far as sex differences in participation are concerned, it may be stated that expectations with regard to the sexes may influence membership in certain types of associations (e.g., instrumental or expressive, as discussed earlier, Booth, 1972; Scott, 1957). Ethnic differences may be accounted for by differences in subcultures or beliefs about one's ability to influence events as a result of one's location in the social structure (Antunes and Gaitz, 1957; Williams and associates, 1973). With regards age differences, it may be hypothesized that they coincide with different stages in the life cycle with their corresponding roles, duties and responsibilities, which are then reflected in differential patterns of involvements in associations (Curtis, 1971; Hausknecht, 1971). As for length of residence, it may be argued that the longer one's residence is in a given community, the more socially integrated one becomes (i.e., linked with certain groups or positions in the community). This link should manifest itself in a certain pattern of associational behavior (Edwards and associates, 1973; Wright and Hyman, 1957; Zimmer, 1955).

On the macrostructural level, a community with a high level of economic development is expected to be associated with a greater diversity of interest groups and educational attainment and occupational differentiation (Blau, 1974:629).
Hence, correspondingly, a higher level of associational participation is expected in such a community.

**Associational Involvement as Intentioned Behavior**

To say that patterns of behavior (whether they be those of participation in associations, cliques, or other informal ties) are determined or explained by reference to structural positions, ascribed/achieved characteristics, or roles, does not fully explain the behavior. As Weber says, "social reality is not merely to be explained by mechanical analogies to the natural world, but must be understood (Verstehen) by imagining oneself into the experiences of men and women as they act out their own worlds" (Collins and Makowsky, 1978:115).

Whether social structure is a sociological construct, or is inherent in reality itself, it is an arrangement of relations among conscious, acting persons (Holzner and Marx, 1979:117). Holzner and Marx suggest that society has two interdependent aspects: the **situational** structure and the **orientational** structure. The former sees society as a distribution of persons in environment, settings or situations. The orientational structure of society includes the images its members have of it, the distribution of beliefs about social facts, and the knowledge and evaluation of groups or institutions. Social structure hangs together through relations of trust and legitimacy.
The ecology of settings (situations), according to Holzner and Marx, is shaped by the social division of labor, social differentiation, and the availability of power that can be brought to bear upon them. It is the social structure of power that results in specific allocations of situations to persons. The situational structure thus implies a conception of social structure in which individuals and groups attempt to control and stabilize the situations with which to deal. Associational participation may be conceived of as one of the "strategies for situation control, in relation to the actual distribution of situations and their demands for action" (Holzner and Marx, 1979:120).

The mention of the words "power" and "power arrangements" in society does not necessarily mean that this study utilizes a utilitarian, power-oriented perspective. Instead, it is argued that power is used by actors as a tool to implement their beliefs, values or images of the desirable state of society. Indeed, Wilkinson (1972:47) characterizes community development as a process in which community leaders view the local structure as a "manipulable tool" for achieving their "images" of future states.
The quest for an answer to the question of 'why' an actor involves himself in voluntary associations brings us back to the assumptions about the nature of men and of social reality. In a Parsonsian sense, and as opposed to purely utilitarian, power-oriented theories of structure inequality, this study assumes that "a stratification can be justified only to the extent that its distribution/income, power, expertise, influence, and prestige follows rules which/they themselves incorporated in a generally shared system of values" (Munch, 1982:816). Legitimate stratification arises in the zone of "interpenetration" between economic acquisitiveness, acquisition of political power, professional competence, and communally grounded ethnics (Munch, 1982:815).

As applied to voluntary association involvement, the above idea assumes that actors are motivated partly by self-interest and partly by altruism. Actors participate in voluntary associations not only to satisfy their needs (which may be psychological, biological, or material) but

---

9In the U.S. where the dominant ideology is capitalism or liberalism (Rossides, 1978), actors may in general, be motivated more by self-interest than altruism. Galaskiewicz (1979), for example, assumes that actors are motivated mainly by self-interest and rarely by altruism. This assumption is reflected in many other works in Western social science. However, in a theocratic state, or a state where actors are less motivated by self-interest, one may find a greater proportion of people whose lives are dominated by strivings for the common good, or for what is viewed as good. (Of course, the synics may still argue that even the altruists are selfish as they are altruistic because they want to go to heaven!)
because they want to achieve something considered good for the community. Viewed from this perspective, associational involvement may also be regarded as a vehicle to community power and influence, the latter being used, not necessarily mainly for self-aggrandizement but as a mechanism for achieving the common good such as community development, as mentioned earlier.

With the above framework in mind, the main ideas and concepts may be recaptured in the form of a model.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 1**

*Note:*

Arrows with bold lines indicate strong hypothesized relationships, while those with dotted lines indicate uncertain relationships.
The above diagram seeks to explain the nature of participation in voluntary associations by referring to the structural properties of the community as well as to characteristics of individual actors. As mentioned earlier, it is proposed that both the individual characteristics (socio-economic status, length of residence, age) and community characteristics (population size, degree of urbanization, racial composition) be examined as possible determinants of participation in voluntary associations. Community characteristics here would be the 'structure' - the "limiting factors" (Young and Larson, 1970). Within these limits, the opportunities for interaction will influence an actor's 'image' of the community as well as his participation in its organizations.

In addition, there is also the situational structure, which refers to the distribution of persons, groups or organizations in particular settings. This includes organization diversity. The individual actor will have to deal with this structure in his attempt to control and stabilize the situation.

The model also shows the relationship of participations and influence. Actors may regard associations as a means to the acquisition of community influence (Merton, 1968). Through networks of associations, an actor could gain access to community power. Hence, participation in voluntary associations is expected to raise one's level of influence.
With the aid of the model, the foregoing discussions may be summarized in terms of a series of research hypotheses:

1) The higher an actor's socioeconomic status, the greater his degree of participation in voluntary associations. (The assumption here is that persons with higher socioeconomic status are more aware of the way society runs, and feel more responsible or committed. However, it is admitted that some actors may be involved mainly for reasons of self-interest).

2) There is a curvilinear relationship between age and membership in voluntary associations. (This relationship reflects an actor's involvement with society as he matures, and subsequent detachment as he approaches old age. Corresponding changes in roles are implied; Cutler, 1976; Curtis, 1971; Hausknecht, 1971).

3) The longer an actor's length of residence, the greater his participation in voluntary associations. (The assumption is that length of residence affects one's integration into the community. This influence one's values as well as social position in the community, which in turn should appear as differences in

4) The more urbanized (or economically developed) the community, the greater the degree of participation in voluntary associations. (The rationale is that urbanization is associated with higher educational levels, and "democratization" of social and political life, which should encourage participation; Wright and Hyman, 1958; Curtis, 1971; Bell and Force, 1956).

5) Communities with a higher proportion of Whites tend to have higher levels of voluntary association participation.

6) The greater the community size, the greater the number and types of voluntary associations available to join. Therefore, the greater number produces greater opportunities for participation and greater participation. (Size is a structural dimension that has been shown to be related to associational behavior; Curtis, 1971).

7) The more active a community actor is in voluntary associations, the more likely is he to be identified as influential. (This
hypothesis assumes that a certain 'image' of an influential man is conveyed to a group of actors, intentionally or otherwise, by ego through his membership and active involvement in several associations).

In order to empirically examine these hypotheses they need to be translated into operational terms. This, then, is the concern of the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The Setting

This study uses data collected for the S-120 Regional Research Project which includes data that are relevant to the conceptual issues raised in this dissertation. The data are from twelve rural counties located in six southern states. The twelve counties were drawn for the most part from a sample of counties studied in a precursor to the S-120 project, Southern Regional Project S-79.

For the S-120 sample, each state selected a minimum of two counties or parishes from the earlier sample, based upon the amount of development experienced between 1950 and 1970. One of the counties was to have experienced a relatively "successful" amount of development based on economic indicators, while another a relatively low or "steady-state" development. This provided a minimal basis for comparisons. The twelve counties for which complete data are available were selected for the present analysis. It should be noted that the selection of counties was not intended to provide a sample that would generalize to the south as a region. The counties selected, however, should provide a sufficient number of individual case studies to permit inferences about specific aspects concerning participation in rural areas in general.
Sampling Procedures

The sampling procedures were designed to identify local leaders in each of the parishes or counties who were actively involved with decision-making in general areas of health and economic development. The field procedure involved what is called the "snowball method", a technique which begins with a list of respondents generated by a few "knowledgeables". The knowledgeables for the regional project were to be the following or equivalent: (1) the chief county administrative official (i.e., chairman of county commissioners, president of the police jury, etc.); (2) the editor of a major local newspaper; and (3) the mayor of the largest community in the county. Each of these persons was asked to identify what he or she considered to be major local development projects in the county or parish during the previous few years. In addition, and importantly, each was asked to provide a list of those persons who were the most active relative to local decision-making efforts.

---

Kadushin (1968) discusses the merits of this method for uncovering "social circles."
Local Development Projects

The determination of the local development projects upon which to focus research efforts was important for several reasons. First, one of the overall objectives of the regional project was to attempt to link local decision-making processes to specific development projects in order to get data on concrete and observable events (i.e., the relative success or failure of projects). Second, by focusing on specific development areas and projects, the sampling process would have some focus and thus closure could be brought to the snowball/procedure. And third, by specifying different areas and projects, one could identify the relevant formal organizations involved in local action.

The selection of specific local projects was left to each of the regional project researchers for his or her state sample, but each followed specific guidelines. At least one local project was to be selected which fell within 'general' economic development and another one which fell within general health development. The exact definitions of these categories were not specified/allow researchers latitude to select situations which were relevant to the
development of those areas in which they occurred. In addition to the information concerning local development projects gained through the interviews with knowledgeable, researchers reviewed local documents and three years of newspaper accounts to familiarize themselves with recent activities and to aid in deciding which development projects were relevant or at least received attention in the press.}

**Local Decision-makers**

The lists of local decision-makers provided by the knowledgeable were combined and each person on the composite list was interviewed (the instrument will be discussed below) and asked to study the list and to indicate if any other persons should be added to the list (i.e., each person was asked if in his/her opinion persons not on the list were important to local decision-making activities associated with economic or health development). Those who were mentioned more than two times were added to the list and interviewed. The number of decision-

---

11 Economic and Health Development were selected by the members of the regional research committee because these topics maximized the collective interests of members.

12 See Laumann and Pappi (1973) for a discussion of the importance of selecting issues for sociometric research.
makers interviewed for each county ranged from 21 to 43. Interviews from a total of 442 decision-makers in twelve counties, therefore, provide an important part of the data to be analyzed in this thesis.

