

**MOBILIZATION AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION:
WHO IS ASKED TO PLAY IN THE GAME**

by

Marguerite A. Grabarek

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Social Work and Political Science)
in the University of Michigan
2011**

Doctoral Committee:

**Professor Mary E. Corcoran, Co-Chair
Professor Lorraine M. Gutierrez, Co-Chair
Professor Gregory B. Markus
Associate Professor Andrew C. Grogan-Kaylor**

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| List of Tables | v |
| List of Appendices | vi |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 1 |
| Recruitment Factors | 2 |
| Resources and Individual Characteristics | 3 |
| Social Connections and Past Activity | 5 |
| Neighborhood | 7 |
| A Theory of Political Recruitment..... | 12 |
| Questions to be tested | 14 |
| Data and methodology | 15 |
| Chapter overview | 19 |
| Chapter 2 Mobilization - Generic | 21 |
| Introduction..... | 21 |
| Research Questions | 25 |
| Data and methodology | 27 |
| Results..... | 30 |
| Race and Recruitment | 30 |
| Race Discussion | 33 |
| Predicting Recruitment: Full Model | 34 |
| Discussion | 38 |
| Conclusion | 40 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter 3 Mobilization - Schools | 42 |
| Introduction..... | 42 |
| Research Questions | 48 |
| Data and methodology | 50 |
| Results..... | 54 |
| Who is recruited? | 54 |
| Race and Recruitment | 55 |
| Race Discussion | 58 |
| Predicting Recruitment | 59 |
| Overall Discussion | 64 |
| Conclusion | 67 |
| Chapter 4 Mobilization: Crime | 69 |
| Introduction..... | 69 |
| Research Questions | 75 |
| Data and methodology | 77 |
| Race and Recruitment | 82 |
| Race Discussion | 84 |
| Predicting Recruitment | 84 |
| Overall Discussion | 88 |
| Conclusion | 90 |
| Chapter 5 Conclusion..... | 92 |
| Who is recruited..... | 93 |
| Descriptives..... | 93 |
| Race and Recruitment | 96 |
| Predictors of Recruitment – Full Model | 99 |

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Accessibility..... | 99 |
| Neighborhood Context..... | 101 |
| Conclusion | 103 |
| Appendices..... | 108 |
| Bibliography | 114 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 2-1: Percent Contacted..... | 31 |
| Table 2-2: Race Effect on Probability of Recruitment: % Change..... | 32 |
| Table 2-3: Predictors of Generic Recruitment, Percentage Change in Probability of Contact | 35 |
| Table 3-1: Percent contacted about a school issue..... | 54 |
| Table 3-2: Race Effect on Likelihood of School Related Recruitment: % Change..... | 56 |
| Table 3-3: Accessibility by race | 56 |
| Table 3-4: Predictors of Recruitment for School Related Activities - Full Model..... | 61 |
| Table 4-1: Percent contacted about a Crime Issue..... | 82 |
| Table 4-2: Race Effect on Likelihood of Crime Related Recruitment: % Change..... | 83 |
| Table 4-3: Accessibility by race | 83 |
| Table 4-4: Predictors of Recruitment for Crime Related Activities Partial Model | 85 |
| Table 4-5: Predictors of Recruitment for Crime Related Activities Full Model | 86 |
| Table 5-1: Percent Recruited by Issue, Activity and Demographic Characteristics | 95 |
| Table 5-2: Race Effect on Likelihood of Recruitment - % Change..... | 97 |

List of Appendices

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Appendix A | 1989 Detroit Area Studies Survey Questions..... | 108 |
| Appendix B | % Change in Probability of Recruitment for All Issues and Activities | 111 |
| Appendix C | Neighborhood Characteristics by Race of Respondent..... | 113 |

Chapter 1

Introduction

In a rural county in North Carolina, the poorest in the state, and one in which American Indians, African Americans, and Hispanics made up the majority of the county, a large corporation proposed the building of a toxic waste treatment facility near a river that served as a water supply for several local communities. Some of the residents suspected one of the reasons their county had been chosen was because their demographics were reflective of the politically quiescent and the belief was that their communities would not try to block the proposed facility. However, when a public hearing was held, well over three hundred people showed up, packing the room to overflowing and necessitating the addition of chairs and a speaker system out in the halls. Many of the participants were American Indian, African American, Hispanic, individuals with low levels of education and income, and limited ownership of working vehicles. They not only filled the seats, but were also some of the main speakers against the building of the proposed facility.¹ In short, they were precisely the types of individuals that the political science literature would have predicted least likely to show up. On the other hand, they were exactly the kinds of individuals that the community organizing literature in the social work tradition argues should be organized and tapped for political participation. There is a puzzle behind this story and one that needs the contributions of both social work and political science. In this paper, I will bring together these two disciplines to highlight what each field can learn from the other, and will utilize data from the Detroit Area Study to further explore influences on who is recruited for political participation.

For decades, political scientists have attempted to solve the puzzle of political participation--the continuing disparities in rates of participation between groups

¹ The author was present at the hearing as one of the funders of the local community group organizing in the county. For more information on the organizing effort, please see Gaventa and Smith (1990).

categorized by race and class. Recent research has highlighted the key role played by mobilization in explaining some of the disparities in participation. However, research on predictors of recruitment² has been fairly limited. Most political science studies have focused on recruitment to politics in general, with little distinction made between recruitment for different activities to issues, or to the influence of neighborhood on who is ultimately mobilized. These are the precisely the factors that community organizers are encouraged to consider in their recruitment strategies. Factors influencing participation are complex. To assume that mobilization is less complex or that one strategy is utilized for all issues and activities may diminish our ability to tease apart the participation puzzle. Further, over the last several decades, social science has paid increasing attention to neighborhood effects. However, little of this conversation about neighborhood effects has entered into the literature on recruitment to political participation. Lastly, given the persistence of residential segregation in the United States (particularly in urban areas with high proportions of African Americans), and the fact that blacks are more likely than whites to live in the most resource poor neighborhoods (Massey, 2007), it is time to pay closer attention to the neighborhood context of recruitment.

Recruitment Factors

Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) have argued that political strategists target 1) individuals who are known to them and who are effective when they take action (typically those from the upper echelons of society); 2) who are likely to participate (activists); and 3) those who are socially connected. In essence, what matters are individual resources and characteristics, social connections and past political involvement. The authors' data however, is based solely on responses from individuals about whether they had been recruited for political participation. They did not interview activists to ascertain their recruitment strategies, and thus were not able to provide evidence of what actually guides mobilizers' targeting decisions. We do have some clues about what is in the minds of organizers from the community organizing literature. Rosenstone and Hansen's theory, along with guidance from the organizing literature will be utilized as a starting framework for examining the recruitment literature in the field of political science.

² I use recruitment and mobilization interchangeably throughout this paper.

Resources and Individual Characteristics

Greater individual resources (education and income) have been shown to be strong predictors of recruitment by political parties and by other political and non-political organizations, for voting, campaign contributions, and campaign work (Abramson & Claggett, 2001; Brady, Schlozman, & Verba, 1999; Gershtenson, 2003; Kenneth M. Goldstein & Ridout, 2002; Krassa, 1988; Leighley, 2001; Zipp & Smith, 1979). In the few cases where individual activities were analyzed separately, there was some variation in the influence of resources on recruitment to specific activities. Abramson and Claggett (2001) found higher levels of education associated with an increase in the likelihood of contact to vote, give money or work on a campaign, but greater wealth only influenced the chance of contact for the latter two activities. Goldstein (1999) found greater levels of education increased an individual's chance of being contacted during lobbying about Clinton's healthcare reform, but income did not appear to be a factor. In other words, resources may be an important predictor of mobilization, but income and education are not interchangeable.

Age and gender also play a role in recruitment to politics, but their influence on likelihood of contact is much smaller and more mixed than is true for education and income. In a few instances older citizens were more likely to be asked by a political party to vote or contribute to a campaign than were younger citizens (Abramson & Claggett, 2001; Gershtenson, 2003; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Zipp & Smith, 1979). In some studies, men were more likely than women to be recruited by strategists to vote or to become politically active (Kenneth M. Goldstein, 1999; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995), but in the majority of studies, gender was not a significant predictor of contact. Verba, et al (1995) used a summary variable for mobilization that included recruitment to do campaign work, make a campaign contribution, participate in a community activity and to protest. Thus, it was not possible to determine if there was any variation in recruitment by gender for each of the different activities.

Several studies suggest that blacks were less likely to be contacted for electoral participation than were whites (Kenneth M. Goldstein, 1999; Verba, et al., 1995; Wielhouwer, 2000). If, as Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) suggest, strategists target the upper echelons of society, this finding is no surprise since race is so closely associated

with both education and income in the United States. However, the influence of race on contact was not a consistent factor in all electoral years or for all activities. Abramson and Claggett (2001) found that blacks were less likely to be contacted to contribute to a campaign, but race did not predict contact to vote or to work on campaign. Blacks were less likely to be contacted by the Republican Party between 1972 and 2000, but not between 1956 and 1968 (Gershtenson, 2003). Race did not appear to influence Democratic Party strategies. Leighley (2001) suggests there were minimal differences by race for institutional mobilization (by churches, on the job, and by voluntary organizations), but a clear bias toward Anglos for particularized mobilization. Anglos were twice as likely as African Americans and four times as likely as Hispanics to be asked to contact a government official. There were similar gaps in contact rates by race for those asked to work on a local activity or to do campaign work. In other studies, due to the use of national data and the small sample size for African Americans, SES may have overwhelmed the race effect given its strong link to class.

The mixed results for the influence of race on mobilization may be due to different strategies utilized by different types of organizers, particularly if the organizing takes place at the local, rather than the national level. It may be true as Rosenstone and Hanson suggest that political organizers target individuals with resources (more likely to be white). In the community organizing literature however, it is precisely the poor and marginalized (more likely to be black) who activists are encouraged to bring into the political game (see for example, (Alinsky, 1972; Piven & Cloward, 1979; Yeich, 1996). If neighborhood or civil rights organizations are mobilizing for electoral participation, it might explain some of the differences seen in the racial profile.

Individual characteristics and resources were strong predictors of participation, so it is no surprise that organizers might consider these factors in recruitment strategies. As Brady, et al (1999) have suggested, political recruiters are rational actors and want to get the most return on their investment. However, identifying individuals with specific characteristics in large geographic areas is a big task and requires a large investment of resources. Although political parties may have the resources for such a data mining operation, this is not often the case for groups organizing at the community level,

particularly for non-electoral activities or issues. Thus some other method of locating potential activists may be required.

Social Connections and Past Activity

Past voting and campaign activity, indicators of a propensity to participate and to respond to a request for action, have been shown to be strong predictors of political recruitment (Abramson & Claggett, 2001; Brady, et al., 1999; Gershtenson, 2003; K. Goldstein & Paul, 2002; Kenneth M. Goldstein & Ridout, 2002; Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1992; Parry, Barth, Kropf, & Jones, 2008). Abramson and Claggett (2001) found that past campaign activity was the strongest predictor of contact to work on a campaign, outweighing the influence of education and income. Past campaign contributions and voting were positive predictors of each respective activity, but were less significant than resources. This differential influence of resources and past activity on recruitment by type of activity begins to hint at the use of activity specific targeting strategies, at least by political parties.

For anyone who has ever made a financial contribution or participated in a local activity, the relationship between past activity and contact to participate in a subsequent activity comes as no surprise. If organizers are rational as Brady et al (1999) suggest, they will keep lists of individuals who have previously responded positively to recruitment efforts or simply shown up at an event. Lists of previous participants decreases the effort needed to find those who will respond positively to a contact in the future. Indeed, Kahn (1991) in his text on grassroots organizing recommends that activists keep lists of all contacts they have with individuals, including notes on their interests. There is a reason for the identification of individuals' interests, past participation alone is not a guarantee that in person will be interested in or likely to participate in an unrelated issue or activity. Strategists often need to expand beyond past participants, thus other clues are needed to determine who else might respond to a request for action on a particular issue or activity.

Zipp and Smith (1979) found that individuals who knew party members personally or considered themselves opinion leaders were more likely to be recruited than others who did not share these characteristics. Members of groups (typically unions), those who attend religious services, and long-time community residents were recruited

more often than non-joiners for political activities, most often electorally related (Abramson & Claggett, 2001; Brady, et al., 1999; Djupe & Grant, 2001; Gershtenson, 2003; Kenneth M. Goldstein, 1999; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Wielhouwer, 2000, 2003). Membership in organizations or residential status may make an individual more visible to organizers, particularly if organizations are targeted as well as individuals. Some community organizing entities, ACORN for example, recruit members by contacting individuals. Other groups, such as the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) founded by Saul Alinsky, People in Communities Organized (PICO) and the Gamaliel Foundation recruit organizational members who are in turn asked to bring their members to organizing efforts (Fisher, 2009). Particular types of organizational membership may also serve as indicators of interest in a specific issue. For example, unions and their membership were targeted during lobbying efforts around healthcare reform (Goldstein, 1999) and several authors argue that Black churches were the focus of organizing efforts in support of the civil rights movement (Branch, 1988; McAdam, 1982; Morris, 1984).

One of the premises of the community organizing field is that strategists need to recruit individuals and groups who have a stake in an issue, since they are more likely to act if invited (Alinsky, 1972; Bobo, Kendall, & Max, 2001; Delgado, 1986; Fisher, 1994, 2009; Kahn, 1991, 1994; Mondros & Wilson, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 2008). This is important, since much of the community organizing literature, often “how to” manuals, focuses on organizing around issues rather than around elections. Thus, the type of organizations individuals choose to join provides clues about the issues in which they might be interested, and possibly about the types of political activity to which they are drawn.

In a study of associations, Knoke (1990) found differences among unions, professional, trade and recreational associations regarding the type of activity for which they recruited their membership. Unions for example, were more likely to ask their members to contact a government official, write to a newspaper, demonstrate or work on a local or national election than any of the other types of associations. However, there is little research on specific types of organizational membership and recruitment, other than membership in general or in unions, and religious service attendance. If organizational membership serves as an indicator of interest or willingness to participate in certain types

of activities or issues, one should expect different types of groups to make a difference in who is contacted for action for specific issues and the activities.

In addition to organizational membership, results from a few studies suggest that other factors related to social connectedness or accessibility may be important. Rosenstone and Hansen's (1993) analyses suggest that homeownership and longer residency in a community increase the likelihood of contact by a political party (see also Wielhouwer, 2003). It may be that such factors make an individual less of a moving target and thus more visible to organizers. As with group membership, these factors may also serve as indicators of interest in an issue. Homeowners were targeted in efforts to defeat a ballot issue in San Francisco, in part "because they tend to be reliably moderate to conservative on economic issues relative to renters" (McNulty, 2005). The author also argued homeownership served as a proxy for age, SES, and residential stability—potential indicators of positions on the ballot issue. If this is the case, homeownership and residential longevity may matter more on some issues rather than others.

Membership in a group and in specific types of groups, length of residency in an area, and homeownership can provide access points for organizers as well as clues about potential interest in a specific issue. However, strategists may miss potential activists if they content themselves with lists of groups and their membership lists. Individuals who are not members of a group may be willing to act if a particular issue impacts their self-interest. Issues do not affect all neighborhoods to the same extent, nor are economic and social resources equally distributed across all geographic areas. To be sure, individual characteristics and resources, past activity and social connections may be factors in who is tapped for political participation, but they do not take into account the geographical clustering of individuals in similar social and economic situations or the continued housing segregation by race. For this, it is necessary to factor into the mobilization story the residential context of individuals.

Neighborhood

Most research on political recruitment focuses on individual characteristics and resources and to some extent, organizational memberships as predictors of contact by activists. However, despite the growth of neighborhood effects literature in other areas of research (see for example, (Massey, 2007) and (Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowley,

2002) for important reviews of this literature) few studies have considered the influence of place of residence on who is recruited. From the national perspective, Goldstein (1999) suggested organizers in lobbying efforts around national healthcare first targeted strategic states and then moved to the individual level. Certainly more recent elections have highlighted efforts by political parties to target key states and areas within states and cities in order to win campaigns.

On a more local level, several authors have argued that strategists target (or avoid) certain neighborhoods depending on their level of educational and income resources or past participation in electoral activities (Cohen & Dawson, 1993; Gimpel, Lee, & Kaminski, 2006; Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1992; Leighley, 2001). Leighley (2001) examined predictors of mobilization by party chairs and found that party chairs were more likely to target an area for some type of activity if the chair was a Democrat and there was a higher percentage of African Americans or Hispanics, and less likely to focus on an area as the area SES increased. However, black population size became insignificant when areas with less than one percent blacks were eliminated from the analysis. Unfortunately, SES was operationalized as the percent of the white population with a high school degree. It is not clear that black and white educational levels can be equated across the board, or that education is the sole resource party chairs or any other organizer deem important when developing recruitment strategies.

Cohen and Dawson (1993) suggest that strategists looking for monetary contributions might avoid neighborhoods with greater levels of poverty or that are perceived to be dangerous. It does not make sense to go where people don't have what is needed. On the other hand, we may underestimate people's willingness to participate based on the preconceived notions of outsiders, particularly if there is a large minority population. The story may be different if organizing is initiated from within a community or on an issue that is perceived to directly impact a community's self-interest.

Just as type of organizational membership may matter to political recruiters when organizing around a specific issue, the type of neighborhood and its resources may influence political strategies. Not all issues have an impact on all neighborhoods in the same way or to the same extent. It makes sense that greater levels of organizing would occur in neighborhoods most directly affected by an issue. Since most of the data

available comes from national election studies, it is difficult to determine whether there are neighborhood differences in recruitment profiles for other types of non-election related activities or issues. National samples also do not typically include neighborhood or environmental characteristics.

It is possible that the importance of individual resources is over estimated in the recruitment literature due to the general failure or inability to include neighborhood characteristics and resources. With current technology, it is certainly feasible for activists to fine tune the areas they wish to target before moving to the individual level, and given limited resources, it would be foolish not to target neighborhoods as well as individuals. Further, in light of the importance of individual resources as predictors of recruitment and the continuing housing segregation by race and class in this country, the role of individual resources may be overestimated if neighborhood characteristics are not considered.

In summary, what is missing in the political science literature is a more nuanced study of the predictors of mobilization. Most of the research is limited by data available from national election studies, and therefore to recruitment for voting and in a few instances, to contact by a party to contribute to or work on a campaign. Where there is some attention to other activities, such as contacting a public official or protesting, activities are generally collapsed into one summary variable. It is likely that not all activities require the same kind or level of resources from potential activists, and it is also likely that all issues do not generate the same level of interest. Elections are infrequent occurrences, so to ignore other types of non-electoral activities or issues may cause us to miss important nuances in the recruitment story. Indeed, if the community organizing literature is correct, there is a lot of recruitment occurring on a daily basis, but who is organized and the types of activities and issues for which they are recruited are very different than has typically been addressed in the political science literature.

The specification of social connectedness, or what makes an individual visible to an organizer, has been somewhat limited in the recruitment literature. Social connectedness is usually limited to only two types of groups in the recruitment literature, unions and religious groups. To a lesser extent, years in a community and home ownership. As with individual resources, it is possible that strategists target different

types of groups or forms of social connection depending on the issue and/or activity for which they are recruiting. Affiliations serve not only to make an individual accessible to an organizer, but can also be indicators of expertise or stake in an issue. Thus to limit affiliations to the groups mentioned above is to assume that no other types of groups matter, regardless of the issue.

The other drawback to many of the theories and studies is that such theories usually fail to account for the environmental context or the neighborhood in strategists' decisions. With limited resources, organizers may focus on neighborhoods most likely to have the resources and the interest in an issue and activity to respond to a request for action. Conversely, strategists may avoid particular areas due either to a historically based belief that residents will not respond to a request for action or to biases or fears about particular neighborhoods, possibly based on the racial makeup of the area. Without the addition of neighborhood characteristics and resources, analyses may unduly emphasize the importance of individual characteristics and resources. Race may matter, but it might be at the larger neighborhood level, rather than at the individual level.

Lastly, most of the existing studies are based on national data which results in an overwhelmingly white sample. The national studies do not allow for an examination of local context, nor do they allow for a more nuanced examination of the role of race in recruitment. To stop there is to fall into the assumption that one model fits all races. Given historical gaps in black and white political participation, it is not clear one size fits all. Given the significant impact of mobilization on likelihood of participation, we need to understand which factors most affect the recruitment of black citizens into politics if the gaps are to be minimized.

Since much of the political science research is focused on national and electorally related mobilization, it misses the larger story that occurs in everyday politics at the local level. The community organizing (CO) literature and manuals might provide some of the answers to the local mobilization puzzle. Extensive writing in this field provides guidance on how to organize at the local level. Recruitment in the Alinsky tradition in particular focuses on tapping into and building on the already existing social capital in a neighborhood (Alinsky, 1972; Kahn, 1991; Reisch, 2008; Reitzes & Reitzes, 1987; Warren, 2001). This does not contradict the findings in political science, but it does

highlight the importance of social accessibility through organizational membership. One of the key strategies is to bring together individuals, organizations and neighborhoods around common issues and interests, and one of the key avenues is the use of existing organizations—both for the recruitment of participants and the identification of the issues. In many cases, organizers work in poor and politically marginalized communities. These areas are often hardest hit by specific issues, such as cuts in school budgets, public transportation, or police services. These issues will not be the same as those experienced by wealthier neighborhoods. If the CO methods are followed and if we presume that local organizing often occurs in communities hardest hit by economic problems, one should see a different profile of the recruited for local issues than is found in national election studies. Thus, the influence of high individual resources as a factor in recruitment found in the political science research may not hold if issue specific organizing is examined.

Another key in much of the CO literature is tapping into an individual's self-interest, as well as utilizing non-organizational relationships as access points when recruiting for an issue or activity. If they care and if they can be reached, individuals are more likely to act. While organizational membership offers a clue to issue interest, there are other avenues suggested as guides. Several authors urge organizers to build membership by personally interviewing community residents and keeping notes on contacts' skills, interests, family and community involvements, etc. (Bobo, et al., 2001; Delgado, 1986; Kahn, 1991; Mondros & Wilson, 1994). Some of the noted interests might come directly from the individuals interviewed or from the linkages made by the recruiters during the interview process. For example, individuals with children might be concerned about the condition of neighborhood parks, the level of traffic on their streets, or the quality of the local school system. The children also serve as an indirect access point to the adults. When a parent cannot be reached directly, they might be reached via the schools or organizations to which the children belong. Thus demographic information about an individual can serve not only as an indicator of interest, but also as a clue to indirect access. Lastly, information about an individual's skills is important for matching the right people with the right activities, and determining who might be potential leaders for the organizing effort.

In short, the political science research provides a good starting point about predictors of mobilization, but its story is more national in scope and thus more generic. It may not be nuanced enough for the organizing that takes place at the community level where issues matter. While the CO literature is short on research, it is rich on how to organize at the local level. It might provide some answers to the mobilization, and ultimately the political participation puzzle. It also provides avenues for exploring the differences between national and local mobilization, in particular in terms of the influence of issues and activities on who is mobilized.

A Theory of Political Recruitment

Bringing together the fields of political science and community organizing, I utilize an expanded version of Rosenstone and Hansen's theory of mobilization to hypothesize who is mobilized. If political activists target individuals who 1) have the *individual resources* to participate and to be efficacious in their action and 2) who are *accessible* via social connections, or a history of participation, then individuals who have the greatest levels of education and wealth, and are politically and socially connected should have an advantage over their counterparts in receiving a political invite. If the CO literature is right, then 3) *neighborhood* characteristics and resources and 4) the specific *activity and issue* around which organizing is occurring should shape recruitment as well. Individual resources and accessibility are not new as explanatory factors for mobilization, but neighborhoods may play a greater role in predicting recruitment than previous research has been able to test. If a strategist wants to reach wealthy or highly educated individuals, lacking a list, the most efficient route might be to target neighborhoods with a greater proportion of such individuals. In addition, given continuing housing segregation in the United States by race, disparities in access to resources, such as employment, education, and other services by neighborhood and race, and the differential impact social and economic issues on particular neighborhoods, activists should not be expected to mobilize all individuals in a city. Rather, they should be expected to target those individuals and neighborhoods most directly impacted by an issue and with the perceived resources to act.

The idea that recruitment strategies are crafted with an eye toward individual resources and accessibility has contributed greatly to our understanding of recruitment.

However, I argue that the weight these factors play may not be static across all issues or activities, and that accessibility (group membership) may be more nuanced than previous research has been able to test. Strategists may look for individuals with higher levels of education and income to contact a public official, partly because such individuals may have greater clout when they do act, but also because they may have more of the skills necessary to act on such a request. However, attendance at a community meeting or at a protest may not require such skills. For such activities, it might be important to simply turn out large numbers of individuals, regardless of their perceived clout or skills. If this is the case, getting a positive response to a request to attend a meeting or protest may be more dependent on figuring out who cares about the issue or which neighborhoods have a stake in the issue at hand. Race may matter, both at the individual and neighborhood levels, because many social and economic issues are strongly related to race.

Although past researchers have accounted for group membership in general, and unions and religious groups in particular, other types of groups can give more detailed clues about a citizen's priority concerns. An individual's interests and concerns may not be physically visible to an organizer, but recruiters may be able to target individuals through the groups they join. Members of environmental or anti-crime groups may share some common interests, but their concerns may also diverge quite a bit. To lump these types of groups together may hide key information. For an activist to recruit individuals to write legislators about the issue of water pollution, it is probably a lot easier and productive to locate individuals who are members of an environmental group than to find citizens with greater individual resources or who are members of any group and hope that they will care about the environment. Thus the issue focus of a particular group should be a more important factor for a political recruiter than membership in general.

