Wayne State University Dissertations

1-1-2010

Bridging Social Capital Formation In A Faith-Based Organization

Angela Kaiser
Wayne State University

Recommended Citation

BRIDGING SOCIAL CAPITAL FORMATION IN A
FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATION

by

ANGELA A. KAISER

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2010

MAJOR: SOCIAL WORK

_____

Advisor   Date

_____

_____

_____

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Robert and Mary Kaiser.

Without them, I would not be where I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to the other School of Social Work doctoral students who I have gotten to know over the past four years. I appreciate your cheerleading and wish all of you success in your careers!

To my friends and family, I thank you for your patience and emotional support through this difficult, but rewarding experience. You know who you are! Special thanks to my parents who have always supported me in every challenge I have decided to pursue. You are truly the most kind, generous, and caring people I know and your unconditional love and support have made me the person I am today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ix

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

American citizens have a long, solid history of contributing to democracy through participation in civic activities. Alexis de Tocqueville, a French aristocrat who observed civic processes in the 1830s, marveled at the distinctive characteristics of democracy in America (2001). De Tocqueville argued that an array of voluntary associations, vibrant religious culture, competitive elections and decentralized governance all combined to make the United States an unusually civic democracy (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999; de Tocqueville, 2001). From the nineteenth century to the early 1960s, American citizens were more involved in the democratic process compared to other nations (Putnam, 1996; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999).

In his analysis of survey data from average Americans in 1965, 1975 and 1985, Putnam concluded that time spent on informal socializing, participating in clubs and organizations, and volunteering in organizations and associations declined roughly by 25 to 50 percent since 1965 (Putnam, 1996). Putnam's work on social capital and civic engagement stresses that civic engagement and hence, social capital, are declining in the United States. In addition to inquiring about civic activities, Putnam also looked at indicators or elements that contribute to social capital using data from the General Social Survey (GSS). Along with the

decline in participation in groups, organizations and associations, Putnam also found a 30 percent decrease in trust since 1974 (1996).

Putnam offers numerous explanations as to why civic participation may have declined including the growth of women's participation in the workforce, growth in educational levels of adults, residential mobility, suburbanization, economic changes, the invention of television, and technological changes such as computers and the Internet (1996). While most Americans claim to be members of various organizations, they are not engaged in committee work, serving as officers or volunteers, or attending meetings (Putnam, 2000). Despite the decline in several areas of social and organized life, Putnam argues that religion remains today, as in the past, "an extremely important sector of American civil society" (2000, p. 64) and participation in religious congregations and organizations has not declined to the same degree as in other social institutions.

The United States is one of the most religiously observant countries in the contemporary world, and faith communities in which people worship together could possibly be one of the most important sources of social capital in the country (Putnam, 2000). Several studies have shown that religious involvement is a strong predictor of civic engagement and promotes the development of civic skills (Hodgkinson, et al., 1995; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). In African American communities, religious congregations often serve as the largest organized social and civic institution, encouraging political participation, coordinating tangible and intangible resources needed for political action, and

increasing opportunities for the development of civic skills among members (Calhoun-Brown, 1996; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990).

Some scholars suggest it is the religious values and beliefs that connect individuals to altruism, motivating them to engage in civic activities (Wald, 1987), while others believe that connectedness, and not faith alone, is the reason for involvement (Cnaan, Kasternakis, & Wineburg, 1993). Whatever the motivation, it is clear that Americans regularly involved with churches or religious organizations are staying more connected to their communities both socially and politically. What is particularly important to the purpose of this study is that faith-based institutions are the most dynamic examples of community organizing nationwide (Slessarev-Jamir, 2004). In regards to people who are economically disadvantaged or politically marginalized, church-based community organizing efforts make up the most widespread movement advocating social justice among the poor and working-class (Slessarev-Jamir, 2004; Wood, 1999). Further, faith-based organizations have high political capacity. Research conducted by Wood and Warren (2002) and Swarts (2008) suggests that most faith-based organizations are capable of having significant influence on decision-making processes in municipal governments and local political society.

According to a number of scholars studying democracy and the impact of race and culture on politics, one of the major issues affecting social change is the racial and ethnic divide of American citizens (Warren, 2001; Wilson, 1987). For true democracy to flourish and for the economically challenged and

disadvantaged individuals to have a voice within their communities, differences based on race, ethnicity, religion, and socioeconomic status need to be confronted and addressed. By remaining divided, American citizens relinquish their power.

Case studies and survey research conducted on faith-based organizations have shown that these organizations are making progress in bridging the racial, ethnic, and religious gaps that exist in the United States (Warren, 2001; Warren & Wood, 2001; Wood, 2002). These studies tell us that people of different races, ethnicities, and religions (mainly Christian denominations) are working together on social issues and are achieving successful outcomes.

The results of studies suggesting that faith-based organizations are bringing people from different racial, ethnic, and religious groups together to work on community issues is encouraging. Currently, there are not many social institutions in the United States where people from different racial backgrounds can have the opportunity to interact and work together (Wood, 2002). In addition to religion being an institution in which Americans are still involved, it also provides an initial foundation from which to work. People who have faith in God or a higher power often share a common set of values and goals. Having common values and goals may, in turn, provide a starting point for the building of trust and solidarity – elements that are essential to the formation of social capital.

While the aforementioned studies offer information about the various strategies these organizations employ to bring people together, they do not

delineate the underlying processes associated with the formation and sustenance of long-lasting, trusting relationships between people from different racial, ethnic, or religious groups. Some scholars have suggested that the bridging strategies used by the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) may provide a useful method for building relationships across multiple races, ethnicities, religions and cultures (Robinson & Hanna, 1994; Warren, 2001). According to Warren (2001), addressing race-related issues through discussions, being aware of the discriminatory and hierarchical dynamics of society and not projecting them into the organizing arena, promoting equal partnership among members, encouraging congregations and organizations to develop strong relationships from within so they will be more effective at building relationships with those outside of their groups, and avoiding issues that may divide members based on race, ethnicity, or religion, facilitate the development of bridging social capital. Although useful strategies have been identified, there currently are no distinct practice models for building bridging social capital within faith-based organizations.

In order to build upon the theory and practice of bridging social capital as well as to examine the processes involved with creating effective multicultural coalitions within faith-based organizations, I conducted a 12-month, mixed-methods case study of Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength (MOSES). The research questions I addressed in the study were: (1) To what extent do each of the dimensions of social capital exist within the organization?

(2) To what extent is MOSES bridging gaps between people from different demographic groups? (3) What are the strategies MOSES uses to develop and sustain the dimensions of social capital within the organization? (4) To what extent are differences between members addressed? If they are addressed, how are they addressed? (5) What are the internal and external barriers MOSES faces to developing and sustaining each of the dimensions of social capital? (6) How effective is mobilizing members based on their interest in particular issues in building social capital?

Case Description

MOSES is a non-profit, congregation-centered, faith-based community organization with an annual budget of $400,000 located in the city of Detroit. Currently comprised of 65 congregations, five institutions of higher learning, and roughly 200 members, MOSES facilitates partnerships between congregations of faith as well as other community-based organizations to identify common interests and exercise power on behalf of those interests. Like most faith-based organizations, MOSES is action-focused, helps to build solidarity through religious identity and works to build bridges across race, class, and political lines. The organization also bridges altruism and self-interest, and integrates private life with public action (Swarts, 2008).

MOSES was established in 1997 when three Detroit-area organizations, the Jeremiah Project, the West Detroit Inter-Faith Community Organization (WDIFCO), and the Northeast Organization Allied for Hope (NOAH) merged into

one organization. Each of the three organizations were working to improve the quality of life in neighborhoods where their members lived, but as their work increased and their understanding of the democratic process deepened, members became aware that decisions affecting their daily lives were being made at levels far beyond their reach. In order to begin to address larger issues in a more comprehensive manner, the three organizations came together to form MOSES (MOSES, n.d.).

Since its inception, MOSES has trained over 400 clergy and laity to be community and congregation leaders and organized public meetings for as many as 5,000 people. MOSES has also built and rehabilitated housing including 60 affordable housing units in Detroit and has established congregational safe-zones to deal with crime and blight that resulted in the closing of dozens of crack houses and the confiscation of millions in cash, guns and illegal drugs. MOSES has assisted in the formation of the regional transit authority (DARTA); registered over 17,000 new voters during the 2004 presidential election; and organized forums on affirmative action in the cities and suburbs of southeast Michigan. Currently, MOSES is organizing leaders around the issues of transportation, healthcare, supermarkets and quality food in Detroit, and immigration (MOSES, n.d.).

MOSES' board of directors is comprised of 17 individuals, seven of whom are clergy members, eight of whom are members of congregations or religious groups, and two who are representatives of secular organizations. The majority

of board members are from Detroit congregations or organizations, with six members residing in suburban areas. Roughly half of the board members are women and half are African American.

MOSES is a member of the Gamaliel Foundation, one of three major national organizing institutes in the United States (the other two being the Industrial Areas Foundation and People Improving Communities through Organizing). The Gamaliel Foundation originally was established in 1968 to support the Contract Buyers League, an African American organization fighting to protect homeowners on Chicago's west side who experienced lending discrimination by banks and savings and loan institutions. In 1986, the Foundation was restructured to become an organizing institute providing resources to community leaders in the efforts to build and maintain powerful organizations in low-income communities (Gamiliel Foundation, 2008). The mission of Gamaliel Foundation is "to assist local community leaders to create, maintain and expand independent, grassroots, and powerful faith-based community organizations so that ordinary people can impact the political, social, economic, and environmental decisions that affect their lives; to provide these organizations with leadership training programs, consultation, research and analysis on social justice issues; and to be a network for mutual learning environments and working coalitions" (Gamaliel Foundation, 2008).

The underlying philosophy of the Gamaliel Foundation is that all human beings are created equal and should be given the greatest opportunity for

achieving their fullest potential. In addition, all people should participate in shaping the community in which they live. The organization believes that in order to build enough power to transform declining cities in the United States, geographically-based organizing on the metropolitan level must take place. From their perspective, it is only through the organization of independent, community-based institutions, that people will be able to find the integrity and freedom to challenge the current system and fight poverty, inequality and oppression effectively. Spatially based, regional organization allows people to organize across the racial and political jurisdictions that have been created to ensure that people remain divided and ineffective (Gamaliel Foundation, 2008). Currently, the Gamaliel Foundation consists of more than 60 affiliates in twenty-one states and five provinces of South Africa. They represent over one million multi-faith and multi-racial individuals who work on social justice campaigns (Gamaliel Foundation, 2008).

Geographical and Historical Context of the Organization

In order to understand the case being presented in this study, it is important to understand the environmental context in which MOSES operates. The city of Detroit and surrounding suburbs have had a long history of racial tension, racial segregation and violence between African American and White residents (Sugrue, 2005). Although racial tension began as early as the late 1700s centered around the issue of slavery, the population of African American people in northern cities remained relatively small. After the industrialization that

took place shortly after World War II, tensions between African American and White people dramatically increased due to competition for employment and housing (Farley, Danziger, & Holzer, 2000).

In the 1940s, Detroit became known as the "arsenal of democracy" (Sugrue, 2005). The growth of industry was so overwhelming that the demand for workers was extremely high. African Americans from the south began to migrate northern cities, including Detroit, for job opportunities and to improve the lives of their families. Despite numerous employment opportunities, many African American men were unable to obtain employment due to discrimination. African Americans also experienced issues with finding housing. Once dominated by Whites, Detroit began to change in racial and ethnic composition. As populations increased, the demand for housing also increased. Threatened by the influx of African Americans in their communities, many Whites refused to sell homes to blacks and used violent tactics to deter blacks from living in their neighborhoods (Sugrue, 2005). As time went on, neighborhood resistance became the foundation for laws and policies that directly excluded the housing rights of African Americans. Neighborhood associations were supported by elected officials, public housing developments for African Americans were dismantled, restricted covenants were allowed to be implemented and real estate companies were not discouraged from practicing racial steering and blockbusting (Sugrue, 2005).

As tensions grew in regards to jobs and housing, violence erupted from both sides. In 1943, Detroit and several other northern cities were plagued by race riots. In Detroit, African American residents looted White stores and Whites destroyed African American neighborhoods. At the end of the riot, 34 people were killed (mostly African American), 675 people suffered injuries, and 1,893 were arrested (Sugrue, 2005).

During the 1950s, fair employment laws and the progressive attitudes of the automotive industry improved the employment situation for many African American men, yet the jobs they were given were often unskilled, dangerous tasks lacking the wages, stability, and benefits afforded to White men (Sugrue, 2005). Housing remained an issue, but through continued efforts of African American families, they started to penetrate formerly White neighborhoods throughout the city of Detroit. As African American families moved into neighborhoods, more violence erupted between African American and White residents, resulting in White families moving out of these neighborhoods. The 1950s marked a significant change in the growth and development of the city. Between 1949 and 1960, Detroit suffered four major recessions (Sugrue, 2005). As deindustrialization began to unfold, African Americans were first to lose their jobs regardless of seniority and had more difficulty finding new employment compared to whites (Sugrue, 2005).

As businesses and jobs left Detroit, families that could afford to also left. With the majority of African American men being unemployed or underemployed,

movement for most black families was not possible and access to well-paying jobs outside of the city was also hampered by transportation issues. African Americans essentially became trapped in a declining city with very little opportunity for upward social movement or economic growth (Farley, Danziger, & Holzer, 2000). The lines between blacks and whites became hardened and animosity between the groups was heightened by the 1960s.

Among the most significant events in the history of Detroit were the 1967 riots. The riots started when police officers decided to bust a "blind pig" in an African American neighborhood in Detroit, near Twelfth Street and Clairmount Avenue. In reaction to the arrests, patrons and owners began accusing officers of brutality. As attention was brought to what was happening, neighbors began collecting in the streets and started to throw bottles, beer cans, and rocks at the police. The riot quickly got out of control and spread throughout portions of the city (Goldberg, 1968), particularly northwest Detroit then over to the east side of the city (Detroit Riots of 1967, n.d.). After five days of violence, 43 people were dead; 30 of whom were killed by police officers. Approximately, 7,231 men and women were arrested and 2,509 buildings were looted and burned (Sugrue, 2005).

Even though racial tensions were high during the 1940s through the 1960s and White residents began leaving the city, the 1967 riots contributed to "White flight", or the migration of White residents to areas outside of Detroit. African American middle-class families also left the city for safer environments (Sugrue,

2005). Property values for African American homes in the neighborhoods where the riots took place plummeted, leaving many African American residents stuck in a city declining economically (Collins & Margo, 2007).

Detroit continues to be one of the most segregated metro areas in the country (Katz & Bradley, 2009; Sugrue, 2005). Detroit's population dropped significantly from 1,849,568 in 1950 to 916,952 in 2008 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). In 1950, Detroit was approximately 80 percent White. Currently, Detroit is approximately 85 percent African American. (Sugrue, 2005; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Although large-scale violence between African American and White citizens is not commonplace at this point in time, groups remain segregated in regards to where they live, work and attend school.

Two other major ethnic groups are quite prevalent in the metro Detroit region: Latino, primarily Mexican immigrants, and middle-eastern immigrants from varying countries. Latino immigrants started arriving in the Detroit around 1915, with a large number of Mexican immigrants settling in the city around 1920 (Balderrama & Rodriguez, 2006). Many immigrants came over to the North, and Detroit specifically, as migrant workers to support their families. While Northern cities like Detroit were somewhat hostile to Mexican immigrants, they were more welcoming than many southern states (Balderrama & Rodriguez, 2006). Southwest Detroit is home of "Mexicantown", an area that is primarily inhabited by Mexican immigrants. Interestingly, this area of Detroit has flourished due to an

influx of approximately 20,000 immigrants residing and starting businesses in that area (Bonisteel, 2007).

Dearborn, a suburb of Detroit, is home to a large and growing community of Arab-Americans. Approximately 30 percent of Dearborn residents are Arab-American (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Immigrants of middle-eastern descent started arriving in Detroit as early as the late 1800s, with significant migration to the United States by Lebanese families in 1975 and peaking between 1983 and 1990 (Howell & Shryock, 2003). The Detroit and surrounding suburban areas are primarily comprised of individuals who migrated from Lebanon, Iraq, and other Arab countries in smaller numbers. Within the Detroit Arab community are many cultural (depending on country of origin) and religious differences (Christian and Muslim) which technically divides the larger community into several sub-communities (Howell & Shryock, 2003). Differences within the Arabic communities as well as differences with non-Arabic residents of Detroit and surrounding suburbs, has made assimilation and relations among differing ethnicities in the region difficult (Howell & Shryock, 2003).

The history and ethnic groups discussed above are components of the region in which MOSES operates. Having knowledge of race relations and the myriad of groups that exist within the region is important for understanding the challenges that MOSES must address in order to bridge gaps and mobilize people from different backgrounds to work together. MOSES has the challenge of bringing individuals together from different races, ethnic backgrounds and

religions, and in addition, must address the wounds left over from a tumultuous history.

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the basic purpose of the study, the research questions addressed, the organization studied, and the context within which the organization operates. In chapter two, I will present literature relevant to grassroots organizing in the United States, as well as the formation of bridging social capital within faith-based organizations.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Grassroots Organizing in the United States

The Settlement Movement. Fisher (1984) dates the beginning of grassroots neighborhood organizing specifically in the late 1800s with the settlement movement. After the Civil War, many cities in the United States became industrial hotspots with rapid increases in population taking place. As cities grew, government officials became focused on the economic growth taking place and the local concerns of citizens were essentially ignored. Over time, residents became segregated by class, ethnicity and race and those individuals with fewer employment and economic opportunities were less able to benefit from the growth of industrialization. As a response to these changes, neighborhood organizers started the American settlement movement, beginning in major cities such as New York and Chicago (Fisher, 1984, Chapter 1).

Most settlement workers were White, college educated females who did not belong to an oppressed group. The main focus of settlement work was to assist the immigrant poor with the assimilation process and improve their health and social conditions. All settlement groups shared one main objective: to promote social order by serving as class mediators between the rich and the poor. They hoped to inform the upper class about the poor and vice versa, hopefully reducing the tension between groups (Fisher, 1984, Chapter 1). Although many involved with the settlement movement had good intentions, the movement was not considered beneficial to those who were the targets of the

intervention. The immigrant poor did not experience any tangible benefits from the movement nor did they gain empowerment through involvement in the movement (Fisher, 1984, Chapter 1).

During the same time settlement houses were emerging to help the white immigrant poor, African American communities were also organizing, but from within and on their own. As a result of widespread segregation and racism in the United States at that time, African Americans had to rely on resources within their own communities and developed community self-help groups using churches and schools as the central hubs of organizing (Devore, 1998; Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990). African Americans were not organizing politically at this time; instead they were focusing on community development in order to meet the daily needs of community members. Unfortunately, this early form of community organizing within African American communities is not well documented (Devore, 1998).

The Community Organization Movement. In the early 1900s, many political movements emerged around the world as a result of war, changes in government and political leadership. On a local level in the United States, neighborhood organizers started to move away from the settlement movement and toward the community center movement, which focused on using neighborhoods to address urban problems (Fisher, 1984; Fisher, 1990). Around this time, the social work profession began to grow and the focus of neighborhood organizing shifted from social reform to coordinating social welfare services to the poor. The community organization movement emphasized

expertise on providing services and community members became *clients* or *recipients* of services.

In most cities, schools were designated as community centers and services and activities such as voting, recreation, health services and even employment information were offered. Programs differed based on the political climate of each city. Ideally, community centers were to be managed from the bottom up, but similar to the settlement movement, citizen involvement was quite limited. Like the settlement movement, the community center movement was unsuccessful at facilitating change in struggling neighborhoods and failed to involve and empower the organizations they were trying to serve (Brager, Specht, & Torczyner, 1987; Fisher, 1984; Fisher, 1990).

The Great Depression and the Unemployed and Industrial Workers

Movements. In 1929, several things happened that changed politics, the American economy and grassroots organizing. In 1929, the stock market crashed resulting in the Great Depression (Fisher, 1984). People lost their financial investments, employment, and housing, especially those who already belonged to lower socioeconomic groups. The economic depression coupled with the government's inadequate relief programs and failure to respond to the needs of citizens resulted in communists, socialists and other radical groups organizing locally in neighborhoods and at workplaces to demand rights and relief from housing and employment losses (Fisher, 1984).

While many of the poor suffered the consequences of this economic collapse in silence, some chose to express discontent through mob looting, marches, and riots over specific issues such as job loss, rent, and the need for food (Piven & Cloward, 1977). Other groups approached local government offices in cities across the United States and protested the lack of response to the economic crisis (Axinn & Stern, 2008; Piven & Cloward, 1977). From 1930 to 1936, several local organizations with the assistance of Communist and Socialist organizations, a larger poor people's movement had been formed, linking several worker and unemployment councils across the United States in 43 states (Piven & Cloward, 1977).

In 1933, Franklin Delano Roosevelt introduced the first New Deal which consisted of a number of relief activities which provided assistance to some businesses and residents, but overall, effects did not trickle down to people of lower socioeconomic groups (Axinn & Stern, 2008). With the limited effectiveness of the first New Deal, many radicals and workers took direct action protesting in communities, workplaces and other locations demanding relief (Fisher, 1984). The combination of social action taken as well as an upcoming presidential election sparked Roosevelt's creation of the second New Deal in 1935. This approach was designed to benefit people in lower socioeconomic groups. Programs such as unemployment insurance, Social Security, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and the Wagner Act, which protected workers from unfair treatment and gave the more bargaining power with management, all were

a result of the second New Deal (Axinn & Stern, 2008). The second New Deal unintentionally encouraged or opened up opportunities for direct local action via the Wagner Act because of the new protection given to workers. By 1937, many of the programs comprising the New Deal were cut, new plans were halted, and unemployment spiked considerably.

The Great Depression and the New Deal also paved the way for the industrial workers' movement, also known as the labor movement (Piven & Cloward, 1977). Although unions had existed prior to the labor movement, in 1935, the Committee for Industrial Organization (CIO) was created and was composed of several leaders of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) unions to implement industrial unionism. Industrial unions were essentially unions made up of unskilled workers whom were often looked down upon and treated unfairly (Piven & Cloward, 1977). During the 1930s, immigrants were arriving increasingly in America for a better life. Many industrialists were hiring immigrants at lower wages and essentially replacing American workers. Establishing industrial unions with the help of the Wagner Act, allowed workers to have more bargaining power with employers. The growth of industrial unions allowed individuals to have a voice through the strength and numbers of a group (Piven & Cloward, 1977).

Also during this era, a very important face in community organizing emerged: Saul Alinsky. In 1939, Alinsky organized a multi-issue neighborhood organization in Chicago called the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council and

later in 1940, he established the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), a headquarters for his community organization projects around the country (Valley, 2008). Alinsky recruited labor organizations, churches and other local groups involved in community issues and eventually took on corporations and even the federal government. By 1941, Alinsky had secured 17 victories on social issues they addressed (Fisher, 1984; Robinson & Hanna, 1994). Alinsky's model for community organization would later become the standard model for community organizing in the United States, used both by faith-based organizations as well as secular organizations committed to social action (Swarts, 2008).

The Civil Rights Movement. According to Morris (1984), the Civil Rights Movement began in 1953 with a mass bus boycott in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The boycott was mobilized and directed through local black churches and the United Defense League (UDL) which was specifically created to confront the issue of segregation on buses. The more famous Montgomery bus boycott led by Rosa Parks followed in 1957. While the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) had existed since 1918, it was not until small groups organized within black churches that direct social action really began to take place on a larger level (Morris, 1984). While local protests and boycotts may have marked the beginning of the civil rights movement, the Southern Christian Leadership Council (SCLC) was the main force that developed the infrastructure of the civil rights movement (Morris, 1984).

Other organizations instrumental in the Civil Rights Movement include Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a mixed-race middle class group dedicated to non-violent action; Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), a student group that staged mass sit-ins, and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Both student organizations strengthened the Civil Rights Movement through the use of disruptive tactics in the vein of Saul Alinsky that brought attention to their issues rather than attempting to initiate change by cooperating with legal and political systems. By using confrontational and disruptive tactics, both groups ultimately changed the dynamics of organizing within the civil rights movement (Fisher, 1984; Morris, 1984).

The Civil Rights Movement had an enormous impact on American society. The movement dismantled some of the societal components that restricted the personal freedom of blacks. It altered and expanded American politics by providing other oppressed groups with organizational and tactical models. It allowed blacks to have access to societal structures where they were previously not allowed, including educational institutions. Within politics, it influenced other oppressed groups such as women, farm workers, and other racial/ethnic minorities to mobilize on their own behalf (Morris, 1984). Finally, the Civil Rights Movement changed the orientation of social movements (Tilly, 2004). Prior to the Civil Rights Movement, social movements were based on economic struggles and political clashes between classes. The Civil Rights Movement was one of the first movements that was based on the defense of a group identity. While

economic issues were important in the Civil Rights Movement, organizations and groups banded together in solidarity based on race, not class (Tilly, 2004). The emergence of this type of movement eventually influenced the development of new social movement theory.

Neo-Alinsky and contemporary organizing. The events during the 1960s and the economic crisis that followed influenced a widespread interest in neighborhood organizing in the 1970s (Fisher, 1984; Fisher & Shragge, 2000). New populist organizations, organizations focusing on the struggle of the people against the power of privileged elites, were directly initiated by Alinsky-trained organizers and their students, but developed an independent style which was termed neo-Alinsky (Fisher, 1984; Fisher & Shragge, 2000). The goal of the neo-Alinsky organizations of this era was to develop mass political organizations rooted in neighborhoods, grounded in local concerns, and focused on winning concrete gains (Fisher, 1984).

The Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), established in 1970, is one of the earliest and most successful examples of a race-based or secular neo-Alinsky organization. ACORN is comprised of over 350,000 members and organizes low and moderate-income families in neighborhoods around social issues such as neighborhood safety, environmental justice, voter engagement, schools and housing (ACORN, 2008).

The Center for Third World Organizing (CTWO), another larger, successful race-based organization was established in the mid-1980s. CTWO is

a racial justice organization led by people of color. Their focus is on local and national campaigns that address economic and racial inequality in the United States (CTWO, n.d.).

People Improving Communities through Organizing (PICO), is an organization comprised of faith-based community organizations. Established in 1972, PICO serves urban, suburban, and rural communities. The organization has addressed various social issues including health care, improving public schools, creating affordable housing, and increasing safety in neighborhoods (PICO, n.d.).

Direct Action Research and Training (DART), another faith-based organization, was formed in 1982. DART focuses on training member organizations to successfully address social issues affecting their communities. DART affiliates have addressed numerous social issues including affordable housing, public transportation, and reinvestment in redlined communities (DART, n.d.). The Gamaliel Foundation (described in the "Introduction" chapter) is also considered a larger, neo-Alinsky organization.

Currently in the United States there are two types of organizing taking place: race-based organizing and faith-based organizing (Swarts, 2008; Wood, 2002). Race-based or secular organizations focus on racial or ethnic identity to mobilize participants to take action. Faith-based organizations focus on faith in God or a divine power to mobilize participants (Swarts, 2008; Wood, 2002). While similar in purpose, each organization mobilizes using a different dimension

of personal identity. Most local organizations, regardless of being faith-based or race-based, are members of the larger, national organizations that were described above. In the next section, I will examine the history, characteristics, and strategies of each type of organizing strategy in order to understand the similarities, differences, and outcomes of each approach.

Race-Based Organizing in the United States

The emergence and history. The first race-based grassroots organization that emerged in the United States was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), established in 1909 (NAACP, 2009). It emerged in response to the mistreatment of African Americans through race riots and lynching. In the 1930s and 1940s, the NAACP focused on economic justice for African American citizens. Their work ultimately influenced the outlawing of job discrimination and the opening of thousands of jobs for African Americans through the New Deal (NAACP, 2009). The NAACP was also a major force in the Civil Rights Movement. The Civil Rights Movement began as a means to protect and secure the rights of African American citizens in the south. The NAACP was at the forefront of this movement, attempting to create change through political and legal tactics.

In the 1950s, the NAACP was responsible for the victory of outlawing the segregation of public schools (Brown vs. the Topeka Board of Education) and later, helped advance the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1964, and 1968, as well as the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (NAACP, 2009). Although the

NAACP is considered a secular organization, it was closely tied to African American churches during the Civil Rights era. Churches provided meeting spaces as well as a vehicle from which to recruit members to the movement (Morris, 1984). The NAACP was clearly an important force as the first African American protest organization. Unfortunately, the organization had difficulty building their membership base and was often criticized for working within the system rather than rebelling against the system. Despite this negative perception, the NAACP helped create a structure from which the Civil Rights Movement could develop and grow (Morris, 1984).

During the Civil Rights era, a number of strong African American organizations formed to secure the rights of African Americans. Many of these organizations emerged from churches and used faith to mobilize members (Morris, 1984).

Other organizations formed within schools and neighborhoods and used African American identity as the basis for mobilization. One of these secular or race-based organizations was the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). CORE worked closely with the NAACP and the SCLC, but was different than many of the civil rights organizations. CORE was established in the north, plus it was comprised primarily of graduate students from the University of Chicago, was intellectually oriented, and had an inter-racial membership with more Whites than African Americans. Like other secular organizations, CORE relied on the African

American church for both tangible and intangible resources and support (Morris, 1984).

Other important secular organizations that emerged in the 1960s were the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), both White student civil rights organizations. Both of these organizations were loosely structured and emphasized local autonomy and direct action. Both used sit-ins as their primary protest model (Morris, 1984).

Each of the above mentioned organizations played an important part in driving the Civil Rights Movement forward through recruiting members of all races and engaging in actions demanding change. The NAACP and CORE are still active organizations to this day and continue to address issues related to social justice for minority groups residing in the United States. Unfortunately, both SNCC and SDS disbanded by the 1970s. While both secular and religious organizations relied heavily on African American churches for support, they differed in that secular organizations used racial identity to mobilize members and religious organizations used religion or faith (Morris, 1984).

By the mid-1960s, concerns among African American citizens about segregation and basic rights shifted to economic issues, specifically government aid for those living in poverty (Morris, 1984). It was during this time that a very prominent secular organization emerged; the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) (ACORN, 2008). In 1970, an organizer for the NWRO traveled to Arkansas to start a campaign to help welfare recipients attain their

basic needs. This campaign created a movement that became the Arkansas Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN). As ACORN began to grow and become established in other regions, the name was later changed to Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (Brooks, 2005; ACORN, 2008). Since the 1970s, ACORN has launched numerous campaigns and has gained entry into national politics. The organization has played a vital role in putting pressure on political candidates to address issues of economic inequality and has also addressed other issues concerning lower income families including employment and affordable housing.

Currently, ACORN is one of the larger and well-known race-based organizations in the United States. As of 2004, ACORN became an international organization, establishing offices in Canada, Peru, Mexico, and Argentina (Johnson, 1999; Swarts, 2008; ACORN, 2008). ACORN currently reports having more than 400,000 low and moderate income families organized into more than 1,200 neighborhood chapters in 42 states (ACORN, 2008). ACORN's current campaigns include affordable housing, better schools, fair housing, fair tax fees, foreclosures, predatory lending, health care, immigration, and voter engagement (ACORN, 2008).

The Center for Third World Organizing (CTWO) is another example of a race-based, grassroots organization currently operating within the United States. Founded in 1980 by welfare-rights community organizers, the organization's philosophy is that minority populations, including African American, Latino, Asian

and Native American residents, have been forced to live in similar conditions as those who reside in third world countries. The goal of the organization is to ultimately achieve economic and social justice for people of color in the United States (CTWO, n.d.). Like most race-based organizations, ACORN and CTWO are racially and economically diverse, and tend to target neighborhoods comprised of lower and moderate income families.

Characteristics of race-based organizations. Race-based organizations link racial or ethnic identity to political work (Wood, 2002). Operating from the philosophy of Saul Alinsky, these organizations are focused on building a *power organization*, or in other words, having within the organization the ability and willingness to have political leverage in the interests of the community it is serving (Wood, 2002). By having political leverage, organizations can influence elected officials and ultimately, impact policies that contribute to social injustice. This leverage is built by recruiting membership as well as forming relationships with neighborhoods and communities.

Based on his case studies of race-based organizations, Wood (2002) suggests that most race-based organizations organize based on seven fundamental concepts. The first concept is action. Action is defined as a collective activity that brings people with a common problem in direct confrontation with an individual or group who has the power or influence to address the problem. Actions can be overt such as protests, rallies, sit-ins, and disrupting business or daily activities of an institution, or they can be less overt

such as letter writing campaigns or boycotting products. Regardless of the form, the purpose of an action is to communicate a concern or stance on a particular issue. Brooks (2002) also discusses the importance of actions as strategies in race-based organizations.

Another fundamental concept is demand (Brooks, 2002; Wood, 2002). A demand is a specific claim for what is wanted. It is not enough for an organization to identify an issue and express disapproval or concern. For effective results, groups must clearly identify what it is they would like from the individual, group or institution that has the power to change the situation. Demands can then be discussed and possible solutions developed.

A third concept is leadership. A leader is someone who demonstrates initiative in analyzing problems, thinking through solutions and has earned the loyalty and trust of other members of their organization. Leadership is very important in the organizing realm. For individuals to be effective leaders, they need to be able to carry out the strategies for addressing problems and they need to be able to properly represent the members of their group or organization. Leadership training is an important component of most organizing institutes because it is leaders who are ultimately responsible for pushing organizations forward on social issues (Brooks, 2002; Wood, 2002).

Fourth is the concept of a problem. Wood (2002) defines problem as something the members believe affects the quality of their lives. In order to organize in the first place, groups and organizations need to have a problem or

concern. Problems may be local such as crime rate, school quality or lack of public transportation or could be something on a regional or national level such as healthcare or immigration.

Next, is the concept of a target, which is an individual or organization that has the power to meet the organization's demands. Identifying a problem is an important step to organizing, but even more vital is having a target to go after. Many times, the identity of the target determines the strategy as well as the demands that may be made (Alinsky, 1971; Brooks, 2002; Wood, 2002).

The fifth concept is about strategy, which is defined as a plan to disrupt the target. Oftentimes, strategies may come in the form of actions, but can also include covert activities that are focused on confusing your target or going outside of their knowledge or experience. Strategies can be issue-specific and differ depending on what the issue is as well as who has the power to change it (Alinsky, 1971; Wood, 2002).

Finally, Wood (2002) states that organizations need a constituency or group of people whose interests would be served if they supported an organization's campaign. Internal organization members as well as outside supporters such as politicians, business owners, and prominent community leaders are vitally important for success.

One of the main focuses of race-based organizations is to build a sense of community and bridge people of different races and ethnicities within communities of color. In other words, race-based organizations practice

multiracial and multicultural organizing (Swarts, 2008; Wood, 2002). The solidarity built within the group produces bonding social capital, which involves relationships among a homogeneous community or group. Race-based organizations excel at reaching poor and working class people and generally those who do not attend church (ACORN, 2008; Swarts, 2008; Wood, 2002). They tend to have a long-term political strategy which includes a consistent alliance with the labor movement, and they participate in electoral politics and implement local, state and national campaigns. These types of organizations tend to embrace social movements and use more radical strategies for organizing, particularly actions that are highly confrontational with elected officials and large, powerful institutions. Because these organizations do not have a built-in constituency, they tend to organize within neighborhoods, using both small and larger-scale campaigns (Swarts, 2008).

Practices and strategies within race-based organizations. According to Wood (2002), race-based organizations rooted in the tradition of the Saul Alinsky incorporate several strategies or practices in taking social and political action. The first practice often used is door-knocking campaigns. Because many race-based organizations organize in neighborhoods rather than in already organized institutions, race-based organizers must go door-to-door to mobilize participants (Brooks, 2007; Swarts, 2008). Using this strategy, organizers can target neighborhoods with residents belonging to particular socioeconomic groups as well as residents who may have been on the receiving end of a

particular social issue. Door-knocking campaigns allow organizers to build relationships with potential participants and identify problems that are considered important to residents.

Another practice of race-based organizations is political education. This practice involves identifying community leaders and providing training and education for them to become effective and competent leaders. Political education may come in the form of formal training as well as special meetings and in the daily context of organizing (Wood, 2002). This involves educating leaders about the institutions they must confront, framing issues, and developing a particular ideology that is congruent to the philosophy of the organization.

A third practice used is direct action. Direct action involves executing pressure on institutions or people in power in a confrontational manner. Examples of direct action are takeovers of city offices, disrupting public meetings, or other actions that might generate conflict in order to get the attention of those in power and the larger community (Wood, 2002). The emphasis is on disrupting rather than participating in political events that produce inequality or social injustice. Direct action is a fundamental practice in race-based organizations (Brooks, 2005).

A fourth practice is the use of community meals as ritual social events. Organized meals are used as a means to build relationships, create bonds and stabilize organizational solidarity (Wood, 2002). Because solidarity can be

difficult to build in secular, race-based organizations, creating opportunities for relationship building is important to creating unity among members.

Accountability sessions are another practice implemented by race-based organizations. With accountability sessions, organizers seek endorsements on issues from key public officials. These sessions are usually held at rallies, larger meetings or other events and places where community members are present in order to put pressure on those in power (Wood, 2002).

Finally, cultural action is a practice used by race-based organizations. These are public events that focus on generating a multicultural experience for participants in order build a shared political culture. Members may be encouraged to attend Kwanzaa or Cinco de Mayo celebrations, for example, in order to develop an increased understanding of other traditions (Wood, 2002). These events also serve as a vehicle to help members transcend racial and ethnic differences and build identities around political perspectives (Wood, 2002).

Many race-based organizations are made up of people of color rather than one, specific race or ethnicity. Building a common vision despite racial and ethnic differences becomes an important task in race-based organizing to keep participants mobilized (Wood, 2002). Challenges facing race-based organizations may include selecting issues that a majority of members are interested in addressing. For example, Latino members may be concerned about immigration, but African American members may not see immigration as an issue necessary to address.

Outcomes and challenges of race-based organizing. According to a case study conducted by Swarts (2008) examining both race-based and faith-based organizations, the race-based organizations studied were more effective at reaching lower income and working class individuals; especially those who do not attend church services. Effectiveness at reaching lower income individuals may have something to do with targeting particular neighborhoods when conducting door-knocking campaigns. Faith-based organizations operate within congregations and do not actively recruit outside of those congregations. This could limit the types of individuals who get involved. ACORN, one of the race-based organizations studied, made a significant, national impact on the issue of predatory mortgage lending, for example. In 2000, ACORN secured a three-year pilot program committing a mortgage company to giving $363 million in home loans for low-income families as well as pushed a city ordinance outlawing lending abuses in Oakland, California. While ACORN, the largest secular organizing entity in the United States is well known for its success with large-scale nationwide campaigns, the organization has also been somewhat successful with local campaigns focused on community development (Swarts, 2008).

One of the challenges within race-based organizations is they spend little time constructing collective identity due to their focus on multiracial and multicultural organizing. At the same time, they also tend to be racially and ethnically homogenous, so very little bridging occurs with other groups (Swarts,

2008). Also, race-based organizations are focused primarily on building multiracial organizations, frequently among people of color. While this can be an effective strategy for building relationships among people of color, it also may hinder the development of trust and social networks within the group because they are organizing based on a characteristic or particular identity (race or ethnicity) that may be different for each member (Wood, 2002). Bystydzienski and Schacht (2001), also support the idea that multiple identities within a coalition or organization can be difficult to negotiate. Based on the history of discrimination in the United States as well as ongoing racial and ethnic conflict, building trust between different groups is difficult.

Another challenge is that race-based organizations may have less access to social capital because they tend to organize within neighborhoods rather than organizations or institutions where trust and relationships may already exist. While neighborhoods can be sources of social capital, it is more likely for strong relationships to develop in more organized institutions where people interact on a daily basis such as work, school, or church (Wood, 2002). Not having a built-in constituency can also make it more difficult for raced-based organizations to mobilize large numbers of people (Swarts, 2008).

Finally, raced-based organizations often have difficulty building relationships with public officials because of the use of more radical and aggressive organizing approaches or confrontational direct actions such as interrupting meetings or hearings and conducting protests (Swarts, 2008). A

confrontational approach can often weaken ties with community leaders, therefore raced-based organizations struggle with forming and sustaining ties while using tactics they feel are most effective for social change.

Faith-Based Organizing in the United States

The emergence and history. The influence of religion on politics is not a new phenomenon. It began in the 1500s with the Puritans using the morals and ethics of religion to improve communities and continued in the 1800s with the Evangelical crusade against alcohol; a landmark effort in politics that lasted well into the 20th century (Fowler & Hertzke, 1995). While religion played a prominent role in communities and in politics in the United States throughout history, organized involvement with social issues on the local, state and federal levels peaked in the 1960s during the Civil Rights Movement (Calhoun-Brown, 2000; Morris, 1984).

The Civil Rights Movement in the United States essentially began and was led by African American churches and organizations that emerged from churches. *Local movement centers*, defined as "social organizations within the community of a subordinate group, which mobilizes, organizes, and coordinates collective action aimed at attaining the common ends of that subordinate group" (Morris, 1984, p. 40), organized in southern cities such as Montgomery, Tallahassee, and Birmingham were among the first in the Civil Rights Movement. Three organizations in particular were instrumental in starting the momentum of the movement; the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA), organized in

December 1955; the Inter Civic Council (ICC) of Tallahassee, organized in May 1956; and the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights (ACMHR), organized in Birmingham in June 1956 (Morris, 1984).

Each of the three organizations operated in a context of charisma, mass emotionalism, and mass enthusiasm; characteristics reminiscent of churches (Morris, 1984). These organizations also inherited church culture in their practices, bringing whole congregations into community activities, making sure there was mass participation in events. In contrast to the NAACP, a secular organization, the three organizations relied on disruptive tactics such as economic boycotts and direct action demonstrations (Morris, 1984). The three organizations were active in early demonstrations against racism and discrimination. The MIA was successful with the Montgomery bus boycott and also introduced a non-violent approach for social change. The ICC also was successful with bus boycotts and arranging transportation for African Americans, and the ACMHR led efforts on desegregating a railroad station, fighting discrimination in hiring, the segregation of public schools, as well as segregation at swimming pools, libraries and retail stores (Morris, 1984).

As the Civil Rights Movement grew, larger organizations developed and came to the forefront of the movement. The Southern Christian Leadership Council (SCLC), a church-related protest organization, was the driving force behind the establishment and organization of the Civil Rights Movement (Morris, 1984). Martin Luther King, Jr. is one of the most recognized leaders involved with

the SCLC (Morris, 1984). The SCLC was not an individual membership group, only other organizations, churches and civic groups could become members. Local organizations such as the MIA, ICC, and ACMHR all became affiliates of the SCLC and took action in the communities in which they served. The SCLC was essentially the pioneer of what we current see with faith-based organizations; smaller, local groups working within larger organizing institutes.

In addition to African American churches and religious-oriented groups, White churches and religious groups, particularly the Roman Catholic Church, also became involved in organizing (McGreevy, 1996). As mentioned previously, in the late 1930s, Saul Alinsky organized a Back of the Yards Council (BOYC) which later grew into the IAF in Chicago, Illinois. In an area that was 90 percent Catholic, church support was vital for Alinsky. With the aid of younger clergy members, Alinsky was able to get the support of area Catholic churches and involve them in social action projects within their communities (McGreevy, 1996). Very few white churches were involved with addressing the issues of racism and segregation, but that changed in 1965 when several northern Catholic leaders traveled to Selma, Alabama to challenge the resistance of southern leaders and congregations, responding to a request for help from Martin Luther King, Jr. (Hite, 2002; Mann Wall, 2009; McGreevy, 1996).

With the combination of changes within papal leadership in the Vatican and increased clergy interest in social and political activism, the focus of the Catholic Church shifted from recruiting new members to helping the oppressed

(Krier Mich, 1998; McGreevy, 1996). Catholic clergy began to focus on social action, participating in protests and working in inner-city communities to influence change. In some cities, such as Philadelphia, protests were effective in forcefully integrating Catholic institutions, yet in other cities, protests were met with extreme resistance and even violence towards clergy members (McGreevy, 1996).

Catholic bishops, priests and nuns were instrumental in developing programs aimed at integrating schools, building strong ties within the neighborhoods and communities where churches were located, teaching racial tolerance and understanding through neighborhood and church groups, working in inner cities to combat urban renewal efforts aimed at destroying homes and neighborhoods inhabited by blacks, and increasing employment and training opportunities for African Americans and other impoverished and oppressed groups through the establishment of hospitals and other service organizations (McGreevy, 1996). In addition to the development of programs aimed at improving race relations and overall conditions for African Americans, clergy members risked their lives and reputations through marches and protests in order to shed light on racism and segregation in cities throughout the United States (McGreevy, 1996).

Unfortunately after continued resistance from the Vatican and other church leaders regarding legal issues surrounding protests as well as declining church membership, race relations activities suffered over time and by the 1970s

the Catholic Church made the decision to focus efforts toward other oppressed populations including the poor, and those living in Third World countries (McGreevy, 1996). Many churches, including African American churches and groups changed their focus from protests and other forms of political action to providing social services to the poor and other members of their communities.

Currently in the United States, larger national faith-based organizations are building power by organizing local organizations and congregations in cities throughout the country. Many of these organizations, approximately 72 percent, were founded in the 1990's (Wood & Warren, 2002), possibly in response to initiatives implemented by the federal government. These initiatives include the Charitable Choice Provision of the Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act of 1996 which encourages government support for religious organizations and allows them to display religious symbols (Cnaan, Wineberg, & Boddie, 1999) as well as the creation of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives which was created to increase charitable donations and volunteering, and to expand the role of faith-based organizations in human services by encouraging them to seek public funding (Compassionate Conservatism, 2001).

More recently, President Obama amended Executive Order 13199 for the president's Office for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships. This office was established to be a supportive resource for faith-based and secular nonprofits and community organizations working to provide needed social

services in communities (The White House, 2009). Through this Executive Order, faith-based organizations will continue to receive federal support and will become an even more integral part of American society in providing services for communities in need (The White House, 2009).