The Instrument

An interview schedule (see Appendix I) was used to request information from respondents. Specifically, the respondents were asked to name individuals, groups, and organizations which were influential in the areas of economic and health development, and to rank them in terms of the amount of influence they had in each development area. Respondents were asked about the nature of their contacts with other actors (with whom one is in contact, how frequently, and who initiates the contact). They were asked to rank the three among the individuals named whom they thought had the most influence in each development area. Finally, information on involvement in organizations (name and type of organization, membership status, responsibilities, attendance at meetings) was requested.

To bring the data to manageable proportions, "health" development is subsequently omitted from the analysis.
Research Design: Variables and Relationships

The basic research design for this study is suggested by the conceptual model as shown in Figure 1. While analysis focuses on the influence of ecological, situational and individual factors on voluntary organization participation, the relationship between participation and local influence is also an important aspect of the research effort. As can be seen in Figure 1, the relationships depicted in the conceptual model require an analysis of variables at the county, individual actor, and aggregate levels. Each of these levels is discussed as different analytical questions are addressed. For instance, the relationship between the ecological setting and the "situational structure" is examined by treating counties as units of analysis. On the other hand, when dealing with the relationship between socioeconomic characteristics and participation, the unit of analysis is individual actors. In addition, in order to gain an overview of general tendencies which may not appear in individual counties, data on all individuals are aggregated across counties.

---

14The use of 'counties' (as opposed to 'communities', which was the focus of earlier discussions) is conceptually justified by the fact that the projects treated are not only county wide but involve decision-making at a county level. Further, it is also assumed that any given county would contain the elements of a 'community' as identified by Christenson and Robinson (1980:6): "People, within a geographically bounded area, involved in social inter-
Operationalization of the Variables

(a) Definition of Voluntary Associations

Following Scott (1957) and Bell and Force (1956), a voluntary association is a group of persons relatively organized to pursue mutual and personal interests or to achieve common goals, usually non-profit in nature. Identifiable by a name, it has qualifying criteria for membership, a written constitution, offices filled by election or selection by representatives so empowered by by-laws, and periodic meetings frequently in a regular meeting place. Voluntary associations do not include cliques, gangs, economic concerns, governmental agencies, schools, and associations instituted by fiat. They also mean the same thing as those defined as "formal groups," "formal associations," "clubs," "societies," and "special interest groups."

(b) Degree of Participation in Voluntary Associations

Each respondent is asked to list the groups or organizations that he/she participated in during the twelve months preceding the interview (summer, 1977). The respondent is also required to indicate his membership status, attendance record, and responsibilities (e.g. officer or committee member).\(^{15}\) Summary participation scores are action, and with one or more psychological ties with each other and with the place they live."

\(^{15}\) One way of analyzing participation is by dividing the respondents into "joiners" and "non-joiners." Following Freeman and his associates (1957), the cutting point is two associations, so that membership in such semi-voluntary associations as religious groups and unions could be
calculated for each respondent following a method suggested by Olsen (1972). For each organization listed, the following values are assigned: membership only = 1, attendance of at least one-fourth of the scheduled meetings = 2, and serving as an officer or committee member = 3. The sum of these values for each actor is treated as the degree of organizational participation (hereafter referred to as General Participation Score).

Another measure that is used for participation involves scores assigned to individuals for their membership in "influential" organizations. This score (called Influential Organization Score) takes into account the perceived ranking of organizations considered "influential" in specific economic development issues. These organizations are first ranked by the respondents in terms of the amount of influence the organizations had in some aspect of economic development (1 = most influential, 2 = second most influential, ........, 6 = least influential). The different rankings given to a particular organization by different actors are then summed, and this sum divided by the sample size (the number of actors in each county) gives the standardized ranking for each organization.

In other words, the joiners are members of at least one clearly voluntary association. Those who belong to three or more associations would be termed "active joiners." It is also useful to make a distinction between
Now, if an actor is a member of a particular influential organization, he is assigned a participation score, which is actually the standardized ranking of that particular organization. If he joins two or more influential organizations, then the total ranking of these organizations are assigned to the actor. Thus, the influential organization membership score not only reflects the number of influential organizations joined by a given actor, but also the degree of perceived influence of these organizations.

The rationale behind using this measure is that it may not only account for actors who are active in a specific as opposed to a general field, but also may show that membership in specifically influential organizations, in contrast with membership in any given set of organizations, lend the actor greater prominence by virtue of the organizational resources inherent in such organizations (see Galaskiewicz, 1979; Dahl, 1961; Perrucci and Pilisuk, 1970; Laumann and Pappi, 1976). Also, it is assumed that access to such resources or other "rewards" may lead the actor to greater participation (Warner and Heffernan, 1967).

---

simple membership and active participation. The former would just entail a simple count of the number of associations joined, while the latter would include officerships and committeeships (Cutler, 1976).
(c) **Degree of Influence**

Level of community influence is measured in two ways. First, others' perceptions of an actor's influence in general and specific economic issue areas are determined. Respondents are required to select and rank the three most influential persons among the individuals cited as involved in each of the above areas. Each actor would then have an influence score based upon aggregating the evaluations of all other actors (this score shall later be referred to as *Influence Perception*).

The second measure of influence is based upon the nature of contacts between an actor and all other actors. This measure involves the creation of summary contact scores for an actor's overall amount of contact in the community. Contact reports are arranged in a square matrix with row and column totals corresponding to each respondent. Column totals comprise contacts received by him. The number of incoming contacts (contacts received) divided by row totals \((n-1, \text{ where } n = \text{ number of influentials involved in the ranking})\) gives a proportion, (hereafter called *Contact Ratio*) which is, in effect, a summary measure of an actor's contact across all others in the matrix. A bigger ratio indicates that an actor reports receiving relatively more contacts than all other actors.
Conceptual justification for this measure is provided by Pool and Kochen (1978/79) who argue that while people find it hard to recall contacts in general, they will selectively recall contacts with important people or those with more prestige. Based on this observation, it is assumed that actors with more influence will report receiving higher average contacts than those with less influence.

(d) **Classification of Associations**

Following Gullett and his associates (1982), associations are classified into three main types: governmental, business/industry, and voluntary. As pointed out by Gullett and his associates, rural communities frequently do not have a significant complement of voluntary organizations that provide local services and functions. Consequently, these communities must depend upon local government, or other organizations, to take initiatives that would normally be taken by voluntary associations.

---

16 This typology is based on those developed by Blau and Scott (1962) and Hausknecht (1962). Blau and Scott's classification is based on *cui bono*, i.e., who benefits from the association. Using this criterion, they identified four main types of associations: (1) mutual benefit associations, (2) business concerns, (3) service organizations: civic or service organizations; mutual benefit associations: lodges, churches, and others.
elsewhere. These considerations suggest that it is perhaps relevant to involve broad categories of organizations (e.g. governmental, business-industry, and voluntary) that might be related to local action. In addition, it is felt that this classification is capable of reflecting the relative organizational diversity within each county.

(e) **Individual Characteristics**

The variables that are used are occupation, education, length of residence and age. Occupation is divided into two dummy variables, say $D_1$ (where 1 = professional, 0 if "otherwise") and $D_2$ (scored 1 if "business", 0 if "otherwise"). Education is treated as the number of years of school ranging from 0-17. Length of residence is treated in number of years while age is treated as a dummy variable (1 = 35-55 age group, 0 = others).

(f) **Ecological Characteristics**

Ecological characteristics of a community involve three variables - population size, degree of urbanization, and proportion of whites. The "degree of urbanization" of a county is based on the U.S. Census (1960-1970) definition of "percent urban." An urbanized area is defined as consisting of a central city, or cities, and surrounding closely settled territory. The criteria are: (i) (a) A central city of 50,000 or more in 1960, in a special census conducted by the Census Bureau between 1960 and
1970, or in the 1970 Census; OR (b) two cities having contiguous boundaries and constituting a single community with a combined population of at least 50,000 with the smaller city having a population of at least 15,000; (ii) surrounding closely settled territory, including the following (but excluding the rural portion of "extended cities"): (a) incorporated places of 2500 inhabitants or more; (b) incorporated places with fewer than 2500 inhabitants provided that each has a closely settled area of 100 housing units or more; and (c) contiguous small parcels of land normally less than 1 square mile having a population density of 1000 people or more per square mile.

Another important structural variable associated with participation is the racial composition of a community. Racial composition is measured by the proportion of whites in a given county. This figure is obtained from the County and City Data Book, 1977.

(g) Situational Structure

Situational structure is measured for each county using two indicators. First, the total number of organizations mentioned by respondents as having something to do with local development is treated as an indicator of the structural availability of organizations. The greater the number of organizations listed by respondents, the
greater the structural opportunity to participate. It should be noted that this estimate is based upon respondents' assessments of available organizations and not necessarily on their actual membership to them.

The second measure of situational structure is an indication of the organizational diversity found within each county. Essentially, this measure is calculated using the mean square contingency coefficient, $M$, and then converting this value to the Cramer's $V$. The formula is as follows:

$$M = \frac{J}{N} \sum_{j} \frac{n_j^2}{N (J - 1)}$$

where $J$ is the number of columns (there are three columns - governmental, business, voluntary), $n_j$ = the value in each of the cells, e.g. the number of governmental organizations in county $A$; $N$ = the total number of organizations in each county (i.e. governmental, business, plus voluntary organizations).

Then $\sqrt{M} = \text{Cramer's } V$, a measure of the dispersion or heterogeneity of the organizations in a given county. The value of the Cramer's $V$ ranges from 0 to 1, with zero indicating complete homogeneity and 1 indicating complete heterogeneity. Thus, suppose a particular county has six governmental organizations, one business organization, and two voluntary organizations, then the computation is as follows:
\[ M = \frac{3}{9} \left( 6^2 + 1^2 + 2^2 \right) - 9 = \frac{3}{9} (41) - 9 \]
\[ = \frac{18}{9 (2)} = 0.2592 \]
\[ \sqrt{M} = \sqrt{0.2592} = 0.5091 \]

To put this figure in percentage form, it is multiplied by 100, which gives 50.91 percent. Thus, this particular county is 50.91 percent heterogeneous in terms of its organizational dispersion.\(^\text{17}\)

**Data Analysis**

The variables suggested in the conceptual model is analyzed using the General Linear Models (GLM) procedures available in the SAS computer system for data analysis (Barr et al., 1976). More specifically, the analysis focuses on the examination of the independent variables specified above as determinants of organizational participation and influence using a multiple regression analytical strategy. The GLM procedure is well suited for the problem at hand because it is able to handle both classification and continuous variables and to estimate the relative effects of specific independent variables on the

\(^{17}\) The application of this formula for the problem at hand is made in consultation with Professor George Tracy of the Experimental Statistics Department, Louisiana State University. See also Cramer (1946).
dependent variable. Particular attention is paid to assessing the differential influence of structural versus individual factors on participation.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In a broad sense, the aim of this study as outlined earlier, is to explain the phenomenon of organizational participation. For this purpose the preceding sections have been devoted to the identification/relevant concepts, variables, and their operationalizations. Three broad categories of variables were considered to influence participation: ecological, situational, and individual variables. Several hypotheses pertaining to participation were then outlined. In short, the main task of the study is to investigate the relationship between the variable or variables in each of the categories outlined above and organizational participation. It was also argued that an important aspect of the study of participation includes its possible relationship with community influence. The latter is thus included as an integral part of organizational participation.