One other type of accessibility has not been adequately addressed. Some studies have included the marital status of a citizen in their analyses of recruitment. I argue that not only are individuals made accessible to organizers through their partner or spouse, but also through their children. Parents or children's caregivers often receive information from schools or groups to which their children belong about events, requests for action or information about particular issues. Children are an access point, but also an indicator to activists of a possible stake in a particular issue. For example, the quality of our

educational system should be important to all citizens, but may be a higher issue priority for parents, simply because they and their children are more directly affected by educational decisions.

Questions to be tested

To be clear, my data will not allow me to directly analyze factors that influence strategists' targeting decisions. However, by examining data from individuals about whether or not they were contacted by activists, it may provide us with a dim reflection of the factors that influence strategists' thinking. At the very least, the results should shed a little more light on who is contacted and who is ignored.

I address four questions in each chapter. First, given the race disparities in political participation, what role is played by race in the recruitment strategies of organizers? Does race enter as a factor for some forms of activity more than for others, if at all? Since mobilization strongly predicts political participation, the answer to this question not only has consequences for participation, but ultimately for which voices are heard in the defining of policy, particularly at the local level. The quality of our political, social and economic systems tends to disproportionately favor those who are better off, and those who are white. Although the provision of services and access to resources are complicated, part of the reason for some of the local disparities by race may be due to who is invited to influence political decisions and who is ignored.

The second question pertains to the extent accessibility and involvement in the community play in the recruitment process. Is it simple membership, membership in specific kinds of groups, past participation or something as simple as having children that makes one visible, and thus accessible to recruiters? Given limited resources, organizers will most likely choose to recruit those who are easiest to find and, if targeting a specific issue focus on individuals who are thought to care about the issue.

Third, does place of residence play a part in whether or not an individual is invited into the political process? Organizers in the electoral realm can use extensive voting lists to refine their recruitment strategies, but this resource is not available for many forms of political participation or for particular issues. To locate individuals for non-electoral recruitment can be a costly process. If, as some have argued, organizers are rational and strategic, do they minimize their costs by identifying and focusing on

neighborhoods with the skills, interest in and resources necessary for political action, as well on individuals who are accessible through other means? If targeting individuals with the skills, knowledge and resources necessary for participation on the issue of crime, a focus on neighborhoods most directly impacted by the issue, generally poorer areas and with greater numbers of black citizens, might be a far more cost effective strategy than doing a broad sweep of the populace. On the other hand, organizers might ignore certain neighborhoods, possibly in the belief that there aren't enough individuals living in such areas with the requisite political resources, or because of organizers' biases or fears—regardless of the issue.

The final question is whether profiles of the mobilized vary based on the type of activity and the specific issue for which they are recruited. My assumption is that strategists use a different individual, social and neighborhood profile when recruiting for attendance at a meeting than they do for urging people to join a protest or make a financial contribution, for example. Different political activities require different skills, knowledge and levels of interest. It would be foolish and costly to expect a positive response to a request for action from all individuals. We should also see a different profile based on the issue for which recruiting is occurring. Not everyone cares equally about all issues. Strategists know this and should vary their strategies if they wish to get a positive response to their request for action.

My goal is to examine political recruitment in the broader context of individual, social and neighborhood characteristics. In particular, I add to current research by illuminating differences in targeting strategies for participation in general and on the issues of schools and crime in particular. Much of the current research either focuses exclusively on recruitment in the electoral arena or fails to distinguish the issue for which an individual is mobilized. We cannot assume that strategists believe all activities or issues require the same resources or interest. To do so, is to assume that organizers are irrational and clueless on effective strategies.

Data and methodology

To answer the four questions, data from the 1989 Detroit Area Study (DAS) is utilized.³ It includes data from 916 face-to-face interviews with respondents who were part of a random, 2 stage sample of the Detroit tri-county area. Detroit census tracts with a high proportion of Black residents were over sampled to insure adequate sub sample of Black respondents for analysis.⁴ Compared to the 1990 NES sample, respondents in DAS were similar on mean years of education and Party ID. Average income was about \$3,500 less in the DAS sample, and the NES had about six percent more males than did the DAS. Lastly, the DAS had a greater percentage of Black respondents (22%) and fewer whites (78%) compared to the NES, 13% and 84% respectively. Thus it is a fairly comparable sample with the national NES sample.

There are some limitations in the use of this dataset. One of the biggest is that the sample was drawn from the Detroit tri-county area, and Detroit continues to be one of the most segregated cities in the United States. Respondents were also highly segregated by race, leading to the possibility that the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhood could swamp the influence of an individual's race on recruitment.⁵ If individual race remains as a factor with the addition of neighborhood characteristics, it will only serve to underscore the enduring impact of race on politics, at least in Detroit. Also, it should be no surprise that there were some strong correlations (ranging between .378 and .678) between some of the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhoods included in the sample. In light of this, and the strong possibility of multicollinearity, the addition of neighborhood variables was purposely limited.⁶

A key advantage of the DAS sample is that it includes recruitment to a broader range of political activities than does the NES or that used by Brady et al, and it allows for an examination of recruitment to local politics. It includes data about recruitment to activities about any issue, and specifically about local schools and crime. It also includes detailed information about group membership in general, and about crime and school

³ The author was a member of the group that designed the study and collected the data.

⁴ A weighted dataset was used for all analyses. The weight variable was created by the survey sampling staff to account for the Detroit oversample.

⁵ For a comparison of means for neighborhood characteristics by race of respondent, please see Appendix C.

⁶ When neighborhood characteristics were regressed on the percent black residents in the census tract, the tolerance levels fell between .530 and .715 and the variance inflation factor (VIF) for multicollinearity ranged from 1.398 to 1.886. The level of multicollinearity was determined by the author to be acceptable.

related groups. Respondents were asked if they had been contacted during the prior 12 month period to: 1) attend a meeting (general, schools, crime); 2) contact a public official or influential person to express views (general, schools, crime); 3) do volunteer work in local public schools; 4) contribute money (general, schools, crime); 5) participate in a crime or neighborhood watch group; and 6) participate in a rally or protest (general, schools, crime). For exact question wording, see 0. Separate dichotomous variables were used for recruitment to each type of activity and for each issue. Although respondents were asked if they had been personally contacted about an activity, the question wording also included the possibility of seeing an announcement or poster. Thus, it is not possible to distinguish the means of recruitment. Mobilization, recruitment and contact will be used interchangeably, but in any event should not be construed to only mean a personal invitation to act.

The first group of independent variables, individual demographic characteristics includes sex, age, and race. Individual resources includes education and an income to poverty threshold ratio. The latter was utilized in the belief that it is not actual dollar increments that matter, but the level of income relative to the poverty line.

Social accessibility is a group of variables comprised of married/living with a partner; having a child in public school; home ownership; whether the respondent knew an influential person; past participation (not including the year prior to the survey); membership in a group that discusses politics, in a school group, or in other types of groups; and having been a victim of crime.⁷ The link between an individual and an influential person should move in two ways. Just as one might turn to an influential person for help in getting what they need, the influential person may well turn around and do the same. Various types of groups were included, such as school, crime, and religious; whether the group discussed politics and membership in any group in the belief that mobilizers view groups as having different skill levels, interests, and a willingness to act. Having been a victim of crime was included as a proxy for stake in local policy issues, particularly since the issue of crime often arises in discussions of school issues, as well as in discussions about crime.

⁷ In order to compare results from this sample to previous research, membership in any group, union membership, and frequency of religious service attendance were initially considered, but dropped as they were not significant predictors of recruitment.

The final group of variables is neighborhood characteristics and resources. Census tract data for 1990 was appended, and used as a proxy for neighborhood information. A census tract is probably far larger than what one might consider a neighborhood, but it does provide a way to examine the context within which a respondent lives. The percentage of Black residents allows a test of whether it is an individual's race that matters in recruitment--if at all, or if it is the proportion of races in a residential area. Neighborhood resources was operationalized as percent of residents with at least a high school degree. Mean income was initially included, but it did not reach significance. Lastly, percent owner-occupied was included as both a proxy for accessibility (more stable than renters) and for stake in the issue of education. In Michigan, there have been several ballot attempts to shift school funding away from a dependence on property taxes. Presumably, homeowners would have a stake in the outcome of this issue, as well as in decisions about crime.

To explore the role of race in general, schools and crime mobilization, four progressively inclusive equations for each of the types of action are estimated. The purpose is to tease out how the race effect changes, if at all, as resources, accessibility and neighborhood are added in. Given that the dependent variables are dichotomous, probit analysis is used to estimate the percent change in probability of being contacted for each independent variable, holding the remaining variables at their mean. In the first equation, only the individual demographic characteristics are included.

$$\text{Equation 1: } \Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{race}))$$

In the second equation, individual resources are added. If it is resources rather than race that matters, any race effect should diminish or disappear. On the other hand, if the race effect remains, we cannot at this point dismiss the idea that race is a factor in recruitment strategies.

$$\text{Equation 2: } \Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{Resources}))$$

Equation three adds the Accessibility variables. This allows us to test to what extent the ability of political activists to reach citizens is a factor in the recruitment process. Rather than race or resources, the differences in probability of contact may have more to do with who is visible and accessible.

Equation 3: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \Sigma\beta_3(\text{Accessibility}))$

Lastly, equation four builds on the previous equation and brings in the neighborhood context.

Equation 4: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \Sigma\beta_3(\text{Accessibility}) + \Sigma\beta_4(\text{Nhood}))$

By gradually adding in the different categories of recruitment factors, a progressive story is built that permits the teasing out of the race effect. This is particularly important, since few other studies include the residential context, and usually stop at the accessibility stage. Race effect will be discussed for each of the equations. For all other variables, only the final model will be discussed.

The statistical package utilized for all analyses was Stata (version 10). The Dprobit command was used to estimate all equations and all independent variables were set to their mean. Dprobit was used instead of the probit command because it returns the change in probability for dummy variables, rather than the coefficients. Since there is no variance in neighborhood data for all respondents living in the same tract, the cluster option was incorporated in the dprobit analyses to account for the correlation in neighborhood characteristics. This option and a weight variable that accounts for the oversample of Detroit were utilized in all estimates. In each chapter, a table with the estimates for each model is presented. All independent variables included in the model are listed in each table.

Chapter overview

The next three chapters each focus on recruitment to one of three issue areas—politics in general (generic), crime and schools. They are followed by a conclusion chapter. Each of the three core chapters provide a description of who is mobilized, as well as the factors influencing the probability of recruitment. Next, each of the four previously noted equations will be estimated to isolate the influence of demographic characteristics, resources, accessibility and neighborhood on recruitment by race. Lastly, the full equation will be estimated for the whole sample. Recruitment to politics is most likely a more complex enterprise than we have previously allowed or been able to study. My intent in this paper is to explore a more nuanced recruitment story by examining

mobilization to various types of political activity and issue areas, and by expanding the list of explanatory factors to include neighborhood characteristics and resources. In light of continuing racial disparities in political participation, I will also examine factors influencing the recruitment of blacks to the particular political activities and issues. Further unraveling the recruitment process may ultimately help us better understand and solve the participation puzzle.

Chapter 2

Mobilization - Generic

Introduction

Racial and socio-economic disparities in political participation continue in the United States, both at the national and the community levels. Mobilization as an important predictor of political participation has received much greater attention in recent years. However, not as much is known about predictors of mobilization, in particular about recruitment to non-electoral acts such as attending meetings or contacting a public official. Such acts are the means through which ordinary citizens can attempt to influence the policies and practices that affect their lives. If there are disparities in who is recruited for political participation, these differences could well be reflected in the voices heard or not heard in the political arena. If we wish to understand the continuing disparities in political participation, then it behooves us to understand who is invited to participate in the multiple facets of the political process and who is ignored.

There is ample evidence supporting the positive role played by mobilization in increasing electoral focused activities, such as voting, giving money to or working for a campaign (Abramson & Claggett, 2001; Brady, Verba, & Schlozman, 1995; Cohen & Dawson, 1993; Eldersveld, 1956; Ellison & Gay, 1989; Gosnell, 1927; Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1992; Kramer, 1970; Krassa, 1988; Niven, 2001; Norrander, 1991; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Schlozman, Burns, & Verba, 1999; Smith & Zipp, 1983; Wielhouwer, 1999; Wielhouwer & Lockerbie, 1994).⁸ Some authors have found mobilization to be particularly important for African Americans {Ellison & Gay 1989 #260}. Most of these studies focus on voter turnout or other types of electoral behavior, such as contributing to a campaign or putting up a sign.

While elections are important, they only occur once a year and nationally important elections occur even less frequently. Citizens can attempt to influence political outcomes

⁸ The effect of phone calls is mixed. See Blydenburg (1971); Cardy (2005); Gerber and Green (2005).

throughout the year through such acts as contacting public officials, attending meetings, or participating in protests. However, relatively few studies have examined the effect of mobilization on participation in activities other than in the electoral realm (Brady, et al., 1995; Cohen & Dawson, 1993; Kenneth Michael Goldstein, 1996; Marschall, 2004; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993). Those that have, found the effect of recruitment to be positive and significant, so much so that Cohen and Dawson (1993) have argued it might provide an important leveling effect for people who reside in low-income neighborhoods, given their lower rates of participation (p. 297).

Given the apparent importance of the mobilization factor, what do we know about who is mobilized or the predictors of mobilization? The answer is, “not much.” Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) argue that political elite, i.e., parties, politicians and interest groups, target those who are well connected, whose actions are effective and who more likely to respond positively to the recruitment message. Their research suggests this may be the case for mobilization efforts by political parties in general. Predictors of contact by parties in presidential and mid-term election years were wealth, higher educational levels, being older—in terms of both age and tenure in the community--church attendance and union membership (pp. 287-289).⁹ Goldstein and Rideout (2002) and Gershtenson (2003) found similar results. However, when they included an additional variable, past voting history, its effect was often far larger than those of the variables Rosenstone and Hansen had included.¹⁰ If nothing else, voting in a previous election may give recruiters a clue as to potential effectiveness of a contact. Unfortunately, although the National Election Study data utilized in each of the studies included a question on mobilization, the format of the question was very general. Respondents were only asked if someone from a political party spoke to them about a specific candidate or campaign. We do not know if they were asked to vote, contribute money, attend a campaign meeting or perform some other action. Thus, we also do not know if individuals targeted for the various actions all fit the same profile.

⁹ Campbell et al (1960) indicated that likelihood of contact by a political party in 1956 was highest for those in the skilled and semi-skilled professions. Professional level could certainly be viewed by recruiters as a proxy for political resources or effectiveness.

¹⁰ Huckfeldt and Sprague (1992) examined contact by party separately in a 1984 study in South Bend, Indiana. Past participation in Democratic primaries was a positive predictor for Democratic contact, with similar results for Republican contact. Education was only demographic variable included and it was only significant for Republican Party contact.

In their survey, Brady, et al. (1999) did move beyond mobilization for electoral activity alone. They included questions asking whether a person was contacted to work on a campaign, contact a governmental official, protest, and become involved in a community activity. Similar to findings in the electoral arena, the authors found higher levels of education, family income, political engagement and past political participation to be positive predictors of mobilization. However, these authors combined mobilization for all types of activity into an index. Thus, we do not know if all predictors effect mobilization for each type of activity in the same way. Interestingly, church attendance and working were significantly, but negatively associated with mobilization. Organizational membership was not significant, but the question used by Brady, et al. (1999) was limited to membership in organizations that do not take a political stand (p. 158). They thus excluded membership in organizations that are most likely to prospect for recruits. The authors further tested their recruitment model on contact to make a contribution and found family income to be the largest predictor of recruitment to make a contribution. They did not report the effects of any other variables (p. 161). In essence then, we are still limited to a one size fits all model for predicting mobilization. If recruiters are rational, they surely use different clues about who will respond, depending on the desired action. Not all actions require the same political skill or investment.

Abramson and Claggett (2001) do address the idea that recruiters change their tactics based on the action requested, specifically voting, making a campaign contribution or any other campaign activity. As did others, they found past participation to be a strong, positive predictor of current recruitment, but the effect of past participation varied by the action requested. For recruitment to campaign activities, past campaign activity carried more weight than individual resources or group membership.¹¹ In the case of requests for campaign contributions, age and individual resources had bigger effects than did past giving, and Blacks were less likely to be contacted than whites.¹² Lastly, recruiters attempting to get individuals to support a particular candidate do appear to take into

¹¹ While the Brady et al. group membership variable was limited to non-political organizations, Abramson and Claggett's variable was also limited. The question wording only asked about organizations "that represented the interests and viewpoint of the group that they felt particularly close to." (p. 914).

¹² Gershtenson (2003) also found a similar negative effect for race, but only for Republicans for the years 1964 to 1968.

account past voting history, but here the effect of past participation is the smallest. In addition to age and education, strength of party ID was also a positive factor in recruitment. Goldstein (1996) focused on recruitment to lobbying efforts and in addition to the race and resources results mentioned earlier, he also found men and members of union households were more likely to be targeted.

There is thus suggestive evidence of specific recruitment strategies for various types of action. However, we are limited in our understanding of the role accessibility plays in recruitment. For example, in Brady et al., the group membership variable was limited to non-political organizations, while Abramson and Claggett only included groups with which an individual strongly identified. Group membership lists can cut the costs of recruitment for organizers, but targeting all groups may not be cost effective. More exploration is needed about the role played by group membership in the recruitment process, as well as other factors that might increase organizers' access to individuals. While we have a beginning understanding of the role played by an individual's social membership, we are thus far missing a consideration of the broader political and social context within which individuals live—their neighborhoods.

Huckfeldt and Sprague (1992) provide one of the few studies that examine the effect of the neighborhood on contact. For the gubernatorial and congressional races, the Republican Party was more likely to target those living in neighborhoods where there had been a high turnout in the Republican primary--neighborhoods also associated with higher educational levels. The authors used proportion of the neighborhood canvassed by the Democrats to predict individual contact. Not surprisingly, the likelihood of contact went up as the proportion in the neighborhood canvassed went up. When the authors added in controls for individual education and party ID, the neighborhood effect disappeared for Republican contact, but not for Democratic. Neither individual educational level nor party ID was significantly associated with Democratic contact (p. 75). At least in this case, it appears Democrats may have targeted neighborhoods, while Republicans targeted individuals. This suggests that organizers look not only at the characteristics of individuals, but of neighborhoods as well. This particularly makes sense for non-electoral activities where aids such as voting records may not be available. If organizers don't have a lot of information about individuals likely to turn out for a meeting for example, it may be cost

effective to target those neighborhoods perceived to have the resources necessary for participation or with a perceived stake in an issue. Conversely, some organizers might avoid resource poor neighborhoods or those perceived to be dangerous. Unfortunately, the individual and neighborhood variables utilized in Huckfeldt and Sprague's study were very limited.

The political science literature on political mobilization is limited in terms of what actually guides the recruitment strategies of activists. However, literature in the field of community organizing (CO) is replete with guides on who and how to organize for political action. While much of the research in political recruitment has focused on national and electoral politics, but the CO literature focuses to a much greater extent on local communities and neighborhoods and their issues (See for example, (Alinsky, 1972; Fisher & Romanofsky, 1981; Piven & Cloward, 1979; Reitzes & Reitzes, 1987; Rubin & Rubin, 2008; Saegert, 2006)). Some of the differences found in factors influencing recruitment to politics in general, may be that organizers use different strategies when recruiting for electoral politics versus politics at the local level where there is a greater concern with specific issues, such as schools, crime, the placement of toxic waste sites, access to city services, etc. According to the CO literature, the goal is to recruit individuals and organizations, particularly in poor communities who are directly impacted by the local community issues. If this is the case, we should see different profiles of the recruited based on the issue. Something political science has not been able to adequately address to date.

Thus far, some evidence suggests that political recruiters are strategic with regard to the specific actions requested. However, the research to date is limited in three respects. There is little analysis of 1) non-electoral activities; 2) factors which might make one more visible or accessible to organizers; 3) neighborhood characteristics as a factor in mobilization strategies; and 4) the influence of specific issues on who is recruited.

Research Questions

I address four questions in this chapter and I examine recruitment to both electoral and non-electoral activities. First, given the race disparities in political participation, what role is played by race in the recruitment strategies of organizers? Does race enter as a factor for some forms of activity more than for others, if at all? Since mobilization strongly predicts political participation, the answer to this question not only has consequences for

participation, but ultimately for which voices are heard in the defining of policy, particularly at the local level.

Second, what role does accessibility play in recruitment strategies? Is it simple membership that matters, membership in specific kinds of groups, past participation or something as simple as having children? I argue that past participation and group membership make one visible, and thus accessible to recruiters. Given limited resources, organizers will probably choose to recruit those who are easiest to find. The use of voter registration lists is a prime example for electoral activities, but available lists are not limited to electoral activities. Many organizations keep lists of members and those who have participated in past activities. Often groups share their lists. As many people have experienced, once they are placed on a group's list, it is not uncommon to hear from other groups as well. People with children may be accessible as well, since schools in particular often use the children as a conduit of information to parents. To be sure, individuals might be notified of important education issues if they are a member of a school group, but non-school group members might also be notified of an action through their children.

Third, how does neighborhood context influence the likelihood that residents will be contacted about political activities? Organizers in the electoral realm can use extensive voting lists to refine their recruitment strategies, but this resource is not available for many forms of political participation. If, as some have argued, organizers are rational and strategic, focusing their efforts on individuals with the skills and resources necessary for political action, might not the same be true for the targeting of neighborhoods? Cho et al (2006) found a negative effect on electoral turnout rates for neighborhoods with high poverty rates and percentage of Black and Hispanic residents, and a positive effect on turnout for neighborhoods with high levels of education. Possibly, some geographic areas are simply ignored by recruiters, while others are targeted. Indeed, if the information available to organizers at the individual level is limited, the search for potential activists might be akin to the search for a needle in a haystack. A focus on resource rich neighborhoods might be a far more cost effective strategy than doing a broad sweep of the populace. On the other hand, organizers might ignore certain neighborhoods, possibly in the belief that there aren't enough individuals living in such areas who possess the needed political resources, or because of organizers' biases or fears.

Fourth, how does recruitment vary, if at all, by activity and issue? The final section will explore profiles of the mobilized based on the type of activity and issue for which individuals are recruited. My assumption is strategists use a different individual, social and neighborhood profile for when recruiting for attendance at a meeting than they do for pulling in people to attend a protest or searching for financial contributors, for example. My goal is to fill in some of the gaps within previous studies of political recruitment. We cannot fully understand the team of players already active in the political arena unless we first look at who has been asked to play in the game, and specifically for which activities and issues.

Data and methodology

To answer these questions, I used data from the 1989 Detroit Area Study (DAS).¹³ It includes data from 916 face-to-face interviews with respondents who were part of a random, two-stage sample of the Detroit tri-county area. Detroit census tracts with a high proportion of Black residents were oversampled to insure adequate sub-sample of Black respondents for analysis.¹⁴ Compared to the 1990 NES sample, respondents in DAS were similar on mean years of education and Party ID. Average income was about \$3,500 less in the DAS sample, and the NES had about six percent more males than did the DAS. Lastly, the DAS had a greater percentage of Black respondents (22%) and fewer whites (78%) compared to the NES, 13% and 84% respectively. Thus it is a fairly comparable sample with the national NES sample.

Detroit has been described as one of the most segregated cities in the United States; sometimes characterized as a hyper-segregated city. This presents a large limitation in the use of this dataset for testing the influence of both individual and neighborhood race. Given the random sampling procedure, respondents were also highly segregated by race, leading to the possibility that the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhood could swamp the influence of an individual's race on recruitment.¹⁵ If individual race remains as a factor with the addition of neighborhood characteristics, it will only serve to underscore the enduring impact of race on politics, at least in Detroit.

¹³ The author is a member of the group that designed the study and collected the data.

¹⁴ A weighted sample was used for all analyses.

¹⁵ For a comparison of means for neighborhood characteristics by race of respondent, please see Appendix C.

Also, it should be no surprise that there were some strong correlations (ranging between .378 and .678) between some of the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhoods included in the sample. In light of this, and the strong possibility of multicollinearity, the addition of neighborhood variables was purposely limited.¹⁶

A key advantage of the DAS sample is that it includes recruitment to a broader range of political activities than does the NES or that used by Brady et al. Respondents were asked if they had been contacted during the prior 12 month period to participate political activities, including recruitment to 1) work on a campaign or on a community issue, 2) contact a public official, 3) attend a meeting, 4) attend a rally or protest, and 5) make a financial contribution to a campaign or community issue. For exact question wording, see Appendix A. Separate dichotomous variables were used for each form of recruitment. Respondents were asked if they had been personally contacted about an activity, or saw an announcement or poster. Thus, if they were recruited, it is not clear which form the recruitment took. Mobilization, recruitment and contact will be used interchangeably, but in any event should not be construed to only mean a personal invitation to act.

The first group of independent variables, individual demographic characteristics includes sex, age, and race. Individual resources include education attainment and an income to poverty threshold ratio. The latter was utilized in the belief that it is not actual dollar increments that matter in strategists' targeting decisions, but the level of income relative to the poverty line.

Social accessibility is a group of variables comprised of married/living with a partner, home ownership, whether the respondent knew an influential person, past participation (not including the year prior to the survey), membership in a group that discusses politics, membership in a school group, and having been a victim of crime.¹⁷ The

¹⁶ When neighborhood characteristics were regressed on the percent black residents in the census tract, the tolerance levels fell between .530 and .715 and the variance inflation factor (VIF) for multicollinearity ranged from 1.398 to 1.886. The level of multicollinearity was determined by the author to be acceptable.

