

Local Action on Behalf of Local Collectives in the U.S. and Israel: How Different Are Leaders From Members in Voluntary Associations?

Robert R. Friedmann, Ph.D., Paul Florin, Ph.D., Abraham Wandersman, Ph.D., and Ron Meier, Ph.D.

While leadership in voluntary organizations is important to the understanding of voluntary action, not enough is known about differences between leaders and members in voluntary organizations. This study explored the differences between leaders and members in local voluntary organizations in the U.S. and Israel. Using discriminant function analysis on demographic characteristics, social psychological variables, and cost-benefit relationships it was found that leaders differ significantly from members in several of these areas. Patterns of greatest similarity were found between the American and Israeli participants on the social psychological variables. Gender distinguished members from leaders in Israel; occupation and education did so in the U.S. A very significant finding in the area of costs and benefits was that leaders perceived their activism as more costly than did members; leaders viewed costs to their participation as being equal to benefits while members perceived more benefits than costs.

The importance of citizen participation in voluntary organizations throughout the world has been repeatedly discussed.¹ One enigma is: If participation is such a good thing why don't more people participate? The issue of participation versus nonparticipation has received a considerable amount of popular and empirical attention (Wandersman, Florin, Friedmann, & Meier, 1987). A key issue which can be viewed as a follow-up to the above question involves the question of why people become leaders. Oliver (1984) asked this question referring to active members of local voluntary associations who invest great efforts to provide collective benefits for their neighbors but often are under-rewarded for it. Voluntary (social) activism on behalf of the block or the neighborhood can be seen on a continuum ranging from non-activism through active membership, to leadership in such associations. This is particularly important because in work organizations there is competition for leadership positions, while in voluntary organizations leadership opportunities are often avoided (Pearce, 1980).

In this article we examine the differences between two levels of voluntary activism: members and leaders; this is done in a cross cultural context with activists on behalf of neighborhood and/or block associations in Israel and the United States.

Dr. Robert R. Friedmann, Department of Criminal Justice, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

The data has particular relevance for: a) cross cultural advancement of the growing body of knowledge on voluntary activism, and b) implications for recruiting, training, facilitating, and maintaining leaders in voluntary organizations.

THE CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

It is important to emphasize that despite the desirable outcomes participation promises, relatively few people participate in government-initiated efforts or in grassroots groups (Peattie, 1968; Warren, 1963). Local voluntary collectives depend on leaders for the pursuit and actualization of various functions (Hollander, 1985; Prestby, 1984). Leaders are thus a key in the success or disintegration of voluntary organizations such as neighborhood groups (Bolduc, 1980; Knoke, 1985; Moe, 1980; Pearce, 1980; Rich, 1980). Despite the importance of the leader's role (or probably because of it), the role is costly and demanding in terms of time, energy and tediousness of tasks, and it yields little reward or coercive power over members (Pearce, 1980, 1982; Rich, 1980). Often those occupying such positions forego other opportunities and sustain financial and social losses (Bailey, 1974; Yates, 1973). Indeed, little is known about the characteristics that distinguish leaders from members in voluntary associations. Much of the traditional literature on leadership includes no reference to voluntary organization leaders (Bass, 1981; Hollander, 1985; Stogdill, 1974) and hence to the distinction between leaders and members in voluntary organizations.

According to the literature on voluntary organizations demographically, voluntary leaders tend to be more than 30 years old (Bers & Mezey, 1981), have higher levels of education, occupation, and income (Bolduc, 1980) and are more rooted in the community (e.g., length of residence, residence ownership, kinship and friendship) than members (Babchuk & Gordon, 1962). No clear relationships were found between leadership and gender, or between leadership and race (Gittell, 1980). Gender may have an impact depending on the type of organization (York, 1977) while leaders and members have few differences as to their racial background (Yates, 1973).

Social psychologically, leaders appear to be more confident and have more positive views toward and more positive relations with others than members do (Florin, Mednick & Wandersman, 1986; Prestby, 1984). Further, leaders manifest higher levels of participation and political involvement than members as expressed in attitudes toward government, community, organization, social issues and themselves (Bolduc, 1980; Prestby, 1984; Smith, 1975; Tomeh, 1974). Also, leaders differ from members with respect to their higher intelligence/knowledge score (Rose, 1962).

In political participation, leaders are more likely than members to participate in community, political, and voluntary organizations or activities (Laskin, 1962; Lawson, 1975). Prior to becoming leaders, individuals are involved in a development process which culminates in a mature sense of participatory competence and the assumption of leadership positions (Kieffer, 1983). Once in leadership positions, individuals are more likely to engage in various political and organizational experiences and appear to receive personal benefits from leadership (Sharp, 1978; Widmer, 1985).

Several typologies provide schemes to view leaders' incentives/motives for action. The typology developed by Clark & Wilson (1961) is widely cited and has some

empirical support (Knoke & Wood, 1981; Rich 1980). It distinguishes *material* (tangible rewards), *solidary* (intangible, without monetary value, such as group membership) and *purposive* (organizational or collective goals which do not benefit members directly) incentives. It is hypothesized that since voluntary associations can provide few material incentives for members and leaders, they will act upon more solidary and purposive ones. From the perspective of Olson's (1965) collective goods theory and Moe's (1980) refinements, leaders of voluntary associations perceived receiving a net benefit from their leadership role outweighing the many costs attached to it, while members may be "free riders" letting "others" bear the costs of leadership. Applying Olson's theory to neighborhood voluntary associations, Rich (1980) introduced four types of incentives which offset the costs of leadership: collective goods (benefit all members), leaders surplus (difference between cost of collective good and contribution gained), incidental benefits (personal contact, political career), and leadership itself (status of holding office). Some of these incentives may emerge out of leaders' sense of pessimism that no one else will act (Oliver, 1984) while other incentives may be incidental to the organization's purpose. However, research by Wellstone (1978) and Yates (1973) suggest that leaders' motives appear to be connected with the improvement of the neighborhood.

