

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 10705 6545

LIBRARY

Michigan State
University

~~DELETED~~ 051

JUN 24 '87
160 C 163

JUL 15 '88

ABSTRACT

RELATIVE DEPRIVATION AND PARTICIPATION IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

by

Barbara N. Geschwender

The civil rights movement of the 1960's became a mass movement which drew both black and white participants with divergent views and objectives. Much of the literature which has sought to explain black participation in this movement has utilized some version of the relative deprivation notion. This study analyzes Southern black student participation by testing hypotheses derived from different versions of relative deprivation theory.

Scores derived from Cantril's Self-Anchoring Striving Scale are utilized as the independent variables. Three patterns of relative deprivation using these scores are identified: aspirational deprivation, progressive deprivation, and reference group deprivation. A typology of participation activities is also constructed to analyze differences by type of participation. Passive, Active and Combative participation indices are developed.

Not all patterns of relative deprivation are associated with participation. Aspirational deprivation (defined as perception of a gap between achievement and ideal life situation) is associated with participation when defined in group terms. Activists on all three indices perceive blacks experiencing aspirational deprivation in the future. When deprivation relative to the present is perceived, it produces participation only in Combative activities. Progressive deprivation (defined as

7

Barbara N. Geschwender

perception of substantial past progress but little or no future progress) is not associated with any of the participation indices. Reference group deprivation (whether defined as the gap between level of achievement of self and blacks, self and whites, or blacks and whites) is not associated with participation, but reference group success (seeing self doing better than blacks) is associated with Passive and Combative activities when defined relative to the present and is associated with Combative activities when defined relative to the future.

The findings suggest that the analysis of participation in a mass movement must consider a variety of factors. One of these is the extent of participation. Factors producing early participation in a small young movement may be different from those producing participation when the movement becomes mature and takes on a mass membership. Constructing a typology of activities may help to clarify the analysis. The strongest relationship between participation and the various patterns of relative deprivation occurs with the Combative index. Combative index activities are those that could be termed most militant by logical standards. They are engaged in by the fewest number of individuals but these are the most active persons in terms of total number of participations.

RELATIVE DEPRIVATION AND PARTICIPATION
IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

by

Barbara N. Geschwender

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1971

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to James A. Geschwender for allowing me to conduct an analysis of data that he had collected. I also wish to express my indebtedness to Professor William A. Faunce for his time and efforts on my behalf and without whom this thesis would never have been initiated. Finally, I would like to thank Professors James B. McKee and Frederick Waisanen for serving on my thesis committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
RELATIVE DEPRIVATION	1
Progressive Deprivation	1
Reference Group Deprivation	2
METHODOLOGY	4
Independent Variables	4
Dependent Variables	5
Sample	11
Development of Hypotheses	14
Status Scores	14
Change Scores	15
Comparison Scores	17
FINDINGS	17
Hypothesis IA: There will be a positive association between participation and personal status scores.	17
Hypothesis IB: There will be a negative association between participation and black status scores.	20
Hypothesis IIA: There will be a positive association between participation and perception of past progress.	21
Hypothesis IIB: There will be a negative association between participation and anticipated future progress.	21
Hypothesis IIIA: There will be a negative association between participation and comparison indices (black minus self scores).	23
Hypothesis IIIB: There will be a positive association between participation and comparison indices (white minus self scores).	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Hypothesis IIIC: There will be a positive association between participation and comparison indices (white minus black scores).	26
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	28
Summary	30
Characteristics of Participants	32
Conclusions	34
LIST OF REFERENCES	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Gamma Measures of Association Among Activities	8
Table 2. Trial Participation Indices	9
Table 3. Participation Rate and Mean Number Other Participations	12
Table 4. Gamma Measures of Inter-Index Associations	13
Table 5. Association Between SASS Scores and Participation	18
Table 6. Status Scores by Mean Number of Participations	19
Table 7. Change Scores by Mean Number of Participations	22
Table 8. Comparison of Black and Self SASS Scores by Mean Number of Participations	25
Table 9. Comparison of White and Self SASS Scores by Mean Number of Participations	27
Table 10. Comparison of White and Black Status Scores by Mean Number of Participations	29

INTRODUCTION

The civil rights movement became a mass movement in the mid-1950's and dominated much attention until the mid-1960's. It is a phenomenon of considerable sociological, as well as human, interest. It presents two major sociological problems: the explanation of the origins of the movement and the explanation of individual participation in it. It is likely that the former problem requires a structural answer, while the latter requires a social psychological one. It is also probable that a different social psychological answer is required for the explanation of white and black participation. The present paper is only concerned with the latter problem: what accounts for differences in degree and type of black participation in the civil rights movement.

RELATIVE DEPRIVATION

Gurr (1970:24) defines the concept of relative deprivation as "actors' perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities." Value expectations refer to the goods and conditions of life to which one feels rightfully entitled, and value capabilities refer to the goods and conditions of life that one feels capable of getting and keeping. This discrepancy between expectations and capabilities may be produced in different ways. The aim of this paper is to identify several patterns that may have contributed to the development of the civil rights movement and to test their relative usefulness in predicting differential participation.

Progressive Deprivation

"Progressive deprivation" is one of several patterns of disequilibrium that may be present in societies (Gurr, 1970:52-58). Long-run improvement in the value positions of individuals generates expectations

of continued improvement. Progressive deprivation results from the stabilization or decline of value capabilities after such a period of improvement. This pattern of disequilibrium is similar to Davies' J-Curve of Rising and Declining Satisfactions (1969:690).

Murphy and Watson (1969) indicate that perceived blockage of legitimate aspirations is an essential component in this development. They suggest that high aspirations are not sufficient to predict support for violence.

...the supporters of violence are those who have accepted the cultural definitions of success in the society, made some gains in achieving these goals, but perceive that the gap between their aspirations and achievements can not be closed because of structural and institutional restrictions. The sense of frustration which results from the comparison between what one wants and has been invited to expect and what one currently enjoys leads to militancy and violence (Murphy and Watson, 1969:2).

Several other researchers cite hopes generated by society beyond the capacity of the society to meet them as an explanation of participation in the civil rights movement (see Meier and Rudwick, 1968; Mack, 1968; Vander Zanden, 1969).

Berkowitz (1968) indicates that this gap between aspirations and achievements can be created either in the manner suggested by Davies or may simply result from the fact that very rapid socio-economic improvements may produce more hopes and expectations that can be fulfilled. "Hopes outstrip reality, even though conditions are rapidly improving for the society as a whole, and many of the people in the society are frustrated (Berkowitz, 1968:45)."

Reference Group Deprivation

The deprivation that derives from reference group comparisons focuses on the gap that exists between what one has and what others

have. If the individual's reference group is perceived as being as deprived as he is, the individual is apt to be content with his lot; if it is more successful, he may develop feelings of deprivation. This pattern of relative deprivation is not totally separable from the progressive deprivation pattern. Perceived gains of reference groups, along with sense of past improvement, may produce rising expectations (see Gurr, 1970:Ch. 4).

During the 1960's blacks have been assumed to evaluate their own and their group's position in relation to the more privileged white segments of society. Middle class blacks may see themselves better off relative to their own group but may feel that they lag behind their white peers and feel relatively deprived with respect to the latter comparison (see Searles and Williams, 1962). Matthews and Prothro (1969) found that black college students perceiving better race relations in their home town than in the South, and those ranking the South low in quality of race relations, were the most active protestors. Thus, activists felt relatively fortunate when comparing their lot to that of other blacks in the South but less well off when using the broader standard of race relations in the larger world.