¹⁷ Whether a respondent had a child in public school was initially included in the model, but unlike being a member of a school group, it did not prove significant. Similarly, membership in a group concerned about crime and home ownership were originally included, but later dropped since they were never significant. In order to compare results with this sample to previous research, membership in any group, membership in a religious group and frequency of religious service attendance were initially considered, but they were not significant factors.

link between an individual and an influential person should move in two ways. Just as one might turn to an influential person for help in getting what they need, the influential person may well turn around and do the same. Various types of groups were included in the belief that mobilizers view groups as having different skill levels, interests, and a willingness to act. Having been a victim of crime was included in the belief that victims might be thought to have a stake in local policy issues.

The final group of variables is neighborhood characteristics and resources. Census tract data for 1990 was appended to the survey data, and used as a proxy for neighborhood information. A census tract is probably far larger than what one might consider a neighborhood, but it does provide a way to examine the context within which a respondent lives. The percentage of Black residents in a neighborhood allows a test of whether it is an individual's race that matters in recruitment or the racial makeup of the neighborhood. Neighborhood resources were operationalized as percent of residents with at least a high school degree and the percent female-headed households. Mean income was initially included, but it did not reach significance.

As will be seen, for almost all types of action, there are some large and striking differences in the contact rates of recruitment of Blacks compared to Whites. To test the effect of race holding other factors constant, four different equations for each of the five types of action are estimated. Given that the dependent variables are dichotomous, probit analysis is used to estimate the percent change in probability of being contacted for each independent variable, holding the remaining variables at their mean. In the first equation, only the individual demographic characteristics are included.

$$\text{Equation 1: } \Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{race}))$$

In the second equation, individual resources are added. If it is resources rather than race that matters, any race effect should diminish or disappear. On the other hand, if the race effect remains, we cannot at this point dismiss the idea that race is a factor in recruitment strategies.

$$\text{Equation 2: } \Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{Resources}))$$

Equation three adds the Accessibility variables. This allows us to test the relative importance of accessibility in the recruitment process. Rather than race or resources, the

differences in probability of contact may have more to do with who is visible and accessible.

Equation 3: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \Sigma\beta_3(\text{Accessibility}))$

Lastly, equation four builds on the previous equation and brings in the neighborhood context.

Equation 4: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \Sigma\beta_3(\text{Accessibility}) + \Sigma\beta_4(\text{Nhood}))$

By gradually adding in the different categories of recruitment factors, a progressive story is built that permits the teasing out of the race effect. This is particularly important, since few other studies include the residential context, and usually stop at the accessibility stage. Race effect will be discussed for each of the equations. For all other variables, only the final model will be discussed.

Stata was the statistical package used for all analyses. All analyses were weighted by the sampling weight in order to account for the oversample of Detroit. The Dprobit command rather than the Probit command, was used to estimate the marginal effect of the independent variables on recruitment because the results are presented as changes in probability rather than as raw coefficients. In addition, the cluster option was utilized to compensate for the lack of variance in census tract data for residents living in the same tract.

Results

Race and Recruitment

White citizens are far more likely than Black citizens to be recruited to contact a public official, or to work on or contribute money to a political campaign or a community issue. Chances are fairly even for the two groups on invitations to protest or attend a meeting. Men are only slightly more likely than women to be contacted for most activities, with the exception of contributing money to a political campaign or a community effort, where the bias toward men is much more pronounced. For all activities, the contact rates are three to seven times greater for those who earn \$90,000 or more than for those who earn less than \$10,000. A similar pattern appears for those who have at least a college

degree compared to those with less than a high school degree. Thus, those who are recruited are more likely to be white, male, and to have greater individual resources.

**Table 2-1:
Percent Contacted**

| | Work on Party/ Community issue | Give \$ to campaign/ community issue | Contact public official | Attend community meeting | Protest |
|------------------|---|---|--|---|----------------|
| Total | 29.6% | 41.4% | 27.2% | 32.6% | 12.3% |
| Race | | | | | |
| Black | 22.3% | 27.6% | 17.2% | 33.9% | 10.0% |
| White | 31.7% | 45.5% | 30.1% | 32.3% | 13.0% |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Female | 28.9% | 36.4% | 25.1% | 32.3% | 11.2% |
| Male | 30.7% | 49.2% | 30.6% | 33.0% | 14.1% |
| Income | | | | | |
| < \$10,000 | 14% | 18.4% | 13.8% | 18.1% | 4.6% |
| ≥ \$90,000 | 48% | 73.5% | 57.1% | 53.1% | 35.7% |
| Education | | | | | |
| < HS degree | 12.% | 18.7% | 14.9% | 22.6% | 3.9% |
| ≥ BA degree | 52% | 64.6% | 49% | 44.4% | 19.2% |

Bold Chi. Sq. sig. < .05

Given the gaps in recruitment by race, the question arises whether mobilizers focus on race alone or other factors possibly related to race. In order to tease out the role of race, Table 2.2 presents only the effect of race on the probability of being contacted for five different activities over a progression of equations. Holding other demographic characteristics constant, the probability of being contacted diminishes by 9-17% for Blacks for party/community work, contributing money and contacting a public official. There is no significant race effect for meetings or protesting. Mobilizers seem to consider race in their targeting strategies, at least for some activities; however, race is correlated with income and educational levels, in a negative direction for Blacks.

**Table 2-2:
Race Effect on Probability of Recruitment: % Change**

| | Party/ Community work | \$ to campaign/ community issue | Contact public official | Attend community meeting | Protest |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|----------------|
| Model 1: Only | -9.0 | -17.4 | -12.9 | 1.0 | -3.0 |
| Demographics | (2.61)** | (4.11)** | (3.58)** | (0.26) | (1.03) |
| Model 2: | -0.1 | -7.7 | -6.3 | 9.5 | 1.4 |
| Plus resources | (0.02) | (1.83) | (1.60) | (2.06)* | (0.48) |
| Model 3: | -7.6 | -14.5 | -10.9 | 4.2 | -1.2 |
| Plus connections | (2.16)* | (3.57)** | (2.89)** | (0.89) | (0.49) |
| Model 4: | -7.1 | -3.9 | -19.5 | -4.8 | -3.4 |
| Plus Neighborhood | (0.97) | (0.43) | (3.01)** | (0.59) | (0.90) |

Robust z statistics in parentheses

* significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

When controls for individual resources are added in, the race effect previously seen for several of the activities disappears. Thus it may be that individual resources guide mobilizers' strategies rather than race. However, when predicting probability of recruitment to attend a meeting the race factor becomes significant and in a positive direction; Blacks are more likely to be contacted than Whites. In the case of white and black citizens with comparable resources, it is possible organizers believe Blacks are more likely to respond to recruitment efforts or that they are simply more accessible. At the very least, there are different strategies at work for the different activities.

To test the accessibility idea, controls for factors that might make one more visible to mobilizers are added to the model. As can be seen in Table 2.2, the race effects return in a mirror image of the results seen in model 1. All else being equal, Blacks are less likely to be contacted for party/community work, contributions and contacting a public official, although they are now no more likely than Whites to be recruited for meetings. Thus for meetings, simple accessibility may be the leveler between the races. For the first three activities however, accessibility in and of itself does not explain the differences. Indeed, there is little difference in the rates of membership in any group for Blacks and Whites, 67% and 69% respectively. Blacks are more likely to belong to groups that discuss politics and attempt to influence policies, so membership in such groups can't be the explanation. It

is possible that there are differences in the types of groups that are targeted by recruiters or that it is something beyond resources and groups: neighborhoods.

For the final model, controls were added for the demographic characteristics and resources of a neighborhood. With this addition, the only activity for which individual race remains a factor is contacting a public official. However in this case, the effect is large. Holding all else constant, Blacks are almost 20% less likely to be recruited than Whites. It appears that in this one case, recruiters are ignoring black citizens, regardless of where they live, their level of individual resources and accessibility. For recruitment to party/community work, the size effect for race remains the same as in the previous model, however it is no longer significant. Race is also no longer significant for contact to make a financial contribution. Race never appears to be a factor in recruitment decisions about who to invite to protests.

Race Discussion

Given the changes in the role played by race when neighborhood controls are added to the model, residential environment appears to provide an important component for understanding the mobilization story. Abramson and Claggett (2001) found individual race to be a negative factor in recruitment of blacks to give money. In my analysis however, their findings were not supported once neighborhood was taken into account. Their findings may have been influenced by the fact that African Americans are more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods not on the priority list for fundraisers—those with fewer resources. It is also possible the difference in findings is due to the difference in the variables used for recruitment to give money. While Abramson and Claggett looked only at campaign contributions, the DAS variable included contributions to a community issue as well. It may be that community fundraisers discriminate less than do the political fundraisers. Further, an individual's race does not appear to be a targeting factor for recruitment to work on a campaign or community issue, attend a meeting or to protest. The lack of a race effect on meeting attendance and protest activities probably comes as no surprise since the recruitment rates for whites and blacks are similar.

The gaps in contact rates for blacks and whites are however sizeable for party/community work and fundraising. So, if race is not the explanation, we need to expand the story. Further, the sizeable and negative effect of race on recruitment to contact

a public official is very troubling. To explore the other factors impacting the likelihood of being mobilized and to place the race factor in context, I turn now to the full set of predictors for the 5 types of recruitment.

Predicting Recruitment: Full Model

The five activities will be examined separately, followed by an examination of the similarities and differences between the factors affecting each activity. Invitations to work for a political party or on a community issue appear to be determined solely by factors related to accessibility. Neighborhood and individual resources and demographics do not appear to affect the probability of being recruited. Similar to results found by Abramson and Claggett (2001), past participation increases the likelihood of an individual being mobilized by about 17% over those who have not been active in the past. A person who is married or living with a partner or a member of a group that discusses politics is 10% more likely to be contacted than the unconnected.¹⁸ Additionally, knowing an influential person in the community increases the likelihood of recruitment by 18.5%. Differing from the findings of previously mentioned authors however, individual resources and demographic characteristics do not appear to influence recruitment for party or community work. This may in part be due to the inclusion of community work as well as work for a political campaign in the dependent variable. It may also be due to the inclusion of a larger number of accessibility variables, as well as the neighborhood characteristics and resources. Individual resources certainly vary within a neighborhood, but the general characteristics of a neighborhood may mask those of the individual. Ignoring neighborhoods may prevent us from seeing the bigger picture.

Recruitment in political and community fundraising campaigns is fairly similar to the pattern seen in political work. However in this case, there was a 0.4% increase in the chance of being recruited for the oldest citizens over the youngest, and a 10% increase for the most educated over the least educated. Contrary to what one might expect income was not significant. Given the fact that this variable encompasses community as well as party contributions, mobilizers may be targeting those with greater education rather than with greater income due to the types of issues for which they are recruiting.

¹⁸ Membership in any group was originally included in the model, but the coefficients were never significant.

Table 2-3:
Predictors of Generic Recruitment,
Percentage Change in Probability of Contact

| | Party/ Community work | \$ to campaign/ community issue | Contact public official | Attend community meeting | Protest |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------|
| <i>Demographics</i> | | | | | |
| sex <i>Female=1</i> | 0.072 (1.90) | -0.060 (1.18) | -0.023 (0.60) | 0.039 (0.95) | 0.008 (0.33) |
| age | 0.000 (0.22) | 0.004 (2.98)** | 0.000 (0.43) | -0.001 (0.39) | -0.001 (0.93) |
| race <i>Black=1</i> | -0.060 (0.83) | -0.055 (0.63) | -0.205 (3.24)** | -0.043 (0.52) | -0.038 (1.02) |
| <i>Individual resources</i> | | | | | |
| Education | 0.041 (1.69) | 0.100 (3.54)** | 0.044 (2.01)* | 0.004 (0.13) | 0.004 (0.26) |
| Income/poverty ratio | -0.001 (0.06) | 0.017 (1.30) | 0.011 (0.85) | 0.023 (1.72) | 0.019 (2.37)* |
| <i>Accessibility</i> | | | | | |
| Married/ live with partner | 0.106 (2.43)* | 0.101 (2.31)* | 0.031 (0.72) | 0.104 (2.16)* | 0.021 (0.80) |
| Knows influential person | 0.185 (3.70)** | 0.092 (1.55) | 0.039 (0.85) | 0.061 (1.34) | 0.050 (1.89) |
| Past participation | 0.166 (3.62)** | 0.224 (4.59)** | 0.231 (5.73)** | 0.289 (6.78)** | 0.097 (3.69)** |
| Member group discusses politics | 0.101 (3.96)** | 0.078 (2.66)** | 0.035 (1.45) | 0.040 (1.42) | 0.006 (0.37) |
| School group | 0.124 (1.81) | -0.013 (0.14) | 0.228 (3.09)** | 0.035 (0.46) | -0.010 (0.21) |
| Crime victim | -0.008 (0.72) | -0.026 (2.25)* | -0.017 (1.45) | -0.006 (0.51) | -0.011 (1.61) |
| <i>Neighborhood</i> | | | | | |
| % Black | 0.048 (0.45) | -0.154 (1.36) | 0.252 (2.46)* | 0.106 (1.01) | 0.120 (2.01)* |
| % female headed households | -0.337 (0.86) | 0.034 (0.10) | -0.609 (1.75) | 0.306 (1.00) | -0.606 (2.70)** |
| % high school grad & up | 0.153 (0.71) | -0.136 (0.56) | -0.026 (0.13) | 0.255 (1.15) | -0.025 (0.21) |
| Observations | 882 | 882 | 883 | 883 | 883 |

Robust z statistics in parentheses significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Indeed, those who have been a victim of crime are 3% less likely to be contacted than non-victims, suggesting that issue may be a factor. Past participation appears to carry the most weight, increasing the chance of contact by 22%, and membership in a political group adds 8% to an individual's chances of being recruited. This could be a result of lists kept by fundraisers. Targeted lists of possible donors probably include those who have been involved in the past. As with party/community work, neighborhood does not appear as a significant factor in recruitment. Those contacted to give money then, are more likely to have a history of political participation, be better educated, married or living with a partner, a member of a group that discusses politics, older and not a victim of crime.

In recruitment to contact a public official, past participation and education continue as factors in the recruitment process. Those with an activist history are 23% more likely to be contacted than those who are politically uninvolved, and those with the most education are 4% more likely to be recruited than the least educated. Membership in a school group further increases the chance of contact by 23% compared to non-members. This certainly lends support to the possibility raised earlier that there may be a link between recruitment and particular issues. For recruitment to contact public officials, race appears for the first time as a mobilization factor—both at the individual and neighborhood levels. African Americans are 25% less likely to be recruited than white citizens. However, individuals who live in neighborhoods with the highest proportion of black residents are more likely to be mobilized than those living in areas with the fewest black citizens. This finding is intriguing. It suggests that political strategists are more likely to target black neighborhoods, but not black individuals. One possible explanation is that political organizers target neighborhoods experiencing a greater number of social and political disparities, but believe black residents are least likely to respond to a contact. It is also possible organizers are influenced by unfounded racial biases. At this point however, the reasons for the incongruity between targeting based on individual and neighborhood race are unclear.

Organizers appear fairly egalitarian when it comes to invitations based on individual and neighborhood characteristics and resources. The only group of variables which significantly affects recruitment to attend a meeting lies within the accessibility domain. Those who have been politically active in the past are 29% more likely to be

sought out then those who have not been active. In addition, those who are married or living with a partner are 10% more likely to be recruited than those not living with a partner. The reliance on these two factors suggests that the main concern of strategists may simply be efficiency. There are probably not many resources available to determine who might be most interested in a particular meeting or most likely to show up. Lists of those who have participated in the past are certainly an easy place to start. This avenue is all the more understandable if meetings are focused on local issues and local networks are already in existence. It does raise concerns however, about who is left out of the process.

Given the importance of past participation for meeting attendance--a local activity--it is somewhat surprising that its impact is the smallest for recruitment to attend a protest or rally. There is only a 10% increase in the likelihood of recruitment for activists compared to non-activists. If, however, lists of past participants are used to contact individuals, then this finding makes sense. There is generally not an attendance sheet to sign at rallies, a practice more common at meetings. Income shows up for the first time as a factor in recruitment. Those with higher incomes are slightly more likely to be recruited. On the other hand, individuals in neighborhoods with the highest proportion of female-headed households are 60% less likely to be recruited. Thus individual resources appears to be a positive factor, albeit minimally, while the lack of neighborhood resources is a very large negative factor in the likelihood of recruitment. In one iteration of the equation, neighborhood poverty was included, but the effect was not significant. Given the insignificance of poverty rate, it is possible the presence of high numbers of female-headed households is an indicator of the lack of other resources necessary for protest activities, such as time, interest or possibly transportation. Again, as with recruitment to contact a public official, the racial mix of the neighborhood in which one lives matters. Those living in areas with the greatest percentage of black residents are 12% more likely to be contacted than those in areas with the fewest black residents. The importance of this factor along with the percent female-headed households, suggests that neighborhoods rather than individuals are of primary concern in the strategies of political organizers. Further, given the greater propensity of black neighborhoods to have higher percentages of female-headed

households, and the likelihood that the former will be targeted, it appears recruiters are focused on something other than simple economic assets.¹⁹

Discussion

I began with the assumption that political recruiters use different individual, social and neighborhood profiles in targeting strategies--depending on the type of activity for which they are recruiting. From the data presented thus far, this appears to be the case.

Individual demographics appear to contribute little to our understanding of who is likely to be mobilized for specific acts—with a few exceptions. Age is positive and significant, but only for contact to contribute money to a political or community issue. Even here however, its effect is fairly small. There is only a .4% increase in likelihood of contact for the oldest compared to youngest citizens—an effect that appears to be far smaller than that found by Abramson and Claggett (2001). These authors also found race to be a significant negative factor in the recruitment of Black citizens to contribute to a political campaign. That was not the case in this analysis. However, black individuals were 20% less likely to be mobilized to contact a public official than their white counterparts. Abramson and Claggett (2001) did not look at recruitment to contact a public official. At the very least, there are indicators that black citizens as individuals may be at a disadvantage for recruitment to some forms of participation.

Abramson and Claggett (2001) found both education and income to be positive factors for campaign and money mobilization, as did Brady, et al (1999) for their index of activities. In this study however, income is only significant for contact about a protest and education is only a factor for recruitment to make a contribution and contact a public official. Those with the highest levels of education are more likely to be mobilized to contribute money and contact a public official than citizens with the least education, 10% and 4% respectively. In only one case does individual income appear to be a factor in recruitment. The richest individuals are 2% more likely to be mobilized to protest than were the poorest citizens. While the evidence presented here does indicate that individual resources do matter for political recruitment, they do not appear to matter as much as accessibility.

¹⁹ The correlation between the proportion of black residents and female-headed households is .652.

As a group, the accessibility variables appear to carry the most weight in predicting recruitment across the various types of activities. Similar to the findings of previous authors, past participation is one of the largest contributors to an understanding of the recruitment puzzle--for all acts, except protest. Activists are 10-29% more likely to be recruited than inactive citizens. Someone who is married or living with a partner is about 10% more likely to be contacted to work on a political campaign or community issue, attend a meeting, or make a financial contribution than their counterparts. Similarly, members of a group that discusses politics stand a higher chance of mobilization for campaign or community work, or to give money than non-members.

In a similar vein, membership in a group focused on school issues, increases the likelihood of recruitment to contact a public official by almost 23% over non-school group members. Simple group membership is not a factor in mobilization outcomes. On the other hand, crime victims are less likely to be recruited for campaign or community work than non-victims. Are crime victims purposely less accessible, for example by not answering knocks at their doors? It is not clear from this data, but it does lend support to the importance of a more nuanced definition of accessibility, beyond past participation or group membership. After all, targeting strategies are important, but they are only the beginning. Someone has to be available to hear the recruitment request.

One other factor in the accessibility category is important for recruitment, specifically for work for a party or on a community issue, namely knowing an influential person. Indeed, it is the largest predictor for this particular activity, increasing the chance of contact by about 19% for the politically connected compared to those with no such connection. Certainly, this lends some support to Rosenstone and Hansen's (1994) theory that mobilizers target individuals who are well connected. Accessibility as a whole clearly is an important group of factors for predicting who will be mobilized.

Neighborhood variables as predictors of recruitment do not perform consistently across all types of participation, but they do provide some interesting and surprising insights. Only for recruitment to contact a public official and to protest is neighborhood context significant. For these activities, individuals living in areas with the highest percentage of black residents are twelve to twenty-five percent more likely to be mobilized than those living in areas with the fewest black citizens. Indeed, neighborhood race has the

largest effect on recruitment to contact of a public official of any of the included predictors. For this particular act, the result is also somewhat surprising given the opposite effect found for individual race. One possible explanation may be that strategists are least likely to contact black individuals, no matter where they live. However, if the CO guidance is followed, more organizing might take place in areas with higher percentages of black residents due to a preference for working in marginalized neighborhoods. What is striking is that individual race still matters, even with severe segregation that occurs in the Detroit metropolitan area. It may also be that collapsing recruitment to contact a public official for any and all types of issues, hides or melds together distinct racially based strategies that are issue dependent.

Lastly, the extreme dampening effect on recruitment for individuals living in neighborhoods with the highest percentages of female-headed households is both surprising and very concerning. While it only comes into play for protest activities, its size effect is about two and half times the size of any other variable for any of the activities analyzed. Organizers may believe that areas with a high percentage of female headed-households do not have the resources to participate in a protest. Nonetheless, if one thinks of a protest as an act performed where little else seems to be working, these types of neighborhoods may be precisely the areas where such acts are most needed.

Conclusion

This study extends that of previous researchers by examining recruitment to individual activities beyond the typical party related acts, by including a broader range of accessibility variables as predictors and by examining the neighborhood as an important context for the recruitment process. Accessibility, neighborhood race and prevalence of female-headed households in the neighborhood each predict an individual's chance of being recruited. The broader social context of recruitment is at least as important as individual attributes if we wish to understand who is invited to participate in the political game. It is also clear that there is not one mobilization strategy that fits all types of activities. Accessibility plays a strong role in recruitment for all acts. The role of individual and neighborhood demographics and resources differs depending on the political activity.

The apparent over reliance of political organizers on accessibility factors, and on past participation in particular, raises some troubling concerns. It appears that we are

targeting those easiest to reach. This group may not include those with the greatest stake in an issue. If mobilization provides citizens information about an issue, about its potential impact on their lives, and about ways to influence decisions on the issue, targeting those easiest to find may exclude those with the greatest stake in the outcomes. If it is important for citizens to have a voice in political decisions that affect their lives, then political recruiters may need to reexamine their strategies. On the other hand, some organizers may consciously attempt to give certain segments of the population a greater say in political outcomes and exclude other segments from the process. The ultimate test will be to examine the effect of these recruitment strategies on actual participation. Who we see in the political game may simply reflect those who invited to join in, but we will not know this until we tease out the strategies by activity and by issue.

There were some striking differences in these analyses from that found in previous political recruitment research. These differences point to the need for the fields of political science and community organizing/social work to begin crossing the bridges that divide them. Paying more attention to issues and neighborhoods, might help political science achieve a better understanding of political recruitment, and ultimately a better grasp of the factors that impact and shape political life in the local community. Political science can help social work gain a better understand the results of their organizing efforts, in terms of who is ultimately recruited and the impact on community life. One set of facts does not mean that there is only one story to be explored.

Chapter 3

Mobilization - Schools

Introduction

Relatively little is known about who is recruited to participate in political activities in general. Even less is known about whether mobilization strategies differ by issue, and if issue specific recruitment profiles differ from those found for recruitment to politics in general. Why should we care if strategies differ by issue and activity? Some issues have a greater impact on people's lives than others, and individuals recruited to influence decision outcomes may not represent those who have the most at stake in a given issue. In this chapter, I focus on who is mobilized around public school issues.

For some school issues, parents who have greater resources could choose to enroll their children in a private school if they are displeased with the decisions of a public school system or if the system is under-funded. Parents with fewer resources may be disproportionately affected by an educational decision, precisely because they do not have the means to opt out of the public school system. In this scenario, who is recruited to participate in the various issues and activities may have direct consequences for the bias of any policy or political decisions that ultimately result. If we believe a democracy is best served when the breadth of citizens' voices are heard, then it behooves us to better understand who is invited to make their voice heard and not assume that issue-based mobilization strategies are all the same.

There is ample evidence that recruitment plays a role in increasing participation in both electoral politics, and what Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) refer to as governmental politics. Governmental politics encompasses activities such as contacting members of Congress, attending a meeting, or joining in a protest; as opposed to voting, campaigning or making a campaign contribution. At times, recruitment's contribution to the participation story is over and above that played by traditional predictors such as resources and

individual attributes (Abramson & Claggett, 2001; Brady, et al., 1995; Cohen & Dawson, 1993; Eldersveld, 1956; Ellison & Gay, 1989; Gerber & Green, 2000a, 2000b; Kenneth M. Goldstein, 1999; Gosnell, 1927; Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1992; Kramer, 1970; Krassa, 1988; Marschall, 2004; Niven, 2001; Norrander, 1991; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Schlozman, et al., 1999; Smith & Zipp, 1983; Wielhouwer, 1999; Wielhouwer & Lockerbie, 1994). Some authors have found mobilization to be particularly important for African Americans (Ellison & Gay, 1989).

Given the role of mobilization in politics, it is important to examine who is recruited for participation. This is especially true if, as Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) have argued, mobilization accentuates the bias in political participation towards those with greater individual and political resources. Past research has shown that for electoral activities, organizers appear to target individuals who have greater financial and educational resources, are older, have longer tenure in the community, attend religious services, are union members and are past activists (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes, 1960; Djupe & Grant, 2001; Ellison & Gay, 1989; Gershtenson, 2003; K. Goldstein & Paul, 2002; Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1992; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993). Unfortunately, the surveys analyzed in these studies asked respondents if they were contacted by a political party or campaign, but did not ask what action they were recruited for. Thus, we do not know if respondents were asked to vote, contribute money, attend a campaign meeting or perform some other action, and we cannot determine if the same or different recruitment profiles were used across different electoral activities.