Recent research on Israeli citizen participation focused on types of local neighborhood committees (weak, autonomous) (Cnaan & Katan, 1986), on representation of citizens in administering Project Renewal (PR) (Liron, 1985), on citizen governance as part of PR and as analyzed from documented minutes (Liron & Spiro, 1984), on differences between participants and non participants (Aviran, 1984; Churchman, 1987), and on the relationship between alienation and participation (Goldstein, 1985). There is however, little explicit discussion of differences between leaders and members. Since voluntary leaders are different from business, military, educational, or small group leaders (Bass, 1981) it is important to focus specifically on the differences between leaders and members of voluntary organizations.

The general approach taken in the literature on leaders involves a single type of variable across organizations, supplying us with information as to how much participation there is but not with who participates in what organization and why (Emmos, 1979, p. 6). Moreover, there is little evidence to support the assumption that any single variable consistently distinguishes between leaders and members (Deaux & Vrightsman, 1984). While much research has addressed the issue of who participates in various community activities, relatively little has investigated the reasons why there is a differential level of activism and even fewer have asked both questions at the same time (with the notable exception of Lavrakas et al. 1980).

In the present study we will attempt to distinguish between members and leaders in a single type of organization (block, or neighborhood voluntary association) in two different cultures (U.S. and Israel) by using three sets of variables: Demographic, social psychological (personality, attitudinal), and cost-benefit (of participation). This will enable us to: 1) identify specific variables from each of the sets associated with the leader-member differences; 2) compare the three sets in their ability to discriminate leader-member differences; and 3) cross-culturally examine similarities and differences between leaders and members in a setting where there is ample opportunity for participation. The use of the cross-cultural comparison will lend greater generalizability to the findings if we find similar patterns across cultures. Our hypothesis, based on the literature, is that leaders tend to have higher socio-economic

status (as measured by education, occupation and income), more voluntary participation in other organizations, more positive view of themselves and others and see more benefits (than costs) than do members. These variables will be examined within the context of three general realms of demography, social psychology and cost benefit variables.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

THE SETTING

United States

Data were obtained as part of the Neighborhood Participation Project (Florin & Wandersman, 1983; Wandersman, 1978) which systematically studied participation in block organizations in the Waverly-Belmont neighborhood of Nashville, Tennessee. The Waverly-Belmont neighborhood is typical of many American transitional urban neighborhoods. Following a post World War II exodus to the suburbs by middle class residents, the neighborhood experienced decreasing property values, increasing crime rate, and a general deterioration of the physical environment. Recently, however, there has been a reverse migration to urban areas such as this one which offers spacious older homes with the convenience and amenities of an urban location (Clay, 1979). Although the neighborhood is racially integrated, individual blocks tend to be more homogeneous, having primarily either white residents or black residents of varying socio-economic status. Houses are primarily one and two family dwellings with a few multiple units interspersed.

Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) developed a project to serve the neighborhood. NHS is a non-profit, cooperative organization of citizens, city officials, and local lending institutions designed to assist neighborhood residents in revitalizing their neighborhood. NHS is the single most widely employed model for neighborhood upgrading (Ahlbrandt & Brophy, 1975), and currently there are over 160 NHS programs operating in 140 cities across the United States. One of the ways that NHS stimulates citizen action is to assist in the development of block organizations. NHS serves as a catalyst for block organizations by employing community organizers to work with people in the community, block by block. A "block" refers to both sides of a resident's street, cross streets serving as block boundaries. The block organization serves as a forum for block focus on issues of common concern such as crime, street repairs, street lighting, etc.

Israel

Rapid urbanization and development of the country left its mark on many neighborhoods which deteriorated and turned into the areas of poverty and crime. In 1978 a national urban renewal project known as Project Renewal (PR) emphasized the rehabilitation of both physical and social aspects of blighted neighborhoods. The project has several goals including improving the quality of the physical environment, improving the quality of the social environment, and increasing the opportunities and responsibilities for residents to improve their own condition and the condition of the neighborhood. In each PR neighborhood, there is a steering com-

mittee which helps plan and decide what programs and projects will be conducted in the neighborhood (one such project involves training provided to neighborhood activists, see below).² Since PR demarcated for the first time a program of widespread citizen participation instituted in Israel, courses on citizen participation were developed for teaching citizen participation skills and program planning.³ By 1985 over 1000 have graduated from 70 such schools.

Cross Cultural Similarities and Differences

In both the U.S. and Israel our samples come from blocks or neighborhoods that are affiliated with neighborhood rehabilitation programs that place a heavy emphasis on resident and local government input. However, some mention should be made of the cultural similarities and differences between the two countries. While both are pluralistic democracies, they differ in age, size (territory and population) and in their historical roots. In the U.S., common nationality provides bridges among different ethnic, religious and racial groups to promote national identity. In Israel, the commonality is religious as well as national. The key differences relevant to citizen participation involve the role the citizen plays in each country. In the U.S., a long tradition of decentralized government and a philosophy of citizen initiatives helped shape cultural realities in which citizens do not expect that only the government will act on their behalf. In Israel, the strong centralized governmental, administrative and political system influences decision making over which citizens have relatively little control. While there is a large number of voluntary associations in Israel, there are relatively few examples in which grassroot citizen action groups have maintained independence from government control. This can be viewed as an attempt of citizens to gain some relief from the strong political control. However, up to this point it has not been transformed to citizen action prior to the emergence of PR. Even PR is centrally administered, but it has given essentially free mandates to the communities to make their own decisions. In both countries, the common theme is the mobilization of citizens to improve the locality.

SAMPLING

United States

The respondents in this study were 517 adult residents (18 years or older) on 17 blocks with organizations in Nashville, Tennessee. Interviews, requested with all adults living in each household on each block, were conducted during the period May–September, 1978, in the homes of the respondents.

