I. Unit Title: Division of Social Sciences          School: Arts & Sciences

Unit Administrator: Albert B. Nylander, III

II. Data and information for division:

The Division of Social Sciences aims at a broad development of the individual. Its goal is to present the main approaches to understanding our world and maintain a student-centered environment. In the process, faculty in the Division seek to develop certain skills and enduring habits of mind--intellectual curiosity, critical thinking, tolerance of and openness to different views and values, and the ability to communicate one's thoughts orally and in writing. In short, this philosophy of learning should enable students to embark on a lifetime of learning and to adapt to a rapidly changing world. It is also the mission of the Division to serve the Delta by developing programs of study that match the cultural needs of the region and state. To determine the extent to which the Division is meeting some of these needs, an analysis of trends is presented in the next section.

ANALYSIS OF TRENDS

In this section, a five-year analysis of the number of graduates for each program is discussed. In addition, multi-year comparisons of the number of majors in each program are presented. Credit hour production for the faculty and programs are also presented as methods to assess workloads of faculty and to measure the appeal of the Division's seven degree programs.
Number of graduates

The Division's seven programs have shown consistent graduate production. Table 1 shows the number of graduates in each program over a five-year period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSCJ</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSGS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCJ</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCD</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Degree in 1995; **New Degree in 1996

The data in Table 1 suggest that the number of graduates in the Division has been steadily increasing over the past years. A reasonable explanation for the jump in the number of graduates in the BSGS program was the elimination of this general studies degree. We now have a Bachelor of Science in Social Sciences degree. This new degree is more rigorous; thus, it will not be a dumping ground for students, who are unsuccessful in other degree programs. Along with these higher expectations of our students, it is likely the Division will see a short-term drop in the number of graduates. The next section examines trends in the number of majors for each program.
Number of Majors

In this section, a five-year trend in the number of majors in each program is presented. The following table shows the data for the number of majors:

Table 2: Number of majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSCJ</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>*35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCJ</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BS – New program replaces the Bachelor of Science in General Studies

The data in Table 2 reveal the expected drop in the number of majors in the Division. There is a Divisional push for raising the level of academic rigor, with an expected outcome of a short-term drop in the number of majors and graduates. This is recognizable with the new Bachelor of Science in Social Sciences program (BS). The Division also revised its undergraduate Criminal Justice program to better reflect the needs in the field. There are plans to continue this revision process in the Criminal Justice program for 2000-20001. The other programs have held steady or increased over the past several years. For example, the Division’s Master’s program in Criminal Justice remains very attractive, and Community Development is drawing record numbers of students.
Credit hour production

In this section, student credit hour production is discussed as a means of assessing program and teacher effectiveness. Table 3 shows FTE production for the Fall Semesters during the academic years 1997, 1998, and 1999.

Table 3: Credit Hour Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrahams</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armishaw</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraw</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loewen</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylander</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routman</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct*</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(1997, n = 4; 1998, n=5; 1999, n=4)

Table 4: Credit Hour Production for Fall 1998 and 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall '98</th>
<th></th>
<th>FALL 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJ</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEN</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLF</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 3177 252 3057 366

COD=Community Development; COR=Corrections; CRJ=Criminal Justice; GEO=Geography; LEN=Law Enforcement; PSC=Political Science; SOC=Sociology; SSC=Social Sciences; WLF=Wildlife Enforcement.
Table 3 above shows that, when comparing production numbers for faculty who taught during 1997, 1998 and 1999 terms, the overall output has changed little. Professors Abrahams and Jennings teach three courses per term. Table 4 above shows the credit hour production for 1998 and 1999, including undergraduate and graduate students. It also shows the credit hour production for each area within the division.

Table 4 also shows that Sociology produces more credit hours than the other Divisional programs; however, this is in part due to the larger number of course offerings at the Introductory to Sociology level.

What is clear from Table 5 below is that the student credit hours within the Division have remained fairly stable over the past five years.

| Table 5: Student Credit Hours 5-Year Trend for the Division of Social Sciences |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|                               | 3157 | 3435 | 3673 | 3429 | 3423 |

III. PERSONNEL

Noteworthy activities and accomplishments:

(1) Caryl Abrahams

Dr. Abrahams continues to serve as program coordinator for the Master of Science program in Community Development. She has invested a great amount of time and energy with the Division's graduate committee to restructure the community development program. She also served as the Chair of the Search Committee in filling a tenure-track position in Community Development. We were successful and Brent Hales, Iowa State University, will be joining our Division in the Fall.