An alternate interpretation might suggest that blacks experiencing relatively good race relations in their home town may develop high aspirations regarding race relations in the larger world. The frustration of these aspirations yields more discontent than would have occurred without initially high aspirations. Thus, it may be the case that either a reference group or a progressive deprivation interpretation may be utilized with the same data. Alternately, it may be the case that both processes operate simultaneously.

METHODOLOGY

Independent Variables

Centril's Self-Anchoring Striving Scale (SASS) permits gathering data which may be used to test hypotheses involving either notion of relative deprivation. This instrument is designed to tap the unique reality world of an individual to learn what it has in common with that of others and enables comparisons between reality worlds of different individuals, groups and societies.

A person is asked to define on the basis of his own assumptions, perceptions, goals and values the two extremes or anchoring points of the spectrum on which some scale measurement is desired--for example, he may be asked to define the "top" and "bottom," the "good" and "bad," the "best" and "worst." This self-defined continuum is then used as our measuring device (Centril, 1965:22).

The top anchoring point represents the personal wishes and hopes that constitute his conception of the best possible life. At the other end are the fears and frustrations that are part of the worst possible life he can imagine for himself.

Then utilizing a nonverbal ladder device, symbolic of "the ladder of life," he is asked where he thinks he stands on the ladder today, with the top being the best life as he has defined it, the bottom the worst life as he has defined it. He is also asked where he thinks he stood in the past and where he thinks he will stand in the future (Centril, 1965:22).

It is possible to rank collectivities as well as individuals. Centril asked respondents to place their country in terms of present, past and future standings on the ladder.

Individual responses to the SASS (ladder rungs numbered 0 to 10) will serve as the independent variables of this study. Individuals are asked to rank themselves, whites as a group, and blacks as a group using the same definition of the best possible and worst possible life. These

rankings are done for the present, five years in the past, and five years in the future. Fourteen SASS scores are divided into three broad categories of status scores, change scores, and comparison scores.

Status scores measure the distance between the rung the individual/group occupies on the SASS ladder and the top of the ladder as perceived at present and in the future. They measure the gap between achievement and ideal life situation and will be used to test Hypothesis I regarding the effect of deprivation relative to aspirations. These scores are utilized as four measures: personal present, personal future, black present and black future.

Change scores are constructed by comparing present with past and future rankings. This provides an index of changes in the gap between achievement and ideal life situation experienced in the past and anticipated for the future. Change scores will be used to test Hypothesis II regarding the effect of progressive deprivation. Change indices are constructed for personal past change, personal future change, black past change and black future change.

Comparison scores are constructed to measure the gap (or distance) between rungs occupied on the SASS ladder by self and significant reference groups or between blacks and whites. They will be used to test Hypothesis III regarding the effect of reference group deprivation. Six indices are constructed: differences between present rankings of blacks and self, whites and self, blacks and whites and differences in future rankings of blacks and self, whites and self, blacks and whites.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables are made up from the following twelve activities conducted by the civil rights movement:

Honoring a boycott or a picket line.

Financial contributions to civil rights group(s).

Membership in civil rights group(s).

Token picketing (calling public attention to unsatisfactory policies but not interfering with the normal conduct of business).

Mass picketing (picketing in such large numbers or in such a manner as to interfere with the normal conduct of business).

Hit-and-runs (attempts to gain service but leaving when refused).

Sit-ins (attempts to gain service but not leaving when refused).

Street demonstrations, protest marches, and parades.

Lodging, or co-operating in the lodging of, court suits.

Voter registration drives.

Blocking the streets by sitting in them.

Lying down in front of vehicles, trucks, construction vehicles, etc. to interfere with their normal activities.

This sample of activities does not include the use of violence, as violence per se was not characteristic of the civil rights movement of the early and middle 1960's.

Various methods of scoring participation in the civil rights movement have been used. Some researchers have compared individuals who indicated any protest participation and those who indicated none (see Orum and Orum, 1968). Others have compared individuals who engaged in more militant and less militant activities (Matthews and Prothro, 1966). Finally, researchers have compared participants engaged in one specific type activity (see Pinard et al, 1969). Findings were not always consistent. Thus, this study will utilize measures of both degree and type of involvement.

The twelve activities were used to develop four participation indices labeled Passive, Active, Combative and Total. A combination of logical and empirical considerations determined activity placement. Logical considerations provided the starting point and some guidelines and statistical measures determined final placement.

The civil rights movement incorporated several sub-movements which have gravitated toward different kinds of tactics (see Wehr, 1968). It is also likely that there are differences among individuals who engage in sideline activities and those who perform center stage. Trial combinations of indices were developed based upon these assumptions. The Passive index initially included "spectator" kinds of activities such as honoring a picket line, making a financial contribution, or joining a civil rights group. "Typical" nonviolent protest activities (token picketing, protest marches, hit-and-runs, court suits and voter registration drives) were initially incorporated into the Active index. The Combative index originally included the more gladiatorial activities: mass picketing, sit-ins, blocking streets and impeding vehicles. The Total index is the total number of participations and thus combines the other three indices.

Table 1 presents the matrix of associations among individual activities. These Gammas provided the base reference points in drawing up seven trial combinations of indices using variations upon the original Passive-Active-Combative classification system. Table 2 reports the Gammas associated with these seven trial combinations. It is clear that the original combination (F) was not the best empirical cluster of activities. The best grand average Gamma is achieved by combination A. The average Gammas for the Passive and Active indices (.599 and .699,

Table 1. Gamma Measures of Association Among Activities

Item ^a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1												
2	.249											
3	.429	.686										
4	.616	.008	.491									
5	.656	.034	.473	.750								
6	.633	-.093	.367	.740	.902							
7	.366	.298	.323	.400	-.025	.173						
8	.587	.346	.462	.870	.685	.478	.258					
9	.700	.691	.881	.848	.766	.648	.778	.824				
10	.304	.557	.515	.408	-.059	.137	.448	.618	.398			
11	.461	-.692	-.333	.762	.745	.536	.853	.356	.673	.271		
12	.143	-.456	.007	.565	-.537	.238	.714	.619	.823	1.00	1.00	

^a1, Honor picket line; 2, Contributions; 3, Membership; 4, Token picketing; 5, Mass picketing; 6, Protest marches; 7, Hit-and-runs; 8, Sit-ins; 9, Court suits; 10, Voter registration drives; 11, Blocking streets; 12, Impeding vehicles.