The blocks were predominantly blue-collar and lower-middle class. Ages of respondents ranged from 18–91 with an average of 43.9 years. The majority of the respondents were black with 38.6% being white; 61% of the sample were women and 39% men. Marital status varied among the respondents with 46% married, 54% either single, divorced, separated or widowed. The 201 respondents who reported that they were a member of a block organization were used in the analysis in this article.

Israel

In-person interviews were performed with 154 graduates at their homes (lasting approximately 60 minutes).⁴ Neighborhoods⁵—in which there were established schools for neighborhood activists—were split statewide to southern/northern districts. Out of the northern one we selected every second neighborhood (or residential area) out of which we then selected every second activist. Data collection was completed in February—March of 1985. Activists ranged in age from 20 to 80 years with the average age being 41. Just over 51% were males and 48.7% females; 77.9% were married and 22.1% single, divorced or widowed. According to father's country of birth, 31.3% were Ashkenazi (of European-American origin) and 66.9% were Sephardi (of African-Asian origin).

These procedures resulted in the following numbers: U.S., 80 leaders and 121 members. Israel, 32 leaders and 80 members.

MEASURE OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dependent variable in the study was the level of participation in a block association or neighborhood activities. This variable was operationalized by the degree of self-reported involvement. Members were those who reported that they attended meetings, talked at meetings, worked on committees and worked for the association or the neighborhood outside of meeting times but who held no leadership positions. Leaders were defined as heading a committee (in Israel and the U.S.) or being an officer of the association (in the U.S.). An initial question was whether there were really substantive differences in the participatory behavior of leaders. It is apparent in both samples that we have cross-validated a group of leaders which is significantly different from the group of members with respect to their participatory behavior in terms of having more roles, being active for a longer period of time and dedicating more time to their activism.

MEASURES OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

In order to compare leaders and members, we looked at three types of variables:

1. Demographic—age, race (for the U.S.; country of origin for Israel), gender, education, occupational status, length of residence, marital status, number of children under 17, number in household, intended length of residence.

2. Social psychological—(In the U.S., questions were asked about the block because of the focus on block organizations; in Israel, questions were asked about the neighborhood because of the focus on neighborhood renewal). Variables included importance of the block/neighborhood, satisfaction with the block/neighborhood, participation in other voluntary associations, perceived personal influence in changing the block/neighborhood, sense of community on the block/neighborhood, importance of sense of community, sense of citizen duty (Campbell, Gurin, & Miller, 1954), self esteem (Coopersmith, 1967), political cynicism (Agger, Goldstein and Pearl, 1961), political efficacy (Campbell et al. 1954), leadership style (Fleishman, 1957; see Table 2 for description of variables), perception of participation skills, perception of specific problems on the block, power people on the block or organiza-

tion have to solve a problem, ratings of block/neighborhood 1 year ago, now, 1 year from now.

3. Costs and benefits of participation (Israel only)—We developed 11 benefit items based on the Clark and Wilson (1961) typology of material, solidary, and purposive incentives which were rated on a 1 (very much) to 5 (very little) scale. Six cost items measuring time, effort, and frustration were also rated on a 1 to 5 scale. In addition, there was one item exploring the ratio between benefits and costs of activism ranging from 1 (much more benefits than costs) to 7 (much more costs than benefits). See Tables 3 and 4 for description of cost-benefit variables.

MODE OF ANALYSIS

In order to distinguish between leader and members we employed X^2 procedures for nominal variables, T-test for interval variables and Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA).

RESULTS

LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The demographic variables yielded few differences between leaders and members. In the U.S., activists who had higher educational and occupational rankings were significantly more likely to be leaders (see Table 1). In Israel, females constituted the majority of members (60%) but males were significantly more likely ($p < .024$) to become leaders (66%). In the U.S. females constituted 66% of the members and leaders alike. Variables *not* significantly related to activism included race (ethnic origin), age, marital status, having children under 17, number of people in the household, and length of residence (past and planned).

SELF-REPORTED REASONS FOR PARTICIPATION, CONTINUATION AND ACHIEVEMENT

We wanted to examine whether leaders differ from members as to the reasons they stated for becoming active volunteers. The responses to the open-ended question (in the Israeli sample) "What was your most important reason for becoming a neighborhood activist?" were collapsed into 4 groups focusing on "inner needs", "desire for specific change", "personal empowerment/involvement in the process", and "caring about/interested in the neighborhood." The most frequently mentioned category for both leaders (56%) and members (35%) was "caring about/interested in the neighborhood". Although leaders mentioned this category more frequently than members, a X^2 test was not significant. We also asked two open-ended questions about what would encourage or discourage persons to continue to participate. Leaders and members most often mentioned achievements such as getting results, improving the neighborhood, and personal satisfaction as the most encouraging factors. Lack of time and apathy of residents were most often mentioned as the most discouraging factors. There were no significant differences between leaders and members on encouragement or discouragement to continue activism. Leaders were significantly ($p < .02$) different from members on their responses to "What are your

most important achievements as a neighborhood activist?" Specifically, leaders far more than members (54% to 29%) saw their greatest achievement in the activation of people and helping others while more than twice as many members than leaders (24% to 11% respectively) saw "no achievement."

LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES

In both countries, the same four variables were found to distinguish between leaders and members (the first 4 variables in the social psychological section in Table 1). Leaders have greater political efficacy ($p < .017$) and a higher level of perceived participation skills ($p < .005$). Leaders participate more in other voluntary associations ($p < .001$). Leaders perceive they have more influence in getting the block or neighborhood the way they want it ($p < .029$ for Israel; $p < .004$ for the U.S.). American leaders saw their block a year ago more negatively than did members ($p < .011$). Interestingly, American and Israeli members and leaders reflected an increasing optimism with respect to their perception of the neighborhood/block "now" and "a year from now" compared with "a year ago". Variables that were *not* significantly related to level of activism in both samples are also interesting: Sense of community on the block or neighborhood, importance of sense of community, self-esteem, problems on the block/neighborhood, rating of block characteristics, satisfaction with the block/neighborhood, rating of the block/neighborhood (a year ago); in Israel) at present and a year from now (in Israel and the U.S.). The striking aspect of these results is the near replication of significant and nonsignificant differences in the two samples.

LEADERSHIP STYLES (ISRAEL ONLY)

The 17 items of the leadership style inventory (Fleishman, 1957) were subjected to a factor analysis which yielded six distinct factors, from personal style of leadership to style of group activation. They accounted for 57.2 of the variance in the matrix (Table 2).⁶ Contrary to our expectations, leaders did not differ from members on any of these 6 leadership factors. We then checked for differences between participants (leaders and members combined) and nonparticipants and found that there were significant differences between the two groups on three of the six leadership factors. Non-participants have a greater tendency to act alone, are less willing to change, and act less as the group's spokesman than participants (see Table 2).

LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION AND COST-BENEFIT ISSUES (ISRAEL ONLY)

Benefits—A factor analysis performed on the benefit items yielded two distinct factors (Table 3). They accounted for 56.6% of the variance in the matrix. Factor 1 ("personal gains") included such variables as material benefits, solution of a specific problem of direct interest to the activist, increased political influence and enhanced personal and professional goals. Factor 2 ("helping others") included such variables as sense of contribution and helpfulness, providing useful service to the community, increased knowledge of the community, increased sense of responsibility and friendship with other members or staff. Overall, the absolute numerical values suggest that both leaders and members agree that the greatest benefits are in making a contribu-

TABLE 1
Significant T-Tests for Member Leader Differences on Activism,
Demographic, Social Psychological and Cost-Benefit Variables.

| Variable | Means | | U.S. | | 1-Tail | | Means | | 1-Tail | |
|--|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Leader | Member | T | P | Leader | Member | T | P | Leader | Member |
| Demographic | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education ^a | 3.57 | 4.15 | 2.60 | .005 | 3.50 | 3.28 | .40 | N.S. | | |
| Occupation ^a | 4.97 | 5.74 | 2.40 | .0009 | 4.87 | 5.27 | .32 | N.S. | | |
| Social Psychological | | | | | | | | | | |
| Participation in other voluntary organizations | 22.25 | 20.04 | -3.02 | .0015 | 14.00 | 11.88 | -3.09 | .001 | | |
| Leadership competence | 11.71 | 10.35 | -3.42 | .0005 | 15.87 | 14.70 | -2.62 | .005 | | |
| Political efficacy | 9.89 | 9.49 | -2.10 | .018 | 21.31 | 19.84 | -2.16 | .017 | | |
| Sense of influence over the neighborhood affairs | 3.80 | 3.33 | -2.63 | .0045 | 3.22 | 2.76 | -1.93 | .029 | | |
| Roles participants play ^a | N/A | | | | 10.47 | 12.31 | 4.34 | .0001 | | |
| How long has been active | N/A | | | | 5.00 | 4.03 | -3.08 | .001 | | |
| Political involvement (take part in demonstrations) | N/A | | | | 1.55 | 1.09 | -2.92 | .003 | | |
| Time (dedicated to voluntary activities) | N/A | | | | 3.50 | 2.84 | -2.80 | .003 | | |
| Political involvement (contact public officials) | N/A | | | | 2.47 | 2.00 | -2.77 | .003 | | |
| Political involvement (participate in political campaigns) | N/A | | | | 1.97 | 1.53 | -2.29 | .013 | | |
| Sense of citizen duty | 6.80 | 6.80 | -1.09 | N.S. | 15.56 | 14.21 | -2.11 | .019 | | |
| Perception of the neighborhood "a year ago" ^a | 3.71 | 4.37 | 2.33 | .01 | 4.53 | 4.85 | .08 | N.S. | | |
| Cost-Benefit | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost factor #1 ("opportunity costs") | N/A | | | | 9.44 | 11.53 | 2.91 | .005 | | |
| Cost-Benefit contrast | N/A | | | | 4.00 | 3.18 | -1.83 | .0365 | | |

^aLow means imply the leaders rank higher than members.

TABLE 2
Factor Analysis Summary for Leadership Items (n = 227)^a

| Factor | Variables | Loadings | % of common variance | | | 1-Tail | |
|---|---|----------|----------------------|------------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | | A | N-A ^b | T | P | |
| Factor1 "Allow freedom" | Allow members to do their work as they see fit | .83 | 15.8 | 5.87 | 6.10 | -.91 | N.S. |
| | Give members complete freedom | .61 | | | | | |
| | After activating members let them go on without interfering | .54 | | | | | |
| | Encourage initiative | .49 | | | | | |
| Factor2 "Act solo" | Refuse to explain actions | .78 | 12.0 | 12.32 | 10.94 | 4.71 | .0001 |
| | Act without consulting the group | .70 | | | | | |
| | Would decide what and how to do it | .57 | | | | | |
| Factor3 "Willing to change" | Would delegate some roles to other members | .75 | 9.2 | 6.86 | 7.58 | -2.29 | .001 |
| | Would be willing to make changes | .73 | | | | | |
| Factor4 "Hard worker & concerned with image" | Would be swamped with details | .71 | 7.8 | 8.27 | 8.37 | -.33 | N.S. |
| | Convince others that his ideas are to their benefit | .62 | | | | | |
| | Would abstain from giving freedom of action to members | .58 | | | | | |
| | Encourage group to achievements | .37 | | | | | |
| Factor5 "Act as spokesman" | Prefer to be the group spokesman | .68 | 6.3 | 4.66 | 5.24 | -2.70 | .0035 |
| | Urge members to make greater effort | .57 | | | | | |
| Factor6 "Act as a bureaucrat" | Make the group operate according to rules and standards | .81 | 6.0 | 5.15 | 5.07 | .36 | N.S. |
| | Get a schedule to fulfill the task | .60 | | | | | |

^aThe "n" in Tables 2, 3, and 4 includes non-members as well (158); factors were calculated for the inclusive sample.