The largest of the national faith-based organizations is the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), the first national organizing entity founded by Saul Alinsky. Approximately 36 percent of groups organizing around political and social issues in the United States are members of the IAF. The next largest group, People Improving Communities through Organizing (PICO), comprises 23 percent, the Gamaliel Foundation comprises about 20 percent, Direct Action Research and Training (DART) about 15 percent, with the rest working with smaller organizations or independently (Wood & Warren, 2002). These organizations address social issues such as housing, policing, healthcare, race relations, public finances, environment, social services (Warren & Wood, 2002).

Characteristics of faith-based organizations. According to Wood and Warren (2002), faith-based organizing groups share a common set of characteristics that make them distinctive. Faith-based organizations are faith-based, meaning the membership is primarily drawn from religious congregations and the groups ground their organizing in the values and traditions that come from religious faith (Ebaugh et al., 2003). Essentially, members are mobilized based on their faith in God or a divine power and the ethics and morals that go along with their spiritual beliefs.

Second, faith-based organizations are broad-based, meaning that they strive to be diverse and inclusive of the communities that make up their local organizing area. Organizations may be ecumenical (incorporating a variety of Christian congregations) or interfaith (incorporating non-Christian congregations) and many include other non-religious groups in their membership such as unions, schools, and other community-based groups or organizations, in order to represent their surrounding community (Wood & Warren, 2002).

Third, faith-based organizations are locally constituted, meaning that faith-based organizing groups conduct their organizing in specific, local areas. Tackling issues within a larger region can be difficult and draining on resources, so having several small organizations operating on a local level can often be more effective and efficient (Wood & Warren, 2002; Swarts, 2008).

Fourth, faith-based organizations are multi-issue, meaning that they often address multiple issues at a time and these issues are identified by trained leaders representing membership (Wood & Warren, 2002). Issues that affect the communities in which they serve are often chosen. In some cases, local groups will address issues that have been identified by the larger organizing institution of which they are affiliated.

Fifth, faith-based organizations are staffed by professional organizers who are responsible for recruiting and training local leaders who work voluntarily. It is important to have individuals whose primary task is to keep members mobilized and interested in the issues (Wood & Warren, 2002).

Finally, faith-based organizations are political, but nonpartisan, meaning that they seek to use their power in the public arena based on the relationships that have been developed and not necessarily based on the political party of the public officials in power. Faith-based organizations are usually classified as non-profit 501(c)3 organizations so are limited in their ability to endorse political agendas (Wood & Warren, 2002).

Practices and strategies of faith-based organizations. One of the most important strategies used by faith-based organizations to build relationships and solidarity is the one-to-one (Wood, 2002). A one-to-one is a 30-to-45 minute informal meeting between an organizer and a participant designed to establish a relationship between the individuals meeting. More specifically, the ultimately goal of a one-to-one is to identify the issues that are important to that person and the congregation they represent in order to get them mobilized around specific issues (Wood, 2002). Participants are encouraged to conduct one-to-ones with leaders of other congregations in order to expand their networks and ties and build relationships across groups. In a one-to-one session, individuals are encouraged to identify and share their own *self-interest* as well as assist the other with identifying theirs. Also, one-to-one participants are encouraged to identify leadership qualities and abilities in the other person, providing a base from which that person can work to develop their leadership skills, finally, participants are encouraged to use one-to-ones as a way to identify other

possible leaders in order to broaden leadership and further build the power organization (Wood, 2002).

Another strategy used by faith-based organizations is building organizational identity. Wood refers to this as *credential* and defines it as a "ritualized assertion of the organization's identity, purpose, and strength" (2002, p. 37). The ritual, according to Wood, occurs at the start of every meeting or event and includes identifying the organization as separate, but rooted in religious congregations, asserting the strength of the organization as an institution as well as the size of members, and outlines the purpose of the organization in civic and/or religious terms that are broad and inclusive (Wood, 2002). The purpose of this strategy is to build solidarity through reinforcing the idea that the organization is a strong, reputable organization with a membership that holds a common vision and capacity to take action.

A third strategy used by faith-based organizations is prayer. The purpose of prayer is to essentially reaffirm that the organization is faith-based and that members are unified based on their faith in God or a higher power. Prayer builds solidarity and communicates a common bond between members (Wood, 2002). Prayer also helps to motivate members to take action through incorporating spiritual chants and cheering.

Another strategy used is research. Once an issue is identified, organizations conduct research to learn as much about an issue as possible. Leaders may hold research meetings with elected officials, city employees,

academics, union leaders, school officials and other individuals who may hold power positions and/or have knowledge or involvement with the issue. The ultimate goal is to learn about the issue itself, how the issue may be addressed, the target for action, and any barriers they may need to be dealt with for addressing the issue. The information gained from the background research provides a guideline of how to proceed on a given issue (Wood, 2002).

Action is another strategy used by faith-based organizations. Once the organization identifies a person or entity with decision-making authority in regards to a chosen issue, that person or entity becomes a *target* for action. These actions are known as *public dramas* designed to draw participants into the political tension and use the energy of the participants to escalate the drama to ultimately have an effect on public decision making. Actions often include scripted testimonies by members sharing their experiences with an issue as well as factual research report presented to the person or entity in power. Actions usually conclude by presenting decision-makers with yes and no questions in regards to taking action on the issue. (Wood, 2002).

Challenging and holding accountable is another strategy widely used by faith-based organizations. In regards to this strategy, organizers use internal accountability which involves challenging leaders, clergy and other organization participants to take leadership roles, assume responsibility for necessary tasks, and stay focused on goals. In addition, external accountability challenges public officials, business leaders and other individuals or entities outside of the

organization to maintain their commitments as public leaders and follow-up with agreed upon actions.

Negotiations are yet another strategy incorporated by faith-based organizations. For faith-based organizations, building relationships is one of the most important strategies for addressing social issues. By creating relationships with individuals and entities in power and being open to compromise, faith-based organizations have made leaps and bounds in changing local policy (Wood, 2002). The idea behind negotiation is to not damage the relationship the organization has with those in power. Instead, faith-based organizations work to find a solution that improves the issue being addressed while maintaining the relationship.

Evaluation is a strategy used by faith-based organizations to assess meetings and other events used to increase organizational learning (Wood, 2002). By evaluating meetings and events, organizers can make note of which strategies or methods were effective and any modifications that may need to be made to make meetings and events more effective, efficient or accommodating for members. The important part of evaluation is getting member feedback. Not only does it provide helpful information that can be applied to future meetings and events, but it also builds trust with members by including them in the process.

Finally, public conflict is a strategy used when other strategies have not been effective and holding public officials or others in power accountable

becomes difficult. This strategy involves increasing the tension at an action in order to put pressure on the decision-makers who have control over a particular issue. An example of public conflict would be not allowing an elected official to finish a speech at a rally or giving them limited time to address demands (Wood, 2002).

Strengths and outcomes of faith-based organizations. Studies conducted on faith-based organizing have shown that faith-based organizations are making gains in their pursuit in addressing important social issues. In a case study comparing faith-based and race-based organizations, Swarts (2008) found that the faith-based organizations had positive reputations in their community and had regular access to authorities such as public officials and other decision-makers due to being able to mobilize larger numbers of people (future voters) as compared to race-based organizations. Swarts also found that faith-based organizations built effective coalitions across race and class, and were especially successful bridging the racial and ethnic divide between members. In regards to policy changes, they found that faith-based organizations excelled in the local arena, but some were also successful with national campaigns.

In his case study comparing a race-based and a faith-based organization, Wood (2002) concluded that faith-based organizing has significant potential to get and keep Americans civically engaged since many Americans are already committed to religious practice and attending church. In churches, people are already somewhat mobilized. While it is not the only effective strategy for

organizing, it has been shown to be more successful in the area of bridging relationships between different cultures using faith as the common identity or mobilizing tool. For race-based organizations, mobilizing based on race and/or ethnicity becomes difficult due to these organizations being multicultural in nature. With multiple cultures being present it can be difficult for these organizations to build solidarity around one central identity. Faith, on the other hand, is a solid identity that transcends race and ethnicity.

Other studies also have found that faith-based organizations are effective at bridging gaps between different groups. In a national survey of 133 local faith-based community organizing groups active in the United States, Warren and Wood (2001) examined the existence of bridging social capital. They found that nationally, faith-based organizations bridge religious institutions across three main categories: Roman Catholics, mainline Protestants and Black Protestants. To date, faith-based organizations have been most successful in constructing relationships between these three Christian groups.

Interestingly, the data shows that faith-based groups were having difficulty creating relationships with more conservative Christian groups as well as had limited contact with other religious groups including Unitarian-Universalist, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist and Hindu groups, despite outreach attempts. The study also revealed that faith-based organizations are building relationships between three of the largest racial groups in the United States; White, Black and Hispanic/Latino. In regards to non-religious groups that may hold membership in

faith-based organizations, Warren and Wood found that bridging social capital is taking place with them as well.

Reviewing the data from their study, Warren and Wood (2001) conclude that faith-based organizations in the United States are highly racially diverse: 36 percent were predominantly White, 35 percent were predominantly Black, 21 percent were predominantly Hispanic/Latino and 6.5 percent were interracial. Faith-based organizations were relatively religiously diverse: 33 percent Catholic, 33 percent mainline Protestant, 16 percent Black Baptist, and about 2 percent having Jewish, Unitarian-Universalist and Black Evangelical members. Finally, faith-based organizations are diverse in the types of non-religious organizations that hold membership with about 13 percent having non-congregational institutions. They conclude that faith-based organizations bridge social capital by fostering inter-congregational, inter-denominational, and interfaith links between religious congregations, by building inter-racial ties between racial and ethnic communities often isolated or in competition with each other, and also by linking faith-based and secular institutions together.

Warren (2001) also concluded that faith-based organizations are highly effective at building bridging social capital through his case study on the Texas IAF. Warren made this conclusion based on the fact that faith-based organizations use faith or the belief in God to unite and mobilize individuals, rather than race or ethnicity. By mobilizing on faith, these organizations can bring different types of people together under one unifying concept of spirituality. Faith

is also used as a tool to minimize racism (through religious morals and ethics) and to help individuals realize similarities in their beliefs and the issues that affect them. Warren also found that due to their large networks of congregations and organizations in communities, faith-based organizations give individuals the opportunity to work with others who belong to different racial, ethnic or religious groups. By simply bringing different groups of people together, the potential for building relationships and hence, bridging social capital exists.

Similarly, Slessarev-Jamir (2004) conducted interviews with leaders from faith-based organizations and found that the most frequently mentioned strength of engaging in organizing was the bonding and unity created by diverse people of faith working together. The leaders who participated in the study placed a high value on the very experience of diverse people coming together to develop strategies, formulate issues, and plan actions. In turn, these experiences created bridging social capital.

Limitations and challenges of faith-based organizations. One limitation of faith-based organizations is they tend to be more successful at the local level, rather than at the national level (Swarts, 2008; Wood, 2002). Addressing local issues is an important component to grassroots organizing, but having limited impact on larger-scale issues and national policy will not build power for faith-based organizations. Improving efforts with national campaigns is a strategy that may help faith-based organizations build more power and have a stronger presence within American politics.

Another limitation to faith-based organizations is the difficulty bridging the gaps between different economic classes (Swarts, 2008). Faith-based organizations can be economically diverse, but lower income individuals often encounter barriers when trying to serve as leaders due to time constraints and limited civic skills (Swarts, 2008). Race-based organizations are more effective at bridging the gap between classes.

Although mentioned earlier as a strength, faith-based organizations also struggle with bringing together large numbers of people with differing opinions to work together on issues. (Slessarev-Jamir, 2004). With members coming from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds, it can be difficult to motivate and mobilize people toward a common vision or goal. Similarly, faith-based organizations may struggle with recruiting members that are representative of the community in which the organization works. For example, Warren and Wood (2001) discuss the racial, ethnic and religious composition of the organizations surveyed in their study. While the organizations included appeared to bridge gaps between three major racial groups; White, Black, and Latino, the organizations were limited in their ability to include religious groups outside of Christian denominations.

What appears to be missing from the literature on faith-based organizing is whether or not these organizations are truly bridging across multiple cultures and if they consist of members that are representative of the communities they are serving. Further, literature on faith-based organizing is limited in its

description of how relationship building and bridging across cultures actually happens and whether the relationships that are formed are restricted to addressing particular issues or if they become deeper, long-term bonds between members. By examining interactions among members of MOSES as well as inquiring about their personal experiences with relating to and interacting with other members, I hope to fill in these gaps in the literature. It is my hope that I will capture the process of bridging social capital development through immersing myself in the activities of the organization as a member, and witnessing as well as experiencing how these bonds are formed and sustained.

The literature is also limited in the types of organizations researchers have studied and written about. The IAF has been studied by several researchers, and PICO has been a subject of inquiry as well. The Gamaliel Foundation, the third largest faith-based organizing institution, of which MOSES is a member, has not been studied at length. While most faith-based institutions have developed their organizations based on the structure of the IAF, the original organizing institution founded by Saul Alinsky (Robinson & Hanna, 1994), each has their own philosophy and strategy for building power. Examining the strategies and processes of MOSES may illuminate practices for building bridging social capital that researchers have yet to discover.

Finally, while not a gap in the literature per se, but something that has not been discussed in the literature regarding faith-based organizing is a faith-based organization mobilizing members on something other than faith. Specifically,

MOSES organizes on issues, not faith, despite being a faith-based organization. This study will look at the strategies MOSES uses to mobilize around issues and how this affects building solidarity and relationships among members. Is it the issues that bring people together and motivate them to work as a team or is faith part of a personal identity that helps members to relate to one another and foster working relationship? This is important to understand in regards to what facilitates the formation of bridging social capital.

CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL CAPITAL THEORY

Emergence and Evolution

The concept of capital as it relates to people emerged as early as the 17th century and was initially conceptualized from an economic standpoint to measure the financial value of a human being to greater society, and was also known as human capital (Kiker, 1966). In order to understand how people contribute to the wealth of a society, economists attempted to estimate the value of a human being by examining the cost of supporting, educating and training people, the product of their labor, and how their productivity adds to national wealth (Kiker, 1966). Later, Adam Smith expanded the concept of human capital by including the skills and useful abilities of human beings as forms of capital (1937). Essentially, these early discussions of capital and how it is generated focused primarily on how the productivity of people could increase wealth within society.

According to several social capital scholars (Farr, 2004; Lin, 2001; Woolcock & Narayan, 2000), Karl Marx was one of the first theorists to discuss capital in a social context. Rather than emphasizing individual skills and the potential to produce goods or services that yield returns, Marx suggested that capital emerges through social relations in the *processes* of production and consumption (Lin, 2001; Marx, 1967). Focusing on the exploitive social relations between classes, Marx accepted the general notion that capital involves the production and exchange of commodities, however, he also expressed that capital is more than just a commodity or value. He argued that capital involves an

investment by the parties involved to make the exchange. Only by being exchanged do the products of labor acquire value or social status (Marx, 1967). Marx believed that capital is a social notion; it entails the processes of social activity: "The exchange of commodities, therefore, first begins on the boundaries of such communities, at their points of contact with other similar communities, or with members of the latter. So soon, however, as products once become commodities in the external relations of a community, they also, by reaction, become so in its internal intercourse" (p. 87). Finally, Marx emphasized that capital is captured by those who make the investment to the production of capital, in other words, those who have control or power over the process of capital are the ones who will benefit from it (Marx, 1967).

While Marx's classical theory focuses on the production of surplus and the power status of particular groups, it also defines capital as a social process involving social interaction and exchange which represented a different perspective during this time. Marx also made an important observation about the importance of investing in capital and controlling the mechanisms that produce capital. Looking at current literature on social capital, it is apparent that Marx helped paved the way to understand the power of capital formation and the importance of controlling resources.

The concept of capital in the economic sense as well as human capital continued to be defined, measured and examined during the late 1800s and early 1900s. *Social capital*, the way it is currently defined, emerged through the work of

Lyda Hanifan, a superintendent of schools in West Virginia in 1916 (Putnam, 2000; Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). Hanifan defined social capital not in terms of tangible resources, but in regards to the substances that make the tangible resources count: "goodwill, fellowship, mutual sympathy, and social intercourse among a group of individuals and families who make up a social unit…" (1916, p. 130). Hanifan's concept of social capital emphasized the worth of relationships and connections formed by people rather than what people produced through social interactions. Hanfian believed that individuals were helpless by themselves and that human beings have an inherent desire to be part of a larger group. Interaction with others satisfies the social needs of an individual, which in turn, can lead to community improvement:

> "When the people of a given community have become acquainted with one another and have formed a habit of coming together upon occasions for entertainment, social intercourse and personal enjoyment, that is, when sufficient social capital has been accumulated, then by skillful leadership this social capital may easily be directed towards the general improvement of the community well-being" (1916, p. 131).

Hanifan's perspective on social capital underscores the importance of human relationships and also makes one of the first connections between social relationships and civic engagement in the form of improving one's community.

After Hanifan, the idea of social capital as a topic of scholarly discourse disappeared for several decades, but was revisited by three urban sociologists, Seely, Sim, and Loosely in the 1950s who studied middle-class suburban life in a Toronto community that lacked a strong local identification. Seely, Sim and Loosely (1954) focused on the increased individualization occurring within

suburban communities and how this type of isolation may have detrimental effects on sustaining healthy communities.

Jane Jacobs, also an urban sociologist, emphasized protecting social capital within cities. She believed that social bonds were necessary to the vitality of a city (1961). In her book, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Jacobs states that two things are central to maintaining the social capital of any place: (1) neighborhood diversity so that people can remain within their local area even though their housing needs, jobs and lifestyles may change, and (2) agreeable, easily accessible settings for public contact including well-designed public infrastructure, public spaces and commercial resources and other institutions (1961).

The work of these four sociologists contributed to contemporary conceptualizations of social capital by examining how people can generate it through interactions within neighborhoods, communities, and throughout cities. It also reinforced the idea of interdependence among individuals to generate and sustain social capital through social interaction and exchange. These contributions emphasized the importance of relationships between individuals for the formation of social capital.

The work of Glenn Loury, an economist, has also been prominent in social capital literature. In his study of racial income inequality, Loury concluded that racial inequality could not be reduced through legal remedies or equal opportunity programs alone due to the inherited poverty of black parents which

would be transmitted through limited access to material resources, fewer educational opportunities, and limited social networks of young black workers that restricted access to information about opportunities (Loury, 1981; Portes, 1998). Although Loury's concept of social capital emphasized the importance of social connections to enhance opportunities, his work did not translate to the further development of social capital theory.

Pierre Bourdieu, a French sociologist, is credited for providing the first systematic contemporary analysis of social capital (Portes, 1998; Putnam, 2000). He defined social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition" (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 248). Bourdieu's version of social capital suggests that social relationships in and of themselves allow individuals to access resources. Bourdieu also introduced the concepts of *cultural capital*, which refers to the knowledge, experience or connections one has had through the course of his/her life that enables s/he to succeed more so than someone from a less experienced background, and *symbolic capital*, which are the resources available to an individual on the basis of honor, prestige or recognition (Bourdieu, 1985). Like Marx and Loury, Bourdieu recognized the importance of social structures for building and sustaining social capital.

James Coleman is another scholar who has made significant contributions to the concept of social capital. According to Coleman (1988), social capital is

"not a single entity, but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors – whether persons or corporate actors – within the structure" (p. S98). Coleman differentiated between the different forms of capital; *physical capital* which refers to tangible objects or resources; *human capital* which is created by the skills and capabilities brought by individuals; and *social capital*, which is developed through relationships between individuals (1988).

Coleman (1988) suggested that there are three elements of social relations that can yield useful capital resources for people; obligations, access to information, and group reinforcement of norms. The first one, obligations, expectations and trustworthiness of structures, involves individuals creating expectations and obligations through reciprocal actions. Basically, this refers to people doing good things for one another. This type of social relation depends on trust, knowing obligations will be reciprocated; and social environment, the extent of obligations held. Importantly, Coleman argues that individuals in social structures with high levels of obligation have more social capital on which they can draw.

The second element of social relations is linked to access to information. According to Coleman, access to information is important for providing a basis for action. Further, information can often be difficult or arduous to come by. Through social relations that are already maintained for other purposes, one can acquire needed information which often leads to increased resources.

Finally, the third element is group enforcement of norms. When norms exist and are effective, they can establish powerful forms of social capital. For example, norms that inhibit crime can make people feel safer about leaving their home at night. This type or element of social capital can facilitate certain actions as well as constrain others in a way that can be beneficial to all members of a community.

In addition to social relations, Coleman believed that social structures also facilitate some forms of social capital (1988). People establish relationships purposefully and continue those relationships when they continue to provide benefits. According to Coleman, certain kinds of social structures are especially important in facilitating some forms of social capital. The first one Coleman discusses is the closure of social networks. Closure of social networks involves avoiding the imposition of negative actions from outside sources. From Coleman's perspective, closure of the social structure is important for the existence of effective norms, but also for the trustworthiness of social structures that allows for the development of obligations and expectations. The other social structure that Coleman discusses is appropriable social organization (1988). Organizations are almost always established for a purpose and are often institutions that help people to organize and confront particular community issues. Organizations can be sources of social capital for members and although initiated for one purpose, can be used for other purposes as well.

Current Perspectives

According to Grootaert, et al. (2004), there are two broad perspectives for discussing social capital within the contemporary social science literature. The first perspective focuses on the resources (e.g. information, ideas, support) that individuals are able to obtain through their relationships with others. The resources which are considered *capital* are considered *social* because they are only accessible through relationships. This perspective also emphasizes the importance of network structure (who interacts with whom, in what context and how often), on the flow of resources through that network. Contemporary social capital scholars, such as Nan Lin and Ronald Burt, have each contributed to this conceptualization of social capital.

According to Nan Lin (2001), a social capital scholar who has focused primarily on social networks, social capital is "the investment in social relations with expected returns in the marketplace" (p. 19). Lin offers a set of theoretical assumptions in regards to social capital that are framed in the micro, mezzo, and macro structures of society. For the macrostructure, Lin presents three theoretical assumptions. First, the basic structure of society is shaped like a pyramid. Those who are at the top of the pyramid have more access to and control of resources. Second, this hierarchical structure applies to all resources. In other words, people with more access to one particular resource will likely have more access to other resources. Finally, those at the top of the pyramid are few in number. So essentially, a select group of people have access and control

63

over the resources in society.

For the micro and mezzo structures, Lin presents two assumptions. First, social interactions are more likely to take place among people at similar or adjacent levels, or in other words, among people who are alike or belong to the same community or group. According to Lin, interactions with people who are different demand effort due to difference and inequality. Essentially, people who are different are less likely to interact and are therefore less likely to engage in collective activity with one another. The second assumption Lin presents is that there are two primary driving forces that account for actions: gaining and maintaining valued resources (2001). Basically, Lin suggests that people form relationships with others who are convenient or relatively easy to interact with and the purpose of reaching out to others is to obtain and or maintain needed resources.

Like Lin, Burt views social capital from the social networks perspective. According to his structural hole theory, social capital is defined in terms of "the information and control advantages of being the broker in relations between people otherwise disconnected in social structure" (Burt, 1997, p. 340). The people who are not connected stand on opposite sides of the hole in social structure, and the hole is an opportunity for the *broker* to control information and resources between the disconnected people. Having access to and control of the information resources is considered capital and again it is social because it

involves forming relationships. So from the network perspective, social capital is dependent on one's place in the social structure.

The second broad perspective or way of discussing social capital is most commonly associated with Robert Putnam and focuses on involvement with various informal networks and formal civil organizations (Grootaert, et al., 2004). Putnam defines social capital as "features of social life - networks, norms and trust - that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (Putnam, 1996, p. 34). Putnam's concept of social capital focuses on the interaction of people within networks and the resulting effects of these interactions on neighborhoods, communities and local government. Unlike the social network perspective, Putnam's conceptualization emphasizes the benefits to the larger public, rather than on individual gains through forming relationships. He believes that civic engagement, "people's connections with the life of their community" (Putnam, 1995b, p. 665), provides people with the social connections that build trust. The trust gained through social connections ultimately increases cooperation, resulting in increased collective action for solving social problems.

From Putnam's view, trust and engagement are the two major facets of social capital (Putnam, 1995b). By engaging with others we connect with them, and the more we connect with other people, the more we trust them and vice-versa. Ultimately the benefit of trust and engagement is the improved performance of government and other social institutions in society. Putnam has

shown in his studies on social capital and civic engagement that governments and institutions are more effective when citizens are involved civically (1993). Putnam's conceptual framework of social capital is unique because it allows us to look at neighborhood, community and societal gains through collaborative efforts by individuals, rather than focusing on how resources can be accessed and controlled by a select few.

Through his work, Putnam has made four important distinctions between types of social capital (Putnam & Goss, 2002). First, social capital can be *formal* or *informal*, meaning it can be built through formal organizations or less formal groups like block clubs. Second, social capital can be *thick* or *thin*, meaning that the connections people make can be with people they interact with every day and are intertwined with or they can be with casual acquaintances they may not know very well. Third, social capital can be *inward looking* or *outward looking*. With inward social capital, a group would be looking at their own interests within the group. With outward social capital, people would be looking at public goods or things outside of the group.

Finally, Putman (Putnam & Goss, 2002) believes that social capital can be *bonding* or *bridging*. Bonding social capital brings together people who are alike or belong to the same group whether it is gender, race, religion or culture. As purported by Homans (1950) and Lin (2001), bonding social capital can be easier to build because people may already be in contact with one another and already have similarities among them. Bridging social capital brings together people who

are not alike such as people of different races, religions or socioeconomic status. This type of social capital is more difficult to build because of limited opportunities for interaction as well as significant differences between groups which may act as a barrier to trust. Many groups or organizations attempt to maintain a balance between bonding and bridging social capital, forming and maintaining both internal and external relationships (Putnam & Goss, 2002).

Bridging social capital is especially important for developing the type of social capital described by Putnam; namely the social capital that yields healthy, productive communities and more effective government and social institutions. By building trust and relationships across differences, citizens who would not otherwise interact may engage in collective action together to bring about social change. The literature on faith-based organizations working to increase cooperation between people of different racial groups, ethnicity, class and other dividing lines has examined the process of bridging social capital and its effectiveness for building strong working relationships across differences.

Bridging Social Capital

As briefly discussed in the previous section, bridging social capital refers to connections across communities and the ties that are generated among those who are different along a relevant dimension of social life (Wood & Warren, 2002). Bridging social capital involves forming cooperative connections across boundaries, particularly those of race and class, in order to bring people together for the common good. While more difficult to generate, bridging social capital

enables people to gain access to different information, resources and opportunities (Narayan, 1999).

Granovetter (1973) emphasized the importance of these *cross-cutting* or weak ties between individuals since more people can be reached through these types of ties rather than the strong ties we form within our own groups. The strong ties that we maintain are strong due to convenience and frequency of contact and resources tend to be easily accessible through these contacts. Weak ties are often with groups or individuals we are not so familiar with and hence, have limited access to the information and resources they hold. From a social network perspective, having these cross-cutting ties expands the pool of resources and increases social capital.

Other scholars have argued that bridging social capital is important because it promotes a sense of civic responsibility, overcomes divisiveness and encourages tolerance and cooperation (Portes & Landolt, 1996; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999) and may increase the likelihood of collective action on social and political issues (Larsen et al., 2004).

According to Wood and Warren (2002) bridging social capital is missing in American life. Despite the efforts of the civil rights movement and groups working to challenge racial and ethnic divides, American cities are still highly segregated (Massey & Denton, 1993). On a day-to-day basis, most Americans are limited to contact with individuals who are similar to themselves and rarely venture out to form relationships with people from different racial, ethnic, and religious

backgrounds. These divisions are what make bridging social capital more difficult to generate and sustain because it requires that people look beyond their immediate networks and social groups (Wuthnow, 2002). Building solidarity within homogeneous groups is important because it provides a foundation for members to feel confident about engaging in democratic life, yet if communities remain isolated and do not reach out to different groups, they will continue to be powerless against large-scale political institutions (Warren, 2001; Wood & Warren, 2002). Bridging social capital can be seen as a way to build power through numbers and the expansion and sharing of resources needed to facilitate social change.

Since most Americans do not interact outside of their own social circles, *how do we build bridging social capital?* Wood and Warren (2002) suggest that bridging social capital is being established and sustained within faith-based organizing institutions. Interestingly, church congregations themselves reflect the segregation that exists in larger society and are, in general, divided by race and class (Putnam, 2000). As discussed previously, faith-based organizing institutions work to bridge local member congregations and promote relationship building between clergy and church leaders that may differ in race, ethnicity, religion, and/or religious denomination. While secular, race-based organizations have the important task of building solidarity among various groups of color, faith-based organizations have the challenge of building bridges that address several

dimensions of difference. Are faith-based organizations living up to this challenge?

While the literature suggests that faith-based organizations are working to bridge the divides between race, religion and secular/religious affiliation, it is somewhat vague in describing how bridging social capital occurs. Is bridging social capital something that happens naturally over time or is there a distinct process that must be initiated to properly establish relationships between people of different groups? Also is there a certain level of bridging that must occur to keep participants active and involved? According to Warren (2001), faith-based organizations create bridging social capital by bringing leaders from different faith communities together and encouraging them to work to find a common ground for taking action together. Building this type of social capital involves building trust among leaders over time which requires addressing specific issues and understanding the roles of others in society.

In his qualitative case study of the IAF in Texas, Warren (2001) found several strategies they used to be effective for building bridging social capital. First, the Texas IAF incorporated frank discussions of race in meetings and through relationship building activities. From Warren's perspective, individuals can decide to interact and work together, but without a deeper understanding of personal experiences with racism and discrimination, it may be difficult to develop trust and understanding of the importance of particular issues. Warren warns that by avoiding discussions on race, relationships will be superficial and

succumb to destruction. He suggests that to facilitate bridging social capital, groups can arrange seminars with guest speakers to address issues faced by a particular group in addition to having informal discussions/education sessions among members. As discussed previously, one of the components of social capital is trust. By building trust among members, it is believed that members will be more likely to engage and with engagement comes social capital formation (Putnam, 1995b).

Another strategy discussed was being aware of the discriminatory and hierarchical dynamics of society and not projecting them into the organizing arena. In other words, groups should avoid allowing individuals who may belong to privileged racial, ethnic, gender or other demographic or social groups to dominate in the organizing realm. Similarly, it is important to address the issue of privileged groups approaching organizing from a *charity* standpoint rather than through equal partnership. Organizing is not about helping people or giving people power, it is about working together equally to generate and harness power. If White group members believe they need to help other non-white members or wealthy members express the need to assist those who are less fortunate, these attitudes will not build trust. Instead, they are likely to build suspicion and resentment. In order to build trust, members need to feel they are equal and are engaging for a common good. Leaders must approach organizing around issues in a way that assumes that all groups are equal and bring equal skills and ideas to the table.

A third strategy is to encourage congregations and organizations to develop social capital from within (bonding social capital). Groups who have trust and understanding inside of their groups will be more effective bridging with external groups. According to Warren, it is important for groups to maintain their own identities and hold on to issues that are important to them. In his study, Warren (2001) discusses how the IAF encouraged groups to work on issues that were important to their own respective church or group in addition to working jointly with other congregations. If churches and organizations are unable to build relationships and solidarity from within, it is unlikely they will be able to build trusting relationships with others. Literature on bonding and bridging social capital has suggested that strong bonding social capital is necessary for the formation of bridging social capital (Larsen, et al., 2004; Newell, Tansley, & Huang, 2004; Warren, Thompson, & Saegert, 2001).

Finally, Warren suggests that groups should select issues they agree on and avoid issues that may be divisive. Based on race, religion or other characteristics, there will be issues that not all groups can agree on. By focusing on common issues and concerns, groups can build relationships and solidarity to effectively address those issues. In the first strategy presented, Warren expresses the importance of discussing and making attempts to understand differences, but ultimately, differences should not be the focus of organizing efforts. Faith-based organizing institutions have the difficult task of building relationships between individuals who may never interact in larger society. By

selecting issues that most can agree on, organizers can build trust and solidarity based on the intent to address the issue and not on identity.

Limitations of Social Capital Theory

In academic literature, social capital is frequently discussed as a concept that has several different definitions, and hence, can be hard to conceptualize and measure. Many of the elements that are involved with the creation or formation of social capital, such as trust and solidarity, are also difficult to measure. As mentioned previously, faith-based organizations have been identified as entities that have been successful at generating bridging social capital, or relationships between heterogeneous groups. While Warren (2001) offers several suggestions for encouraging the development of bridging social capital, a theoretical model describing how bridging social capital is formed and developed currently does not exist. The closest reference to a model for generating bridging social capital is the literature on studies that have examined the strategies incorporated by the IAF, the largest and most frequently studied faith-based organizing institution in the United States (Robinson & Hanna, 1994; Warren, 2001).

Several dimensions of social capital have been identified by Grootaert, et al., (2004) in their quest to develop a quantitative instrument that will accurately measure social capital. These dimensions consist of connections within groups and networks, trust and solidarity, collective action and cooperation, information and communication, social cohesion and inclusion, and empowerment and

political action. Each of these dimensions are important components for the formation of social capital, yet social capital theory does not provide a clear understanding of how we build trust, solidarity, cohesion, inclusion and the other components. For studying bridging social capital and developing a model for how it emerges, it is important to understand the processes involved in social capital formation. In this study, I hope to capture the process of bridging social capital as well as the elements that facilitate the formation of it. These elements may be particular strategies that MOSES' employs in their organization or within taskforces that work on specific issues or a more natural process that is facilitated by people working together over a period of time.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this mixed-methods case study was to capture the process of bridging social capital formation within a faith-based organization in order to enhance theories on social capital as well as practice models aimed at increasing and improving relationships among people from different racial, ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds. This study incorporated a sequential qual-QUAL-quan design, comprised of a qualitative pilot study, a qualitative approach to the core study, and a survey designed to capture quantitative data. This chapter describes the study's research methodology overall and includes details about: (a) research questions to be addressed, (b) description of the research sample, (c) the research methods employed, (d) conceptualization and measurement, and (e) data analysis.

Research Questions

In order to gather general information about the organization and develop research questions that would assist me in capturing the process of bridging social capital formation within faith-based organizations, I conducted a 4-month, exploratory, pilot study on MOSES. I collected data using three different strategies. First, I interviewed important stakeholders within the organization. The individuals interviewed consisted of current staff members, current board members, and currently active clergy members. The Executive Director was also interviewed as part of the study. Interview questions consisted of several items

inquiring about the history and philosophy of the organization, as well as daily operations and management. Discussions with those interviewed regarding goals, strategies for recruitment, the mobilization of members, and fundraising also occurred.

In addition to conducting preliminary interviews, I collected archival data on the organization, including newspaper articles, annual reports, bulletins, programs and/or event booklets, flyers promoting special events and fundraisers, training materials, board meeting minutes, and notes taken from meetings and events. Archival data was collected in order to gather historical and structural information about the organization. Archival data, particularly newspaper articles, were collected to have a better understanding of the social issues addressed and the strategies used to address them. Finally, I observed organizational functions such as taskforce meetings, rallies, training sessions, and special events.

Findings from the pilot study indicated that MOSES appears to be one of few, if not the only multicultural, interfaith organization in Detroit addressing social issues. Second, MOSES organizes member congregations by encouraging them to form core teams that are dedicated to a particular social issue (e.g., transportation). The organization uses staff organizers to mobilize the core teams to take action around the issues they are passionate about. Third, although MOSES considers itself to be a multicultural, interfaith organization, members are primarily Christian, and either African American or White. Fourth, the pilot study revealed that there were some external and internal barriers to

sustaining membership as well as recruiting new members. Specifically, external barriers include divisions along city/suburban lines or across religious traditions. Study participants reported that some current members are not comfortable with purposely recruiting non-Christian congregations. Internal barriers, such as a lack of a systematic recruitment process, may also make finding new members more difficult.

Finally, the importance of relationship building within MOSES was underscored. According to those interviewed, building relationships among members created trust, solidarity, and accountability; all of which help to sustain membership and encourage members to act on social issues. Relationship building also plays a role in improving cooperation between members from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. These findings, while somewhat broad, provided pertinent information about MOSES that facilitated the development of the research questions and methodology for the core study.

This study addresses six research questions: (1) What are the strategies MOSES uses to develop and sustain the eight dimensions of social capital within the organization and within issue taskforces?; (2) What are the internal and external barriers MOSES faces to developing and sustaining each of these dimensions of social capital?; (3) To what extent do each of these dimensions of social capital exist within the organization? Within the taskforces?; (4) To what extent is MOSES bridging gaps between people of different demographic groups (e.g., Are taskforces truly heterogeneous)?; (5) To what extent are differences

between members addressed? If they are addressed, how are they addressed?; and (6) How effective is mobilizing members based on social issues in building social capital?

According to Grootaert et al., (2004), there are six dimensions or facilitators of social capital: (1) groups and networks, (2) trust and solidarity, (3) (3) social cohesion and inclusion, (4) information and communication, (5) collective action and cooperation, and (6) empowerment and political action. The presence of each of these dimensions within an organization suggests that forms of social capital, such as bridging, bonding, and linking, may be present. Because social capital itself is an abstract construct, capturing words and actions that are representative of the dimensions could help identify the presence of social capital within the organization or taskforces. Identifying the extent to which these dimensions exist is important for measuring social capital. Since this study aims to capture the process of social capital formation as well, inquiring about the strategies that seem to produce each of the dimensions is also important.

Through my interviews, it became apparent that there may be certain ideologies or external circumstances that could have an influence on relationship building within the organization. For example, there may be tension between members who live in the city of Detroit and members who live in the suburbs. There also may be internal barriers, such as the lack of processes or procedures that would facilitate the development of the dimensions of social capital. These concerns prompted my inquiry about potential barriers to social capital formation.

The fourth research question emerged from the extant literature which suggests that faith-based organizations are more successful at building working relationships among people of different races, ethnicities, and religions (Swarts, 2008; Wood, 2002; Wood & Warren, 2002). However, results from the pilot study results suggest that there may be some barriers across people of different backgrounds that impede their working together. I felt it was important to examine whether or not people from different backgrounds are truly working together on issues of common concern. One strategy for inquiring about this was to look at the taskforces that operate within MOSES. Since the taskforces are the means by which MOSES addresses social issues, their interactions could reveal whether or not racial, religious, and socioeconomic gaps between different people were being bridged.

The fifth research question is linked to the suggested strategies for effective relationship building in faith-based organizations proposed by Warren (2001). Two of the strategies Wood suggests for building bridging social capital are (1) having organizations directly address the racial and cultural differences that exist between members; and (2) acknowledging the hierarchical nature of society in order to avoid recreating that dynamic within the organization. Since this may be an effective strategy for developing lasting, working relationships, I felt it was important to examine whether or not such differences were being addressed within MOSES.

Finally, the last research question was developed as a result of a discussion with the Executive Director of MOSES as well as from the literature on faith-based organizations that underscores how such organizations are mobilized to act on social issues using their faith beliefs (Swarts, 2008; Wood, 2002). Although faith-based organizations are unique due to framing social issues around religious beliefs, MOSES purports to mobilize their members based on the issues and not on faith. This seems to be a different approach compared to other faith-based organizations. Because it is unique, I think it is important to explore whether organizing around social issues is effective as a mechanism for building trust and solidarity.

The Research Sample

Qualitative methods. For the participant observation component of the study, both purposive and convenience sampling methods were utilized. The purposive sampling method initially was used since I knew I wanted to attend larger organization meetings, clergy caucus meetings, taskforce meetings, and board meetings in order to observe interactions between staff, board members, clergy members, and taskforce members. Convenience sampling also was incorporated in addition to purposive sampling because once at meetings and events, I had the opportunity to observe other individuals who were involved with MOSES. While my intent was to focus on particular types of members, I wanted to be open to the contributions others were making in forming and sustaining relationships within MOSES. Rather than limit my observations to those I

selected, I also made notes on observations of other individuals participating in meetings and events.

All members of MOSES who received email, viewed the website, or attended general organization meetings, board meetings, clergy caucus meetings, and taskforce meetings were informed of the possibility of being observed. An information sheet explaining the observation process was distributed through email, posted on the organization's website, and distributed and discussed in-person at meetings and events. Members were informed that no personal identifying information would be recorded and that they had the option of not participating in the study. Members were instructed to inform me in-person, over the phone or by email of their desire to opt out of participating in the study. The observation sample consisted of approximately 120 individuals, not including larger scale public meetings that are open to the greater community and non-members. Larger-scale meetings, such as the annual public meeting and the immigration rally, attracted more than 1,000 individuals, many of whom would not be considered members of the organization.

For the in-depth interviews, purposive sampling methods were utilized; selecting only members who serve as taskforce members, clergy members, non-clergy congregation leaders, board members, and MOSES staff members. Individuals selected for interviews were those who, through participant observation, were identified as highly involved in the activities of the organization. Potential interviewees were approached in-person, via email or over the phone

and invited to participate in a 60 to 75 minute, in-person interview. While the majority of participants were selected on the basis of my observations in various meetings and events, snowball sampling was also used to recruit additional interviewees. On a number of occasions, interview participants would recommend that I speak to a particular member due to their commitment, experience or personal knowledge of the organization or a particular issue. Some of these recommendations led to inviting certain members to participate in interviews. A total of 20 interviews were completed during the course of the study.

Quantitative methods. The SC-IQ survey was administered to all current members of MOSES serving on a taskforce as well as clergy members, congregation leaders/representatives (other than clergy), board members, and MOSES staff members. The sampling method used was purposive due to my intent to seek responses from the types of organization members mentioned above. The survey was administered in two different formats: electronically through a secured website and via U.S. mail for those who did not have Internet access. Participants receiving the electronic version of the survey received an email message with a link directing the recipient to the survey website. An information sheet explaining the survey and the purpose of the study was distributed in the body of the email. Participants who did not have email addresses or Internet access and who were taskforce members, clergy members, congregation leaders/representatives, board members or staff

members, were mailed a paper copy of the survey, including an information sheet and a postage-paid return envelope. The survey sample consisted of 286 members initially; 112 administered via email and 174 administered via hard-copy through U.S. mail. After conducting follow-up telephone calls for the hard-copy survey, it was determined that only 103 were valid addresses, which altered the survey sample to a total of 215. A total of 78 surveys were completed online or returned via U.S. mail, yielding a response rate of approximately 36 percent.

Survey participant characteristics. Full results of respondent characteristics are found in Table 4.1. Of the MOSES members who participated in the survey, approximately 48 percent were African American, 46 percent were White, and 6 percent were Latino, Native American, or Bi-Racial. Approximately 55 percent were female. Respondents tended to be older, with about 22 percent being between the ages of 30 and 49, 31 percent between the ages of 50 and 59, 38 percent between the ages of 60 and 69, and 9 percent being 70 years of age or older. In regards to residence, the majority (63 percent) were residents of the city of Detroit, followed by outer-ring suburbs (24 percent) and then inner-ring suburbs (13 percent).

Most respondents identified with the middle socioeconomic class (72 percent), with 16 percent identifying as upper class and 12 percent as working or lower class. Most respondents were also highly educated. 31 reported having bachelor's degrees and 40 percent reported having master's degrees. 7 percent shared they had a doctoral degree, 16 percent had high school educations, and

approximately 6 percent had associate's degrees. 82 percent of respondents identified as Democrats. The remaining 18 percent identified as "other" which included Independent, Moderate, and Green party affiliation. In regards to religious/spiritual affiliation, respondents were primarily of the Christian faith, with the majority being Catholic (37 percent) and Baptist (27 percent). Almost 8 percent reported identifying as Lutheran, almost 8 percent Unitarian-Universalist, almost 8 percent non-denominational Christian, and approximately 13 percent indicated "other" which included other Protestant denominations, Jewish, and non-religious.

In regards to length of membership within the organization, 27 percent of the respondents were involved for 9 years or longer, 24 percent for 3 to 4 years, 18 percent for 1 to 2 years, 13 percent for 5 to 6 years, 10 percent for 1 year or less, and 8 percent for 7 to 8 years. In regards to members' primary roles in the organization, 32 percent indicated their primary role is as a clergy member or congregation leader, 30 percent indicated they were members of a MOSES taskforce, and another 23 percent indicated they were general members without specific roles. Board members comprised 11 percent and secular organizations leaders made up the remaining 4 percent of respondents. Of the respondents whose primary role in MOSES was a member of a taskforce, 50 percent of respondents were members of the transportation taskforce, 20 percent were members of the healthcare taskforce, 8 percent were members of the civil rights and immigration taskforce, 5 percent were members of the supermarket

Table 4.1

Characteristics of MOSES Survey Respondents

Characteristic	All %	African American %	White %
Race			
African American	47.8	0.0	0.0
White	46.3	0.0	0.0
Other	5.9	0.0	0.0
Gender			
Female	54.7	75.9	35.5
Male	45.3	24.1	64.5
Age			
30-49	11.8	21.9	3.2
50-59	32.4	31.3	35.5
60-69	36.8	37.5	35.5
70+	19.1	9.4	25.8
Location of Residence			
Detroit	62.7	75.0	43.3
Inner-ring suburb	13.4	18.8	10.0
Outer-ring suburb	23.9	6.3	46.7
Religion/Denomination			
Catholic	37.3	12.9	54.8
Baptist	26.9	48.4	9.7
Lutheran	7.5	6.5	9.7
Unitarian-Universalist	7.5	3.2	12.9
Non-denomination Christian	7.5	12.9	0.0
Other	13.3	16.1	12.9

Table 4.1 (continued)

Characteristic	All %	African American %	White %
Socioeconomic Status			
Upper class	16.4	6.5	29.0
Middle class	71.6	77.4	67.7
Working/Lower class	12.0	16.1	3.2
Level of Education			
High school/Some college	16.2	21.9	3.2
Associate's degree	5.8	9.4	3.2
Bachelor's degree	30.9	37.5	25.8
Master's degree	39.7	31.3	51.6
Doctorate degree	7.4	0.0	16.1
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	82.1	90.6	71.0
Other	17.9	9.4	29.0
Length of MOSES Membership			
Less than 1 year	10.3	6.3	6.5
1 to 2 years	17.9	18.8	16.1
3 to 4 years	24.4	34.4	16.1
5 to 6 years	12.8	9.4	16.1
7 to 8 years	7.7	6.3	9.7
9 years or more	26.9	25.0	35.5
Primary Role in Organization			
Taskforce member	30.1	34.4	20.0
Board member	11.0	15.6	10.0
Clergy/Congregation leader	31.5	21.9	36.7

Table 4.1 (continued)

Characteristic	All %	African American %	White %
Secular leader	4.1	0.0	6.7
Other	23.3	28.1	23.3
Primary Taskforce			
Transportation	50.0	46.7	50.0
Healthcare	20.0	13.3	25.0
Supermarket	5.0	6.7	6.3
Civil rights and Immigration	7.5	0.0	6.3
Other	17.5	33.3	12.5
Length of Taskforce Membership			
2 years or less	54.1	53.8	46.7
3 to 6 years	35.1	30.8	40.0
7 years or more	10.8	15.4	13.3

N=68

taskforce and approximately 17 percent identified as members of "other" taskforces which included the land bank and safe zone taskforces which are no longer active. Interestingly, the majority of respondents who belong to taskforces have been serving on those taskforces for 2 years or less (54 percent). 35 percent were members for 3 to 6 years, and approximately 11 percent were members for 7 years or more.