Using 1990 and 1992 NES data, Abramson and Claggett (2001) did look at recruitment to specific electoral activities—campaign participation, campaign contributions, and support for a particular candidate. They found that recruiters do change their tactics based on the action requested. For campaign recruitment, past campaign activity was the strongest predictor of mobilization. Past participation was a predictor of vote and contribution contact, but to a lesser extent. Across all activities, individuals with greater resources were more likely to be recruited. Organizational membership was a

positive factor, but only for campaign participation.²⁰ Unfortunately, the membership question only asked about groups an individual felt close to. Thus, we do not know if other types of groups affected the likelihood of recruitment, particularly for activities where membership was not significant. Lastly, whites were more likely to be asked for campaign contributions than were blacks (see also, Gershtenson, 2003). So far, it appears too early to conclude one recruitment strategy fits all, at least for electoral politics.

Brady, et al (1999) used a combined recruitment index that included both electoral and governmental activities, and found that higher levels of education, family income, political engagement and past political participation were positive predictors, and that church attendance and employment decreased the likelihood of contact.²¹ Their finding on the effect of church attendance is opposite that found in studies of electoral activity alone. This suggests that targeting profiles may vary by activity. Brady et al (1999) also found that organizational membership was not a significant predictor of recruitment to the combined recruitment index. In models predicting recruitment to electoral activities, organizational membership is positive and significant. Brady et al's study only included contact by non-political organizations. One might expect organizations with a political bent to be more likely than their counterparts to mobilize their membership, especially if the request was for campaign work for example. Thus, the impact of overall organizational membership is not known.

When Goldstein (1999) examined recruitment to contact a congressional representative about healthcare reform (governmental activity), he found a profile similar to that found for electoral fundraising. Those targeted were more likely to be white, educated and union members. He also found men, individuals employed outside the house, and individuals living in states targeted by organizers in lobbying efforts around President Clinton's healthcare reform were more likely to be recruited to contact a member of

²⁰ Unfortunately, the group membership variable Abramson and Claggett used was limited. The NES question wording only asked about organizations "that represented the interests and viewpoint of the group that they felt particularly close to." (p. 914).

²¹ In the analysis discussed here, Brady et al (1999) reported on results which used a summary index of activities to which a respondent might have been mobilized. It included campaign work or contribution, contacting a government official, protesting, participating on a public or political issue at the local level. The authors did separately test a recruitment model for contact to make a contribution and found family income to be the largest predictor of recruitment to make a contribution. Unfortunately, they did not report the effects of any of the other predictor variables so it is not clear if the contribution recruitment profile varies from the overall mobilization index they used (p. 161).

congress. Based on conversations with lobbyists, the author argues that strategists first target the districts of representatives they want to influence on a specific issue, and secondly, individuals within the selected districts who can influence legislators and who will take action. Goldstein's research raises an important point, i.e., it is quite possible that political strategists determine who they will target based on who they want to influence on a particular issue, and for a specific action.

If organizers target those they believe will take action, one might expect they would not only target those with the resources to do so, but also individuals perceived to have a self-interest or a stake in the issue. Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) analyzed causes of attending a local town/school meeting or signing a petition, and found that individuals with school age children were more likely to participate. Whether all such individuals are simply more active or whether these particular individuals were more active because the issue was education is not clear. While school issues are definitely included, many other issues could have been the focus of a petition or town meeting. However, even though the focus is on causes of participation, it does raise the possibility that these individuals were targeted for mobilization *through* their children, particularly if the issue was schools. Alternatively, recruiters might have directly targeted parents rather than individuals without children, due to a belief that they would have a greater stake in schools' related outcomes and might be more likely to act. To date, there is little evidence as to which of these strategies, if either, guides decisions of organizers. While data is limited about targeting strategies for specific activities, even less is known about issue specific profiles. If recruiters are rational, they surely use different clues about who will respond, depending on the desired action. Not all actions require the same political skill or investment, and not all people care equally about all issues. In discussing issue specific canvassing strategies, Shaw (2004) advocates creating voter databases that identify not only individual demographics, but also whether there are kids in the home and occupation. Presumably, these two pieces of information indicate potential stake in issues for which a politician might need to garner support.

Just as individuals are more invested in some issues than in others, it stands to reason that the same may be true for organizations, and that such groups would provide an access point for political activists. Indeed, (Walker, 1991) argued that institutions are the key to understanding the different levels of mobilization among different groups of

citizens. In the previous paragraph, it was argued that parents who participated in a town/school meeting might have been targeted through their children. However, it is also possible that they were mobilized by an organization to which they belonged—one with a focus on educational issues. As noted earlier, there is some evidence for a link between particular types of organizational membership, e.g., religious, union, or political, and recruitment to specific types of political action, but the research is limited with regard to issue specific membership and issue specific recruitment. Knoke (1990) is one of the few researchers who have offered evidence that types of organization matter in whether they mobilize their members to participate politically and the types of activities in which members are urged to participate. In his study, unions were the most active in their mobilization efforts of members.

Given the cost of mobilization efforts, one might assume that strategists would seek to minimize their costs and target groups whose members have indicated an interest in the issue at hand, or that issue specific organizations would seek to mobilize their own membership for group related interests. Members of such groups have already indicated a propensity to act on the issue, simply by joining up. Indeed, Shaw's (2004) precinct analysis argues for the inclusion of gathering any information available on groups to which individuals might belong, such as the NRA or unions. However, more exploration is needed about the role played by particular types of group membership in the recruitment process, as well as other factors that might increase organizers' access to individuals, such as that suggested previously--access to parents through their children. Individuals may be pulled into the political process through their kids or through school organizations if the issue is schools, but that may not be the case for other issues. One might expect organizers to look for different points of access depending on the activity and especially, the issue for which they are recruiting.

While we have a beginning understanding of the role played by an individual's characteristics and accessibility to organizers in the targeting process, we are thus far missing a consideration of the broader political and social context within which individuals live—their neighborhoods. Some researchers argue that neighborhoods with a higher level of resources—age, income and education--have a positive effect on electoral participation, while neighborhoods with higher levels of poverty and proportion Black or Hispanic

residents have a negative impact, over and above the effect of individual characteristics (Cho, 2003; Cho, et al., 2006; Gimpel, et al., 2006). Studies that do control for neighborhood effect are almost exclusively focused on electoral participation. In one of the few studies that go beyond electoral activities, Cohen and Dawson (1993) found that severe neighborhood poverty had a large dampening effect on community meeting attendance for African American residents, as well as on church and organizational membership. Whether people in these areas participate less frequently because of lower levels of group membership, and thus accessibility to mobilizers or because organizers avoid these neighborhoods is not clear. We also do not know if there were any variances by issue, since the authors used a measure for meeting attendance that included any community issue.

Neighborhood profiles may be an important component in issue specific recruitment profiles for several reasons. If, as Goldstein (1999) has suggested, organizers first target policy makers they wish to influence, and in turn the districts they represent, where an individual lives matters. Further, several authors have argued that it is through the structures and social networks of neighborhoods that residents receive information about political issues and options and are encouraged to participate (Cho, et al., 2006; Oliver, 1984). In electoral politics, Huckfeldt and Sprague (1992) did find that the Republican Party strategists only appeared to target based on individual characteristics, while the Democratic Party operatives also included neighborhood characteristics. Unfortunately, the individual and neighborhood variables utilized in Huckfeldt and Sprague's study were very limited (see also Kramer, 1970).

Targeting neighborhoods makes even more sense for non-electoral activities where aids such as voting records may not be available. Organizers often don't have a lot of information about individuals likely to turn out for a meeting, for example. It may be cost effective to target those neighborhoods perceived to have a greater stake in an issue specific outcome, as well as the resources and willingness to engage in specific types of political activity. Conversely, organizers might avoid resource poor neighborhoods, those perceived to be dangerous, or those areas strategists suspect of not caring about the issue. In the case of schools, the quality of education and available funding, as well the types of issues faced by the schools vary greatly by neighborhood, as do the political skill and influence available to impact educational decisions. At times, school issues are broad-reaching, such

as whether to continue funding the educational system through property taxes. At other times, they are locally focused, as in the case of school closings—more often in poorer neighborhoods.

Lastly, with so much of the research on political participation focused on electoral politics, participation at the neighborhood level is often overlooked. To ignore the neighborhood context, is to fail to consider the traditional community organizing efforts that take place at the local level. These efforts, in the style of the Direct Action and Research Training Center (DART); Gamaliel Foundation; Industrial Areas foundation (IAF) (based on Saul Alinsky's philosophy); Midwest Academy; and People Improving Communities through Organizing (PICO) to name but a few, focus on issues relevant to the local community or neighborhood. In this context, the level of organizing and recruitment will vary by neighborhood, as will the issues and their impact on residents. Although not as pervasive as one might hope, some of these efforts have been documented in the work of Berry, et al (1993), Fisher (1994), Fisher and Romanofsky (1981), and Thompson (2001), among others.

Thus far, some evidence suggests that political recruiters are strategic with regard to the specific actions requested. However, the research to date is limited in four respects. There is little analysis of 1) issue-specific recruitment; 2) activity specific recruitment, particularly non-electoral activities; 3) issue specific factors which might make one more visible or accessible to organizers; and 4) neighborhood characteristics as a factors in mobilization strategies.

Research Questions

In this chapter, I address four questions with a focus on political activities specific to the issue of schools. First, given the race disparities in political participation, what role is played by race in the recruitment strategies of organizers? Does race enter as a factor for some forms of activity more than for others, if at all? Since mobilization strongly predicts political participation, the answer to this question not only has consequences for participation, but ultimately for which voices are heard in the defining of policy, particularly at the local level. The quality of our educational systems tends to disproportionately favor those who are better off, and those who are white. Although the provision of quality education and issues related to its provision are complicated, part of

the reason for some of the local disparities may be due to who is invited to influence educational decisions and who is ignored.

The second question pertains to the extent involvement in the community and accessibility play in the recruitment process. Is it simple membership, membership in specific kinds of groups, past participation or something as simple as having children that makes one visible, and thus accessible to recruiters? Given limited resources, organizers in the educational arena will most likely choose to recruit those who are easiest to find and care about issue—those who are members of a school-related organization. On the other hand, Baumgartner and Leech (1998) argue that most groups, even those that are purportedly focused on a single issue, monitor and are active in policy across several domains. If this is the case, than any type of group membership may also contribute to the chances of being recruited to be active on a schools issue. Many organizations keep lists of members and those who have participated in past activities. Often groups share their lists. As many people have experienced, once they are placed on a group's list, it is not uncommon to hear from other groups as well. Parents may be more accessible than those without children, since schools in particular often use students as a conduit of information to parents. To be sure, individuals might be notified of important education issues if they are members of a school group, but non school group members might also be notified of an action through their children.

Third, does place of residence play a part in whether or not an individual is invited into the political process? Organizers in the electoral realm can use extensive voting lists to refine their recruitment strategies, but this resource is not available for many forms of political participation. To locate individuals for non-electoral recruitment can be a costly process. If, as some have argued, organizers are rational and strategic, do they minimize their costs by identifying and focusing on neighborhoods with the skills, interest in and resources necessary for political action, as well on individuals who are accessible through other means? If one is looking for individuals with the skills, knowledge and resources necessary for participation on school issues, a focus on resource rich neighborhoods might be a far more cost effective strategy than doing a broad sweep of the populace. On the other hand, organizers might ignore certain neighborhoods, possibly in the belief that there aren't enough individuals living in such areas with the requisite political resources, or because of

organizers' biases or fears. On the other hand, one might expect more organizing and thus greater levels of recruitment in areas with fewer resources and often, more problems with educational quality, precisely because there is a need for action.

The final question is whether profiles of the mobilized vary based on the type of activity for which they are recruited in the educational arena. My assumption is that strategists use a different individual, social and neighborhood profile when recruiting for attendance at a meeting than they do for urging people to join a protest or make a financial contribution, for example. Different political activities require different skills, knowledge and levels of interest. It would be foolish and costly to expect a positive response to a request for action from all individuals.

My goal is to examine political recruitment in the broader context of individual, social and neighborhood characteristics. In particular, I hope to add to current research by illuminating differences in targeting strategies within the schools domain. Much of the current research either focuses exclusively on recruitment in the electoral arena or fails to distinguish the issue for which an individual is mobilized. We cannot assume that strategists believe all activities or issues require the same resources or interest. To do so, is to assume that organizers are irrational and clueless on effective strategies.

Data and methodology

To answer the four questions, data from the 1989 Detroit Area Study (DAS) is utilized.²² It includes data from 916 face-to-face interviews with respondents who were part of a random, 2 stage sample of the Detroit tri-county area. Detroit census tracts with a high proportion of Black residents were over sampled to insure adequate sub sample of Black respondents for analysis.²³ Compared to the 1990 NES sample, respondents in DAS were similar on mean years of education and Party ID. Average income was about \$3,500 less in the DAS sample, and the NES had about six percent more males than did the DAS. Lastly, the DAS had a greater percentage of Black respondents (22%) and fewer whites (78%) compared to the NES, 13% and 84% respectively. Thus it is a fairly comparable sample with the national NES sample.

²² The author was a member of the group that designed the study and collected the data.

²³ A weighted sample was used for all analyses.

There are some limitations in the use of this dataset. One of the biggest is that the random sample was drawn from the Detroit tri-county area, and Detroit continues to be one of the most segregated cities in the United States. Respondents were also highly segregated by race, leading to the possibility that the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhood could swamp the influence of an individual's race on recruitment.²⁴ If individual race remains as a factor with the addition of neighborhood characteristics, it will only serve to underscore the enduring impact of race on politics, at least in Detroit. Also, it should be no surprise that there were some strong correlations (ranging between .378 and .678) between some of the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhoods included in the sample. In light of this, and the strong possibility of multicollinearity, the addition of neighborhood variables was purposely limited.²⁵

A key advantage of the DAS sample is that it includes recruitment to a broader range of political activities than does the NES or that used by Brady et al. It also has data about recruitment to activities focused on the issue of local public schools, and on membership in education specific organizations. Respondents were asked if they had been contacted during the prior 12 month period to participate in a public schools focused activity, including: 1) asked to attend a meeting; 2) asked to contact a public official or influential person to express views; 3) asked to do volunteer work in local public schools; 4) to give money to a group concerned about local public schools; and 5) to participate in a rally or protest about local public schools. For exact question wording, see Appendix A. Separate dichotomous variables were used for each form of recruitment. Although respondents were asked if they had been personally contacted about an activity, the question wording also included the possibility of seeing an announcement or poster. Thus, it is not possible to distinguish the means of recruitment. Mobilization, recruitment and contact will be used interchangeably, but in any event should not be construed to only mean a personal invitation to act.

²⁴ For a comparison of means for neighborhood characteristics by race of respondent, please see Appendix C.

²⁵ When neighborhood characteristics were regressed on the percent black residents in the census tract, the tolerance levels fell between .530 and .715 and the variance inflation factor (VIF) for multicollinearity ranged from 1.398 to 1.886. The level of multicollinearity was determined by the author to be acceptable.

The first group of independent variables, individual demographic characteristics includes sex, age, and race. Individual resources includes education and an income to poverty threshold ratio. The latter was utilized in the belief that it is not actual dollar increments that matter, but the level of income relative to the poverty line.

Social accessibility is a group of variables comprised of married/living with a partner; having a child in public school; home ownership; whether the respondent knew an influential person; past participation (not including the year prior to the survey); membership in a group that discusses politics, in a school group, or in other types of groups; and having been a victim of crime.²⁶ The link between an individual and an influential person should move in two ways. Just as one might turn to an influential person for help in getting what they need, the influential person may well turn around and do the same. Various types of groups were included, such as school, crime, and religious; whether the group discussed politics and membership in any group in the belief that mobilizers view groups as having different skill levels, interests, and a willingness to act. Having been a victim of crime was included as a proxy for stake in local policy issues, particularly since the issue of crime often arises in discussions of school issues.

The final group of variables is neighborhood characteristics and resources. Census tract data for 1990 was appended, and used as a proxy for neighborhood information. A census tract is probably far larger than what one might consider a neighborhood, but it does provide a way to examine the context within which a respondent lives. The percentage of Black residents allows a test of whether it is an individual's race that matters in recruitment--if at all, or if it is the proportion of races in a residential area. Neighborhood resources was operationalized as percent of residents with at least a high school degree. Mean income was initially included, but it did not reach significance. Lastly, percent owner-occupied was included as both a proxy for accessibility (more stable than renters) and for stake in the issue of education. In Michigan, there had been several ballot attempts to shift school funding away from a dependence on property taxes. Presumably, homeowners would have a stake in the outcome of this issue.

²⁶ In order to compare results from this sample to previous research, membership in any group, union membership, and frequency of religious service attendance were initially considered, but dropped as they were not significant predictors of recruitment.

To explore the role of race in schools mobilization, four progressively inclusive equations for each of the five types of action are estimated. The purpose is to tease out how the race effect changes, if at all, as resources, accessibility and neighborhood are added in. Given that the dependent variables are dichotomous, probit analysis is used to estimate the percent change in probability of being contacted for each independent variable, holding the remaining variables at their mean. In the first equation, only the individual demographic characteristics are included.

Equation 1: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{race}))$

In the second equation, *individual resources* are added. If it is resources rather than race that matters, any race effect should diminish or disappear. On the other hand, if the race effect remains, we cannot at this point dismiss the idea that race is a factor in recruitment strategies.

Equation 2: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{I Resources}))$

Equation three adds the *Accessibility* variables. This allows us to test to what extent the ability of political activists to reach citizens is a factor in the recruitment process. Rather than race or resources, the differences in probability of contact may have more to do with who is visible and accessible.

Equation 3: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \Sigma\beta_3(\text{Accessibility}))$

Lastly, equation four builds on the previous equation and brings in the neighborhood context.

Equation 4: $\Pr(Y=1) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \Sigma\beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \Sigma\beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \Sigma\beta_3(\text{Accessibility}) + \Sigma\beta_4(\text{Nhood}))$

By gradually adding in the different categories of recruitment factors, a progressive story is built that permits the teasing out of the race effect. This is particularly important, since few other studies include the residential context, and usually stop at the accessibility stage. Race effect will be discussed for each of the equations. For all other variables, only the final model will be discussed.

The statistical package utilized for all analyses was Stata (version 10). All analyses were weighted by their sampling weight in order to account for the oversampling of Detroit. The dProbit command was employed to estimate all equations

and all independent variables were set to their mean. Dprobit was used instead of the probit command because it returns the change in probability for dummy variables, rather than the coefficients. Also, since there was no variance in neighborhood data for respondents living in the same census tract, the cluster option was incorporated in the dprobit analyses to account for the correlation in neighborhood characteristics. This option was utilized in all probit estimates. In each chapter, a table with the marginal effect of each independent variable on the probability of recruitment is presented for each model. All independent variables included in the model are listed in each table.

Results

Who is recruited?

Citizens are far more likely to be recruited to attend a meeting than to do anything else in the school domain. Respondents were more than twice as likely to be contacted to attend a meeting as to volunteer in the schools, contribute money or contact a public official about a school related issue. They were least likely to be contacted about a protest.

Table 3-1: Percent contacted about a school issue

| | Contact Public official | Attend meeting | Contribute \$ | Volunteer in schools | Protest |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Total (weighted) | 13.1% | 41.4% | 19.5% | 17.8% | 5.7% |
| Race | | | | | |
| Black | 13.4% | 30.3% | 16.9% | 16.3% | 7.6% |
| White | 11.2% | 37.8% | 17.2% | 15.7% | 3.9% |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Female | 11.6% | 34.1% | 18.6% | 18.2% | 6.1% |
| Male | 13.4% | 34.0% | 14.8% | 12.5% | 5.5% |
| Income | | | | | |
| < \$10,000 | 7.1% | 22.4% | 10.5% | 12.3% | 2.3% |
| ≥ \$90,000 | 22.7% | 59.1% | 18.2% | 22.7% | 4.6% |
| Education | | | | | |
| < HS degree | 4.6% | 21.4% | 11.3% | 10.5% | 3.0% |
| ≥ BA degree | 28.1% | 57.0% | 33.3% | 24.6% | 14.2% |

Bold Chi. Sq. sig. < .05

Across all types of activities, those who had the greatest financial and educational resources were recruited at rates far higher than those who were poor or had less than a high school degree. The only exception is recruitment to protest, where there was not a

significant difference between those with the highest and lowest incomes. There were significant differences in contact by race in two categories, requests to attend a meeting and to protest. White citizens were recruited 7.5% more often than were black citizens. On the other hand, blacks were almost twice as likely as whites to be invited to protest. Although the numbers contacted to protest for either group were small. The only activity for which there was a significant difference in contact rates by gender was for volunteering in the schools. Not surprisingly, women were recruited to volunteer in the schools more often than were men.

Overall, there is a significant imbalance in the recruitment rates between individuals with the greatest financial and educational resources and those with the least. Thus far, those who are already on the margins of society appear to be further excluded from the political arena as well. Whether the resource/recruitment relationship remains when other factors are controlled for will be explored in a later section. Lastly, race and gender also appear to be correlated with contact, but the relationship seems to be less consistent across recruitment to the various activities.

Race and Recruitment

Since the race and recruitment relationship fluctuates by activity, it worth exploring the effect of race on mobilization by controlling for other factors. Table 3.2 presents a progressive story of the effect of race on an individual's chances of being contacted by gradually factoring in resources, accessibility and neighborhood. When controlling only for demographic characteristics, the race effect mirrors the findings in the previous frequency tables. Being black decreases the probability of recruitment to attend a meeting by 11% compared to whites. For protest activities, blacks are 5% more likely to be contacted than are whites. Race is not a significant factor in recruitment to the other activities.

Table 3-2: Race Effect on Likelihood of School Related Recruitment: % Change

| | Contact Public official | Attend meeting | Contribute money | Volunteer in schools | Protest |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Model 1: Only Demographics | 1.4% (0.58) | -11.3% (2.78)** | -1.1% (0.31) | -0.9% (0.30) | 5.3% (2.21)* |
| Model 2: Plus resources | 5.1% (2.16)* | -6.2% (1.47) | 3.2% (0.90) | 0.7% (0.23) | 7.1% (2.69)** |
| Model 3: Plus connections | 2.0% (1.06) | -12.8% (2.65)** | 2.5% (0.71) | 0.0% (0.00) | 5.1% (2.50)* |
| Model 4: Plus Neighborhood | -0.5% (0.16) | -0.9% (0.09) | 15.4% (2.04)* | 2.4% (0.53) | 7.3% (1.62) |

Robust z statistics in parentheses: * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

When individual resources (education and income) are controlled for, the picture changes to some extent. In model 2, Blacks are slightly more likely than whites to be recruited to protest, and their chances of being asked to contact a public official now become greater and significant when education and income are controlled. These two findings suggest political strategists focus on race rather than resources when recruiting individuals to contact a public official or join in a protest. Political strategists may believe African American citizens are more likely to take part in these two activities than their white counterparts or, given the disparities in school systems, have more at stake on the issue of schools. On the other hand, the race effect diminishes in both size and significance for contact about a meeting. In this case, resources may play a stronger role in recruitment strategies.

Table 3-3: Accessibility by race

| | Member of any group | Group discusses politics (often) | School group member | Child in public school | Religious group member | Home owner | Past activist |
|--------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Total | 68.0% | 41.4% | 7.0% | 28.0% | 45.1% | 63.6% | 53.3% |
| Race | | | | | | | |
| Black | 66.5% | 42.2% | 6.2% | 32.7% | 48.4% | 56.7% | 51.5% |
| White | 69.5% | 33.8% | 7.7% | 23.4% | 41.8% | 70.2% | 55.1% |

Bold Sig. < .05

Strategic targeting of recruitment efforts based on a citizen's demographic and resource characteristics presumes organizers know where to find specific individuals.

While this may be the case, the story may also be one of accessibility—who can be found with the least effort. There is little difference between the races in membership in any group, in a school related organization or in past participation (Table 3.3). Blacks are significantly more likely to be a member of a group that often discusses politics, to join a religious group, and to have a child in public school, and less likely to be a home owner. To test the race and accessibility story, controls for factors that might make one more visible to mobilizers, such as past participation and membership in organizations are added to the model. As can be seen in Table 3.2, there is little change in the effect of race on recruitment to contribute money, to volunteer in a school, or to protest. On the other hand, the race effect diminishes and is no longer significant for contacting a public official, suggesting that organizers may focus on accessibility rather than on individual race for this activity. The biggest change in race effect occurs in recruitment to attend a meeting. Controlling for accessibility, blacks are now 12% less likely than whites to be contacted about a meeting. Regardless of resources or accessibility, it appears organizers believe whites are more likely to attend a meeting or possibly to have greater influence once they show up. This is the point at which most of the research has stopped. However as we will see, accounting for neighborhood changes the picture yet again.

It makes sense that organizers might focus their strategies on particular neighborhoods as well as on individuals, given differences in school quality and issues by residential area. To test this notion in the final model, controls were added for the demographic characteristics and resources of a neighborhood. The race effect on recruitment to contact a public official and to volunteer in the schools remains small and non-significant, although the sign is now negative for blacks for contacting an official. The large race effect present when neighborhood characteristics were not controlled is now nearly zero for meeting recruitment and is no longer significant for protest mobilization. Being asked to contribute money is the only activity for which race now has a significant effect, and it is quite large. Regardless of where a person lives, how well off they are, or whether they are accessible to recruiters, the probability of being asked to contribute money related to a schools issue is 15% greater for blacks than for whites. Whether organizers' believe black citizens will care more about the schools issue, or be seen as more approachable for example, is not clear. However, it is clear that not accounting for the

context in which citizens live hides an important factor in the contacting strategy of fundraising on school related issues. On the other hand, race was a significant factor in mobilizing for meeting attendance and protests in the previous model. The inclusion of the neighborhood context negates the race effect for the former, and diminishes it for the latter. While the size effect of race on recruitment to protest goes up slightly, it is no longer significant. Thus it appears organizers place a greater emphasis on neighborhood characteristics in their recruitment strategies than on characteristics of the individual or their accessibility for meeting and protest activities. Not including the neighborhood context in recruitment explanations for these activities may overemphasize the importance of an individual's race, just as it masks the story for fundraising efforts. Lastly, for efforts aimed at recruiting school volunteers, race never appears to be part of the story.