^bA = Activists (participants); N-A = Non Activists (non participants). Comparison of means was performed on 112 activists and 117 non activists. The lower the score the more the leadership trait. Despite the different direction of the differences between activists and nonactivists on the leadership factors their interpretation reveals a consistent pattern where activists are willing to change, act as spokesman and less independently than nonactivists.

tion and helping others rather than in self-interest or personal gains. However, there were no significant differences between leaders and members on any of the individual benefit variables or the two benefit factors.

Costs—Factor analysis yielded two distinct factors accounting for 63% of the variance (Table 4). Factor 1 suggests a factor of "opportunity costs" (what people give up in other parts of their lives in order to participate). These costs are inherent to participation in almost any setting. Factor 2 is more related to participation costs arising from "organizational frustration" (lack of making progress and interpersonal conflict).

Cost Factor 1 ("opportunity costs") significantly ($p < .002$) differentiates between leaders and members, demonstrating that leaders do perceive more costs than members. No significant difference was found between leaders and members on Factor 2. Leaders and members were asked to directly contrast costs with benefits of voluntary activity. Leaders view costs as equal to benefits while members saw themselves

TABLE 3
Factor Analysis Summary for Benefit Items (n = 223)

| Factor | Variables | Loadings |
|------------------|--|----------|
| <i>Factor1</i> | | |
| "Personal gains" | Enhanced personal professional goals | .84 |
| | Solution to specific problems of direct concern | .75 |
| | Increased status or prestige | .72 |
| | Provide material benefits | .71 |
| | Increased political influence | .69 |
| <i>Factor2</i> | | |
| "Helping others" | Increased knowledge of the community and how to improve it | .79 |
| | Sense of contribution and helpfulness | .77 |
| | Provide a useful service to the community | .75 |
| | Increased sense of responsibility | .75 |
| | Friendship with other members or staff | .65 |

as having more benefits than costs. This difference in overall cost-benefit ratio judgement was significant ($p < .04$).

The relative strength of the three sets of variables (e.g., which set was best able to distinguish between leaders and members) and variables within each set were examined for strongest prediction. Separate, stepwise discriminant function analyses were performed on each set. From Israel we had data on all three sets; from the U.S., we had data on the demographic and social psychological sets. The results showed that in both Israel and the U.S. the demographic variables accounted for less variance in the dependent variable of level of participation (4% and 3% respectively) than did the set of cost-benefit items (6% for Israel only) and the social psychological variables (12% and 9% respectively). Classification analyses (where the discriminant function from a set of variables is used to statistically "predict" group membership and is compared against known group membership) also pointed to the relative strength of the social psychological set. The demographic variables correctly classified 62% (Israel) and 59% (U.S.), while the social psychological set correctly classified 66% (Israel) and 64% (U.S.). The cost-benefit set correctly classified 55% (see Table 5).

TABLE 4
Factor Analysis Summary for Cost Items (n = 223)

| Factor | Variables | Loadings |
|------------------------------|---|----------|
| <i>Factor1</i> | | |
| "Opportunity costs" | The need to participate in meetings | .81 |
| | The effort pertaining to neighborhood activism | .78 |
| | The need to give up personal and family matters | .76 |
| | The amount of time it takes | .74 |
| <i>Factor2</i> | | |
| "Organizational frustration" | Frustration from lack of making progress | .85 |
| | Interpersonal conflict with others | .70 |

TABLE 5
Three Set Results of Discriminant Analyses (n = 112)

| Set | Index of Discrimination | Variance Accounted For | p | Cases Correctly Classified |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------|----------------------------|
| <i>Demographic Variables</i> | | | | |
| Israel | .20 | 4% | .04 | 62% |
| U.S. | .16 | 3% | .03 | 59% |
| <i>Social Psychological Variables</i> | | | | |
| Israel | .34 | 12% | .001 | 66% |
| U.S. | .30 | 9% | .001 | 64% |
| <i>Cost-Benefit Variables</i> | | | | |
| Israel (only) | .25 | 6% | .01 | 55% |

Examining each set separately for which variables from the set entered into the discriminant function equation provided a more direct assessment of the relative strength of the independent variables within each set. The strongest predictor variables, in the order of their relative contribution to the discriminant function equation, were as follows:

- DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES: gender (Israel), education (U.S.).
- SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES: Participation in other voluntary associations (Israel and the U.S.); perception of neighborhood problems (Israel); perception of participation skills, view of the block in the previous year (U.S.).
- COST-BENEFIT VARIABLES: Cost factor 1 = "opportunity costs" (Israel only).

In all of the social psychological and cost benefit variables, leaders scored significantly higher than members. Other variables within each set which were significant in bivariate analyses were presumably correlated with the variables from each set that entered the equation but these variables did not supply any significant unique variance over and above the variables which did enter (see Table 6).