Interview participant characteristics. Of the MOSES members interviewed, 13 were White, six were African American and one identified as Latina. Approximately half of the interview participants were women (11). Of the members interviewed, 10 were between the ages of 60 and 69, five were

between the ages of 40 and 49, three were between the ages of 50 and 59, and two were between the ages of 30 and 39. In regards to religion, seven were Lutheran, five were Catholic, four were Unitarian-Universalist, two were non-denominational Christians, one was Jewish, and one was not affiliated with a particular religion or congregation. Seven of the interview participants were taskforce members, six were both members of the board and clergy members, four were board members only, two were clergy only, and one was a former board member who is currently a general members. Nine interviewees were clergy in member churches, 11 were members of taskforces, two considered themselves general members (no specific role), and one was a Gamaliel Foundation staff member. Of the 11 interview participants who were members of taskforces, five were members of the healthcare taskforce, three were members of the transportation taskforce, two were members of the supermarket taskforce, and one was a member of the civil rights and immigration taskforce.

Methods Employed

I selected a sequential qual-QUAL-quan, mixed-methods research design for my 12-month case study. This allowed me to gather general information about the existence and development of social capital from a diverse array of organization members while at the same time, capturing personal experiences of key leaders who have been involved in developing and sustaining relationships within the organization. According to Dudwick, et al. (2006), a mixed-methods approach to studying social capital formation is ideal because of the abstract

nature of both the concept and the process. In other words, social capital cannot necessarily be measured just quantitatively or qualitatively since it is both a theoretical concept and a process that involves people interacting and relating. While this study incorporated primarily qualitative methods (archival research, participant observation, and interviews) to capture the process of bridging social capital formation, administering a survey allowed me to measure dimensions of social capital within the organization from a larger, more generalizeable sample. Combining the two methods allowed me to examine the extent of which bridging social capital is present quantitatively within the organization, within the issue taskforces, and among clergy members, as well as document the process of how bridging social capital emerges or is developed and sustained qualitatively.

Qualitative methods. From the onset of the study, I was interested in describing the process of social capital formation within MOSES because the extant literature suggests churches have built-in social capital (Putnam, 1999) and faith-based organizations have the ability to establish bridging social capital between differing groups (Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002). While it seems logical that social capital would develop within churches where members tend to interact and socialize, it is not clear how an organization could purposely make this happen between members of churches with varying faith traditions, racial compositions, and geographic locations. From the outside, it appears that MOSES is making this happen, but how it is happening is unclear. In order to determine whether bridging social capital was present within MOSES and how it

was being developed and sustained, I felt I needed to observe that process as well as understand the experiences that organization members have had in developing cooperative, working relationships through their affiliation with MOSES.

Using interviews, participant observation, and the collection of archival materials seemed to be the best strategies for understanding the internal and external working relationships that members of MOSES have developed and sustained since its inception. In general, these and other qualitative methods are ideal for exploring processes because they can capture subjective experiences of participants within a particular context (Dudwick, et al., 2006; Padgett, 1998). Qualitative methods are also appropriate for studying program and practice within an organization and are widely used for evaluating these components (Padgett, 1998). Quantitative approaches can suggest that relationships exist between variables, but they cannot capture the subjective nature in which programs are implemented or how a particular practice method is executed (Dudwick, et al., 2006). Community organizing as a practice is not easily measurable, and understanding how the goals and objectives of the organization are pursued by individual members is a key component to evaluating outcomes and effectiveness. Qualitative strategies allow me as researcher to look at these things from the perspectives of the organization members.

Another benefit to using qualitative methods is the capacity for qualitative methods to allow the voices of participants to be heard, an outcome that can be

empowering as well as helpful for understanding the meaning of an experience (Gilgun & Abrams, 2002). Because MOSES is an affiliate of the Gamaliel Foundation and is partially governed by the foundation as well as by a local board of directors, taskforce members, non-board member clergy and others may not have the opportunity to share ideas about the organization on a regular basis. In addition, board members may not feel comfortable sharing opinions among peers. Giving members of MOSES a chance to be interviewed may have a provided an opportunity for members to have their voices heard as well as allowed them to critically think about their relationships within the organization and the changes they see necessary to be successful. Most quantitative methods do not provide this type of exchange of ideas and thoughts which can yield important details and information.

In the following sections, I will describe the three qualitative strategies used to collect data relevant to the process of bridging social capital formation. These strategies include archival material collection, participation observation, and structured interviews. Each of these strategies offer information related to different perspectives on the process of bridging social capital formation within the organization.

Archival materials. I collected archival materials that contained information about the organization as a whole, the primary taskforces, and the specific issues addressed by MOSES. Archival materials collected included newspaper articles, online news articles, board meeting minutes, taskforce

meeting minutes, special event program bulletins, email messages pertaining to MOSES events, email messages from individual taskforces, and message board posts on the MOSES Internet forum. Hard-copy newspaper articles were copied from archives housed at the MOSES office. Online news articles were obtained through conducting searches online using Google and Yahoo search engines. Board meeting minutes were obtained from a board member who took notes at each meeting and mailed the notes electronically to all attendees. Taskforce meeting minutes, when taken, were also sent to all meeting attendees by one of the taskforce co-chairs. Special event booklets were obtained from the MOSES office. Email messages from the organization and taskforces were received and stored in electronic file folders, and message board posts were copied into Word documents and saved in electronic file folders.

Initially, the main purpose of collecting these materials was to gain a better understanding of the structure, culture, processes and procedures of the organization and each of the individual taskforces. As the study progressed, I realized that archival materials, specifically newspaper and Internet articles, were helpful for examining relationships MOSES had created with outside entities, such as other community organizations, businesses, government agencies, and public officials. Articles also provided information about strategies MOSES uses to address issues and the perceived effectiveness of these strategies. Email messages from the organization and taskforces provided information on the level, intensity, and consistency of communication with members. They also

provided information about organizational skills, activity levels, and leadership effectiveness of each of the taskforces. Email correspondence about board meetings, scheduling meetings and events, and general announcements, were useful in examining relationships between board members.

A coding guide was developed to assist me in identifying which archival data would be useful for the purpose of my study. The guide was designed to identify characteristics about the organization as a whole. These characteristics included the history and philosophy of the organization, as well as operational structure such as policies and procedures and member recruitment. In addition, the guide included organization accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses of the organization, and issues that are most important to the organization. Finally, the guide included information related to relationships within the organization, relationships outside of the organization, and leadership roles of organization members (see Appendix A).

Participant observation. I used participant observation as a data collection strategy in and of itself as well as a tool for selecting interview participants. Participant observation was conducted in order to observe general organizational processes, such as decision-making, recruitment procedures, training, and designation of leadership roles. I also used participant observation to examine relationship and solidarity building strategies, relationships between members, member involvement, the handling of conflict and disagreement between members, and addressing differences between members (see Appendix

B). This guide was also utilized to examine the activities and processes discussed above within each of the taskforces. Because the taskforces are the primary vehicles in which members interact, I paid close attention to attendance, consistency in membership, interactions at meetings, and actions implemented by specific taskforces. My initial assumption was that interactions within the taskforces would give me the most accurate information about relationship building and social capital formation. Meetings and events attended include the Gamaliel National Leadership Training, the MOSES' Annual Public Meeting, monthly board meetings, a board retreat, issue meetings, a listening campaign training, an immigration rally, clergy caucus meetings, and monthly taskforce meetings for each of the taskforces currently active in MOSES.

My level of participation and degree of note-taking differed depending on the meeting or event attended. When attending larger organization meetings, clergy caucus meetings, board meetings, and taskforce meetings other than the healthcare taskforce, I was able to observe somewhat objectively and take notes as I observed. For note-taking, I used observation guides that were developed using my research questions and the eight dimensions of social capital. I also noted attendee demographic characteristics, meeting structures, as well as events and situations that seemed related to my research questions, but were not necessarily included on the observation guides. Notes were taken during these meetings by hand, then typed later and saved into an electronic document.

When attending smaller organization meetings, the board retreat (where I was asked to participate), the Gamaliel leadership training or healthcare taskforce meetings, I abstained from note-taking during the meetings and participated as a member. While attendee demographic characteristics and significant events within meetings, events and trainings were recorded in hand-written notes, in general, I focused on active participation during the meeting. Notes were typed and saved into an electronic document after the meeting or event. In these situations, observation guides were reviewed prior to these meetings, and only very brief notes were completed while I was participating.

Interviews. Finally, I conducted 20 interviews with selected members of each of the taskforces, MOSES board members, clergy not currently serving on the board, and non-clergy congregation leaders. Unfortunately, the organization lost several staff members during the course of the study and I was unable to interview those staff members as well as the Executive Director who was overwhelmed with managing the organization.

The purpose of the interviews was to capture the personal experiences of participants in the context of working within a multicultural, multi-faith organization. As mentioned previously, interview questions were focused on the existence of each of the dimensions of social capital, and particularly trust, which involves relationship building and active participation. Interviews were structured using an interview guide (see Appendix C) and were from 45 to 75 minutes in length. Interview questions focused on the level and nature of involvement with

the organization, the level of involvement in taskforces; perceptions of trust, solidarity, group cohesion, and diversity within the organization and taskforce(s); relationship building between members; member differences and similarities; and strategies used by the organization and taskforces(s) to mobilize members, build relationships, and maintain and expand membership.

Although the interviews were structured, they were conducted in a manner that facilitated an open discussion between the interviewer and the participant. Due to my role as a participant observer and acting member of the organization, I had access to personal experiences and first-hand information about the organization. For example, I was aware of the tension between the Executive Director and the Board President as a result of attending monthly board meetings. This is an issue that is only known by board members and others who work closely with the two individuals. By sharing some of my experiences with interview participants, I felt I was able to obtain more information about the depth and meaning of member experiences. This strategy was also helpful for verifying some of my thoughts and assumptions about the philosophy and structure of the organization. Additional probes were used in several interview questions and for situations in which participants had difficulty answering.

Interviews were conducted mainly in members' homes, but also took place in churches, restaurants, health clubs, businesses, and at the MOSES office. Prior to the interviews, participants were informed about the purpose of the study and the nature of the interview questions. Each participant was required to read

and sign the informed consent form (see Appendix D) prior to beginning the interview.

Interviews were recorded using a digital audio recording device. Recordings were then uploaded to a computer and converted to a digital sound file. Sound files were copied to a CD and were transcribed by a professional transcriptionist. Once transcribed, interviews were downloaded into Word documents and saved into a computer. No identifying information was associated with the documents and the only information recorded was taskforce affiliation, church affiliation, and the individual's primary role in the organization (e.g. clergy member, taskforce member, board member, or MOSES staff member).

Quantitative methods. Qualitative methods were helpful in providing information about the process of relationship building as well as the personal experiences of members, however, they were restricted to those members who attended taskforce meetings regularly and agreed to participate in the interview process. To address this limitation, I administered a modified version of the *Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital (SC-IQ)* (Grootaert, et al., 2004) to the larger membership of MOSES. The SC-IQ is a survey designed to measure processes of social capital formation in communities and organizations. After reviewing the survey, I felt that with modifications, it would allow me to obtain information about the dimensions of social capital that exist in the working relationships between taskforce members, board members, staff members, and clergy members, and congregation leaders. Permission to

use the survey instrument was requested and granted by the publisher prior to survey administration.

The SC-IQ measures social capital formation on six dimensions: (1) groups and networks, (2) trust and solidarity, (3) collective action and cooperation, (4) information and communication, (5) social cohesion and inclusion, and (6) empowerment and political action. The SC-IQ addresses the structural dimensions of social capital (group membership), cognitive dimensions of social capital (perceptions of trust and norms), the ways in which social capital operates (collective action, cooperation, information and communication), and major areas of application or outcomes (social cohesion, inclusion, empowerment, and political action) (Grootaert, et al., 2004).

Since the SC-IQ was developed as part of a larger household survey, it was modified to fit the scope of this study. The survey was modified in three distinct ways. First, the original version of the survey combines the measurement of four different dimensions of social capital. For example, trust and solidarity were measured using the same items and social cohesion and inclusion were measured using the same items. In the modified version of the survey used in the study, trust and solidarity were measured as separate dimensions as were social cohesion and inclusion. It was my belief that each of these dimensions differ enough that measuring them individually was more appropriate for the purpose of this study. I also chose to measure collective action without cooperation. After modifications, I identified eight dimensions of social capital: (1) trust, (2)

solidarity, (3) social cohesion, (4) inclusion, (5) collective action, (6) information and communication, (7) empowerment and political action, and (8) groups and networks.

Next, several question modules from the original instrument were reconstructed to pertain to organization membership, taskforce membership, and roles within the organization. Because the original survey was designed from a societal rather than an organizational perspective, words and phrases were slightly altered to fit the context.

Finally, additional questions were developed by the researcher in order to capture the processes that are specific to organization and taskforce participation as well as involvement as a clergy member. Eight questions focused on respondents' membership and involvement with the organization, including reasons for joining the organization, length of membership, primary roles in the organization, and the benefits of being a member. Three questions focused on solidarity within the organization. Four questions inquired about information obtained from the organization as well as the consistency of communication and effectiveness of the methods used to communicate and share information within the organization. Two questions focused on cohesion or the degree to which members get along despite their differences.

For taskforce involvement, 16 questions focused on taskforce membership and participation, including length of membership, benefits to being a member, and collaborations with other groups within and outside of MOSES. Four

99

questions focused on solidarity within respondents' primary taskforces. Two questions inquired about collective activities facilitated by taskforces. Two questions addressed the sharing of information and the consistency of communication within taskforces. One question focused on involvement in political action activities by taskforces.

For additional questions directed towards clergy members within the organization, four questions focused on membership and involvement with the organization. Three questions inquired about solidarity among fellow clergy members. Three questions focused on collective activities within the churches represented by clergy members. One question addressed methods of communication between clergy members and their churches. Three questions focused on inclusion of member churches represented by clergy members. Four questions inquire about the demographic characteristics of member churches, including location, membership size, and racial composition. Nine questions were also included to measure respondents' demographic characteristics including race, gender, age, and political and religious affiliations at the time of completing the survey.

The survey instrument was administered in two different formats to solicit responses from a variety of taskforce members, clergy, board members, church leaders and MOSES staff members. The first format employed Zoomerang, a computer-based survey application accessed via a hotlink to the survey site on the Internet. Once the survey was designed within the Zoomerang program, the

survey information sheet (see Appendix E) and hotlink to the survey were administered to the selected sample through the MOSES electronic mail system. Although the link was sent to staff members, board members, clergy, non-clergy church leaders, and taskforce members, individual identifying information was not tracked or associated with survey responses. Email messages containing the hotlink were sent to 112 MOSES members on three different occasions. The first email message sent was the initial invitation asking selected members to participate in the survey. Two weeks later, a second email message was sent to the same organization members reminding them to complete the survey if they had not already done so; and the third email message was a final reminder asking members to complete the survey and informing them that the survey would be closed within two weeks. Of the 112 emails sent, only 6 came back as being non-existent.

The survey was comprised of three main modules: (1) questions pertaining to membership in the organization as a whole; (2) questions pertaining to taskforce membership; and (3) questions pertaining to clergy members or church leaders. Respondents who indicated any primary role within the organization other than as a taskforce member were directed to the first set of questions addressing membership in the organization as a whole. Respondents who indicated taskforce member as their primary role were directed to a second module which addressed taskforce membership. This skip pattern was implemented because of the similarity between questions about the general

organization and those about the taskforces. Members who only served on MOSES taskforces would most likely perceive the organization through their involvement in the taskforces. Members who indicated both a different primary role but a secondary role as a taskforce member, were directed to answer questions in both sections since their experiences in one role might be different than those as a taskforce member.

After being directed to the organization section, the taskforce section or both (depending on roles in the organization), respondents were asked if they served as clergy or non-clergy church leaders within the organization. If that was the case, respondents were directed to a third module in the survey which focuses on their involvement as clergy members as well as on demographic information about their congregations. All respondents were directed to the final module of the survey which documented individual demographic characteristics. After completing the survey, respondents were given the opportunity to share additional contact information if they wished to be considered for a personal interview. This was the only circumstance in which identifiable information was collected; only email addresses and phone numbers were exchanged. The Zoomerang survey was designed to take 10 to 30 minutes to complete, depending on the number of modules completed.

The second format used to administer the survey was a paper version of the survey distributed via U.S. mail. A listing of taskforce members, clergy, and non-clergy church leaders who did not have email addresses or Internet access

was provided by the organization. Paper versions of the information sheet, the survey, and a postage-paid envelope were mailed directly to residential or church addresses of the members. In order to track which surveys were returned, surveys were linked to each respondent using a unique identifier. The paper survey was comparable to the Zoomerang survey, but with instructions in regards to skip patterns rather than automatic re-direction. The paper survey also was designed to take 10 to 30 minutes to complete, depending on the number of sections completed. At total of 174 hard-copy surveys were mailed to MOSES members lacking Internet access.

Two weeks after surveys were mailed to members, follow-up phone calls were made to individuals who had not completed and returned surveys. Phone calls served as a reminder for people to complete the survey, but also gave potential respondents an opportunity to complete the survey over the phone or receive another copy of the survey if it had not arrived. One follow-up call was made to each of the members who did not return the survey initially. Eight surveys were resent to members as a result of the follow-up phone calls. Only seven surveys were returned by the U.S. Postal Service because members had passed away or were no longer available at the address on file. In addition, follow-up phone calls revealed that 47 individuals were no longer at the listed phone numbers, 17 individuals did not consider themselves members of MOSES, and two could not speak to me because of language barriers. I was unable to

reach 42 individuals on the list and therefore could not confirm current MOSES membership status.

Conceptualization and Measurement

The primary variable I examined in this study is social capital. According to Putnam, social capital refers to "features of social life – networks, norms, and trust – that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (1995b, p. 665). More specifically, I was particularly interested in bridging social capital; which refers to the social connections that are made across communities, bridging gaps between differences such as class, race or religion (Wood & Warren, 2002).

In order to identify and measure bridging social capital, I looked for several indicators or dimensions that have been identified within the social capital literature as facilitating conditions or sources of bridging social capital. These indicators included: groups and networks, trust, solidarity, social cohesion, inclusion, collective action, information and communication, and empowerment and political action (Grootaert, et al., 2004). Each are described in detail below.

Trust. The first indicator is trust. The definition of trust I am using for the purpose of this study is: a person's belief that others will not knowingly do him or her harm, but will act with his or her interests in mind (Newton, 2001). Trust involves having confidence in another and an expectation that the other person will reciprocate in ways that will be beneficial. According to Putnam (1995b), social trust is strongly related to collective action and civic engagement. People

are more likely to engage in collective activities if they feel a sense of trust within a group, organization, or community. Trust is considered by some social capital theorists as the single most important component to social capital (Coleman, 1998; Putnam, 1993, 1995, 2000; Fukuyama, 1995), but tends to be more difficult to build in groups that are heterogeneous (Narayan, 1999). The presence of trust in a heterogeneous group could indicate the existence of bridging social capital, and is therefore an important construct to examine.

In this study I was interested in the level of trust current members have for MOSES as an organization, the level of trust that taskforce members have for other members of their chosen taskforce, and the level of trust that clergy members have for other clergy members. Therefore, I measured them separately.

I measured organizational trust, trust within taskforces, and trust between clergy members using different qualitative strategies. First, I measured trust through my observations of meetings, trainings, actions, and other events in the context of the organization, issue taskforces and among clergy. To assist with the identification of words, gestures, activities and behaviors that indicated the existence of trust, items listed under the *Trust/Solidarity* section of the MOSES observation guide were utilized (see Appendix B). For determining the existence of trust, I looked for conversations between members that addressed personal matters or details, appeared friendly and relaxed, and included humor or a playful demeanor. I also looked for discussions on accountability and providing support

and assistance to other members. In regards to activities, I examined members' comfort with participating in meetings and events, specifically, whether they seemed comfortable to share ideas and engage with other members. I also made note of how new members of the organization or of a taskforce were welcomed and treated initially. In regards to behaviors and gestures, I looked for physical indications of trust such as consistent eye contact, shaking hands, hugging, or tapping a members' back or shoulder to greet or encourage.

Trust was also measured qualitatively through interviews with MOSES members. Questions measuring trust inquired about members' experiences and feelings at the time of initial membership into the organization, specifically, whether they felt welcomed, and a sense of acceptance or belonging within the organization. I also looked for responses that indicated the existence of trust in their current working relationships with other members, especially, indications of knowing other members, feeling close to other members, and discussions on forming relationships with other members. Responses that indicated feeling accountable to other members or groups, feeling comfortable about sharing ideas and information, and a having confidence in their working relationships with other members also were considered indicators of trust.

Trust for the organization was measured quantitatively by two subscales comprised of 8 items and two questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F) that asked respondents to indicate their level of trust for MOSES members within

the organization. The first subscale asked members to what extent members of MOSES can be trusted, are likely to take advantage of others, and are willing to help other members. This subscale was comprised of three items, each with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The second subscale was comprised of five items inquiring about the extent to which members trust people of their own races and religions, as well as people from different races, religions, and geographical locations. Each had a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very small extent (1) to very great extent (5).

The third question asked respondents about the level of trust for members in the organization. The fourth question asked respondents about level of trust for members in larger society. Both the third and fourth questions consisted of one item each and used a 3-point Likert scale consisting of gotten worse (1), stayed about the same (2), and gotten better (3). Questions 1, 3, and 4 regarding trust for MOSES members were recoded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of trust. The third and fourth questions were also recoded for the same purpose. Overall scale scores ranged from 10 to 46. Reliability for this scale is .981.

Trust of taskforce members was measured quantitatively with two subscales and 3 questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F) that asked respondents about the extent of trust they have for different types of people in their taskforces. The first subscale asked taskforce members to what extent other taskforce members can be trusted, are likely to take advantage of other taskforce members, and are willing to help other taskforce members. The first subscale

Table 4.2

Reliability Analysis of the Dimensions of Social Capital Scales

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Organizational Trust	.981
Taskforce Trust	.986
Clergy Trust	.991
Organizational Social Cohesion	.903
Taskforce Cohesion	.903
Organizational Collective Action	.791
Taskforce Collective Action	.794
Organizational Empowerment and Political Action	.933
Organizational Information and Communication	.908
Taskforce Information and Communication	.926

was comprised of three items, each using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The second subscale asked taskforce members to what extent they trust people from their own races and religions, as well as people from different races, religions, and geographical locations. This subscale was comprised of five items, each using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very small extent (1) to very great extent (5).

The third, fourth, and fifth questions were all single item questions. The third question asked respondents about level of trust among taskforce members. It was comprised of a 3-point Likert scale with gotten worse (1), stayed about the same (2), and gotten better (3). The fourth question asked taskforce members how close they feel to other taskforce members. This question used a 5-point

Likert scale ranging from somewhat distant (1) to very close (5). Finally, the fifth question asked taskforce members how well they know other members of their taskforces. This question incorporated a 3-point Likert scale with responses of not at all (1), somewhat well (2), and very well (3). Four of the five questions were reverse coded so that higher scores represented higher levels of trust. Overall scores ranged from 11 to 51 points. Reliability for this scale is .986.

Trust among clergy members was measured quantitatively with two subscales and two questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F) that asked clergy members about trust between clergy members in the organization. The first subscale was comprised of two items and asked respondents to what extent clergy members can be trusted and are willing to help other clergy members. This subscale used a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The second subscale was comprised of five items and asked respondents to what extent they trust clergy members from their own races and religions as well as clergy members from different races, religions, and geographical locations. The second question was comprised of five items, each with a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from very small extent (1) to very great extent (5). Both the third and fourth questions consisted of single items. The third question asked respondents how close they feel to other clergy members in MOSES. This question used a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very distant (1) to very close (5). The fourth question asked respondents how well they know other clergy members in MOSES. This question used a 3-point Likert scale consisting

of not at all (1), somewhat well (2), and very well (3). Three of the four questions were reverse coded so that higher scores were representative of higher levels of trust among clergy. Overall scores ranged from 9 to 43 points. Reliability for this scale is .991.

Solidarity. Another indicator related to bridging social capital is solidarity. Related to trust, solidarity refers to individual's identification with one another in a particular context, bounded by the limits of a community (Marx & Engels, 1964; Portes, 1998). According to Portes (1998), bounded solidarity involves identification with one's group or sect and can be a strong motivational force for action. Like trust, solidarity may be more difficult to generate in a group comprised of people who differ in race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status or political viewpoints. Literature on secular, multicultural organizing suggests that creating a collective identity among people with differences is an important, but arduous task (Wood, 2002).

Solidarity within the organization, within taskforces, and among clergy was measured qualitatively through the use of several qualitative strategies. As with trust, I measured solidarity through my observations of meetings, trainings, actions, and other events in the context of the organization, issue taskforces and among clergy. To assist with the identification of words, gestures, activities and behaviors that indicated the existence of solidarity, I used items listed under the *Trust/Solidarity* section of the MOSES observation guide (see Appendices C and D). To determine whether solidarity was present in MOSES, I looked for

strategies that seemed to bring members together or make them feel unified, such as prayer or shouting cheers or mantras at meetings and events. I also looked at whether there were any discussions in regards to sharing a group identity, making references to "we" or claiming ownership of the organization.

Solidarity was also qualitatively measured through interviews with MOSES members. Specifically, I looked for responses in which members indicated feeling a sense of solidarity and what the solidarity was based on (e.g. race, faith, gender, or social issues). In addition, I looked for responses that discussed events, actions, or experiences that made respondents feel unified with other members. Using the term "we" or other phrases that suggest belonging to a group or ownership of the organization or taskforce were also considered indicators of solidarity.

Solidarity within the organization was measured quantitatively with two distinct questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F) that asked whether respondents felt as if they shared a common identity with other members and if yes, what those common identities were (e.g. race, religion, political views, passion for social change, gender, vision/goals for the community/region, socioeconomic status, and other). These same two questions also were used to measure taskforce solidarity and solidarity among clergy. For clergy members, an additional question was asked whereby they identified which of the common identities identified was the most important or significant in determining a feeling of solidarity.

Social cohesion. Kawachi and Berkman (2000) define social cohesion as "the absence of latent social conflict" and "the presence of strong social bonds" (p. 175). For social capital to develop, members need to establish relationships with one another that are friendly, supportive and free of underlying conflict. The presence of tension, arguments, and heated disagreements were especially of interest, as these things can disrupt the development of cohesion.

Qualitatively, I measured social cohesion through my observations of organization, taskforce, and clergy meetings, events, and trainings. To guide my observations, I used the items listed under the *Social cohesion/Inclusion* module of the MOSES observation guide (see Appendix B). To determine the presence of social cohesion in the organization, taskforces, and among clergy, I noted whether members got along with one another and if they demonstrated friendliness and positive attitudes in their interactions. I also noted members' abilities to make decisions and collaborate on tasks together. In addition, I noted significant differences of opinions and viewpoints, disagreements, and both subtle and blatant conflicts between members. Finally, I looked for displays of aggressive physical or verbal behaviors, and conflicts related to differences such as race, gender, religion or other demographic and personal characteristics.

Social cohesion in the organization, taskforces, and among clergy was also qualitatively measured through interviews with MOSES members. Using the definition for social cohesion presented above as a guide, responses that focused on getting along and resolving conflicts with other members were

considered indicators of social cohesion. I also considered responses that mentioned disagreements, tension among members, differences between members and respondents feeling disconnected from the organization or primary taskforces as indicators of social cohesion.

Social cohesion within the organization was measured quantitatively by using one subscale and two questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F). The subscale asked respondents the extent to which personal differences cause problems or difficulties within the organization. The subscale was comprised of six items: race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, political beliefs, gender, religion, and location of residence. This subscale incorporated a 3-point Likert scale with major problem (1), minor problem (2), and not a problem (3). The first question asked respondents how strong the feeling of togetherness or closeness is among the membership of MOSES. This question consisted of a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very distant (1) to very close (5). The second question asked whether any of the differences listed in the subscale had ever led to heated disagreements. This question was coded as 0 for "no" and 1 for "yes". The subscale and first question were combined to create a scale for social cohesion. The first question was reverse coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of social cohesion. Overall scores for this scale ranged from 7 to 24 and reliability is .903.

Social cohesion within taskforces was measured quantitatively by including the same subscale and two questions described above for

organizational cohesion. Social cohesion among clergy members was not measured quantitatively in this study. Social cohesion within clergy congregations was measured quantitatively by including one question on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F) that inquired about the level of social cohesiveness within their respective congregations. Responses were structured in a 4-point Likert scale format ranging from not cohesive at all (1) to very cohesive (4).

Inclusion. Inclusion is a difficult concept to define, but essentially refers to a person's ability to contribute fully and effectively within an organization (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998). To measure inclusion, I examined the degree to which members were able to participate in group processes as well as in what circumstances, if any, members were discouraged from participating.

Qualitatively, organization inclusion and taskforce inclusion were measured with an open-ended question on the SC-IQ survey that asked respondents who indicated they had felt excluded to explain what made them feel excluded. Congregation inclusion was measured qualitatively with an open-ended question on the SC-IQ survey that asked clergy who indicated that congregation issues were not addressed, which issues not addressed were of the most importance.

Inclusion was also measured qualitatively through participant observations and interviews. First, I measured inclusion through my observations of meetings, trainings, actions, and other events in the context of the organization, issue taskforces and among clergy. To assist with the identification of words, gestures,

activities and behaviors that indicated the existence of inclusion, I used the MOSES observation guide (see Appendix B). Specifically, the items listed under the *Social cohesion/Inclusion* section of the guide were utilized. For determining the existence of inclusion, I noted occasions when members were encouraged to participate in organization and taskforce activities, when members were excluded from participating, and in which activities members were included or excluded. I also noted whether members' ideas were considered or acknowledged, if certain members were included or excluded more than others, and finally, attempts to include underrepresented groups within the organization through collaboration or recruitment.

For interviews, responses that discussed diversity within the organization, including different groups of people in the organization, and soliciting membership of individuals and groups of different racial, ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds were all considered indications of inclusion. The definition of inclusion was used as a guide for determining the existence of inclusion.

Inclusion within the organization was measured quantitatively by including a yes or no question on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F) that asks whether respondents have ever felt excluded from discussions or activities in MOSES. "No" responses were coded as 0. "Yes" responses were coded as 1. Taskforce inclusion was measured using this same indicator. Inclusion among clergy members' congregations was measured by including two distinct questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F). The first question asked if there were any

issues important to respondents' congregations that were not addressed by MOSES. "No" responses were coded as 0 and "yes" responses were coded as 1. The second question asked in what way the congregation was impacted by the issue not being addressed. The responses for this question included: has not affected the congregation, the congregation participates less, and the congregation has addressed these issues independently.

Groups and networks. As mentioned previously, Putnam (1995b) believes that civic engagement, or involvement with one's community, builds social capital. For measuring social capital, it is important to explore the networks, connections, and relationships the organization has with outside entities including other organizations, businesses, and communities.

I measured groups and networks qualitatively through my observations of meetings, trainings, actions, and other events in the context of the organization, issue taskforces and among clergy. To assist with the identification of words, gestures, activities and behaviors that indicated the existence of trust, I used the MOSES observation guide (see Appendix B). Specifically, the items listed under the *Groups and Networks* section of the guide were utilized. Interactions between MOSES and the outside community, other organizations, and businesses were considered indicators of connections with groups and networks. I also considered discussions around partnerships with outside entities as indicator of these connections. Participation by outside groups and leaders in taskforces and

organization meetings was also considered an indicator of connections with groups and networks.

Connections with groups and networks were also qualitatively measured through interviews with MOSES members. Responses that focused on outside group membership and partnerships with communities and other organizations were considered indicators of connections with groups and networks.

Connections with groups and networks for the organization as a whole and for clergy members were not measured quantitatively. For taskforces, I measured this dimension by including six separate questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F). Respondents were asked if their taskforces worked or interacted with other taskforces in MOSES. Respondents were asked if their taskforces worked or interacted with other groups or organizations outside of MOSES with similar goals. Finally, respondents were asked if their taskforces worked or interacted with other groups or organizations outside of MOSES that had different goals. Response choices for each question included no, yes (occasionally), and yes (frequently). Respondents who answered yes were asked to identify the taskforces or groups involved in each context. Interacting with other MOSES taskforces or outside groups was considered an indicator of connections with groups or networks.

Collective action. According to Putnam, social capital is a necessary condition for collective action (Putnam, 1995b). In the case of MOSES, taskforces are already organized vehicles for acting collectively, yet it is

important to inquire how active the taskforces are. By collective action, I mean a group of people acting on a shared set of goals to achieve a particular outcome. The taskforces operating at MOSES may be structurally organized, but whether or not they are directly acting on issues in a truly collective manner is important to know.

I measured collective action through my observations of meetings, trainings, actions, and other events in the context of the organization, issue taskforces and among clergy. To assist with the identification of words, gestures, activities and behaviors that indicated the existence of trust, I used the MOSES observation guide (see Appendix B). Specifically, the items listed under the *Collective Action* section of the guide were utilized. Member involvement with actions, meetings, and events were indicative of collective action. Frequency and intensity of collective activities by the organization or taskforces also were considered as indicators of collective action. In addition, commitments made by members to complete tasks and follow-through on those commitments were indicative of this dimension. Finally, changes in membership and attendance also were indicative of this dimension. For determining whether this dimension existed among clergy and their congregations, I noted actions and discussions focused on engaging congregation members to participate in collective activities.

Collective action was measured qualitatively through my review of archival materials. The observation guide (see Appendix B) was used to assist me in identifying this dimension within the materials. Content that showed collective

activities, such as attending or hosting meetings, protesting, holding rallies, or launching campaigns, were considered indicative of collective action. Questions addressing collective action were not included in the interview guide.

Collective action within the organization was measured quantitatively by including two distinct questions on the SC-IQ survey. The first question asked respondents to rate the extent to which MOSES was effective at organizing members for collective activities. This question used a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very ineffective (1) to very effective (5). The second question asked respondents their perceptions on the proportion of MOSES' members who volunteered time and resources to the organization on a regular basis. Responses were constructed in a 5-point Likert scale format with responses consisting of no one (1), less than one-half (2), about one-half (3), more than one-half (4), and everyone (5). These questions comprised the organization collective action scale. Scores for this scale ranged from 2 to 10. Reliability for this scale is .791.

Taskforce collective action was measured quantitatively by including two questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F). The first question asked respondents what proportion of the people within their primary taskforces volunteered time and other resources on a regular basis. Responses were constructed in a 5-point Likert scale structure. Responses included no one (1), less than one-half (2), about one-half (3), more than one-half (4), and everyone (5). This question was reverse coded so that higher numbers of member

participation indicated higher levels of collective action. The second question asked whether membership in the taskforce had increased (3), remained the same (2) or declined (1), and was structured as a 3-point Likert scale. These questions comprised the taskforce collective action scale. Scores for this scale ranged from 2 to 8. Reliability for this scale is .794.

Collective action among clergy congregations was measured by including four questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F). The first question asked respondents to estimate the percentage of members from their congregations who participated in MOSES activities on a monthly basis. Response choices included less than 10 percent, 11 to 24 percent, 25 to 49 percent, 50 to 74 percent, 75 percent or more, and none. The second question asked respondents about the strategies used to get congregation members to participate in MOSES. Response choices included discuss MOSES at Sunday services, include MOSES activities in church bulletins and websites, and approach congregation members individually to get them involved. A third question asked respondents what prevents congregation members from participating with MOSES. Response choices included lack of time, lack of financial resources, lack of interest in the issues MOSES addresses, and members feeling they cannot make a difference. The fourth question asked respondents to list three major MOSES-related activities in which their congregations participated since their involvement.

Empowerment and political action. In this context, I define empowerment as the extent participants feel they have control over institutions

and processes that directly affect their well-being (World Bank, 2002). In addition to having a feeling of empowerment, I am concerned with how this translates into political action through organization and taskforce activities.

I measured empowerment and political action qualitatively through my observations of meetings, trainings, actions, and other events in the context of the organization, issue taskforces and among clergy congregations. To assist with the identification of words, gestures, activities and behaviors that indicated the existence of this dimension, I used the MOSES observation guide (see Appendix B). Specifically, the items listed under the *Empowerment and Political Action* section were referenced. Displays of confidence among members, expressions of feeling powerful, and positive attitudes regarding change were all considered indicators of this dimension. In addition, the discussion and implementation of actions that were political in nature were also considered indicative of empowerment and political action.

Organization empowerment and political action also was qualitatively measured through my review of archival materials. To review archival materials, I used the MOSES observation guide referenced above (see Appendix B). Content showing the organization engaged in political activities such as protests, legislative visits, and meetings with elected officials, was indicative of the existence of empowerment and political action.

Finally, this dimension was measured qualitatively through interviews. Responses discussing one's ability to facilitate change and examples of

implementing change in the community or at the policy level were considered indicative of empowerment and political action. Responses that suggested a connection between involvement with MOSES and empowerment were also considered indications of empowerment and political action.

Empowerment and political action was measured quantitatively on the organization level with seven questions on the SC-IQ survey. First, respondents were asked how much control they felt they had in making decisions that affect daily activities as a result of working with MOSES. Responses were structured as a 5-point Likert scale ranging from no control (1) to control over all decisions (5). Second, respondents were asked if being involved with MOSES made them feel like they have the power to make important decisions that may change the course of their lives. Responses to this question were also structured as a 5-point Likert scale ranging from totally unable to change life (1) to totally able to change life (5). Third, respondents were asked how much impact they think MOSES will have on making the region a better place to live. Responses were structured as a 3-point Likert scale using no impact (1), small impact (2), and big impact (3). Next, respondents were asked if they voted in the last local and presidential elections and if they voted for a candidate of a different race or ethnicity. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which local government takes into account concerns voiced by them and others. Responses for this question were structured as a 3-point Likert scale including not at all (1), a little (2), and a lot (3). Four of the seven questions made up the organization empowerment and

political action scale. Of the four questions, the final two were reverse coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of empowerment and political action. Scores for this scale ranged from 4 to 16. The scale has a reliability score of .933.

Taskforce empowerment and political action was measured quantitatively by one question on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F) that asked respondents about the number of actions their primary taskforces participated in during their involvement that involved petitioning local government officials or political leaders for things that benefit the community. Response choices included none, one to two, three to five, and six or more. Empowerment and political action within clergy congregations was measured by one question on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F): that asked respondents if members of their congregations believe that involvement in political activities facilitated change and impacted social issues. Responses for this question were structured as a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). This question was reverse coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of empowerment and political action.

Information and communication. As previously discussed, having access to information is considered an element of social relations that can lead to the building of social capital (Coleman, 1988). In this context, I am concerned about the nature of information members obtain from their involvement with

MOSES as well as the information received through communication with other members, staff members and clergy within the organization.

I measured organization information and communication qualitatively by using participant observations and interviews. To capture indicators of information and communication in organization, taskforce, and clergy meetings, actions, and events, I used the MOSES observation guide (see Appendix B). Specifically, the items listed under the *Information and Communication* section of the guide were utilized. Discussions or behaviors that exhibited an understanding of the political system, the sharing of information about issues, hosting trainings to build leadership skills, and discussions about receiving or not receiving organization information and materials were considered indicators of this dimension.

Organization information and communication was measured qualitatively through interviews. Responses that focused on the quality and consistency of communication in the organization and gaining skills and knowledge through the sharing of information were considered indicative of the existence of this dimension within the organization.

Information and communication was measured quantitatively on the organization level by including eight questions on the SC-IQ survey. Three questions asked respondents to identify sources that provide the most helpful information about local politics. Response choices for each of the three questions included relatives, friends and neighbors; MOSES; church/spiritual meeting, local

newspaper, national newspaper, radio, television, Internet, and organizations other than MOSES. Two additional questions asked respondents to identify the extent to which MOSES has given them a better understanding of the political systems in Michigan and the city of Detroit. The responses for each of these questions were structured as 5-point Likert scales ranging from very small extent (1) to very great extent (5).

Respondents also were asked about the extent to which MOSES had provided them with the skills and training necessary to be effective community leaders. Responses for this question were designed as a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very small extent (1) to very great extent (5). Survey respondents also were asked how consistent communication was within MOSES. Responses were structured as a 4-point Likert scale ranging from very inconsistent (1) to very consistent (4). Finally, respondents were asked how helpful the organization's website is in keeping them up-to-date on important issues and events. Responses were designed as a 5-point Likert scale ranging from not helpful at all (1) to very helpful (5). Scores for this scale range from 5 to 24. This scale has a reliability score of .908.

I measured taskforce information and communication quantitatively with two questions on the SC-IQ survey (see Appendix F). The first question asked respondents if being active in their primary taskforces had given them a better understanding of the issues being addressed. Responses for this question were structured as a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly

agree (5). The second question asked respondents how consistent communication is in their taskforces. Responses for this question ranged from very inconsistent (1) to very consistent (4). Both questions were reverse coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of taskforce information and communication. Scores for the scale range from 2 to 9. Reliability for this scale is .926. Information and communication among clergy member congregations was measured quantitatively with one question that asks respondents how congregation members are informed about MOSES events. Responses included church bulletins, announced at masses/religious services, letters sent out in the mail, email announcements, church website, via conversations with members or church leaders, and other.

Data Reduction

Factor Analysis. Scales for each of the dimensions of social capital were constructed prior to collecting data for the study. While the items in each scale appeared to be measuring the dimensions they were intended to measure, I felt it was necessary to utilize a factor analysis to confirm that items were assigned to the appropriate dimension and reduce the number of variables as appropriate. In order to identify any outliers among the scale items, a regression was conducted. The regression revealed that there were no outliers and that a confirmatory factor analysis was appropriate for determining the structure of factors measuring the dimensions of social capital.

A total of 64 items from the SC-IQ survey were included in the initial factor analysis. Principal components analysis was conducted using the Varimax rotation method. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .729, indicating a high sampling adequacy for factor analysis. The initial factor analysis results determined that there were six different factors. Other than trust, it was less clear as to what other dimensions were being measured based on factor loadings. It also appeared that less than six factors may be appropriate for measuring the dimensions based on Scree plot results.

In order to clarify which dimensions of social capital were being captured by the scale items in the survey, I divided all of the scale items into three distinct subsets: items pertaining to the organization, items pertaining to taskforces, and items pertaining to clergy members. Next, I conducted a factor analysis for each of the three subsets. The factor analysis of organization-related items yielded two factors reflecting two dimensions of social capital: organizational trust and organizational cohesion. The factor analysis of taskforce-related items yielded one factor measuring one dimension of social capital: taskforce trust. Finally, the factor analysis conducted for clergy member-related items yielded one factor measuring one dimension of social capital: trust among clergy members.

Based on the results of the factor analysis, I re-estimated four factors measuring organizational trust, organizational cohesion, taskforce trust, and clergy member trust.