Table 2. Trial Participation Indices

Combination	Individual Activity and Corresponding Gamma ^a	Index Avg. ^b	Grand Avg. ^c
A: Passive	2(.653), 3(.610), 10(.533)	.599	
Active	1(.577), 4(.750), 5(.812), 6(.707), 8(.650)	.699	.725
Combative	7(.779), 9(.745), 11(.939), 12(.949)	.853	
B: Passive	1(.336), 2(.567), 3(.599), 10(.490)	.506	
Active	4(.794), 5(.839), 6(.751), 8(.665)	.762	.707
Combative	7(.779), 9(.745), 11(.939), 12(.949)	.853	
C: Passive	2(.653), 3(.610), 10(.533)	.599	
Active	1(.584), 4(.684), 5(.815), 6(.766)	.712	.682
Combative	7(.465), 8(.461), 9(.823), 11(.880), 12(.907)	.707	
D: Passive	2(.653), 3(.610), 10(.533)	.599	
Active	1(.594), 4(.705), 5(.761), 6(.730), 7(.276)	.613	.673
Combative	8(.747), 9(.796), 11(.727), 12(.940)	.802	
E: Passive	1(.336), 2(.567), 3(.599), 10(.490)	.506	
Active	4(.722), 5(.857), 6(.843)	.807	.665
Combative	7(.465), 8(.461), 9(.823), 11(.880), 12(.907)	.707	
F: Passive	1(.346), 2(.518), 3(.597)	.487	
Active	4(.732), 6(.403), 7(.474), 9(.809), 10(.312)	.546	.605
Combative	5(.684), 8(.648), 11(.849), 12(.885)	.766	
G: Passive-	1(.577), 2(.345), 3(.582), 4(.570), 6(.416),		
Active	10(.428)	.486	
Active-	5(.528), 7(.242), 8(.619), 9(.867), 11(.844),		.570
Combative	12(.819)	.653	

^aThe numbers in parentheses are Gammas that report the association of the individual activity to the participation index in which it is included, with the effect of that individual activity removed. For example, in combination A the Passive index consists of items 2, 3 and 10. The Gamma reported by activity 2 is the relation of activity 2 to the combination of activities 3 and 10 (Passive index minus activity 2). The numbers outside the parentheses refer to the individual activities: 1, Honor picket line; 2, Contributions; 3, Membership; 4, Token picketing; 5, Mass picketing; 6, Protest marches; 7, Hit-and-runs; 8, Sit-ins; 9, Court suits; 10, Voter registration drives; 11, Blocking streets; 12, Impeding vehicles.

^bComputed using only the individual activities--and their corresponding Gammas--included in the particular index.

^cComputed using the individual activities--and their corresponding Gammas--for all three indices.

respectively) indicate a moderate to high degree of interrelatedness of the included items, but they rank below the average Gamma of the Combative index (.853). In all the trial combinations the average index Gammas are higher than .480 and the decision as to which was the best combination was based solely on the best grand average Gamma.

The particular grouping of items in combination A is not as logically neat as originally anticipated but is compatible with the rationale underlying a breakdown of activities into a Passive-Active-Combative classification. Of the Passive index only activity 10 (participation in voter registration drives) is not on face characteristics a sideline activity. Fifty-four per cent of the sample reported participation in this activity, which is the second highest participation rate achieved by any activity. As suggested below, this high participation rate implies a spectator kind of behavior.

Voter registration drives, membership and financial contributions are activities that require minimal contact with whites. They may take place in a primarily black context and thus may differ in meaning to the participant from either Active or Combative activities. Honoring a picket line (originally placed in the Passive index) may involve an element of black-white confrontation and thus may logically, as well as, empirically, belong in the Active index. Final placement between Active and Combative indices was made on empirical grounds. However, with the exception of sit-ins it does appear that activities included within the Active index have less of an element of direct combat with whites than do activities included within the Combative index.

Two further checks of logical validity were made before finalizing the decision to use combination A. Milbrath (1965:16-30) suggests that

a list of conventional political activities forms a hierarchy from behaviors most often to those least often performed. Participation in items on the hierarchy is also cumulative. Those who engage in "topmost" behaviors are likely to perform behaviors lower in rank, but those engaging in low ranking behaviors are unlikely to participate in high ranking ones. This may be generalized to apply to unconventional behaviors. Table 3 presents the percentage participating in each activity and mean number of other participations reported.

The indices of combination A form a perfect hierarchy. The percentage participating in the activities of the Passive index are 72, 50 and 54, respectively. These are the three highest participation rates. Participation rates for the Active index are 43, 22, 23, 38 and 19 per cent, respectively. The Combative index provides the lowest participation rates (15, 9, 2 and 1 per cent, respectively). An examination of the last column in Table 3 reveals that all items included within the Combative index score a higher mean number of other participations than any of the items included within the Passive index. Two activities (items 7 and 8) spoil a perfect rank order for the Active and Combative indices.

Finally, the interrelationship of participation indices was examined and is reported in Table 4. The low to moderate inter-index Gammas suggest that the indices measure different, but related, participation dimensions. This provides support for the belief that the use of separate indices will yield information that could not be gained from a simple analysis of total number of participations.

Sample

The data were collected in the summer of 1964 by James A. Geschwender. A 100 per cent sample of students in sociology classes at

Table 3. Participation Rate and Mean Number Other Participations

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Per Cent Participating</u>	<u>Mean Other Participations</u>
1, Honor picket line	43	4.09
2, Contributions	72	3.04
3, Membership	50	3.86
4, Token picketing	22	5.30
5, Mass picketing	23	4.91
6, Protest marches	38	4.19
7, Hit-and-runs	15	4.55
8, Sit-ins	19	5.34
9, Court suits	9	6.71
10, Voter registration drives	54	3.55
11, Blocking streets	2	6.00
12, Impeding vehicles	1	6.50
Total N = 149	Passive index: Activities 2, 3, 10	
	Active index: Activities 1, 4, 5, 6, 8	
	Combative index: Activities 7, 9, 11, 12	

Table 4. Gamma Measures of Inter-Index Associations

Passive index x Active index	.298
Passive index x Combative index	.386
Active index x Combative index	.407
Passive index x Total^a index	.310
Active index x Total^b index	.179
Combative index x Total^c index	.435

^aActive plus Combative indices.

^bPassive plus Combative indices.

^cPassive plus Active indices.

all-black Florida A & M University responded to a questionnaire eliciting their attitudes toward, and participation in, the civil rights movement (N=149). The Self-Anchoring Striving Scale was also administered eliciting rankings of self, blacks and whites at three points in time. A student sample was utilized because black college students were the most numerous and most visible supporters of the civil rights movement.

Development of Hypotheses

Hypotheses are developed separately for status, change and comparison scores and are presented below.

Status Scores

Several studies of the student civil rights movement have shown participants to have generally higher socio-economic backgrounds than nonparticipants (Orbell, 1967; Searles and Williams, 1962; Matthews and Prothro, 1966; Ch. 14). Wehr (1968) reports that his sample of black college students (94 per cent of whom had participated in the movement in some way) largely came from the middle and upper class elements of the Southern black community and that they were hopeful of their own personal future and of achieving higher social status within American society. Thus, it is to be expected that a small gap between achievement and aspirations will be associated with activism.

It does not follow, however, that higher levels of activism will be found among those who perceive blacks as experiencing a small discrepancy gap relative to an ideal life situation. Orbell (1967) concludes that perception of group deprivation, but not individual deprivation, was associated with high levels of protest.

...there is a marked association between protest and feelings about the general position of the whole Negro race; among students who recorded "high" on a measure of satisfaction

with the present racial situation 28 per cent were participants; among those recording "low" 52 per cent were participants (Orbell, 1967:55-56).

For the purposes of Hypothesis I relative deprivation is operationally defined as the gap between the respondent's ranking at present (or anticipated in the future) and his aspirations. SASS status scores as measures of relative deprivation are similarly used by Curr (1970:64-65), Crawford and Naditch (1970:210) and Bowen et al (1968:192).