In pursuit of scholarly activities, Abrahams attended the AL/MS Sociological Meetings in February, 2000 to support the presentations by four of the Community Development Graduate Students. She is a member of the Editorial Board, Social Development Issues Journal, assisting Jerry Robinson, Jr., with his Editorship of a special issue of the Community Development Journal. In addition, she is a Faculty Associate at Center for Community Development.

Abrahams has applied for a HUD Grant for the support of the Work Study Program for Community Development Students for the academic years 2000-2002, $150,000, pending. She received Wyatt Development Funds to extend work in Thailand to update materials for an International Community Development Course to be taught next year.
Other activities include: A member of Faculty Senate; held a proposal writing workshop for School of Nursing; Organized student facilitators for the Day of Reconciliation workshops in Marks, MS; Provided Training workshop for student facilitators for the Day of Reconciliation workshops in Marks, MS; Attended the two days of sessions for the Day of Reconciliation workshops in Marks, MS; A Member Executive Committee of the Delta Race Relations Consortium

(2) Jim Armishaw

Armishaw continues to receive excellent marks in his teaching evaluations. He developed a class in Police Deviance (LEN 412) which deals with behavior of police contrary to the normal standards of police conduct. He taught Police Deviance (LEN 412) to the vocational instructors at Mississippi State Penitentiary. He also served as chairman of the Golf Course Committee on the Delta State University campus.

He is also the secretary of Pi Gamma Mu, which is a social science honor society. Armishaw served as chairman of the Heath and Safety Committee on the Delta State University campus. Finally, he was recognized by the Alpha Phi Sigma, the Delta State University Criminal Justice Honor Society, as an honorary member to show appreciation for his many years service to Delta State.

(3) Rob Brown

Brown has completed all courses in the Ph.D. program in Geography at Louisiana State University and is writing his dissertation on African American Return Migration to the Mississippi Delta. For the Division, he is planning a new course, “History/Geography of the Mississippi Delta.” Brown also has been generous to Delta State University by donating in-kind gift hours (5 hours) by conducting oral history interviews for Capps Archives. He has served on Dr. Potter’s committee for Delta culture and preservation; given a lecture to Teacher’s Institute of Mississippi Geographic Alliance; and Co-taught GST mentors course.

For the Delta community and region, he has served as Delta regional faculty for Mississippi Geographic Alliance, an organization based at Mississippi State Geography Department. Brown gave a community lecture on Blues tourism to Culture Club of Drew; gave community lecture on events in Russia to Senior Luncheon Group at First Methodist Church of Cleveland; and served on committee for tourism and culture with Delta State and the Bolivar County Chamber of Commerce. Additionally, he will present the brown bag luncheon some time this month (April, 2000) at the Center for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi.

With all the above, Brown continues to be active in professional organizations, presenting a paper at the Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting in Pittsburgh, April, 2000.

(4) Darrel DeGraw

DeGraw continues his academic endeavors by receiving a Ph.D. in Religious Counseling. His also is currently working on a M.Ed. in Geography and D.Ed. in Educational Leadership at Delta State
University. Further, he has been accepted as a candidate for Doctor of Ministry degree at the University of Liverpool, England.

In addition to his pursuit of further education, he continues to teach four courses each semester. He serves as the Graduate Coordinator for the graduate program in Criminal Justice. He developed and taught Sociology of Violence and Assaults, Spring 2000.

He remains active in scholarly work. He presented a paper, "A Comparison of Selected Traits of Political Women Compared to the Same Traits of Non-Political Women," at the Annual conference of the American Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences held in Las Vegas, January 24-28. He also attended the following conferences: AL/MS Sociological Association annual meeting in Clinton, MS, Spring, 2000; Annual conference of American Society of Criminology in Toronto, Canada Fall, 1999.

DeGraw’s service to the community included serving on the Attendance Committee; Advisor to the Criminal Justice Club; and advisor to the newly formed local chapter (Delta Delta) of the National Criminal Justice Honorary Society, Alpha Phi Sigma. He was selected as officer for local chapter of Kappa Delta Pi, Education Honor Society. He organized and participated, along with his criminal justice graduate students, in the annual initiation of Alpha Phi Sigma, Spring 2000. He also participated in induction of new members in local chapter of Psi Chi, Psychology Honor Society.

(5) Ron Dodge

Dodge taught new courses in Wildlife Enforcement: Organization & Philosophy of Wildlife Law Enforcement; Wildlife Offenses & Offenders; and Biodiversity, Conservation, and the Law. Dodge is the manager of the Division’s webpage. Also, he provides community service for alcohol and drug therapy three days a week.