The analyses above treated each set of independent variables separately. We also combined the significant variables from the three separate sets in the Israeli sample into one overall stepwise analysis (gender from demographics, participation in other voluntary associations and perceptions of problems from the social-psychological set, and cost factor 1 "personal costs" from the cost-benefit set). This combination did not increase the overall percentage of variance accounted for, nor did it increase the percentage of cases correctly classified. Two of the four variables entered the equation: Participation in other voluntary associations and cost factor 1 "personal costs". Each contributed approximately equally to the equation. These results suggest that the separate sets of variables contain insufficient unique variance to boost the overall results significantly. It is worth noting, however, that cost factor 1 entered the equation, supplying more unique variance to the participation variable than was able to be added by gender or perception of block problems. This would indicate that

TABLE 6
Significant Independent Variables from Discriminant
Analyses Within the Three Sets. (n = 112)

| Set | Variable | Structure Coefficient | Shared Variance with Discriminant Dimension |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|
| <i>Demographic Variables</i> | | | |
| Israel | 1. Gender | 1.00 | 100% |
| U.S. | 1. Education | 1.00 | 100% |
| <i>Social psychological Variables</i> | | | |
| Israel | 1. Participation in other voluntary associations | .82 | 69% |
| | 2. Perception of problems | .43 | 18% |
| U.S. | 1. Perception of participation skills | .71 | 50% |
| | 2. Participation in other voluntary associations | .66 | 44% |
| | 3. View of block conditions in previous year | -.51 | 26% |
| <i>Cost-Benefit Variables</i> | | | |
| Israel (only) | 1. Personal costs factor | 1.00 | 100% |

although the cost-benefit variables were not particularly powerful separately, they may capture a unique dimension untapped by other sets.

DISCUSSION

Our research was aimed at discussing differences between leaders and members in voluntary organizations. However, we found consistent cross-cultural patterns showing relatively few distinguishing characteristics between them. The differences we did find tended to be in experiencing participation.

In our samples, the ratio of leaders to members is much higher than those reported in other studies (e.g., Oliver, 1984). This may be explained by the definition of the dependent variable. Other studies specifically, asked for a (self-expressed or self-defined) "leadership" position, while we have defined it as being a chair of a committee, or an officer of the organization. Also, it may signify a different type of voluntary organization.

The bivariate and DFA analyses of the 3 groups of variables indicate that out of 10 demographic variables, age (with mean of over 40) and length of residence differen-

tiated leaders and members in the U.S. and Israel; gender differentiated between Israeli leaders and members, while education and occupation differentiated U.S. leaders and members.

With respect to the social psychological variables, we investigated 16 different social psychological variables and scales and found several important variables which were significantly related to the level of activism or social voluntary participation. These included sense of citizen duty, participation in other voluntary associations, political efficacy, perception of participation skills, and the sense of influence over the neighborhood. The American and Israeli activists showed remarkable similarity in the pattern and direction of the variables where leaders display these characteristics more than members. Examination of the variables that did enter the discriminant function equations leads to the general conclusion that perception of participation skills is a strong factor distinguishing leaders from members. People apparently will not undertake the leadership role if they feel uncertain of their ability or, said another way, have fewer feelings of self-efficacy to enter into their calculations of the possibility of successful action (Bandura, 1977; Henig, 1982). These perceptions of participation related skills might also be highly correlated with participation in other voluntary associations, where an individual might develop the confidence that experience brings and develop participation skills. It thus may not be surprising that leaders are more likely to report more participation in other voluntary associations than members. Also, we found that leaders are more "rooted" in the community than are members, a finding similar to that of Riger and Lavrakas (1981). Finally, leaders seem to perceive more need for action than members, at least in terms of perceiving more specific problems or generally viewing conditions more negatively. The motivation of a felt need (Henig, 1982) seems stronger for leaders than for members. These variables are not very powerful but they are suggestive, particularly when we consider the cost-benefit results. As we hypothesized, leaders perceived more costs to their activities than members. However, our hypothesis that leaders would perceive more benefits was not borne out. While we expected a difference between leaders and members, we did not find one. Regarding the benefits-costs ratio, our hypothesis was also not supported: leaders saw costs and benefits equally while members perceived they had more benefits than costs. If, in fact, costs will be offset by benefits as Olson (1965) suggests, then leaders should have seen more benefits than costs (compared with members). It is possible that members experience more of a "free ride" while leaders are "hanging on" as long as they see benefits to their participation. The imminent danger is in greater loss and turnover of leaders.

The profiles of leaders and members point to initial structural differences (such as greater "rootedness" in the community) and, at the same time, to attitudes and perceptions that have been shaped while occupying differential activism positions (member, leader). Our findings are thus helpful in identifying leaders and members and showing how background and experiential variables operate, and in providing a predictive measure to identify prospective members and leaders for voluntary associations. Moreover, the findings that the U.S. and Israeli samples differ from one another on some demographic characteristics and tend to be similar on attitudes, perceptions, or reasons to join and on factors which will encourage or discourage continuity of activism, is evidence of the similarities of experiences leaders (and members) undergo irrespective of the geo-cultural setting. In other words, the volun-

tary experiences of membership and leadership respectively seem to cut across national boundaries. Therefore, we can re-orient our thinking about leadership in voluntary organizations. Since leaders do not differ from members on leadership styles (but both differ from nonparticipants), then participation itself is what counts and once one participates it is the perception of (participation and leadership) skills which would channel a person into more or less active roles.

The results of both bivariate and DFA analyses from two cultures suggest that leaders and members are not distinguished by leaders attaching more importance to the residential environment than members or feeling more attachment or sense of community than members. (These factors do distinguish people who become activists or members from those who do not, see Wandersman et al. 1987). Rather, those who assume leadership roles appear to feel more comfortable with their skills to lead and these skills are often developed in other, similar participation contexts. These skills may also be related to other attitudes which indicate that leaders feel more confident of their general ability to influence things and have an immediate impact on their environment. And finally, leaders seem to be motivated by more of a felt need to address problems and conditions than members. These specific areas, rather than global attitudinal variables, are those which warrant further investigation.

The social-psychological variables and the cross-sectional nature of our research design have not assumed that leaders (or leadership traits) are not randomly distributed in the population prior to becoming active; we looked for leadership traits in already existing occupied leadership roles. Due to the design, even such findings as greater "rootedness" of leaders could be explained by leaders becoming more rooted rather than "rootedness" leading to leadership. Our post-hoc analysis indicates some differences between members and leaders which seem to emanate from the positions they occupy, and not necessarily from individual traits.