Hypotheses specifying relationships between SASS scores and participation are presented below. In the presentation of hypotheses and the discussion of findings the terms "status score" and "discrepancy gap" will both be used. It must be kept in mind that these are inversely related. Persons with a high status score have a small discrepancy gap, and persons with a low status score have a large discrepancy gap. The hypotheses will be tested utilizing Gamma to measure strength of relationship between SASS scores and participation and t -tests of the significance of difference in mean number of participations within indices. Significance of Gamma will be tested by a formula for χ presented by Freeman (1965:170-72).

Hypothesis IA: There will be a positive association between participation and personal status scores for both present and future.

Hypothesis IB: There will be a negative association between participation and black status scores for both present and future.

Change Scores

The progressive deprivation hypothesis includes two elements: the "rising expectations" notion discussed by Berkowitz and "perception of blockage" discussed by Murphy and Watson (see above). In the hypotheses that follow they will be separately analyzed. Past improvements

stimulate the development of high aspirations for the future. Development of aspirations may outstrip actual rate of improvement and cause dissatisfaction. Thus, the rising expectations component of the progressive deprivation hypothesis should be revealed in perception of past progress. Cataldo and Kellstedt (1968:89-90) found that sense of personal past progress (as measured by the SASS) was positively related to propensity to join in street demonstration and to riot if necessary to get public officials to correct political wrongs. SASS scores do not permit direct tests of all steps involved in this hypothesis. They do permit testing the relationship between the end points; namely, that individuals who sense greater personal (black) past gain will have higher levels of participation.

The blocked aspirations component of the progressive deprivation hypothesis has its impact after the development of rising expectations and should reveal itself in pessimism regarding future progress. Discontent derives from comparing aspirations with the expectation that they will not be fulfilled. Von Eschen et al (1969:312-14) found the discrepancy between aspirations and expectations to be related both to early joining and intensity of activity in a sit-in movement.

Unfortunately, sample size prevented the control of level of status in analyzing perception of past and future change. Obviously, those respondents who record past status as high cannot be expected to perceive either much past or future progress. In fact, only seven respondents record personal past status as high (ladder steps 8-10) and 10 respondents record black past status as high.

Hypothesis IIA: There will be a positive association between participation and perception of past progress for both blacks and self.

Hypothesis IIB: There will be a negative association between participation and anticipated future progress for both blacks and self.

Comparison Scores

Speculation about the relationship of black protest participation and reference group comparisons has been along the lines that protestors see themselves as better off than blacks and worse off than whites (see Matthews and Prothro, 1966:424; and Searles and Williams, 1962:216). A logical extension of this reasoning predicts higher participation rates for individuals who perceive whites as better off than blacks.

Hypothesis IIIA: There will be a negative association between participation and comparison indices (black minus self scores) for present and future.

Hypothesis IIIB: There will be a positive association between participation and comparison indices (white minus self scores) for present and future.

Hypothesis IIIC: There will be a positive association between participation and comparison indices (white minus black scores) for present and future.

FINDINGS

Hypothesis IA: There will be a positive association between participation and personal status scores.

There are four Gammas reporting the relationship between personal present rankings and the indices of participation (see Table 5). No Gamma exceeds .100. A comparison of mean number of participations (see Table 6) indicates that those individuals who perceive a large discrepancy gap have the highest levels of activity for three of the four indices. However, none of the differences between means are statistically significant.

For personal future rankings none of the Gammas exceed .200. A comparison of mean number of participations reveals that higher activity

Table 5. Association Between SASS Scores and Participation

<u>SASS Score</u>	<u>Passive Index</u>	<u>Active Index</u>	<u>Combative Index</u>	<u>Total Index</u>
Personal Present	-.078 ^a	-.058	.013	-.069
Personal Future	-.197	.113	-.018	.009
Black Present	-.121	-.161	-.308 (1.68)	-.185 (1.87)
Black Future	-.201 (1.64)	-.195 (1.69)	-.497 (3.08)	-.257 (2.48)
Personal Past Change	-.034	-.023	.231	.026
Black Past Change	-.105	-.088	-.370	-.128
Personal Future Change	-.205 (1.90)	.053	-.112	-.064
Black Future Change	.061	-.041	-.092	-.010
Black Present-Personal Present	-.181 (1.80)	-.117	-.315 (1.94)	-.172 (1.99)
Black Future-Personal Future	.024	-.153	-.272 (1.79)	-.126
White Present-Personal Present	-.009	.000	-.204	-.026
White Future-Personal Future	.092	.020	-.047	-.008
White Present-Black Present	.081	.027	-.021	.060
White Future-Black Future	.101	.112	.162	.121

^aGamma Measures of Association, computed on detailed breakdown of actual number of participations; z-scores reported in parantheses when significant at .05 level or beyond.

Table 6. Status Scores by Mean Number of Participations

Future Status Scores											
Index	Present Status Scores						Future Status Scores				
	0-4 ^a	5-7 ^b	8-10 ^c	t ^d			0-7 ^b	8-10 ^c	t ^d		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	1-2	2-3	1-3					
Passive	1.87	1.73	1.69	NS	NS	NS	1.97	1.70	NS		
Active	1.44	1.56	1.19	NS	NS	NS	1.19	1.53	NS		
Combative	0.33	0.25	0.27	NS	NS	NS	0.35	0.25	NS		
Total	3.64	3.54	3.15	NS	NS	NS	3.52	3.48	NS		
Number	39	84	26	31						116	
BLACKS	0-4 ^a	5-7 ^b	8-10 ^c	t ^d			0-4 ^a	5-7 ^b	8-10 ^c	t ^d	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	1-2	2-3	1-3	(1)	(2)	(3)	1-2 2-3 1-3	
	Passive	1.85	1.69	1.60	NS	NS	NS	1.82	2.00	1.65	NS 1.79 NS
	Active	1.63	1.31	1.40	NS	NS	NS	1.82	1.66	1.34	NS NS NS
	Combative	0.35	0.23	0.10	NS	NS	1.98	0.82	0.41	0.15	NS 2.23 1.83
	Total	3.84	3.23	3.10	NS	NS	NS	4.45	4.07	3.14	NS 2.17 NS
	Number	68	71	10	11 41 97						

^aTermed large discrepancy gap between achievement and aspirations.

^bTermed medium discrepancy gap.

^cTermed small discrepancy gap.