(6) Garry Jennings

This year Jennings developed the approved course of Economic and Political Rationality. He fully revised the Introduction to Political Science course from an introduction to normative theory to an introduction to research methods. He was innovated in designing a web-based course on Blackboard.com to support the introduction to Political Science course. He also implemented TVView, which is a hardware patch between computer and standard TV monitor. This unit was used to display a variety of course materials, but especially the manipulation of data with the SPSS program.

Jennings was a participant in a round table on Civic Education at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA, August 1999. In addition, Jennings has been very involved in service to Delta State University as evidenced by the following activities on campus: Chair, Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, Spring and Fall 1999; Member, Ad hoc Committee on Diversity; and Member, Presidential Search Committee. He also is a Faculty Associate at the Center for Community Development. In addition, he received a faculty development grant to support research on Justice Antonin Scalia.

Jennings is the Executive Director, Mississippi Political Science Association. He serves on the Life Time Achievement Award Committee, American Political Science Association. He also is on the
Selection Committee for the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation. Finally, Jennings is the Chair of the Division’s Graduate Committee.

(7) Greg Loewen

Loewen developed the following new courses: Social Statistics, Social Problems, Principles of Anthropology, and Sociology of Religion. He also revised the following courses: Research Methods, Principles of Sociology, Social Theory, and Philosophy of Social Science. Some innovative teaching techniques are the use of casino style gambling games in statistics to demonstrate the interface of probability theory and sampling. He also used lego sets and samples to exemplify ordinal and ratio measures of association. In the Introductory to Sociology course, he made use of ancient and modern cross-cultural artifacts to articulate differences in fact/belief/opinion, subject and object, and the idea of discourse vs. opinion. In this same course, he created a ‘McDonaldization’ project based on Ritzer’s theory of globalization and Weber’s theory of rationalization. In Social Theory, he used the construction of a board game for evaluation of students’ knowledge of theory and discourse. Other innovative techniques will be included as an attachment to this report.

Loewen has been active in professional organizations presenting two papers, “No Letter on Verstehen” at the Association of Humanist Sociology annual meetings, Memphis, TN, November, 1999; and “Towards an Executive Understanding of Human Resource Competencies in the New Technology” at the Southern Sociological Society Annual Meetings in New Orleans, LA, April, 2000. He also had two poems published in an in house literary review.

Loewen has continued his studies by presenting a workshop for continuing education entitled, “Structures of Memorialization,” Shiloh, TN/Tishomingo, MS, April 2000. He also will be participating in a new regional think tank concerning education and cultural consciousness in Atlanta, GA, April, 2000. Additionally, Loewen serves Delta State University in the following ways: team-taught GST 100; served as library liaison for Social Sciences; served on the undergraduate curriculum committee for Social Sciences; was a visitor to the faculty senate during interim electoral period; and advised undeclared majors for Arts and Sciences.

(8) Albert B. Nylander, III

Nylander, Chair of the Division of Social Sciences, has two articles currently under review for publication, “Growth Machines and Community Development in the Racially Diverse Mississippi Delta: A Monolithic Approach to a Complex Region,” submitted to the Special Issue of The Journal of the Community Development Society; and “Religious Effects on Adolescent Drug Use,” submitted to Youth and Society. He also will have a chapter published in a special report by the Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University, entitled, “Applied Sociological Work: A Graduate Student’s Experience.”

In addition to these publications, Nylander has been active in professional organizations presenting papers entitled “A Planning and Implementing Participatory Development: The Voice of Delta Youth is Heard,” at the 25th Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Sociological Association, Jackson, MS, November, 1999; and “The Structure of Community Leadership in Three Rural Mississippi
Delta Communities," at the 63rd Southern Sociological Society Meeting, April 20-23, 2000, New Orleans, LA. He also participated in the rural community interest group at the Rural Sociological Association Meeting in Chicago, IL, August 1999. In addition, he served on the Executive Committee and the Nominating Committee for the Alabama-Mississippi Sociological Association.

Nylander received a prestigious honor by being named the 32nd President of the Alabama/Mississippi Sociological Society. Delta State University and the Division of Social Sciences will host the meetings in February, 2002. Other Universities in Mississippi which have had Presidents are Mississippi State University, Mississippi College, University of Mississippi, Jackson State University, Tougaloo College, and Hinds Community College. This is the first President from Delta State University. The President of this organization alternates between Alabama and Mississippi every other year.