Race Discussion

Given the changes in the role played by race as individual resources, accessibility and particularly, neighborhood controls are added to the model, it is clear that the mobilization story needs to account for both individual and environmental characteristics. Abramson and Claggett (2001) found race to be a negative factor for blacks in recruitment to give money to a political campaign. That was not the case for being asked to contribute regarding a school issue, and indeed, the opposite was true. Their findings may have been influenced by the fact that fundraising strategies are radically different when the focus is on schools related issues rather than political campaigns as was the case in their data. It appears that fundraisers for school based efforts discriminate as much as than do the political fundraisers, but the bias is reversed. This is an interesting finding, given the fact that black citizens tend to have fewer economic resources than their white counterparts. Fundraisers must believe that access to financial resources is not enough to guarantee a positive response to a request for money.

Further, an individual's race does not appear to be a significant targeting factor for recruitment to work to contact a public official, volunteer in schools, attend a meeting, or to protest. In some ways, the first two come as no surprise since the recruitment rates for whites and blacks are similar. There are however, racial disparities in rates of contact for attending a meeting and protest. For meetings in particular, it appears to be more of an environmental rather than an individual story once neighborhood context is added to the

picture. It is not clear this is the case for protests. Although its effect drops in significance, the size of the effect remains fairly constant. Thus race as a factor for recruitment to protest cannot be unequivocally be ruled out.

Given the diminishment of race as an explanation for the significant gaps in contact rates for meetings and protests, I turn now to an expanded look at all of the predictor variables in the full model. The effect of race on fundraising strategies must also be examined within a larger context. Race may be important, but it is not yet clear where it falls in relation to other recruitment factors. Each of the core factors—demographics, individual resources, accessibility and environment—will be analyzed for their contribution to the various activity based recruitment strategies.

Predicting Recruitment

On first pass, each of the five activities will be examined separately. This will be followed by an examination of the similarities and differences between the factors affecting each activity. I begin with recruitment to contact a public official about a school related issue. In this case, the only factors which appear to be key in targeting strategies are individual demographics and accessibility, with the greater weight carried by accessibility. Age is the only one of the demographic characteristics to achieve significance, although its effect size is rather small. Not surprisingly, our oldest citizens are .2% less likely to be contacted about a school issue than the youngest citizens. This makes sense if one considers that the elderly are past the age for having children in school, a case much more likely with young adults. Rightly or wrongly, strategists may believe the elderly care less about education issues than do the young. In the accessibility category, membership in a school group leads the pack, increasing the likelihood of recruitment by almost 12% over those who are non members. This is closely followed by past participation, which enhances the likelihood of contact by 10%. To a lesser extent having a child in public school and membership in a group that discusses politics are positive factors, 7% and 3% respectively. Thus, those who are recruited are more likely to be activists, joiners, have children in public school and be young in age.

Recruitment to attend a meeting presents a story different from the previous one. In this case, those contacted are more likely to live in a neighborhood with more stable neighborhoods, be accessible to organizers, and have higher levels of education. Living in a

neighborhood with the highest percentage of owner-occupied dwellings increases the probability of contact by a whopping 43% over those living areas with the fewest owner-occupied residences, and individual home ownership increases the likelihood of contact by 13%. It is possible individual home owners and neighborhoods with high home ownership rates are targeted simply because they tend to be more stable in terms of residence, and thus easier to find when the issue is local schools. Another reason for the owner focus however, might have been the presence of a state ballot initiative which would have limited the reliance of school funding on property taxes. In this case, home owners would have been targeted because of a perceived stake in the issue, rather than or in addition to the accessibility factor. This possibility certainly highlights the importance of examining issue specific mobilization strategies, rather than strategies in general.

Group membership also plays an important role in the meeting recruitment process, raising the chances of contact by 41% for school group members and 13% for religious group members over that of non-members. The probability of recruitment for those with children in public schools is 32% greater than for other citizens. Certainly school group membership is no surprise, since membership usually implies meeting attendance. Nor is the strategy of targeting parents with kids in public schools, since schools often communicate with parents about upcoming meetings or events through their children. The religious group factor is more of a puzzle, unless these individuals had children in religious schools. One other puzzle is the negative, but small effect of having been a victim of crime. If meeting recruitment is accomplished through direct contact, it is possible these individuals may not have answered the phone or the door in order to hear the recruitment request. Lastly, and again no surprise, past participation increased the chance of being recruited for a meeting by 17%. What may be a surprise is that its effect is dwarfed by neighborhood and other accessibility factors.

Table 3-4: Predictors of Recruitment for School Related Activities - Full Model

| | Volunteer in schools | Contribute money | Contact Public official | Attend meeting | Protest |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Demographics</i> | | | | | |
| Sex <i>Female=1</i> | 7.3% (3.00)** | 9.8% (2.72)** | -0.2% (0.11) | 3.0% (0.61) | -0.2% (0.13) |
| Age | -0.5% (4.03)** | 0.1% (0.38) | -0.2% (2.56)* | -0.2% (1.31) | -0.0% (0.03) |
| Race <i>Black=1</i> | 2.4% (0.53) | 15.4% (2.04)* | -0.5% (0.16) | -0.9% (0.09) | 7.3% (1.62) |
| <i>Individual resources</i> | | | | | |
| Education | -1.6% (0.98) | 3.9% (1.89) | 2.2% (1.87) | 6.5% (2.24)* | 1.0% (1.27) |
| Income/poverty ratio | -1.0% (1.18) | 0.4% (0.39) | 0.1% (0.08) | -1.2% (0.89) | -0.3% (0.82) |
| <i>Accessibility</i> | | | | | |
| Working | 3.6% (1.41) | 3.1% (0.73) | 1.9% (0.72) | -11.1% (1.94) | 4.2% (2.94)** |
| Own house | 5.3% (1.86) | 8.0% (2.11)* | 1.0% (0.42) | 13.6% (2.37)* | 0.8% (0.45) |
| Past participation | 9.0% (3.76)** | 7.4% (2.03)* | 10.4% (3.88)** | 17.2% (3.13)** | 3.4% (2.14)* |
| Member group discusses politics | 2.3% (1.42) | 1.0% (0.42) | 3.3% (2.02)* | 4.2% (1.25) | 0.1% (0.06) |
| Child in public school | 20.2% (6.26)** | 7.6% (2.09)* | 7.2% (2.52)* | 32.3% (5.70)** | 2.7% (1.70) |
| School group member | 15.4% (2.52)* | 22.2% (3.41)** | 11.8% (2.42)* | 41.1% (4.59)** | 4.9% (1.77) |
| Religious group member | 2.6% (0.88) | 0.4% (0.11) | -0.7% (0.27) | 13.0% (2.31)* | 0.5% (0.26) |
| Crime victim | -0.2% (0.29) | -0.8% (0.92) | -0.2% (0.36) | -2.6% (2.42)* | 0.4% (1.27) |
| <i>Neighborhood</i> | | | | | |
| % Black | 0.5% (0.09) | -16.9% (2.09)* | 4.2% (0.95) | -11.6% (1.15) | -0.5% (0.15) |
| % High school degree & up | 22.6% (1.60) | -19.7% (1.07) | 1.6% (0.14) | -17.3% (0.67) | 0.4% (0.06) |
| % Owner Occupied | 4.7% (0.55) | 3.7% (0.32) | 4.0% (0.65) | 43.1% (3.13)** | 6.2% (1.71) |
| Observations | 880 | 879 | 880 | 880 | 876 |

Robust z statistics in parentheses: *significant at 5%, ** significant at 1%

Individuals who are asked to contribute money to a school related issue are accessible through school groups, their children, past participation and home ownership. They are also more likely to be female, black, or live in neighborhoods with the fewest black residents. The latter two appear contradictory and present a puzzle. One explanation

may be that black individuals are thought to be more sympathetic to funding requests, or that the schools in the areas where they live have fewer systemic resources and thus need to rely on individual donations. On the other hand, individuals living in areas with the fewest black residents may also be in wealthier neighborhoods—areas where schools are less reluctant to do a lot of external fundraising, believing the residents have the financial resources to contribute. What is interesting is that individual race still matters, even when neighborhood race is held constant.

Interestingly, the pattern of recruitment to volunteer in the schools is very similar to that found for contacting a public official, only individual characteristics and accessibility factors reach significance. The mobilized are most likely to have a child in public school, be a member of a school group, female and young. Accessibility through children and school groups carry the bulk of the weight, increasing the probability of being asked to volunteer by 15-20%. Women are more likely to be recruited to work in the schools, but they are also more accessible if only due to the number of women who are single parents. Lastly the youngest are more often a target than the oldest citizens, but they are also the most likely to have school aged children. The volunteer data appears to present mostly an accessibility and possibly a stakes (if you have kids, you should care) story.

The last activity, recruitment to protest, is purely an accessibility story. Political strategists appear to target those who are working and past activists. Individual and neighborhood characteristics and individual resources do not seem to enter into strategists' calculations. It may be that fewer people are willing to protest, so they target those most likely to respond positively, those who are already activists. Why employment should matter is not clear, they ought to have less free time than the unemployed or the retired. On the other hand, they may be more accessible through co-workers and be thought to place a higher value on the importance of education than the unemployed.

Across all activities, accessibility plays a significant role in recruitment strategies, with much of the weight carried by school group membership and having a child in public school. While these two factors fall into the category I call accessibility to mobilizers, it is also possible they serve as indicators that the individual has a stake in or cares about school issues. Strategists probably look for easy ways to find potential recruits, but they also want someone who is going to respond positively to the contact. Past participation also matters,

but its contribution lags far behind that of the previous two factors. Home ownership appears to be a signal for organizers, but only for requests to attend a meeting or make a contribution. If homeowners are more stable residents of a community than renters, it may simply be that are known to more people or appear on more lists.

The importance of individual characteristics in organizing strategies is inconsistent. All else being equal, females were more likely to be targeted for two out of the five activities, fundraising and volunteering. Whether this is due to the perception that they care more about the schools or are simply more accessible is not clear. In any event, for three of the activities, mobilizers do not appear to discriminate based on gender. In two out the five activities, recruitment to contact a public official and volunteer in a school, it was the youngest citizens who were pulled in, but their advantage was fairly small. Race was a significant recruitment factor in only one case, requests for money, but here it was one of the larger keys in the organizing strategies with the blacks 15% more likely to be asked for a financial donation than whites.

The targeting of individuals with resources appears to play a minor role in recruitment strategies for school related issues. A resource focus only surfaced once, for meeting mobilization, and in this case, it was only education that mattered. Perhaps organizers believe there is less of a need to focus on those with resources, those with clout, and a more general need to pull in a broader based cadre of citizens.

Lastly, we have some evidence that strategists target (or avoid) neighborhoods as well as individuals and social networks. Individuals in neighborhoods with high rates of owner occupied housing are far more likely to receive an invite to a meeting than are living in areas with the highest rates of rental property. It could be an issue of resident stability and thus accessibility, or if the issue was property taxes, it could be the perception that homeowners have more of a stake in the issue, especially given the frequent reoccurrence of state ballot issues seeking to cap the use of property taxes for school funding. For strategies involving fundraising for school related issues, there appears to be an avoidance of areas with the highest percentages of black citizens. It may simply be due to the perception that individuals in these areas just don't have the money to contribute, given a high correlation between poverty rates and percentage of black residents. On the other hand, it could be mobilizers' perception that these residents don't care about education, or

possibly a fear factor since there also tends to be higher levels of physical crime in such areas.

Overall Discussion

I began with the assumption that political recruiters target different individual characteristics, resources, forms of social accessibility and neighborhood characteristics depending on the type of activity for which they are recruiting and the issue for which they are recruiting. In particular, I argued that mobilization for action related to educational issues is different from recruitment in general and specifically for electoral participation. Further, that the types of social accessibility included in any analyses needed to be expanded beyond that currently examined and lastly, that a consideration of neighborhood characteristics had to be included if we are to understand who is mobilized for political participation. From the data presented thus far, this appears to be the case.

Individual characteristics have proven to be important predictors of electoral mobilization in previous research, for recruitment in general, and specifically for campaign contributions and campaign work. There is consistent evidence that strategists target older citizens, and to some extent, men and those who are white (Abramson & Claggett, 2001; Gershtenson, 2003; Kenneth M. Goldstein & Ridout, 2002; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Wielhouwer, 2000, 2003). In some cases, gender, race and age are also significant predictors for recruitment to school related activities; however, their effect is generally different from that found in electoral mobilization. Further, their contribution to the recruitment story is typically outweighed by the accessibility and neighborhood factors. Women stood a greater chance of being asked to volunteer and to contribute to a school related cause than did men, but gender appeared not to matter for the other activities. For the first two activities, it may simply be that moms are still seen as more available, either by their kids or by organizers around school participation.

African Americans were 15% more likely to receive a request to make a contribution concerning a school issue than were their white counterparts. However, there is an equally large and negative effect for individuals who live in neighborhoods with the highest levels of black residents. Thus it appears that the role played by an individual's race in the recruitment process cannot be fully understood unless neighborhood is also part of the equation.

Lastly, strategists appeared to recruit younger individuals to contact a public official and to volunteer in the schools. This difference from the apparent preference for older citizens in the electoral arena holds, even when having a child in public school is held constant. It is possible that strategists believe those who are younger care more about school issues, regardless of whether they have children or not. On the other hand, it might simply be that the young are more likely than to rub shoulders on a daily basis with friends and colleagues who have school-aged children, and are thus presented more opportunities to hear about educational issues and activities. In any event, it appears that age, gender and race play out differently in recruitment to school related activities than they do in electoral mobilization, and failing to consider the issue at hand may mean we miss the boat on when deciphering the strategies of political recruiters.

Moving to the individual resource story, Abramson and Claggett (2001) found both education and income to be positive factors for requests to volunteer on a campaign and for campaign contributions. This is generally true for contact by a political party and for any recruitment in general (Brady, et al., 1999; Gershtenson, 2003; Goldstein and Ridout, 2002; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; and Wielhouwer, 2003). In this study however, income was never a significant factor and higher levels of individual education only increased the chances of contact to attend a school related meeting. However in the latter case, the effect was small compared to the weight carried by the accessibility and neighborhood factors. One of the reasons for the minimal role played by individual resources may be that previous research did not include the broader array of accessibility factors included in these analyses and neighborhood characteristics and resources. It might also be due to a greater willingness to ask for financial contributions for a political campaign than is true for work on educational issues.

As in previous research on recruitment in general and in the electoral arena (Abramson and Claggett, 2001; Brady, et al., 1999; Gershtenson, 2003; Goldstein and Ridout, 2002; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; and Wielhouwer, 2003), accessibility factors significantly increase the likelihood of political mobilization, and in this case, for every school related activity. Past participation is one of the biggest predictors of recruitment to contact a public official and to protest. Indeed, it along with working outside the home, were the only two predictors of invites to protest. On the other hand, while past

involvement significantly increases the likelihood of receiving a request for meeting attendance, money and to volunteer in schools, it is generally dwarfed by having a child in public school and by membership in a school group. Generally, researchers have included a group membership variable in their analyses of predictors of recruitment, and this may be fine if the focus is general or electoral recruitment. However, membership in any group was never significant in the current analyses when membership in a school group was also included.

Additionally, homeowners stood a better chance of being mobilized than did renters for meeting attendance and money requests. Given the time period this data was collected, it is not clear if homeowners were targeted because they were more residentially stable and thus more accessible, or if they were seen by strategists as having a stake in the continuing presence of school funding through property taxes as a ballot issue. Lastly, members of religious groups stood a better chance of being asked to attend a school meeting than did their counterparts. This might be due to having children in private, religious schools.

The broader array of accessibility factors included in these analyses highlights not only the sizable role played by this category of variables, but also the importance of distinguishing the various types of access when considering recruitment to different activities. It is not clear if strategists believe the various types of accessibility are indicators of stake in an issue, knowledge and skill needed for an activity, or simply that, to varying degrees, they make one visible to a recruiter. Brady, et al., (1999) have equated political recruiters with rational prospectors, but much of their focus was on individual characteristics. Indeed, strategists may be rational prospectors, but given the weight carried by accessibility factors, they may be targeting social access points and groups over and above the characteristics of particular individuals. Social movement theorists have argued that organizers recruit participants through pre-existing social ties (Marwell, 1988; Oberschall, 1973; Tilly, 1978). That certainly appears to be the case with recruitment to school related activities.

Neighborhood variables as predictors of recruitment were only significant for two activities, but they do provide some interesting and surprising insights. Residents of areas with the greatest proportion of homeowners were almost 45% more likely to be asked to attend a meeting than those living in areas with the fewest homeowners, even when

individual homeownership is held constant. Again, it is not clear if this is an accessibility/stability issue or the perception that homeowners might have more of a stake in a property tax ballot issue than would renters.

Neighborhood makeup was also a factor in fundraising. Residents in areas with the highest percentage of African Americans were 17% less likely to be asked for money than were residents of mostly white neighborhoods, even while black individuals were more likely to receive such requests than their white counterparts. Part of the story explaining the increased inclusion of individual black citizens may be their relatively high numbers throughout the Detroit metropolitan area, and the continuing imbalance in school quality based on the race of the students. It may be a story of perceived self-interest. On the other hand, the Detroit tri-county area remains one of the most racially segregated urban areas in the country. It may be that there is less fundraising in areas with high concentrations of people of color due to strategists' belief that residents will not or are not able to contribute to school issues, or strategists' own racial biases. Previous research on electoral recruitment has found that individual homeowners are often targeted by organizers and at times, people of color are ignored (McNulty, 2005; Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993; Wielhouwer, 2003). However, failing to include the type of neighborhood in which the individual lives may overestimate the importance of the individual in the recruitment story and paint a picture contrary to that actually played by individual characteristics. Cho, et al. (2006), have argued "that neighborhood context influences political participation because it structures *information flow* and affects the *exogenous forces* that come to bear on potential voters" (p. 158). It appears that the effect of neighborhood context goes beyond voting to the more frequent activities of local school politics.

Conclusion

There has been relatively little research on recruitment to individual political activities or activities beyond the domain of electoral politics. This chapter has expanded upon previous researcher by examining recruitment to individual, school related activities; by including a broader range of accessibility variables as predictors; by examining the neighborhood as an important context for the recruitment process and lastly, by teasing out the role of race as a factor in political recruitment. Individual characteristics are important, but in ways that differ from their role in electoral mobilization. Unlike in electoral

recruitment, individual resources barely make the cut in explaining school related recruitment. Accessibility, neighborhood race and percentage of homeowners in a neighborhood each predict an individual's chance of being recruited. It appears that the broader social context of recruitment is at least as, if not more important than, individual attributes in the strategies of organizers in the schools domain. It is also clear that there is no one mobilization strategy that fits all types of activities or issues. Accessibility plays a strong role in recruitment for all acts. The recruitment story is a complex one that needs to take into account individual attributes and resources, as well as a broad range of accessibility factors and neighborhood characteristics. Clearly future research needs to explore this complexity, especially given the important influence of recruitment on actual participation, and examine the effect of the various profiling strategies on actual participation.

The apparent over reliance of political organizers on accessibility factors raises some troubling concerns. Understandably strategists may choose to make efficient use of currently existing networks. However, continuing racial segregation and biases in the makeup of group joiners toward those who are white and with more resources (Schlozman & Tierney, 1986) (Schlozman & Tierney, 1986) may only serve to continue lower overall political participation rates for those who are already marginalized in our society. We may also be excluding those with the greatest stake in an issue, particularly when it comes to education. If mobilization provides citizens information about an issue, about its potential impact on their lives, and about ways to influence decisions on the issue, targeting those easiest to find may exclude those with the greatest stake in the outcomes. Who is asked to play in the game, may not be the one who most needs to participate.

Chapter 4

Mobilization: Crime

Introduction

The research on recruitment for political participation has been focused on electoral recruitment, and relatively little research has focused on non-electoral and issue-specific mobilization. Where it does exist, research on non-electoral recruitment often overlooks the possibility that strategists may vary their tactics not only by the activity, but also by the issue for which they are recruiting. Some issues have a greater effect on people's lives than others. While it seems plausible that the individual recruited to influence decision outcomes will be those who have the most at stake in a given issue, it is not clear if this is the case. In this chapter, I examine recruitment to political activities that address crime.

Individuals who are faced with the negative effect of crime in their neighborhoods or cities of residence can choose to move to safer locations--if they have the resources available to make such a choice. Some might choose to stay and become involved in improving the neighborhood, while others may have no option but to remain where they are. The latter group may be disproportionately affected by crime, both because they have fewer residential choices and because they are seen by politicians as having less clout in the political process and are thus ignored in any mobilization efforts focused on political participation. In this scenario, biases in any policy or political decisions may be a direct result of who is recruited to participate politically on the issue of crime. If political recruitment to influence decisions about crime mirrors recruitment to participate in the electoral process, then it is precisely those who have the most at stake who are least able to influence their quality of life. However, it is not clear if recruitment strategies on the issue of crime are similar to those used for electoral recruitment. If a democracy is best served when the breadth of citizens' voices are heard, then we need to better understand

whom is invited to make their voices heard, and not assume that issue-based mobilization strategies are all the same.

Ample evidence shows that recruitment plays a role in increasing participation in both electoral politics, and in what Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) refer to as governmental politics. Governmental politics encompasses activities such as contacting members of Congress, attending a meeting, or joining in a protest; as opposed to voting, campaigning or making a campaign contribution. At times, recruitment's contribution to the participation story is over and above that played by traditional predictors such as resources and individual attributes ((Abramson & Claggett, 2001); (Brady, Verba, & Schlozman, 1995); (Cohen & Dawson, 1993); (Eldersveld, 1956); (Ellison & Gay, 1989); (Gerber & Green, 2000a); (Gerber & Green, 2000b); (Goldstein, 1999); (Goldstein & Ridout, 2002); (Gosnell, 1927); (Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1992); (Kramer, 1970); (Krassa, 1988); (Marschall, 2004); (Niven, 2001); (Norrande, 1991); (Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993); (Schlozman, Burns, & Verba, 1999); (Smith & Zipp, 1983); (Wielhouwer & Lockerbie, 1994); (Wielhouwer, 1999)). Some authors have found mobilization to be particularly important for African Americans (Ellison & Gay, 1989).

Given the role of mobilization in politics, it is important to examine who is recruited for participation. This is especially true if, as Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) have argued, mobilization accentuates the bias in political participation towards those with greater individual and political resources. Past research has shown that for electoral activities, organizers appear to target individuals who have greater financial and educational resources, are older, have longer tenure in the community, attend religious services, are union members and are past activists (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes, 1960); (Djupe & Grant, 2001); Ellison & Gay, 1989; (Gershtenson, 2003); (Goldstein & Ridout, 2002); (Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1992); (Rosenstone & Hansen, 1993)). Unfortunately, the surveys analyzed in these studies asked respondents if they were contacted by a political party or campaign, but did not ask what action they were recruited for. Thus, we do not know if respondents were asked to vote, contribute money, attend a campaign meeting or perform some other action, and we cannot determine if the same or different recruitment profiles were used across different electoral activities.

Using 1990 and 1992 NES data, Abramson and Claggett (2001) did look at recruitment to specific electoral activities—campaign participation, campaign contributions, and support for a particular candidate. They found that recruiters do change their tactics based on the action requested. For campaign recruitment, past campaign activity was the strongest predictor of mobilization. Past participation was a predictor of vote and contribution contact, but to a lesser extent than was true for campaign mobilization. Across all activities, individuals with greater resources were more likely to be recruited. Organizational membership was a positive factor, but only for campaign participation.²⁷ Unfortunately, the membership question only asked about groups an individual felt close to. Thus, we do not know if membership in groups that respondents did not feel close to affected the likelihood of recruitment, particularly for analyses where membership was not significant. Lastly, whites were more likely to be asked for campaign contributions than were blacks (see also, Gershtenson, 2003). So far, it appears too early to conclude one recruitment strategy fits all, at least for electoral politics.

Brady, et al (1999) used a combined recruitment index that included both electoral and governmental activities, and found that higher levels of education, family income, political engagement and past political participation were positive predictors, and that church attendance and employment decreased the likelihood of contact.²⁸ Their finding on the effect of church attendance is opposite that found in studies of electoral activity alone. This suggests that targeting profiles may vary by activity. Brady et al (1999) also found that organizational membership was not a significant predictor of recruitment to the combined recruitment index. In models predicting recruitment to electoral activities, organizational membership is positive and significant. Brady et al's study only included contact by non-political organizations. One might expect organizations with a political bent to be more likely than their counterparts to mobilize

²⁷ Unfortunately, the group membership variable Abramson and Claggett used was limited. The NES question wording only asked about organizations "that represented the interests and viewpoint of the group that they felt particularly close to." (p. 914).

²⁸ In the analysis discussed here, Brady et al (1999) reported on results which used a summary index of activities to which a respondent might have been mobilized. It included campaign work or contribution, contacting a government official, protesting, participating on a public or political issue at the local level. The authors did separately test a recruitment model for contact to make a contribution and found family income to be the largest predictor of recruitment to make a contribution. Unfortunately, they did not report the effects of any of the other predictor variables so it is not clear if the contribution recruitment profile varies from the overall mobilization index they used (p. 161).

their membership, especially if the request was for campaign work for example. Thus, the impact of overall organizational membership is not known.