The relationship of each of the independent variables and organizational participation was examined using tests of correlation and multiple regression analysis. The findings about these relationship as well as how they relate to the hypotheses and measurements of the variables are presented here. Accordingly, this chapter will be divided
into three parts: first, a presentation of general research problems as well as more specific hypotheses will be made, after which a brief definition and measurement of specific variables will be attempted. Then the respective findings using Spearman's correlations will be presented. The second part consists of the findings as revealed by multiple regression analysis. The third part will be devoted to a general discussion of all the findings.

**General Research Problems**

One of the objectives mentioned in the early part of this study is the importance of knowing which variables or types of variables are 'determinants' of participation. From this general question, a number of more specific hypotheses were derived and subsequently investigated. These will be discussed one by one as follows.

**Socioeconomic status and participation**

It may be recalled that one of the general research questions posed earlier was whether individual variables are related to participation. The specific hypothesis derived from this is that one's socioeconomic status is positively related to participation. To examine this hypothesis, the present study does not use a single combined measure of socioeconomic status, but assesses the separate correlations of occupation, education, and part-
Occupation is dichotomized into two dummy variables ($X_1$, where $1 =$ Professional, $0 =$ others; $X_2$, where $1 =$ Business, $0 =$ others). Participation is measured in two ways: (1) by calculating for each respondent his/her General Participation Score. This score is a composite measure of his membership in (any given set of) organizations, attendance at meetings, and officerships or committeeships; and (2) by calculating his Influential Organization Score, which is based on his membership in specifically "influential" organizations. The organizations are themselves ranked by respondents according to the amount of influence the respondents think the organizations has in specific economic development issues.

As shown in table 1, the relationship between the Professional dummy and participation is in the predicted direction. That is, there is a positive association between being professional and participation. This is true for both measures of participation ($r = 0.22$ for General Participation Score, and $r = 0.10$ for Influential Organization Score).

On the other hand, this study finds a negative relationship between the Business dummy and participation, as measured by the respondent's General Participation Score. However, there is no significant association
Table 1: Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients for Independent and Dependent Variables (Participation as the Dependent Variable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Influential Organization Score</th>
<th>General Participation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 364)</td>
<td>(n = 351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Ecological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Percent White</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.15 **</td>
<td>-0.19 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Population Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18 ***</td>
<td>0.31 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Urbanization</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Situational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 ***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.14 **</td>
<td>0.15 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Occupation Dummy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10 *</td>
<td>0.22 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = Professional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Occupation Dummy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.21 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = Business)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age Dummy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = 35-55 age group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Length of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < 0.05
** P < 0.01
*** P < 0.001
between the Business dummy and participation when the latter is measured by Influential Organization Scores.

The next individual variable examined is education. As predicted, there is a positive association between education and participation. However, this finding must be qualified. The relationship is positive only when participation is measured by General Participation Scores. There is no significant relationship between the two variables when participation is measured by Influential Organization Scores (that is, there is no association between education and membership in "influential" organizations).

In general, it may be suggested that in so far as occupation and education represent an indication of status differentiation among respondents, there is some evidence that socioeconomic status is related to participation. In other words, the higher one's status, the more likely is one to be active in community organizations.

It was also hypothesized earlier that as an individual matures he becomes more involved with society's activities, including organizational participation. As he approaches old age, however, he becomes more and more detached from society and tends to be less active in organizations. In other words, an individual tends to be most active when he is in the prime years of his life.
From this argument, it was hypothesized that individuals between 35-55 years of age would be positively correlated with participation. However, as shown in table 1, the study finds no significant relationship between the 35-55 age group and participation (The relationship between age and participation will be addressed again in Part II).

The relationship between Length of Residence and Participation

Another individual characteristic that has been hypothesized to be related to participation is length of residence. The rationale here is that length of residence helps one’s integration into the community, and this should be associated with greater participation in the community. However, contrary to expectations, there is no significant relationship between length of residence and participation.

The relationship between Urbanization and Participation

As pointed out earlier, several studies have suggested that urbanization is associated with high education levels and "democratization" of social and political life. These factors should encourage participation. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the more urbanized the county, the higher the rate of participation.18

---

18 The definition of "urban" follows the 1960-70 U.S. Census. Since the definition is too long, the reader is referred to the methodology section.
As shown in table 1, this hypothesis is partly supported by the study. Urbanization is found to be related to the respondents' general measures of participation (attendance at meetings, holding offices or memberships in organizations; \( r = 0.18 \)) but not related to membership in influential organizations.

The relationship between Population Size and Participation

As hypothesized earlier, population size is one of the ecological variables supposed to influence participation. It was also suggested that the greater the population size, the greater the number as well as the types of voluntary associations available to join. Therefore, the greater number produces greater opportunities for participation and greater participation. Hence, two related hypotheses are involved here, (1) population size is related to organization availability and organization diversity, (2) organization availability and organization diversity are related to participation.

The findings show that population size is positively related to organization availability, but is not related to organization diversity. Organization availability, in turn, is positively related to membership in influential organizations but not significantly related to the general measure of participation (General Part-
iciation Scores). On the other hand, organization diversity is negatively related to membership in influential organizations, but positively related to the general measure of participation.

The relationship between Percent White and Participation

Another ecological variable thought to be related to participation is the proportion of whites in a given county. It was assumed that whites tend to be more active than blacks in organizational participation. From this assumption, it was hypothesized that communities with a high percentage of whites will be associated with a higher participation rate. The findings, however, do not support this hypothesis. In fact, the findings show that counties with a high percentage of whites are associated with lower participation.19

The relationship between Organizational Participation and Community Influence

As argued earlier, several studies have suggested that participation in community organizations is associat-

19Since the number of minorities in the sample is too small (less than 5 percent), it is not possible to examine whether minorities, as opposed to whites, are associated with greater participation. However, as noted earlier, some studies have found greater levels of participation among minorities, while others have shown otherwise (see Williams and his associates, 1973; Antunes and Gaitz, 1975; Nyman and Wright, 1971).
ed with community influence. To test this hypothesis, participation was operationalized in two ways as discussed before (using General Participation Scores and Influential Organization Scores). Theoretically, an individual who belongs to an influential organization should have the prestige or resources of the organization to his credit and therefore will tend to be identified as influential. In order to measure this influence, two indicators were used, Influence Perception and Contact Ratio. The influence perception score was based on the ranking of perceived influence of each actor as judged by all other actors. Contact ratio was calculated by dividing the number of contacts received by each actor by \( n-1 \) (where \( n \) refers to the sample size). The assumption was that if an actor were in fact influential, he would receive relatively more contacts than all other actors.

As seen in table 2, there is a modest support for the hypothesis. In other words, the findings are in the predicted direction for all the measures used (i.e. participation as measured by Influence Perception and Contact Ratio). Of particular interest relative to the findings shown in table 2 is the observation that influence seems to be much more correlated with organizational participation than with individualistic characteristics. While the correlation coefficients are not overwhelming, they do
Table 2: Zero-Order Correlations between Independent and Dependent Variables (Influence as the Dependent Variable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 364)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Organizational Participation

1. Influential Organization Score 0.16 ** 0.24 ***
2. General Participation Score 0.19 *** 0.10 *

B. Individual Variables

1. Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional) -0.01 0.05
2. Occupation Dummy (1 = Business) 0.07 0.05
3. Education -0.01 0.04
4. Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group) 0.02 0.06
5. Length of Residence 0.06 -0.03

* P < 0.05
** P < 0.01
*** P < 0.001
reflect a distinctive advantage of organizational over individual variables for explaining both perceptions of influence and influential interaction.

The correlation coefficients reported in tables 1 and 2 provide a general indication of the nature of the relationships between specified independent and dependent variables. However, such findings do not take into account possible joint effects of these variables when considered in relation to one another. An analytical strategy to approach this problem involves using multiple regression procedures which allow a comparative assessment of the relative effects of independent variables on a dependent variable and provide an indication of the predictive power of variables relative to participation and influence.

Multiple Regression Analysis - Findings

The second part of the analysis centers on the findings as revealed by regression analysis. Before the regression analysis was applied, an initial look at the intercorrelations among the independent variables shows that most of the coefficients are at about 0.20 (see table 3). However, among the ecological variables (percent white, population size, and level of urbanization), the coefficients are substantial (about 0.4 to 0.6) indicating possible multicollinearity problems. However, a coefficient of 0.6, for example, is equivalent to an $R^2$ of 0.36,
Table 3: Zero-Order Correlations for Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ECOLOGICAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>SITUATIONAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{x}$ 16794 | 95.50  | 22.00  | 8.57  | 57.50 | 0.36  | 0.53  | 14.70 | 0.56  | 36.70 |

$\text{SD.}$ 7969 | 7.52  | 19.30  | 4.08  | 17.80 | 0.48  | 0.50  | 2.37  | 0.50  | 19.57 |

**LEGEND**

1 = Population Size  
2 = Percent White  
3 = Urbanization  
4 = Organization Availability  
5 = Organization Diversity  
6 = Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional)  
7 = Occupation Dummy (1 = Business)  
8 = Education  
9 = Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group)  
10 = Length of Residence  

Ecological Variables  
Situational Variables  
Individual Variables
which means that only 36 percent of the variance may be affected. Since an $R^2$ of 0.36 is still far from unity, it was concluded that multicollinearity could be safely ignored.\footnote{A more rigorous test for assessing multicollinearity among the ecological variables was also conducted. Regressing each of these variables on all the others, it was found that the largest $R^2$ was .50, which is far from}

Multiple regression analysis was chosen for the second part of the data analysis for the reason that it could allow the assessment of the effects of a particular independent variable when all other variables are controlled. Thus, since few phenomena are products of a single cause, multiple regression analysis would offer a fuller explanation of the dependent variable, organizational participation. Several models were tested (see Appendix II). The models were set up such that the incremental contributions of additional variables could be estimated.

**Ecological variables and participation**

The first category of variables to be examined are the ecological variables - population size, percent white and level of urbanization. When participation (measured by General Participation Scores) is regressed on the ecological variables, the amount of variance explained is only about 9 percent. When participation in influential organizations is regressed on the same independent variables, the amount of variance explained is also about 9 percent (with
the population size regression coefficient significant at 
\( p < 0.001 \). The coefficients for urbanization and percent 
white are both insignificant.