Organizational trust. The factor for organizational trust included 17 items from the SC-IQ survey instrument related to trust among members within the organization. Scores for this factor ranged from 17 to 77, with a mean score of 50.6. Higher scores indicated higher levels of organizational trust. Table 4.3 shows loadings for this factor. Reliability for this factor was .984 (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.3

Component Loadings for Organizational Trust

Component	Loading
Members can be trusted	.755
Members are willing to help	.751
Members are likely to take advantage	.781
Trust members of own race/ethnicity	.751
Trust members of own religion	.747
Trust members of other races/ethnicities	.747
Trust members of other religions	.734
Trust members from other geographic locations	.739
Trust for members of larger society	.747
Consistency of communication	.706
Organization's website helpful for current information	.768
Diversity of organization membership	.759
Satisfaction with the organization	.800
Control over personal decision-making	.741
Ability to make life-changing decisions	.807
Impact of organization on region	.756
Extent local leaders acknowledge citizen concerns	.808

Organizational cohesion. The factor for organizational cohesion included 13 items from the SC-IQ survey instrument measuring social cohesion in the organization. Scores for this scale ranged from 13 to 51, with a mean score for this scale of 33.3. Higher scores indicated higher levels of organizational cohesion. Table 4.4 shows loadings for this factor. Reliability for this factor was .966 (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.4

Component Loadings for Organizational Cohesion

Component	Loading
Level of trust among organization members	.596
Extent organization is successful with collective activities	.585
Proportion of membership involved	.675
Understanding of state political system	.616
Understanding of city political system	.670
Skills provided by the organization	.662
Feeling of closeness in the organization	.642
Differences in race/ethnicity cause problems	.808
Differences in socioeconomic status cause problems	.778
Differences in political beliefs cause problems	.797
Differences in gender cause problems	.775
Differences in religion cause problems	.810
Differences in location of residence cause problems	.837

Taskforce trust. The scale for trust within taskforces included 20 items from the SC-IQ survey instrument. Scores for this scale ranged from 20 to 82,

with the mean score of 59.8. Higher scores indicated higher levels of trust within

taskforces. Table 4.5 presents loadings for this factor. Reliability for this factor

was .990 (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.5

Component Loadings for Taskforce Trust

Component	Loading
Members can be trusted	.855
Members are willing to help	.814
Members are likely to take advantage	.834
Trust members of own race/ethnicity	.873
Trust members of different races/ethnicities	.890
Trust members of own religion	.870
Trust members of other religions	.882
Trust members from other geographic locations	.910
Trust for members of taskforce	.630
Closeness to members of taskforce	.691
Knowing members of taskforce	.688
Taskforce membership and understanding issues	.791
Consistency of communication in taskforce	.664
Diversity of taskforce	.767
Differences in race/ethnicity causes issues	.812
Differences in socioeconomic status causes issues	.795
Differences in political beliefs causes issues	.769
Differences in gender causes issues	.810
Differences in religion causes issues	.769
Differences in location of residence causes issues	.755

Clergy member trust. The clergy member trust scale was comprised of 7 items. Scores for this scale ranged from 7 to 35. The mean score for this scale was 26.7. Higher scores reflected higher levels of trust between clergy members. Table 4.6 shows loadings for this factor. Reliability for this factor was .995 (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.6

Component Loadings for Clergy Member Trust

Component	Loading
Clergy members can be trusted	.985
Clergy members are willing to help	.979
Trust clergy members of own race/ethnicity	.989
Trust clergy members of different races/ethnicities	.985
Trust clergy members of own religion	.990
Trust clergy members of other religions	.970
Trust clergy members from other geographic locations	.966

Table 4.7

Reliability Scores for Social Capital Dimension Factors

Factor	Cronbach's Alpha
Organizational Trust	.984
Organizational Cohesion	.966
Taskforce Trust	.990
Clergy Trust	.995

Data Analysis

　　Qualitative. For analyzing the data obtained through qualitative methods, I incorporated a hybrid version of the grounded theory method proposed by Charmaz (2006) for initial coding. Using Atlas Ti, a qualitative analysis software program, I conducted open line-by-line coding, which involved assigning unique codes as I went through the document. Codes were not pre-determined, but created for each line of the document. After codes were assigned to appropriate lines within each of the documents, I organized the codes using the transcendental realism method (Miles and Huberman, 1994). From here, codes were organized into distinct categories using my research questions as a guideline. Codes that did not fit into the categories determined by the research questions were placed into an "other" category and further organized into additional theme groups. Once codes were placed into categories, they were further analyzed and divided into sub-groups if patterns emerged within each category. This process was repeated until all relevant themes were identified within the data.

　　I consider my method a hybrid method because the first round of coding was conducted without using theory, research questions, or other guidelines, while the second round of coding was conducted using research questions and the dimensions of social capital defined by Grootaert et al., (2004). Combining the two approaches allowed me to address the research questions of the study,

but also uncover other important pieces of information that could be pertinent to the study and helpful to the organization.

Archival materials. The majority of archival materials were in hard-copy format when received. Newspaper articles, event promotion booklets, and archived board meeting minutes were all copied from files stored at the MOSES office. Internet articles, email messages and website forum posts were all available electronically, but to keep this portion of the analysis uniform, I printed out the electronic files so they would be in the same format as the copied materials. All archival materials were coded by hand using the guide designed to help me address the research questions of the study (see Appendix A). For this analysis, I relied primarily on the coding guide and did not use the hybrid-grounded approach discussed above. The purpose of collecting archival materials was mainly to provide background information on the organization and the issues addressed as well as to identify patterns in the data that relate to social capital within the organization, the outside community, and with those in power.

I conducted analysis on the archival materials by using the Miles & Huberman's (1994) transcendental realism analysis method (1994). First I created a *start list* (Miles & Huberman, 1994) which consisted of initially identified themes or categories that existed within the data. The coding guide discussed above was used to help in the classification of the data. Next, I assigned sub-themes where appropriate that further specified the type of information/response.

Following the transcendental realism concept of data reduction, I omitted responses or pieces of information that emerged less than four times in the materials. Finally, to help me visualize the frequency and occurrence of various themes, I constructed data matrices with each of the major themes and sub-themes. Findings will be discussed further in the results section.

Observations. All observations were transcribed into text documents so they could be electronically imported into an analysis software program. Once all observations were complete and notes entered, I imported all of the observation documents into AtlasTi, a qualitative analysis software program that assists in the process of organizing and coding qualitative data. After the data were imported, I conducted line-by-line coding which involved coding sentences or phrases containing a central statement or idea. This process involved coding the data as I went along, letting themes unfold naturally within the data. After the initial phase of coding, I conducted focused coding which involved sorting codes based on the frequency in which they emerged. Both of these methods are considered grounded coding methods (Charmaz, 2006). After applying the two grounded coding methods, I exported the list of all of the codes into a text document. Next, I created themes or categories based on the eight dimensions of social capital and the content of the research questions. Codes that did not fit into these pre-determined categories were categorized as "other" and were organized into new themes where appropriate. This two-part process allowed me to identify themes relevant to the research questions as well as themes that may not have been

expected initially when designing the study. Sub-themes were also identified where appropriate. Data matrices outlining the major themes were constructed to provide a clear picture of the pertinent findings from observation notes. The table and findings will be discussed further in the results section.

Interviews. One-on-one, semi-structured interviews were audio recorded and transcribed into text documents by a professional transcriptionist. Each document was reviewed carefully and notes taken about some of the central ideas that emerged. Three documents were reviewed along with the audio recordings of the interviews to check for accuracy in the transcription process. After all documents were reviewed, they were imported into AtlasTi and analyzed using exactly the same methods described above for the observations. Data matrices highlighting all of the major and relevant themes in the data were constructed and will be discussed further in the results section.

Quantitative. SPSS, a quantitative statistical analysis computer program was used for all quantitative data analyses.

Survey content and face validity. To ensure content and face validity, I reviewed my conceptual definitions and compared those definitions to the items that appeared to measure those concepts on the survey. I also submitted the survey to the Executive Director of MOSES for her review and feedback on the questions and what the items were attempting to measure. The Executive Director expressed her agreement that the items were appropriate for measuring bridging social capital within the organization and did not suggest any

modifications or revisions. Based on my review of the relevant literature and feedback from the organization's leader, I concluded that the SC-IQ appears to have acceptable content and face validity. Statistical tests confirming the accuracy or relevance of the survey items were also conducted and will be discussed below.

Survey instrument. Given the exploratory nature of the study, the focus of the analysis of survey data was on descriptive statistics and examining relationships between personal characteristics and the extent of social capital as measured through the various dimensions. Using SPSS, I ran descriptive statistics for race and ethnicity, religion, age, gender, socioeconomic status, level of education, location of residence, length of membership within MOSES, length of membership within one's primary taskforce, primary role in the organization, and taskforce affiliation for those who are taskforce members for the organization as a whole.

To examine relationships between social capital and member personal characteristics, I began by conducting independent sample t-tests for gender and race with each of the five scales and individual items measured on a scale level from the SC-IQ survey instrument to examine any differences in responses. For personal characteristics with more than two levels, I conducted several one-way between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) with each of the scales and individual items measured on a scale level from the survey. The independent variables included in the different ANOVAs included age, religion, socioeconomic

status, level of education, location of residence, length of membership with MOSES, primary role in the organization, length of taskforce membership, and taskforce affiliation (if applicable).

The purpose of using this type of analysis was to identify differences in the indicators of social capital between members and taskforces. It was important to gain an understanding of the existence of social capital within the taskforces and the organization and also the extent of social capital within the groups in order to identify the processes that may contribute to the formation of social capital. Although the qualitative methods allowed me to capture the depth of experiences and processes in relation to social capital, looking at relationships between member characteristics and dimensions of social capital allowed me to examine different perspectives on bridging throughout the organization, not just through the eyes of those interviewed.

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

Introduction

In this chapter I will present the major qualitative and quantitative findings from the study related to bridging social capital formation. Fourteen major themes related to social capital formation emerged from my interviews with members, and most were supported by findings from archival research, participant observations, and the SC-IQ survey. The major themes identified were: the eight dimensions of social capital (trust, solidarity, social cohesion, inclusion, connections to groups and networks, collective action, information and communication, empowerment and political action); bridging gaps; relationship building; addressing differences within MOSES; and mobilizing members around social issues. Each of these themes can be classified into four distinct groupings: dimensions of social capital within MOSES, strategies that support the development and maintenance of social capital, barriers to the development and maintenance of social capital, and finally, member mobilization within the organization.

Dimensions of Social Capital in MOSES

Survey findings. The survey findings documented the existence of social capital within MOSES. Survey responses indicated that each of the eight dimensions of social capital were present to some degree in the organization.

Trust. Findings suggest that trust exists within the organization, within member taskforces and among clergy members. Several one-way analyses of

variance compared the levels of organizational trust (see Table 5.1), taskforce trust (see Table 5.2), and clergy trust (see Table 5.3) by personal characteristics including length of organization membership, length of taskforce membership, age, race, religion, socioeconomic status, level of education, location of residence, role in the organization, and taskforce membership (if applicable). Tukey HSD tests were conducted to determine differences between response groups.

These analyses found that levels of organizational trust and levels of taskforce trust were higher for members who had belonged to the organization for 5 to 6 years. These results suggest that trust is something that builds over time, within the organization and issue taskforces, peaks around 5 to 6 years, and then decreases beyond that point. This would support some of the ideas expressed by members that trust involves relationship building which is something that happens through participation and dedication over time.

Analyses also revealed relationships between roles in the organization and organizational trust, trust within taskforces, and trust among clergy members. Level of organizational trust was found to be higher for board members compared to taskforce members. Level of organizational trust also was higher for secular organization leaders compared to taskforce members. These results suggest that members holding some leadership roles either inside or outside of MOSES felt a greater sense of trust due to their roles and responsibilities in the organization compared to taskforce members. Leaders may

work more closely and more frequently with one another, allowing for trust to build through those regular interactions.

Within the issue taskforces, level of trust was higher between taskforce members as compared to general members and clergy members. This makes sense because members who identify as taskforce members most likely participate regularly in taskforce activities compared to members who identified other primary roles. For clergy members, level of trust was higher for other clergy members than for general members. Clergy members work closely through the Clergy Caucus and planning actions, so it makes sense that levels of trust would be higher between fellow clergy.

Trust within taskforces was associated with residential location. Members who were residents of the city of Detroit reported significantly higher levels of trust within their taskforces compared to members who were residents of inner-ring suburbs of Detroit. A closer look at member characteristics showed that those who lived in the city had been members of MOSES longer than those who lived in the inner and outer-ring suburbs. This may explain why levels of trust were higher for city residents.

Levels of trust among clergy members were highest among those participating in the healthcare taskforce and lowest among those engaged in the transportation or other taskforces. These other taskforces are inactive, whereas the healthcare taskforce is one of the four major taskforces operating under MOSES presently. Perhaps levels of trust are higher for the healthcare taskforce

Table 5.1

Levels of Organizational Trust by Selected Characteristics

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Age (F= .460, p= .711)		
30-49	59.00	0.00
50-59	30.43	28.76
60-69	33.14	26.16
70+	34.46	25.33
Socioeconomic Status (F= .508, p= .604)		
Upper class	41.36	23.26
Middle class	33.81	26.10
Working/Lower class	30.50	25.63
Religion/Denomination (F= .242, p= .942)		
Catholic	10.72	13.64
Baptist	9.94	13.22
Lutheran	26.80	6.87
Unitarian-Universalist	5.40	12.07
Non-denominational Christian	16.60	15.15
Other	9.22	13.83
Location of Residence (F= 2.640, p= .079)		
Detroit	31.95	26.37
Inner-ring suburb	52.56	3.87
Outer-ring suburb	34.31	25.48
Level of Education (F= .457, p= .767)		
High school/Some college	30.45	29.42
Associate's degree	22.00	25.45
Bachelor's degree	37.52	24.64

Table 5.1 (continued)

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Master's degree	36.93	24.38
Doctorate degree	31.20	28.97
Length of MOSES Membership* (F= 3.163, p= .012)		
Less than 1 year	20.13	23.46
1 to 2 years	18.50	26.13
3 to 4 years	27.21	27.06
5 to 6 years	54.20	4.36
7 to 8 years	38.17	13.99
9 years or more	34.24	27.69
Primary Role in Organization* (F=3.368, p = .014)		
Taskforce member	21.05	27.25
Clergy/Congregation leader	33.30	25.24
Board member	51.25	4.43
Secular leader	58.67	1.52
Other	34.88	24.81
Primary Taskforce (F= .756, p= .561)		
Transportation	20.85	27.57
Healthcare	26.63	28.79
Civil Rights and Immigration	34.67	30.43
Supermarket	28.50	40.30
Other	7.29	19.27
Length of Taskforce Membership (F= 1.120, p= .338)		
2 years or less	16.65	24.45
3 to 6 years	30.69	29.84
7 years or more	27.50	31.92

N=67

Table 5.2

Levels of Taskforce Trust by Selected Characteristics

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Age (F= 1.784, p= .159)		
30-49	81.00	0.00
50-59	37.57	35.58
60-69	22.91	29.07
70+	36.95	31.90
Socioeconomic Status (F= 1.665, p= .197)		
Upper class	17.36	30.04
Middle class	36.65	31.23
Working/Lower class	33.13	35.94
Religion/Denomination (F= .464, p= .802)		
Catholic	36.84	31.77
Baptist	27.06	31.84
Lutheran	45.20	41.59
Unitarian-Universalist	24.80	35.00
Non-denominational Christian	25.20	34.53
Other	29.22	28.60
Location of Residence* (F=3.377, p=.040)		
Detroit	37.00	32.17
Inner-ring suburb	7.56	22.66
Outer-ring suburb	34.56	31.85
Level of Education (F= .239, p= .915)		
High school/Some college	40.27	32.17
Associate's degree	30.00	34.88
Bachelor's degree	32.43	30.75

Table 5.2 (continued)

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Master's degree	31.37	33.83
Doctorate degree	24.80	34.07
Length of MOSES Membership* ($\underline{F}$=3.110, $\underline{p}$=.013)		
Less than 1 year	5.00	14.14
1 to 2 years	51.10	23.72
3 to 4 years	63.50	17.39
5 to 6 years	64.33	3.05
7 to 8 years	58.00	11.31
9 years or more	52.71	17.63
Primary Role in Organization* ($\underline{F}$=3.090, $\underline{p}$=.021)		
Taskforce member	46.14	30.78
Clergy/Congregation leader	25.48	30.78
Board member	39.75	33.10
Secular leader	21.67	37.52
Other	14.71	24.90
Primary Taskforce ($\underline{F}$= .706, $\underline{p}$= .593)		
Transportation	51.10	23.72
Healthcare	63.50	17.39
Civil Rights and Immigration	64.33	3.05
Supermarket	58.00	11.31
Other	52.71	17.63
Length of Taskforce Membership ($\underline{F}$= 2.760, $\underline{p}$= .077)		
2 years or less	49.25	24.66
3 to 6 years	64.15	11.48
7 years or more	65.75	6.39

N=40

Table 5.3

Levels of Clergy Trust by Selected Characteristics

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Age ($\underline{F}$= 1.541, $\underline{p}$= .213)		
30-49	27.00	0.00
50-59	12.29	15.67
60-69	6.82	11.66
70+	13.30	14.09
Socioeconomic Status ($\underline{F}$= .666, $\underline{p}$= .517)		
Upper class	9.27	13.08
Middle class	12.29	13.78
Working/Lower class	6.88	13.34
Religion/Denomination ($\underline{F}$= 1.821, $\underline{p}$= .122)		
Catholic	36.84	31.77
Baptist	27.06	31.84
Lutheran	45.20	41.59
Unitarian-Universalist	24.80	35.00
Non-denominational Christian	25.20	34.53
Other	29.22	28.60
Location of Residence ($\underline{F}$= .413, $\underline{p}$= .663)		
Detroit	10.48	13.13
Inner-ring suburb	12.00	14.88
Outer-ring suburb	14.13	14.71
Level of Education ($\underline{F}$= 1.004, $\underline{p}$= .412)		
High school/Some college	12.09	14.03
Associate's degree	0.0	0.00
Bachelor's degree	14.43	13.21

Table 5.3 (continued)

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Master's degree	10.44	14.19
Doctorate degree	11.20	15.35
Length of MOSES Membership ($\underline{F}$= 2.274, $\underline{p}$= .056)		
Less than 1 year	3.38	9.54
1 to 2 years	9.64	13.89
3 to 4 years	5.58	11.12
5 to 6 years	13.80	14.92
7 to 8 years	4.67	11.43
9 years or more	16.19	13.49
Primary Role in Organization* ($\underline{F}$= 2.962, $\underline{p}$= .026)		
Taskforce member	10.50	14.59
Clergy/Congregation leader	16.87	12.98
Board member	9.75	9.33
Secular leader	9.33	16.16
Other	2.88	8.23
Primary Taskforce* ($\underline{F}$= 2.752, $\underline{p}$= .043)		
Transportation	7.95	12.48
Healthcare	22.50	14.27
Civil Rights and Immigration	15.33	13.61
Supermarket	14.00	19.79
Other	3.14	8.31
Length of Taskforce Membership ($\underline{F}$= .033, $\underline{p}$= .967)		
2 years or less	11.20	14.20
3 to 6 years	12.38	14.26
7 years or more	12.50	14.64

N=28

because members are currently building relationships and interacting with one another. Levels of trust also varied by primary role in the organization. Trust was highest between clergy members and lowest for those who identified as "other" as their affiliation. Because clergy members tend to interact more frequently with one another through the Clergy Caucus and organization events, they may have more opportunity to build trust through their interactions.

Finally, using independent samples t-tests, I looked at differences between gender and race and clergy trust within MOSES (see Table 5.4). Male clergy reported higher levels of trust of other clergy members in the organization compared to female clergy. Unfortunately, there is little information in the qualitative data to illuminate why this is the case.

Table 5.4

Differences in Social Capital Dimension Scales by Gender and Race

Scale	Gender				Race			
	Male		Female		African American		White	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SC-IQ Organizational Trust Scale	33.59	25.85	34.74	24.86	33.09	25.45	35.16	25.64
SC-IQ Organizational Cohesion Scale	22.59	17.43	22.31	17.55	22.16	18.56	22.10	16.25
SC-IQ Taskforce Trust Scale	40.07	32.37	25.17	30.84	30.06	33.23	32.16	31.01
SC-IQ Clergy Trust Scale	16.83*	13.70	8.17	12.59	10.91	13.71	11.26	13.74

N=64

Note: Organizational Trust Scale scores range from 17 to 77. Organizational Cohesion Scale scores range from 13 to 51.

Taskforce Trust Scale scores range from 20 to 82. Clergy Trust Scale scores range from 7 to 35.

* = significant at level $p < .05$

Solidarity. Survey results also indicated the presence of solidarity within the organization (see Table 5.5), issue taskforces (see Table 5.6), and among clergy members (see Table 5.7). Eighty-one percent of respondents believed that members of the organization share a common identity. When asked upon what this identity is based, 51 percent said vision or goals for the region, 37 percent said passion for social change, 10 percent indicated religion or faith, and 2 percent mentioned gender.

Table 5.5

Indications of the Solidarity Dimension in the Organization from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Members Believe They Share A Common Organizational Identity	
Yes	81.4
No	18.6
Organization identity based on vision/goals for the region	50.9
Organization identity based on passion for social change	36.8
Organization identity based on religion/faith	10.5
Organization identity based on gender	1.8

N=70

Seventy-six percent of members who belonged to a MOSES taskforce indicated that members of their primary taskforces share a common identity. When asked what this identity is based on, 46 percent said vision or goals for the region, 36 percent mentioned passion for social change, 14 percent indicated religion or faith, and 4 percent responded with race or ethnicity. Eighty-six percent of clergy members in MOSES indicated that clergy members share a

common identity. When asked what this identity is based on, 46 percent mentioned vision or goals for the region, 21 percent said religion or faith, 17 percent indicated passion for social change, 8 percent mentioned political views, 4 percent said race or ethnicity, and 4 percent indicated gender.

Table 5.6

Indications of the Solidarity Dimension in Taskforces from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Members Believe They Share A Common Taskforce Identity	
Yes	75.7
No	24.3
Taskforce identity based on vision/goals for the region	46.4
Taskforce identity based on passion for social change	35.7
Taskforce identity based on religion/faith	14.3
Taskforce identity based on race/ethnicity	3.6

N=38

Table 5.7

Indications of the Solidarity Dimension among Clergy Members from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Clergy Members Believe They Share A Common Identity	
Yes	86.2
No	13.8
Clergy identity based on vision/goals for the region	45.8
Clergy identity based on religion/spirituality	20.8
Clergy identity based on political views	8.3
Clergy identity based on race/ethnicity	4.2
Clergy identity based on gender	4.2

N=29

Social cohesion. Findings from the survey also documented the existence of social cohesion within the organization. Descriptive statistics on individual survey items measuring social cohesion were generated. In addition, analyses of variance compared the level of organizational cohesion by personal characteristics including length of organization membership, length of taskforce membership, age, race, religion, socioeconomic status, level of education, location of residence, role in the organization, and taskforce membership (if applicable). A Tukey HSD test was applied to identify differences within response groups.

The analysis of variance found that organizational cohesion was highest for members who had been involved with the organization for 5 to 6 years (see Table 5.8). Similar to the findings on organizational trust, these results suggest that organizational cohesion peaks around 5 to 6 years and then slowly declines as time goes on. This test also found that the level of organizational social cohesion was higher for board members compared to taskforce members, clergy members, and general members. More cohesion may exist between board members due to regular monthly meetings as well as the importance of their work to govern the organization. Finally, the analysis of variance found that level of organizational social cohesion was higher for members who resided in inner-ring suburbs compared to members who resided in the city or outer-ring suburbs.

Table 5.8

Levels of Organizational Social Cohesion by Selected Characteristics

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Age ($\underline{F}$= .295, $\underline{p}$= .829)		
30-49	37.00	0.00
50-59	20.43	21.02
60-69	21.68	15.45
70+	23.43	18.63
Socioeconomic Status ($\underline{F}$= .064, $\underline{p}$= .930)		
Upper class	24.45	13.23
Middle class	22.73	18.64
Working/Lower class	21.63	18.98
Religion/Denomination ($\underline{F}$= .313, $\underline{p}$= .904)		
Catholic	21.88	17.27
Baptist	23.67	19.30
Lutheran	28.20	16.17
Unitarian-Universalist	18.40	16.83
Non-denominational Christian	28.20	17.85
Other	19.67	19.35
Level of Education ($\underline{F}$= .492, $\underline{p}$= .740)		
High school/Some college	22.45	22.06
Associate's degree	13.75	16.00
Bachelor's degree	26.24	17.62
Master's degree	22.63	16.32
Doctorate degree	19.60	17.92
Location of Residence* ($\underline{F}$= 3.393, $\underline{p}$= .040)		
Detroit	20.88	18.38

Table 5.8 (continued)

Characteristics	Mean	SD
Inner-ring suburb	36.89	6.54
Outer-ring suburb	22.06	16.37
Length of MOSES Membership* ($\underline{F}$= 5.754, $\underline{p}$= .000)		
Less than 1 year	9.38	11.16
1 to 2 years	8.29	12.70
3 to 4 years	18.11	18.55
5 to 6 years	37.20	6.23
7 to 8 years	32.00	10.77
9 years or more	23.76	19.24
Primary Role in Organization* ($\underline{F}$= 3.033, $\underline{p}$= .023)		
Taskforce member	15.27	19.14
Clergy/Congregation leader	21.78	18.46
Board member	37.88	2.69
Secular leader	33.00	11.00
Other	19.88	15.39
Primary Taskforce ($\underline{F}$= .759, $\underline{p}$= .559)		
Transportation	15.45	19.65
Healthcare	17.25	20.40
Civil Rights and Immigration	27.00	23.38
Supermarket	19.50	27.57
Other	5.43	14.36
Length of Taskforce Membership ($\underline{F}$= 1.084, $\underline{p}$= .350)		
2 years or less	12.05	17.65
3 to 6 years	22.00	21.36
7 years or more	19.50	22.65

N=67

Two individual survey items captured responses related to social cohesion in taskforces (see Table 5.9). First, taskforce members were asked whether they felt a sense of closeness or togetherness within their primary taskforces. Thirty-eight percent of taskforce members responded feeling somewhat close, 31 percent indicated feeling neither distant nor close, 17 percent felt very close, 10 percent felt somewhat distant, and 3 percent felt very distant. Second, taskforce members were asked if cultural differences between members ever resulted in heated disagreements among members. Eighty-five percent of respondents indicated that this had never happened; 15 percent expressed that disagreements had taken place.

Table 5.9

Indications of the Social Cohesion Dimension in Taskforces from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Degree of Closeness in Taskforces	
Very distant	3.4
Somewhat distant	10.3
Neither close nor distant	31.0
Somewhat close	37.9
Very close	17.2
Disagreements Based on Cultural Differences in Taskforces	
No	85.3
Yes	14.7

N=34

On the SC-IQ survey, clergy members were asked about the extent of social cohesion that exists in their congregations (see Table 5.10). 55 percent

indicated their congregations were somewhat cohesive, 31 percent responded very cohesive, 7 percent said not very cohesive, and finally, 7 percent stated their congregations were not cohesive at all.

Table 5.10

Indications of the Social Cohesion Dimension for Clergy Members from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Extent of Cohesion in Clergy Member Congregations	
Not at all cohesive	6.9
Not very cohesive	6.9
Somewhat cohesive	55.2
Very cohesive	31.0

N=28

Inclusion. Findings from the survey confirmed the organization's attempts to be inclusive (see Table 5.11). Descriptive statistics were generated for individual survey items designed to capture the dimension of inclusion. On the SC-IQ survey, members were asked if they had ever felt excluded from discussions or activities within the organization. Approximately 85 percent of respondents reported that they had never felt excluded; 15 percent reported that they had felt excluded from organization activities. The majority of respondents who felt excluded expressed that they felt excluded due to a lack of communication about meetings and events. Taskforce members were also asked if they had ever felt excluded from discussions or activities within their primary taskforces. Eighty-eight percent indicated they had never felt excluded. The 12 percent who reported feeling excluded identified poor communication as the

component that made them feel this way. Finally, clergy members were asked whether there were issues important to their congregations that MOSES had never addressed. 92 percent of respondents indicated that MOSES had not overlooked issues important to their congregations.

Table 5.11

Indications of the Inclusion Dimension from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Exclusion from Organizational Activities	
No	84.6
Yes	15.4
Exclusion from Taskforce Activities	
No	88.2
Yes	11.8
Clergy Member Congregation Issues Not Addressed	
No	91.7
Yes	8.3

N=66

Collective action. Findings from the SC-IQ survey confirmed the existence of collective action to some degree in taskforces (see Table 5.12) and for clergy and their congregations (see Table 5.13). Respondents were asked the proportion of taskforce members who dedicated time and resources on a regular basis. Approximately 50 percent reported that over one-half of members in their taskforces participated regularly. When asked whether membership in their primary taskforce increased or decreased since their initial involvement,

members were somewhat divided. 36 percent of respondents claimed membership increased, 36 percent said membership had declined, and 28 percent indicated that membership had stayed the same. Respondents were also asked to indicate the number of hours they spend per month engaged in taskforce-related activities. The typical taskforce member spends less than two hours on taskforce activities per month. Interestingly, 14 percent reported they

Table 5.12

Indications of the Collective Action Dimension in Taskforces from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Perceived Changes in Taskforce Membership	
Declined	35.7
Remained the same	28.6
Increased	35.7
Perceived Levels of Taskforce Involvement	
No one	8.7
Less than one-half	34.8
About one-half	21.7
More than one-half	30.4
Everyone	4.3
Respondent Actual Time Spent on Taskforce Activities Per Month	
1 to 2 hours	51.4
3 to 4 hours	18.9
5 to 6 hours	10.8
7 to 8 hours	2.7
16 to 20 hours	2.7
25 or more hours	13.5

N=37

spend 25 hours or more per month on taskforce-related activities. The majority of these members were middle-class residents of Detroit, ages 50 to 59, who were members of the transportation taskforce.

Collective action for clergy members yielded mixed findings. One of the major ways clergy members participate in MOSES is through the Clergy Caucus. When asked what percentage of Clergy Caucus meetings members attended in the past year, 57 percent said they had attended Clergy Caucus meetings, with the majority having attended less than one-quarter of the meetings. They were also asked about the amount of time they spend on MOSES-related activities. Most clergy members spend about 5 hours a less per month on organization

Table 5.13

Indications of the Collective Action Dimension for Clergy Members from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Percentage of Clergy Caucus Meetings Attended	
None	42.9
Less than 25 percent	39.3
25 to 49 percent	10.6
50 to 74 percent	3.6
100 percent	3.6
Clergy Member Strategies to Increase Congregation Participation	
Personally approach congregation members	80.8
Advertise MOSES activities in congregations	65.4
Discuss MOSES activities during religious service/mass	38.5

N=28

activities. Clergy members were asked about the strategies they used to encourage their congregation members to participate in MOSES. Clergy

members appeared to use multiple strategies. The most popular was asking members to get involved and promoting events in bulletins and on websites.

Groups and networks. Results from the SC-IQ survey support the finding that taskforces work with other groups both inside and outside of the organization (see Table 5.14). When asked whether their primary taskforces have worked with other taskforces within MOSES, 64 percent of respondents said this happened occasionally and 16 percent indicated that it happened frequently. In regards to working with outside groups (not members of MOSES) with similar goals, 41 percent said this happened occasionally and 41 percent claimed this happened frequently. For working with outside groups that have different goals, 57 percent claimed this happened occasionally.

Table 5.14

Indications of the Groups and Networks Dimension from Survey Responses

Survey Item	%
Taskforce Works With Other MOSES Taskforces	
Yes, frequently	16.0
Yes, occasionally	64.0
No	20.0
Taskforce Works With Outside Groups, Similar Goals	
Yes, frequently	41.4
Yes, occasionally	41.4
No	17.2
Taskforce Works With Outside Groups, Different Goals	
Yes, occasionally	57.1
No	42.9

N=29

Qualitative findings. Qualitative findings further supported the presence of the eight dimensions of social capital and further expanded on the dimensions through the emergence of sub-themes for many of the dimensions.

Trust. Trust is arguably the most important element facilitating the formation of bridging social capital. Table 5.15 summarizes the results of the qualitative data for this theme. Most of the members interviewed expressed they felt trust within the organization as a whole and among the general membership of MOSES. This sense of trust was apparent through participant observations of several organization and taskforce meetings and events. In both contexts, members were welcoming, accommodating, and seemed to be at ease with one another. Interview participants reported that longtime members felt close to one another. Further, they felt that the organization's system of give and take helped to create and maintain a sense of trust between members. Members give the organization and membership their time and effort, and in return, they experience positive changes in themselves, their congregations, and their communities. The relationships are reciprocal.

Board members in particular expressed feeling a sense of trust with other board members:

> It's particularly true in the board, but with clergy as well. And I speak both as someone involved with a larger organization and I'm thinking about a smaller fledgling organization that we've worked on here. There was a very high degree of trust. And that commitment and knowledge that people were going to follow through. So I think there's a high degree, at least for myself (MOSES newer board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

Table 5.15

Trust Themes from Interviews and Observations

Trust Themes	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Trust
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	
General organization	14	42.4	9	26.4	Quote: "I think there is a high degree of trust in MOSES." Observation: Members of the civil rights and immigration taskforce having friendly conversations and engaging in physical contact prior to the meeting.
Building trust	9	27.3	0	0.0	Quote: "If building relationships is at the center of what we're doing, building trust is always a part of relationships."
Accountability	6	18.1	20	58.8	Quote: "Because there's ability to hold accountable because we trust each other and know each other." Observation: Members of the board reporting on tasks completed in monthly board meetings.
Board member trust	4	12.2	5	14.7	Quote: "So I think on the whole that I do feel trustful of the board members." Observation: A humorous discussion between two board members regarding racial discrimination.

The majority of board members expressed feeling close to other board members and reported having some knowledge of one another's personal lives. Several of the members had known each other for several years, but even three of the newer board members shared that they felt a sense of trust very quickly upon involvement.

The process of building trust also was described by study participants. Overall, members interviewed discussed the importance of building trust to form effective working relationships. Several members expressed that a sense of trust formed immediately upon joining the organization and that this immediate trust

was related to the values of the organization. Specifically, interviewees stated that people would not join MOSES if they did not already share the same perspectives and values in regards to social issues. Sharing the same values and passion for social justice appeared to be the seed necessary for deeper levels of trust to grow. Through engaging in the organization through participating in actions and building relationships, the building of trust takes place:

> Relationship building is such an important part. I think I felt connection immediately, and then as it continues it's such a part of the identity of the organization that it happened pretty quickly. Even as I plugged in at different levels, I also had attended some of the Clergy Caucus meetings in Detroit. So even there you had that sense of, "This really is something that I can plug into that will be...it's where I feel welcome and where there are people with similar concerns and similar world views, I guess (MOSES newer board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

> I think sometimes being involved in actions, just spending some time together, whether it's going to Lansing together and doing something. Or, I think the Clergy Caucus meetings at one point in time really helped the clergy build those relationships and trust each other (MOSES board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

Accountability also emerged in relation to trust. I observed several occurrences of accountability in different contexts within the organization. Accountability was observed in board meetings and at the board retreat. For board members, accountability appeared to involve attending monthly board meetings, attending organization meetings and special events, and contributing through brainstorming new strategies for fundraising, member recruitment, and organizational expansion. Accountability was also observed at an organization issues meeting, at which participants were asked to commit to joining a taskforce. Finally, accountability was observed at healthcare, transportation, and

supermarket taskforce meetings. For taskforce members, accountability involved volunteering for new tasks, reporting progress on tasks and responsibilities, and holding members accountable through follow-up discussions regarding assigned tasks.

One particular observation illustrates the meaning of accountability within MOSES. At a healthcare taskforce meeting during the Spring, a member was asked by healthcare taskforce leaders to attend a legislative visit at the state capital in order to establish a working relationship with a legislator and schedule a meeting between him and the MOSES healthcare taskforce. It was expected that by the next taskforce meeting, the taskforce member would have something to report in regards to the visit. At the next healthcare taskforce meeting, the member was asked to report on her experiences and achievements with the visit. The member did attend the legislative visit and arranged a meeting to discuss the taskforce's demands in regards to healthcare issues in Michigan.

Solidarity. A second dimension of social capital found to be present within MOSES was solidarity (see Table 5.16). Based on member responses, solidarity appears to have a few different meanings. Solidarity was described as loyalty to the organization, a feeling of unification, a sense of "we", and sharing similar perspectives and values. Thirteen of the twenty members interviewed reported feeling a sense of solidarity in the organization as a whole. According to members, solidarity included a strong sense of belonging to the organization. Respondents emphasized feeling that they had found "their people" or others

who share common interests and ideologies and that MOSES is an organization

in which they "fit" and felt connected:

> Yeah. I think because there was a real clear shared interest and action orientation to try and let's do something. So yeah, I did [feel a sense of solidarity]. My people (MOSES board member, healthcare taskforce member).

Table 5.16

Solidarity Themes from Interviews and Observations

Solidarity Themes	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Solidarity
	f	%	f	%	
General organization	20	27.8	0	0.0	Quote: "Yes, I definitely feel there has always been a sense of solidarity."
Faith	14	19.4	0	0.0	Quote: "Faith is an essential component [of solidarity]."
Issues	11	15.3	7	36.8	Quote: "No, I think it's [solidarity] most advisably based on issues." Observation: The annual public meeting focused on the issues to motivate members to get involved and take action.
Belonging	10	13.9	5	26.3	Quote: "I think because there was a real clear shared interest and action orientation to try and let's do something. I felt like these are my people." Observation: At the board retreat, non-members were encouraged to participate in the strategic planning process of the organization.
Public Meeting	9	12.5	4	21.1	Quote: "Well, I would say I always had the feeling [solidarity] from those big rallies especially." Observation: Leaders engaged members at the annual public meeting in cheers and the repetition of mantras around social issues and the values held by the organization.
Actions	8	11.1	3	15.8	Quote: "But if you're not going to do anything, you would have a hard time feeling part of it." Observation: The reporting of a successful legislative visit by members of the healthcare taskforce.

The foundations of this solidarity were identified as faith and social issues. Five members interviewed expressed that commonalities in faith brought members together and made them feel unified:

> But there are...faith has to be the reason for...the ultimate reason for doing what you're doing. And I would think that the core team people are responding as good Catholics to the nature of the way the world is. I mean, you know, we go back to many different things...The Second Vatican Council which spoke so importantly about the Church being a part of the modern world and that we have to be a part of this world. We have to contribute to it. It's not just enough to pray. We need to pray, but also need to be involved. So I think a Catholic person would be coming out of that perspective really (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Four members reported that similar perspectives on social issues unified members and made them feel a part of the organization. For them, agreement on social issues transcends all other differences and allows people to focus on similarities rather than differences. This focus in turn, supports solidarity:

> Yeah, in a certain degree I do [feel a sense of solidarity] because I feel like we're on the same plate with the issues. In the beginning, it seemed like more of a struggle to get people to understand. For me, where I came from, I felt like maybe I needed to make myself clear where I came from. I think that was understood and I don't feel that I'm...I mean, I feel like we're on the same plate (MOSES healthcare taskforce member).

Six members interviewed expressed that both faith and caring about social issues influenced solidarity in the organization:

> I think it's a combination of the issue and faith, and how our faith moves us to say, "This is the right thing to do." So faith is the motivation. The issue is the drawing card to come together, where we see that there's an achievable victory. So whether that's public transportation or other issues we've attacked in the past (MOSES Protestant, city clergy member).

Involvement in organizational actions and meetings were one of the mechanisms that facilitated a sense of solidarity among members. As one board member reminisced:

> I remember when our Mass Transportation Committee met on one of the freeways. And it was really exciting. The media came out. There must have been about 25 of us over by I-75 in Southwest Detroit. It just felt good. I'm like a demonstrating kind of person. And here we are, all out there standing over the freeway (MOSES board member).

She went on to say that being involved with other members in this action gave her a sense of belonging and bonding with the other taskforce members. Her participation in this action made her feel like a part of the organization.

Seven interviewees specifically mentioned the annual public meeting sponsored by MOSES as the primary activity that builds solidarity. Respondents shared that bringing all of the organization members into one central location and focusing on developing solutions for social issues was extremely unifying. Although members were from various cultural backgrounds, they were in agreement on the social issues being addressed. Also mentioned was MOSES making attempts to build one solid identity within the organization, focusing not only on the issues, but on faith and member values. Members interviewed shared their thoughts on solidarity and the public meeting:

> Well, I would say I always had the feeling [solidarity] from those big rallies especially. Those rallies were really a good time. I approve very much of the process by which issues were chosen. I was on board with all of that. Those were really good times (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

The issues, the public meetings coming together as a large group. I think that's what gives one a sense of belonging to this larger organization (MOSES board member).

Participant observations of the annual public meeting also support these findings. There were four particular moments that I felt were indicators of a sense of solidarity among members. During the meeting, each of the four social issues were presented by board members or clergy members. MOSES leaders talked about the facts surrounding the issues, they performed skits to demonstrate the impact of the social issues, and then they confronted elected officials in attendance on taking action on each of the issues.

One example of this was when a clergy member from a primarily Latino church addressed meeting participants in regards to current immigration laws in the United States. First, the clergy member presented facts about immigration laws and how those laws have affected families in the metropolitan area. Next, the clergy member introduced three different families or individuals and allowed them to share their personal stories related to immigration laws. Stories were very emotional and involved the deportation and loss of spouses and other family members. After the stories were presented, the clergy member started a cheer and engaged the audience to cheer with him. After a few minutes of cheering, the clergy member addressed each of the elected officials present at the meeting and asked them if they would be willing to work with MOSES on immigration reform. Elected officials were required to answer in front of all participants and

give a simple answer of yes or no. All elected officials addressed agreed to work

with MOSES on immigration reform.

Social cohesion. According to study participants, social cohesion was

present within the organization as a whole, and manifested specifically in terms

of interactions with other members (see Table 5.17).

Table 5.17

Social Cohesion Themes from Interviews and Observations

Social Cohesion Themes	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Social Cohesion
	f	%	*f*	%	
Consistency	10	71.4	0	0.0	Quote: "There are standards of operating, an organizing process of ways of looking at who we are that are pretty consistent across the network."
General organization	4	28.6	4	100.0	Quote: "I think that [annual public meeting] does provide a sense of cohesiveness that could be built upon." Observation: Members responsible for organizing and implementing the annual public meeting seemed to work well together with few disagreements or issues.

The majority of the respondents interviewed expressed that, in general, members

get along with one another and are able to work together with few disagreements

or major differences:

> So let's concentrate on the issues which surface that reflect injustice and talk about what do we need to do to address the injustice. Then we spend more time working and thinking together, as to focusing on what separates me from you (MOSES Board President).

Based on the interviews and participant observations, it appeared the

process of developing social cohesion within MOSES starts with developing

individual relationships with members through conducting one-on-ones. One-on-

ones allow people to get to know one another, help members understand varying cultural backgrounds, and they plant the seed for the beginning levels of trust. From there, working together on social issues, whether on the Board of Directors, the Clergy Caucus, or issue taskforces, allows members to build closer relationships and a stronger sense of cohesion. The following quote from a MOSES taskforce member illustrates this process:

> But I do think, in the process of working with groups like MOSES, maybe it's one person at a time, that as we begin to be more informed and understand more about what group issues are, we can be more cohesive as one group (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

The concept of consistency within the organization emerged from discussions on social cohesion. Consistency appears to mean standards of operating or following particular patterns or procedures. Members interviewed expressed that consistency was related to producing feelings of cohesion within the organization. While the organization as a whole appeared to be somewhat lacking in the area of developing policies and procedures (to be discussed as barriers to social capital formation), I did observe evidence of consistency in the healthcare taskforce.

First, healthcare taskforce meetings were scheduled and conducted every month. If a meeting date was cancelled, an alternative date was rescheduled for that month. Second, communication regarding meetings and events occurred on a weekly basis and sometimes more frequently. Communication with taskforce members was frequently via electronic mail and informed members of upcoming meetings and events. Third, membership and attendance within the healthcare

taskforce was highly consistent. Essentially, the same members attended the meetings each month, allowing members to become comfortable and familiar with one another. Finally, meeting agendas showed consistency. Healthcare taskforce meetings followed a similar, structured agenda with the same two individuals leading the meetings each time.

It appeared that having predictable patterns of operation, along with consistency in member attendance and participation, facilitated members feeling cohesive within a group. For the other taskforces and the organization as a whole, solidifying consistency in operations may increase members' ability to work within the organization more cooperatively and without difficulties or disruptions.

Inclusion. Inclusion was a fourth dimension of social capital present in MOSES (see Table 5.18). Respondents interviewed seemed to be equally divided on their perspectives surrounding inclusion. During member interviews, the existence of inclusion was mentioned 23 times and lack of inclusion was mentioned 20 times. Members who indicated that inclusion existed within MOSES expressed that organization leaders have attempted to be inclusive in regards to recruitment, membership, and encouraging participation among members. Specifically, MOSES had hosted events at varying locations to be inclusive in regards to race, faith, and location of residence.

Table 5.18

Inclusion Themes from Interviews and Observations

Inclusion Themes	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Inclusion
	f	%	*f*	%	
General organization	13	56.6	4	30.8	Quote: "I think one thing we've done, at least in this vein, is by having events at different places." Observation: Discussions in board meetings in regards to the importance of including groups that are representative of the region in which MOSES serves.
Religion	5	21.7	5	38.4	Quote: "I don't need to have my identity of being Christian a placard out there included in my prayer." Observation: The immigration rally included a Muslim Imam who delivered an opening prayer and spoke about the difficulties of immigration policy and how it relates to Middle-Eastern and Muslim immigrants.
Race	5	21.7	4	30.8	Quote: "People understand that it's [annual public meeting] one of the few places, if not the only place, where you see black, white, brown…" Observation: Inviting an Arab-American organization to increase participation in rallies and actions.

For racial and ethnic inclusion, MOSES leaders hosted events such as issue meetings, the annual public rally, clergy caucus meetings, and issue-specific rallies at African American, White, and Latino congregations. To address religious inclusion, MOSES leaders hosted events at congregations of varying denominations and religious traditions. For inclusion of residents of different areas, MOSES leaders hosted events at congregations located in the city and the suburbs. MOSES leaders also have collaborated with outside organizations and communities to include groups not worked with previously, including non-

member Latino groups working on immigration reform and Muslim organizations.

The following quotes illustrate MOSES' effort to be inclusive:

> Well, I spoke yesterday at an African-American Muslim congregation that's very involved with MOSES and that was a good thing. It seemed...it looked...learning a little more about it. I mean, it's a long-established congregation with strong history and roots. They have their own school. And I think that's a good thing (Gamaliel Foundation staff member, MOSES board member).

> I think one thing we've done, at least in this vein, is by having events at different places, like hosting the Clergy Caucus (MOSES board member).

Members identified religion as one of the areas in which MOSES has focused on inclusion. According to some respondents, MOSES has been making attempts to increase Jewish and Muslim membership and participation within the organization. Discussions about strategies for engaging synagogues and mosques within the region were observed in monthly board meetings and at the board retreat. MOSES also included Muslim and Jewish leaders in the annual public meeting and the immigration rally. Leaders from these faiths led prayers at the beginning of the meetings and verbally shared the perspectives of their communities in regards to the social issues MOSES addresses.