When Goldstein (1999) examined recruitment to contact a congressional representative about healthcare reform (governmental activity), he found a profile similar to that found for electoral fundraising. Those targeted were more likely to be white, educated and union members. He also found men, individuals employed outside the house, and individuals living in states targeted by organizers in lobbying efforts around President Clinton's healthcare reform were more likely to be recruited to contact a member of congress. Based on conversations with lobbyists, Goldstein (1999) argues that strategists first target the districts of representatives they want to influence on a specific issue, and secondly, individuals within the selected districts who can influence legislators and who will take action. Goldstein's research raises an important point, i.e., it is quite possible that political strategists determine who they will target based on whom they want to influence on a particular issue, and for a specific action. Goldstein is one of the few researchers who actually asked organizers about their targeting strategies.

If organizers target those they believe will take action, one might expect they would not only target those with the resources to do so, but also individuals perceived to have a self-interest or stake in the issue. Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) analyzed causes of attending a local town/school meeting or signing a petition, and found that individuals with school age children were more likely to participate. It is not clear whether parents are more active in general, or mainly on the issue of education, since the focus of the meeting and petition was not specified. Parents may have a greater propensity to jump into the political process than the rest of the population, but they might also have been recruited through their children. For political strategists, children can provide an access point for recruitment as well as an indicator of possible interest in an issue, whether it is schools or some other issue that affects their children, such as neighborhood crime. To date, there is little evidence as to which of these strategies, if either, guides decisions of organizers. While data is limited about targeting strategies for specific activities, even less is known about issue specific profiles. If recruiters are rational, they surely use different clues about who will respond, depending on the desired action. Not all actions require the same political skill or investment, and not all people care equally about all

issues. In discussing issue specific canvassing strategies, (Shaw, 2004) (2004) advocates creating voter databases that identify not only individual demographics, but also whether there are kids in the home and occupation. Presumably, these two pieces of information indicate potential stake in issues for which a politician might need to garner support.

Just as individuals are more invested in some issues than in others, it stands to reason that the same may be true for organizations, and that issue focused groups provide an access point for political mobilizers. Indeed, (Walker, 1990) argued that institutions are the key to understanding the different levels of mobilization among different groups of citizens. In the previous paragraph, it was argued that parents who participated in a town/school meeting might have been targeted through their children. However, it is also possible that they were mobilized by or through an organization to which they belonged—one with a focus on educational issues. As noted earlier, there is some evidence for a link between particular types of organizational membership, e.g., religious, union, or political, and recruitment to specific types of political action, but the research is limited with regard to issue specific membership and issue specific recruitment. Knoke (1990) is one of the few researchers who have offered evidence that types of organization matter in whether they mobilize their members to participate politically and the types of activities in which members are urged to participate. In his study, unions were the most active in their mobilization efforts of members.

Given the cost of mobilization efforts, one might assume that strategists seek to minimize their costs and target groups whose members have indicated an interest in the issue at hand, or that issue specific organizations would seek to mobilize their own membership for group related interests. Members of such groups have already indicated a propensity to act on the issue, simply by joining up. Indeed, in Shaw's (2004) precinct analysis, the author argues for the inclusion of gathering any information available on groups to which individuals might belong, such as the NRA or unions. However, more exploration is needed about the role played by particular types of group membership in the recruitment process, as well as other factors that might increase organizers' access to individuals, such as that suggested previously--access to parents through their children. Individuals may be pulled into the political process through their kids or through school organizations if the issue is schools, but that may not be the case for other issues. One

might expect organizers to look for different points of access depending on the activity and especially, the issue for which they are recruiting.

The role of neighborhoods is one area that has received scant attention in the recruitment literature. Some researchers argue that neighborhoods with a higher level of resources—age, income and education--have a positive effect on electoral participation, while neighborhoods with higher levels of poverty and proportion Black or Hispanic residents have a negative impact, over and above the effect of individual characteristics (Cho, 2003; Cho, Gimpel, et al., 2006; Gimpel, Lee, et al., 2006). Studies that do control for neighborhood effects focused almost exclusively on electoral participation. In one of the few studies that go beyond electoral activities, Cohen and Dawson (1993) found that severe neighborhood poverty had a large dampening effect on community meeting attendance for African American residents, as well as on church and organizational membership. It is not clear if people in these areas participate less frequently because of lower levels of group membership, and thus accessibility to mobilizers or because organizers avoided these neighborhoods due to discrimination or concerns for safety. We also do not know if there were any variations by issue, since the authors used a measure for meeting attendance that included any community issue.

Neighborhood profiles may be an important component in issue specific recruitment profiles for several reasons. If, as Goldstein (1999) has suggested, organizers first target policy makers they wish to influence, and in turn the districts they represent, where an individual lives matters. Further, several authors have argued that it is through the structures and social networks of neighborhoods that residents receive information about political issues and options and are encouraged to participate (Cho, et al, 2006; (Oliver, 1984). In electoral politics, Huckfeldt and Sprague (1992) found that the Republican Party strategists only appeared to target based on individual characteristics, while the Democratic Party operatives also included neighborhood characteristics. Unfortunately, the individual and neighborhood variables utilized in Huckfeldt and Sprague's study were limited (see also Kramer, 1970).

Targeting neighborhoods makes even more sense for non-electoral activities where aids such as voting records are not often an option, and the outcomes for specific issue decisions often have a more narrow geographical impact than is true for electoral

outcomes. Organizers often don't have a lot of information about individuals likely to turn out for a meeting, for example. It may be cost effective to target those neighborhoods perceived to have a greater stake in an issue specific outcome, as well as the resources and willingness to engage in specific types of political activity. Conversely, organizers might avoid resource poor neighborhoods, neighborhoods perceived to be dangerous, or those areas where strategists suspect residents do not care about the issue. In the case of crime, rates and types of crime vary greatly across communities, as do the responses from political decision makers. While some neighborhoods may feel they have much to protect; other neighborhoods may feel they are shortchanged on protection—particularly in poorer areas. Organizers need to figure out which neighborhoods care enough about the issue to respond to requests for involvement, and which neighborhoods have the political skill and will to influence crime decisions.

Lastly, with so much of the research on political participation focused on electoral politics, organizing on specific issues at the neighborhood level is often overlooked. To ignore the neighborhood context, is to fail to consider the traditional community organizing efforts that take place at the local level. These efforts, in the style of the Direct Action and Research Training Center (DART); Gamaliel Foundation; Industrial Areas foundation (IAF) (based on Saul Alinsky's philosophy); Midwest Academy; and People Improving Communities through Organizing (PICO) to name but a few, focus on issues relevant to the local community or neighborhood. In this context, the level of organizing and recruitment will vary by neighborhood, as will the issues and their impacts on residents. Some of these efforts have been documented in the work of Berry, et al (1993), Fisher (1994), Fisher and Romanofsky (1981), and Thompson (2001), among others.

Thus far, based on profiles of individual who are recruited, there is some evidence suggesting that political recruiters are strategic with regard to the specific actions requested. However, the research to date is limited in four respects. There is little analysis of 1) issue-specific recruitment; 2) activity specific recruitment, particularly non-electoral activities; 3) issue specific factors which might make one more visible or accessible to organizers; and 4) neighborhood characteristics as factors in mobilization strategies.

Research Questions

I address five questions in this chapter, with a focus on activities related to the issue of crime. The first two questions focus on the race disparities in political participation. 1) What role is played by race in the recruitment strategies of organizers? Does race enter as a factor for some forms of activity more than for others, if at all? Since mobilization strongly predicts political participation, the answer to this question not only has consequences for participation, but ultimately for whose voices are heard in the defining of policy, particularly at the local level. 2) If race plays a role, why is that? Is it because blacks have fewer individual resources or are less accessible to organizers, or live in resource poor or dangerous neighborhoods? Individuals who are black or living in neighborhoods with high concentrations of black residents tend to have more negative experiences with the criminal justice systems than do the wealthy and whites. Given these experiences, black citizens have a large stake in the funding and service provision decisions, but it is not clear what influences their inclusion or exclusion from the decision-making table.

3) What roles do involvement in the community and accessibility play in the recruitment process? Is it simple membership, membership in specific kinds of groups, past participation, or something as simple as having children that makes one visible, and thus accessible to recruiters? Given limited resources, organizers in the crime arena will most likely recruit those who are easiest to find and who care about crime—those who are members of anti-crime or community organizations. Parents might also be accessed through their children or through schools, given both the issue of crime in the schools and the impact of neighborhood crime on children's safety as they go to school. Baumgartner and Leech (1998) argue that even single issue groups monitor and are active in policy beyond their stated issue. If this is the case, and especially if organizations share their membership lists, than any type of group membership may contribute to the chances of being recruited on the issue of crime.

4) Does place of residence play a part in whether or not an individual is invited into the political process? Organizers in the electoral realm can use extensive voting lists to refine their recruitment strategies, but this resource is not available for many forms of political participation. Locating individuals for non-electoral recruitment can be costly. If, as some have argued, organizers are rational and strategic, do they minimize their

costs by identifying and focusing on neighborhoods with the skills, interest in and resources necessary for political action, as well on individuals who are accessible through other means? If one is looking for individuals with the skills, knowledge and resources necessary for participation, a focus on resource rich neighborhoods might be far more cost effective than doing a broad sweep of the populace. Similarly, organizers might ignore certain neighborhoods, possibly in the belief that there aren't enough individuals living in such areas with the requisite political resources or because of organizers' biases or fears. On the other hand, one might expect more organizing and thus greater levels of recruitment in areas with fewer resources and often, more problems with the quality of the police and criminal justice systems, precisely because there is a need for action.

5) Do profiles of the mobilized vary based on the type of activity for which they are recruited in the crime arena? My assumption is that strategists use a different individual, social and neighborhood profile when recruiting for attendance at a meeting than they do for urging people to join a protest or make a financial contribution. Different political activities require different skills, knowledge, resources and levels of interest. It would be foolish and costly to expect a positive response to a request for action from all individuals.

My goal is to examine political recruitment in the broader context of individual, social and neighborhood characteristics. In particular, I hope to add to current research by illuminating differences in activity specific recruitment profiles within the crime domain. Much of the current research either focuses exclusively on recruitment in the electoral arena or fails to distinguish the issue for which an individual is mobilized. We cannot assume that strategists believe all activities or issues require the same resources or interest.

Data and methodology

To answer the five questions, data from the 1989 Detroit Area Study (DAS) is utilized.²⁹ It includes data from 916 face-to-face interviews with respondents who were part of a random, 2-stage sample of the Detroit tri-county area. Detroit census tracts with a high proportion of Black residents were over sampled to insure adequate sub sample of

²⁹ The author is a member of the group that designed the study and collected the data.

Black respondents for analysis.³⁰ Compared to the 1990 NES sample, respondents in DAS were similar on mean years of education and Party ID. Average income was about \$3,500 less in the DAS sample, and the NES had about six percent more males than did the DAS. Lastly, the DAS had a greater percentage of Black respondents (22%) and fewer whites (78%) compared to the NES, 13% and 84% respectively. Thus it is a fairly comparable sample with the national NES sample.

There are some limitations in the use of this dataset. One of the biggest is that the random sample was drawn from the Detroit tri-county area. Detroit continues to be one of the most segregated cities in the United States. Thus, respondents were also highly segregated by race in terms of where they lived, leading to the possibility that the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhood could swamp the influence of an individual's race on recruitment.³¹ If individual race remains as a factor with the addition of neighborhood characteristics, it will only serve to underscore the enduring impact of race on politics, at least in Detroit. Also, it should be no surprise that there were some strong correlations (ranging between .378 and .678) between some of the socio-demographic characteristics of the neighborhoods included in the sample. In light of this, and the strong possibility of multicollinearity, the addition of neighborhood variables was purposely limited.³²

A key advantage of the DAS sample is that it includes recruitment to a broader range of political activities than does the NES or that used by Brady et al. It also has data about recruitment to activities focused on the issue of crime and on membership in issue specific organizations. Respondents were asked if they had been contacted during the prior 12 month period to participate in an anti-crime focused activity, including: 1) asked to attend a meeting; 2) asked to contact a public official or influential person to express views; 3) to join a neighborhood watch or similar type of program; and 4) to participate in a rally or protest about the issue of crime. For exact question wording, see Appendix A. Separate dichotomous variables were used for each form of recruitment. Although

³⁰ A weighted sample was used for all analyses.

³¹ For a comparison of means for neighborhood characteristics by race of respondent, please see Appendix C.

³² When neighborhood characteristics were regressed on the percent black residents in the census tract, the tolerance levels fell between .530 and .715 and the variance inflation factor (VIF) for multicollinearity ranged from 1.398 to 1.886. The level of multicollinearity was determined by the author to be acceptable.

respondents were asked if they had been personally contacted about an activity, the question wording also included the possibility of seeing an announcement or poster. Thus, it is not possible to distinguish the means of recruitment. Mobilization, recruitment and contact will be used interchangeably, but in any event should not be construed to only mean a personal invitation to act.

The first group of independent variables, *individual demographic characteristics* includes sex, age, and race. *Individual resources* includes education and an income to poverty threshold ratio. The latter was utilized in the belief that it is not actual dollar increments that matter, but the level of income relative to the poverty line.

This group of variables includes married/living with a partner; having a child in public school; home ownership; whether the respondent knew an influential person; past participation (not including the year prior to the survey); membership in a group that discusses politics, in any group, a crime or school group, and history as a victim of crime.³³ It is assumed that individuals are accessible to organizers through their spouses/partner and their children. An individual may seek help from an influential person they know, but the individual also becomes visible to political activists through the relationship. Various types of groups were included, such as school, crime, and religious; whether the group discussed politics and membership in any group in the belief that mobilizers view groups as having different skill levels, interests, and a willingness to act. Crime victim was included as a proxy for stake in the issue of crime.

Census tract data for 1990 was appended to the DAS data, and used as a proxy for neighborhood information. A census tract is probably far larger than what one might consider a neighborhood, but it does provide a way to examine the context within which a respondent lives. The percentage of Black residents allows a test of whether it is an individual's race that matters in recruitment or racial composition of the residential area. Neighborhood resources were operationalized as percent of residents with at least a high school degree.

I estimate the following probit equation for percent change in likelihood of recruitment to four anti-crime activities (Y)--contacting a public official, attending a

³³ In order to compare results from this sample to previous research, membership in any group, union membership, and frequency of religious service attendance were initially considered, but dropped as they were not significant predictors of recruitment.

meeting, protesting, and joining a crime watch or local anti-crime group. The cluster option was used in the estimation of the models to account for the correlation of neighborhood characteristics for residents of the same census tracts.

Full Equation: $\Pr(Y) = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \beta_3(\text{Access}) + \beta_4(\text{Nhood})$

I will estimate the full equation in four steps in order to investigate the role of race in recruitment (questions 1 and 2). First, I estimate a reduced form of the equation (1) to answer question 1; Does race influence recruitment holding constant other demographic characteristics?

Equation 1: $\Pr(Y) = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{demographics})$

The race coefficients will tell us the extent of black/white differences in mobilization controlling for sex and age.

I then add controls for *individual resources* to equation 1 to answer the race and resources portion of question 2: To what extent are the differences in black/white anti-crime recruitment due to disparities in resources?

Equation 2: $\Pr(Y) = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \beta_2(\text{I Resources})$

If race matters in Equation 1 only because of a strong correlation between race and resources, then the race coefficient should become smaller and insignificant in equation 2.

The *Accessibility* variables are added in equation 3.

Equation 3: $\Pr(Y) = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \beta_3(\text{Access})$

This allows us to test whether race predicts recruitment because of black/white differences in who is visible and accessible to mobilizers (question 2).

Equation 4 controls for neighborhood variables.

Equation 4: $\Pr(Y) = \alpha + \beta_1(\text{demographics}) + \beta_2(\text{I Resources}) + \beta_3(\text{Access}) + \beta_4(\text{Nhood})$

If individual race matters in the previous equations due to disparities in neighborhood characteristics and/or resources, then the individual race coefficient should become small and insignificant (question 2).

I then discuss the results from the full model (Equation A), highlighting the roles played by accessibility (question 3) and neighborhood (question 4) in recruitment to anti-crime activities. The recruitment profiles for each of the four activities will be compared to answer question 5--whether organizers use different profiles for different activities.

The statistical package utilized for all analyses was Stata (version 10). All analyses were weighted by their sampling weight in order to account for the oversampling of Detroit. The dProbit command was employed to estimate all equations and all independent variables were set to their mean. Dprobit was used instead of the probit command because it returns the change in probability for dummy variables, rather than the coefficients. Since there is no variance in neighborhood data for all respondents living in the same tract, the cluster option was incorporated in the dprobit analyses to account for the correlation in neighborhood characteristics. This option was utilized in all probit estimates. In each chapter, a table with the marginal effect of each independent variable on the probability of recruitment is presented for each model. All independent variables included in the model are listed in each table.

Results

Who is recruited?

Citizens are far more likely to be recruited to attend a meeting or join in an anti-crime program than to contact a public official or attend a protest about the issue of crime. Blacks were significantly more likely to be contacted for all crime related activities, often at rates almost twice those of whites. There was little difference in the contact rates for men and women. Low income citizens were contacted more often than affluent citizens for all activities, although the differences were only significant for joining in a protest. Lastly, college graduates were more likely than high school dropouts to be recruited for all activities except protesting, but differences were only significant for meeting attendance.

Table 4-1: Percent contacted about a Crime Issue

| | Contact Public official | Attend meeting | Anti-Crime program | Protest |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Total (weighted) | 8.1% | 22.6% | 26.3% | 5.0% |
| Race | | | | |
| Black | 14.7% | 35.9% | 40.0% | 12.3% |
| White | 7.9% | 21.9% | 26.2% | 3.7% |
| Gender | | | | |
| Female | 10.8% | 28.5% | 33.9% | 7.0% |
| Male | 12.0% | 28.8% | 31.3% | 9.2% |
| Income | | | | |
| < \$10,000 | 10.1% | 23.7% | 32.4% | 7.8% |
| ≥ \$90,000 | 4.6% | 18.2% | 22.7% | 4.6% |
| Education | | | | |
| < HS degree | 8.4% | 19.8% | 27.7% | 7.2% |
| ≥ BA degree | 11.4% | 31.6% | 36.8% | 7.0% |

Bold Chi. Sq. sig. < .05

The higher contact rates for blacks and the poor are no surprise, since these groups are disproportionately affected by crime and might be seen as having a greater interest in doing something about the issue of crime. One might also expect more organizing to take place in neighborhoods where crime is an issue. On the other hand, higher contact rates for individuals with more education suggests strategists target those with the skills and knowledge associated with formal education. Whether recruiters search for individual resources, neighborhood stake in the issue or both will be examined in a later section.

Race and Recruitment

In this section, I present the effect of race on likelihood of recruitment to the each of the four activities for the four models previously described (Equations 1-4). The coefficients for all the other predictors of recruitment are presented in a later section. Blacks are significantly more likely to be recruited than whites for all activities controlling for age and gender (Model 1, Table 4.2, row 1).

Table 4-2: Race Effect on Likelihood of Crime Related Recruitment: % Change

| | Contact Public official | Attend meeting | Anti-Crime program | Protest |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Model 1: Only Demographics | 8.4% (3.32)** | 14.9% (4.14)** | 15.9% (3.32)** | 8.7% (4.25)** |
| Model 2: Plus resources | 9.2% (3.49)** | 17.3% (4.59)** | 17.8% (3.54)** | 8.1% (3.77)** |
| Model 3: Plus connections | 6.4% (2.63)** | 13.2% (3.48)** | 14.5% (2.89)** | 5.7% (3.08)** |
| Model 4: Plus Neighborhood | -1.9% (0.54) | -8.7% (1.62) | -11.9% (1.40) | -1.0% (0.55) |

Robust z statistics in parentheses: *significant at 5%, ** significant at 1%

When controls are added for individual resources, the race effect is unchanged (Table 4.2, Model 2). Unlike models of electoral recruitment, differences in education, employment status, and financial resources are not the reason race predicts recruitment around the issue of crime.

Table 4-3: Accessibility by race

| | Member of any group | Group discusses politics (often) | School group member | Crime group member | Respondent or family victim of crime | Past activist |
|--------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Total | 68.0% | 41.4% | 7.0% | 3.28% | 39.43% | 53.3% |
| Race | | | | | | |
| Black | 66.5% | 42.2% | 6.2% | 3.56% | 42.86% | 51.5% |
| White | 69.5% | 33.8% | 7.7% | 3.00% | 36.13% | 55.1% |

Bold Sig. < .05

I next examine whether blacks are more likely to be recruited because they are more accessible than whites. As can be seen in Table 4.3, blacks are not more likely than whites to be a member of a group in general, an anti-crime group, a school group, or to be past activists, but blacks are more likely to be members of a group that discusses politics and to have been victims of crime. These two differences may be enough to explain the 18-30% drop in the effect of race on likelihood of recruitment when accessibility is added to equation 2, however race remains a consistent and significant predictor of recruitment (Table 4.2, Model 3).

When controls for neighborhood factors are included in the equation (Model 4, Table 4.2), we see a different pattern. The coefficients on race are no longer significant, they drop in size and change from positive to negative. Blacks are not more likely to be

recruited than are whites. Apparently, the positive bias toward blacks seen in the models 1-3 is a result of greater organizing efforts in neighborhoods which have higher proportions of black residents. Once a geographical area is selected by political organizers, individual race no longer predicts recruitment. An individual's race appears to matter less than the racial composition of his or her neighborhood.

Race Discussion

Abramson and Claggett (2001) found whites were advantaged for requests for campaign contributions, and other researchers found no race advantage in generic mobilization (Brady, et al, add others). However looking at Model 3 (Table 4.2), which is generally comparable to those used in previous studies, the influence of race on recruitment to anti-crime related activities looks very different from previous research. This difference, as well as the failure of race to predict recruitment once neighborhood is controlled for, suggests that mobilization outcomes cannot be fully understood without a consideration of both context and issue.

Unfortunately, there is no telling if the dissimilarities between Model 3 and earlier research would remain if neighborhood indicators had been included in the previous studies, or if issue specific recruitment had been examined rather than electoral or generic mobilization. At least for anti-crime recruitment, it appears that the differences in likelihood of contact by race can be explained by environmental factors. Race may still be a factor in targeting strategies, but it appears that place of residence rather than race of the individual is the focus for organizers.

Predicting Recruitment

In this section, I first present results from the regressions for each of the four activities on individual demographics, individual resources and accessibility, but do not include neighborhood characteristics (Table 4.4). Accessibility is also limited to that found in earlier research—past participation and group membership--in order to allow comparison to models from previous research which usually only include individual demographics, resources, and a few accessibility factors. I then present findings from the full model which includes neighborhood characteristics and an expanded version of accessibility (Table 4.5).

In the partial model (Table 4.4), blacks are more likely than whites to be recruited for each of the crime related activities. Past participation is also a positive and significant predictor for all activities except protest, and membership in a group increases the likelihood of recruitment to attend a meeting and join an anti-crime program. Past researchers typically find individual resources are a factor in electoral and generic mobilization; that is not the case here. These results suggest that for crime mobilization, strategists target black citizens and those who are accessible, either through past participation or through membership in an organization.

**Table 4-4: Predictors of Recruitment for Crime Related Activities
Partial Model**

| | Contact Public official | Attend meeting | Anti-Crime program | Protest |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Demographics</i> | | | | |
| Sex <i>Female=1</i> | 0.4% (0.21) | 3.7% (1.10) | 3.1% (0.76) | -1.9% (1.28) |
| Age | 0.000 (0.18) | -0.000 (0.05) | 0.001 (0.93) | -0.0% (0.72) |
| Race <i>Black=1</i> | 7.7% (3.10)** | 15.8% (4.33)** | 15.8% (3.17)** | 7.0% (3.51)** |
| <i>Individual resources</i> | | | | |
| Education | 0.4% (0.42) | 1.5% (0.74) | 1.1% (0.43) | -0.1% (0.16) |
| Income/poverty | -0.3% (0.53) | -0.9% (0.88) | -1.7% (1.51) | -0.7% (1.71) |
| <i>Accessibility</i> | | | | |
| Past participation | 7.7% (3.88)** | 16.0% (4.75)** | 19.9% (4.98)** | 2.3% (1.61) |
| Group member | 1.3% (0.51) | 12.3% (3.20)** | 9.2% (2.05)* | 2.6% (1.57) |
| Observations | 901 | 901 | 901 | 900 |

Robust z statistics in parentheses

* significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

The story changes however, when a broader array of accessibility variables and neighborhood characteristics are included in the analyses (Table 5). Individual race is no longer a significant predictor of recruitment for any of the activities, but neighborhood race is a significant predictor of mobilization. Accessibility continues as a significant predictor of recruitment, but past participation and type of group membership are not the only story.