^dt-scores reported when significant at .05 level or beyond.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000	1001	1002	1003	1004	1005	1006	1007	1008	1009	1010	1011	1012	1013	1014	1015	1016	1017	1018	1019	1020	1021	1022	1023	1024	1025	1026	1027	1028	1029	1030	1031	1032	1033	1034	1035	1036	1037	1038	1039	1040	1041	1042	1043	1044	1045	1046	1047	1048	1049	1050	1051	1052	1053	1054	1055	1056	1057	1058	1059	1060	1061	1062	1063	1064	1065	1066	1067	1068	1069	1070	1071	1072	1073	1074	1075	1076	1077	1078	1079	1080	1081	1082	1083	1084	1085	1086	1087	1088	1089	1090	1091	1092	1093	1094	1095	1096	1097	1098	1099	1100	1101	1102	1103	1104	1105	1106	1107	1108	1109	1110	1111	1112	1113	1114	1115	1116	1117	1118	1119	1120	1121	1122	1123	1124	1125	1126	1127	1128	1129	1130	1131	1132	1133	1134	1135	1136	1137	1138	1139	1140	1141	1142	1143	1144	1145	1146	1147	1148	1149	1150	1151	1152	1153	1154	1155	1156	1157	1158	1159	1160	1161	1162	1163	1164	1165	1166	1167	1168	1169	1170	1171	1172	1173	1174	1175	1176	1177	1178	1179	1180	1181	1182	1183	1184	1185	1186	1187	1188	1189	1190	1191	1192	1193	1194	1195	1196	1197	1198	1199	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1205	1206	1207	1208	1209	1210	1211	1212	1213	1214	1215	1216	1217	1218	1219	1220	1221	1222	1223	1224	1225	1226	1227	1228	1229	1230	1231	1232	1233	1234	1235	1236	1237	1238	1239	1240	1241	1242	1243	1244	1245	1246	1247	1248	1249	1250	1251	1252	1253	1254	1255	1256	1257	1258	1259	1260	1261	1262	1263	1264	1265	1266	1267	1268	1269	1270	1271	1272	1273	1274	1275	1276	1277	1278	1279	1280	1281	1282	1283	1284	1285	1286	1287	1288	1289	1290	1291	1292	1293	1294	1295	1296	1297	1298	1299	1300	1301	1302	1303	1304	1305	1306	1307	1308	1309	1310	1311	1312	1313	1314	1315	1316	1317	1318	1319	1320	1321	1322	1323	1324	1325	1326	1327	1328	1329	1330	1331	1332	1333	1334	1335	1336	1337	1338	1339	1340	1341	1342	1343	1344	1345	1346	1347	1348	1349	1350	1351	1352	1353	1354	1355	1356	1357	1358	1359	1360	1361	1362	1363	1364	1365	1366	1367	1368	1369	1370	1371	1372	1373	1374	1375	1376	1377	1378	1379	1380	1381	1382	1383	1384	1385	1386	1387	1388	1389	1390	1391	1392	1393	1394	1395	1396	1397	1398	1399	1400	1401	1402	1403	1404	1405	1406	1407	1408	1409	1410	1411	1412	1413	1414	1415	1416	1417	1418	1419	1420	1421	1422	1423	1424	1425	1426	1427	1428	1429	1430	1431	1432	1433	1434	1435	1436	1437	1438	1439	1440	1441	1442	1443	1444	1445	1446	1447	1448	1449	1450	1451	1452	1453	1454	1455	1456	1457	1458	1459	1460	1461	1462	1463	1464	1465	1466	1467	1468	1469	1470	1471	1472	1473	1474	1475	1476	1477	1478	1479	1480	1481	1482	1483	1484	1485	1486	1487	1488	1489	1490	1491	1492	1493	1494	1495	14
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	----

levels tend to be related to perception of a medium discrepancy gap (with the exception of the Active index), but no difference is statistically significant. Neither personal present nor personal future is a useful predictor of activism.

Hypothesis 1B: There will be a negative association between participation and black status scores.

All four Gammas reporting the relationship between black present scores and activism are in the predicted direction (see Table 5); only the Combative exceeds .200 and only the Combative and Total indices are statistically significant. Eleven out of 12 differences between means are in the predicted direction (see Table 6), but only one of the Combative comparisons is statistically significant.

For black future rankings three of the four Gammas exceed .200. All four are in the predicted direction and all are statistically significant. The strongest measure of association is found with the Combative index. Eleven out of 12 differences between means are in the predicted direction and four of these are statistically significant, of which two occur with the Combative index. For the Active, Combative and Total indices the relationship tends to be linear. Black future scores, then, are found to be a relatively good predictor of civil rights activism, with the strongest relationship occurring with the Combative index. Black present scores did predict Combative (and Total index) activities but no other.

To summarize: There is no empirical support for Hypothesis 1A. Hypothesis 1B must be divided into predictions dealing with present and future rankings. It receives empirical support across all four indices when utilizing future rankings, but is supported only for the Combative (and Total index) when utilizing present rankings.

Hypothesis IIA: There will be a positive association between participation and perception of past progress.

Of the four Gammas reporting the relationship between perception of personal past change and participation only one exceeds .200, and it is not statistically significant (see Table 5). With the exception of the Passive index, those individuals who perceive substantial past progress tend to have the highest mean number of participations (see Table 7). However, the relationships are not linear and none of the differences between means are statistically significant.

An examination of black past change scores reveals only one Gamma that exceeds .200 and it is not statistically significant. Those individuals who perceive moderate past progress have the highest mean number of participations on all four indices. For the Combative and Total indices the differences in mean participations between those who perceive moderate past progress and substantial past progress are statistically significant. Perception of substantial black past progress does not appear to contribute to higher levels of activism, but perception of lesser amounts of past progress may contribute to higher activity rates on the Combative and Total indices. Perception of personal past progress does not appear to be a good predictor of civil rights activism.

Hypothesis IIB: There will be a negative association between participation and anticipated future progress.

For personal future change scores only the Passive index Gamma exceeds .200. It is both in the predicted direction and statistically significant (see Table 5). Those individuals who perceive substantial future progress have the lowest mean number of participations on all four indices (see Table 7). The relationship is linear only for the Passive index. In the other three instances those who anticipate moderate future

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It mentions the use of surveys, interviews, and focus groups to gather information from stakeholders. Additionally, it discusses the application of statistical analysis to interpret the collected data.

3. The third part describes the process of identifying key performance indicators (KPIs) and how they are used to measure the organization's progress. It highlights the need for regular monitoring and reporting of these indicators to management and other relevant parties.

4. The fourth part focuses on the importance of communication and collaboration in the implementation of the project. It stresses that all team members must be kept informed of the progress and any challenges encountered. Regular meetings and open lines of communication are encouraged to facilitate this.

5. The fifth part discusses the role of the project manager in coordinating the various activities and ensuring that the project stays on track. It mentions the importance of setting clear goals and deadlines, as well as providing support and guidance to the team members.

6. The sixth part addresses the potential risks and challenges that may arise during the project. It suggests that a risk assessment should be conducted at the beginning of the project to identify these risks and develop strategies to mitigate them. It also emphasizes the need for flexibility and adaptability in the face of unexpected changes.

7. The seventh part discusses the importance of documentation and record-keeping throughout the project. It mentions that all decisions, actions, and communications should be properly documented to provide a clear history of the project's progress.

8. The eighth part focuses on the final evaluation and reporting of the project. It mentions that a comprehensive report should be prepared at the end of the project, detailing the achievements, challenges, and lessons learned. This report should be shared with all stakeholders to provide a transparent overview of the project's outcome.

9. The ninth part discusses the importance of continuous improvement and learning from the project experience. It suggests that the organization should regularly review its processes and procedures to identify areas for improvement and implement changes accordingly.

10. The tenth part concludes the document by reiterating the importance of the project and the commitment of the organization to its successful completion. It expresses confidence in the team's ability to overcome any challenges and achieve the project's objectives.