Religious inclusion also was discussed in terms of being cognizant of the predominating Christian culture that exists within MOSES and using language that includes other faith traditions. Five interviewees mentioned the importance of using inclusive language. Respondents who discussed this emphasized using the term "God" instead of "Jesus" and engaging in prayers that encompass different belief systems:

> But it has been my practice that, when I'm praying in a public place, I just call the name of God, because if everybody's there with that understanding, well, then for all of us...well, the atheists I don't know...but for the faith-based people, we can all agree upon the name of God. I don't need to have my identity of being Christian a placard out there included in my prayer (MOSES Protestant, city clergy member).

Respondents also mentioned that MOSES is inclusive in regards to race and ethnicity. At organization meetings and events, it is clear that MOSES has members from the African American, White, and Latino communities. In order to facilitate inclusion of all members at events and meetings, MOSES leaders have attempted to host meetings and events at varying locations. While most meetings and events were held at primarily African American churches in the city of Detroit, at least two meetings were held at Latino churches in southwest Detroit and two meetings at suburban White congregations; one at a Jewish synagogue in Oak Park and the other at a Baptist church in Birmingham. Discussions on engaging the Arab community were observed in monthly board meetings and at the board retreat. ACCESS, an Arab-American community organization, holds membership in MOSES and leaders had discussed strategies to increase their participation in the organization.

Collective action. Respondents expressed that meetings, actions and events promote participation within the organization by engaging members in specific tasks and keeping them active in the organization (see Table 5.19). Essentially, respondents felt that if members have a role or purpose to serve within the organization on a regular basis, their participation will remain consistent:

And it gives you an opportunity to come together to be involved in activities that make you feel that you're actually doing something to make it better (MOSES healthcare taskforce member).

Table 5.19

Collective Action Themes from Interviews and Observations

Collective Action Themes	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Collective Action
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	
Organization Actions and Meetings	18	37.5	5	18.5	Quote: "They pull a lot of people together [referring to the annual public meeting] so you look around and say 'Wow! 3,000 people came out for this. This is really something'." Observation: Board members working cooperatively to develop a strategic plan for the organization.
Church Participation	17	35.4	0	0.0	Quote: "Core groups facilitate church participation."
Taskforce Participation	9	18.8	22	81.5	Quote: "I remember when or Mass Transportation Committee met on one of the freeways; it was really exciting." Observation: Taskforce members volunteering to complete tasks relevant to addressing the issue.
Clergy Participation	4	8.3	0	0.0	Quote: "Well, my most active role I've played has been as chair and co-chair of the clergy caucus."

I observed most of the behaviors around actions and meetings (4 of 5 reported) at the strategic planning board retreat. All but two of the board members were present for the meeting and five non-board members who were interested in participating in the strategic planning process also attended. Overall, it was an impressive turnout for planning the future of MOSES. The other observation of collective action was a discussion in a monthly board meeting about a legislative visit scheduled in Washington, D.C. The event was a rally organized by the Gamaliel Foundation aimed at addressing issues around

healthcare and was planned to take place in front of the White House. In the meeting it was reported that over 46 members of the organization were registered to attend the visit. For out-of-state legislative visits, this was considered an impressive number.

Participation by member congregations also emerged within the collective action dimension. Respondents shared that core teams facilitated congregational involvement in the organization. Core teams were formed within each congregation in order to organize them around particular issues addressed within MOSES. Members of the core team often worked at engaging other members, and many times, acted as liaisons between the congregation and the organization. Interviewees also shared that many congregations had members who were involved with the organization on a regular basis, and tended to have large numbers of members attend the public meeting in support of the organization:

> Again, for "actively involved" you'd have to probably count the members of the core team, which is like ten people. But it's ad hoc. With the help of those ten people, we can get two or three hundred people to come to a public meeting (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Collective action also existed within issue taskforces. Respondents reported that most members, including board members and clergy members, participate with one or more of the issue taskforces. Taskforce membership allows members to engage in the organization in a structured manner with support and follow-up from other taskforce members and leaders. Several respondents specifically mentioned active participation in the transportation and

supermarket taskforces. At the time of the interviews, these taskforces were experiencing changes in leadership and membership and both were growing in size. At least 15 of the 20 members interviewed identified at least one taskforce to which they dedicated their time on a regular basis.

The main purpose of the issue taskforces within MOSES has been to get people to participate collectively in actions and events that will impact social issues. I observed several instances of collective action activities in each of the taskforce meetings I attended. First, attendance for most meetings included at least 10 members for each of the taskforce meetings. Next, I observed taskforce members in all taskforces volunteering to make phone calls to legislators, participate in legislative visits, take meeting minutes, contact other organizations, and arrange rallies and meetings in the city and suburbs. Further, most meeting attendees participated by sharing ideas and opinions, and discussing options with other members.

Members interviewed also expressed that clergy members played an important role in collective action by encouraging members to be involved with MOSES actions and events:

> But within the faith group, you have to have a strong leadership...pastoral leadership is what I'm really trying to say. A minister has to be very actively involved in it, and to promote it within the congregation (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

Interviewees also mentioned clergy members attending the clergy caucus as part of participating in the organization. The clergy caucus is a forum for clergy

members to get to know one another, build relationships, and brainstorm strategies for engaging their church members in social justice:

> When we [his congregation] became involved, it was the result of my participation in the Clergy Caucus. And then from Clergy Caucus, we became more involved with listening campaigns and transit and some other issues (MOSES Board President).

Information and communication. Overall, respondents expressed that communication from MOSES was good and had improved within the organization (see Table 5.20). Good communication was described as members receiving notices of meetings and events, whether it was in-person, via the website or through electronic mail:

> I think it's pretty good, for those who take advantage of it; who go on the website; who go to the meetings (MOSES Board President).

> I'm in the loop to a certain degree. They send out information. They inform the new people coming what's going on (MOSES healthcare taskforce member).

Respondents also expressed that MOSES was doing a good job with the sharing of information through the use of technology. According to respondents, MOSES was using their electronic mail system and website to keep members up-to-date on social issues, taskforce meeting progress, as well as meeting and event dates and times. MOSES hosts a forum on their website for members to join sub-forums based on each of the taskforces. Members can post comments and contact other members through the forums. MOSES also publishes a monthly calendar on their website to keep members informed of important events and meetings.

Table 5.20

Information and Communication Themes from Interviews and Observations

Information and Communication	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Information and Communication
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	
General Organization	26	63.4	7	100.0	Quote: "I'm in the loop to a certain degree. They send out information. They inform the new people coming what's going on." Observation: I received email from MOSES that included a 6-month calendar of meetings and events taking place.
Sharing Information Through Technology	6	14.6	0	0.0	Quote: "MOSES has switched over to email and Internet. So in a sense, MOSES is, I think gone to only one hard-copy a year communication."
Consistent Communication	5	12.2	0	0.0	Quote: "I think its [communication] pretty good, for those who take advantage of it; who go on the website; who go to the meetings."
Gaining Skills	4	9.8	0	0.0	Quote: "Now, however, I think we can begin to do things ourselves too."

Finally, two members shared that through MOSES, they have been able to learn organizing and leadership skills that have helped them work with their congregations independent of MOSES on local issues affecting their churches and communities in which they live:

So when it came to MOSES, it was just helpful that there was a group here that was established that was dealing with political, social, economic issues. I can go to the meetings or the clergy meetings at MOSES, find out exactly what's going on. That was really helpful to getting my feet on the ground. So that was very good. Now, however, I think we can begin to do things ourselves too (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Empowerment and political action. Empowerment and political action was another dimension of social capital found within MOSES (see Table 5.21). Respondents felt a sense of empowerment through actions and meetings

occurring within the organization. These included smaller organizational meetings, such as taskforce meetings and issue meetings; the annual public meeting; and legislative visits conducted by the organization. Responses related to general organization actions and meetings focused on MOSES' involvement with advocacy. Specifically, supporting issues that affect the lives of community members and providing a voice for individuals who have previously not had a voice:

> But it's been helpful for me to see how this organization actually addresses the advocacy side and lobbying and whatever else they do. Again, it's just interesting to see. We have this issue we think needs to be out in the community to be successful. And this is an organization of the community and it's bringing these issues forward and a community voice forward that we think is important (MOSES healthcare taskforce member).

Responses also emphasized facilitating changes in policies or practices:

> We were real involved with healthcare last year, trying to get that referendum on the ballot to change the Constitution. That got my folks really jazzed up (MOSES board member, Lutheran, city clergy member).

Other responses indicated that providing training is an important part of empowering members:

> Well, I think they do [build empowerment] in their training sessions and offering the leadership training and community training they have. I mean, they do provide a lot of that, which I think is quite good (MOSES board member).

I observed strategies to facilitate empowerment at one particular MOSES training that focused on the development of a listening campaign. At this training, members were provided with information on skills they could use to engage other members of their congregations. Specifically, to get other congregation members

to share their personal stories related to one of the four social issues MOSES

had been addressing. The purpose of the listening campaign was to capture

personal stories on video and present them to elected officials in efforts to impact

policy and legislation. At the training, MOSES leaders emphasized the

importance of member participation and engaging others. MOSES leaders

attempted to show members the connections between their actions and the

opportunities for change.

Respondents also expressed that the annual public meeting was an

important strategy for building empowerment within the organization:

> Yeah, I think you can feel empowered by one of those mass rallies (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

One respondent specifically mentioned having a nationally elected public official

at the public meeting as empowering, particularly because it led to changes

within the city:

> Well, I think one of our big successes was we got the... at the time he was President...Bill Clinton's Drug Czar, General Barry McCaffrey, to a public meeting. We got him to commit to some High Density Traffic Authority funds. I don't even know if they exist anymore. It enabled the hiring of additional personnel for Detroit Police, Wayne County Sheriff, and the Bureau of Drugs and Alcohol. So there was a lot more attention to enforcement in areas that we badly needed them. So we really noticed that as a plus. Um, I think generally there's a better sense of the importance of being, as a church, involved in some social justice things. I'm not sure that consciousness was there generally. So it's no surprise to people when we say, "Hey, there's going to be a public meeting. We'd like you to come. Sign up here." And people will do that because they say now, "Oh yeah, that's MOSES. I know what that's about." (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Table 5.21

Empowerment and Political Action Themes from Interviews and Observations

Empowerment and Political Action	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Empowerment and Political Action
	f	%	f	%	
Actions and Meetings	13	28.9	10	32.3	Quote: "It gives you an opportunity to be involved in activities that make you feel you're actually doing something to make it better." Observation: Leaders expressing the importance of each member's role in the change process at a listening campaign training.
Feelings of Empowerment	11	24.4	0	0.0	Quote: "There's no doubt that we never would have been within an arm's length of President Clinton, and even more locally, the mayor and other politicians, the senators from the state and representatives."
Holding Elected Officials Accountable	8	17.8	4	12.8	Quote: "They asked the politicians to make promises." Observation: Elected officials present at the annual public meeting agreed to work with the organization on the issues presented.
Connections with Elected Officials	7	15.6	10	32.3	Quote: "We get the Governor there, the Mayor there." Observation: Several local and state elected officials attended the annual public meeting.
Role/Contribution to Change	6	13.3	7	22.6	Quote: "Belonging to a group reinforces the whole notion of building blocks for building a momentum for social change." Observation: The transportation taskforce assigning tasks to specific members as well as asking all members to recruit friends, family, and colleagues to join the taskforce.

Finally, respondents indicated that legislative visits engage members in the political process and build empowerment since they have the ability to interact with elected officials on matters of social change. I was unable to attend legislative visits during my research with the organization. My observations were

on members discussing the outcome of such legislative visits. These reports on legislative visits were shared in healthcare taskforce meetings, organizational issue meetings, and board meetings. Whether or not victory was achieved through these legislative visits, members reported a sense of empowerment from simply having access to an elected official to share their views. All of the members interviewed felt fortunate for being a part of MOSES because, without the organization, their voices would not have been heard.

Also discussed was the accountability of elected officials. Respondents expressed feeling empowered politically by being part of an organization could communicate with elected officials and persuade them to attend meetings and events. Participation in MOSES gave members a sense of power and achievement by confronting elected officials on social issues at meetings and events. Afterwards, there was follow-up with elected officials to monitor progress on addressing the identified issues:

> They asked the politicians to make promises, so I thought, "This is interesting. As a group, I could accomplish more of what I want to accomplish to participate in a group" (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

This is one area in which interviewees felt that MOSES was most useful. As individuals, several members expressed being unable to influence elected officials and others in positions of power. Since MOSES has established itself as an organization that will continue to emphasize social issues with elected officials, members were able to participate in this process and advance their political agendas with the support of a larger group.

In addition to making elected officials accountable, respondents talked about the importance of the organization simply having connections with elected officials. MOSES has formed connections and working relationships with several politicians within the region which has given members access to these individuals. Several members reported in issue taskforce meetings of having the ability to form relationships with elected officials through legislative visits as well as phone and electronic mail contacts pertaining to particular issues. The majority of members interviewed had not had contact with elected officials or others in power prior to working with MOSES. Interviewees acknowledged that working with a larger organization with a reputation for actively pursuing changes related to social issues was extremely helpful for developing and nurturing these connections.

Finally, respondents mentioned having a particular role within MOSES as a source of empowerment. By being part of a larger organization that confronts social issues throughout the region, members felt they were taking action and contributing to a change on a political level. Some respondents noted that working independently on social issues can feel overwhelming and lack focus. Because MOSES has an organized agenda and different avenues in which people can contribute, it provides a built-in structure from which people can work towards change:

> I think that's part of it. I know for me, and I think that generally for others as well, it provides you, as an individual, with an enormous opportunity to really understand that the voice of the people can make a difference (MOSES healthcare taskforce member).

Empowerment is an extremely important piece to the work MOSES does. Ultimately, the organization's agenda is to promote change relative to the issues that have been identified as priorities. Through the process of empowering its members via training, skill development, and providing appropriate connections and relationships, MOSES has made important progress on their local political agenda. For example, through the organization's advocacy work on addressing vacant land in the city of Detroit, MOSES' efforts led to land bank legislation in 2003 and eventually to the establishment of the Detroit Land Bank Authority in 2008 (MOSES, n.d.). MOSES also influenced state legislation giving immigrants the opportunity to obtain driver's licenses in the state of Michigan (MOSES, n.d.). Essentially, the process of building empowerment within MOSES was beneficial to both the organization and to the members who took advantage of this opportunity.

Groups and networks. Working with other groups on social issues was a theme that emerged relative to connections with groups and networks (see Table 5.22). Although MOSES was established as a faith-based organization that focuses mainly on organizing congregations of varying faith traditions around social justice, all of the issue taskforces have members representing secular organizations, unions, and other non-religious entities. Having these connections seemed to increase participation within the taskforces and to accomplish taskforce goals. For example, the healthcare taskforce is managed and organized by members of a secular health organization that has membership

within MOSES, but also works independently on healthcare reform. Similarly, the

supermarket taskforce is comprised of community members and several food

justice organizations in addition to MOSES members.

Table 5.22

Groups and Networks Themes from Interviews and Observations

Groups and Networks	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Groups and Networks
	f	%	*f*	%	
Working with Other Groups	6	100.0	7	100.0	Quote: "There was some, as I said, people from the bus unions. I think sometimes people from SMART would come." Observation: The supermarket taskforce was comprised of several outside food and environmental organizations as well as business owners and community members.

Having these connections with outside groups and organizations have turned this

taskforce into a larger coalition with a growing membership and increased access

resources:

> B.W., I don't know if you'll ever get around to interviewing him, but he's the community development person from the UFCW, from the Local here. And he's passionate about this and he is really out there meeting people. Like I said, that steering committee now has changed. We don't call ourselves a MOSES taskforce anymore because it has expanded. Although Fr. P and the MOSES Executive Director and I are still a part of it. But we've also got somebody from the Detroit Black Food Security Network there, and another community person from the Rosa Parks Institute. And C.W., who owns a grocery store in Detroit. So we're working with Community Based Enterprises, a non-profit in Detroit that works with groups trying to start businesses in Detroit (MOSES supermarket taskforce leader).

Conversations around recruiting more secular organizations including

unions, colleges, and universities, and other social justice organizations,

occurred on at least 6 different occasions in board meetings and during the board

retreats. These conversations emphasized expanding the membership of MOSES and as well as increasing diversity in regards to age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and faith tradition or lack thereof. MOSES apparently sees collaboration with secular organizations as a strategy to expand the organization and build power within the region. Secular organizations may have connections or resources that congregations do not have. By reaching out to other groups, MOSES can increase their access to resources and information.

Development and Maintenance of Social Capital

Other qualitative findings addressed the organizational structures that support the development and maintenance of social capital within MOSES. These components include relationship building, diversity within the organization, and addressing member differences.

Relationship building. The most fundamental component of the work that MOSES has done in the community and on social issues is relationship building. It is through developing relationships that MOSES recruits new members, strengthens bonds between existing members, and forms connections with outside organizations, elected officials and other entities holding power and influence in the region (see Table 5.23). Within this area of activities is MOSES' effort to bridge gaps, or in other words, facilitate the development of relationships between members from different racial, religious, and geographical backgrounds. Approximately, two-thirds of interviewees expressed that MOSES facilitated bridging between different groups simply by bringing various groups together

around social issues. Interviewees recognized that through MOSES-sponsored actions and meetings, they have been able to interact with people they never would have otherwise. According to MOSES' Board President, the organization has been successful at bridging gaps between members of different backgrounds:

> But I don't know of any organization that does a better job of bringing in white, black and brown, city and suburb, Muslim, Jewish, Catholic and Protestant, poor and affluent and middle incomes, in terms of the range of leaders, laity and ordained, better than MOSES does (MOSES Board President).

Another member interviewed commented on MOSES' facilitating relationships between him and members of other faith traditions:

> How many Unitarians would I know if it weren't for MOSES? I probably wouldn't know any. But I do know Unitarians now (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Respondents also talked about building relationships through the use of one-on-ones. They described how the one-on-ones facilitated getting to know more about other members' personal characteristics and backgrounds. Since interactions at events and meetings tend to be more impersonal, MOSES encouraged members to utilize one-on-ones within their own congregations, as well between members of different congregations:

> I think that's the purpose of one-on-ones is to get some sense of what is the motivation and the initiative that makes this person tick (MOSES Board President).

> Those [one-on-ones] always help as you begin to work together, just to get to know each other (MOSES board member).

By getting to know other members through one-on-ones, individuals often realized that their interests around social issues were similar. Using the one-on-ones as the foundation, working partnerships could then be established.

In addition, MOSES has been successful in building relationships between clergy members through Clergy Caucus meetings and the annual public meeting as well as with board members through monthly board meetings and the board retreat. MOSES staff members, including the Executive Director, also have formed working relationships with MOSES members, particularly taskforce leaders and individual members who were active in attending legislative visits. At least five respondents reported that they had worked closely with the Executive Director or other staff members on specific tasks. These tasks included planning meeting agendas for taskforces, creating agendas for legislative visits, and forming small planning committees for special events and trainings.

The organization has facilitated relationships within member congregations through the establishment of core groups, hosting listening campaigns aimed at engaging congregational members, and using ministers as liaisons between the organization and congregations. By establishing core groups in congregations, MOSES facilitated bonding within them. Congregations that were tightly bonded and had formed strong core groups were in a better position to forge partnerships with other member congregations around issues. One interviewee described building a core group in her congregation:

> And that was a large extent of my work, probably before the board, was just trying to build a group here. And we had...it's such a hard...it's really

hard work. This whole...you know, the relationship building, the group development. I think it could be easy to get frustrated if you don't have like a long-term view because it's just so constant in terms of trying to... connecting with people, inviting people and nurturing those relationships (MOSES board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

According to interviewees, MOSES exerted considerable effort in building relationships with individuals and groups who were outside of the organization. The relationships with other organizations, the surrounding community, and elected officials were important to the organization's mission because having more connections can lead to access to more resources, and hence more power. Examples of relationships with other organizations and elected officials were discussed previously in the sections describing empowerment and political action within MOSES and groups and networks MOSES in which MOSES is connected.

Forming relationships within the surrounding community was further documented through my attendance at two supermarket taskforce meetings. The mission of the supermarket taskforce has been to establish a community-managed supermarket in a Detroit neighborhood that has established a need for such a service. In order to properly serve the community in which the grocery store was to be built, MOSES invited community members to attend meetings and participate in the decision-making process in regards to the location of the store and items to be sold in the store. During the meeting, MOSES' Executive Director asked participants to raise their hands if they lived in the immediate community. At least one-quarter of the meeting participants indicated they were members of the community in which the supermarket was to be constructed.

Table 5.23

Relationship Building Themes from Interviews and Observations

Relationship Building	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Relationship Building
	f	%	*f*	%	
Bridging	27	24.3	33	50.0	Quote: "Bridging is a huge strength." Observation: Transportation taskforce leaders connecting a church from the suburbs with a church from the city to work together on the transportation issue.
One-On-Ones	20	18.1	1	1.5	Quote: "Those [one-on-one's] always help as you begin to work together, just to get to know each other." Observation: Conducting one-on-ones was encouraged during a transportation taskforce meeting by a Gamaliel staff member.
Between Clergy	13	11.7	0	0.0	Quote: "I think the Clergy Caucus meetings at one point in time really helped the clergy build those relationships and trust each other."
Within Member Congregations	11	9.9	5	7.6	Quote: "Churches create these strong bonds and can be more effective as members of MOSES. You can't bridge without bonding." Observation: MOSES attempted to plan and launch a listening campaign aimed at getting participants to recruit other members in their churches and form strong core teams within churches.
Within Other Organizations	9	8.1	5	7.6	Quote: "But we've also got somebody from the Detroit Black Food Security Network there, and a person from the Rosa Parks Institute." Observation: The transportation taskforce had partnerships with at least three outside organizations with similar goals in regards to public transit.
Between Board Members	8	7.2	2	3.0	Quote: "I generally feel very good about my relationships." Observation: Board members interacting prior to the board retreat. Members were discussing their personal lives, family, sports and other more personal topics.
Between Member Congregations	7	6.3	0	0.0	Quote: "A minister suggested we get some of the other churches in this area. So we would like to get a coalition of faith groups up here."

Table 5.23 (continued)

Relationship Building	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Relationship Building
	f	%	*f*	%	
With the Community	7	6.3	6	9.1	Quote: "Half is more focused congregationally. And in our own efforts to build relationships in the community." Observation: The presence of community members at the supermarket taskforce meeting.
Between Members and Staff	5	4.5	3	4.5	Quote: "I work most closely with Ponsella, who is the Executive Director." Observation: The Executive Director and a general member discussing establishing a planning committee for a listening campaign training after an issue meeting.
With Elected Officials	4	3.6	11	16.7	Quote: "You know, we do have visits with legislators." Observation: The presence of elected officials at the annual public meeting.

Diversity. Diversity within MOSES was another theme related to social capital that emerged during member interviews (see Table 5.24). One-half of all interviewees felt that MOSES was a diverse organization. Their assessment was based on MOSES' membership which included congregations representing different faith traditions, individuals of different races and ethnicities, as well as people who lived in the city and suburbs.

Religious diversity was reflected by having members of varying Christian denominations, in addition to one Jewish synagogue and one Muslim mosque:

We have a lot of ex-Catholics here. We have Jews here. We have atheists here. There's a...we truly have a broad umbrella (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

Anyway, there's a Black Muslim Center there and they've been a member of MOSES for quite some time and we've had events there. Often we use that. They have a big parking lot, so if we're going on a bus trip someplace, we quite often meet there because there's a place to leave

your car. I think we got more involved because the office manager for MOSES, until recently, was a member of that group (MOSES supermarket taskforce leader).

Table 5.24

Diversity Themes from Interviews and Observations

Diversity	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Diversity
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	
General Organization	14	51.9	0	0.0	Quote: "And I like the fact that you have churches that are white and black and in the suburbs and in the city and all united in the situation."
Religion	8	29.6	0	0.0	Quote: "There are both Catholics and Protestants. So there's diversity even within the Christian community. Unitarian-Universalists, too."
Race	5	18.5	5	100.0	Quote: "I think there is racial diversity, generally." Observation: The annual public meeting was attended by members who were African American, White, Latino, and Middle-Eastern.

Members felt that MOSES also was racially diverse because of having both African American and White members, as well as some involvement from the Latino community on the issue of civil rights and immigration.

Diversity is a very important dimension to bridging social capital formation. Without access to individuals from different backgrounds, members cannot form working relationships with people who are different from them. Several respondents considered having representation from two racial groups (African American and White) and different denominations within the same religion, as diversity. From a member perspective, it is a unique experience to have these

two racial groups as well as Catholics and Protestants working together within the same organization.

While discussing diversity, five different members mentioned the history of racism in Detroit as well as the challenges associated with people and congregations of different faiths working together. According to those five members, MOSES has made tremendous progress simply by facilitating working relationships between African Americans and Whites and Catholics and Protestants. Members felt that having a Jewish synagogue and a Muslim mosque was also an indicator of diversity within the organization. One clergy member commented on the progress MOSES has made in regards to diversity:

> Detroit is very challenged, in my opinion, when it comes to the true understanding of what is "interfaith" involvement. And I think MOSES does do a good job of at least modeling that. I'm not sure. The depth of it I can't comment on. But at least the model is such that it is open to and welcome of everyone. You know, you'll have a Rabbi speak at something and there's an Imam and a Christian pastor and a Roman priest. So it…I think it models that (MOSES Protestant, city clergy member).

Addressing member differences. Addressing member differences was seen as another mechanism involved in the development of bridging social capital (see Table 5.25). Existing literature suggests that addressing cultural differences between members of organizations facilitates relationship building and makes it more possible for bridging social capital to form. Interviewees expressed that MOSES as an organization, was respectful of differences among members. Further, they noted that MOSES has directly addressed issues

surrounding race and location of residence (city vs. suburbs) through member discussions:

It's [MOSES] an intervention. And sometimes it's because somebody else says, "You can't say that. It's racist." Right? So I mean, I do think that there are those kinds of things that go on in MOSES, and it's a good thing (Gamaliel Foundation staff member, MOSES board member).

Table 5.25

Addressing Member Differences Themes from Interviews and Observations

Addressing Member Differences	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Addressing Member Differences
	f	%	*f*	%	
Race	11	44.0	3	100.0	Quote: "I have seen it in terms of racial issues. There has been conversation about that." Observation: The Board President discussing the importance of addressing differences between Latino and African American members in a monthly board meeting.
General Differences	9	36.0	0	0.0	Quote: "I feel like people have just been plan respectful in regards to differences."
Location	5	20.0	0	0.0	Quote: "I know there are some ministers who have spoken out in various ways and have gotten into some trouble with their congregations. This is people in the suburbs."

As a potential mechanism for addressing differences in regards to location of residence, MOSES' Board of Directors frequently discussed the concept of regionalism. From their perspective, thinking about issues on a regional scale rather than city-specific or suburb-specific, could address some of the differences that exist between members who live in the city and members who live in the suburbs:

But they really are striving to have a regional vision and...and in fact, that was when I recognized that it wasn't just me learning from MOSES, but our congregation could actually be part of this work together (MOSES board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

So I think there's that. I think there's the whole notion that we will not be single issue, which isolates one whole community, so we're multi issue, multi-level, so all the way down to the neighborhood level to even national (Gamaliel Foundation staff member, MOSES board member).

By addressing issues on multiple levels that include the region, MOSES appeared to be at least attempting to address cultural and philosophical differences based on location of residence.

Barriers to Social Capital Development and Maintenance

In analyzing member interviews, it became clear that several barriers to bridging social capital formation existed within MOSES. These barriers can be classified into two sub-categories; those that were internal and those that were external. These are described below.

Internal barriers. Internal barriers were the result of circumstances within the organization. These barriers included organizational structure and governance, failure to build relationships, the absence of diversity, not addressing member differences, and the absence of some dimensions of social capital.

Organizational structure and governance. Organizational structure and governance refers to operating processes and procedures within the organization, as well as daily management of the organization (see Table 5.26).

Organizing model. First, five interviewees reported that MOSES' organizing model was a barrier to forming relationships and bridging social capital. According to these members, MOSES' model was considered to be outdated and ineffective for holding public officials accountable, but more importantly, that it was too aggressive. Four of the five interviewees who discussed MOSES' model felt that MOSES' aggressive tactics for addressing elected officials were

Table 5.26

Organizational Structure and Governance Barrier Themes from Interviews and Observations

Organizational Structure and Governance Barriers	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Organizational Structure and Governance Barriers
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	
Organizing Model Too Aggressive	30	54.6	7	70.0	Quote: "It [MOSES' organizing model] is too aggressive." Observation: At the Gamaliel Foundation National Leadership Training, a trainer aggressively questioned a female trainee as to why she was there. The questioning resulted in the trainee crying and leaving the room.
Organizing Model Ineffective/Outdated	6	10.9	0	0.0	Quote: "The politicians know the Alinsky model now."
Shortage of Staff Members	13	23.6	0	0.0	Quote: "Yeah. But again, we don't have the staff to do that."
Staff Member Turnover	6	10.9	3	30.0	Quote: "Organizers leave and you get a new organizer." Observation: Three staff members left the organization during the course of the study.

unnecessary and off-putting to both people inside and outside of the organization. For members on the inside, training and organizing techniques may be to aggressive, hindering relationship from developing:

I think there's a bit of a disconnect. They'd put...I went to weeklong training and you weren't at the board meeting when I...I left early. I was

appalled at things that were going on at weeklong training. You know, making people cry and...picking at them. I saw people just reduced to sobbing. And I thought, "No. That, to me, doesn't have a place in training." I didn't see the value in that one iota. And I actually left early (MOSES board member).

They sent a guy [MOSES organizer] out to my house one time. He kind of shouted at me and was...Well, he was MOSES-ish. That same mode [aggressive]. And I thought, "I don't need this. I've been doing this for 40 years." As I said, I can't undertake the level of activism. It's great if there's a committee and an action and I can come along and figure that out. But I can't do the level of stuff he was talking about (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

Interviewees also expressed their concern that aggressive tactics may be hindering relationship development with elected officials:

Well, we're trying to be a little more politically astute. Our approach has always been to get those who are citizens to take up our cause and be the pressure upon our elected representatives to get the reform we're after, not to foment discord. That gets us nowhere. And maybe a few steps back (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Staffing concerns. Interview participants noted a lack of adequate staffing within MOSES:

I think what we've lacked in the past few years is a more stable staff that can build long-term relationships with people (MOSES board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

So I think that rebuilding some of those relationships in the base and MOSES to the base is a good thing. In order for that to happen, however, there's a whole new staff that needs to be hired. You know, we just lost three organizers, so it's hard to rebuild the base if you don't have staff enough to work on that (Gamaliel Foundation staff member, MOSES board member).

Their concerns were clearly supported by my observations. As illustrated in the above quote, three staff members left the organization during the course of this study, leaving only two staff members to manage the entire organization. In

addition to lacking staff during the time of the study, respondents expressed concern over the high staff turnover experienced within the organization:

> So it's...it's tough keeping people informed, keeping people engaged, particularly when the people who are giving you the information keep changing. Organizers leave and you get a new organizer. So you thought this was going to be your organizer, but no, sorry, she's not. This is going to be your new one. Okay. Nope, I'm sorry. They were fired. This is your new one. Never mind. There are a lot of "never mind" opportunities on this path. Unfortunately (MOSES Board President).

Unfortunately, the lack of staff members as well as frequent changes in staffing were reported to be disruptive for congregations attempting to establish core teams as well as relationships with other member congregations. The primary focus of staff organizers was to mobilize congregations around issues and help them form relationships with other congregations who share similar concerns. Without staff to assist in the bonding and bridging processes, congregations were limited in their engagement within the organization.

Lack of relationship building. Several members identified a lack of relationship building as a barrier to forming bridging social capital (see Table 5.27). The ability of the organization to build relationships between different groups was questioned. In addition, interviewees discussed the lack of relationships between members in different leadership positions, as well as relationships between churches, within churches, and within the communities MOSES serves.

Bridging. In their discussions around the lack of relationship building, approximately one-third of interview respondents expressed that bridging was not

taking place within the organization. Specifically, members stated that MOSES needed to do more to bridge city and suburb relationships. Interviewees shared that city and suburban congregations do not work together regularly, and that they had not witnessed specific strategies or efforts to remedy this. Interviewees also shared that bridges have not been built across the issue of race. While organization members are open and accepting to one another, African American

Table 5.27

Lack of Relationship Building Themes from Interviews and Observations

Lack of Relationship Building	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Lack of Relationship Building
	f	%	*f*	%	
No bridging	14	31.2	1	33.3	Quote: "And there needs to be a real conversion in the White community in order for MOSES to be successful in bridging." Observation: A discussion at a monthly board meeting regarding how congregations from the city are not working closely on social issues with congregations from the suburbs.
One-on-ones	9	20.0	0	0.0	Quote: "Even the one-on-ones become suspicious because what does it do when it gets to the next level?"
Clergy Member Relationships	6	13.3	0	0.0	Quote: "So there are only like two or three [other clergy] I have become friendly with.
Relationships Within Churches	6	13.3	0	0.0	Quote: "They can't just leave it up to the congregations to communicate among themselves or within the congregation and build those relationships. I think they have to build those relationships, hard as it may be, but they have to do that."
Relationships Between Churches	5	11.1	0	0.0	Quote: "And to do anything else, we would need some more, you know, more help in facilitating some relationships."
Board Member Relationships	5	11.1	2	66.7	Quote: "The members of the board are not persons, for the most part, that I have interaction with, unless its around some specific issue." Observation: In several monthly board meetings, relationships appeared to be formal and impersonal rather than close and friendly.

and White congregations are rarely working closely together, and again, MOSES leaders have not incorporated any strategies to purposely facilitate these relationships. One interviewee shared that White members needed to be more open to building relationships with African American members:

> And there needs to be a real conversion in the white community in order for MOSES to be successful in bridging and bringing communities together (MOSES, Non-denominational, city clergy member).

Building bridges between the city of Detroit and the surrounding suburbs was a topic that was discussed on at least four occasions in monthly board meetings and at the board retreat. At a monthly board meeting, for example, one of the members suggested that more work needed to be done to educate members about the interdependence between the city and the suburbs. He felt that members, particularly those who live in the suburbs, needed to realize that many social issues affect residents regardless of where they live. Interestingly, I did not witness discussions around strategies or specific plans for improving relationships between locales. The Board President agreed that more discussions needed to take place about this issue and then brought the focus of the meeting back to the original agenda. Although bridging social capital may indeed develop without particular strategies in place, the lack of a process or strategy may hinder or obstruct the process.

One-on-ones. Another barrier mentioned to relationship building within MOSES was the use of one-on-ones. Three interview respondents reported that while one-on-ones were encouraged within the organization to form and sustain

working relationships with members, the effectiveness of this particular strategy was unclear:

> Even the one-on-ones become suspicious because what does it do when it goes to the next level? But you don't even get that far because they don't have it. (MOSES Protestant, city clergy member).

One member interviewed found one-on-ones to be destructive for his congregation:

> And the one-on-ones ended up opening up all the sores that we had sort of...as a result of the conflict. And it was...it was a mess. I said, Oh, damn!" (MOSES Non-denominational, city clergy member).

Other members claimed that one-on-ones were not happening frequently within their congregations and one long-term member who had been involved with MOSES since the late 1990s claimed she had never heard of a one-on-one.

From my personal observations and direct experience, one-on-ones could be helpful for initially getting to know other members. During my participation in the Gamaliel Foundation National Leadership Training, I engaged in six one-on-ones with other training participants. While some interactions provided more information than others, each interaction gave me more personal information about that person than I had prior. One-on-ones allowed me to collect background and cultural information and to find out what each member was passionate about in relation to social justice issues. Although a helpful strategy, these were not being conducted very often during the time of this study. Responses from interviews confirm this. One clergy member suggested that MOSES' membership had become stagnant and that may have had an impact on

engaging in one-on-ones. From his perspective, bringing in new members might facilitate one-on-ones in the organization again. Further, it was not clear whether one-on-ones were occurring between members of different congregations or between suburban and city residents. One-on-ones within member congregations have the potential to enhance bonding amongst members. However, if they are not taking place between congregations, their absence may hinder rather than help the bridging process.

Relationships between clergy members. Members interviewed shared that relationships are not being bridged between clergy due to the Clergy Caucus meeting infrequently. The Clergy Caucus was originally formed to allow clergy from different congregations to get to know one another, exchange ideas in regards to engaging members, and form partnerships around social issues. Over the one-year period under study, only two Clergy Caucus meetings were held. One of the strategies MOSES uses to form relationships between different groups is through clergy members working together and engaging their congregations to work with others on social issues. If clergy members do not have any opportunity to build relationships, or do not utilize the ones they have, it is unlikely they will facilitate relationships between member congregations. The quote below illustrates the decline:

> The Clergy Caucus also has become less consistent in terms of its membership. I mean, I don't know the numbers, but my impression was that at least half of the clergy who were members back ten years ago were at the Clergy Caucus. Now, it's maybe 10% of the clergy who are at the Clergy Caucus. There's been a great decline in membership (MOSES board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

Relationships between board members. Some respondents also mentioned that relationships were not developing between board members of the organization. The Board of Directors consists primarily of clergy members, non-clergy congregation leaders, and secular organization leaders. Much like the clergy members of the organization, board members hold positions of power within their congregations or organizations. They were responsible for facilitating relationships within their own congregations or organizations as well as among member congregations and organizations. If strong working relationships were not developing among board members, this not only hinders decision-making processes within the organization, but it also impacts the likelihood of member congregations and organizations working together on social issues.

Relationships within member congregations. Respondents mentioned that relationship building was not taking place within member congregations. Relationship building within member congregations was hampered by clergy members who were unable to encourage their members enough to get involved. According to MOSES' model, each congregation should have a core group that works with a MOSES organizer on a particular social issue. In order for core groups to develop, there must be relationship building within congregations. Interviewees who stated that these relationships were not being established shared that MOSES organizers were not doing enough to help congregations form and sustain relationships from within:

As I said before, my main requirement from MOSES would be more of a communication between a community-organizer and the congregations that are in. I think there should be more of a personal communication. I mean, they have their website and all that kind of stuff, but there really has to be personal communication, which is something they should know [laughs] because their whole...their whole organization is built around personal relationships. And I think they have to do that too. They can't just leave it up to the congregations to communicate among themselves or within the congregation and build those relationships. I think they have to build those relationships, hard as it may be, but they have to do that. (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

Forming and sustaining core groups in churches seemed to be a difficult challenge for MOSES, especially since three staff organizers left the organization during the course of the study. Of the members interviewed, very few reported active core groups in their congregations. The lack of relationship building within member congregations hampers participation within the organization and it limits the ability of congregations to form working relationships with other members.

Relationships between member congregations. Finally, members also expressed concern that MOSES was not facilitating relationships between congregations. When connections were made between congregations, it was more often a result of individual clergy or congregation members reaching out and purposely establishing connections. Rather than connecting through particular meetings or strategies developed by the organization, members were forming connections through their own personal interactions:

I've had conversations with other suburban church leadership...I mean MOSES leadership, not church leadership...but you know, that's a very difficult thing to get going. And everything that we've done, we've tried to engage the other MOSES congregations (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

I have those relationships, some of whom are relationships with people in MOSES, but I wouldn't say that MOSES therefore generates those kinds of relationships (MOSES Board President).

Lack of diversity. Respondents reported that the organization was lacking in diversity on the basis of religion, location of residence, socioeconomic status, and taskforce membership (see Table 5.28). In regards to religion, respondents expressed that while MOSES included congregations from different Christian denominations, it was severely lacking in representation of Jewish and Muslim congregations. Further, little action had been taken by the organization to recruit more non-Christian groups:

> I think, MOSES, in including Jews...and it's only one congregation...but Jews and Arabs are mirroring our reality. That is our metro community. So we do need to be talking to each other and understanding each other. I think we could do more around that (MOSES, Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

> You know, I'm not so sure it's people wanting to have their own thing. I think it's more that we don't have a handle to even get into the initial conversation with people [for recruiting non-Christian groups] (Gamaliel staff member, MOSES board member).

This finding was fully supported by my observations as well as descriptive statistics of the demographic and personal characteristics (see Table 4.1). Discussions about increasing religious diversity were observed in monthly board meetings and at the board retreat. During the board retreat, part of the strategic plan that was developed involved expanding MOSES' membership by inviting more Jewish and Muslim groups to be members. Unfortunately, no plans or strategies were constructed to do this during the retreat/strategic planning. Even

by the end of the data collection period, it was still unclear whether strategies were going to be developed to remedy this issue.

Four interviewees who resided and attended congregations in the suburbs expressed concerns about diversity in regards to location of residence. These members viewed MOSES as an entity that was city-focused relative to addressing issues. They felt that MOSES did not consider suburban issues. Further, they saw this city focus even in relation to selecting locations for meetings and events. Respondents who shared this concern expressed feeling as if their role was to support city issues and other congregations rather than to focus on the issues affecting their immediate neighborhoods and congregations:

> That's not to say that there wouldn't be people in our church or any of the suburban churches that wouldn't be sympathetic to that cause [referring to Detroit supermarket issue], but it's not something you can build a core group around and address that in your own community (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

> I think there are certainly regional issues, and I think we need, as a tri-county area at least, to come together and work together on some of those things. But it's very, very difficult because there are also separate issues (MOSES board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

Interview respondents also mentioned that MOSES was not very diverse in terms of socioeconomic status. Descriptive statistics on demographic and personal characteristics of survey respondents (see Table 4.1) supports this opinion. According to survey data, most of MOSES' members belonged to the middle class and most were college-educated. This would suggest that MOSES has been less successful in building relationships or seeking membership from

congregations and organizations that might serve lower-income individuals and families.

Table 5.28

Lack of Diversity Themes from Interviews and Observations

Lack of Diversity	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Lack of Diversity
	f	%	*f*	%	
Religion	22	52.4	0	0.0	Quote: "Certainly having more mosques, more Muslims, would be representative of the area."
Location	11	26.2	0	0.0	Quote: "Because he [a fellow suburban clergy member] has some concerns too, about being a suburban church and MOSES being more of a Detroit-centered organization."
Taskforces	9	21.4	7	100.0	Quote: "So self-interest, you know, that whole theme is…I would like to see our taskforce more diverse." Observation: The civil rights and immigration taskforce is composed primarily of Latino members.

Finally, respondents reported that some issue taskforces within MOSES lacked racial and ethnic diversity, and were essentially homogenous:

> So people gravitate around what their self-interest is. Yeah, supermarket and the transportation...the transportation taskforce is probably the biggest mixture of people from different backgrounds and socioeconomic groups. When you look at immigration, you don't see those people in any other taskforce. The Latino Catholic community has one issue. And they don't care about any other issues. Healthcare attracts older, White folks (MOSES transportation taskforce leader).

Participant observations supported the interview responses that supermarket and transportation taskforces appeared to be diverse in regards to gender and race. However, both the civil rights and immigration and healthcare taskforces were not very racially or ethnically diverse. The civil rights and immigration taskforce

was composed primarily of Latino individuals but is occasionally attended by individuals of Middle-Eastern descent who belong to a secular member organization. The healthcare taskforce was primarily composed of older, White members. While the organization cannot force members to join particular taskforces or work with particular groups, having homogenous taskforces does not facilitate members of different groups working together. Therefore, members work with people who are similar to them and bridging social capital does not form.

Member differences that are not addressed. According to eight of the members interviewed, MOSES has not been effective at addressing differences between members in general, whether it is based on race, religion, gender, or other personal characteristics (see Table 5.29). In part, this reflects MOSES' emphasis on encouraging members to focus on similarities, such as common values and commitment to social justice, rather than on differences. Also, MOSES leaders were concerned about divisiveness and hence, avoided directly addressing how members differ from one another:

> The differences in denomination and religious belief would potentially...if you talk about differences, I think that will be divisive (MOSES healthcare taskforce member, suburban congregation member).

> I don't really know if I'm saying this right, but I think that to continue to...to make it [differences] an issue would be counter-productive (MOSES healthcare taskforce member, city congregation member).

Table 5.29

Member Issues Not Addressed from Interviews and Observations

Member Issues Not Addressed	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Member Issues Not Addressed
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	
Race	30	60.0	0	0.0	Quote: "No, they haven't [addressed race]. They've been rather ginger about that. I think they could do more about that."
General Differences	15	30.0	0	0.0	Quote: "For the sake of thinking we're integrated, we don't really want to talk about those things because, rather than see that as a possible strength, it also could be a possible weakness, that somebody is going to pick up their marbles and go home."
Location	5	10.0	0	0.0	Quote: "I don't know that we've done too much intentionally to try and bridge that because MOSES has given so much attention to dealing with its priority programs and projects."

In addition to not addressing general differences among members, respondents specifically mentioned the issues of race and location of residence. In regards to race, respondents claimed that members tended to work together without discussing race. Further, they were concerned that members have not been honest about their feelings surrounding race in order to avoid creating a division within the organization:

> Because, like sex, racial feelings are not easily spoken of easily. We say what we're expected to say because we don't want to be perceived as being abnormal or bigoted or whatever. "Oh, no. I would never think such a thing like that!" Well, maybe not, but you certainly know people who think like that. So let's step out of this being about you for a moment and let's talk about the larger community, which you represent and let's surface those. Well, they don't want to go there. It's very hard to have an honest dialogue if people aren't willing to be honest (MOSES Board President).

Respondents admitted that issues pertaining to having members who reside in the city and members who reside in the suburbs had been discussed in board meetings and at issue meetings, but that little action had been taken to directly address such differences. Interviews with city members revealed that they were fearful that suburban congregations held more power over the organization. In contrast, members of suburban congregations felt left out because of the emphasis on city-oriented issues. It appears that avoiding discussions about these concerns has made it difficult to build trusting relationships that foster bridging social capital. The following quote illustrates this issue:

> I don't think we have. What are some things they've done to try and bridge that [city/suburban relations]? I don't know that we've done too much intentionally to try and bridge that because MOSES has given so much attention to dealing with its priority programs and projects (MOSES Non-denominational, city clergy member).

The absence of social capital within MOSES.