**Table 4-5: Predictors of Recruitment for Crime Related Activities
Full Model**

| | Contact Public official | Attend meeting | Anti-Crime program | Protest |
|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Demographics</i> | | | | |
| Sex <i>Female=1</i> | .06% (0.32) | 4.4% (1.32) | 3.8% (0.97) | -1.1% (0.93) |
| Age | 0.0% (0.27) | 0.0% (0.30) | 0.2% (1.43) | -0.0% (0.25) |
| Race <i>Black=1</i> | -1.9% (0.54) | -8.7% (1.62) | -11.9% (1.40) | -1.0% (0.55) |
| <i>Individual resources</i> | | | | |
| Education | 0.6% (0.49) | 2.4% (1.10) | 2.3% (0.91) | -0.2% (0.21) |
| Income/poverty | -0.0% (0.00) | -0.7% (0.57) | -1.5% (1.35) | -0.5% (1.43) |
| <i>Accessibility</i> | | | | |
| Working | 0.2% (0.11) | 1.6% (0.41) | 3.7% (0.99) | 2.1% (2.00)* |
| Past participation | 6.6% (3.28)** | 15.8% (4.08)** | 20.2% (4.88)** | 2.1% (1.58) |
| Member of group discusses politics | 2.5% (2.42)* | 6.3% (3.05)** | 4.2% (1.87) | 2.0% (2.93)** |
| School group member | 3.4% (1.06) | 13.3% (1.91) | 8.3% (1.11) | -2.7% (2.36)* |
| <i>Neighborhood</i> | | | | |
| % Black | 7.1% (1.73) | 24.1% (3.43)** | 32.6% (3.18)** | 5.5% (2.62)** |
| % High school degree or more | -17.8% (2.17)* | -31.3% (2.09)* | -19.3% (0.86) | -9.2% (1.58) |
| Observations | 893 | 893 | 893 | 892 |

Robust z statistics in parentheses

* significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Individuals recruited to contact a public official were more likely to come from the ranks of past activists, members of groups that discussed politics, and neighborhoods with lower educational attainment. Neighborhood education had the strongest impact on recruitment, decreasing the probability of recruitment by 18% for individuals in areas with the highest proportion of high school grads compared to areas with the fewest high school grads. Areas with the highest levels of educational attainment are generally

associated with lower levels of crime. Given this association and the failure of individual education to predict recruitment, it appears that organizers are more interested in targeting areas where crime is an issue, rather than in targeting individuals with particular educational skill sets.

Recruitment to attend a meeting about crime presents a slightly different story. Individual demographics and resources fail to predict recruitment to attend a meeting, while accessibility and neighborhood factors provide the strongest explanations for the recruitment puzzle. Individuals who were asked to attend a meeting were more likely to be past activists, a member of a group that discusses politics or a school group member, to live in a neighborhood with the highest percentage of black residents, and least likely to live in neighborhoods with the most college grads. The relationship between school group membership and meeting recruitment suggests that some of the meetings may have focused on crime associated with schools or getting safely to school. Living in areas with the lowest proportion of high grads increased the likelihood of meeting mobilization by 31% compared to the chance of recruitment for residents of the most educated neighborhoods, while the chance of contact increased by 24% for individuals in neighborhoods with the highest percentage of black residents compared to that of individuals in areas with the fewest black residents.

Those were asked to join an anti-crime program, such as a neighborhood watch, were most likely to be a past activist, and to live in neighborhoods with the highest percentage of black residents. Living in areas with the highest black concentrations increased chances of recruitment to an anti-crime program by 40% compared living in areas with the fewest blacks. Neither individual nor neighborhood resources appear to be factors in recruitment for anti-crime programs. The influence of past participation on recruitment continues as a large and positive predictor of recruitment.

Similar to the pattern found with recruitment to the previous activities, only accessibility and neighborhood factors were significant predictors of contact to protest. Members of a group that discussed politics and individuals who work were 2% more likely to be asked to protest than others, and members of school groups were 2.7% less likely to be asked than non-members. The only significant neighborhood predictor was percent black residents in a neighborhood. Individuals in areas with the highest

proportion black residents were 5.5% more likely to be recruited than those living in areas with the fewest blacks. While none of the coefficients for protest recruitment were large, the influence of the one neighborhood variable on mobilization was twice that of either accessibility variable.

Overall Discussion

Do racial disparities in recruitment to anti-crime activities exist (question 1)? The answer is yes, but the bias runs in favor of blacks, contrary to previous research on electoral and general recruitment. Are the disparities in recruitment due to racial differences in resources, accessibility or place of residence (question 2)? In this case, it is place of residence that explains the recruitment bias towards blacks, rather than resources or accessibility. Is it the case that the role played by race in recruitment on the issue of crime is unique when compared to electoral or generic recruitment? Here, the answer is maybe. There is a clear bias towards blacks on the issue of crime, but it appears that it is race of place rather than race of individual that matters. The higher proportion of blacks recruited to each of the activities, compared to whites, suggests that issue domain needs to be a core consideration when attempting to understand race and recruitment.

I began with the assumption that political recruiters use different targeting strategies depending on the type of activity for which they are recruiting (question 5). In particular, I argued that mobilization for action related to anti-crime efforts is different from recruitment in general and specifically from electoral recruitment. Further, I argued that the types of social accessibility included in any analyses needed to be expanded beyond past participation and simple group membership (question 3). Lastly, that a consideration of neighborhood characteristics has to be included if we are to understand who is mobilized for political participation, specifically for the issue of crime since its impact on an individual's life is so strongly linked to where they live (question 4). The evidence presented thus far is consistent with these arguments.

The results from the analyses in this chapter run contrary to evidence for the importance of individual characteristics found in previous research (Abramson and Claggett, 2001; Brady, Schlozman, & Verba, 1999; Gershtenson, 2003; Goldstein and Ridout, 2002; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; Wielhouwer, 2000; and Wielhouwer, 2003). These authors found that to varying degrees, strategists target men, whites, older

citizens, the educated and individuals who are financially well off. In this study, individual characteristics and resources do not appear to play a part in mobilization decisions. Recruitment on the issue of crime is very different from electoral or general political recruitment. To be sure, crime affects individuals, but who is affected by crime is often highly associated with where one lives. Unlike the impact of issues in the electoral or general political arenas, the disproportionate impact of crime on some neighborhoods is highly visible and makes targeted mobilization a little easier for organizers.

In this study, the overall role played by accessibility in recruitment outcomes is consistent with that found in previous research. However, the expanded version of accessibility used in this study provides a more nuanced view of its role. Consistent with previous research, past participation remains a significant and positive predictor of recruitment, except for protesting (Abramson and Claggett, 2001; Brady, Schlozman, & Verba, 1999; Gershtenson, 2003; Goldstein and Ridout, 2002; Huckfeldt and Sprague, 1992; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; and Wielhouwer, 1999). The latter instance is a bit of a puzzle, since many people are reluctant to protest and one might assume organizers would target individuals who have already shown a bent for activism. On the other hand, past activism may serve as a proxy for experience or knowledge and these characteristics may be more important for activities such as contacting public officials or meeting participation and less important for showing up at a protest.

Contrary to the findings in Brady et al. (1999), group membership was a significant predictor of mobilization, but it is membership in a group that discusses politics that matters, rather than simple membership. This finding supports Knoke's (1990) contention that type of organizational membership influences both general political recruitment and type of activity to which members are recruited. Organizers don't target any person or any group; they target those who appear to be more politically active and thus, more likely to respond to a request for action. While accessibility is important for recruitment on the issue of crime, it is dwarfed by the neighborhood variables. This is no surprise if the activity that takes place is organized by neighborhood community organizers where the emphasis is typically on neighborhoods and their issues, rather than electorally focused activists where the geographic area is much broader.

The big story in this study is the role played by neighborhood characteristics. Although attention has been previously given to the influence of neighborhood on participation, the current results suggest it cannot be ignored in the matter of recruitment either. For the issue of crime, organizers do not appear to recruit based on individual characteristics, but on neighborhood factors. Contrary to what one might expect given the bias towards individuals with greater resources in recruitment to electoral and general politics, lack of neighborhood educational assets is not an obstacle for recruitment, rather, it enhances the likelihood of mobilization on the issue of crime. Given the association between low educational attainment in a neighborhood, greater proportion of black residents and higher crime rates, it may be that neighborhood resources and racial density serve as proxies for neighborhood crime. If this is the case, then the bias towards individuals living in resource poor, high density black neighborhoods, suggests organizers are targeting neighborhoods that appear to have a greater stake in decisions about crime, and thus are more likely to act. The overshadowing of individual race by neighborhood race suggests previous studies may have overestimated the effect of individual race on recruitment. On the other hand, the role of race in recruitment on the issue of crime may simply be different than the one it plays in electoral or generic recruitment. We don't know which story is true, since earlier studies neither isolated recruitment specifically on the issue of crime nor factored in the role played by neighborhoods in mobilization strategies.

Conclusion

Past research on political recruitment has been limited in its attention to mobilization on specific issues and specific activities, focusing mostly on electoral and general recruitment. In addition, there has been scant attention paid to the role played by a broader array of accessibility factors and neighborhood characteristics in mobilization strategies, as well as the specific influence of race at both the individual and neighborhood levels. In this chapter, I have explored the mobilization story specific to the issue of crime and the broader array of types of activities to which one might be recruited. It is clear that recruitment on the issue of crime is very different from that found in electoral and general mobilization.

The importance of past participation, specific types of group membership and neighborhood factors strongly suggests that recruitment strategists on the issue of crime target individuals who are accessible and already active, as well as neighborhoods perceived to have a stake in the issue. Since crime tends to be geographically localized, rather than widely dispersed, it appears that mobilizers are targeting precisely those citizens most directly affected by the issue. This is a different story than that found in general and electoral recruitment research. It is a story to be expected from the CO literature however, where the focus is on pulling people together around issues that directly affect their daily lives—in this case crime, rather than elections. The question that arises is who determines which issues citizens are interested in, have a stake in, or should be involved in. If, due to limited resources, organizers operate on the belief that people in low resource and black neighborhoods care about and are more likely to respond to contact about the issue of crime, but not about elections or politics in general, they may be unfairly denying residents of these areas the chance to participate on a broader range of issues. That's the benign story. If, on the other hand, differences in recruitment are due to the writing off of certain types of people and neighborhoods, then the consequences for the breadth of the voices heard in the democratic processes are significant. Mobilization matters for participation, and if we fail to consider who is recruited for various issues and activities, particularly the role of neighborhood, we may perpetuate the continuing disparities in political participation.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Building on the recruitment theories of previous authors, I put forward and tested a more comprehensive theory of mobilization than have prior researchers. I proposed that the political recruiters target 1) those who have the means to participate and to be effective in their actions; 2) those who are accessible to organizers; 3) neighborhoods that are resource rich or for whom an issue might be salient; and that 4) the criteria for recruitment will vary by both the activity and issue for which action is requested. To be clear, I do not know what is in the minds of organizers. Rather, my judgments about their decisions are based on the profiles of those who are mobilized and the factors that appear to condition whether an individual is contacted.

Although mobilization is a significant predictor of political participation, previous research on predictors of recruitment has generally been limited to a focus on a few electoral activities or on political activities in general. In the latter case, little attention has been given to differentiation in recruitment strategies by issue or for specific activities. I have expanded the research to include recruitment to both a broader array of political activities and to activities within specific issue domains--crime and education. In addition, social accessibility has usually been limited to group membership in general, and to union and religious group membership in particular. Within the three issue domains--generic, crime and education--I tested the influence of issue specific group membership, as well as accessibility through children and knowing a person of influence. Neighborhood characteristics and resources were added to my analyses in order to better understand the role played by residential context in the recruitment process, particularly within specific issue domains and activities. Lastly, I explored the influence of individual resources, social accessibility and neighborhood characteristics on the recruitment of black citizens to the political arena.

What are my big findings? 1) Profiles of the mobilized vary across issue domains and political activities, especially by individual race and neighborhood racial composition. 2) Resources appear to matter for recruitment if one only looks at contact rates by individual socio economic status. However, individual resources appear to only influence the likelihood of mobilization for a few activities in the generic arena, contact about meetings in the schools arena and not at all for the issue of crime. 3) Social accessibility is a critical aspect of mobilization and is more nuanced than described in previous research. 4) Neighborhood matters a lot for some domains and political activities and not at all for others.

Who is recruited

Descriptives

As hypothesized, profiles of individuals contacted for political participation vary dramatically across activity and issue (Table 5.1). In summary, those who are white, male, well educated and wealthy were typically contacted at higher rates than their counterparts in the generic arena. For the schools issue, the story is a little different. Across all activities, individuals with the greatest wealth and education were consistently contacted at far higher rates, than individuals with the fewest resources. Unlike the generic arena, recruitment differences by gender and race were not usually significant. Additionally, there were no consistent recruitment biases by gender or race. In the crime domain, the only consistent bias was towards individuals who are black. Looking only at issue domain, it is clear that there is not a consistent story regarding recruitment rates.

Digging deeper into specific activities across the issue domains, individuals who are white, and with the highest levels of education and income were contacted more often than their counterparts to work for a political party or on a community issue. There was not a comparable activity in the crime or schools arena. Whites, males and individuals with the greatest resources were recruited most often to contact a public official in the generic domain. This differs from the schools domain where the only significant bias was towards individuals with the greatest resources, and from the crime domain where blacks were contacted more often than whites. For recruitment to attend a meeting, there were again differences across the issue domains. Individuals with the greatest levels of income

and education were recruited far more often in both the generic and schools arena. There was a bias towards individuals with the highest levels of education in the crime domain, but not towards those with the greatest wealth. Race differences in recruitment rates only appeared in the schools and crime arenas; however whites were recruited more often in the schools domain and blacks more often in the crime domain. There was not a significant race difference in the generic domain. The role race plays appears to be issue dependent. Whether it is an individual's race or the race of the neighborhood that influences who is mobilized will be explored in a later section.

In the generic domain, individuals with the greatest levels of resources were recruited to join a protest far more often than those with the fewest resources and there was no recruitment bias by race or gender. In both the schools and crime domains however, blacks were recruited more often than whites. Individuals with the highest levels of education were contacted more often about a protest than the least educated, but individuals with the least income were contacted more often than the wealthiest in the crime domain.

Across issue domains, the patterns of recruitment by activity are not consistent. The bias towards individuals with the greatest resources is fairly consistent with previous research. Yet even here, there is at least one instance in the crime domain where this is not the case. There are similar discrepancies in the direction of the race bias. Examining only recruitment rates, it is clear that issue must be considered in order to understand the contact rates by activity.

Table 5-1: Percent Recruited by Issue, Activity and Demographic Characteristics

| | Contact a public official | | | Attend a meeting | | | Protest | | | Contribute \$ | | Work for party/commu nity issue | Volun- teer | Join anti-crime group |
|------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | Generic | School | Crime | Generic | School | Crim | Generic | School | Crime | Generic | School | Generic | School | Crime |
| Total | 27.2% | 13.1% | 8.1% | 32.6% | 41.4% | 22.6% | 12.3% | 5.7% | 5.0% | 41.4% | 19.5% | 29.6% | 17.8% | 26.3% |
| Race | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 17.2% | 13.4% | 14.7% | 33.9% | 30.3% | 35.9 | 10.0% | 7.6% | 12.3% | 27.6% | 16.9% | 22.3% | 16.3% | 40.0% |
| White | 30.1% | 11.2% | 7.9% | 32.3% | 37.8% | 21.9 | 13.0% | 3.9% | 3.7% | 45.5% | 17.2% | 31.7% | 15.7% | 26.2% |
| Gender | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 25.1% | 11.6% | 10.8% | 32.3% | 34.1% | 28.5% | 11.2% | 6.1% | 7.0% | 36.4% | 18.6% | 28.9% | 18.2% | 33.9% |
| Male | 30.6% | 13.4% | 12.0% | 33.0% | 34.0% | 28.8% | 14.1% | 5.5% | 9.2% | 49.2% | 14.8% | 30.7% | 12.5% | 31.3% |
| Income | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| < \$10,000 | 13.8% | 7.1% | 10.1% | 18.1% | 22.4% | 23.7% | 4.6% | 2.3% | 7.8% | 18.4% | 10.5% | 14% | 12.3% | 32.4% |
| ≥ \$90,000 | 57.1% | 22.7% | 4.6% | 53.1% | 59.1% | 18.2% | 35.7% | 4.6% | 4.6% | 73.5% | 18.2% | 48% | 22.7% | 22.7% |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| < HS degree | 14.9% | 4.6% | 8.4% | 22.6% | 21.4% | 19.8 | 3.9% | 3.0% | 7.2% | 18.7% | 11.3% | 12.% | 10.5% | 27.7% |
| ≥ BA degree | 49.0% | 28.1% | 11.4% | 44.4% | 57.0% | 31.6 | 19.2% | 14.2% | 7.0% | 64.6% | 33.3% | 52% | 24.6% | 36.8% |

Bold Chi. Sq. sig. < .05

Race and Recruitment

In this section, I examine in greater detail the interplay between race and recruitment. My results show a much more nuanced view of the influence of race on recruitment than that of previous research. Issue domain really matters and no one has looked at race, issue, activity and recruitment. In the generic arena, whites are more likely than blacks to be asked to work for and contribute to a political party or a community issue, and to contact a public official. For an issue related to crime, blacks were more likely than whites to be recruited for all activities—contact a public official, attend a meeting, join an anti-crime program, and protest. For education issues, it depends on the activity. Whites were more heavily recruited to attend a meeting and blacks were more often recruited to join a protest.

I also looked at the process by which race matters. The contribution here is that a) I more fully controlled for social accessibility; b) I controlled for neighborhood demographics and resources; and c) I examined the influence of race as it changed with the addition of individual resources, then social accessibility, and lastly, neighborhood characteristics as controls. To do this, I ran four progressively complex equations, calculating the influence of an individual's race on the probability of recruitment to each of the activities and within each issue domain. In model 1, only demographic characteristics were included. In model 2, resources were added, followed by the addition of social connections in model 3, and neighborhood characteristics and resources in model 4. As each new group of variables was added, the relative importance of race could then be ascertained. In Table 5.2, I present the effect of race on likelihood of recruitment to the each of the activities as they changed over the four models.

**Table 5-2:
Race Effect on Likelihood of Recruitment - % Change**

| | Model 1: Only Demographics | Model 2: + Individual resources | Model 3: + Social connections | Model 4: + Neighborhood |
|---|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Contact Public official | | | | |
| Generic | -12.9% (3.58)** | -6.3% (1.60) | -10.9% (2.89)** | -19.5% (3.01)** |
| Crime | 8.4% (3.32)** | 9.2% (3.49)** | 6.4% (2.63)** | -1.9% (.054) |
| Schools | 1.4% (0.58) | 5.1% (2.16)* | 2.0% (1.06) | -0.5% (0.16) |
| Work for party/ on a community issue | -9.0% (2.61)** | -0.1% (0.02) | -7.6% (2.16)* | -7.1% (0.97) |
| Attend meeting | | | | |
| Generic | 1.0% (0.26) | 9.5% (2.06)* | 4.2% (0.89) | -4.8% (0.59) |
| Crime | 14.9% (4.14)** | 17.3% (4.59)** | 13.2% (3.48)** | -8.7% (1.62) |
| Schools | -11.3% (2.78)** | -6.2% (1.47) | -12.8% (2.65)** | -0.9% (0.09) |
| Contribute money | | | | |
| Generic | -17.4% (4.11)** | -7.7% (1.83) | -14.5% (3.57)** | -3.9% (0.43) |
| Schools | -1.1% (0.31) | 3.2% (0.90) | 2.5% (0.71) | 15.4% (2.04)* |
| Protest | | | | |
| Generic | -3.0% (1.03) | 1.4% (0.48) | -1.2% (0.49) | -3.4% (0.90) |
| Crime | 8.7% (4.25)** | 8.1% (3.77)** | 5.7% (3.08)** | -1.0% (0.55) |
| Schools | 5.3% (2.21)* | 7.1% (2.69)** | 5.1% (2.50)* | 7.3% (1.62) |
| Join anti-crime group | 15.9% (3.32)** | 17.8% (3.54)** | 14.5% (2.89)** | -11.9% (1.40) |
| Volunteer in schools | -0.9% (0.30) | 0.7% (0.23) | 0.0% (0.00) | 2.4% (0.53) |

Robust z statistics in parentheses: * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Generally, controlling for individual resources and accessibility did not reduce race differences by much across domains and activities (models 1-3). The picture changes when we control for neighborhood characteristics (model 4). It appears that one of reasons blacks are contacted more frequently than whites for activities related to the issue of crime and less frequently than whites for other issues and activities, is that recruiters

are targeting on neighborhood characteristics and resources. So, for example, Blacks are much more likely than Whites to be recruited to political activity around the issue of crime—contact a public official, attend a meeting protest, or join an anti-crime group. But once we control for neighborhood context, the race effect disappears, presumably because recruitment for anti-crime activity is higher in low income, majority Black communities which may also have higher levels of crime.

In the generic arena, blacks were less likely than whites to be contacted to work for or contribute money to a political party or for a community issue, or to contact a public official. Adding in controls for resources and then accessibility, the race coefficients bounce around a bit. However, controlling for neighborhood eliminates individual race as a significant factor for recruitment to work for a party/community issue and contribute money, while the bias toward Whites remains for contacting a public official. In fact, the probability of recruitment to contact a public official almost doubled for whites, increasing from 10.9% to 19.5% between model 3 and 4. In this one instance, it does appear that strategists target individuals by race, regardless of type of neighborhood in which they live.

In the school domain, the initial influence of individual race on recruitment varied by activity. Blacks were more likely than whites to be mobilized for a protest, while the reverse was true for meeting recruitment. In both instances, the race effect became insignificant once neighborhood characteristics were controlled. Once more, it appears that recruiters may be keying in on neighborhood characteristics that are aligned with race. On the other hand, race was not initially a factor for contributing money to a school issue but blacks were significantly more likely to receive a request for money once neighborhood was added as a control. It is not clear if activists believe blacks are more likely than whites to make a financial contribution to a school cause, or if some other thinking is influencing strategists' decisions. It does appear to be a unique case among all the activities.

Overall, the findings in this section strongly suggest that studies that ignore neighborhood context may overestimate the importance of individual race as an influence in recruitment strategies. Out of fourteen activities, race remained a significant predictor of mobilization in only two instances once controls were added for neighborhood. In the

United States, individual race is still inextricably intertwined with race of neighborhood as economics, politics and prejudice continue to constrain residential opportunities available to people of color. It is not surprising that failure to include neighborhood context heightens the importance of race as a recruitment factor. As will be discussed in the next section, racial characteristics do influence activists' targeting decisions, but race of neighborhood influences recruitment for a greater number of activities, than does the race of individuals.

Predictors of Recruitment – Full Model

The majority of other authors have examined demographics, resources and accessibility as predictors of recruitment. My contribution is that I added neighborhood characteristics and resources and a more diversified set of accessibility variables. Like others I found that rates of recruitment are related to the level of individual resources. In general, citizens who have the highest levels of education and income are contacted at much higher rates than individuals with the fewest resources. However, when I estimated all recruitment models, only four of the 28 estimates of individual resource coefficients were significant. Of the four, three were in the generic arena—contact to contribute to a party/community issue, contact a public official and protest. Apparently, resources matter because people with resources tend to be accessible to political mobilizers and live in resource rich neighborhoods.

Accessibility

I improved on previous accessibility predictors by including more dimensions of social accessibility and particularly issue specific accessibility factors. Accessibility matters a lot, even with the inclusion of neighborhood resources and characteristics. Not surprisingly, past participation is positively associated with the likelihood of mobilization for virtually all activities and often had the largest effect on probability of recruitment. Previous authors have found similar results for generic or electoral related recruitment.

In the generic arena, knowing an influential person increased the chance of recruitment to work on a campaign or on a community issue by 18.5%, past participation by 16.6%, being married or living with a partner by 10.6% and membership in a group that discussed politics by 10.1%. Contact to contribute to a campaign or community issue

was positively influenced by the same factors except knowing an influential person. Having been a victim of crime was a negative factor for recruitment to make a monetary contribution. If contributions are solicited at the home, it may be that crime victims simply do not answer a knock at the door. Recruitment to contact a public official was positively influenced by past participation and membership in a school related group. The politically active and school group members were about 23% more likely to be recruited than their counterparts. Individuals who were married/living with a partner and the politically active were more likely to be contacted to attend a meeting. For recruitment to join a protest, past activists were more likely to be contacted than the inactive. For recruitment to work for a party/community issue and attend a community meeting, only the accessibility variables were significant. What is different in my results is that it is not just membership in any group that increases likelihood of recruitment, but membership in an issue specific group and in a group that discusses politics.

In the schools arena, past participation was again a significant predictor of mobilization, but it was often dwarfed in size by having a child in public school and membership in a school related organization. The importance of these two issue specific predictors suggests that they may increase the visibility of individuals who are more likely to care about a particular issue. Membership in a group that discussed politics was far less important for this issue than it was in the generic arena. It was only significant for recruitment to contact a public official and it was the smallest in size of all the accessibility factors. It appears that organizers are more interested in targeting issue specific groups rather than any group that is concerned with politics. Interestingly members of religious groups were more likely to be contacted about a school-related meeting than non-members, but it is unclear why this is so, unless recruitment was about attendance at a religious school meeting. Home owners were more likely to be asked to contribute to and attend a meeting about a school related issue. They may be thought to care more about local education, the meeting could have been related to property taxes and schools, or homeowner may simply be less transient and therefore accessible to activists. The big story with school focused recruitment is accessibility, but it is a much more nuanced and broad than is true for the generic arena.

Resources were rarely significant in contact rates in the crime domain, and never significant as predictors of the likelihood of mobilization in the full recruitment model. Once again, the accessibility factors play a significant role in recruitment for all activities. Of all the accessibility factors, past participation had the greatest positive influence on mobilization for all activities, except protest where it was not significant. Membership in groups that discussed politics was a positive factor for all activities, with the exception of contact about an anti-crime group. Individuals who were employed were slightly more likely to be contacted about a protest than were those who were not working. Lastly, membership in a school related group decreased the probability of contact to join a protest about crime. The accessibility story is again important, but it is not as nuanced as was true in the generic and schools domain.

Overall, social connections appear to heighten the likelihood of contact about political activity. It is clear that accessibility matters, but that it matters in different ways for specific issues and activities. It is not enough to account for simple group membership, particularly in explaining issue specific recruitment.