Table 7. Change Scores by Mean Number of Participations

Past Change Scores							Future Change Scores						
Index	No Gain ^a (1)	Mod. ^b Gain ^b (2)	Sub. Gain ^c (3)	t ^d			Least Gain ^e (1)	Mod. ^f Gain ^f (2)	Sub. Gain ^g (3)	t ^d			
				1-2	2-3	1-3				1-2	2-3	1-3	
SELF	Passive	1.88	1.72	1.77	NS	NS	NS	1.94	1.65	1.52	NS	NS	1.66
	Active	1.46	1.43	1.54	NS	NS	NS	1.30	1.73	1.14	NS	1.76	NS
	Combative	0.25	0.26	0.34	NS	NS	NS	0.27	0.32	0.14	NS	NS	NS
	Total	3.58	3.41	3.66	NS	NS	NS	3.51	3.70	2.81	NS	NS	NS
Number		24	90	35									
BLACKS	Passive	1.58	1.85	1.59	NS	NS	NS	1.76	1.62	1.97	NS	NS	NS
	Active	0.92	1.65	1.19	NS	NS	NS	1.52	1.36	1.53	NS	NS	NS
	Combative	0.25	0.35	0.08	NS	<u>3.26</u>	NS	0.35	0.21	0.24	NS	NS	NS
	Total	2.75	3.85	2.86	NS	<u>2.37</u>	NS	3.53	3.19	3.74	NS	NS	NS
Number		12	99	37									

^aIncludes those who perceive no change or downward mobility.

^bIncludes those who perceive gain of one or two ladder steps.

^cIncludes those who perceive gain of three to eight ladder steps.

^d t -scores reported when significant at .05 level or beyond, using a one-tailed test when the difference between means is in the predicted direction and a two-tailed test when not; underlined t -scores indicate use of a two-tailed test.

^eIncludes those who anticipate downward mobility, no change, or gain of one or two ladder steps.

^fIncludes those who anticipate gain of three or four ladder steps.

^gIncludes those who anticipate gain of five to nine ladder steps.

progress have the highest rates of participation. Two of the differences between means (one each on the Passive and Active indices) are statistically significant.

The Gammas reveal the absence of a relationship between black future change scores and activity in the civil rights movement. None of the Gammas exceed .100. Persons who perceive moderate future progress have the lowest mean number of participations on all four indices but none of the differences between means are statistically significant. Future change scores relative to self may have some predictive utility for Passive index activities. It may also be the case that perception of moderate future progress may stimulate participation in Active index protest. Future change scores relative to blacks do not appear to be good predictors of activism.

To summarize: Hypothesis IIA receives no empirical support. However, two significant findings emerge from the analysis of mean number of participations. Individuals who see moderate amounts of black past progress are the most active participants on both the Combative and Total indices. The lack of linearity does not permit concluding that Hypothesis IIA is supported. Hypothesis IIB receives support only when considering personal progress and the Passive index. There is one other significant finding. Persons who anticipate moderate personal future progress have the highest levels of participation on the Active index.

Hypothesis IIIA: There will be a negative association between participation and comparison indices (black minus self scores).

All four Gammas that report the association between black and personal present indices and participation are in the predicted direction (see Table 5). Only one exceeds .200 but (with the exception of the

Active index) three are statistically significant. When the differences between means are examined (see Table 8), they reveal that (with the exception of the Active index) those who see themselves ranking substantially higher than blacks have the highest activity rates. Those who perceive no difference have the lowest activity rates on all four indices. One or more of the differences between means are statistically significant on all four indices.

When black and personal future rankings are considered, three of the four Gammas are in the predicted direction. Only one exceeds .200 and it is statistically significant (Combative index). Comparison of mean number of participations reveals that, with the exception of the Passive index, those individuals who see their own future substantially higher than black future are the most active. Several of the differences between means on the Combative and Total indices are statistically significant. There is no consistent relationship between seeing no differences in status rankings and the lowest levels of participation.

Perception of differences between oneself and blacks may be useful in predicting activity in the civil rights movement. When present rankings are considered, there is some indication that seeing oneself doing better than blacks contributes to the highest levels of activism; seeing blacks doing better contributes to intermediate levels; and seeing no difference contributes to the lowest levels of activism. This relationship holds less strongly for the Active index. The data linking perceptions of black and personal future rankings and activism are not as strong as those found with present rankings and the pattern of relationships with participation tends to diverge.

Table 8. Comparison of Black and Self SASS Scores by Mean Number of Participations.

Index	Self		Mod. Hr. ^b	N.D. (3)	Blk. Hr. (4)	t ^c			
	Sub. Hr. ^a	Self Hr. ^b				1-2	2-3	1-3	2-4
Passive	2.20	1.76	1.53	1.68	1.68	1.82	NS	2.50	NS
Active	1.40	1.68	1.03	1.40	1.40	NS	2.06	NS	NS
Combative	0.40	0.34	0.10	0.20	0.20	NS	2.18	1.82	NS
Total	4.00	3.77	2.67	3.28	3.28	NS	2.59	2.31	NS
Number	20	74	30	25	25				
Passive	1.74	1.81	1.54	2.10	2.10	NS	NS	NS	NS
Active	2.05	1.42	1.38	1.24	1.24	NS	NS	NS	NS
Combative	0.68	0.22	0.25	0.10	0.10	1.88	NS	1.75	NS
Total	4.47	3.46	3.17	3.43	3.43	NS	NS	1.99	NS
Number	19	59	48	21	21				

^aIncludes those who rank themselves three to eight ladder steps higher than blacks for present rankings, and three to seven steps higher for future rankings.

^bIncludes those who rank themselves one or two ladder steps higher than blacks.

^ct-scores reported when significant at .05 level or beyond.

Hypothesis IIIB: There will be a positive association between participation and comparison indices (white minus self scores).

When white and personal present indices are considered, there is only one Gamma that exceeds .200 and it is not statistically significant (see Table 5). For three of the four indices (excepting the Passive index) those individuals who perceive no difference in status rankings (including those who see themselves doing better) tend to have higher rates of participation than those who see whites ranking higher. None of the differences between means are statistically significant (see Table 9).

None of the Gammas that report the association between white and personal future indices and participation exceed .100. An examination of the differences between means for the Active and Combative indices reveals a tendency for those who rank themselves higher than whites to be more active and for those who see no difference to be the least active. However, those who see whites doing better tend to be more active on the Passive and Total indices. None of the differences between means for any of the indices are statistically significant. There appears to be no empirical relationship between perceptions of either present or future white-self inequality and participation in the civil rights movement.

Hypothesis IIIC: There will be a positive association between participation and comparison indices (white minus black scores).

None of the Gammas that report the association between white and black present indices and participation exceed .100 (see Table 5). An examination of the means for all four indices reveals that those who perceive whites doing substantially better than blacks are the most active, but the relationships are not linear (except for the Passive index) and none of the differences between means are statistically significant (see

Table 9. Comparison of White and Self SASS Scores by Mean Number of Participations

Index	N.D. ^a (1)	Wh.			t ^e			
		Slit. Hr. (2)	Mod. Hr. (3)	Sub. Hr. (4)	1-2	2-3	3-4	1-4
Passive	1.73	1.69	1.90	1.59	NS	NS	NS	NS
Active	1.58	1.31	1.44	1.56	NS	NS	NS	NS
Combative	0.35	0.31	0.19	0.29	NS	NS	NS	NS
Total	3.65	3.31	3.54	3.44	NS	NS	NS	NS
Number	26	36	52	34				
<u>FUTURE</u>								
Index	Self Hr. (1)	Wh.			t ^e			
		N.D. (2)	Hr. (3)		1-2	2-3	1-3	
Passive	1.61	1.77	1.81		NS	NS	NS	
Active	1.55	1.40	1.47		NS	NS	NS	
Combative	0.32	0.21	0.31		NS	NS	NS	
Total	3.48	3.39	3.59		NS	NS	NS	
Number	31	57	58					

^aIncludes those who rank themselves and whites the same and those who rank themselves higher than whites.