**Situational variables and participation**

The amount of variance explained by the situational 
variables (organization availability and organization 
diversity) is also small when participation is measured by 
General Participation Scores \( (R^2 = 0.01) \). On the other 
hand, the situational variables explain a modest 13.5 
percent of the variance in participation in influential 
organizations (see tables 4 and 5). Both the coefficients 
for organization availability as well as organization 
diversity are significant at \( p < 0.001 \). While the organ­
ization availability slope is positive, that of organization 
diversity is negative. However, the coefficients are of 
the same strength.

**Individual variables and participation**

The contribution of individual variables to the 
explanation of participation is small as shown by the 
respective \( R^2 \)'s in both measures of participation. That 
is, occupation, education, age, and length of residence 
account for only less than 5 percent of the variance in 
organizational participation.

unity. Thus, the conclusion is that multicollinearity is 
not a problem for the partial slope estimates of the reg­
ression equations (see Lewis-Beck, 1980 for related 
discussions).
Table 4: Comparative Explanatory Power of Variables for General Participation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equations</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Δ in R²</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(X_1 X_2 X_3 \text{ net } X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 X_{10})</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X_4 X_5 \text{ net } X_1 X_2 X_3 X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 X_{10})</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 X_{10} \text{ net } X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5)</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_5 \text{ net } X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 X_{10})</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4 X_7 X_8 X_9 X_{10} \text{ net } X_4 X_5)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X_4 X_5 X_6 X_7 X_8 X_9 X_{10} \text{ net } X_1 X_2 X_3)</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Standardized betas in parentheses)

**LEGEND**

\(X_1\) = Percent White  
\(X_2\) = Population Size  
\(X_3\) = Urbanization  
\(X_4\) = Organization Availability  
\(X_5\) = Organization Diversity  
\(X_6\) = Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional)  
\(X_7\) = Occupation Dummy (1 = Business)  
\(X_8\) = Education  
\(X_9\) = Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group)  
\(X_{10}\) = Length of Residence

*** \(p < 0.001\)
Table 5: Comparative Explanatory Power of Variables for Membership in Influential Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X1***</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4***</th>
<th>X5***</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Standardized betas in parentheses)

Comparison of Relative Changes in $R^2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X1 X2 X3 net X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10</th>
<th>Δ in $R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4 X5 net X1 X2 X3 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6 X7 X8 X9 X10 net X1 X2 X3 X4 X5</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 net X6 X7 X8 X9 X10</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 net X6 X7 X8 X9 X10 net X1 X2 X3</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4 X5 X6 X7 X8 X9 X10 net X1 X2 X3</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND

- **X1** = Percent White
- **X2** = Population Size
- **X3** = Urbanization
- **X4** = Organization Availability
- **X5** = Organization Diversity
- **X6** = Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional)
- **X7** = Occupation Dummy (1 = Business)
- **X8** = Education
- **X9** = Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group)
- **X10** = Length of Residence

*** p < 0.001
The next step in assessing the comparative effects of the three major categories of variables is to examine the amount of variance explained by the combined model, and then examine the changes in explained variance as each category of variables is dropped from the equation. Findings are as follows.

1. **Explanation of variance in General Participation Scores**

The combined model explaining the variance in General Participation Scores shows an $R^2$ of about 15 percent (see table 4). That is, the ecological, situational, and individual variables, in combination, explain about 15 percent of the variance in participation as measured by General Participation Scores. Taking the ecological variables out of the equation decreases the amount of explained variance to about 6.5 percent. When situational variables are taken out of the equation, the amount of explained variance left is still about 12 percent, meaning that only a small amount of explained variance is lost. Similarly, when individual variables are taken out of the equation, the amount of explained variance left is also about 12 percent.

The above findings show that the situational variables (organization availability/organizational diversity) account only for a small portion of the variance in organizational participation as measured by General Participation Scores. The ecological variables, on the other hand,
account for about 9 percent of the variance, while the individual variables only account for about 3 percent. As the findings also reveal, the effect of the population size partial coefficient is about 1½ times that of organization diversity, one of the situational variables.

Variance in membership in influential organizations (Influential Organization Scores)

The amount of explained variance by the combined model for membership in influential organizations is 20.4 percent. That is, the ecological variables account for about 20 percent of the variance in membership in influential organizations (see table 5).

Taking the ecological variables out of the equation reduces the $R^2$ to about 14 percent, a reduction of 6.4 percent. When situational variables are taken out of the equation, the $R^2$ is markedly reduced to about 10 percent, meaning that situational variables account for a substantial portion of explained variance. On the other hand, when individual variables are removed, only 1 percent of the variance is taken away.

Thus, it may be added that most of the variance is accounted for by the situational variables. Beside the significance of situational variables, the other substantial portion of explained variance comes from the ecological variables. It is also noteworthy that the
Table 6: Variance in General Participation Scores Explained by Types of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>PR&gt; F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8099.31101151</td>
<td>809.93110115</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>45448.34050365</td>
<td>142.47128685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTED TOTAL</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>53547.65151515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER ESTIMATE</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERCEPT -2.558 (0.00)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>13.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW -0.018 (-.01)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 0.0005 (0.33)</td>
<td>3.32***</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB -0.017 (-.02)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA -0.403 (-.13)</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI 0.147 (0.20)</td>
<td>3.50***</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF 1.126 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 1.651 (-.06)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 0.624 (0.11)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-AGE 0.037 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGRESD 0.029 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Standardized betas in parentheses)

LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PW</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>UB</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CHI</th>
<th>PROF</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>D-AGE</th>
<th>LENGRESD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= Percent White</td>
<td>= Population Size</td>
<td>= Urbanization</td>
<td>= Organization Availability</td>
<td>= Organization Diversity</td>
<td>= Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional)</td>
<td>= Occupation Dummy (1 = Business)</td>
<td>= Education</td>
<td>= Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group)</td>
<td>= Length of Residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECOCLOGICAL VARIABLES**

**SITUATIONAL VARIABLES**

**INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES**

*** p < 0.001
### Table 7: Variance in Influential Organization Scores Explained by Types of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>PR &gt; F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>328.47452608</td>
<td>32.84745261</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1284.70429610</td>
<td>3.92875932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTED TOTAL</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1613.17882278</td>
<td>3.92875932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>ESTIMATE</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERCEPT</td>
<td>-4.583</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>2.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>3.39***</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>4.62***</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-5.48***</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-AGE</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGRESD</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Standardized betas in parentheses)

**LEGEND**

- **p < 0.001**

- **ECOLOGICAL VARIABLES**
  - PW = Percent White
  - PS = Population Size
  - UB = Urbanization

- **SITUATIONAL VARIABLES**
  - OA = Organization Availability
  - CHI = Organization Diversity
  - PROF = Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional)
  - BUS = Occupation Dummy (1 = Business)
  - ED = Education

- **INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES**
  - D-AGE = Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group)
  - LENGRESD = Length of Residence
strongest effect comes from organization availability (β = 0.39) followed by that of organization diversity and percent white (β = -0.30 and 0.23 respectively, see tables 6 and 7).

The relationship of organizational participation and community influence

As mentioned earlier, although the main focus of this study is organizational participation (the main dependent variable), the research question as well as theoretical considerations demand that as an important part of the analysis, the possible effect of organizational participation on community influence be also assessed. In this part of the analysis, community influence is therefore the dependent variable, while organizational participation is treated as the independent variable. It may be recalled that influence is measured in two ways: Influence Perception as well as Contact Ratio. Participation consists of two types of participation measures (General Participation Scores and Membership in Influential Organization Scores).

The first part of the test was to regress the dependent variable, influence, on only one independent variable - organizational participation. Then individual variables (occupation, education, age and length of residence) were added to see how much of the variance is accounted for. Contrary to expectations, an examination of the
findings reveals that organizational participation explains only a very small portion of the variance in level of influence ($R^2 = 0.065$, as measured by Contact Ratio, and $R^2 = 0.043$, as measured by Influence Perception). Further, the combined effect of organizational participation and individual variables also does little by way of explanation ($R^2 = 0.093$, as measured by Contact Ratio, and $R^2 = 0.057$, as measured by Influence Perception, see tables 8 and 9). A look at the regression coefficients also show that membership in specifically influential organizations has about the same effect as the membership and holding of offices in any random set of organizations.

**Discussion**

It may be recalled that the main objective of this study is to explain organizational participation using a framework incorporating ecological, situational and individual variables. Previous research has not given adequate attention to the effects of these three variables, especially their combined effect in an explanatory model. Most studies either focus on one of these categories of variables or give inadequate attention to relative influences.

This study has, therefore, attempted to assess the relative contributions (in terms of explained variance) of the three major types of variables mentioned. The ecological variables examined are population size, percent white,
Table 8: Variance in Contact Ratio Explained by Participation & Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>PR &gt; F</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.34044613</td>
<td>0.19149230</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>13.09703723</td>
<td>0.04067403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTED TOTAL</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>14.43748336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>ESTIMATE</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERCEPT</td>
<td>0.43 (0.00)</td>
<td>3.88*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTSCORE</td>
<td>0.00 (0.14)</td>
<td>2.50*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGSCORE</td>
<td>0.02 (0.18)</td>
<td>3.41***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>0.09 (0.21)</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>0.11 (0.27)</td>
<td>2.86**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>-0.00 (-.02)</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-AGE</td>
<td>0.00 (-.00)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGRESRD</td>
<td>-0.00 (-.09)</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Standardized betas in parentheses)

**LEGEND**

- **PARTSCRE** = General Participation Score
- **ORGSCORE** = Membership in Influential Organization Score
- **PROF** = Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional)
- **BUS** = Occupation Dummy (1 = Business)
- **ED** = Education
- **D-AGE** = Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group)
- **LENGRESRD** = Length of Residence

* p ≤ 0.05
** p ≤ 0.01
*** p ≤ 0.001
Table 9: Variance in Influence Perception Explained by Participation and Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F VALUE</th>
<th>PR &gt; P</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.50194602</td>
<td>0.21456372</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>25.06703217</td>
<td>0.07784793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTED TOTAL</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>26.56897819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>ESTIMATE</th>
<th>T VALUE</th>
<th>STD. ERROR OF ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERCEPT</td>
<td>0.20 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.31**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTSCORE</td>
<td>0.00 (0.14)</td>
<td>2.51**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGSCORE</td>
<td>0.02 (0.15)</td>
<td>2.67**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>0.05 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>0.07 (0.12)</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.04)</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-AGE</td>
<td>0.03 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGRESD</td>
<td>0.00 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Standardized betas in parentheses)

Legend:
- ** p < 0.01

PARTSCORE = General Participation Score
ORGSCORE = Membership in Influential Organization Score
PROF = Occupation Dummy (1 = Professional)
BUS = Occupation Dummy (1 = Business)
ED = Education
D-AGE = Age Dummy (1 = 35-55 age group)
LENGRESD = Length of Residence

PARTICIPATION SCORE

INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES
and level of urbanization. Situational variables consist of organization availability and organization diversity. The individual variables are made up of occupation, education, age, and length of residence, where occupation is broken down to two dummy variables ($X_1$, where 1 = Professional, and $X_2$, where 1 = Business), and age is converted to a dummy variable where 1 = 35-55 age group).