Trust. While most interview respondents felt a sense of trust within the organization, a few members indicated that there was a general lack of trust within the organization (see Table 5.30). Two members expressed that there was a lack of welcoming in the organization in the sense that when people attend meetings or events, they are expected to find their own way. In other words, MOSES does not provide guidance in the form of information or emotional support to make members feel comfortable and welcomed. I observed this on five different occasions. Specifically, at two issue meetings, a listening campaign

training, and two board meetings. At one organization issues meeting, MOSES did not have anyone responsible for directing attendees as to where the meeting room was located, where to sit, or whether attendees could enjoy the food displayed in the meeting room. It was unclear who was managing the meeting and what the agenda entailed. For someone who was new to MOSES, this could seem off-putting.

Three members suggested that member differences may contribute to a lack of trust. These interviewees discussed different perspectives between various cultural groups and the fact that these groups are not used to working with another. All three interviewees who mentioned this talked about differences based on race. The quote below illustrates trust issues based on differences in race and ethnicity:

> So the difficulty in now building a black/brown coalition is that we have, for whatever reason, kind of retreated into that clannishness, and we're not trusting of you [referring to Latino members] and you're not trusting of us [referring to African American members], and there's a language barrier and all these other different issues, which is why we need to focus on justice (MOSES Board President).

One of the three interviewees also mentioned that MOSES mobilizes on issues, not faith, because there is a lack of trust between the various faith traditions:

> I can understand somewhat of the way that it is possibly again because of the weakness of our faith and the challenge of, "Well, you're different than me and so now it's going to be which one of us is right in this thing called "faith." And that kills a lot of organizations. Maybe that's ultimately what hurts MOSES, because that's not strong enough to endure. So that we are issue-driven (MOSES Protestant, city clergy member).

Table 5.30

Absence of Trust Themes from Interviews and Observations

Absence of Trust	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Absence of Trust
	f	%	*f*	%	
Member Differences	5	55.6	0	0.0	Quote: "Not organizing on faith to me, is a reflection of mistrust."
Lack of Welcoming	4	44.4	5	100.0	Quote: "There was no sense of anybody in the room being in charge. No sense of anybody welcoming anybody. No sense of, 'Here's the sign-in. Here's what you do'." Observation: Attending an organization issues meeting and not having anyone greet me or provide instructions on what was happening.

Solidarity. While the majority of interview respondents expressed feeling a general sense of solidarity within the organization, a few members felt that solidarity was either lacking within the organization or that it fluctuated depending on activity levels or the political climate (see Table 5.31). In regards to activity levels within the organization, it appears that members felt a stronger sense of solidarity when they were involved in specific tasks, events, or actions through the organization. When such activities were lacking, solidarity seemed to diminish. For study participants, it appears that working together on a regular basis on common areas of interest equated to solidarity:

> Yeah, they...you know, you won't feel a sense of belonging unless you are proactive, as you just...you will not be part of it. I mean, their whole business is action and so forth. So if you're planning an event, that's great! You know. But if you're not going to do anything, you would have a hard time feeling part of it. It is...It is kind of a...It is kind of difficult to figure MOSES out, to tell you the truth (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

Table 5.31

Absence of Solidarity Themes from Interviews and Observations

Absence of Solidarity	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Absence of Solidarity
	f	%	*f*	%	
General Organization	5	55.6	3	100.0	Quote: "It has, to use an old term, waxed and waned in different times. At times, its been a lot stronger." Observation: Due to disagreements regarding planning an immigration rally, the sense of unity and solidarity were lacking in a civil rights and immigration taskforce meeting.
Clergy	4	44.4	0	0.0	Quote: "Very few strong bonds among clergy in the organization right now."

Political climate also appeared to affect the sense of solidarity within the organization. One interviewee mentioned that having elected officials who support MOSES' values and stances on issues in office often facilitated a sense of solidarity. Changes in political representation may cause fluctuations in the level of solidarity within the organization:

It [solidarity] has, to use an old term, waxed and waned in different times. At times, it's been a lot stronger. At other times, it's been on the weak side. I would say probably our strongest time was back when Jennifer Granholm was first elected. Our public meeting then was almost 5,000 people (MOSES former board member).

Others interviewed commented on the lack of solidarity among clergy in the organization. Respondents expressed that that the level of solidarity differed among member congregations. They also noted that not having ministers/leaders directly involved with MOSES decreased solidarity:

The trouble was we had a minister who was supposed to represent us at MOSES, but he was out to lunch. He has now left, but he was completely out to lunch. I mean, he would be at a MOSES meeting with me and they would say, "Will a clergyperson please give the opening invocation?" He

would never do it. He would just sit there silently. Even when he was there, he wasn't there. So that was our problem. If we had a minister who could relate to the MOSES leadership, we would have much more solidarity, but we haven't (MOSES transportation taskforce member).

Bonding appears to be an important component to building solidarity. For member congregations, clergy and other congregation leaders are often the glue that holds core groups together and helps them to stay connected with the organization. If congregation leaders are not actively involved with organizing their members, and members are not working together around issues, it may be difficult to form relationships and experience bonding with other groups and individuals.

Social cohesion. Respondents also mentioned the lack of cohesion within the organization as a barrier to bridging social capital formation (see Table 5.32).

Table 5.32

Absence of Social Cohesion Themes from Interviews and Observations

Absence of Social Cohesion	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Absence of Social Cohesion
	f	%	*f*	%	
Tension	10	71.4	0	0.0	Quote: "But then when they became MOSES and expanded to include the suburbs, I think some African-American ministers felt the white folks were taking over."
Disconnection	4	28.6	0	0.0	Quote: "Very few strong bonds among clergy in the organization right now."

Tension was the most frequently cited reason for the lack of social cohesion. Interestingly, I documented two different types of tension described in my interviews and participant observations. One form of tension might be described as positive because it influenced members to take action on an issue.

This type of tension described members who became agitated about a social issue and felt tension related to taking actions to address the issue. The other type of tension could be considered more of a barrier to bridging social capital formation because it involved disagreement or the failure to work with others harmoniously. An example of this type of tension might be a heated argument during a meeting.

Respondents shared that within the organization, tension primarily exists between members who live in the city and members who live in the suburbs. Tension around location of residence focused mainly on differing perspectives of which issues were most important to address. For example, city residents felt that the lack of supermarkets in Detroit was a very important issue, whereas suburban residents do not feel personally affected by the lack of supermarkets in the city. There was also tension in regards to trust between members who live in different areas. According to interviewees who mentioned this, trust issues most likely stem from the racial and socioeconomic climate in the region, but ultimately affect the ability of members to engage with one another and work together productively:

> Some of our community-based people [referring to residents of Detroit] are people that are really leery of suburbanites (MOSES supermarket taskforce leader).

Disconnection was another element identified as a barrier influencing social cohesion. First, respondents noted disconnect between African American

and White clergy members. According to these respondents, bridging social capital cannot form successfully until relationships are fostered between clergy:

> That bridge has never been crossed yet [referring to gaps between African American/city pastors and White/suburban pastors]. I think you need also to have this dialogue about bridging with just pastors. I think you have to have the pastors and some of their significant lay leaders (MOSES Non-denominational, city clergy member).

As discussed previously, without guidance and leadership, members of churches are not likely to reach out to members who are from a different area, a different religious denomination or a different race. As leaders, clergy need to initiate these relationships and engage their members to work with other groups on social issues.

Similarly, two respondents talked about the importance of White clergy members connecting with their own congregations in order to emphasize the importance of issues that affect the city of Detroit:

> Suburban pastors, for the most part, I'm not convinced that they see the significance of dealing with race. Let me rephrase that: As an individual pastor they probably do, but they are serving a clientele that don't want that much to do with Detroit. …And while there might be white pastors in the suburbs who see the issues clearly. They know there is racism. They see that something needs to be done about it, but their livelihood is dependent upon the freewill contributions of persons who don't want anything to do with Detroit (MOSES Non-denominational, city clergy member).

According to these respondents, White clergy have failed to educate and provide guidance to their congregations in regards to the interconnectedness between the city and suburbs. If this is the case, bridging will not occur until leaders are

able to effectively communicate the importance of suburb involvement with city concerns.

Inclusion. This dimension also was found to be lacking within the organization (see Table 5.33). Commenting on the lack of inclusion within MOSES, respondents discussed the potential regional focus of the organization and the under-representation of various groups that inhabit the region. For MOSES to truly be a regional organization, respondents argued that perspectives from those who make up the region needed to be considered and absorbed into the organization. This includes individuals of various economic levels, races, ethnicities, religions, ages, gender, and political viewpoints.

Table 5.33

Absence of Inclusion Themes from Interviews and Observations

Absence of Inclusion	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Absence of Inclusion
	f	%	*f*	%	
Religion	9	45.0	6	75.0	Quote: "You've got to be inclusive. At that meeting, there was a Muslim group and me. There were obviously people who were not Christians." Observation: Using primarily Christian terms and concepts when delivering prayers at organization events and meetings.
General Organization	7	35.0	0	0.0	Quote: "Or, who are we missing? Who is important to include in this discussion and are they here?"
Language	4	20.0	2	25.0	Quote: "When we have a public meeting, we're always the ones who say, 'Don't forget. We need to have translation services'." Observation: At a listening campaign training meeting, a group of Latino members had to bring a friend to translate for them.

Respondents specifically talked about the lack of inclusion in regards to religion. Although the organization has been labeled inter-faith, MOSES is primarily a Christian organization with a large Baptist and Catholic membership. While the emphasis of MOSES tends to be on social issues, the structures of meetings and events are highly influenced by Christian traditions. All MOSES meetings and events begin and end with prayer. Most of the time prayers are led by Christian clergy, and Christian concepts and language are frequently used during prayers. For the few members who are Jewish, Muslim, Unitarian-Universalist or not connected to a faith tradition, Christian prayers can seem exclusive and may affect participation or a sense of belonging:

> You know, I've been a Detroiter all my life, and I'm so used to the Baptist Church kind of...being very overpowering in Detroit. And for years, going to functions...dinners, breakfasts, lunches, and everything is a Christian prayer. And for most of my years, I didn't say anything. Then I would start saying something. "You know, that doesn't include me. It's not inclusive." And usually I'd get, "I never thought about that." I mean, people don't stop and think about being offensive with a prayer, or being exclusive. And I think many Jews feel the very Christian nature of MOSES (MOSES board member).

Two respondents also discussed language barriers in regards to the lack of inclusion within the organization. Members expressed concerns that Spanish-speaking members were excluded at meetings and events because of the inability to speak English. In addition to voicing concerns about the language barrier, two members of the organization also shared that civil rights and immigration issues were often over-looked at MOSES board and issue meetings. This taskforce has limited participation from general membership and

involvement from the Executive Director; it appears to function as an independent entity. However, it is unclear if it is language barriers or the lack of interest that has created an exclusionary divide.

Collective action. The main theme that emerged under this barrier is lack of participation (see Table 5.34). Respondents expressed that, overall, there had been a decline in membership and participation over time. More specifically, members interviewed reported that the participation of member congregations had declined sharply.

Table 5.34

Absence of Collective Action Themes from Interviews and Observations

Absence of Collective Action	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Absence of Collective Action
	f	%	*f*	%	
Lack of Participation in the Organization	12	41.4	5	71.4	Quote: "There's been a great decline in membership." Observation: Low attendance at an organizational issues meeting.
Lack of Participation by Member Churches	11	37.9	2	28.6	Quote: "It's just hard to visualize an ongoing action group, particularly within our congregation." Observation: Low attendance at the listening campaign training.
Lack of Participation by Clergy	6	20.7	0	0.0	Quote: "Clergy need to be more vocal about participation in MOSES."

One of the purported reasons influencing this decline in participation was lack of follow-up with congregational core teams. Four members expressed that organizers had not contacted or visited congregations to conduct relationship building activities aimed at increasing bonding within the congregation and participation within MOSES:

> I think part of the problem here is that we felt out of the loop, not having a community organizer. I mean, like for months and then not hearing anything from [the Executive Director] and not knowing what's going on (MOSES Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Lack of church participation was apparent during the data collection period of this study. Two listening campaign trainings designed to train members to engage fellow congregants on telling stories about social issues were lightly attended. MOSES' intent was to have all member congregations send one to two representatives to form and strengthen core teams operating inside of congregations. The expected turnout for these trainings was at least 100, yet only 10 individuals were present and most congregations were not represented at the training. As has already been discussed, the lack of bonding within congregations influences the ability to successfully form relationships other congregations and outside groups.

Respondents also expressed concern in regards to clergy participation within the organization. At one time, the MOSES Clergy Caucus was a forum that facilitated relationship building and the sharing of ideas between clergy members within the organization. Clergy Caucus meetings were previously held on a monthly basis. During the one-year period that I conducted this study, the Clergy Caucus only met two times. This directly impacts bridging social capital since the Clergy Caucus meetings were considered one of the major avenues for developing relationships with different groups.

Information and communication. Interview respondents identified poor communication as a major barrier to participation and forming relationships within the organization (see Table 5.35). Respondents reported that the organization typically engages in last minute planning and communication, making members feel "out of the loop". They also expressed the need for improving and increasing communication:

> Unfortunately, I haven't...again, between my schedule or scheduling...my biggest frustration with MOSES is if there's a meeting Thursday, tomorrow, I get notification yesterday, Tuesday (MOSES board member).

Table 5.35

Absence of Information and Communication Themes from Interviews and Observations

Absence of Information and Communication	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Absence of Information and Communication
	f	%	*f*	%	
Poor Communication within the Organization	15	71.4	7	100.0	Quote: "Well I guess they don't need me because I never hear anything. And they call me at the last minute." Observation: Board members expressed at a monthly board meeting that they did not receive emails or announcements about meetings and events.
Distant Communication for Suburban Members	6	28.6	0	0.0	Quote: "There was a time when I was really frustrated and felt like communication just wasn't happening, and that we'd find out about things... and sometimes I attributed that to the fact that I was here and not in the city."

In addition, members who resided and attended congregations in the suburbs specifically discussed the difficulties of being far away from the city and how this influenced the speed in which they received information from the organization. Some suburban members expressed feeling distant or removed from things happening within the organization:

It certainly could be my imagination, but I really think the difference in distance has made a big difference for me. Again, when I was...you know on Vernier Road in Grosse Pointe Woods, right on the edge of the City of Detroit, I felt much more connected. Being almost to Hall Road, which is twelve miles outside the city limits of Detroit, it's made a big difference for me (MOSES board member, Protestant, suburban clergy member).

In regards to bridging social capital, communication is vitally important. The organization needs to be able to promote communication among different members. Without having a system of communication in place within the organization, connecting members with one another may be difficult.

Empowerment and political action. While the majority of respondents discussed the existence of this dimension within the organization, some members felt that a sense of empowerment was lacking (see Table 5.36).

Table 5.36

Absence of Empowerment and Political Action Themes from Interviews and Observations

Absence of Empowerment and Political Action	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Absence of Empowerment and Political Action
	f	%	*f*	%	
Victories Needed	7	63.6	0	0.0	Quote: "We need to have some victories."
National vs. Local Issues	4	36.4	0	0.0	Quote: "Larger-scale issues take time. I was involved with MOSES ten years ago and we were working on transportation then. So people do get tired."

Specifically, members mentioned the need for victories on local issues to build empowerment:

A few people suggested that maybe addressing some local concerns might help people feel more empowered because, okay, we got some traffic lights installed or three houses were torn down or they were rebuilt or something (MOSES, Roman Catholic, city clergy member).

Respondents explained that at the organization's inception, the focus tended to be on smaller-scale issues such as drugs, crime, and issues around land use in Detroit. Over time, MOSES' agenda switched to addressing larger-scale, national issues that take more time to address and solve. Some members felt that only focusing on the larger-scale issues has made people tired and frustrated because of the amount of work and length of time involved. Achieving victories on manageable, short-scale issues may increase the sense of empowerment within the organization and possibly increase participation.

External barriers. External barriers were circumstances or conditions that existed outside of the organization such as MOSES' relationship with the Gamaliel Foundation and social conditions in the region within which MOSES operates.

Relationship with the Gamaliel Foundation. Several respondents expressed their discontent with the Gamaliel Foundation's governance over MOSES (see Table 5.37). Although MOSES is somewhat autonomous in its decision-making, members interviewed shared concerns about how social issues are selected and the organizing model that MOSES was encouraged to adopt. It appears that some members felt that Gamaliel had too much governance over MOSES:

> And that's a matter of some controversy. Is Gamaliel an organization with a head and a middle tier and bottom layer of congregations throughout the country? Or is Gamaliel a network of relationships between me and people in Minnesota and Iowa and California and Atlanta (MOSES Board President).

[In regards to selecting social issues to address]: So people were able to voice issues, but then the real agenda [from the Gamaliel Foundation] came down and superseded those (MOSES Protestant, city clergy member).

In addition, three members criticized the National Leadership Training held by the Gamaliel Foundation and encouraged by MOSES leadership. Rather than developing a sense of unity and belonging to the foundation as a whole, these members felt attacked and excluded during the weeklong training. Members specifically commented on the aggressive tactics of the trainers:

And it's a valid criticism that some people are uncomfortable. When I was in the training, they immediately attacked me. Or I felt like it was an attack (MOSES supermarket taskforce leader).

Table 5.37

Barriers Associated with MOSES' Relationship with the Gamaliel Foundation Themes from Interviews and Observations

Barriers Associated with MOSES' Relationship with the Gamaliel Foundation	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of the Barriers Associated with MOSES' Relationship with the Gamaliel Foundation
	f	%	*f*	%	
Governance of MOSES	18	54.5	8	88.9	Quote: "So even these leaders that are locally within, they still have to answer to this…to the foundation as a whole, the Roman Catholic Church." Observation: Conversations in monthly board meetings regarding the power dynamic between the Gamaliel Foundation and MOSES.
National Leadership Training	10	30.3	1	11.1	Quote: "I was appalled at the things that were going on at weeklong training." Observation: Trainees becoming visibly upset with the aggressive approach of the trainers.
Racial Issues	5	15.2	0	0.0	Quote: "Certainly for many of my colleagues in the Black church, I still believe the link with Gamaliel, linked with the Catholic Church, is a problem."

Finally, race was discussed in relation to the Gamaliel Foundation. In particular, some respondents reported that African American clergy were disturbed by the Gamaliel Foundation's connections to the Roman Catholic Church and the predominance of White leaders in the foundation. One member in particular discussed her concerns around the Roman Catholic Church's history of racism and discrimination against African Americans, particularly in Detroit:

> …And when African Americans started moving into neighborhoods like this, the Catholic Churches let the community who didn't want people moving in here have their meetings and stuff in their churches, by which they're helping the community. But that also gave the impression that, even if the church didn't feel that way, okay the people in this church don't want blacks here. So that's where the issue of the African Americans feeling that MOSES is real white comes from (MOSES former board member).

Another member told a very similar story and added that several African American congregations left MOSES in the past because of the Gamaliel Foundation's connection to the Roman Catholic Church. He also added that he had difficulty recruiting African American congregations for membership in MOSES because of that connection.

Social conditions in the region. Social conditions including racial, religious, and residential segregation was another theme discussed by interview respondents (see Table 5.38).

Table 5.38

Social Conditions of the Region Themes from Interviews and Observations

Social Conditions of the Region	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Social Conditions of the Region
	f	%	*f*	%	
Location	19	47.5	1	100.0	Quote: "I mean I would certainly welcome more interaction between the Detroit area and us. I just don't know how to go about it." Observation: A discussion at a monthly board meeting regarding the need for building bridges between the city and the suburbs to develop a regional strategy for social change.
Race	11	27.5	0	0.0	Quote: "So the distrust that was there between Blacks and Whites maybe continues to permeate even into the ages today."
Religion	10	25.0	0	0.0	Quote: "It's uncommon for different denominations to work together in Detroit."

First, residential location emerged as an external barrier because of the region's history of racial segregation. Respondents specifically mentioned regional differences in perceptions on social issues. According to interviewees, suburbanites, for example, may not see the importance of addressing transportation or supermarkets in Detroit because those are not issues where they reside:

> Well, the Grocery Store Task Force, except for B.W. from the union, is all Detroiters. We don't have any suburbanites coming in for that, as opposed to the healthcare one, which is much broader. And even the transportation one is much broader than the Grocery Store one. Because it's a city problem. I mean, I've talked to people, even at MOSES meetings...You know, when you say "grocery store" and they sort of look at you like, "Is that a problem?" (MOSES supermarket taskforce leader).

Participant observations confirmed that MOSES' leaders were aware of this discrepancy in view points between the city and suburbs. MOSES' Board

President expressed in at least two board meetings that clergy and organization leaders needed to work on educating members on the inherent connection between the cities and the suburbs. Another member also discussed this:

> I wish that someone could invent a similar model [referring to a model of the circulatory system of the human body] that would show how the money flows in Southeastern Michigan; how Detroit tax dollars...let's say for transportation... ends up building better highways in the suburbs than in Detroit. And it's Detroiters' money that makes that happen. Detroit is helping, in significant ways, to fund urban sprawl. The people in the suburbs need to see that. And why should we help Detroit? It's not a matter of helping Detroit. It's a matter of knowing where the money flows and you're seeing how you're pimping off of Detroit (MOSES, Non-denominational, city clergy member).

Respondents also underscored the deep distrust between African American and White members within the Detroit area and subsequently, within the organization. Members reported that race had not been properly addressed within the region or the organization. Further, they pointed to the lack of connections between African American and White members within the region and the organization:

> In Birmingham, we have a Unitarian Church and they wanted me to come out and speak because they have no black people at their church. And I'm like, "Well, if you can't see that as a problem at your church..." Or some people do see it as a problem at their church, so they invite me to come out and open up the dialogue around race. But then, as I spent a summer there, I realized that the people who make up the church are people who made up the community. If the community is bigoted, then the church community is bigoted, even though they say they cover these principles. They say that they are liberal, open and welcoming, but really they're not because their community isn't open and welcoming. They're afraid. They're afraid of anybody that's different. And they have their one token black guy who comes to the church. You know. And they say, "No, we're open. We have a black guy there" (MOSES transportation taskforce leader).

Finally, respondents expressed concerns in terms of religion. According to study participants, Detroit has a history of different congregations and religious denominations being resistant to working together:

> I think, again, as a...one of my biggest frustrations in Detroit as a whole has been the lack of the development of trust relationships between denominations and in between faith groups as well (MOSES Lutheran, city clergy member).

While each of these issues are circumstances that exist outside of the organization, they directly influence MOSES' ability to build relationships between people of different groups.

Mechanisms for Mobilizing Members

Mobilizing members refers to what the organization uses to motivate members to get involved and take action. Three mechanisms for mobilization emerged from member interviews: issues, values, and faith (see Table 5.39). The most frequently mentioned mechanism for mobilizing members was issues. Almost 40 percent of all interview respondents expressed that MOSES mobilized members using the social issues that they choose to address. In other words, members come together and take action because they agree on the social issues MOSES is addressing:

> I guess I'd have to say my guess would be that it's the issues. I would presume that MOSES attracts, especially from white mainline denominations, the people who feel left out. The marginalized people, those that are crazy enough to hold up banners about injustice and oppression or whatever (MOSES Protestant, city clergy member).

Almost one-third of interview respondents noted that having common values was an important mobilizing tool since it affected which issues were

selected and how to effectively address those issues. Members mentioned the importance of being "on the same page":

> I think there's a lot of shared values in the group, and I think that's what pulls them together (MOSES healthcare taskforce member).

The final sub-theme identified in regards to mobilization was faith. Interestingly, of the three sub-themes that emerged, faith was not the most popular answer even though MOSES is a faith-based organization. Members who discussed faith talked about the importance of doing "God's work", feeling a calling to work for social justice, and that having faith is a motivator to be involved:

> I think we bring our faith-based grounding and background and relate it to the commonalities in our communities (MOSES board member).

Important to note is 6 percent of responses mentioned both faith and values working together and 4 percent of responses mentioned faith and issues working together. It appears that some members believe that it may take a combination of items to mobilize people around social issues.

These findings were supported by observations. In general the organization seems to focus on the importance of issues over faith. In regards to specific events, I observed the emphasis on issues at the board retreat, monthly board meetings, the healthcare taskforce and the supermarket taskforce. Interestingly, at the board retreat which was organized to do strategic planning, board members focused on how to address the issues rather than organizational

management and structure. While there was prayer and discussion of faith at the

retreat, the overwhelming focus and emphasis was on the issues.

Table 5.39

Mechanisms for Mobilizing Members Themes from Interviews and Observations

Mechanisms for Mobilizing Members	Interviews		Observations		Illustrations of Mechanisms for Mobilizing Members
	f	%	*f*	%	
Issues	44	38.0	6	75.0	Quote: "Yeah, in a certain degree I do [feel MOSES mobilizes members on issues] because I feel like we're on the same plate with issues." Observation: Issues were emphasized at the board retreats, organizational issue meetings, and the annual public meeting.
Values	33	28.4	0	0.0	Quote: "And I think it's those underlying values that I think bring the group together."
Faith	27	23.3	0	0.0	Quote: "Faith has to be the reason for…the ultimate reason for doing what you're doing."
Faith and Values	7	5.2	0	0.0	Quote: "We operate out of our faith or our values in order to live those values out in the real world."
Faith and Issues	5	4.3	0	0.0	Quote: "I think it's an aspect of both [faith and issues]."

Summary

Both quantitative and qualitative data revealed that each of the eight

dimensions of social capital were present within the organization. In addition, the

data suggest that particular strategies, such as relationship building, addressing

member differences, and creating opportunities for diversity, facilitated the

development and maintenance of social capital. The absence of such strategies

as well as conditions inside and outside of the organization may act as barriers to

the development and maintenance of social capital. In the next chapter, I will

summarize the major findings, discuss the findings in the context of literature on social capital and faith-based organizing, and present study limitations, implications, and future directions for research.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

A 12-month, mixed methods case study was conducted on a faith-based social justice organization located in a major Midwestern metropolitan area. The qualitative methods employed in the study included archival research, participant observation, and in-depth interviews with organization members. A survey also was administered to the general membership to gather information about the extent of social capital within the organization, within issue taskforces, and among clergy members. In this chapter, I will highlight key findings from the qualitative and qualitative components of the study, integrating relevant literature on social capital and faith-based organizing. Study limitations and implications for future research also will be discussed.

Key Findings

The extent of social capital within the organization. All eight dimensions of social capital were found to exist within MOSES in varying degrees. In this next section, I will discuss each dimension and the themes and examples that emerged as representations of these dimensions.

Trust. Literature on social capital underscores that one of the major components of social capital, and particularly bridging social capital, is trust (Coleman, 1988; Fukuyama, 2001; Putnam, 1995a; Putnam, 1995b; Putnam, 2000). Both interviews with members and participant observations of activities within MOSES revealed that most members felt a strong sense of trust. Those

who expressed a strong sense of trust reported that it occurred mostly between board members and clergy members.

Results from the survey also appear to support the notion that trust exists within the organization, within issue taskforces, and among clergy members. In regards to organizational trust, one's role in the organization seems to have an impact on trust. Members in organizational or church leadership roles, such as board members or secular leaders, indicated higher levels of trust relative to taskforce members and members who did not indicate specific roles within the organization. The literature on organizational trust supports this association between trust and one's role in an organization (Kramer, 1999). Organization members may be more trusting of those in leadership roles, but in addition, board members and secular leaders may feel a stronger sense of trust due to being involved with decision-making and governance.

In addition, the length of membership in MOSES influenced organizational trust. Levels of organizational trust peaked around 5 to 6 years, and then decreased thereafter. This finding is supported by other research on trust in voluntary associations. According to Stolle (1998), membership length does not necessarily have a linear effect on trust. In his study, Stolle found that trust did build over time, but that there was a decline for long-time members (1998). Trust is something that takes time to build, especially in organizations in which members may differ in their level of participation. After peaking at a certain level, it is possible that trust may decline because of changes in membership, changes

in activity levels among members, or even changes with organizational leadership.

An individual's role within the organization also appears to influence the level of trust within taskforces. Individuals whose primary roles in the organization were as taskforce members reported significantly higher levels of trust than those who were clergy members or general members. This finding makes sense because the level of involvement would likely be higher for someone who is primarily a taskforce member compared to clergy or general members who may only occasionally work with the organization. Analysis of variance results confirm this observation: members who primarily identify as taskforce members had higher levels of collective action within taskforces compared to clergy members and general members.

Length of membership in the organization also appears to influence the levels of trust within MOSES taskforces. Like organizational trust, levels of taskforce trust seem to peak around 5 to 6 years of involvement with MOSES. Since taskforces are the primary vehicle for involvement in the organization for most members who are not clergy, this finding makes sense. Just as trust would take time to build within the organization as a whole, it would also take time to build within taskforces. As with the larger organization, changes in taskforce membership, member participation, and taskforce leadership may all have an impact on declining levels of trust.

Moreover, high levels of trust within one's taskforce were associated with the place of residence of taskforce members. Members who lived in the city of Detroit reported higher levels of trust within their taskforces than those who lived in the inner-ring suburbs. Some interviewees felt that MOSES was primarily a city-oriented organization whereas other members felt that MOSES does not emphasize city issues enough. Members who lived in outer-ring suburbs felt the most disconnected from events and actions in general. Those members who resided in the inner-ring suburbs lived close enough to the city to know what was going on. However, they expressed concern that their taskforces were not addressing issues that directly affected their communities. This could impact overall trust for others within their primary taskforces because they may feel the needs of their communities are not being acknowledged. Feeling excluded can impede the development of trust (Jones, 2009).

In regards to level of trust among clergy members, survey results suggest that male clergy had higher levels of trust than female clergy. However, information derived from the in-depth interviews did not necessarily support this finding. First, there were very few female clergy who were in leadership positions within the organization at the time of the study. The majority of the clergy interviewed were male and when relationships between clergy were discussed in interviews, it was clear that it was mostly clergymen building relationships with one another. Neither of the clergywomen interviewed indicated issues with trust among other clergy members.

One of the elements fostering trust among some members of the organization was accountability. Members believed they could rely on other organization members to follow through with important tasks and provide support to other members in the organization. In an organization that relies so heavily on volunteerism, accountability is a very important component. For tasks to be completed, members need to work together and by following through with the responsibilities agreed to, members learn to trust one another. Accountability is an important piece to faith-based organizing (Wood, 2002). Holding members accountable for their actions serves two purposes: it fosters progress on tasks within the organization, as well as contributes to relationship building within the organization because it requires members to interact and be supportive of one another.

In summary, it appears that one of the dimensions of social capital, trust, exists within MOSES. Also, it appears that some degree of trust is present at the beginning of an individual's membership within the organization, and this trust grows over time, peaks at 5 to 6 years, and then levels off for long-time members. This suggests that trust develops naturally over time and runs its course rather than being purposely facilitated by MOSES through specific strategies. Since trust is considered the foundation from which civic engagement emerges (Putnam, 1999; Putnam, 2000), perhaps MOSES would benefit from encouraging more contact between members through one-on-ones, actions, and

meetings focused on establishing partnerships between member churches, especially city-based and suburban churches.

Solidarity. It appears that a second dimension of social capital, solidarity, existed within MOSES. Many members reported a sense of solidarity within MOSES and it was frequently mentioned in member interviews. Related to solidarity, several members shared that they felt a sense of belonging within the organization, and specifically, a feeling of being welcomed or of finding like-minded individuals with whom they could collaborate. When asked about what helps to create a feeling of solidarity within MOSES, members mentioned having commonalities in regards to faith, agreeing on the social issues to address, and sharing common values. Each of these tied into a sense of identity or sharing similar perspectives with others.

Study participants also talked about participating in actions and events, and particularly, the annual public meeting as mechanisms for fostering solidarity. While actions are implemented for the purpose of addressing specific issues in the community (Wood, 2002), MOSES members reported that being involved helped them to feel unified and part of the organization. Similarly, the annual public meeting provides an opportunity for members to participate and feel a part of something bigger.

Social cohesion. A third dimension of social capital, social cohesion, appears to exist within the organization as a whole, and especially between board members. Levels of cohesion were found to be significantly higher for

board members when compared to those for clergy members and the general membership. This finding suggests that board members may have developed strong connections through their working relationships. According to the literature on social cohesion, this dimension of social capital involves more than tabulating the frequency of interaction or simply getting along; it suggests a sense of community (Speer, Jackson & Peterson, 2001). Board members demonstrated this sense of community through their interactions at board meetings, organizational meetings, and special events. It was clear through participant observations that decision-making was based on shared goals and concerns regarding the organization and social issues addressed.

Organizational cohesion was related to length of membership within the organization. Similar to the findings for trust, levels of social cohesion were the highest for people who had been with the organization for 5 to 6 years. Social cohesion in the organization seemed to peak at 5 to 6 years of membership, then slowly decline. Like trust, cohesion within an organization is something that often takes time to build. In this case, members may have felt cohesive after working together after 5 years. The decline in social cohesion after 5 to 6 years could be because of changes in membership, changes in member participation or changes in organization leadership.

Further, levels of social cohesion were found to be higher among members who lived in inner-ring suburbs compared to those who lived in the city of Detroit. Interestingly, the only difference between survey respondents who

lived in inner-city suburbs relative to city residents and outer-ring suburban residents was the concentration of clergy members. While the number of inner-city resident survey respondents overall was lower (13 percent), over one-half served as clergy members within the organization. While not definitive, it is possible that the higher concentration of clergy members in inner-ring suburbs created this difference. Survey results revealed that social cohesion was found to be high between clergy members; therefore, an area with a higher concentration of clergy members would likely yield higher levels of social cohesion.

Inclusion. Results from both the interviews and participant observations suggest that MOSES has made honest attempts at being inclusive (this theme was mentioned 23 times in interviews), but whether or not inclusion actually exists within the organization was unclear. Study participants noted that the importance of diversity within the organization had been discussed and MOSES had attempted to expand the organizational membership in terms of religion. According to interviewees, MOSES has attempted to recruit more Muslim and Jewish groups and involve these groups in larger community events. The Executive Director reported in board meetings that she had been involved with conducting outreach as well as working with current members to recruit colleagues and acquaintances. Members also mentioned that MOSES had formed relationships within the Latino and Arab-American communities in an attempt to expand diversity and include population groups that are represented in

the Metro Detroit region. These attempts also were made through personal relationships members had with other community groups and congregations.

Organization members also reported the lack of inclusion within MOSES. This theme was mentioned 20 times during member interviews. Members reported a lack of inclusion based on religious denomination affiliation and language. In regards to religious exclusion, several members expressed discomfort with the organization's emphasis on Christian traditions, such as prayer at meetings and using the name "Jesus", as opposed to using terms such as "God" or "higher power". Although MOSES is a predominantly Christian organization, it has Jewish, Muslim, Unitarian-Universalist and non-religious members. While these members admit to having similar values as their Christian counterparts, some expressed discomfort with the use of those traditions because it does not reflect their beliefs and spiritual practices.

Also, two members serving the Latino membership of MOSES expressed a concern regarding exclusion based on language. All of the major meetings and events are held in English. While some meetings have had translators, some members have found it difficult to fully participate without understanding the language. For example, MOSES addresses the issue of immigration and has consistent participation from Latino members on this issue. Therefore, it is important that these members feel included in the organization by including use of the Spanish language at meetings, events, and in organizational resource materials.

The MOSES members interviewed in the study appear to be equally divided in terms of their perspectives on the extent of inclusion within the organization. Faith-based organizations are believed to facilitate the formation of relationships between different groups of people (Wood & Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002). Fostering an environment that is open to all groups is vitally important for bridging social capital formation. According to Wolff (2001), inclusion needs to be monitored and cultivated to in order for coalitions to be successful. Based on the responses of study participants, it would appear that inclusion exists to some degree within the organization. Further, they suggest that leaders in MOSES are aware of the need to monitor inclusion. Nevertheless, according to several members interviewed, strategies or actions have yet to be taken to increase this dimension of social capital.

Collective action. The data from the qualitative interviews reveal a high level of collective action taking place within the organization. Findings suggest that activities within the organization seem to facilitate collective action and continued involvement in the organization. This finding is supported by literature on social movement participation (Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986). Members shared that having regular actions and meetings facilitated their continued involvement. In addition, building and sustaining core teams within congregations also provided the motivation to stay involved. Finally, study participants stressed that active participation in a taskforce promoted ongoing involvement and collective action. Essentially, specific actions are used as

mobilization strategies and engage participants to get and stay involved (Klandermans, 1984). Study results also indicated that length of involvement within the organization influences the likelihood of engaging in collective action with one's taskforce. Members who had been involved with the organization 9 years or more were much more likely to participate in collective activities in their taskforces than people who had been involved for 8 years or less. Literature on social movement participation supports this finding. According to Tindall (2002), long-time movement participants tend to have stronger levels of identification with a movement or organization and this identification sustains participation.

Information and communication. Overall, communication within MOSES was reported as consistent and effective. Technology, specifically Internet and email, has improved access to information for many members. In addition, information shared through trainings and actions have given member congregations and organizations the ability to develop organizing skills, allowing them to work on social issues on their own in their own communities. Several clergy members I interviewed discussed feeling confident in their abilities to address issues within their communities using the skills they have developed through working with MOSES. I think this is a very important component. By training member congregations and organizations to act on their own, MOSES is contributing to community development on a larger scale. Leaders can apply the skills learned from working with MOSES and within their congregations to address local concerns that directly affect their communities. Through education

and training, MOSES can have a substantial effect on both national and local issues. Member congregations can tackle local community issues and then also contribute to work on national issues pursued by MOSES and the larger Gamaliel Foundation.

Empowerment and political action. The majority of members interviewed expressed that MOSES has given them a sense of empowerment. Those who felt empowered talked about the ability to have a voice. Prior to working with MOSES, some members expressed not having a vehicle to or mechanism for sharing their views and concerns as well as acting on them. MOSES helped members to find their voices through actions and legislative visits. Members also mentioned the importance of having a designated role in the change process. Most MOSES members take on specific roles within the organization and by having specific responsibilities within the organization they are accomplishing something and contributing to the change process.

The resource that seemed to make members feel the most empowered was the ability to have contact with elected officials. Members found the ability to attend legislative visits, talk to politicians, and hold politicians accountable during these visits and in the annual public meeting to be empowering. In other words, MOSES facilitated the development of linking social capital, which involves connecting members to individuals or groups that are in positions of power. Six members expressed that without MOSES, they would not have had the opportunity to engage with elected officials and voice their concerns.

MOSES also appears to promote participation in the political process in general. Data from member interviews and participant observations indicated that MOSES provides opportunities for members to get involved with voting registration, legislative visits, public rallies and events challenging legislation around social issues, and encouraging members to obtain positions in the political arena. This finding is supported by literature on religious culture and political participation. According to Wood (1999), certain forms of religion culture enable political participation. Specifically, providing opportunities for participants to engage with others, offering resources to assist participants in understanding the political realm, and questioning power through political conflict, influence political participation. Harris (1994) and Brown and Brown (2003) also support this finding that religious principles as well as resources provided through religious institutions support political involvement.

Groups and networks. Since its inception, MOSES has formed partnerships with outside organizations sharing similar goals related to the social issues MOSES is addressing. For example, MOSES' transportation taskforce was comprised of both member and non-member congregations and groups. At least three outside groups working on public transit were involved with the MOSES transportation taskforce. The supermarket taskforce also was comprised of several outside organizations working on building community grocery stores throughout Detroit. The healthcare taskforce is technically managed by an outside organization that is a MOSES member.

Connections with outside groups are important to the development of bridging social capital because they can facilitate relationships with groups that MOSES has not worked with before. For instance, connections with a local Arab-American organization, has enabled MOSES to reach out to the Arab community. By forming relationships with Jewish congregations, MOSES expanded membership and increased contact between different groups of people. Literature on social networks supports this finding. According to Lin (2001) investing into networks often yields returns, increasing social capital. By reaching out to additional groups and organizations, MOSES can create relationships that may ultimately give them access to additional resources and possible increase their membership and power within the region.

The extent of bridging social capital within the organization. The majority of MOSES members interviewed believed that relationship building between members of different racial, religious, and geographical bridging was happening within MOSES. Looking at member demographic characteristics, one could come to this conclusion as well. While MOSES has not been able to engage all racial and ethnic groups represented in the region, the fact that there is almost equal African American and White membership is impressive for such a segregated metropolitan area.

In regards to religion, MOSES faces the same issue. Although MOSES lacked diversity in terms of non-Christian denominations and was limited in its composition of Protestant denominations, the organization has large numbers of

both Protestant and Catholic individuals who hold membership in the organization and work together in some capacity.

These findings are supported by previous studies on faith-based organizations that have found that these organizations are the most effective at producing bridging social capital (Swarts, 2008; Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002). Research conducted by Warren and Wood on affiliates of the IAF, showed similar patterns of faith-based organizational membership (2001). Faith-based organizations in the United States tend to be primarily comprised of Christian denominations and African American, White, and Latino individuals. Members who expressed that bridging is taking place seem to infer that participating in the organization itself provided the connections that facilitate bridging.

While observations of actual instances of bridging social capital were limited, it seems that if and when bridging occurred, it happened naturally through members building relationships when working together in taskforces or interacting at special events or meetings. In regards to particular strategies employed to foster such social capital, I did not see much evidence of purposeful bridging, other than one attempt to establish a working relationship between two Unitarian-Universalist churches (one a city church and the other a suburban church) around the issue of transportation. While the public meeting has been used as a strategy to build solidarity since it brings members into the same space, this venue does not provide opportunities to get acquainted or interact on a personal level.

For many members, simply belonging to an organization comprised of difference races, religions, denominations, and geographic locations may seem like bridging since most individuals would not have access to people different from themselves in their daily lives. With the high level of residential segregation by race in the metropolitan Detroit area, interactions are oftentimes few and far between. MOSES creates an environment for regular interaction between members of differing backgrounds.

One-third of the interview respondents suggested that MOSES was not bridging gaps between different groups of people within the organization. Several members mentioned issues specific to the divisions between city and suburbs. Some members felt that MOSES had done very little to address the distrust and differences that exist between members who live in varying locations within the metropolitan area. Some members who resided in Detroit felt that suburban members did not care about issues affecting the city. In turn, suburban members expressed feeling left out of issues and disconnected from the organization at times due to the strong emphasis on urban congregations and issues. Study participants also expressed that bridges had not been formed between African American and White members. While members were coming together at larger public meetings and actions, African American and White congregations were not working closely together.

One strategy MOSES has attempted to use to increase the likelihood of different people participating and working together was to host events at various

geographical and congregational locations. While this may have helped with inclusiveness, it did not provide an avenue for city residents and suburban residents to get to know one another and form working relationships. Over time, my participant observations revealed that most MOSES events were purposeful, structured, and time-limited. Therefore, even when events were held at varying locations, they tended to be task-oriented and did not provide opportunities for members to interact with one another. Without interaction, relationships may not be developed, hindering the process of bridging.

Within MOSES, the emphasis was on relationship building in general. From the perspectives of MOSES leaders, relationships should be developed primarily within congregations using clergy to recruit congregation members and core groups to manage and mobilize members around issues. When those internal relationships are intact, external relationships can be created between congregation members of the clergy. Unfortunately, there seems to be disruption in this process. According to interview participants, many congregations did not have organized core teams. Also, many clergy were too busy sustaining the membership and financial stability within their own congregations that they did not have the time to facilitate recruiting congregation members and monitoring core teams for MOSES. Relationships that were formed and sustained seem to be more a result of individual members reaching out and establishing contacts.

In sum, interviews with MOSES members indicated that they were given opportunities to work with individuals from different backgrounds and locations.

While it appears that specific strategies or processes do not exist within MOSES to facilitate these relationships, the organization did clearly provide access and opportunities for members who are willing to reach out, build relationships and work on issues that may or may not affect their immediate congregations or communities. Rather than an organizational process, perhaps bridging is something that is driven by individuals who wish to cross those boundaries. From my participant observations, it appeared that MOSES leaders were highly focused on tasks and actions rather than on organizational processes. This perception also was supported by member interviews. Since MOSES as an organization is driven by working on the social issues it addresses, processes such as building relationships across differences may be overlooked.

Strategies used to develop and sustain dimensions of social capital. While it appears that MOSES does not have a systematic process for developing bridging social capital, results suggest that one particular strategy employed within the organization may be facilitating its formation, namely, relationship building. Relationship building is the primary focus of the organization. MOSES conducts relationship building within member churches, taskforces, and communities. Relationship building also takes place at clergy caucus meetings, board meetings and retreats, and through organization actions and rallies. Finally, MOSES puts strong efforts into relationship building with external entities such as other organizations and elected officials.

It appears that members gain trust for one another through relationship building strategies within MOSES. Previous studies on social capital formation and faith-based organizing support this finding: the more people work together and get to know one another, the more they trust one another (Putnam, 1995b; Wood, 2002). The findings also suggest that relationship building contributes to solidarity and social cohesion within the organization. As MOSES members have gotten to know one another, they recognized their shared perspectives and values, despite their differences in social, economic, or religious backgrounds. These shared values, in turn, have fostered a sense of belonging and agreement on community issues. In particular, MOSES has used one-on-one interactions and rituals, such as prayer, to build solidarity and cohesion. These are relationship building tools that often are employed to build solidarity and cohesion in faith-based organizations (Wood, 2002).

In addition, I found that MOSES exerts considerable effort in building relationships with other organizations and communities. These relationships have given the organization access to additional resources and support. Investing into social networks often leads to increased resources, and thus, increased social capital (Lin, 2001). Through relationships with organizations and communities, MOSES has forged new partnerships with other agencies to address specific social issues.

Finally, the study findings suggest that building relationships with elected officials at local and state levels builds empowerment within the organization and

also motivates members to participate collectively with the organization. Faith-based organizations are considered unique in this aspect. According to Swarts (2008), faith-based organizations often excel at creating relationships with elected officials and those in power because of their less aggressive approach during interactions. While some MOSES members felt that MOSES might be too aggressive in its approach, it was clear through the results that the organization has connections and relationships with public officials. Creating these types of relationships is known as "linking social capital" (Woolcock, 1999). Linking is related to bridging, but provides members with vertical connections as opposed to horizontal connections. It affords individuals the opportunity to be heard by those in power (Grootaert, et. al., 2004). For MOSES members, this form of social capital appears to strongly impact involvement in the organization.