Nylander also provided service to Delta State University through the following activities: served on the Teacher Education Committee; Delta State University Hall of Fame Committee; Proxy to the Faculty Senate; Faculty Representative, James Madison Foundation Fellowship; Planning for the Delta Center; Resource Coordinator for the Mississippi Teacher Fellowship Program; and Faculty Administrator of Bolivar Civic Club Award.

In addition to the above, Nylander continues to serve as the administrator in the Division of Social Sciences. The Social Sciences has seven degree programs with approximately 300 majors. Three programs are at the graduate level. The Division will triple its thesis production this academic year. Under Nylander’s management, each program is and will continue to be revamped to ensure academic rigor. Nylander also has brought top-notch faculty from around the world to the Division. Recent hires hold Ph.D’s from Penn State University, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the University of British Columbia, Iowa State University, and the University of Calgary.

(9) John O’Sullivan

O’Sullivan revised courses in Human Ecology, Social Problems and Social Change. He has an innovative teaching style in which his classes are done as Service Learning Classes, i.e., all students are required to be involved with a school, business or local non-profit organization as part of the class. He has presented papers, “Culture and Violence: The Democratization of the Brain and the Beginning of Civilization,” at the Association for Humanistic Sociology annual meeting in Memphis, TN. November 1999; and “In The Service of Learning: Civic Involvement and The University,” at the Southern Sociological Society annual meeting in New Orleans, LA. April 2000.

O’Sullivan recently published “Creation of Brain-Compatible Learning Environments: Applications of Neuroscience,” Academic Exchange Quarterly, Spring 2000, Vol. 3, Issue 5. In addition, he serves on the Mississippi Consortium for Service Learning, Division of IHL. He established and supported MS Dept. of Education grant to establish Brain Based Learning School in Ruleville; Re-application for maintaining grant in 1999 ($60,000) successful. Re-application for maintaining grant in 2000 ($60,000) is expected to be successful. Due to success of program, additional three years of funding appear to be forthcoming. He also aided in writing of "Century 2000" grant proposal to US Dept. of Education to establish comprehensive regional after school
programs. $1,300,000 request; funding to be announced mid June 2000. He wrote and received funds from the Wyatt Faculty Developments account and organize campus/faculty wide staff development opportunities around service learning.

Local Community/University Service--involved helping design and implement Delta Youth Summit involving 200 local youth. He brought "Adolescent Therapeutic Drumming Group" to Delta to perform for 600 people and introduce concept of integrated arts programs into local schools; developed partnerships with local arts council and Cleveland community groups to sponsor group; sponsored National expert in brain based learning techniques (Dr. Fritz Mengert) to work one day with DSU school of education and other interested faculty; and organized sponsorship of brain based learning symposium to area educators in conjunction with Center for Community Development.

(10) Hedy Richardson

Richardson has been actively involved in teaching new courses. She developed and taught the following courses: Sociology of Education, Methods for Secondary Social Studies, Introduction to Human Geography, and Science Technology and Society. She serves on both the Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in the Division of Social Sciences. In addition, she is engaged in the Teacher Education Meetings with the College of Education.

Richardson currently supervises four student teachers in the field who are completing their practice teaching in Secondary Social Studies. She also is preparing a report on the curriculum for the Bachelor of Science in Secondary Social Studies for NCATE. This review has been under way for the entire academic year (1999-2000).

(11) Jerry Robinson, Jr.

Robinson's activities will appear in the annual report of the Center for Community Development.

(12) Mark Routman

Routman's book, "Understanding Politics: Political Positions, Political Realities, False Consciousness and the Future," was published by Five Corners, Plymouth, VT. He has begun another book, "Making Your Marriage Work: Suggestions for Engaged Couples and Newlyweds," which should be published this year. He also is implementing innovative teaching methods in his classes by introducing concepts of applied sociology through exercises in Group Dynamics and Marriage and the Family. Further, he has revised five correspondence courses. His services to the community are as follows: Parent/Teacher/Student Association member - Cleveland High School; Booster Club member - Cleveland High School; serves on the Cleveland High School academic awards ceremony committee and athletic awards committee; and Parent Soccer Group - Cleveland High School.

(13) Arlene Sanders

Sanders presented a paper, "Moving Strategically into the Next Millennium," at the Delta Chapter of the National Council of Negro Women's meeting. She also has participated in
professional organizations by attending the Annual Conference of the Mississippi Political Science Association. She is a member of the Nominating Committee in this association.