Previous studies have shown that population size and level of urbanization are related to organizational participation. For example, Wright and Hyman (1958) found that there were slightly higher rates of participation in communities of 20,000-50,000, although beyond this there was no consistent trend.

The present study also supports the hypothesis that population size is related to participation, as shown by the zero-order correlations. Further, as revealed by the multiple regression analysis, population size (along with urbanization and percent white) accounts for about 9 percent of the variance in participation (as measured by General Participation Scores and Influential Organization Scores). There is some evidence, then, that population size is associated with organizational participation.

In the Wright and Hyman study (1958), population size was used as a crude index of urbanization. Therefore,
whatever variance that is explained by population size could have, in effect, been attributed to level of urbanization. The possible contributory effect of urbanization level on participation, however, has been ruled out by the present study (the coefficient for level of urbanization is insignificant).

It was earlier mentioned that the mechanism by which population size affects membership is probably through the influence of population size on the availability of organizations. In other words, the greater the population size, the greater the availability of organizations. This relationship is supported by the study.

Although it is almost a truism to say that the greater the availability of organizations the greater will be the participation, it remains to be demonstrated if the relationship really holds. Contrary to expectations, organization availability is not significantly related to participation (as measured by General Participation Scores). However, it is positively related to membership in influential organizations. This difference in findings may be in part due to the fact that General Participation Scores include attendance at meetings and the holding of offices, as well as simple membership, which may not be related to the availability of organizations. On the other hand, Influential Organization Scores are based on simple membership, which may be associated with organization availability.
Beside organization availability, another situational variable tested was organization diversity, which is the degree of heterogeneity of organizations in the counties. It may be recalled that these organizations were categorized into three types - governmental, business, and voluntary. The relative combination of these types of organizations, as opposed to mere availability, gives a measure of organization heterogeneity, or diversity. It was hypothesized that this heterogeneity is associated with participation. As expected, the finding is in the predicted direction when membership is measured by General Participation Scores. However, organization diversity is negatively correlated with membership in influential organizations. This negative relationship may be explained by the fact that influential organizations may be concentrated in just one type of organization, say governmental organizations. Thus, the concentration of memberships in one type of organization may yield negative correlations with organization diversity.

In the multiple regression analysis, both organization availability and organization diversity are treated together as situational variables. As shown in the combined model, which explains 15 percent of the variance in General Participation Scores (Table 6), one of the situational variables, organization diversity, is
significant at $p < .001$. The coefficients show that the effect of organization diversity is only slightly less than that of population size, which exerts the strongest influence on the dependent variable. Again, in the explanation of the variance in membership in influential organizations (Table 7), situational variables are found to have the strongest effects on participation, followed by an ecological variable, percent white.

Thus far, the study has moved from the ecological (or macro-level) 'determinants' of participation. These situational variables were earlier called the "situational structure." Working on the assumption that actors will have to "deal with this structure in their attempt to control and stabilize the situation" (Holzner and Marx, 1979), this study has shown that the situational structure significantly influences organizational participation.

The findings also demonstrate that mere availability of organizations may not necessarily lead to increased participation. One has to also consider organization diversity in discussions on participation.
Having found the significance of the situational structure in the explanation of organizational participation, this study went on to investigate if the amount of explained variance changes by the addition of individualistic variables - occupation, education, age, and length of residence. To test for the effects of these variables, they were treated both as a separate model as well as in combination with other types of variables (ecological and situational). Contrary to expectations, individualistic variables are not significantly related to organizational participation in any of the models. This is true for both measures of participation.

Previous studies on the influence of socioeconomic characteristics (which include occupation, income, education, age, and length of residence) on participation have produced mixed results. While some studies show persistent evidence for the influence of socioeconomic status on participation (Rank and Voss, 1982; Olsen, 1970), others (e.g. Mueller and Johnson, 1975; Goode, 1966) find its effects mixed or attenuated after controls were administered. As far as the present study is concerned, there is no support for the influence of socioeconomic characteristics on participation. All the  

21 This conclusion is based on the multiple regression analysis. However, as mentioned earlier, the zero-order correlations show some support for the relationship.
beta coefficients for the individual variables (occupation, education, age, and length of residence) are insignificant.

A possible explanation for this lack of statistical significance is the way the various individual variables were treated in the model. Perhaps occupation, education, age, and length of residence could have had significant effects if they had been combined into a single status measure. Alternatively, a more refined socioeconomic scale (which incorporates total family income, level of living, and land ownership) may be a better measure of variations in the sample.

Another probable reason for the lack of significant findings for some of the hypotheses tested is that the variables may be linked by more complex forms of relationships, which violate the linearity assumption of the regression equation. The relationship between age and participation is a good example. As discussed earlier, these two variables may be linked by a curvilinear relationship. Nevertheless, given the limitations of the models employed, many relationships have to be inferred from the way the models were set up. For example, examination of the least squares means (see Appendix III) of Influential Organization Scores for the two age categories studied (35-55 age group, and "others") reveals that
there is no difference in their rates of participation. The least squares means for the groups are 1.35 and 1.33 respectively. Similarly, the General Participation Score least squares means for the two groups are virtually the same, 19.58 and 19.54 respectively. Hence, it is safe to assume that the two groups are not different with regard to participation.

Organizational Participation and Community Influence

The above discussion has thus far focused on the "explanation" of organizational participation by a series of independent variables or predictors. However, in order to make the study of participation more meaningful, it is also assessed for its possible effects on community influence.

For this purpose, two measures were used to indicate level of influence: Contact Ratio and Influence Perception. The Spearman test shows that there is a significant association between participation and influence. However, as pointed out earlier, the amount of variance explained by the additional models tested is small. This result is most unexpected in view of the large literature which suggests organizational participation as a possible path to community influence and political participation (e.g. Gittel, 1980; Merton, 1968; Hunter, 1953, 1980; Parenti, 1978). Even the conside-
ration of membership in "influential" organizations fails to explain most of the variance in community influence (the combined model, with individual variables included, explains only about 9 percent of the variance).

A possible explanation for this finding is that one of the influence measures used (Influence Perception) involves subjective judgements. It may be recalled that each respondent was required to identify certain individuals with whom he was in contact regarding some general or specific aspect of economic development, and then to rank the individuals in terms of perceived influence. Hence, there is not only a subjective element in this ranking but also the possibility of inaccurate reporting due to unreliable memory.

A presumably more objective measure of influence (Contact Ratio) was also used. As pointed out earlier, Contact Ratio refers to the number of reported incoming contacts divided by n-1 (where n refers to the sample size). The idea behind this ratio is the assumption that the more contacts received by an actor relative to other actors, the more influential the actor is. As the findings reveal, the use of Contact Ratio also did not result in a substantial increase in amount of explained variance. Perhaps more rigorous measures of influence as well as other dimensions of participation are needed to explore both these variables.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I. Introduction

The present study began by exploring the major theoretical orientations found in the literature. This was done to discover relevant concepts or variables to be considered or included in the analysis. As mentioned earlier, the literature contains a rich mixture of structural, mass society, interaction, exchange and other perspectives. The researcher feels that each of the existing perspectives is too biased — either neglecting or exaggerating certain variables in order to enhance a particular 'pet' theory or value. As a result, the present study has attempted to synthesize previous sociological concerns to give a more balanced picture of social reality. This is reflected in the study's choice of three major categories of variables, the ecological, the situational, and individual variables.

This choice takes into consideration the assumption in the that one's position/social structure affects one's life chances or behavior (e.g., organizational participation). The recognition of the importance of structure does not necessarily mean that individuals are passive creatures, merely reacting to the environment. Therefore, to complete
the model, individual and situational variables are added, implying that individuals have to deal with the situational structure in their daily life. In this way, individuals are not conceptualized as responding to a vague "macro structure", but rather to concrete situations facing them. The situational structure is an example of a concrete situation with which actors have to contend.

From the above theoretical layout, it is possible, at least in theory, to say that if one knew a person's economic status, his age, length of residence, etc., one should be able to "predict" that person's participation level. In addition, as Bell and Force (1956) pointed out earlier, knowing the social type of neighborhood in which an individual lives should also help the prediction of his participation because different types of neighborhoods have different patterns of economic, family, or ethnic characteristics, which might shape the form and frequency of participation. In so far as different organizational diversities are products of different communities, then, knowing these diversities should help explain differential rates of participation.

Implicit in the above design is the assumption that although social structures are constructed through individual social choice processes on the microlevel (Berger and Luckman, 1967), "these structures do exist as powerful
influences themselves delimiting options in the social organization on the macro-level (Galaskiewicz, 1979:17; Young and Larson, 1970). The study was carried out with this framework in mind. The relationships of the three categories of variables (ecological, situational and individualistic) and organizational participation including the relationship of the latter with community influence were examined through tests of correlation as well as multiple regression analysis. The findings can be summarized as follows.

A. Individualistic variables

(i) The hypothesis that socioeconomic status is related to participation.

This specific hypothesis was derived from the more general hypothesis that individual variables are related to participation. It must be noted that this study did not use a single combined measure of socioeconomic status, but analyzed the independent effects of occupation and education on participation. As mentioned before, occupation was dichotomized into two dummy variables ($X_1$, where $1 = \text{Professional}$, and $X_2$, where $1 = \text{Business}$). Participation was measured in two ways: (1) Calculating General Participation Scores (a summary measure incorporating membership in associations, attendance at meetings, and holding of offices in associations), and (2) Influential Organization Scores, based on membership in organizations.
considered influential in economic development.

The findings reveal that there is a positive association between the professional category and participation. On the other hand, as expected, the business category is negatively correlated with participation. With regard to membership in influential organizations, while the finding is positive for the Professional group, the relationship is not significant for the Business group.

Education is another individual variable examined. The findings show a positive correlation between years of education and the general measure of participation (General Participation Scores). However, there is no significant relationship between education and membership in influential organizations.