While relationship building appears to be a process that is initiated immediately with member involvement in the organization, it is clear that building strong working relationships between different groups takes time and long-term commitment to the organization. Members who expressed they had strong relationships with others in the organization were those who had been involved for several years and served in leadership roles such as board member or clergy member.

The extent of addressing differences within the organization. MOSES members who were interviewed in the study were essentially equally divided as to whether MOSES addressed differences that exist between members. Those

who felt that MOSES had addressed differences reported that as an organization, MOSES was open, accepting and tolerant and that generally, members were open to disclosing their backgrounds and learning about other individual's backgrounds. Six respondents mentioned that MOSES had addressed differences through discussions in meetings as well as organized seminars. During my observations, I witnessed members address race-related issues in regards to creating partnerships between communities, but I was not aware of any seminars or workshops that addressed race or other member differences.

The members who expressed that MOSES was not addressing differences claimed that MOSES did not provide education or information about such differences, and that MOSES was not doing a good enough job addressing differences based on location of residence and religion. Members who felt that MOSES was not properly addressing these issues suggested that the organization implement two strategies to improve in this area. First, members suggested that MOSES put together an education program that would involve seminars and guest speakers to talk about and inform members about different races, cultures, and religions. Second, members suggested that organized discussions regarding differences take place in board meetings, clergy caucus meetings, and taskforce meetings.

Several members expressed concern about the consequences of addressing differences in MOSES. Some members believed that focusing on

differences might create a division between members and that by focusing on common interests and values, MOSES can stay focused on the issues. Based on my own observations, it appeared that MOSES was avoiding addressing member differences. For the most part, differences were not discussed and common ideologies regarding social justice were the emphasis in MOSES meetings and events. What is less clear is how not addressing differences affects relationship building within MOSES. By not learning about member backgrounds, this may limit the depth of relationships and perhaps member commitment and involvement in the organization. In his study on faith-based organizations, Wood (2002) discusses the importance of members having discussions around race and other differences in order to build strong working relationships. From his perspective, addressing differences is an important step to proper relationship building and to forming bridging social capital. When these issues are not addressed, it may be difficult for members to develop trust for one another. As mentioned previously, trust is an important component of bridging social capital formation.

Barriers to developing and sustaining dimensions of social capital.

Two different types of barriers were identified by MOSES members: internal and external. Internal barriers are considered those impediments that are manifested within the organization, such as policies and procedures, staff member performance, or issues between organization members. External barriers involve forces outside of the organization that have an impact on its

operations, such as the political climate, social conditions, and the economy. According to members, internal barriers accounted for the majority of the barriers MOSES faces to developing and sustaining bridging social capital, suggesting that there may be some weaknesses in organizational management within the organization. Internal barriers mentioned included organizational structure and governance, lack of relationship building, lack of diversity, and member differences not being addressed. The absence of the following dimensions of social capital were also considered as internal barriers: trust, solidarity, social cohesion, inclusion, collective action, information and communication, and empowerment and political action.

Organizational structure and governance. First, members expressed concern on 30 different occasions that the organizing model used by MOSES was too aggressive. Among those that expressed this concern, several members mentioned that the strategies MOSES uses to train and mobilize members as well as to engage public officials in the change process are confrontational and can be off-putting to people. It appears that these strategies may be creating obstacles for members to build trust and feel a sense of solidarity and cohesiveness. Further, these strategies are no longer seen as being effective in influencing elected officials on policies and social issues.

According to previous studies of grassroots organizing, the Alinsky model employed by MOSES is widely used by both secular and faith-based organizations (Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002). While studies on faith-based

organizing suggest that this model can be effective for facilitating change (Swarts, 2008; Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002), the fact remains that various versions of this model have been used for over 60 years. This model may need to be updated to appropriately address changes that have occurred in the political arena over time. In addition, most faith-based organizations use less aggressive tactics when compared to secular organizations (Swarts, 2008). Interview results suggested that members may be interested in making changes to the strategies used to address elected officials, particularly strategies that are less aggressive, but effective.

Second, members expressed several concerns in regards to staffing issues. High staff turnover, the lack of staff, and the Executive Director's participation in tasks meant for staff organizers were all identified as barriers to the successful daily management of the organization. One of the main concerns about staffing issues was the absence of organizers to help mobilize core teams within congregations. Organizers are responsible for mobilizing members, keeping churches connected to MOSES, and leading actions (Wood, 2002). Without staff organizers, it can be difficult to keep congregations engaged and even more difficult to connect them to other members outside of their own congregations. Studies on coalition building suggest that coalitions without paid staff members are less able to produce results compared to those with paid staff members (Wolff, 2001). Without staff organizers keeping them connected, many members felt unsure about how to stay involved.

Failure to build relationships. Despite the use of relationship building to develop and maintain social capital within and outside of the organization, lack of relationship building was mentioned by study participants 53 times. Respondents appeared to be evenly divided as to whether clergy, board members, members within churches, and members among churches were building relationships with one another. These results are troubling for an organization attempting to implement societal change through focusing on working relationships and commonalities. While the lack of relationship building between churches suggests limited bridging social capital, the lack of relationship building within churches is also a major concern. Bonding social capital is more likely to occur within groups in which members are similar to one another. The literature on bonding and bridging social capital underscores that bonding is generally a precursor to bridging (Larsen, et. al., 2004). If applied to MOSES, that means that congregations with strong core teams or strong internal relationships are more likely to have the capacity to engage in bridging with different groups. However, this is something MOSES appears to be struggling with which may suggest that bridging is not happening as much as it could be.

Lack of diversity within the organization. Members cited the lack of diversity as a major internal barrier. The lack of diversity in terms of religion was mentioned the most frequently. Study participants who felt that MOSES was lacking in religious diversity stressed the need to increase membership among Jewish and Muslim faith communities. Most faith-based community organizations

are ecumenical (predominantly Christian) as opposed to interfaith (Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002; Warren & Wood, 2002). It is possible that MOSES' intent to become a regional organization is changing the dynamics of membership. While MOSES members have expressed the desire to expand interfaith membership, it is unclear whether this is feasible given what appears to be limited interest on the part of non-Christian congregations to become involved. Results from member interviews revealed that attempts to recruit other faith communities have failed on a number of occasions mainly because leaders of these congregations do not see the benefits of belonging to MOSES. According to interviewees, MOSES leaders need to provide incentives to gain the interest of these communities. Incentives may include helping congregations increase their membership, assisting congregations with neighborhood concerns, and connecting congregation leaders to elected officials.

Study participants also mentioned the lack of diversity within MOSES relative to place of residence, taskforce membership, and socioeconomic status. The lack of diversity within taskforces is of particular importance since these groups are the primary vehicles in MOSES within which people from different backgrounds can work together on a regular basis. Although the transportation and supermarket taskforces appeared to be diverse, they also were the largest taskforces and their size limited member interaction. The smaller taskforces, healthcare and civil rights and immigration (CRI), were homogeneous in composition – one predominantly White and the other predominantly Latino. This

lack of ethnic diversity brings into question the extent to which MOSES is able to cultivate bridging social capital within the general membership (excluding board members and clergy), since taskforces are the primary venue for interaction within MOSES. Homogeneity in taskforce membership would suggest that bridging is not occurring within these contexts.

The absence of dimensions of social capital.

Trust. Lack of trust within the organization was reported less frequently by members than a sense of trust, but was still of concern to some of the members interviewed. Interviewees reported they had not built very many relationships within the organization, primarily because of a lack of opportunities. This led them to feel less trust toward other members. Study participants specifically expressed concern about mistrust between members of different races. There appears to be two different perspectives on race in MOSES. First, several African American members believed MOSES needs more African American members, with African American leadership, and a strong focus on city issues. On the other side, several White members believed that MOSES is an African American organization that is not very inclusive of White suburban congregations and groups. Both sides felt as if they are not in power positions within the organization. I believe this leads to mistrust since it is unclear as to who is being served by the organization, which may in turn, introduce some competition between the two groups relative to leadership and addressing issues.

African American Protestant members claimed to be mistrustful because of MOSES' affiliation with the Gamaliel Foundation, which was essentially started by members of the Roman Catholic Church. Protestant members reported discomfort with being managed or tied to a Catholic entity. This mistrust appeared to cause friction between MOSES' board president and Gamaliel Foundation leaders, as well as created concerns for members favoring organizational autonomy. One clergy member in particular shared that at least two or three African American churches had left MOSES because of their discomfort with the Gamaliel Foundation connection. He also shared that he personally has had difficulty recruiting African American Protestant churches as a result of this connection.

Solidarity. Although the existence of solidarity was mentioned by the majority of interviewees, some members felt that solidarity was lacking within the organization. Those who discussed the lack of solidarity reported that the sense of solidarity fluctuated within the organization and often is tied to the political climate and what is happening with the issues MOSES addresses. For example, one member specifically mentioned feeling a strong sense of solidarity and empowerment when a Democratic governor was elected to office. From my observations, members seem to come together around specific actions or events and if there was nothing to engage in, members would pull away. Rather than coming together around faith or values, it appears the issues and actions tied to the issues are what facilitates members feeling united and keeps them engaged

with the organization. Since MOSES organizes around social issues, this observation makes sense. If members' identities are based upon agreement on social issues, levels of solidarity would be expected to be higher when issues are being actively addressed.

Social cohesion. As mentioned previously, study participants were evenly divided on their perspectives related to the existence of social cohesion within the organization. Members who expressed concern about the lack of social cohesion discussed two major themes: tension and disconnection. Discussions about both themes focused mainly on relationships between members who resided in the city and members who resided in the suburbs.

In regards to tension, interview respondents who resided in the city expressed concern that members who resided in the suburbs were not very involved with issues impacting the city. Further, they felt that suburban members fail to see the interdependence between the city and the suburbs. Members who were city residents found this frustrating because they felt more progress could be made on issues if suburban members would participate in city-related activities. On the other hand, suburban residents expressed openness to working with members who resided in the city, but also felt that their social issues were neglected by the organization. Tension also emanates from the general mistrust that exists within the region between the city and the suburbs that is external to MOSES, but ultimately affects the internal organization. One clergy member suggested that MOSES might be a stronger organization if it only had city

congregations, preferring avoidance of bridging relationships between city and suburban congregations.

In regards to disconnection, suburban respondents reported feeling distant and "out of the loop" around some of the issues that MOSES addresses, while expressing discontent about the organization's responsiveness to issues that affect their communities. For example, one clergy member expressed that once he relocated from an inner-ring suburban church to an outer-ring suburban church, he felt further removed from city-related issues. He also expressed feeling somewhat disconnected from the organization because of the distance he must travel to attend many of the MOSES events and meetings which are frequently held in the city. One of the strategies to address this concern that MOSES has used on a few occasions is to host events in suburban locations, such as Sterling Heights or Birmingham. This may encourage attendance from suburban congregations, but it is unclear whether this would affect participation from city congregations.

Collective action. Findings from the study underscore the decline in member participation within the organization. The lack of participation was mentioned 29 times by members interviewed. Concerns expressed by members underscore an overall decline in membership as well as decreasing attendance at meetings and actions. Study participants indicated a lack of participation by member congregations and also among clergy. In the past, clergy caucus meetings provided an opportunity for clergy to build relationships and learn

strategies to engage their congregations. At the time of the study, however, clergy caucus meetings were not being held regularly. Several clergy members discussed the influence that the economy was having on local congregations and the fact that clergy members were focusing more on their fiscal viability of their congregations. As a result, MOSES activities were not considered to be the top priority. For general membership participation, some members interviewed suggested that high staff member turnover and lack of staff members may have had an impact on participation. Staff organizers play an important role in MOSES in keeping members engaged and active.

Information and communication. Several study participants reported a lack of consistent and effective communication within the organization. Many interviewees reported feeling "out of the loop" at times. Board members voiced concerns about not receiving email messages and materials relevant to meetings and actions. General members noted that MOSES often engaged in last minute planning, and hence, last minute notifications for meetings and events. It was unclear whether poor communication has been a consistent issue since the inception of the organization or a more recent development. During the course of the study, three staff members left the organization; therefore, it is possible that communication problems may be a more recent phenomenon associated with this. In addition, MOSES was transitioning from paper communication to electronic communication using their website, electronic mail, and Facebook during the course of the study. This transition period appeared to have affected

the communication with members who previously were used to receiving phone calls or notifications through the U.S. mail. Individuals lacking Internet or access to electronic mail may receive less information from the organization. Based on the survey, it was clear that MOSES had numerous members who do not use the Internet. Maintaining communication with these members is something that needs to be further examined by staff members and leaders within MOSES.

One of the results discussed in regards to barriers within the organization was the lack of victories on issues. Because MOSES mostly has been focusing on national issues that take time, victories have been few. According to Wolff (2001), a coalition's ability to affect change impacts member participation in coalition activities. Perhaps focusing on large, long-term issues has had an affect on member participation within the organization.

Empowerment and political action. Lack of empowerment was mentioned less frequently in member interviews. Members who expressed feeling disempowered talked about the need for victories as well as the importance of addressing smaller issues on a more local level. Several members expressed their concerns about the agenda that has been encouraged by the Gamaliel Foundation which involves tackling larger issues that affect people on a national level. While members believe that national issues are important, they also realized that these issues take longer to resolve and that many members become tired and weary over the lack of victories on these larger issues. Some members suggested that MOSES select smaller, local issues in order to increase

the likelihood of victories as well as continue to address local community issues. Small victories could possibly be used to motivate members and keep them active while local issues keeps MOSES engaged in the community in which it operates. These activities may have an impact on recruiting and sustaining membership and ongoing involvement. Addressing local issues is vitally important to enhancing bridging social capital within MOSES. Study findings underscore the concerns that African American members who live in the city have about social issues directly impacting where they live. Focusing on local and regional concerns is more likely to bring members together while national issues are more likely to alienate members. Although social issues differ between residents of the city and suburbs, regional issues specific to metro Detroit might provide the basis for consensus of members across all locations.

Relationship with the Gamaliel Foundation. Members expressed concern about the Gamaliel Foundation's power over MOSES. Respondents expressed discomfort with MOSES' limited autonomy. They also questioned the decision-making process, particularly in regards to the process of selecting social issues. While many study participants could appreciate the importance of national issues, a small group of MOSES members emphasized the need to focus on issues directly affecting the city and region. Study participants also expressed concern about the Gamaliel Foundation National Leadership training. Several respondents, in particular, felt the trainers were too aggressive in their interactions with trainees. Members expressed that the training did not motivate

them to build relationships, but rather, made them feel uncomfortable and to question their interest in participating in the organization. Previous studies have found that most local, faith-based organizations are affiliated with larger organizing institutes (Swarts, 2008; Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002). Holding membership in a larger organization provides the smaller organizations with resources, including training, and connections to political figures. While it is unclear whether autonomy in faith-based organizations is an issue, members of MOSES have certainly expressed this as an important issue for them. Because Detroit has many local issues that need to be addressed, perhaps members feel reluctant to focus on a national strategy.

Social conditions in the region. The diversity in social conditions across the region produces tension between members of MOSES who live in the city and those who live in the suburbs. The history of racial and economic segregation in the region has had an impact on all residents of the metropolitan area and members of MOSES are not immune. MOSES members interviewed who were residents of the city expressed frustration when suburban residents failed to see the connections between the two areas. Suburban members seemed eager to bridge the gaps between them and city-dwelling members but admitted not knowing how to do this. Similarly, race, and religion were mentioned as part of Detroit's legacy of segregation and discrimination. According to study participants, the racial and religious events that have transpired throughout Detroit's history have created divisions among people of different races and

religions. These regional differences and divisions also have manifested within the organization. Specifically, members of MOSES expressed uncertainty as to how to address these issues and seem more comfortable avoiding confrontation of these issues in order to continue their work around social issues.

Past studies of faith-based organizing supports these findings regarding external social conditions on social capital formation. According to Wood (2002), bridging does not happen naturally. People tend to surround themselves with others who are like them, and racial and economic segregation reinforce this. Despite religious institutions being potential places for high levels of social capital, they are also some of the most segregated places where people come together (Putnam, 2000). Essentially, MOSES, like other faith-based organizations located in highly segregated areas, faces an uphill battle for resolving issues around lack of trust and discomfort among its racially and religiously diverse membership.

Effectiveness of mobilizing members using social issues. Based on the interviews conducted with members of the organization, there are three perspectives regarding what MOSES uses to mobilize members and create a sense of solidarity. About one-third of the members interviewed believed that MOSES mobilizes members by creating a unified identity based on common interests in social justice and social issues. Members who gave this response claimed that although MOSES is a faith-based organization, mobilizing members around faith could create divisions since MOSES is a multi-faith organization with

differing viewpoints on God and spirituality. Approximately one-quarter of those interviewed stated that having similar viewpoints on social justice and the same basic values was what brings people together and mobilizes members around issues. Slightly less than a quarter of members interviewed shared that MOSES used faith to mobilize members. Members who talked about faith shared that faith is what motivates members to work towards social justice. From their perspective, God intended for all people to be equal and striving for equality is part of practicing one's faith. According to these members, issues will change depending on the political climate and social conditions of the region, but one's faith remains constant and this is the common thread that holds the organization together.

Observations of board meetings, issue meetings, the public meeting and the board retreat support the finding that the primary concern of the organization is the focus on social issues. While meetings usually started and ended in prayer and the organization's membership is primarily made up of religious congregations, faith seems to be a small piece of what is emphasized in the organization.

One of the main concerns about emphasizing faith is division. Although MOSES primarily is comprised of religious entities, the organization includes secular groups and has shown interest in expanding membership to other types of organizations such as unions and colleges and universities. Some members feared that by emphasizing faith too much, they would isolate secular groups or

cause differences between members of different faiths. Although issues change, some members believed that focusing on the task at hand is the best way to keep the organization together and focus on similarities to avoid division.

Grassroots organizations use particular approaches to frame issues, create identity, and mobilize members. Most secular organizations use race or other inherent personal characteristics related to identity to engage members (Swarts, 2008). Most faith-based organizations use faith as the common identity and driving force to engage members (Altemose & McCarty, 2001; Swarts, 2008; Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002). The main argument for tapping into identity is that issues will change, be resolved, or be abandoned. If members are united around issues alone, how can organizations sustain membership? While membership participation appeared to be declining during the course of the study, many of the survey respondents reported longer-term involvement with the organization. Over three-quarters of survey respondents reported being involved for 3 or more years. Approximately one-quarter of all respondents had been involved for 9 or more years. Although past studies suggest that organizing based on faith is effective for bridging social capital formation, it is unclear whether organizing based on issues may also be just as effective or perhaps more effective. This warrants further investigation.

Strengths of the Study

Trustworthiness. One of the major strengths of this study was my ability to build trust and establish a rapport with study participants. As a participant

observer, I attended meetings, trainings, and events in order to understand the organization and become familiar with the members. Further, interviews were conducted in a manner that facilitated a shared dialogue between myself and interview participants, yielding responses that appeared to be open, honest, and heartfelt. Interview participants, including the Board President, seemed comfortable sharing with me both the positives and the negatives of the organization, as well as their own personal experiences and insights. As a researcher and participant observer, I immersed myself in the culture and work of MOSES and as a result, I feel I have a personal understanding of the organization and the people who dedicate themselves to it.

Transferability of findings. While the purpose of a qualitative case study is not to produce results that are generalizeable to a larger population, these studies can yield results that are transferable to similar contexts. The findings of this study provide insight on bridging social capital in a faith-based organization that could be applied to other faith-based organizations doing work similar to MOSES. In this study, I identified factors that support the development and maintenance of bridging social capital as well as barriers that hinder the formation of bridging social capital. The findings are suggestive of a practice model that could be applied to other settings in order to facilitate relationships between different groups of people working together on social justice issues.

Limitations of the Study

Study sample. One limitation of this study was the study sample. For survey administration, I began with a list of 286 members which included an electronic mailing list and a physical mailing address list for those without Internet access. After following up with members on the lists, it was clear that many of the physical addresses were either out-dated, inaccurate, or belonged to individuals who did not consider themselves members of MOSES. In addition, several members could not be reached by telephone to confirm their status as members. It was clear that MOSES' physical mailing address database was not up-to-date. In the end, I determined an official sample size of approximately 215 people. Of those 215, only 78 completed surveys yielding a relatively low response rate of 36 percent.

The purpose of the survey was to gather information about the existence of the eight dimensions of social capital within the organization, taskforces, and among clergy members. Because it was not feasible to interview all active members of the organization, the survey was administered to capture responses from a larger subset of the membership. While the survey did do this, I believe the study would have been strengthened by a higher response to the survey.

Another limitation related to the research sample was my inability to collect data from staff members within MOSES. During the time of my data collection, MOSES lost three staff members, essentially leaving MOSES without organizers. Because staff organizers play such an important role in mobilizing

members and linking members to one another, additional interview and survey data from these individuals would have greatly contributed to the study. Also, because of the lack of staff members to complete daily organizational tasks, the Executive Director took on some of the responsibilities of front-line staff members. This made her virtually inaccessible at times, and as a result, I was unable to interview her. Fortunately, I was able to get her feedback on the survey and have informal conversations with her regarding happenings within the organization.

Limited participant observations. Finally, because of time limitations, organizational scheduling, and issues with member participation, I was not able to observe some meetings and events that may have added to my knowledge of organizational processes and actions. As mentioned previously, the Clergy Caucus was to have held monthly meetings designed to facilitate connections between clergy members and their congregations. During the 12 months of my data collection, however, the clergy caucus only met twice because of a lack of participation and the absence of a caucus chairperson. I believe these meetings might have provided additional insights about bridging social capital developed through clergy member relationships within the organization. Since MOSES relies on clergy members to mobilize their congregation members and be active in the process of collaboration with other member congregations, this would have been an important process to capture.

Other important events that I was unable to observe were the legislative visits held at both at the state and federal levels. Interview participants described these legislative visits as actions that made them feel empowered and connected to the political process. Experiencing legislative visits first-hand as well as observing other members during these visits would have provided me with invaluable information related to building empowerment. In addition, it would have helped me to understand the challenges MOSES faces to addressing social issues and working towards changes in policies or legislation. Further, it would have allowed me to witness the strategies MOSES uses to build and maintain relationships with elected officials, which is an important piece to connecting members to those in power (known as linking social capital).

Finally, I was unable to attend all of the various taskforce meetings occurring within the organization, limiting my ability to observe how relationships differed in each taskforce. The healthcare taskforce met consistently each month and I was able to attend the majority of their meetings. Unfortunately, the transportation taskforce met sporadically throughout my data collection period and varied dramatically in attendance. Some meetings had 25 participants, whereas other meetings had 5 participants. The supermarket taskforce also met sporadically and was comprised of MOSES members, members of several collaborating organizations, and community members residing where the first supermarket was to be constructed. This made observations of relationships and interactions difficult. I was only able to attend one civil rights and immigration

(CRI) taskforce meeting during the data collection process. While taskforce meetings are advertised as being open to everyone, I received very little communication about the dates and locations for CRI taskforce meeting despite following up with MOSES to obtain that information.

Not being able to attend several of the taskforce meetings limited my ability to make comparisons between taskforces as well as gain a broader understanding of relationship building within the organization. Since MOSES is an issue-driven organization, it would have been helpful to know how members and taskforces differed in their approaches of addressing particular issues.

My role as a participant and a researcher. From the beginning, I approached MOSES as a researcher interested in directly getting involved and participating as a trained volunteer organizer. I went through the necessary training and began attending meetings and events as much as possible. While participation brought me closer to the members, it was clear that I was never completely an "insider" in the organization. I would describe the feeling as "one foot in and one foot out". While members were very welcoming and accommodating, I think knowing that I was collecting information about the organization and its activities may have limited the information they chose to share with me. To address this, I attempted to conduct interviews in a manner that encouraged discussion rather than pointed questions. I shared my observations with members and allowed them to share their perspectives as well. I believe this strategy helped a great deal, but I believe I was still viewed as a

researcher rather than a member. Perhaps participating as a member for a period of time prior to data collection would have allowed me to build a stronger sense of trust among members and consequently, lead to more in-depth details regarding members' opinions and experiences.

Limited access to documentation and archives. Finally, a limitation of this study was the limited access to archival information, specifically board meetings minutes of past board meetings and reports and documentation related to MOSES' affiliation with the Gamaliel Foundation. Despite repeated requests, I was unable to obtain past board meeting minutes. This information would have allowed me to compare past meeting minutes to those taken during my data collection period and look for patterns or changes in the interactions and relationships between board members. While my observations of board meetings helped me to understand what was happening currently with the board, information about past interactions would have provided me with information related to processes of relationship building among board members.

In addition, some interviewees reported tension between the Gamaliel Foundation and MOSES, especially in regards to autonomy. During my observations of board meetings, reports and other documentation were discussed related to these tensions. Despite several requests, I was unable to obtain copies of these reports and other documents. Having access to this information may have provided me with more in-depth information in regards to the tension between MOSES and the Gamaliel Foundation.

Implications of the Study

This study explored the process of bridging social capital formation in a faith-based organization, specifically looking at the existence of dimensions of social capital within the organization and the process of forming relationships and bridging members from different cultural backgrounds. In addition, this study examined whether the differences between members were addressed, barriers that hindered the development of bridging social capital, and the means in which MOSES mobilized and engaged their members. By understanding the extent to which bridging social capital exists in the organization, the process of how relationships are developed, and the barriers that MOSES faces to bridging social capital formation, conceptual and practice models can be constructed that create the necessary conditions for bridging to occur.

Literature. This research study adds to literature on faith-based organizing and bridging social capital in several distinct ways. First, MOSES is unique in its approach for mobilizing members. While most faith-based organizations mobilize their members based on faith, MOSES mobilizes members based on social issues. By focusing on the issues, MOSES leaders believe that tension related to cultural differences can be avoided and the organization can create a sense of solidarity rather than promote division. While it is unclear as to whether mobilizing members around social issues is more or less effective than mobilizing based on faith, it provides a different perspective on how faith-based organizations can engage their members.

Second, this study suggests that bridging social capital may not be a structured or planned process. While studies on faith-based organizing support the idea that these organizations excel at bringing different types of people together, they have not revealed specific processes or procedures on how this is done. This study implies that it may be more of a natural process rather than a planned intervention. On a similar note, members may have a big responsibility in the formation of bridging social capital. While MOSES provided opportunities for members to meet and interact, it appeared that members, especially clergy members, ultimately had to purposely pursue partnerships and build relationships on their own. As mentioned previously, this could be due to staff member turnover in the organization, but it may also be based on the philosophy of the leadership within MOSES that clergy members are responsible for engaging their congregations and participating in relationship building with other clergy.

Finally, this study provides perspective on bridging social capital from a region that has a long history of racial and economic segregation. Encouraging relationships between groups that are culturally different is difficult in and of itself, but attempting to do this in an area that is still highly segregated and carries high levels of racial and religious tension is unique. While MOSES continues to struggle with issues around diversity and inclusion, the fact that the organization has been able to gain a membership that is African American, White, Latino, Catholic, and Protestant, is an impressive feat. Perhaps focusing on similarities

such as perspectives on issues has enabled MOSES to bring individuals together who would have otherwise stayed divided.

Practice. The findings from this study also lend some insight to the practice of developing bridging social capital. As mentioned previously, bridging is happening to some degree without direct intervention from the organization. Incorporating a practice model that employs strategies that support the development of bridging social capital may increase the likelihood of relationships developing between members of different racial, ethnic, and religious groups. One practice that may certainly enhance this process would be MOSES establishing partnerships between city and suburban congregations working on common social issues. This could be done through assigning certain congregations to work together on specific tasks. By assigning members to work together, MOSES would be purposely creating opportunities for different groups to work together.

Another practice that may facilitate bridging social capital is addressing differences, particularly race, religion, and location of residence. As mentioned above, addressing differences is clearly an obstacle for the region, and in turn, the organization. Addressing differences is an important component to building trust in the organization and developing long lasting relationships among members and between members and the organization. Addressing differences could be done through educational sessions, inviting guest speakers to talk about

race relations, or hosting structured meetings or forums on issues affecting MOSES.

Finally, increasing diversity in membership is another strategy that MOSES needs to incorporate in their model for bridging social capital formation. This involves developing a process for member recruitment as well as identifying congregations, organizations, and other groups representative of the surrounding region to engage in social action. MOSES and the Gamaliel Foundation have already made a commitment to addressing social issues from a regional perspective. To support this commitment, MOSES needs to develop strategies for regional inclusion. Increasing diversity within the organization will provide additional opportunities for members of differing cultural backgrounds to work together and build relationships.

Future Research

Future research on faith-based organizations needs to expand on a few specific areas. First, I think it is important to look at organizing models. While most faith-based and secular organizations have used the Alinsky model as the foundation for organizing tactics over the years, many have added their own strategies as appropriate. As mentioned previously, MOSES has modified their faith-based model slightly by mobilizing members based on issues rather than faith, and approaching elected officials in a more aggressive manner. These are two tactics that have not been traditionally used by faith-based organizations. For examining bridging capital formation, I think it is vital to compare organizing

models for both faith-based and secular organizations to examine the effectiveness of particular models for encouraging the development of relationships between individuals from different backgrounds. Is mobilizing on faith more effective in forming relationships? What about mobilizing on issues, ethnicity, geographical location or values? Knowing what is most effective can help us to understand how to encourage bridging social capital formation.

Similarly, looking at recruitment and mobilization strategies is important for bridging social capital formation. As discussed previously, MOSES was struggling with expanding membership to groups who were non-Christian. Bringing people of different faiths together is an important part of bridging. Researching strategies that are effective at engaging different religious communities and maintaining their interest in an organization is vitally important.

Finally, I think more research needs to be conducted on the barriers that hinder bridging social capital formation. Obviously, there are limitations to addressing external barriers such as social conditions in a region and autonomy from a larger umbrella organization, but I think internal organization barriers need to be examined further. One of the major barriers I feel should be further studied is the issue around addressing differences among members in faith-based social justice organizations. It is highly possible that avoiding the discussion of differences is what makes different groups working together successful, but this is unclear. If individuals do not address cultural differences, are they still building the trust that is so fundamental for engaging civically with others? If individuals

do not have an understanding of one another, will this affect the likelihood of working with the organization over a long period of time? These are important questions to answer.

Another important barrier to address is the things that hinder the process of relationship building. At the core of bridging social capital formation is relationship building. Although relationship building was considered a primary component of the work that MOSES does, several members expressed concerns about this taking place. Relationship building needs to be further examined within churches (bonding social capital) as well as between churches and communities (bridging social capital) to identify obstacles that may prevent relationships from forming.

Summary

Findings from the study suggest that social capital does exist within the organization and that some effort has been made to maintain levels of social capital. At the same time, it is clear that MOSES faces several obstacles to bridging relationships between members from different cultural backgrounds. Issues related to race, religion, and location of residence both inside and outside of the organization were identified as significant barriers that challenge bridging social capital. More importantly, the avoidance of addressing these issues may be even more harmful to the overall effectiveness and longevity of the organization. Further research on strategies that facilitate bridging social capital and barriers that hinder the development of bridging social capital are needed to

identify practice models that may be useful to faith-based organizations in their pursuit to bridge racial and religious divides. Understanding the issues that need to be addressed is certainly important, but knowing how to address these issues is detrimental to the process of bridging social capital formation in a faith-based organization.

APPENDIX A

MOSES Archival Coding Guide

1. Purpose of the organization – content that includes mission, goals, vision

2. Philosophy of the organization – content that includes faith or religion-related content, political stances on issues, and/or general orientation towards community issues.

3. Accomplishments of the organization – content that includes accomplished goals, implemented policies, special events, meetings with politicians, community activities and other achievements.

4. Current and future goals.

5. Strengths and weaknesses of the organization – content that critiques the actions or philosophy of the organization.

6. Policies/Procedures/Strategies – content that discusses the policies and procedures used by the organization. May include organizing strategies, organizational procedures and policies.

7. Recruitment and mobilization of the organization – content that includes discussion of recruiting members/gaining new partners, training leaders, and mobilizing members for social action.

8. Multicultural issues – content that includes discussion of various races/ethnicities/religions working together on issues.

9. Fundraising/special events – any content that covers fundraising events such as grant writing, fundraising events and special events that may include public rallies or forums.

10. Priority issues – content that identifies the issues that MOSES members have been dedicated to addressing.

11. Leadership – any content that described the role of leaders or leadership

12. Collaborations/partnerships – content that discussed partnerships MOSES has built with non-member organizations in the metro area as well as within the state of Michigan.

APPENDIX B

MOSES Observation Guide

<u>Groups/Networks Dimension</u>

1. Partners of MOSES, who does MOSES know/have relationships with in the community?

2. What kinds of funding/fundraising activities does MOSES engage in?

3. Composition – who attends meetings (demographics, characteristics)

4. Leadership – who are the primary leaders, what kind of leadership strategies are used?

5. Norms, rules, guidelines – are there rituals/practices at meetings/events? What is expected of members at meetings/functions?

6. Structure of meetings/events – how things happen.

<u>Trust/Solidarity Dimensions</u>

1. Are members helpful to one another?

2. Is there a sharing of ideas/thoughts?

3. Are there any rituals/practice aimed at bringing members together (ex. prayer, chanting, cheers)?

4. What are the general attitudes towards others outside of MOSES (trust towards outside entities?)

5. Do members seem to know personal information about one another (i.e. family members' names, personal accomplishments/problems, job issues)?

6. Physical interaction such as hugging, touching, eye contact?

7. Any discussion regarding sharing a group identity? References to "we"?

8. What does clergy interaction look like? Board interaction?

9. How are new members welcomed? How do they gain the trust of the other members?

Collective Action Dimension

1. What does the level of participation by members look like?

2. What is the level of motivation/interest in the organization/issues?

3. How many and what kinds of actions/events does the organization have planned?

4. Commitments made by members, follow-through on responsibilities and commitments.

5. Strategies/methods the leaders are using to mobilize the organization.

6. Clergy and church mobilization – any indication this is happening/how is it happening?

7. Are there partnerships with other organizations, businesses or public officials?

Information and Communication Dimension

1. Any discussions or behaviors that exhibit an understanding of issues and the political system?

2. How do organization leaders reach consensus on issues?

3. Are differences between members discussed?

4. Any attempts made to understand viewpoints/cultures of others in the organization?

5. Things related to training/leadership development.

Social Cohesion and Inclusion Dimensions

1. Do members get along? Do they demonstrate friendliness/positive attitudes towards one another?

2. Are there significant differences in viewpoints/opinions?

3. Any conflict within the organization (blatant or subtle)? Among members or among leadership?

4. Any aggressive behaviors in the organization?

5. Conflict related to differences (race, gender, religion, etc.) in the organization?

6. Are all members encouraged to participate in organization activities? How?

7. Is anyone of the members excluded from participating? If yes, why? What kind of activities?

8. Are all members' ideas being heard/acknowledged?

9. Are there certain types of people/churches/organizations that are excluded from membership? Which ones? If so, what is the reason?

10. Is diversity in membership sought? Attempts to diversify?

Empowerment and Political Action Dimension

1. Do strategies/tactics discussed in the organization seem realistic/reasonable?

2. Do members express confidence about the work the organization is doing?

3. Is there a general belief in the organization that they will be heard by politicians/those in power?

4. What kinds of actions planned? Are plans carried through?

5. What kinds of attitudes do members have about change?

APPENDIX C

MOSES Interview Guide

Questions for MOSES Taskforce Members

1. Tell me a little bit about the church/organization you are affiliated with and how you came to be involved with MOSES.

2. Tell me about the taskforce(s) you belong to, how long you have been involved and your role in the taskforce. What made you select this/these taskforce(s)?

3. Please describe your experiences when first joining the taskforce. *(Probes: Did you feel welcomed from the beginning? Did you feel a sense of acceptance or belonging immediately or over time? Was there a formal orientation to the organization? What are your most significant memories from when you first became involved?)*

4. Describe your current working relationships with members of your taskforce now. *(Probe: Do you trust your taskforce colleagues? Do you have expectations of your taskforce colleagues? Do you feel close to them? If so, how?)*

5. Tell me about how you have formed relationships with members of your taskforce and other members of MOSES you have worked with.

6. Do you think your taskforce members feel a sense of solidarity within the group? In your opinion, what is this solidarity based on (ex: race, faith, gender, agreement on issue, etc.)? Give me an example of a time when you felt a sense of solidarity within your group (event, meeting, action etc.).

7. Describe what the communication and sharing of information is like within your taskforce. *(Probe: Do you feel like you are "in the loop" with what is going on? Do you feel that you are able to share your knowledge and viewpoints? Do you feel knowledgeable about the issues you are addressing and how to address them?)*

8. How would you describe your taskforce members in terms of diversity? Are people in the group similar or different? In what ways are members similar or different?

9. How do these similarities (or differences) affect the taskforce? (Probe: Is there tension in group? Is there an increased understanding of others in the group?)

10. Are differences (such as race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, or gender) among group members ever discussed in your taskforce? If yes, give me some examples of what was discussed and how it was discussed. If no, do you feel differences should be discussed? Why or why not?

11. Could you please tell me about how MOSES promotes learning about and understanding members' races, ethnicities, religions, area of residence and other personal characteristics? *(Probe: Are there cultural seminars/trainings? Special meetings/discussions?)*

12. In your opinion, what do you think brings people together within MOSES? *(Probe: Faith? Issues? Strategies used (rallies, actions, special events).* What do you think divides people within MOSES?

13. Explain how you feel about your ability to facilitate social change? Give me an example of a particular time when you felt like the work you are doing with MOSES was making change happen in the community. Prior to joining MOSES, did you feel that you could impact your community this way?

14. Describe how you feel about inclusion within MOSES. Specifically, do you think it is a good idea for MOSES to solicit membership from congregations representing other religions, races, and ethnicities not currently participating? Why/why not? How do you think this would affect MOSES' effectiveness?

<u>Questions for MOSES Clergy Members</u>

1. Tell me a little bit about the church/organization you are affiliated with and how you came to be involved with MOSES *(Probe: describe the recruitment process)*.

2. Tell me about the issues that are most important to you and your congregation. Why these issues? What is your/the congregation's interest in these issues?

3. Please describe your experiences when first joining MOSES as a clergy member. *(Probe: Did you feel welcomed from the beginning? Did you feel a sense of acceptance or belonging immediately or over time? Was there an orientation process? What are your most significant memories from when you first became involved?)*

4. Describe your current working relationships with members of the clergy within MOSES. *(Probe: Do you trust your colleagues? Do you have expectations of your colleagues? Do you feel close to them? If so, how?)*

5. Tell me about how you have formed relationships with other members of MOSES you have worked with (particularly other clergy members).

6. Do you think clergy members feel a sense of solidarity within the organization? In your opinion, what is this solidarity based on (ex: race, faith, gender, agreement on issue, etc.)? Give me an example of a time when you felt a sense of solidarity within the caucus (event, meeting, action etc.).

7. Describe what the communication and sharing of information is like among clergy members. *(Probe: Do you feel like you are "in the loop" with what is going on? Do you feel that you are able to share your knowledge and viewpoints? Do you feel knowledgeable about the issues you are addressing and how to address them?)*

8. How would you describe clergy members within MOSES in terms of diversity? Are clergy members similar or different? In what ways are members similar or different?

9. How do these similarities (or differences) affect meetings, actions and/or the clergy caucus and decisions made by clergy members? (Probe: Is there tension in group? Is there an increased understanding of others in the group?)

10. Are differences (such as race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, or gender) among clergy members ever discussed? If yes, give me some examples of what was discussed and how it was discussed. If no, do you feel differences should be discussed? Why or why not? Are these discussed in the clergy caucus or at other meetings?

11. Give me some examples of how MOSES promotes learning about and understanding members' races, ethnicities, religions, area of residence and other personal characteristics. *(Probe: Are there cultural seminars/trainings? Special meetings/discussions?)*

12. In your opinion, what do you think brings people together within MOSES? *(Probe: Faith? Issues? Strategies used (rallies, actions, special events).* What do you think divides people within MOSES?

13. Explain how you feel about your ability to facilitate social change? Give me an example of a particular incident when you felt like the work you are doing

with MOSES was making change happen in the community. Prior to joining MOSES, did you feel that you could impact your community this way?

14. Describe how you feel about inclusion within MOSES. Specifically, do you think it is a good idea for MOSES to solicit membership from congregations representing other religions, races, and ethnicities not currently participating? Why/why not? How do you think this would affect MOSES' effectiveness?

Questions should be approached in general terms, but also inquire about the role of the clergy caucus. Do they attend? What is the purpose and how does this affect relationship building among clergy?

Questions for MOSES Board Members

1. Explain your primary role and responsibilities within the organization.

2. Tell me a little bit about the church/organization you are affiliated with and how you came to be involved with MOSES *(Probe: describe the recruitment process)*.

3. Tell me about the issues that are most important to you and your congregation. Why these issues? What is your/the congregation's interest in these issues?

4. Please describe your experiences when first joining MOSES. *(Probe: Did you feel welcomed from the beginning? Did you feel a sense of acceptance or belonging immediately or over time? Was there an orientation process? What are your most significant memories from when you first became involved?)*

5. Describe your current working relationships with the other board members. *(Probe: Do you trust your colleagues? Do you have expectations of your colleagues? Do you feel close to them? If so, how?)*

6. How long has the current board membership been in place?

7. Tell me about how you have formed relationships with the other board members in MOSES.

8. Do you think board members feel a sense of solidarity within the organization? In your opinion, what is this solidarity based on (ex: race, faith, gender, agreement on issue, etc.)? Give me an example of a time when you felt a sense of solidarity within the board. Within the organization as a whole (event, meeting, action etc.).

9. Describe what the communication and sharing of information is like among board members. *(Probe: Do you feel like you are "in the loop" with what is going on? Do you feel that you are able to share your knowledge and viewpoints? Do you feel knowledgeable about the issues you are addressing and how to address them?)*

10. How would you describe board members within MOSES in terms of diversity? Are board members similar or different? In what ways are members similar or different?

11. How would you describe the organization in terms of diversity? Are members in general similar or different? In what ways are members similar or different?

12. How do these similarities (or differences) affect the board and the organization? (Probe: Is there tension in group? Is there an increased understanding of others in the group?)

13. Are differences (such as race, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, or gender) among board members ever discussed? What about among the general membership? If yes, give me some examples of what was discussed and how it was discussed. If no, do you feel differences should be discussed? Why or why not? Are these discussed in the clergy caucus or at other meetings?

14. Give me some examples of how MOSES promotes learning about and understanding members' races, ethnicities, religions, area of residence and other personal characteristics. *(Probe: Are there cultural seminars/trainings? Special meetings/discussions?)*

15. In your opinion, what do you think brings people together within MOSES? *(Probe: Faith? Issues? Strategies used (rallies, actions, special events).* What do you think divides people within MOSES?

16. Explain how you feel about your ability to facilitate social change? Give me an example of a particular incident when you felt like the work you are doing with MOSES was making change happen in the community. Prior to joining MOSES, did you feel that you could impact your community this way?

17. Describe how you feel about inclusion within MOSES. Specifically, do you think it is a good idea for MOSES to solicit membership from congregations representing other religions, races, and ethnicities not currently

participating? Why/why not? How do you think this would affect MOSES'
effectiveness?

APPENDIX D

Interview Consent Form

[Behavioral] Research Informed Consent

Title of Study: *Bridging Social Capital Formation in Faith-Based Organizations*

Principal Investigator (PI):   Angela Kaiser, MSW, PhD Candidate

School of Social Work

4756 Cass Avenue

Detroit, MI 48202

313-577-5254

Purpose

You are being asked to participate in a research study on building relationships within Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength (MOSES), a multicultural, multi-faith organization. You were identified as someone who is actively involved with the organization and who may have knowledge about and experience with working with other members within the organization. This study is being conducted by a researcher from Wayne State University and will be taking place at the location of your choice. The estimated number of study participants to be involved is approximately 20. **Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.**

In this research study, I will be gathering pertinent information about MOSES in order to have a more thorough understanding of how relationships are

formed and sustained between people of different races, ethnicities, cultures, and faith traditions within the organization. This information will allow me to gain a better understanding about the processes involved in bridging racial, ethnic, and religious gaps in order to assist MOSES with improving their ability to increase understanding and build solidarity within the organization.

Study Procedures

If you agree to take part in this research study, you will be asked to participate in one 60-to-90 minute in-person interview led by a researcher from the School of Social Work at Wayne State University. With your consent, the interview will be audio recorded in order to accurately capture your responses and the interview will take place at the MOSES office, your congregational office, or at the School of Social Work, whichever is most convenient for you.

The questions included in the interview will address your role within the organization, your personal experiences as a member of the organization, your working relationships with other members, your perceptions of solidarity, trust, and communication, and your experiences with the organization addressing issues related to diversity.

You have the right to refuse the audio recording of your responses, the right to refuse to answer any of the questions presented to you as well as the right to end the interview at any time. Your name or organization will not be associated with the audio recording and once the recordings are transcribed, the tapes will be destroyed.

Benefits

As a participant in this research study, there is no direct benefit to you; however, information from this study might help me to develop an understanding about effective strategies for faith-based multicultural coalition building. This may be beneficial to MOSES and other community organizations as well as the people for whom they advocate.

Risks

There are no known risks at this time to participation in this study.

Study Costs

Participation in this study will be of no cost to you.

Compensation

You will not be paid for taking part in this study.

Confidentiality

All information collected about you during the course of this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. You will be identified in the research records by a code name or number. Information that identifies you personally will not be released without your written permission. However, the study sponsor, the Human Investigation Committee (HIC) at Wayne State University, or federal agencies with appropriate regulatory oversight [e.g., Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), Office of Civil Rights (OCR), etc.) may review your records.