Neighborhood Context

I was interested in exploring the extent to which resource poor neighborhoods and neighborhoods with high crime rates were targeted or avoided by political recruiters. My measure of neighborhood characteristics were crude—the percent of residents living in female-headed households, percent who are Black, percent who are high school graduates, and the percent living in owner-occupied housing. These measures are highly correlated with each other. However, the hope is that they provide crude controls for neighborhood resources and safety, especially in the absence of neighborhood crime statistics.

What do I find? Neighborhood characteristics strongly predict recruitment for crime-related political activity. Their influence on mobilization in the school and generic domains was quite sizeable for a few activities, but was not significant across all activities across all activities as was true for the crime domain.

In the crime domain, residents of areas with the fewest high school graduates were more likely to be asked to do something about the issue of crime than their counterparts in areas with the highest educational achievement. Individuals living in

neighborhoods with the highest percentages of black citizens were more likely to be politically mobilized than individuals in areas with the fewest Blacks. This is hardly surprising because resource poor neighborhoods have the highest rates of crime compared to the wealthiest neighborhoods and areas with the highest concentrations of black citizens tend to have higher crime rates than mostly white neighborhoods. Unfortunately, there is a greater necessity to organize around the issue of crime in resource poor and areas with the highest proportions of black residents.

In the schools domain, living in neighborhoods with the highest proportion of black citizens greatly decreased the chances of receiving a request to contribute money to an educational cause. For individuals living in areas with the greatest proportion of owner-occupied housing, their chance of recruitment to attend a school-related meeting was 43% higher over that of citizens in areas with lowest percentage of owner-occupied houses. Neighborhood was only significant for two activities. However, in the case of meeting attendance, it had the largest influence on likelihood of mobilization; and for contact to contribute money, it had the second highest coefficient of all the significant predictors. Although neighborhood factors were inconsistent as predictors of recruitment across all activities, it is clear that they cannot be ignored if we are to understand who is asked to participate in school related activities. This is particularly true, since the inclusion of neighborhood greatly reduces the apparent importance of individual resources highlighted by biases toward the wealthy and educated in recruitment rates for all school related activities.

In the generic domain, neighborhood resources and racial characteristics were the biggest predictors for recruitment to contact a public official and protest. Individuals in areas with the highest proportion of black residents were twenty-five percent more likely to be asked to contact a public official and twelve percent more likely to be recruited for a protest, than their counterparts in areas with the fewest black citizens. This finding is interesting in light of the negative influence of race for black citizens for recruitment to contact a public official, results similar to that of previous researchers. Although it appears that neighborhoods with a high percentage of black citizens are targeted, it also appears to be the case that black residents are avoided. Residents in neighborhoods with the highest proportion of female-headed households were sixty percent less likely to be

contacted about a protest than residents with the fewest female-headed households. They were not significant for party/community work, financial contributions or meeting attendance.

The influence of neighborhood on recruitment is not nearly as consistent as is true for accessibility. However where it does matter, its impact is often at least as large, if not larger than that of accessibility. Neighborhood resources and characteristics have rarely been included in past research on recruitment to political activity. It is clear from the results in this study, that neighborhood can no longer be ignored, particularly with regard to issue and activity specific mobilization. There appears to be some neighborhoods that are targeted for inclusion in the political process and others that are ignored or avoided. One might expect that it is the neighborhoods with the fewest resources that are ignored, but the results in this study suggest that it is highly dependent on the issue and on the activity.

Conclusion

What is new in this study is that I have examined the relationship between recruitment for activities within specific issue domains: generic, schools, and crime. I have also included a broader array of activities than have past authors. Based on the results in this study, it is clear that we can no longer generalize about recruitment patterns based on electoral contact or mobilization in general. Issue domain matters a lot for who is recruited. This is no surprise, given the focus on issues in the community organizing literature. Profiles of the recruited vary greatly across the generic, school and crime domains, and in some cases, the influence of individual resources, and neighborhood on recruitment are reversed across the issue domains. Activities matter as well. Even within a particular issue domain, there is not always a consistent pattern of mobilization across all activities, and for some of the activities, neighborhood characteristics have a very large influence on who is recruited. Given the importance of recruitment as a predictor of participation and the differences in patterns of recruitment across activities and issues highlighted in this research, it appears that a simple, generic recruitment predictor variable may not be sufficient to explain participation except in a general, non-issue specific approach to participation.

What is also new is that I have opened up the black box of recruitment by examining more dimensions of accessibility. It is not just membership in a group that matters for recruitment, but rather membership in issue specific groups—even for generic recruitment—and membership in groups that discuss politics. Beyond groups, individuals appear to be recruited through their children and partners—more so for some issues and activities than for others. For some activities, knowing an influential person appears to be a reciprocal relationship--it also makes the knower visible to other activists. Crime victims are less likely to be contacted than non-victims, but that may be the result of self-imposed isolation rather than avoidance by recruiters. As with previous researchers, I find that the influence of past participation continues to be a significant influence on recruitment, even with the addition of a more diverse group of accessibility variables and the inclusion of neighborhood characteristics. Thus, previously highlighted gaps in participation between activists and non-activists are likely to be maintained, if not exacerbated by an apparent reliance on the recruitment of those who are already active.

In this study, I have also begun to tease out the influence of neighborhood on recruitment relative to that of individual demographics and resources, and social accessibility. The contribution of neighborhood to mobilization is not consistent, but where it matters, it matters in a big way. It appears that neighborhoods are targeted as well as individuals and groups. Which neighborhoods are targeted varies greatly by both issue and activity. The inclusion of neighborhood characteristics also appears to greatly diminish the importance of individual race and resources as predictors of mobilization highlighted in previous research. Indeed, out of fourteen activities, individual resources are only significant as predictors of recruitment for four activities when neighborhood characteristics were also included, and individual race is only significant for two activities. What cannot be ignored however, particularly for an area such as Detroit where race of individual and neighborhood is so closely aligned, is that individual race still does matter, even when race of neighborhood is held constant. The neighborhood context can no longer be ignored as a predictor of recruitment, especially since its influence is often as large as or larger than any other predictor included in this study. Where an individual lives can dramatically increase or decrease the likelihood of inclusion in the political process. It is clear that failure to account for neighborhood context leaves out a

significant key to our understanding of political recruitment and ultimately, our understanding of disparities in political participation.

There are a few implications for Social Work that bear considering. Typically, the community organizing literature focuses on either the theory or methods for organizing and recruiting participants for social action. There has been little effort to analyze who is actually organized. In light of disparities highlighted in this study, the field would do well to carefully examine who activists say they intend to recruit, and who they actually reach. In the crime arena, rates of contact are higher for blacks, but the reverse is true in the schools arena. There are also differences by socio economic status and type of neighborhood. It may well be that issues really do affect groups differently, therefore organizers target groups differently. Crime for example, tends to disproportionately affect people of color. On the other hand, when organizers plan their strategies, they would do well to determine whether they are operating under unexamined biases that some groups of people care more or less about particular issues. Certainly, education is a concern for all people, regardless of their skin color, their educational and economic status or where they live. In fact, budget cuts, school closings and limited resources are more likely to impact people of color, individuals with the fewest resources, and those who live in resource poor neighborhoods, but these are precisely the people who are less likely to report being invited to participate on the issue of schools.

Political science also has something to learn from the field of community organizing/social work. Much of the political recruitment research in political science focuses on the national level and on electoral politics, but much of the organizing by non-electorally focused activists takes place at the community or neighborhood levels, often with an emphasis on building the capacity for political action in the local communities. It is not enough to get people to a meeting or contact a public official as a onetime event. Part of the goal of community organizing is to build the community organizations and structures that will support the development or capacity of residents to participate politically. It is also at the community level that organizers say issues are what matters. Not all issues are relevant to all individuals or communities. The community organizing literature encourages activists to focus their efforts on those who have a stake in the issue, since they are more likely to respond to a request for action. As the saying goes, “all

politics are local,” and the corollary is that all recruitment is local and of necessity needs to be guided by the context in which individuals reside. It would certainly enhance the field of political science research if there were greater attention paid to the guidance provided to activists in the community organizing literature about who and how to recruit for community change. Social work may help political science better understand the story behind the differences in political recruitment at the national and local levels, particularly given the focus of many organizers on low-income and marginalized groups. Political science may help social work determine whether and how their techniques for organizing are successful. While many organizers are cognizant of the broader impact of state, national, and global factors on their ability to bring about change at the local level, political science is in a unique position to help shed light on ways to address the ways in which some of these institutional factors interfere with and undermine local control.

There are a few limitations in this study that might be better addressed in future research. Although the inclusion of census tracts is a good beginning to account for residential context, it is at best a poor substitute for more meaningful and realistic neighborhood boundaries. Neighborhood data was also limited to census information. Better measures of neighborhood characteristics, especially as indicators of neighborhood stake in crime and education issues might be crime rates, perceived neighborhood safety, per pupil educational expenditures, property tax rates, high school graduation rates, and school scores on standardized tests. Unfortunately, these indicators were not easily available at the time of this study. In addition, the lack of information from individuals making recruitment decisions, limits my study to a description of the patterns visible via individual reports of contact or the lack of contact. The addition of interviews with activists about their targeting decisions would greatly enhance our understanding of recruitment patterns made visible via individual reports of contact.

There is also the highly segregated nature of the Detroit metropolitan area sample to consider. A future research agenda should certainly include a testing of the recruitment models presented in this paper in cities that are less segregated than is true for Detroit. Race may play out very differently in communities where its history and context are not as segregated. Lastly, there is the fact that the interviews for this study took place in 1989. Much has changed in the past twenty years, particularly in the use of technology

and social networking for political recruitment. Older techniques for recruitment via face to face and phone contact favored individuals who were at home more often. Now, individuals can be reached anywhere, as long as they are carrying a cell phone or some other portable communications device. If anything, this shift may bias the profile of the recruited to reflect a younger generation.

If we truly wish to address some of the disparities in political participation and ultimately the distribution of public goods, disparities in recruitment must be remedied. Individuals who are not invited to join the political arena may not get the opportunity or the experience they need to influence decisions that affect their lives, particularly at the local level. Indeed, they may not even know that decisions are being considered that could benefit or hurt them. Further, it is not just individuals we need to consider. Given the results in this study, it appears that individuals living in resource poor neighborhoods, and by extension their neighborhoods as well, are often ignored. It matters where you live. These are precisely the communities who have the most to lose if their collective voices are not heard in the political arena. If we wish more of the same, then a continuation of the status quo in recruitment is called for. If we instead wish to embolden a democracy that truly promotes the common good, then we have to reevaluate who we ask to play in the game. This is particularly true for issues such as education and crime, where decisions can have long term consequences for both individuals and neighborhoods. The reality is, participation in the political arena is a deadly serious game.

Appendices

Appendix A

1989 Detroit Area Studies Survey Questions

University of Michigan

The data for the analysis is based on 919 face to face interviews conducted in Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne counties during the 1989 Detroit Area Study on political participation. The survey was based on a random sample of the tri-county area with an oversample of Detroit to ensure a sizeable number of blacks. The final unweighted racial distribution of the sample included 450 Black respondents and 466 non-Black respondents, with an over-all response rate of 70.2%.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Mobilization

Many people have been contacted during the past 12 months, since (CURRENTMONTH), 1988, to take part in some activity concerned with a community issue or problem. Please think about occasions when you may have been contacted, by mail, by phone, in person, or even by seeing posters or announcements.

Generic Mobilization

During the past 12 months, were you contacted in any way to do work for a political party, a candidate, or some organization concerned with a community issue or problem?

.....to contribute money to a candidate, a political party, or to a group concerned with a community issue or problem?

.....to speak to, write to, or go to see a public official or some other person of influence in the community to express your views about some community issue or problem?

.....to attend a meeting about some community issue or problem?

.....to take part in a rally or protest about some community issue or problem?

.....to complain to a business or corporation, or take part in a boycott against one of its products, because of a community issue or problem?

Crime Mobilization

Many people have been contacted during the past 12 months to take part in some activity concerned with crime. Please think about occasions when you may have been contacted, by mail, by phone, in person, or even by seeing posters or announcements.

During the past 12 months, were you contacted in any way to let you know of a public event or a meeting that was going to be held about crime?

....to speak to, write to, or go to see a public official or some other person of influence in the community to express your views about crime?

....about an anti-crime program such as a neighborhood watch or organization?

....to encourage you to participate in a rally or protest about crime?

....did anyone offer you a ride so you could participate in a meeting or activity concerned with crime?

School Mobilization

Now I'm going to ask a similar set of questions about your local public schools. Please think about occasions when you may have been contacted, by mail, by phone, in person, or even by seeing posters or announcements.

During the past 12 months, were you contacted in any way to let you know of a public event or a meeting that was going to be held about your local public schools?

....to speak to, write to, or go to see a public official or some other person of influence in the community to express your views about your local public schools?

....to do volunteer work in your local public schools?

....to give money to some organization or group concerned about your local public schools?

....to encourage you to participate in a rally or protest about your local public schools?

....did anyone offer you a ride so you could participate in a meeting or activity concerned with your local public schools?

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Demographics

age

sex

race

Individual Resources

education

income

Accessibility

Married/living with partner

Own/rent home

Knows an influential person: Do you personally know any local public officials, someone who works for the local government, or an influential person in the community who you could call upon to help you resolve a community problem?

Past Participation: I am going to ask you about some community activities you may have done in the past. Please think back to before (CURRENTMONTH), 1988. (author's note: survey year was 1989)

Did you ever attend a meeting, rally, or protest about some community issue or problem?

Did you ever speak to, write to or go to see a public official or some other person of influence in the community to express your views about some community issue or problem?

Did you ever work with others in your community to try to do something about some community issue or problem?

Group Membership

belongs to any group

belongs to a group that discusses politics

belongs to a labor union

belongs to a schools, crime, religious group or one that discusses politics

attendance at religious services

If child(ren) living at home:

Child in school, grades K through 12? (If yes, in a public or private school?)

Crime Victim: Thinking about crimes against people or their property, have you (or your family living with you) ever been the victim of a crime?

Neighborhood – 1990 Census Tract data

Proportion Black

Proportion age 25+, who are high school grads

Proportion families < poverty level

Proportion female-headed household

Appendix B

% Change in Probability of Recruitment for All Issues and Activities

| | Generic | | | | | Schools | | | | | Crime | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------|
| | Party/ community work | Give \$ | Contact Public Official | Go to meeting | Protest | Give \$ | Contact Public Official | Go to meeting | Protest | Volunteer in school | Contact Public Official | Go to meeting | Join anti- crime group | Protest |
| Demographics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| sex (Female=1) | | | | | | 10% | | | | 7% | | | | |
| age | | .4% | | | | | -.2% | | | -.5% | | | | |
| race (Black=1) | | | -21% | | | 15% | | | | | | | | |
| Individual Resources | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | | 10% | 4% | | | | | 7% | | | | | | |
| Income/poverty ratio | | | | | 2% | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessibility | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Married/ living with partner | 11% | 10% | | 10% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Knows influential person | 19% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Past participation | 17% | 22% | 23% | 29% | 10% | 7% | 10% | 17% | 3% | 9% | 7% | 16% | 20% | |
| Member: group discusses politics | 10% | 8% | | | | | 3% | | | | 3% | 6% | | 2% |
| Member: School group | | | 23% | | | 22% | 12% | 41% | | 15% | | | | -3% |

| | Generic | | | | | Schools | | | | | Crime | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| | Party/ community work | Give \$ | Contact Public Official | Go to meeting | Protest | Give \$ | Contact Public Official | Go to meeting | Protest | Volunteer in school | Contact Public Official | Go to meeting | Join anti- crime group | Protest |
| Member: Religious group | | | | | | | | 13% | | | | | | |
| Child in Public School | | | | | | | 7% | 32% | | 20% | | | | |
| Crime victim | | -3% | | | | | | -3% | | | | | | |
| Working | | | | | | | | | 4% | | | | | 2% |
| Own house | | | | | | 8% | | 14% | | | | | | |
| Neighborhood | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % Black | | | 25% | | 12% | -17% | | | | | | 24% | 33% | 6% |
| % Female head | | | | | -61% | | | | | | | | | |
| % High School grads | | | | | | | | | | | -18% | -31% | | |
| % Owner occupied | | | | | | | | 43% | | | | | | |

Bold numbers, significant at 1% level

Non-bold numbers, significant at 5% level

Appendix C

Neighborhood Characteristics by Race of Respondent

| BLACK VS. NON-BLACK RESPONDENTS | | Percent black | Percent female head households | Percent with \geq high school degree | Percent owner occupied housing |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| NOT BLACK | Mean | .05708 | .0640 | .7769 | .6851 |
| | N | 707 | 707 | 707 | 707 |
| | Std. Dev. | .150248 | .06771 | .12050 | .21185 |
| BLACK | Mean | .82495 | .1758 | .6406 | .5171 |
| | N | 209 | 209 | 209 | 209 |
| | Std. Dev. | .207449 | .08743 | .11827 | .21408 |
| Total | Mean | .23243 | .0895 | .7458 | .6467 |
| | N | 916 | 916 | 916 | 916 |
| | Std. Dev. | .362237 | .08647 | .13290 | .22366 |

Bibliography

- Abramson, P. R., & Claggett, W. (2001). Recruitment and political participation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(4), 905-916.
- Alinsky, S. D. (1972). *Rules for radicals; a practical primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Random House.
- Baumgartner, F. L., Beth L. (1998). *Basic Interests: The importance of groups in politics and in political science*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berry, J. M., Portney, K. E., & Thomson, K. (1993). *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Blydenburg, J. C. (1971). A controlled experiment to measure the effects of personal contact campaigning. *American Journal of Political Science*, 15, 365-381.
- Bobo, K. A., Kendall, J., & Max, S. (2001). *Organizing for social change: Midwest Academy manual for activists*. Santa Ana, Calif.: Seven Locks Press.
- Brady, H. E., Schlozman, K. L., & Verba, S. (1999). Prospecting for participants: Rational expectations and the recruitment of political activists. *American Political Science Review*, 93(1), 153-168.
- Brady, H. E., Verba, S., & Schlozman, K. L. (1995). Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation. *American Political Science Review*, 89(2), 271.
- Branch, T. (1988). *Parting the waters: America in the King years, 1954-1963*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The American Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cardy, E. A. (2005). An Experimental Field Study of the GOTV and Persuasion Effects of Partisan Direct Mail and Phone Calls. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 601(1), 28.
- Cho, W. K. T. (2003). Contagion Effects and Ethnic Contribution Networks. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(2), 368.
- Cho, W. K. T., Gimpel, J. G., & Dyck, J. J. (2006). Residential concentration, political socialization, and voter turnout. *Journal of Politics*, 68(1), 156-167.
- Cohen, C. J., & Dawson, M. C. (1993). Neighborhood poverty and African American politics. *The American Political Science Review*, 87(2), 286.
- Delgado, G. (1986). *Organizing the movement: the roots and growth of ACORN*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Djupe, P. A., & Grant, J. T. (2001). Religious institutions and political participation in America. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 303-314.
- Eldersveld, S. J. (1956). Experimental Propaganda Techniques and Voting Behavior. *The American Political Science Review*, 50(1), 154-165.
- Ellison, C. G., & Gay, D. A. (1989). Black Political Participation Revisited: A Test of Compensatory, Ethnic Community, and Public Arena Models. *Social Science Quarterly*, 70(1), 101.

- Fisher, R. (1994). *Let the people decide: neighborhood organizing in America*. New York: Toronto: Twayne Publishers ; Maxwell Macmillan Canada ; Maxwell Macmillan International.
- Fisher, R. (2009). *The people shall rule: ACORN, community organizing, and the struggle for economic justice*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Fisher, R., & Romanofsky, P. (1981). *Community organization for urban social change: a historical perspective*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Gaventa, J., Smith, B. E., & Willingham, A. W. (1990). *Communities in economic crisis: Appalachia and the South*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press.
- Gerber, A. S., & Green, D. P. (2000a). The Effect of a Nonpartisan Get-Out-the-Vote Drive: An Experimental Study of Leafletting. *The Journal of Politics*, 62(3), 846.
- Gerber, A. S., & Green, D. P. (2000b). The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment. *The American Political Science Review*, 94(3), 653.
- Gershtenson, J. (2003). Mobilization strategies of the Democrats and Republicans, 1956-2000. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(3), 293-308.
- Gimpel, J. G., Lee, F. E., & Kaminski, J. (2006). The Political Geography of Campaign Contributions in American Politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 626.
- Goldstein, K., & Paul, F. (2002). Campaign advertising and voter turnout: New evidence for a stimulation effect. *The Journal of Politics*, 64(3), 721.
- Goldstein, K. M. (1996). *Watering the Grassroots: Interest Groups, Lobbying, and Participation in America*. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Goldstein, K. M. (1999). *Interest groups, lobbying, and participation in America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstein, K. M., & Ridout, T. N. (2002). The politics of participation: Mobilization and turnout over time. *Political Behavior*, 24(1), 3-29.
- Gosnell, H. F. (1927). *Getting out the vote: An experiment in the stimulation of voting*.
- Green, D. P., & Gerber, A. S. (2005). Recent Advances in the Science of Voter Mobilization. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 601(1), 6.
- Huckfeldt, R., & Sprague, J. (1992). Political Parties and Electoral Mobilization: Political Structure, Social Structure, and the Party Canvass. *The American Political Science Review*, 86(1), 70.
- Kahn, S. (1991). *Organizing, a guide for grassroots leaders*. Silver Spring, Md.: National Association of Social Workers.
- Kahn, S. (1994). *How people get power*. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.
- Knoke, D. (1990). *Organizing for collective action: The political economies of associations*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Kramer, G. H. (1970). The effects of precinct-level canvassing on voter behavior. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 34, 560-572.
- Krassa, M. A. (1988). Context and the Canvass: The Mechanisms of Interaction. *Political Behavior*, 10(3), 233-246.
- Leighley, J. (2001). *Strength in numbers?: The political mobilization of racial and ethnic minorities*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

- Marschall, M. J. (2004). Citizen Participation and the Neighborhood Context: A New Look at the Coproduction of Local Public Goods. *Political Research Quarterly*, 57(2), 231-244.
- Marwell, G. O., Pamela E./Prahl, Ralph. (1988). Social Networks and Collective Action: A Theory of the Critical Mass. III. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(3), 502-534.
- Massey, D. S. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McAdam, D. (1982). *Political process and the development of Black insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McNulty, J. E. (2005). Phone-Based GOTV--What's on the Line? Field Experiments with Varied Partisan Components, 2002-2003. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 601(1), 41.
- Mondros, J. B., & Wilson, S. M. (1994). *Organizing for power and empowerment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Morris, A. D. (1984). *The origins of the civil rights movement: Black communities organizing for change*. New York : London: Free Press ; Collier Macmillan.
- Niven, D. (2001). The limits of mobilization: Turnout evidence from state house primaries. *Political Behavior*, 23(4), 335-350.
- Norrander, B. (1991). Explaining Individual Participation in Presidential Primaries. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 44(3), 640-655.
- Oberschall, A. (1973). *Social conflict and social movements*. Englewood Cliffs., N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Oliver, P. (1984). "If You Don't Do it, Nobody Else Will": Active and Token Contributors to Local Collective Action. *American Sociological Review*, 49(5), 601-610.
- Parry, J., Barth, J., Kropf, M., & Jones, E. T. (2008). Mobilizing the Seldom Voter: Campaign Contact and Effects in High-Profile Elections. *Political Behavior*, 30(1), 97-113.
- Piven, F. F., & Cloward, R. A. (1979). *Poor people's movements: why they succeed, how they fail*. New York: Vintage books.
- Reisch, M. (2008). *Intervention with Communities*: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Reitzes, D. C., & Reitzes, D. C. (1987). *The Alinsky legacy: alive and kicking*. Greenwich, Conn.: Jai Press Inc.
- Rosenstone, S., & Hansen, J. M. (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. NY: Macmillan.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. (2008). *Community organizing and development*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Saegert, S. (2006). Building Civic Capacity in Urban Neighborhoods: An Empirically Grounded Anatomy. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(3), 275-294.
- Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing "neighborhood effects": social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology* (pp. 443(436)).
- Schlozman, K. L., Burns, N., & Verba, S. (1999). "What Happened at Work Today?": A Multistage Model of Gender, Employment, and Political Participation. *Journal of Politics*, 61(1), 29.

- Schlozman, K. L., & Tierney, J. T. (1986). *Organized Interests and American Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Shaw, C. (2004). *The Campaign Manager: Running and winning local elections* (3rd ed.). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Smith, J., & Zipp, J. F. (1983). The party official next door: Some consequences of friendship for political participation. *The Journal of Politics*, 45, 958-978.
- Thompson, K. (2001). *From Neighborhood to Nation*. Nashua, NH: University Press of New England.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, J. L. (1990). Political mobilization in America.
- Walker, J. L. (1991). *Mobilizing interest groups in America: Patrons, professions, and social movements*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Warren, M. R. (2001). *Dry bones rattling: community building to revitalize American democracy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Wielhouwer, P. W. (1999). The Mobilization of Campaign Activists By the Party Canvass. *American Politics Research*, 27(2), 177.
- Wielhouwer, P. W. (2000). Releasing the Fetters: Parties and the Mobilization of the African-American Electorate. *The Journal of Politics*, 62(1), 206.
- Wielhouwer, P. W. (2003). In Search of Lincoln's Perfect List: Targeting in Grassroots Campaigns. *American Politics Research*, 31(6), 632.
- Wielhouwer, P. W., & Lockerbie, B. (1994). Party Contacting and Political Participation, 1952-90. *American Journal of Political Science*, 38(1), 211.
- Yeich, S. (1996). Grassroots Organizing with Homeless People: A Participatory Research Approach. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52(1), 111-121.
- Zipp, J. F., & Smith, J. (1979). The Structure of Electoral Political Participation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 85(1), 167-177.