Thus, as argued earlier, assuming occupation and education represent socioeconomic status, the study shows that there is no consistent evidence that they are positively related/participation. This finding is therefore similar to those of previous studies which found the same lack of consistency between socioeconomic status and participation (e.g. Mueller and Johnson, 1975; Goode, 1966).

(ii) The relationship between age (and length of residence) and participation

Age and length of residence are two other individual variables hypothesized to influence participation. How-
ever, the findings show no significant relationship between either age or length of residence and organizational participation. The explanation, as suggested earlier, was that age and length of residence are probably related to participation through some complex logarithmic function which thereby has not been identified by the regression model used.

3. Ecological variables

(i) The relationship between population size and organization availability and organization diversity

It was hypothesized earlier that the greater the population size, the greater the availability of organizations. This hypothesis is supported by the study. However, there is no evidence for a positive relationship between population size and organization diversity (the relative distribution of types of organizations).

(ii) The relationship between urbanization and participation

Another ecological variable hypothesized to influence participation is urbanization. As predicted, the test of correlation shows that urbanization is related to participation as measured by General Participation Scores. However, this relationship is weak ($r = .1^\circ$). Furthermore, the relationship of urbanization to membership in influen-
tial organizations is found to be insignificant. In sum, urbanization has no strong influence on participation.

(iii) The relationship between percent white and participation

It was assumed that whites tend to be more active than blacks in organizational participation. Communities with a higher percentage of whites should be associated with a higher participation rate. This hypothesis is, however, not supported by the study. The communities with a high percentage of whites are in fact associated with a lower participation rate. 22

C. Situational Variables

A major category of variables thought to be related to participation is situational - organization availability and organization diversity. The specific hypotheses tested were whether organization availability and organization diversity are positively related to participation. The findings show that organization availability is in fact positively related to membership in influential organizations but not related to the general measure of participation (General Participation Scores).

22As stated earlier, since the number of minorities in the sample is too small (less than 5 percent), it is not possible to examine whether minorities, as opposed to whites, are associated with greater participation.
On the other hand, organization diversity is negatively related to membership in influential organizations, but positively related to the general measure of participation.

As was explained earlier, this seeming inconsistency in the findings may be in part due to the two different ways in which participation was measured. General Participation Scores include attendance at meetings, holding offices as well as simple membership, which may not be related to the availability of organizations. On the other hand, influential Organization Scores were based on simple membership in influential organizations, which may be associated with organization availability.

The negative relationship between organization diversity and participation in influential organizations was explained by the fact that the latter may be concentrated in just one type of organization (e.g., governmental organizations). Since this concentration contrasts with the measure of diversity, this may have led to the negative relationship.

The relationship between organizational participation and community influence

It was argued earlier that though the main focus of this study is on the 'determinants' of organizational participation, the study of the latter is made more meaningful by investigating its possible impact on community influence.
As the correlation results show, the relationships are in the predicted direction. Organizational participation is, in fact, related to community influence.

The above analyses were based mainly on the Spearman's correlation coefficients. Besides the Spearman's test of correlation, multiple regression analysis was also carried out. The results are outlined below.

**Summary of results of multiple regression analysis**

Multiple regression analysis was applied to the variables in order to assess the independent effects of the variables while controlling for the others. Several models were tested and the results can be summarized as follows:

1) Ecological variables, in a model by themselves, account for about 9 percent of the variance in organizational participation measured by both types of participation scores (General Participation Scores and Influential Organization Scores). The amount of variance explained by ecological variables is, therefore, quite substantial. Among the ecological variables, population size has the strongest influence on participation.

2) Situational variables (Organization Availability and Organization Diversity), treated as a model by themselves, only account for about 1.5 percent of the variance in General Participation Scores. However, the same variables explain as much as 13.5 percent of the variance in Influential Organization Scores. In other words,
situational variables explain a greater portion of the variance in membership in Influential Organization Scores than in the General Participation Scores. As indicated earlier, this finding may be partly due to the fact that activities like attendance at meetings and holding offices, which are incorporated in General Participation Scores, may be a function of variables other than the situational variables. Influential organization scores, on the other hand, were based on simple membership in influential organizations, which may be a function of the availability or diversity of organizations (the situational variables).

3) Contrary to expectations, individual variables (occupation, education, age and length of residence) account only for a small portion of the variance in organizational participation, regardless of the measure used (less than 5 percent). Therefore, it may be said that individual variables do not contribute much to the explanation of organizational participation.

The above discussion has centered on the amounts of explained variance by each of the three categories of variables treated separately. In a combined model where the three types of variables were put together, the amount of explained variance is about 15 percent in General Participation Scores and about 20 percent in Influ-
tial Organization Scores. In the explanation of the variance in the former, population size has a stronger influence than organization diversity. In the explanation of the variance in the latter (membership in influential organizations), the strongest influence is exerted by organization availability, followed by organization diversity, and percent white.

The situational variables account for a substantial portion of the explained variance in Influential Organization Scores, although they explain only a minor portion of General Participation Scores. On the other hand, ecological variables account for about half of the explained variance in both types of participation scores. Contrary to expectations, the individual variables, as pointed out above, account only for a small portion of the explained variance (less than 5 percent) in both types of participation scores.

It may be concluded that, of the three categories of variables, both the ecological and situational variables contribute substantially to the explanation of organizational participation. Individual variables, on the other hand, do not contribute much to this explanation.

The relationship of organizational participation and community influence

The investigation of the possible impact of organ-
izational participation on community influence was also subjected to multiple regression analysis procedures. The results show that participation only accounts for a small portion of the variance in community influence (less than 7 percent). Further, when participation is combined with individual variables (i.e. occupation, education, age, and length of residence), the amount of explained variance goes up to only about 9 percent.

It was assumed earlier that an actor's influence is more a function of his organizational resources than his personal resources. Now, if membership in influential organizations were regarded as an organizational resource as opposed to individual or personal resource (such as occupation, education), then the former fails to account for a substantial portion of the variance in actors' community influence. The effect of individual variables, while controlling for this organizational resource, is also negligible.

III. Theoretical Implications

It was stated earlier that implicit in this study is the assumption that although social structures emerge out of individual interactions, they may eventually become social facts, defining or restricting choices in society (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). This is particular-
ly true of voluntary and formal organizations that were first created by man but later define one's options.

Blau (1974), for instance, talks about two basic types of social facts: (1) the common values and norms embodied in a culture or subculture, and (2) the networks of social relations in which processes of social interaction become organized and through which social positions of individuals and subgroups become differentiated. These social facts, according to Blau, are an attribute of groups or communities, as opposed to the attributes of individuals.

Social phenomena such as organizational participation and community influence have been studied by focusing on either individual characteristics, or more rarely, both. However, as Blau argues, the systematic analysis of structural constraints requires the simultaneous use of indices of social structure and of individual behavior, and the isolation of that effects of the one from the other.

As mentioned earlier, the present study incorporates three categories of variables as possible 'determinants' of organizational participation. The ecological and situational categories constitute the structural dimension of the study, whereas the individual category represents the individual dimension. It was hypothesized
that organizational participation could be explained, in part, by each set of these variables. As the findings reveal, there is some evidence that structural attributes as opposed to individual characteristics offer a better "explanation" of the phenomenon studied - organizational participation.

Early in the study, it was mentioned that as a result of the increase in population size, urbanization and the increasing differentiation of society's functions, modern communities have witnessed a tremendous growth in the number and types of organizations. Theoretical explanations for this growth usually refer to Durkheim's (1933) idea of the growing complexity in the division of labor as a result of the increase in "moral and dynamic density" of society, which is associated with population growth.

Thus, Durkheim's principle that "competition generates differentiation in a territorially based population" (Lincoln, 1979:916) can be used to explain the availability and diversity of organizations in the different communities. To the extent that opportunities for and limits of participation are conditioned by population growth and structural differentiation (in terms of organization availability and diversity), ecological and situational variables become powerful predictor's of not only organizational participation but other social pheno-
mena such as voting behavior and influence.

From the foregoing discussion, it may readily be grasped that explanations of social phenomena cannot be made by reference to differences among individuals without including considerations of structural influences. Although it may be too deterministic to say that the availability or diversity of organizations limits membership in associations in particular communities, the "structural opportunity" to participate must inevitably be addressed in order to offer a fuller explanation of organizational participation.

As used in this study, the word 'structure' connotes the constraints associated with macrolevel phenomena such as population growth and urbanization as well as the opportunities and limitations imposed by the situation in which actors have to make their choices (the situational structure). Though the situational structure is operationalized as the number of available organizations as well as the degree of heterogeneity of organizations, it was assumed that these organizations exist in the form of "interorganizational linkages", sharing and competing for resources to further their goals. These factors are supposed to condition the kinds and amount of participation opportunities available for actors in the community.
The present study, however, has not made the claim that interorganizational linkages serve a particular class of actors or are sustained for their benefits as usually suggested by the elitists. In addition, the study has not referred to values or dominant ideologies influencing the form or quantity of participation. The important point to be made is that, without reference to "vested interests" or "dominant values", this study has found evidence that participation can be explained by reference to macrolevel factors such as population size, structural differentiation, or situational factors.

It was stated in the early part of this study that, if one knew a person's economic, family, and ethnic status, his age, sex or aspirations, one should be able to predict closely that person's participation pattern (Bell and Force, 1956). Theoretically, this prediction sounds plausible. However, the findings of this study have shown that very little explanation can be achieved by reference to those variables alone. Nevertheless, Bell's second hypothesis that the social type of neighborhood is an efficient indicator, in its own right, of an actor's social participation, probably gets better theoretical and empirical support from this study, to the extent that different types of neighborhoods hold different types and numbers of organizations in which
actors can participate.

That the importance of structural variable has been demonstrated does not necessarily mean that every variable (including individual variables) is reducible to structural properties. If this were so, then everything in social life is structurally determined. However, if it can be empirically demonstrated that an individual variable (e.g. occupation) can be regarded as a structural property because it tends to limit an actor to a certain class, group, or a set of organizations in which to participate, then this would lend greater support to the structural explanation.

The above discussion has centered on the theoretical implications of the study with regard to organizational participation. These implications can also be extended to the relationship between organizational participation and community influence, which forms an important, though not the main, aspect of the present research effort. It was one of the hypotheses of this study that organizational participation is related to community influence. This is especially true if an actor happens to hold important offices in influential organizations. The idea behind this is that an actor becomes influential by virtue of his access to community resources (Laumann and Pappi, 1976; Dahl, 1961).
Further, an actor becomes influential not so much due to his resources or personal attributes but due to the resources inherent in organizations or organizational networks. It must be noted that this hypothesis has been explored by several researchers (e.g., Perrucci and Pilisuk, 1970; Galaskiewicz, 1979; Beaulieu, 1982). These researchers have shown that there is some evidence that organizational resources do contribute to the explanation of an actor's influence over and above the explanation provided by his personal resources.