It seems that leadership, or occupying leadership roles in voluntary organizations, makes leaders distinct from nonleaders. This may explain why we have data which show a great deal of diversity between nonparticipants and participants but relatively few differences between levels of participation. It is possible that despite our formal attempts to define leadership, the *informal* context of voluntary associations does not lend itself to great differentiation between the members and leaders. Perhaps there are no differences after all, or they are much more subtle and difficult to locate. This may well fit with the view that leadership is a process of directing activities through the exercise of influence/power and it is plausible to argue that beyond the differences already evident in our study—leaders and members are rather similar to one another (see Hollander, 1985). Although the social psychological set was the strongest discriminator between leaders and members, the bivariate results of the cost-benefit analyses are probably more instructive. Their advantage lies in the usage of a conceptual framework which has practical implications. Clearly, the reduction of costs and the provision of greater resources for training and technical assistance point to the need to focus more attention on the organizational context where leadership emerges, develops and is maintained. Perhaps future research should utilize variables to examine skills and experiential attitudes focusing more on *why* a person becomes a leader rather than on *who* becomes a leader.

These findings have three interesting implications for the recruitment and maintenance of leaders: 1) Increasing benefits to leaders is difficult since there is little which can be offered materially (except in rare occasions where leaders are publicly recog-

nized). Adding benefits will tend to apply equally to leaders and members and thus will not differentiate between them; 2) Reducing the costs of leadership is essential and this could be accomplished through greater diversification and sharing of efforts, differentiation of roles and delegation of whatever "authority" there is, as well as some limitation of volunteer hours; 3) since many members could become leaders, as evidenced by the few differences in demographic and leadership traits, greater attention can be paid to enable members to become leaders by training them in specific leadership skills.

NOTES

1. Please address all correspondence to Dr. Robert R. Friedmann, Department of Criminal Justice, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta GA 30303.
2. The committee consists of 23 members, at least 11 of which are neighborhood residents. The other members are from relevant local and national government agencies (information is gathered from the 1982 annual report of the International Committee for the Evaluation of Project Renewal). In 1985, there were 85 PR neighborhoods in Israel.
3. These courses were set for PR participants, but were open to others. The Israeli National Council of Schools for Neighborhood Activists used local coordinators to interview candidates in participating communities, screening and then assigning approximately 20 candidates to each "school" or course. The selected participants underwent 100 hours of courses (usually 3 hours one night a week and/or full days or weekends) lasting for about 6 months. For successful graduates, there were plans for more advanced training.
4. The total population of Neighborhood Activists was targeted; at the time of the study it consisted of 1031 activists from which we sampled 15% (approximately 155 activists). Thus our "return rate" is close to 100%. We also have data on 158 nonactivists. While the results on nonmembers are not included in this study, factor analyses of measures used all subjects for consistency purposes.
5. It should be noted that blocks and neighborhoods are not identical. It seems to us that the Israeli concept of "neighborhood" is however, close enough to the American concept of the "block" particularly when our unit of analysis is local action and characteristics of leaders and members.
6. An Orthogonal (Varimax) rotation was used in this and other analyses. There was little overlap between the factors; all of the variables which loaded high on one factor, loaded low ($p < .30$) on the other factors and vice versa. This exclusiveness criterion was consistently used in later analyses.
7. The "n" in Tables 2, 3, and 4 includes non-members as well (158); factors were calculated for the inclusive sample.
8. A = Activists (participants); N-A = Non Activists (non participants). Comparison of means was performed on 112 activists and 117 non activists. The lower the score the more the leadership trait. Despite the different direction of the differences between activists and nonactivists on the leadership factors their interpretation reveals a consistent pattern where activists are willing to change, act as spokesman and less independently than nonactivists.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The U.S. research was supported by National Science Foundation grant BNS 78-0887, and the Israeli research was supported by the School of Social Work at the University of Haifa and the Department of Psychology and the Byrnes International Center at the University of South Carolina.

The authors wish to thank David Cooperman and David Knoke as well as three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments made on earlier drafts of this article, and acknowledge the generous help of Yosef Pardes (head of the Council of Neighborhood Activists Schools) for his support and cooperation in facilitating data collection in Israel; and Shmuel Goldstein (of the Council), for his help in pretesting, site selection, and questionnaire translation, etc. in Israel.

REFERENCES

- Agger, R. E., M. N. Goldstein, and S. A. Pearl
1961 "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning" *Journal of Politics* 23:477-506
- Ahlbrandt, R.S. and P. Brophy
1975 *Neighborhood Revitalization: Theory and Practice* (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington

- Aviran, N.
1984 *Participants and Non Participants in Neighborhood Organizations: Environmental and Human Characteristics*. Haifa, Israel: Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Haifa
- Babchuk, N. and C. W. Gordon
1962 *The Voluntary Association in the Slum*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Bailey, R. Jr
1974 *Radicals in Urban Politics: The Alinsky Approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Bandura, A.
1977 "Self-Efficacy: Towards A Unifying Theory of Behavior Change" *Psychological Review* 89:191-215.
- Bass, B. M.
1981 *Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bers, T. H. and S. G. Mezey
1981 "Support for Feminist Goals Among Leaders of Women's Community Groups." *Signs* 6:737-48.
- Bolduc, V. L.
1980 "Representation and Legitimacy in Neighborhood Organizations: A Case Study" *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 9:165-78.
- Campbell, A., G. Gurin, and W. Miller
1954 *The Voter Decides*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.
- Churchman, A.
1987 "Can Resident Participation in Neighborhood Rehabilitation Programs Succeed? Israel's Project Renewal Through a Comparative Perspective" In I. Altman & A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Neighborhood and Community Environments*. New York: Plenum
- Clark, P. B. and J. Q. Wilson
1961 "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 6:129-66
- Clay, P. L.
1979 *Neighborhood Renewal*. Mass: Lexington.
- Cnaan, R. A. and Y. Katan
1986 "Local Neighborhood Communities in Israel: Potentials for Self Help Group Activity" *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 15(2):33-46.
- Coopersmith, S.
1967 *The Antecedents of Self-Esteem*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman
- Deaux, K. and L. Wrightsman
1984 *Social Psychology in the Eighties*, 4th Edition, Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Emmons, D.
1979 *Neighborhood Activities and Community Organizations: A Critical Review of the Literature*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, Center for Urban Affairs.
- Fleishman, E. A.
1957 "The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire" In *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*, edited by R. M. Stogdill. Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University
- Flonn, P. and A. Wandersman
1983 "A Psychological Perspective on Neighborhood Conservation." In *Environmental Psychology: Directions and Perspectives*, edited by N. R. Feimer and S. E. Geller, New York: Praeger
- Florin, P., M. Mednick, and A. Wandersman
1986 "Cognitive Social Learning Variables and the Characteristics of Leaders." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 16: 808-30.
- Gittell, M., B. Hoffacker, E. Rollins, S. Foster, M. Hoffacker
1980 *Limits to Citizen Participation. The Decline of Community Organizations*. Beverly Hills: Sage
- Goldstein, I.
1985 *The Correlation Between Social Participative Leisure and Alienation*. Haifa, Israel. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Haifa
- Henig, J.
1982 *Neighborhood Mobilization*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press
- Hollander, E. P.
1985 "Leadership and Power" In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 3rd edition, Vol. 2, edited by G. Lindzey, and E. Aronson. New York: Random House, pp. 485-537
- Kieffer, C. H.
1983 "Citizen Empowerment: A Developmental Perspective." *Prevention in Human Services* (January).
- Knoke, D.
1985 "The Political Economies of Associations." *Research in Political Sociology* 1:211-42.

- Knoke, D. and J. R. Wood
1981 *Organized for Action. Commitment in Voluntary Associations*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press
- Laskin, R.
1962 *Leadership of Voluntary Organizations in A Saskatchewan Town*. Saskatoon, Centre for Community Studies, University of Saskatchewan
- Lavrakas, P. I., J. Normolye, W. Skogan, G. Salem, and D. Lewis
1980 *Factors Related to Citizen Involvement in Personal, Household, and Neighborhood Anti Crime Measures*. Executive Summary. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice
- Lawson, R.
1975 "Community Leaders and Urban Housing Problems: Leadership Roles, Organizational Goals and Effectiveness in Seven New York City Community Planning Districts" *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 4:75-84.
- Liron, R.
1985 *Participation of citizen representatives in the Administration of Project Renewal*. Unpublished Dissertation (Hebrew). Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
- Liron, R. and S. Spiro
1984 *Citizen Participation in the Governing of Urban Renewal Project: An Evaluative Study*. Tel Aviv, Sapir Institute, Tel Aviv University
- Moe, T. M.
1980 *The Organization of Interests: Incentives and the Internal Dynamics of Political Interest Groups*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Oliver, P.
1984 "If You Don't Do It, Nobody Else Will: Active and Token Contributors to Local Collective Action" *American Sociological Review* 49:601-10
- Olson, M.
1965 *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pearce, J. L.
1980 "Apathy or Self Interest? The Volunteer's Avoidance of Leadership Roles." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*; 85-94.
- 1982 "Leading and Following Volunteers: Implications for A Changing Society" *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 18:385-94.
- Peattie, I.
1968 "Reflections on Advocacy Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 34:80-88
- Prestby, J. E.
1984 "Leaders and Members in Voluntary Organizations." Working paper. Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC
- Rich, R. C.
1980 "The Dynamics of Leadership in Neighborhood Organizations." *Social Science Quarterly* 60:570-87.
- Riger, S. and P. J. Lavrakas
1981 "Community Ties: Patterns of Attachment and Social Interaction in Urban Neighborhoods" *American Journal of Community Psychology* 9(1):55-56.
- Rose, A. M.
1962 "Alienation and Participation: A Comparison of Group Leaders and the 'Mass.'" *American Sociological Review* 27:834-38.
- Sharp, E. B.
1978 "Citizen Organizations in Policing Issues and Crime Prevention: Incentives for Participation." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 7:45-58.
- Smith, D. H.
1975 "Voluntary Action and Voluntary Groups." In *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 1, edited by A. Inkeles, J. Coleman, and N. Smelser Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, pp. 247-70.
- Stogdill, R. M.
1974 *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press
- Tomeh, A. K.
1974 "Formal Voluntary Organizations: Participation, Correlates and Interrelationships." *Sociological Inquiry* 43(3-4):89-122
- Wandersman, A. (Principal Investigator)
1978 *Participation in Block Organizations*. Funded by the National Science Foundation, 1978-1982
- Wandersman, A., P. Florin, R. R. Friedmann, and R. Meier
1987 "Who Participates, Who Does Not Participate, and Why? Participation in Block and Neighborhood Organizations in the United States and Israel." *Sociological Forum*, 2 (3):534-55.

- Warren, R. L.
1963 *The Community in America*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Wellstone, P. D.
1978 *How the Rural Poor Got Power: Narrative of a Grassroots Organizer*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Widmer, C.
1985 "Why Board Members Participate?" *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 14(4): 8-23.
- Yates, D. T.
1973 *Neighborhood Democracy: The Politics and Impact of Decentralization*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- York, A. S.
1977 "Leaders of Voluntary Associations in Difficult Housing Estate" *International Review of Community Development* 37-38: 273-84.
- Zimmerman, J. F.
1972 *The Federated City: Community Control in Large Cities*. New York: St. Martin's Press.