^bIncludes those who rank whites one or two ladder steps higher than themselves.

^cIncludes those who rank whites three or four ladder steps higher than themselves.

^dIncludes those who rank whites five to ten ladder steps higher than themselves.

^et-scores reported when significant at .05 level or beyond.

Table 10).

When white and black future indices are considered, none of the Gammas exceed .200. Those who see whites doing substantially better have the highest mean number of participations on all four indices. The relationships tend to be linear (except for the Active index) but none of the differences in activity rates are statistically significant. Neither perceptions of present nor future white and black inequality appear to be good predictors of activism.

To summarize: Hypothesis IIIA must be separated into present and future rankings. It receives support for the Passive, Combative and Total indices when dealing with present rankings; for the Active index differences in mean number of participations indicate that those who perceive self doing moderately better than blacks are the most active. It receives support only for the Combative index when future rankings are utilized; for the Total index, differences in mean number of participations indicate that those who perceive themselves doing substantially better than blacks have the highest activity rates. Neither Hypothesis IIIB nor IIIC receives empirical support.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The object of this paper has been threefold. First, it has attempted to ascertain whether relative deprivation contributed to participation in the civil rights movement. Second, it has examined the relative predictive utility of several patterns of relative deprivation. Third, it has evaluated the utility of constructing a typology of protest activities in order to determine whether different types of activities are differentially related to the relative deprivation measures. These objectives will be considered in the discussion presented below. The

Table 10. Comparison of White and Black Status Scores by Mean Number of Participations

Index	Wh. Sl _t Hr. (1)	Wh. Mod _t Hr. (2)	Wh. Sub _t Hr. (3)	t^d		
				1-2	2-3	1-3
Passive	1.65	1.77	1.82	NS	NS	NS
Active	1.46	1.28	1.62	NS	NS	NS
<u>PRESENT</u> Combative	0.26	0.26	0.29	NS	NS	NS
Total	3.37	3.30	3.73	NS	NS	NS
Number	46	47	55			
Index	N.D. ^e (1)	Wh. Mod _t Hr. (2)	Wh. Sub _t Hr. (3)	t^d		
				1-2	2-3	1-3
Passive	1.69	1.74	1.93	NS	NS	NS
Active	1.44	1.36	1.71	NS	NS	NS
<u>FUTURE</u> Combative	0.20	0.26	0.46	NS	NS	NS
Total	3.33	3.36	4.11	NS	NS	NS
Number	54	66	28			

^aIncludes those who rank whites one or two ladder steps higher than blacks, those who rank whites and blacks the same, and those who rank blacks higher than whites.

^bIncludes those who rank whites three or four ladder steps higher than blacks.

^cIncludes those who rank whites five to ten ladder steps higher than blacks.

^d t -scores reported when significant at .05 level or beyond.

^eIncludes those who rank blacks and whites the same and those who rank blacks higher than whites.

^fIncludes those who rank whites one or two ladder steps higher than blacks.

^gIncludes those who rank whites three to seven ladder steps higher than blacks.

initial discussion will combine the first two objectives.

Summary

Aspirational deprivation defined as the gap between present (future) achievement and aspirations bears no relationship to participation when defined in personal terms. Aspirational deprivation defined in group terms produces participation in Combative activities when present level of achievement is considered and produces participation in all activities when future level of achievement is considered. It is probably the case that regardless of personal prospects in a biracial society, blacks are primarily defined by others in terms of their group identification. Thus, group rather than personal prospects may be the salient dimension for determining participation. Perhaps Marx states it best.

Recognition that the problems of Negroes are group problems, and that the rights and privileges of an individual depend in large measure upon the status of the group to which he belongs, is an important defining characteristic of the current civil rights movement, and those who have this perspective are much more likely to be militant than those who do not. (Marx, 1969:83)

Rising expectations (perception of past progress) defined in group terms only contributes to participation to the extent that those seeing moderate black gains may be the most active in Combative type protest. Blocked aspirations (perception of little or no future progress) defined in personal terms appears to be productive of only Passive type activities. Perception of moderate personal gain may also contribute to higher participation rates on the Active index. Progressive deprivation defined in either personal or group terms does not appear to be productive of participation in any protest activity.

It may be the case that the pattern of progressive deprivation is applicable to black protest activities only after the decline of the

non-violent phase of the civil rights movement. The phenomena of black power and urban ghetto riots may have been a response to both the successes and failures of the civil rights movement. The movement may have stimulated elevated aspirations through its apparent successes. A combination of growing white resistance and the failure of the movement to effect drastic changes in the life situations of most blacks may have precipitated more discontent than had previously been felt. (See Davies, 1969, for a similar interpretation of the rise of black violence in the 1960's; Murphy and Watson, 1969, empirically demonstrate a relationship between level of aspiration, perception of blockage and support for riot activity.)

Reference group deprivation does not appear to be productive of participation. However, reference group success defined as self doing better than group is productive of Passive and Combative activities when defined relative to the present and is productive of Combative activities when defined relative to the future. Seeing self doing moderately better than blacks at present may also contribute to higher participation rates on the Active index.

Thus, SASS comparison scores indicate that activists feel advantaged relative to their group but do not feel that either they personally or their group is deprived relative to whites. SASS status scores indicate that activists expect their group (blacks) to be deprived relative to aspirations. Runciman (1968) makes a similar kind of distinction between personal and group relative deprivation. One might be relatively advantaged where his own situation is involved but may feel that the relative position of his group is not what it should be. The combination of findings from the status and comparison scores re-emphasizes the role of

perceived group deprivation rather than personal deprivation in explaining participation.

Characteristics of Participants

It has been shown that the relative deprivation measures differentially relate to the constructed typology of protest activities. Background characteristics also differ among those active with respect to the different indices. A brief discussion is presented below.

Persons over 35 years of age have the highest mean number of participations on the Passive index, while those under 25 years of age have the highest mean number of participations on the Active and Combative indices (findings are significant for all three indices). Males have significantly higher participation rates for the Active and Combative indices. The difference is in the same direction but not significant for the Passive index.

Those employed full-time are more active on the Passive index (non-significant), while those who are not employed full-time have significantly higher participation rates on both the Active and Combative indices. Juniors and seniors are more active than either underclassmen or graduate students on all three indices (findings are significant only for the Active and Combative indices).

There is no significant relationship between father's occupation (white collar, blue collar, or farm) and participation, although those who come from a farm background are most active in Passive-type protest and those who come from a white collar background have the highest rates of participation for the Active and Combative indices. Father's level of education is found to be significantly related to all three indices (years of schooling was grouped into 0-8, 9-11, 12, and at least some

college levels). The most active in Passive index protest report their father's level of education to be 9-11 years; the highest participation rates on the Active index are exhibited by those who report at least some college; and the fathers of the most active participants on the Combative index have 12 years of schooling.