To test the above hypothesis, the present study operationalized an actor's organizational resources by his membership in influential organizations, implying that the more influential an organization one joins, the more likely one is to be identified as influential. As mentioned before, the zero-order correlations support the hypothesis. However, the multiple regression analysis reveals that only a small amount of variance is accounted for by the actor's membership in influential organizations.

The implication of this finding is that while organizational resources may contribute to one's influence, it must be remembered that these resources are not the only ones open to actors. Therefore, a thorough inventory of resources is necessary in order to assess his influence. In addition, perceived influence also depends on
exchange of, and bargaining in, resources between actors as well as between organizations (see Laumann et al., 1977). Thus, more complicated theoretical models as well as operationalizations need to be attempted.

IV. Strengths and Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

Most studies are beset by limitations of one form or another, and this one is by no means an exception. It is important to review some of these limitations and weaknesses. These limitations can be more fully discussed by reference to the research questions and hypotheses, as well as the operationalization or measurement of variables used in this study.

Though most of the hypotheses examined in this study were found to be supported, a number of the findings were contrary to expectations. For example, although it was found that organization availability was positively correlated with membership in influential organizations (which was expected), the study found no significant correlation between organization availability and the general measure of participation used (i.e., participation as measured by attendance at meetings, holding offices, and simple memberships). This finding may be due to the lack of a more accurate or refined measurement of the dependent variable, organizational participation. Participation could perhaps be improved by including not
just the holding of offices but also the duration of the office.

In addition, since participation in voluntary organizations would be expected to correlate with other forms of participation such as in networks of neighbors or associates or voting in local elections, these forms of participation could have been incorporated as part of the study design to act as a validity check. Data available in the present study were insufficient for such an exercise. However, future research could take this into consideration.

With regards to the classification of organizations into the three categories - governmental, business, and voluntary, an attempt was not made to distinguish the more locally based organizations from the "extra-local." It was assumed that most of these organizations were "local" organizations. Since local or extra-local organizations may differ in terms of structure or function and thus affect participation, this could have posed problems of comparison of participation across counties.

It must also be admitted that the measurements of 'organization availability' and 'organization diversity' were based solely on organizations that had to do with economic development. This could have limited or narrowed the implications of the concepts. Although there
were enough of these organizations to be categorized into Governmental, Business and Voluntary organizations, the inclusion of other organizations that were associated with other pertinent issue areas may demonstrate better the concepts of organization availability and diversity, and thus provide better theoretical support.

Lincoln (1979) for example, distinguished between "sheer number of organizations" from the "density" of organizations. Organizational density refers to the number of organizations relative to community size. This measure has not been explored by the present study. However, its effect could be examined by future researchers. Since the different counties studied have different population sizes, it makes sense to include the latter in the measurement of organization availability or diversity. In addition, since a greater density of organizations may lead to a greater competition for scarce resources and thus affect the participation of members, the consideration of organization density has both theoretical as well as practical implications.

It may be recalled that one of the unexpected findings of this study is the lack of a significant association between age and participation, and between length of residence and participation. As mentioned earlier, this finding may be due to the study's lack of other statistical techniques, the use of which could have brought more
significant findings. Multiple classification analysis, a form of multivariate technique, for example, could be used to assess the relationship between age and participation, in which age can be categorized into several age groups and observed for its effect across these categories while controlling for the effects of income and education (see Cutler, 1976). The present study, however, has used only zero-order correlations and multiple regression analysis to examine the relationships among the variables. As mentioned earlier, the linearity assumption of the models may be too simplistic to investigate some of the hypothesized relationship.

The design of the present study is considered suitable for the kind of hypotheses it set out to investigate. These hypotheses have centered on the explanation of rates or variations in participation. As such, the effort has not been on the explanation of "human" behavior, for example, why people participate. Such a research problem could perhaps be approached by utilizing exchange theory as a framework. As Warner and Heffernan (1967) suggest, there is some evidence that participation is related to the degree of "benefit-participation contingency." That is, actors are expected to increase their participation level, given greater rewards. Furthermore, as Warriner and Prather (1965) pointed out, since
different kinds of organizations provide different kinds of rewards or benefits for membership, it makes sense to incorporate actors' motives in joining organizations. Though this kind of research is more suitable for case studies rather than large aggregate data sets, it could perhaps be explored in the latter kind of research.

One of the hypotheses investigated by the present study involves the relationship between organizational participation and community influence. This investigation is, in a sense, a replication and extension of the works of Perrucci and Pilisuk (1970) and Beaulieu (1982) who tested the hypothesis that belonging to, or occupying executive positions in, several local organizations is associated with community influence. The present study has gone beyond these works by not only considering the number of organizations joined by actors, but also by ranking these organizations in terms of influence and by assigning standardized values of this ranking to the actors as a measure of their membership in influential organizations. Though the finding is in the predicted direction, the amount of explained variance is unexpectedly low. It is felt that a more refined measure of influence has to be attempted. For example, this measure should not only use perceived influence but assign weights to formal positions held by actors.
V. Conclusion

The present study has attempted to explain the phenomenon of organizational participation. For this purpose, the review of the literature has helped in the identification of a series of variables or possible predictors of participation, together with the various theoretical perspectives utilized in this research area. From this literature, the researcher has attempted a synthesis of perspectives by suggesting new combinations of variables to be considered as possible determinants of organizational participation. In particular, three categories of variables were employed - ecological, situational, and individual variables. It must, however, be admitted that this choice has not exhausted all other possible variables.

Though the findings are not conclusive, as are most findings in this type of research, many of the hypotheses were found to be supported. For example, ecological variables (population size, urbanization, and percent white) and situational variables (organization availability and organization diversity) are found to account for most of the explained variance in organizational participation. In contrast, individual variables (occupation, education, age, and length of residence) are found to account for only a minor proportion of the
It was concluded that this finding lends support to the structural as opposed to the individual explanation of organizational participation.

The findings were subsequently related to the larger body of sociological theory, including Durkheim's division of labor, structural differentiation, urbanization and how this is related to the growth and dominance of organizations in modern society. The "social facticity" of organizations as discussed by Berger and Luckmann (1967) is also included as part of the explanation of the findings.

Beside considering the 'determinants' of participation, this study also considered the possible relationship of the latter with community influence. Though the finding is in the predicted direction, the amount of explained variance is relatively weak. Several reasons were offered to explain the findings.

Finally, what was thought to be the strengths and limitations of the study were discussed together with the recommendations for future research. In particular, it is suggested that future research should try to improve the measurement of the situational structure (organization availability and organization diversity), organizational participation, as well as community influence. In conclusion, it may be stated that despite its limita-
tions, this study has achieved modest support for what it had set out to do. It has not only gone beyond previous work in the area by synthesizing the levels of sociological focus and considering new categories of variables, but also shown how the findings relate to other theories prevalent in the literature.
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APPENDIX I

COUNTY ORGANIZATION FOR DEVELOPMENT
S-120 REGIONAL RESEARCH PROJECT

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
SUMMER 1977

Date ____________________________
Interviewer ______________________
Respondent Name ____________________________
Respondent No. card 1/1-3 ______________________
State ____________________________
County ____________________________

INTERVIEWER INTRODUCTION CHECKLIST:

___ Your Name
___ Organization Represented
___ Local Sponsorship
___ Study Purpose
___ Study Method
___ Confidentiality
Hello! My name is ____________________________. I am from ______________________.

As you have probably heard, our team is here to conduct a survey which is aimed at learning more of how the people in this county organize to do something about needs felt to exist in the county. We hope to utilize the information collected to help county leaders learn how to be more effective in bringing about desired changes in counties throughout the South. To be able to do this, we need information from you and other leaders about some recent changes and how they were brought about.

You are under no obligation to participate in this interview, or to answer questions you feel are too personal. However, please keep in mind that the success of the study will depend upon the accuracy and completeness of the information we obtain from you and other community leaders. For your protection, the information you give us will be kept confidential and you will remain anonymous, that is, your name will not be identified with any information. Each interview is given a number rather than identifying it with a name. We will, however, keep your name and address on a separate card in order to notify you of any public meeting which may be organized to present the findings of the study.

The results of this study will be made available through College of Agriculture publications and releases to the mass media. The findings should aid leaders, officials and citizens in understanding the nature of the organization necessary to bring about changes needed to make the county a better place to live.

(The above is only an example of what you should say for an introduction. Put the ideas in your own words! Be careful what you promise!)
I. COUNTY IMAGE

Every community or county tends to have its own characteristics which set it apart from other communities or counties.

1. Would you please tell me what you think are three aspects of ________ county which you especially like. Please rank these aspects in terms of what you like best (1), second best (2), and third best (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>B 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C 16-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What do you think are the three most important needs or problems of ________ county? Please rank in terms of their importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A 19-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>B 22-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>C 25-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. DEVELOPMENT

3. There has been a lot of talk in recent years about the DEVELOPMENT in this county. Not everybody agrees on what "development" is. What does the term "development" mean to you?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

4. Of the many organizations and agencies having some involvement in this County, which ones have something to do with the ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT of the County?

A  ____________________________________________
B  ____________________________________________
C  ____________________________________________
D  ____________________________________________
E  ____________________________________________
F  ____________________________________________
G  ____________________________________________

5. Which organizations and agencies have something to do with DEVELOPMENT of HEALTH related services and programs in the County?

A  ____________________________________________
B  ____________________________________________
C  ____________________________________________
D  ____________________________________________
E  ____________________________________________
F  ____________________________________________
G  ____________________________________________
III. PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZATIONS

6. Now I would like to ask about the groups and organizations that you participated in during the last 12 months.

Go down the list of examples of types of organizations and ask if s/he attends any organizations of that type. If s/he belongs to an organization, list and check the characteristics of his/her involvement that apply.

Types of Organizations:
1. Civic or Service
2. Patriotic Groups
3. Fraternal Orders
4. Professional or Occupational
5. Advisory or Planning Committees, Boards, Councils
6. Parent Teacher Association (PTA)
7. Church, Sunday School, or Religious Organization
8. Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>(A) Membership status (Check if member)</th>
<th>(B) Responsibilities (Check if Officer or Committee member)</th>
<th>(C) Attendance (Check if attend at least 1/3 of the meetings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Additional organizations may be included on the back of this page if necessary).