When the results of this research are published or discussed in conferences, no information will be included that would reveal your identity.

The audio recordings of the interviews will only be handled by the principal investigator and a professional transcriptionist and will be erased after they are transcribed into a word processing document. You have the right to review and/or edit the audio recordings at any time before they are destroyed. You will have one month from the date of your interview to contact the principal investigator to request a review or edits. Your name will not be associated with the audio recordings or the typed document containing the responses.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. You are free to only answer questions that you want to answer. You are free to withdraw from participation in this study at any time. Your decisions will not change any present or future relationship with Wayne State University or its affiliates, or other services you are entitled to receive.

The Principal Investigator may stop your participation in this study without your consent. The Principal Investigator will make the decision and let you know if it is not possible for you to continue. The decision that is made is to protect your health and safety, or because you did not follow the instructions to take part in the study.

Questions

If you have any questions about this study now or in the future, you may contact Angela Kaiser, Principal Investigator, at 313-577-5254 or her advisor, Dr. Anna Santiago, at 313-577-8806. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Human Investigation Committee can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call (313) 577-1628 to ask questions or voice concerns or complaints.

APPENDIX E

Survey Information Sheet

Bridging Social Capital Formation in Faith-Based Organizations

Principal Investigator (PI): Angela Kaiser

Wayne State University

School of Social Work

313-577-5254

Ah3477@wayne.edu

Purpose:

You are being asked to complete a 30 minute web-based survey as part of a research study about building and sustaining relationships within a multicultural, multi-faith organization because you are a board member, clergy member, staff member, congregation representative, core leader or taskforce member with Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength (MOSES). This study is being conducted at MOSES and member congregations/organizations, in conjunction with Wayne State University.

Study Procedures:

By checking the agreement box below and beginning the survey, you will be giving your permission for the researcher to use your survey responses in her study. Your personal information such as your name or affiliated church/organization will not be associated with your survey responses and all responses will be kept confidential. You may refuse to answer a question at any

time during the survey and your refusal to answer will not disqualify the rest of your responses. At the end of the survey, you will be asked if you would like to participate in an in-person, 60-to-90 minute interview with the researcher in regards to your personal experiences as a member of MOSES. If you would like to participate in the interview, you will be asked to provide your email address so that the researcher may contact you to schedule an interview at a time and location that is most convenient for you.

Benefits:

- As a participant in this research study, there will be no direct benefit to you; however, information from this survey may benefit MOSES in developing more effective strategies for building relationships among members.

Risks:

- There are no known risks at this time to participating in this survey.

Costs:

- There will be no costs to you for completing the survey.

Compensation:

- You will not be paid for completing this survey.

Confidentiality:

- Only key personnel working on the research project will have access to survey responses and these responses are completely confidential. Your personal information will not be linked to survey responses.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:

Taking part in this survey is voluntary. You may choose not to take part in this study, or if you decide to take part, you can change your mind later and withdraw from the study. You may refuse to answer any of the questions and may withdraw from the study at any time. Your decision will not change any present or future relationships that you have with MOSES, Wayne State University or its affiliates.

Questions:

If you have any questions about the survey or about the larger research study now or in the future, you may contact me, Angela Kaiser, at 313-577-5254 or my advisor, Anna Santiago, at 313-577-8806. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Human Investigation Committee can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call (313) 577-1628 to ask questions or voice concerns or complaints.

Participation:

By selecting the agreement box and completing the survey, you will be consenting to having your responses recorded. If you agree to participate in an interview, you will be contacted at a later time and asked to sign a separate consent form in-person.

___ I agree to the terms and conditions described above and wish to participate in the survey at this time.

___ I do not wish to participate.

APPENDIX F

MOSES Member Survey 2009

In this first section, you will be asked questions about the nature and level of your involvement with MOSES.

1. How long have you been a member of MOSES?
   - ☐ Less than one year
   - ☐ 1 to 2 years
   - ☐ 3 to 4 years
   - ☐ 5 to 6 years
   - ☐ 7 to 8 years
   - ☐ 9 years or more

2. What was your *primary reason* for joining MOSES? *(Select one response)*
   - ☐ I personally care about a particular issue they are addressing
   - ☐ The organization benefits the community
   - ☐ There are personal benefits to me for being a member
   - ☐ Religious/spiritual reasons
   - ☐ To become a leader in the community
   - ☐ To help my congregation grow/improve
   - ☐ I was asked by my congregation/organization leader to get involved
   - ☐ Other, specify: _____

3. What is the *main benefit* for you being a member of MOSES? *(Select one response)*
   - ☐ It develops/improves my leadership skills
   - ☐ It improves my access to resources (tangible or intangible)
   - ☐ Spiritual growth
   - ☐ It raises my social status
   - ☐ It improves the reputation of my congregation
   - ☐ Enjoyment
   - ☐ Other, specify: _____

4. Thinking about the members of MOSES, are *most* members of the same…*(Select one response for each item listed below)*

Geographic area	Yes	No	DK
Race/ethnicity	Yes	No	DK
Religion	Yes	No	DK
Denomination	Yes	No	DK
Gender	Yes	No	DK
Age	Yes	No	DK
Socioeconomic status	Yes	No	DK
Political views/party affiliation	Yes	No	DK

5. Since you have been a member of MOSES, has membership in the organization declined, remained the same, or increased?

☐ Declined
☐ Remained the same
☐ Increased
☐ Don't know

6. Overall, how effective is the organization's leadership?

☐ Very effective
☐ Somewhat effective
☐ Neither effective nor ineffective
☐ Somewhat ineffective
☐ Very ineffective

7. What is your *primary role* as a member of MOSES? *(Select **one** response)*

☐ Taskforce member
☐ Staff/Intern
☐ Clergy and/or church representative/congregation leader
☐ Board member
☐ Secular organization leader
☐ Other, specify: _____

8. In what other roles do you serve as a member of MOSES? *(Select **all** that apply)*

☐ Taskforce member
☐ Staff/Intern
☐ Clergy and/or church representative/congregation leader
☐ Board member
☐ Secular organization leader
☐ Other, specify: _____
☐ No other roles

*If your only level of involvement with MOSES is through participation with an issue taskforce, please skip to question 41 on page 8.

*If you serve as a staff member, intern, clergy member/congregation leader, organization leader or board member, please continue to question 9.

In this next section, you will be presented with questions about your perspective on trust and solidarity within MOSES as a whole organization.

9. In general, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Most members of MOSES can be trusted.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

In MOSES, one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Most members of MOSES are willing to help if you need it.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Next are some questions to assess how much you trust different types of people within MOSES. To what extent do you trust:

Very small Extent	Small extent	Neither small/great extent	Great extent	Very great extent

People from your ethnic/racial group

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from your religion/denomination

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from other ethnic/racial groups

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from other religions/denominations

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from a different geographical location *(ex. city or suburbs)*

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11. Since you have been a member of MOSES, do you think that the level of trust among members in the organization has gotten better, worse, or stayed about the same?

☐ Gotten better
☐ Gotten worse
☐ Stayed about the same
☐ Don't know

12. Since you have been a member of MOSES, do you think that the level of trust among members of larger   society has gotten better, worse, or stayed about the same?

    ☐ Gotten better
    ☐ Gotten worse
    ☐ Stayed about the same
    ☐ Don't know

13. Do you feel you share a common identity with other MOSES members?

    Yes *(go to question 14)*   No *(go to question 15)*

14. What is this identity *primarily* based on? *(Select **one** response)*

    ☐ Race/ethnicity
    ☐ Religion/Spirituality/Faith
    ☐ Gender
    ☐ Political views
    ☐ Vision/goals for the community/region
    ☐ Socioeconomic status
    ☐ Passion for social change
    ☐ Other, specify: _____

15. To what extent is MOSES effective at organizing members for collective activities such as rallies, fundraisers, and other larger scale events?

    ☐ Very effective
    ☐ Somewhat effective
    ☐ Neither effective nor ineffective
    ☐ Somewhat ineffective
    ☐ Very ineffective
    ☐ Don't know

16. From your perspective, what proportion of MOSES' total membership dedicates time and resources on a regular basis?

    ☐ Everyone
    ☐ More than half
    ☐ About half
    ☐ Less than half
    ☐ No one
    ☐ Don't know

In this section, you will be asked questions about the information and quality of communication you receive from MOSES as a whole organization.

17. Of the sources that provide you with information about local politics and government activities, which source provides you with the *most useful* information? *(Select __one__ response)*

    ☐ Relatives, friends and neighbors
    ☐ MOSES
    ☐ Church/Spiritual meeting
    ☐ Local newspaper(s)
    ☐ National newspaper(s)
    ☐ Radio
    ☐ Television
    ☐ Internet
    ☐ An organization other than MOSES
    ☐ Other, specify: _____

18. Of the sources that provide you with information about local politics and government activities, which source provides you with the *second most useful* information? *(Select __one__ response)*

    ☐ Relatives, friends and neighbors
    ☐ MOSES
    ☐ Church/Spiritual meeting
    ☐ Local newspaper(s)
    ☐ National newspaper(s)
    ☐ Radio
    ☐ Television
    ☐ Internet
    ☐ An organization other than MOSES
    ☐ Other, specify: _____

19. Of the sources that provide you with information about local politics and government activities, which source provides you with the *third most useful* information? *(Select __one__ response)*

    ☐ Relatives, friends and neighbors
    ☐ MOSES
    ☐ Church/Spiritual meeting
    ☐ Local newspaper(s)
    ☐ National newspaper(s)
    ☐ Radio
    ☐ Television
    ☐ Internet
    ☐ An organization other than MOSES
    ☐ Other, specify: _____

20. To what extent has being active with MOSES given you a better understanding of the political system in the state of Michigan?

    ☐ To a very small extent
    ☐ To a small extent
    ☐ Neither small nor great extent
    ☐ To a great extent
    ☐ To a very great extent

21. To what extent has being active with MOSES given you a better understanding of the political system in metro Detroit?

☐ To a very small extent
☐ To a small extent
☐ Neither small nor great extent
☐ To a great extent
☐ To a very great extent

22. To what extent do you feel MOSES has provided you with the skills and training necessary to be an effective community leader?

☐ To a very small extent
☐ To a small extent
☐ Neither small nor great extent
☐ To a great extent
☐ To a very great extent

23. How consistent is communication (email, mail, phone, etc.) regarding meetings and other events within MOSES?

☐ Very consistent
☐ Somewhat consistent
☐ Somewhat inconsistent
☐ Very inconsistent

24. How helpful is MOSES' website in keeping you up-to-date with important issues, upcoming events, important membership information, and things going on in the region?

☐ Very helpful
☐ Somewhat helpful
☐ No opinion either way
☐ Not very helpful
☐ Not helpful at all

In this section you will be asked about how MOSES members interact and relate to one another within the organization as a whole.

25. How strong is the feeling of togetherness or closeness among the membership within MOSES?

☐ Very distant
☐ Somewhat distant
☐ Neither distant nor close
☐ Somewhat close
☐ Very close
☐ Don't know

26. How diverse is the membership of MOSES?

□ Very diverse
□ Somewhat diverse
□ Not very diverse
□ Not at all diverse

27. For each of the following, please indicate whether or not each of the differences listed below cause problems or difficulties *within MOSES*:

Major Problem	**Minor Problem**	**Not a Problem**	**Don't Know**

Differences in race/ethnicity

□	□	□	□

Differences in socioeconomic status

□	□	□	□

Differences in political beliefs

□	□	□	□

Differences in gender

□	□	□	□

Differences in religion/religious denomination

□	□	□	□

Differences in location of residence (city vs. suburbs)

□	□	□	□

Other

□	□	□	□

Specify other: _____

28. Have any of these problems ever resulted in heated disagreements between members?

□ Yes *(go to question 29)*   □ No *(skip to question 30)*

29. Which differences led to heated disagreements?_____
_____
_____

30. Have you ever felt excluded from discussions or activities taking place *within MOSES*?

□ Yes *(go to question 31)*   □ No *(skip to question 32)*

31. What made you feel excluded? *(Briefly explain situation)*

      _____
      _____
      _____

In this next section you will be asked questions about how MOSES as an organization has affected your participation in political and community activities.

32. In general, how satisfied are you with **MOSES** as an organization?

      ☐ Very satisfied
      ☐ Moderately satisfied
      ☐ Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied
      ☐ Moderately unsatisfied
      ☐ Very unsatisfied

33. How much control do you feel you have in making decisions that affect your everyday activities as a result of working with MOSES? Do you have…

      ☐ No control
      ☐ Control over very few decisions
      ☐ Control over some decisions
      ☐ Control over most decisions
      ☐ Control over all decisions

34. Does being involved with MOSES make you feel like you have the power to make important decisions that may change the course of your life?

      ☐ Totally unable to change life
      ☐ Mostly unable to change life
      ☐ Neither able nor unable
      ☐ Mostly able to change life
      ☐ Totally able to change life

35. Overall, how much impact do you think MOSES will have on making your region a better place to live?

      ☐ A big impact
      ☐ A small impact
      ☐ No impact

36. Did you vote in the last local (city/county/state) political election?

      ☐ Yes   ☐ No

37. Did you vote in the last presidential election?

      ☐ Yes   ☐ No

38. Have you ever voted for a candidate who was not from your racial/ethnic group?

      ☐ Yes   ☐ No

39. To what extent do local government and local leaders take into account concerns voiced by you and people like you when they make decisions that affect you?

    ☐ A lot
    ☐ A little
    ☐ Not at all

40. Are you currently a member of any taskforces at MOSES?

    ☐ Yes   *(go to question 41)*   ☐ No *(go to page 14, question 76)*

In this next section you will be asked questions about your involvement with taskforces at MOSES.

41. In which taskforce(s) are you currently a member? *(Select all that apply)*

    ☐ Transportation
    ☐ Healthcare
    ☐ Civil Rights and Immigration
    ☐ Safe Zones
    ☐ Land Bank
    ☐ Detroit Supermarkets
    ☐ Other, specify: _____

42. In which taskforce are you ***most active***? *(Select **one** response)*

    ☐ Transportation
    ☐ Healthcare
    ☐ Civil Rights and Immigration
    ☐ Education
    ☐ Land Bank
    ☐ Detroit Supermarkets
    ☐ Other, specify: _____

*If you are a member of more than one taskforce at MOSES, please answer the following questions in regards to the taskforce in which you are **most active**, referred to here as your **primary** taskforce.*

43. How long have you been a member of your primary taskforce?

    ☐ Less than 1 year
    ☐ 1 to 2 years
    ☐ 3 to 4 years
    ☐ 5 to 6 years
    ☐ 7 to 8 years
    ☐ 9 or more years

44. On average, how many hours per month do you spend on activities related to this taskforce (including meetings)?

- ☐ 1 to 2 hours
- ☐ 3 to 4 hours
- ☐ 5 to 6 hours
- ☐ 7 to 8 hours
- ☐ 9 to 10 hours
- ☐ 11 to 15 hours
- ☐ 16 to 20 hours
- ☐ 21-25 hours
- ☐ If over 25 hours, please specify: _____ hours

45. What was your ***primary reason*** for joining this taskforce? *(Select **one** response)*

- ☐ I personally care about the issue
- ☐ It benefits the community
- ☐ There are personal benefits to me for being a member
- ☐ Religious/spiritual reasons
- ☐ To become a leader in the community
- ☐ To help my congregation grow/improve
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

46. What is the ***main benefit*** for you being a member of this taskforce? *(Select **one** response)*

- ☐ It develops/improves leadership skills
- ☐ It improves my access to resources (these may be tangible or intangible)
- ☐ Spiritual growth
- ☐ It raises my social status
- ☐ It improves the reputation of my congregation
- ☐ Enjoyment
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

47. Thinking about the taskforce, are ***most*** members of the same…
    *(Select **one** response for each item listed below)*

Geographic area	Yes	No	DK
Race/ethnicity	Yes	No	DK
Religion	Yes	No	DK
Denomination	Yes	No	DK
Gender	Yes	No	DK
Age	Yes	No	DK
Socioeconomic Status	Yes	No	DK
Political views/party affiliation	Yes	No	DK

48. Since you have been a member of the taskforce, has membership in the group declined, remained the same, or increased?

- ☐ Declined
- ☐ Remained the same
- ☐ Increased
- ☐ Don't know

49. In your opinion, how effective is the taskforce's leadership?

- ☐ Very effective
- ☐ Somewhat effective
- ☐ Neither effective nor ineffective
- ☐ Somewhat ineffective
- ☐ Very ineffective
- ☐ Don't know

50. Does the taskforce work or interact with other taskforces within MOSES?

- ☐ No   *(skip to question 52)*
- ☐ Yes, occasionally   *(go to question 51)*
- ☐ Yes, frequently   *(go to question 51)*
- ☐ Don't know   *(skip to question 52)*

51. If yes, which taskforces?

1 _____
2 _____
3 _____

52. Does the taskforce work or interact with other groups/organizations outside of MOSES that have *similar goals*?

- ☐ No   *(skip to question 54)*
- ☐ Yes, occasionally   *(go to question 53)*
- ☐ Yes, frequently   *(go to question 53)*
- ☐ Don't know   *(skip to question 54)*

53. If yes, which groups or organizations?

1 _____
2 _____
3 _____

54. Does the taskforce work or interact with other groups/organizations outside of MOSES that have *different goals*?

- ☐ No   *(skip to question 56)*
- ☐ Yes, occasionally   *(go to question 55)*
- ☐ Yes, frequently   *(go to question 55)*
- ☐ Don't know   *(skip to question 56)*

55. If yes, which groups or organizations?

1 _____
2 _____
3 _____

In this section you will be asked questions about your perspective on trust and solidarity within your primary taskforce.

56. In general, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Neither agree/disagree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Most members of the taskforce can be trusted.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

In the taskforce, one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Most members of the taskforce are willing to help if you need it.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Next are some questions to assess how much you trust different types of people within your primary taskforce.

57. To what extent do you trust:

Very small extent	**Small extent**	**Neither small/great**	**Great extent**	**Very great extent**

People from your ethnic/racial group

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from your religion/denomination

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from other ethnic/racial groups

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from other religions/denominations

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

People from a different geographical location *(ex. city or suburbs)*

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

58. Since you have been a member of MOSES, do you think that the level of trust among members of the taskforce has gotten better, worse, or stayed about the same?

- ☐ Gotten better
- ☐ Gotten worse
- ☐ Stayed about the same
- ☐ Don't know

59. How close do you feel to members of your taskforce?

- ☐ Very close
- ☐ Somewhat close
- ☐ Neither close nor distant
- ☐ Somewhat distant
- ☐ Very distant
- ☐ Don't know

60. How well do you feel you know members on your taskforce?

- ☐ Very well
- ☐ Somewhat well
- ☐ Not at all

61. Do you feel you share a common identity with your fellow taskforce members?

☐ Yes *(go to question 62)*   ☐ No *(skip to question 64)*

62. What is this identity based on? *(Select **all** that apply)*

- ☐ Race/ethnicity
- ☐ Religion/Spirituality/Faith
- ☐ Gender
- ☐ Political views
- ☐ Vision/goals for the community/region
- ☐ Socioeconomic status
- ☐ Passion for social change
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

63. Which of these identities do you feel is the most important? *(Select **one** response)*

- ☐ Race/ethnicity
- ☐ Religion/Spirituality/Faith
- ☐ Gender
- ☐ Political views
- ☐ Vision/goals for the community/region
- ☐ Socioeconomic status
- ☐ Passion for social change
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

In this next section you will be asked questions about group effort within your primary taskforce.

64. List *three major activities* your taskforce participated in within the past year:

1 _____
2 _____
3 _____

65. What proportion of the people in your primary taskforce dedicate time and other resources on a regular basis?

- ☐ Everyone
- ☐ More than half
- ☐ About half
- ☐ Less than half
- ☐ No one
- ☐ Don't know

In this section you will be asked questions about the information and quality of communication you receive from your primary taskforce.

66. Do you feel that being active in your primary taskforce has given you a better understanding of the issue being addressed?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

67. How consistent is communication (email, phone, etc.) regarding meetings and other events within your primary taskforce?

- ☐ Very consistent
- ☐ Somewhat consistent
- ☐ Somewhat inconsistent
- ☐ Very inconsistent

In this section you will be asked about how members interact and relate to one another within your primary taskforce.

68. How strong is the feeling of togetherness or closeness within your primary taskforce?

- ☐ Very distant
- ☐ Somewhat distant
- ☐ Neither distant nor close
- ☐ Somewhat close
- ☐ Very close
- ☐ Don't know

69. How diverse is the membership of your primary taskforce?

- ☐ Very diverse
- ☐ Somewhat diverse
- ☐ Not very diverse
- ☐ Not at all diverse
- ☐ Don't know

70. For each of the following, please indicate whether or not each of the differences listed below cause problems or difficulties within the taskforce you are most active:

	Major Problem	Minor Problem	Not a Problem	Don't Know
Differences in race/ethnicity	☐	☐	☐	☐
Differences in socioeconomic status	☐	☐	☐	☐
Differences in political beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Differences in gender	☐	☐	☐	☐
Differences in religion/religious beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Differences in location of residence (city/suburbs)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐

Specify other: _____

71. Have these problems ever resulted in heated disagreements among taskforce members?

☐ Yes ☐ No

72. Have you ever felt excluded from discussions or activities taking place **within your primary taskforce**?

☐ Yes *(Go to question 73)* ☐ No *(Skip to question 74)*

73. What made you feel excluded *(briefly explain situation)*

_____
_____
_____

In this next section, you will be asked questions about how involvement in your primary taskforce has affected your participation in political and community activities.

74. In general, how satisfied are you with the taskforce in which you are most active?

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Moderately satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied
- ☐ Moderately unsatisfied
- ☐ Very unsatisfied

75. Since you have been a member of your primary taskforce, how many actions has your group been a part of aimed at petitioning local government officials or political leaders for something benefiting the community?

- ☐ None
- ☐ 1 to 2
- ☐ 3 to 5
- ☐ 6 or more

76. Are you a clergy member or congregation leader?

☐ Yes *(Go to question 77)*   ☐ No *(Skip to page 19, question 102)*

The following questions address your level of involvement with MOSES as a clergy member or congregation leader.

77. As a clergy member or church representative, how much time per month do you spend on MOSES related activities?

- ☐ 5 hours or
- ☐ 6-9 hours
- ☐ 10-14 hours
- ☐ 15-19 hours
- ☐ 20 hours or more

78. Approximately what percentage of clergy caucus meetings did you attend in 2008?

- ☐ Less than 25 percent
- ☐ 25 to 49 percent
- ☐ 50 to 74 percent
- ☐ 75 to 99 percent
- ☐ 100 percent
- ☐ None

79. Which of the following issues is the *most important* to your congregation? *(Select __one__ response)*

- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Civil rights and immigration
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Supermarkets in Detroit
- ☐ Land usage
- ☐ Health care
- ☐ Other, please specify: _____

In this section you will be asked questions about your perspective on trust and solidarity among clergy members/congregation leaders within MOSES.

80. In general, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Neither agree/disagree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**

Most congregation leaders who belong to MOSES can be trusted.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Most congregation leaders within MOSES are willing to help if you need it.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Next are some questions to assess how much you trust different types of people within MOSES who are clergy members/congregation leaders.

81. To what extent do you trust:

Very small extent	**Small extent**	**Neither small/great extent**	**Great extent**	**Very great extent**

Clergy members/Congregation leaders from your ethnic/racial group

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Clergy members/Congregation leaders from your religion/denomination

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Clergy members/Congregation leaders from other ethnic/racial groups

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Clergy members/Congregation leaders from other religions/denominations

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Clergy members/Congregation leaders from a different geographical location *(ex. city or suburbs)*

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

82. How close do you feel to other clergy members/congregation leaders within MOSES?

☐ Very close
☐ Somewhat close
☐ Neither close nor distant
☐ Somewhat distant
☐ Very distant

83. How well do you feel you know other clergy members/congregation leaders within MOSES?

    □ Very well
    □ Somewhat well
    □ Not at all

84. Do you feel you share a common identity with other congregation leaders within MOSES?

    □ Yes   *(Go to question 85)*   □ No   *(Skip to question 87)*

85. What is this identity *primarily* based on? *(Select all that apply)*

    □ Race/ethnicity
    □ Religion/Spirituality/Faith
    □ Gender
    □ Political views
    □ Vision/goals for the community/region
    □ Socioeconomic status
    □ Passion for social change
    □ Other, specify: _____

86. Which of these identities do you feel is the most important? *(Select __one__ response)*

    □ Race/ethnicity
    □ Religion/Spirituality/Faith
    □ Gender
    □ Political views
    □ Vision/goals for the community/region
    □ Socioeconomic status
    □ Passion for social change
    □ Other, specify: _____

In this section you will be asked about MOSES-related group efforts within your congregation.

87. List three major MOSES-related activities in which your congregation participated:

    1 _____
    2 _____
    3 _____

88. Approximately, what percent of members from your congregation participate in MOSES activities on at least a monthly basis?

    □ Less than 10 percent
    □ 11 to 24 percent
    □ 25 to 49 percent
    □ 50 to 74 percent
    □ 75 percent or more
    □ None
    □ Don't know

89. What strategies do you use as a church leader to get congregation members to participate with MOSES? *(Select **all** that apply)*

    ☐ Discuss MOSES at Sunday services
    ☐ Include MOSES activities in church bulletin/website
    ☐ Approach congregation members individually to ask them to get involved
    ☐ Other, please specify: _____

90. What do you think prevents your congregation members from participating with MOSES? *(Select **all** that apply)*

    ☐ Lack of time
    ☐ Lack of financial resources
    ☐ Lack of interest in the issues MOSES addresses
    ☐ Members feel they cannot make a difference (disempowered)
    ☐ Other, please specify: _____

In this section you will be asked a question about the information and quality of communication your congregation receives from MOSES.

91. How are congregation members at your church informed about MOSES events? *(Select **all** that apply)*

    ☐ Announced at masses/religious services
    ☐ Church bulletins
    ☐ Letters sent out in the mail
    ☐ Email announcements
    ☐ Church website
    ☐ Via conversations with you or other church leaders
    ☐ Other, please specify: _____

In this section you will be asked questions about how your congregation members interact and relate to one another and to MOSES as an organization.

92. How cohesive are members of your congregation?

    ☐ Very cohesive
    ☐ Somewhat cohesive
    ☐ Not very cohesive
    ☐ Not cohesive at all
    ☐ Don't know

93. Have there been any issues that were important to your congregation that MOSES chose not to address?

    ☐ Yes *(Go to question 94)*
    ☐ No *(Skip to question 96)*
    ☐ Don't know *(Skip to question 96)*

94. Of the issues that are/were ***most important*** to your congregation, which issues were not addressed? Please list the top three:

1 _____
2 _____
3 _____

95. How has not addressing these issues affected your congregation?

- ☐ It has not affected the congregation
- ☐ The congregation participates less
- ☐ The congregation has addressed these issues independently
- ☐ Other, please specify: _____

In this section you will be asked questions about how your involvement with MOSES has affected your congregation.

96. Would you agree that members of your congregation believe that by getting involved, they can facilitate change and impact social issues?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

97. How satisfied are you with the level of participation in your congregation?

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Somewhat satisfied
- ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ Dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied

This section will ask you questions about the congregation you represent in MOSES.

98. What religion/denomination is your congregation?

- ☐ Christian (Protestant)
- ☐ Christian (Catholic)
- ☐ Christian (Non-denominational)
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Islam
- ☐ Unitarian-Universalist
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

99. How many members do you currently have in your congregation? _____

100. Where is your congregation located?

- ☐ City of Detroit
- ☐ Inner-ring suburb
- ☐ Outer-ring suburb

101. What is the primary racial/ethnic composition of your congregation?

- ☐ European American
- ☐ African American
- ☐ Hispanic/Latino
- ☐ Arabic/Middle Eastern
- ☐ Native American
- ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

Finally, we would like to ask you some questions about your background and demographics.

102. Please select the race/ethnicity you most identify with *(select **one** response)*:

- ☐ African American (Black)
- ☐ Caucasian (White)
- ☐ Latino/Hispanic
- ☐ Arabic/Middle Eastern
- ☐ Native American
- ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
- ☐ Bi-racial, specify: _____
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

103. Please indicate your gender:

☐ Female   ☐ Male

104. Please indicate your age category:

- ☐ 18-29
- ☐ 30-39
- ☐ 40-49
- ☐ 50-59
- ☐ 60-69
- ☐ 70-79
- ☐ 80 +

105. Please indicate your religion/denomination/spiritual beliefs:

- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Muslim
- ☐ Hindu
- ☐ Buddhist
- ☐ Unitarian-Universalist
- ☐ Christian (specify denomination): _____
- ☐ Agnostic
- ☐ Atheist
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

106. Do you reside in the city of Detroit or in a suburb?

- ☐ City of Detroit
- ☐ Inner ring suburb (borders Detroit)
- ☐ Outer-ring suburb (does not border Detroit)

107. In which county do you live?

- ☐ Wayne
- ☐ Oakland
- ☐ Macomb
- ☐ Monroe
- ☐ Livingston
- ☐ Washtenaw
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

108. How do you identify politically?

- ☐ Democrat
- ☐ Republican
- ☐ Libertarian
- ☐ Green
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

109. Please indicate your level of education:

- ☐ Did not complete high school
- ☐ High school graduate
- ☐ Some college/training
- ☐ Associate's degree
- ☐ Bachelor's degree
- ☐ Master's degree
- ☐ Doctoral degree
- ☐ Other, specify: _____

110. Please indicate how you define yourself in terms of social/economic class:

- ☐ Upper class
- ☐ Upper middle class
- ☐ Middle class
- ☐ Lower middle class
- ☐ Working class
- ☐ Lower class

Would you be interested in being contacted to participate in a 60-minute interview regarding you involvement with MOSES? If yes, please provide your phone number on the line below.

Phone number: _____

Thank you for your time. Your responses are appreciated!

APPENDIX G

Institutional Review Board Approval

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

HUMAN INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE
101 East Alexandrine Building
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577-1628
FAX: (313) 993-7122
http://hic.wayne.edu

Full AAHRPP Accreditation

NOTICE OF EXPEDITED APPROVAL

To: Angela Kaiser
Social Work Instruction Ur
4756 Cass

From: Ellen Barton, Ph.D. *F. Affotato*
Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: May 01, 2009

RE: HIC #: 049809B3E

Protocol Title: Bridging Social Capital Formation in Faith-Based Organizations

Sponsor: ■ College of Social Work

Protocol #: 0904007062

Expiration Date: April 30, 2010

Risk Level/Category: 45 CFR 46.404 - Research not involving greater than minimal risk

The above referenced protocol and items listed below (if applicable) were **APPROVED** following *Expedited Review* (Category 7*) by the Chairperson/designee for the Wayne State University Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3) for the period of 05/01/2009 through 04/30/2010. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required.

- Recruitment Email for Survey
- Survey Information Sheet
- Interview Consent Form (dated 4/14/09)
- Observation Information Sheet (dated 4/14/09)

■ Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. You may receive a *"Continuation Renewal Reminder"* approximately two months prior to the expiration date; however, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval *before* the expiration date. Data collected during a period of lapsed approval is unapproved research and can *never* be reported or published as research data.

■ All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the HIC **BEFORE** implementation.

■ Adverse Reactions/Unexpected Events (AR/UE) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the HIC Policy (http://www.hic.wayne.edu/hicpol.html).

NOTE:

1. Upon notification of an impending regulatory site visit, hold notification, and/or external audit, the HIC office must be contacted immediately.
2. Forms should be downloaded from the HIC website at each use.

*Based on the Expedited Review List, revised November 1998

REFERENCES

Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN). (2008). Retrieved from http://www.acorn.org.

Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Altemose, J.R. & McCarty, D.A. (2001). Organizing for democracy through faith based institutions: The Industrial Areas Foundation in action. In J.M. Bystydzienski and S.P. Schacht (Eds.), *Forging radical alliances across difference: Coalition politics for the new millennium* (pp. 133–145). London: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Axinn, J. & Stern, M.J. (2008). *Social welfare: A history of the American response to need*. 7th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Balderrama, F.E. & Rodriguez, R. (2006). *Decade of betrayal: Mexican repatriation in the 1930s*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Bonisteel, S. (2007, January 11). In Detroit it's the Mexicans welcoming visitors to America. *Fox News*. Retrieved from http://www.foxnews.com.

Bourdieu, P. (1985). The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Brager, G., Specht, H., & Torczyner, J.L. (1987). *Community organizing*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Brooks, F. (2002). Innovative organizing practices: ACORN's campaign in Los Angeles organizing workfare workers. *Journal of Community Practice, 9*, 65-85.

Brooks, F. (2005). Resolving the dilemma between organizing and services: Los Angeles ACORN's welfare advocacy. *Social Work, 50*, 262-270.

Brooks, F. (2007). Racial diversity on ACORN's organizing staff, 1970-2003. *Administration in Social Work, 31*, 27-48.

Brown, R.K. & Brown, R.E. (2003). Faith and works: Church-based social capital resources and African American political activism. *Social Forces, 82*, 617-641.

Burt, R.S. (1997). The contingent value of social capital. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42*, 339-365.

Bystydzienski, J.M. & Schacht, S.P. (2001). Introduction. In J.M. Bystydzienski & S.P. Schacht (Eds.), (pp. 1-20). *Forging radical alliances across difference: Coalition politics for the new millennium*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Calhoun-Brown, A. (2000). Upon this rock: The Black church, nonviolence, and the Civil Rights Movement. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 33*, 168-174.

Calhoun-Brown, A. (1996). African American churches and political mobilization: The psychological impact of organizational resources. *The Journal of Politics, 58*, 935-953.

Charmaz, K. (2007). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Cnaan, R.A., Kasternakis, A., & Wineburg, R.J. (1993). Religious people, religious congregations, and volunteerism in human services: Is there a link? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 22*, 33-51.

Cnaan, R.A., Wineberg, R.J. and Boddie, S.C. (1999). *The newer deal: Social work and religion in partnership.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology, 94*, S95-S120.

Collins, W.J. & Margo, R.A. (2007). The economic aftermath of the 1960s riots in American cities: Evidence from property values. *The Journal of Economic History, 67*, 849-883.

Center for Third World Organizing (CTWO). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.ctwo.org.

Compassionate conservatism takes a bow. (2001, February 3). *The Economist*, p. 1.

Direct Action and Research Training Center (DART). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.thedartcenter.org.

Detroit Riots of 1967 (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.67riots.rutgers.edu.

Devore, W. (1998). The house on Midland: From inside out. In F. Rivera & J. Erlich (Eds.) *Community organizing in a diverse society*, (pp. 62-74). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

325

Dudwick, N., Kuehnast, K., Jones, V.N., & Woolcock, M. (2006). *Analyzing social capital in context: A guide to using qualitative methods and data*. The World Bank Institute, Washington, D.C.

Ebaugh, H.R., Pipes, P.F., Chafetz, J.S., & Daniels, M. (2003). Where's the religion? Distinguishing faith-based from secular social service agencies. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 42*, 411-426.

Farley, R., Danziger, S., & Holzer, H.J. (2000). *Detroit divided*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Farr, J. (2004). Social capital: A conceptual history. *Political Theory, 32*, 6-33.

Fisher, R. (1984). *Let the people decide: Neighborhood organizing in America*. Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers.

_____. (1990). Grass roots organizing in the community center movement. In N.B. Betten & M.J. Austin (Eds.). *The roots of community organizing, 1917-1939*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fisher, R. & Shragge, E. (2000). Challenging community organizing: Facing the 21st century. *Journal of Community Practice, 8*, 1-19.

Fowler, R.B. & Hertzke, A.D. (1995). *Religion and politics in America: Faith, culture, and strategic choices*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2001). Social capital, civil society and development. *Third World Quarterly, 22*, 7-20.

Gamaliel Foundation. (2002). Retrieved from http://www.gamaliel.org.

Gilgun, J.F. & Abrams, L.S. (2002). The nature and usefulness of qualitative social work research: Some thoughts and an invitation to dialogue. *Qualitative Social Work, 1*, 39-55.

Goldberg, L.C. (1968). Ghetto riots and others: The faces of civil disorder in 1967. *Journal of Peace Research, 5*, 116-132.

Granovetter, M.S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology, 78*, 1360-1380.

Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V.N., & Woolcock. M. (2004). *Measuring social capital: An integrated questionnaire*. The World Bank Institute, Washington, D.C.

Hanifan, L.J. (1916). The rural school community center. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 67*, 130-138.

Harris, F.C. (1994). Something within: Religion as a mobilizer of African-American political activism. *The Journal of Politics, 56*, 42-68.

Hite, G.N. (2002). *The hottest places in hell: The Catholic Church and civil rights in Selma, Alabama, 1937-1965* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Hodgkinson, V.A., Gorski, H.A., Noga, S.M., & Knauft, E.B. (1995). Giving and volunteering in the United States, 1994. *Vol 2: Trends in Giving and Volunteering by Type of Charity*. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector.

Homans, G. (1950). Social behavior as exchange. *The American Journal of Sociology, 63*, 597-606.

Howell, S. & Shryock, A. (2003). Cracking down on diaspora: Arab Detroit and America's "war on terror". *Anthropological Quarterly, 76*, 443-462.

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. New York, NY: The Modern Library.

Johnson, K. (1999). ACORN branches out. *City Limits. February*, 2-4.

Jones, E. (2009). *Why am I out of the loop?: Attributions influence responses to information exclusion* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Katz, B. & Bradley, J. (2009, December 9). The Detroit project: A plan for solving America's urban disaster. *The New Republic*. Retrieved from http://www.tnr.com.

Kawachi, I., & Berkman. L. (2000). Social cohesion, social capital and health. In L. Berkman and I. Kawachi (Eds.), (pp. 174-190). *Social Epidemiology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kiker, B.F. (1966). The historical roots of the concept of human capital. *The Journal of Political Economy, 74*, 481-499.

Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American Sociological Review, 49*, 583-600.

Kramer, R.M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 569-598.

Krier Mich, M.L. (1998). *Catholic social teaching and movements*. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.

Larsen, L., Harlan, S.L., Bolin, B., Hackett, E.J., Hope, D., Kirby, A., Nelson, A., Rex, T.R., & Wolf, S. (2004). Bonding and bridging: Understanding the relationship between social capital and civic action. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 24*, 64-77.

Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, C.E. & Mamiya, L.H. (1990). *The black church in the African American experience*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Loury, G.C. (1981). Intergenerational transfers and the distribution of earnings. *Econometrica, 49*, 843-867.

Mann Wall, B. (2009). Catholic sister nurses in Selma, Alabama, 1940-1972. *Advances in Nursing Science, 32*, 91-102.

Massey, D.S. & Denton, N.A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1964). *The communist manifesto*. New York, NY: Washington Square Press.

Marx, K. (1967). *Capital, Vol. 1*. New York, NY: International Publishers Co., Inc.

McGreevy, J.T. (1996). *Parish boundaries: The Catholic encounter with race in the twentieth-century urban north*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mor Barak, M.E. & Cherin, D.A. (1998). A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: Exploring a measure of inclusion-exclusion. *Administration in Social Work, 22*, 47-64.

Morris, A. (1984). *The origin of the civil rights movement: Black communities organizing for change*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength (MOSES). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.mosesmi.org.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). (2009). Retrieved from http://www.naacp.org.

Narayan, D. (1999). *Bonds and bridges: Social capital and poverty*. July. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Narayan, D. & Cassidy, M.F. (2001). A dimensional approach to measuring social capital: Development and validation of a social capital inventory. *Current Sociology, 49*, 59-102.

Newton, K. (2001). Trust, social capital, civil society, and democracy. *International Political Science Review, 22*, 201-214.

Newell, S., Tansley, C., & Huang, J. (2004). Social capital and knowledge integration in an ERP project team: The importance of bridging and bonding. *British Journal of Management, 15*, S43-S57.

Padgett, D.K. (1998). *Qualitative methods in social work research: Challenges and rewards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

People Improving Communities through Organization (PICO). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.piconetwork.org.

Piven, F. & Cloward, R. (1977). *Poor people's movements: Why they succeed, how they fail*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 1-24.

Portes, A. & Landolt, P. (1996). The downside of social capital. *American Prospect, 26*, 18-21.

Putnam, R.D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

_____. (1995a). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6,* 65-78.

_____. (1995b). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 28*, 664-683.

_____. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. *The American Prospect, Winter*, 34-47.

_____. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R.D. & Goss, K.A. (2002). Introduction. In R.D Putnam (Ed.) *Democracies in flux,* (pp. 3-20). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, B. & Hanna, M.G. (1994). Lessons for academics from grassroots community organizing: A case study – The Industrial Areas Foundation. *Journal of Community Practice, 1*, 63-94.

Rubin, A. & Babie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work.* 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole-Thomson Learning.

Seeley, J.R., Sim, A.R., & Loosley, E.W. (1956). *Crestwood Heights: A study of the culture of suburban life.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Skocpol, T. & Fiorina, M.P. (1999). Making sense of the civic engagement debate. In T. Skocpol and M.P. Fiorina (Eds.). *Civic engagement in American democracy,* (pp. 1-26). Washington, D.C.: Russell Sage Foundations and Brookings Institution Press.

Slessarev-Jamir, H. (2004). Exploring the attraction of local congregations to community organizing. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*, 585-605.

Snow, D.A., Rochford, E.B., Worden, S.K., & Benford, R.D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review, 51*, 464-481.

Speer, P.W., Jackson, C.B., & Peterson, N.A. (2001). The relationship between social cohesion and empowerment: Support and new implications for theory. *Health Education Behavior, 28*, 716-732.

Smith, A. (1937). *The wealth of nations.* New York, NY: Modern Library.

Stolle, D. (1998). Bowling together, bowling alone: The development of generalized trust in voluntary associations. *Political Psychology, 19*, 497-525.

Sugrue, T.J. (2005). *The origins of the urban crisis: Race and inequality in postwar Detroit.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Swarts, H. (2008). *Organizing urban America: Secular and faith-based progressive movements.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

The White House. (2009). Office of faith-based and neighborhood partnerships. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov.

Tilly, C. (2004). *Social movements 1768-2004.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Tindall, D.B. (2002). Social network, identification and participation in an environmental movement. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 39*, 413-452.

Tocqueville, A. (2001). *Democracy in America.* Signet Classics.

United States Census Bureau (2010). American fact finder. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K., Brady, H.E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wald, K.D. (1987). *Religion and politics in the United States.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Warren, M.R. (2001). *Dry bones rattling: Community building to revitalize American democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Warren, M.R. & Wood, R.L. (2001). *Faith-based community organizing: The state of the field*. Jericho, NY: Interfaith Funders.

Warren, M.R., Thompson, J.P., & Saegert, S. (2001). The role of social capital in combating poverty. In S. Saegert, J.P. Thompson, & M.R. Warren (Eds.). *Social capital and poor communities*, (pp. 1-28). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Wolff, T. (2001). A practitioner's guide to successful coalitions. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 29*, 173-191.

Wood, R.L. (1999). Religious culture and political action. *Sociological Theory, 17*, 307-332.

_____. (2002). *Faith in action: Religion, race, and democratic organizing in America*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Wood, R.L. & Warren, M.R. (2002). A different face of faith-based politics: Social capital and community organizing in the public arena. *The International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 22*, 6-54.

Woolcock, M. & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *The World Bank Observer, 15*, 225-249.

334

World Bank. (2002). *Empowerment and poverty reduction – A sourcebook*. Washington, D.C.

Wuthnow, R. (2002). Religious involvement and status-bridging social capital. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41*, 669-684.

ABSTRACT

BRIDGING SOCIAL CAPITAL FORMATION IN A
FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATION

by

ANGELA A. KAISER

August 2010

Advisor: Dr. Anna Maria Santiago

Major: Social Work

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Previous research on faith-based organizations suggest that these organizations are highly effective at forging relationships between individuals from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds, known as bridging social capital. This study examines the process of bridging social capital formation within MOSES, a faith-based organization located in Detroit, Michigan. Through the use of in-depth interviews, participant observation, archival research, and a member survey, I documented the forms of social capital present within the organization. I also explored whether bridging relationships were forming within the organization and the strategies that facilitated their formation. Diversity within the organization, recognition of member differences, and barriers to social capital formation were also examined. Finally, I assessed mechanisms for unifying and mobilizing members within the organization.

The study depicts how one faith-based organization has attempted to bridge the gaps between organization and community members from different

cultural backgrounds through relationship building. An analysis of the data revealed that MOSES has made some progress toward bringing African American, White, and Latino individuals together to work on social issues. MOSES also has made some progress on bringing together members from different Christian denominations to work on issues.

Findings also suggested that many of the barriers the organization faced to bridging social capital formation were internal barriers inside of the organization as opposed to societal issues that exist outside of the organization. These barriers included the absence of dimensions of social capital and limited diversity within the organization. Other barriers identified were the lack of relationship building, failure to address member differences, and issues with organizational governance and structure. Strategies such as increasing diversity within the organization, addressing member differences in terms of race, religion, and location of residence; and developing organizational processes, may all contribute to bridging social capital formation.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Angela Kaiser received her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from the University of Michigan in 1995. In 1996, Angela enrolled in the Master's of Social Work program at Wayne State University. During the master's program, she discovered her interest in organizational culture and capacity building, and focused on macro practice methods and research. After graduating from Wayne State University in 1998, Angela worked in both the nonprofit and for-profit industries. In 2002, she accepted a position at an HIV/AIDS prevention and education organization and worked as a grants and programs manager for five years.

In 2006, Angela enrolled in the newly established social work doctoral program at Wayne State University. During her coursework in the program, she became interested in social movements and grassroots organizing, which eventually led to her dissertation research topic. While at Wayne State University, Angela worked on two research projects: a study examining the effects of a program aimed at assisting lower-income residents build human, financial, and social capital assets, and a project exploring the existence of health and well-being programs in churches for African American elders. She also taught graduate courses in social welfare policy and macro theory and practice. In January of 2010, Angela accepted an Assistant Professor position at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, and will be starting a new journey there in Fall 2010.