Thus, the profile of those most active on the Passive index is that of an older student who is employed full time (mostly in a professional-technical capacity). Their personal prospects regarding future progress are perceived as dim, although they see themselves doing better than blacks at present. The advanced age of the activists is consistent with their lack of anticipated future progress, and their occupational level is consistent with seeing themselves better off than blacks. If it is assumed that those employed in a professional-technical capacity are likely to be under white supervision, then it may also follow that this limits possible participation to money, membership and voter registration drives.

The profile of those with highest participation rates on the Active index somewhat resembles the profile of civil rights participants presented in the literature. They tend to be young, full-time students from relatively advantaged backgrounds as measured by father's education. They are more optimistic about personal future progress than those active in Passive index protest. Lack of full-time employment permits both engaging in more time-consuming activities and activities unpopular with the white community.

The profile of those active on the Combative index is similar to that found for the Active index, with the exception that father's educational level tends to be somewhat lower for activists in Combative-type

protest. Persons with highest participation rates tend to perceive aspirational deprivation for blacks both at present and in the future, to see themselves doing better than blacks both at present and in the future, and to perceive moderate amounts of black past gain.

Conclusions

It can be observed that the major hypothesis of this study (that there is a relationship between relative deprivation and participation in the civil rights movement) has been supported. But the findings make necessary the specification that not all variations of the relative deprivation hypothesis have been supported and that the relationships vary among the participation indices. It should be noted that even those findings with the strongest empirical support should be interpreted with caution. Drawing a causal connection between participation and the SASS measures may not be warranted when time order is not controlled (see McPhail, 1969, for additional cautionary statements regarding research on the urban riots). In the case of this study the assumption is made that the perceptions indexed by SASS scores lead to participation, rather than participation leading to viewing life situation in a certain way. Perception of relative deprivation may be either the cause or the result of protest participation, or there may be a mutually reinforcing cyclical effect.

It is also possible that the results of this study may be a function of the time and place in which the research was conducted. By 1965 Tallahassee had experienced nearly a decade of civil rights protest in various forms. The history of this locale and the time at which the data were collected must affect the findings. Thus, it is possible that the results are unique to the particular situation.

In addition, the time period in which the study was conducted may

have mitigated against finding more, and stronger, relationships. By 1964-65 the non-violent protest movement had attracted widespread support from many segments of the black community. Initial differences between participants and nonparticipants may have disappeared as individuals with divergent views and diverse objectives became active. If this is the case, then one would expect the clearest differentiation to be found with those activities which were less "popular" and which had the lowest proportions participating. This does, in fact, occur. Combative index activities both have more significant associations with the independent variables and higher level Gammas when two or more indices are associated with the same variable. The acceptance of this interpretation suggests the desirability of constructing a typology of activities when one is analyzing participation in social movements which have developed a mass base.

Perhaps, the major contribution of this paper lies in the development of participation indices. It suggests research procedures that may have applicability to the study of other social movements. Social movements undergo changes over time in terms of goals, tactics utilized, the population base that contributes support, and the reactions of the wider society. All of these variables influence participation and suggest that research on the nature and cause of participation must control for such factors. A tool which permits the differentiation among types of participation activities may be useful for this task. If the widespread support of a movement masks the influencing characteristics that initially drew persons to participate, it is possible that traits characterizing participants at an earlier stage may only characterize the most militant members at a later stage. The participation typology used in this study

will not be generalizable to other social movements (or to the same social movement at another time), but the principle of typological construction and the methods used herein are hopefully generalizable.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Berkowitz, Leonard.

1968 "The study of urban violence: some implications of laboratory studies of frustration and aggression." Pp. 39-49 in Louis H. Masotti and Don R. Bowen (eds.), *Riots and Rebellion*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Bowen, Don R., Elinor Bowen, Sheldon Gawiser and Louis H. Masotti.

1968 "Deprivation, mobility, and orientation toward protest of the urban poor." Pp. 187-200 in Louis H. Masotti and Don R. Bowen (eds.), *Riots and Rebellion*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Cantril, Hadley.

1965 *The Pattern of Human Concerns*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Cataldo, Everett, and Lyman Kellstedt.

1968 "Conceptualizing and measuring political involvement over time: a study of Buffalo's urban poor." Reprinted from the 1968 Social Statistics Section, Proceedings of the American Statistical Association.

Crawford, Thomas J., and Murray Naditch.

1970 "Relative deprivation, powerlessness, and militancy: the psychology of social protest." *Psychiatry* 33(May): 208-223.

Davies, James C.

1969 "The J-curve of rising and declining satisfactions as a cause of some great revolutions and a contained rebellion." Pp. 690-730 in Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr, *Violence in America*. New York: Bantam Books.

Freeman, Linton C.

1965 *Elementary Applied Statistics: For Students in Behavioral Science*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Gurr, Ted Robert.

1970 *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Mack, Raymond W.

1968 "Of white racism and black mobilization." *Social Science Quarterly* 49 (December): 444-447.

Marx, Gary T.

1969 *Protest and Prejudice*. New York: Harper & Row.

LIST OF REFERENCES (continued)

- Matthews, Donald R., and James W. Prothro
1966 Negroes and the New Southern Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
1969 "Negro students and the protest movement." Pp. 379-418 in James McEvoy and Abraham Miller (eds.), Black Power and Student Rebellion. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- McPhail, Clark.
1969 "Civil disorder participation studies and the analysis of crowd behavior: a critical examination of the research literature." Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association: San Francisco.
- Meier, August, and Elliott Rudwick.
1968 "Negro protest and urban unrest." Social Science Quarterly 49 (December): 438-443.
- Milbrath, Lester W.
1965 Political Participation. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Murphy, Raymond J., and James W. Watson.
1969 "Level of aspiration, discontent, and support for violence: a test of the expectation hypothesis." Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association: San Francisco.
- Orbell, John M.
1967 "Protest participation among southern Negro college students." The American Political Science Review 61(June): 446-456.
- Orum, Anthony M., and Amy W. Orum.
1968 "The class and status basis of Negro student protest." Social Science Quarterly 49(December): 521-533.
- Pinard, Maurice, Jerome Kirk and Donald Von Eschen.
1969 "Processes of recruitment in the sit-in movement." Public Opinion Quarterly 23(Fall): 355-369.
- Runciman, W. G.
1968 "Problems of research on relative deprivation." Pp. 69-76 in Herbert H. Hyman and Eleanor Singer (eds.), Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press.

LIST OF REFERENCES (continued)

Searles, Ruth, and J. Allen Williams, Jr.

1962 "Negro college students' participation in sit-ins." *Social Forces* 40(March): 215-220.

Vander Zanden, James W.

1969 "The non-violent resistance movement against segregation." Pp. 53-62 in Barry McLaughlin (ed.), *Studies in Social Movements*. New York: The Free Press.

Von Eschen, Donald, Jerome Kirk and Maurice Pinard.

1969 "The conditions of direct action in a democratic society." *The Western Political Quarterly* 22(June): 309-325.

Wehr, Paul E.

1968 "Nonviolence and differentiation in the equal rights movement." *Sociological Inquiry* 38(Winter): 65-76.

MAY 13 1971

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293107056545