TOTALS

(A) Number Checks x 1 =  
(B) Number Checks x 3 =  
(C) Number Checks x 2 =  

Total Participation Score (A+B+C) =  

}


### III. PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZATIONS (con'd)

#### A. PARTICIPATION SCORE (From bottom of preceding page).

Card 1/51-88

#### B. Organization ID numbers from those listed on preceding page and which appear on the "composite organization list" for each county (see coding instructions for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization ID Numbers</th>
<th>Organization ID Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 89-69</td>
<td>14. 19-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 81-62</td>
<td>15. 12-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 61-62</td>
<td>16. 14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 55-65</td>
<td>17. 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 47-69</td>
<td>18. 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 62-70</td>
<td>19. 20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 71-72</td>
<td>20. 22-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 73-79</td>
<td>21. 24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 75-76</td>
<td>22. 24-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 77-78</td>
<td>23. 26-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 79-80</td>
<td>24. 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card/2</td>
<td>25. 12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 8-3</td>
<td>26. 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. A. With whom on this list are you in contact in connection with the variety of activities in the county that could be considered economic development?
   
   a. How frequently are you in contact with this person?
   
   c. Which of you usually initiates the contact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card 2 -001</th>
<th>Card 3 -016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Title and Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 001</td>
<td>001 001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002 002</td>
<td>002 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 003</td>
<td>003 003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004 004</td>
<td>004 004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 005</td>
<td>005 005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006 006</td>
<td>006 006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007 007</td>
<td>007 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 008</td>
<td>008 008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 009</td>
<td>009 009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010 010</td>
<td>010 010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (Card 2/36-80, Card 3/6-80)

   **Contacts In This Area Not Listed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Location</th>
<th>Card Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   B. Would you now select and rank the three among the individuals named that you think have the most influence in economic development decisions for this county (1=most influence).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   **CODE FOR 7B, 8B, 9B, & IOC:**
   1. Have contacts only on special occasions
   2. Have monthly contacts
   3. Have weekly contacts
   4. Have several contacts weekly
   5. Have daily contacts
   6. Have several contacts daily

   **CODE FOR 7C, 8C, 9C & IOC:**
   1. Most of the time I contact him/her
   2. Most of the time he/she contacts me
   3. About equal each way.
8. A. With whom on this list did you have contact in connection with [some aspect of economic development]?

B. How frequently are you in contact with this person?

C. Which of you usually initiates the contact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Freq.</th>
<th>Contact Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contacts In This Area Not Listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Would you now select and rank the three among the individuals named that you think have the most influence on [this aspect of economic development]?

1  2  3
E. With regards to [some aspect of economic development] name individuals known to you who gave the most opposition to the issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposition</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Card 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-41</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-51</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-61</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-71</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-81</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Of all the individuals you have named, would you please rank them in terms of the amount of influence they had on this issue? (1=most influential, etc.)
8. G. WITH REGARD TO [SOME ASPECT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT], WHICH GROUPS OR ORGANIZATIONS WERE INFLUENTIAL IN HELPING GET IT ESTABLISHED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT: GROUPS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>card a 6-7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. WHICH GROUPS OR ORGANIZATIONS WERE INFLUENTIAL IN OPPOSING [SOME ASPECT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPOSITION: GROUPS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. OF ALL THE GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS YOU HAVE NAMED, WOULD YOU PLEASE RANK THEM IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE THEY HAD ON THIS ISSUE? (1 being most influential, 2 being the second most influential, etc.)
9. A. With whom on this list are you in contact in connection with activities that could be considered development of health facilities or services in the county?

B. How frequently are you in contact with this person?

C. Which of you usually initiates the contact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Area</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Location</th>
<th>Contact Frequency</th>
<th>Contact Direction</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Card 001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contacts In This Area Not Listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Location</th>
<th>Contact Frequency</th>
<th>Contact Direction</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Would you now select and rank the three among the individuals named that you think have the most influence on health related decisions for this county.

1  2  3
10. A. With whom on this list did you have contact in connection with [some aspect of health development]?  

B. How frequently are you in contact with this person?  

C. Which of you usually initiates the contact?

| Card # | List Number | Contact Date | Contact Time | Contact Field | Contact Direction | Rank | List Number | Contact Date | Contact Time | Contact Field | Contact Direction | Rank | List Number | Contact Date | Contact Time | Contact Field | Contact Direction | Rank | List Number | Contact Date | Contact Time | Contact Field | Contact Direction | Rank | List Number | Contact Date | Contact Time | Contact Field | Contact Direction |
|--------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|
| 001    | 9 10 11     | 011          | 021          | 011           | 011              | 032  | 032         | 032          | 032          | 032           | 032              | 032  | 032         | 032          | 032          | 032           | 032              | 032  | 032         | 032          | 032          | 032           | 032              | 032  | 032         | 032          | 032          | 032           | 032              | 032  | 032         |
| 002    | 10 11 12    | 012          | 022          | 022           | 022              | 033  | 033         | 033          | 033          | 033           | 033              | 033  | 033         | 033          | 033          | 033           | 033              | 033  | 033         | 033          | 033          | 033           | 033              | 033  | 033         |
| 003    | 11 12 13    | 013          | 023          | 023           | 023              | 034  | 034         | 034          | 034          | 034           | 034              | 034  | 034         | 034          | 034          | 034           | 034              | 034  | 034         | 034          | 034          | 034           | 034              | 034  | 034         |
| 004    | 12 13 14    | 014          | 024          | 024           | 024              | 035  | 035         | 035          | 035          | 035           | 035              | 035  | 035         | 035          | 035          | 035           | 035              | 035  | 035         | 035          | 035          | 035           | 035              | 035  | 035         |
| 006    | 14 15 16    | 016          | 026          | 026           | 026              | 037  | 037         | 037          | 037          | 037           | 037              | 037  | 037         | 037          | 037          | 037           | 037              | 037  | 037         | 037          | 037          | 037           | 037              | 037  | 037         |
| 007    | 15 16 17    | 017          | 027          | 027           | 027              | 038  | 038         | 038          | 038          | 038           | 038              | 038  | 038         | 038          | 038          | 038           | 038              | 038  | 038         | 038          | 038          | 038           | 038              | 038  | 038         |
| 008    | 16 17 18    | 018          | 028          | 028           | 028              | 039  | 039         | 039          | 039          | 039           | 039              | 039  | 039         | 039          | 039          | 039           | 039              | 039  | 039         | 039          | 039          | 039           | 039              | 039  | 039         |
| 009    | 17 18 19    | 019          | 029          | 029           | 029              | 040  | 040         | 040          | 040          | 040           | 040              | 040  | 040         | 040          | 040          | 040           | 040              | 040  | 040         | 040          | 040          | 040           | 040              | 040  | 040         |
| 010    | 18 19 20    | 020          | 030          | 030           | 030              | 041  | 041         | 041          | 041          | 041           | 041              | 041  | 041         | 041          | 041          | 041           | 041              | 041  | 041         | 041          | 041          | 041           | 041              | 041  | 041         |

Contacts In This Area Not Listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Would you now select and rank the three among the individuals named that you think have the most influence on [this aspect of health development].

1  2  3
E. With regards to [some aspect of health development] were individual known to you who gave the most opposition to the issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposition</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Card 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Of all the individuals you have named, would you please rank them in terms of the amount of influence they had on this issue? (1=most influential, etc.)
C. WITH REGARD TO [SOME ASPECT OF HEALTH DEVELOPMENT]

WHICH GROUPS OR ORGANIZATIONS WERE INFLUENTIAL IN THE SUPPORT OF THIS PROJECT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT:</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>card 11</td>
<td>8-7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. WHICH GROUPS OR ORGANIZATIONS WERE INFLUENTIAL IN OPPOSITION TO THIS PROJECT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPOSITION:</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-37</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. OF ALL OF THE GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS YOU HAVE NAMED, WOULD YOU PLEASE RANK THEM IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE THEY HAD ON THIS ISSUE?

(1 being the most influential, 2 being the second most influential, etc.)
RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

I would like to ask you some questions about yourself, not to identify you as a person, but in order to determine the opinions of broad classes of people.

11. Age __________

12. Sex __________ 1. male
                2. female

13. Race __________ 1. White
                2. black
                3. other

14. What are your main occupations? What is your title and who is your employer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Employer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How many years of education have you completed?

Elementary and high school _____ (years)
College _____ (years) 40-50
Other (Trade school, etc.) _____ (years)

16. Are you a resident of this county?

1. yes
2. no

If yes: How long? (years) 50-60

In which community or neighborhood do you live? 60-70

17. Do you presently hold any political office?

1. yes
2. no

If yes: Which one or ones?

A

B

C
18. Do you hold any municipal, parish, or state appointed position (e.g., County Library Board of Trustees, Parish Industrial Commission, State Wildlife Commission, Municipal Recreation Commission, etc.)?

Yes  [ ]  No  [ ]

If Yes, which ones?

A. 65-66
B. 67-68
C. 69-70
D. 71-72
Appendix II

Model I: \[ Y = a_0 + b_1PW + b_2PS + b_3UB + e, \]
where \( Y \) = organization participation, \( a_0 \) = intercept, \( PW \) = percent white, \( PS \) = population size, \( UB \) = urbanization, \( e \) = error term.

Model II: \[ Y = a_0 + b_1OA + b_2CHI + e, \]
where \( OA \) = organizational availability, \( CHI \) = organizational diversity.

Model III: \[ Y = a_0 + b_1PROF + b_2BUS + b_3ED + b_4AGE (35-55) + b_5AGE (others) + b_6LENGRES + e, \]
where \( PROF \) = professional, \( BUS \) = business, \( ED \) = education, \( AGE \) = dummy variable (where 35-55 = 1, others = 0), \( LENGRES \) = length of residence.

Model IV: \[ Y = a_0 + b_1PW + b_2PS + b_3UB + b_4OA + b_5CHI + e \]
Model V: \[ Y = a_0 + b_1PW + b_2PS + b_3UB + b_4PROF + b_5BUS + b_6ED + b_7AGE (35-55) + b_8AGE (others) + b_9LENGRES + e \]
Model VI: \[ Y = a_0 + b_1OA + b_2CHI + b_3PROF + b_4BUS + b_5ED + b_6AGE (35-55) + b_7AGE (others) + b_8LENGRES + e \]
Model VII: \[ Y = a_0 + b_1PW + b_2PS + b_3UB + b_4OA + b_5CHI + b_6PROF + b_7BUS + b_8ED + b_9AGE (35-55) + b_{10}AGE (others) + b_{11}LENGRES + e, \]
where the terms are defined as above.

As can be seen above, the models allow the incremen-
tal effects of additional independent variables to be assessed. For example, in Model I, we allow the ecological variables to do the explaining on the dependent variable. Then, other variables for example, "organizational availability", and "organizational diversity" (situational variables) are added to the model to see how much of the variance is accounted for by the latter, with the effects of the preceding variables controlled (see Model IV).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Membership in Influential Organizations</th>
<th>General Participation Scores</th>
<th>Contact Ratio</th>
<th>Influence Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>20.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>18.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>20.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-55 age-group</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>19.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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