She is an active member on the Social Work Advisory Board and an advisor to the Agora Club at Delta State University. Sanders held mini-workshops on voter participation at Camellia Apartments, Cleveland, MS. She was the Guest Speaker at the Student Government Association’s Black History program and at a Local Black History Program, Merigold, MS.

As for teaching, Sanders makes the ideas of politics and government more realistic and applicable to a student’s every day life by bringing in guest speakers to help produce informed and responsible citizens, and also taking students on field trips.

Finally, Sanders is working toward her Doctorate in Education Degree at Delta State University. Her research interests focus on Diversity Studies and the Impact of Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972.

New Positions Requested

None

Recommended change of status (promotion/tenure):

The Division recommends promoting Albert B. Nylander, III to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. In addition, recommendations are made to tenure Professors Garry Jennings and Jerry Robinson, Jr.. These recommendations are made in recognition of their successful teaching, scholarship, and community service. Their portfolios have been submitted separately.

IV. DEGREE PROGRAM CHANGES

There will be curriculum changes to both the undergraduate Criminal Justice and Social Science programs; however, no new resources will be required for these changes. Further, there will be continual revisions by the graduate committee to all graduate programs. Again, no new resources are expected to be needed.
V. Assessment of 1999 Goals

UNIT GOALS

GOAL 1

A. Division Goal #1: The Division of Social Sciences will seek better technology in its classrooms—that is, Internet connections, projection systems, and other technological equipment in order to tap into the wealth of information available for instructors.

B. Evaluation Procedure: This goal was evaluated by examining whether or not this technology was available for faculty in the Division of Social Sciences.

C. Actual Results: The goal was not attained, as classrooms in Kethley Hall are not equipped for data projectors and other multimedia equipment.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: This goal will continue for next year.

GOAL 2

A. Division Goal #2: The Division of Social Sciences will seek to significantly increase the division’s travel budget because faculty members in the division are now more active than in the recent past.

B. Evaluation Procedure: There was no increase in the travel budget.

C. Actual Results: This goal was not attained.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: This goal will continue for next year.

GOAL 3

A. Division Goal #3: The Division of Social Sciences will continue its move toward establishing an increased collaboration with the Center for Community Development.

B. Evaluation Procedure: This goal will be assessed by showing the increase in efforts between the two organizations through the establishment of joint appointments in the Division and Center.

C. Actual Results of Evaluation: The Division has three full-time faculty members working a quarter time in the Center for Community Development. Dr. Caryl Abrahams, graduate coordinator in Community Development, continues to supervise students who work in the Center. This also gives her an opportunity to recruit students in the larger Delta Community. Dr. Jerry Robinson, Jr., former director of the Center, has submitted a USDA proposal for funding opportunities for the Division and Center. Dr. Myrtis Tabb, Interim Director, teaches a
Community Development course in Leadership for the Division.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: Through these efforts, the Community Development program has benefitted by an increase in the number of students. Moreover, these students develop connections with the Delta communities and are able to work with citizens throughout the Delta in improving their communities. Through these networks, students often move right into jobs. We will continue this effort next year.

STUDENT OUTCOMES FOR 1999

BS in Social Sciences

Outcome # 1
A. Student Outcome #1: Students will recognize the different disciplines in the social sciences.

B. Evaluation Procedure: In an Introduction to Sociology course, this goal was assessed by having students orally describe the differences in geography, psychology, political science, and sociology.

C. Actual Results: This was not an easy task for students, who often confuse psychology and sociology.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: however, after evaluating these oral responses, changes were made to improve the presentation of these concepts.

Outcome # 2
A. Student Outcome #2: Students will employ their knowledge of the scientific method by preparing papers in research methods using the appropriate methodological techniques.

B. Evaluation Procedure: Students' research papers will be evaluated.

C. Actual Results: For the most part, students were successful in writing their papers in the Research Methods course.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: In response to some of the weaknesses encountered, Dr. Garry Jennings is incorporating an introduction to social research in his introduction to Political Science course.

BA in Political Science
Outcome # 1
A. Student Outcome #1: Students will demonstrate the skills necessary to succeed in an increasingly global environment.

B. Evaluation Procedure: Assessment of graduates' work experience.

C. Actual Results: This assessment is not complete because a survey of recent graduates in
Political Science has not been administered.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** This assessment will be completed when funds are available to administered surveys to recent graduates.

**Outcome #2**

A. **Student Outcome #2:** Students will argue and defend an issue position in constitutional law.

B. **Evaluation Procedure:** Students’ exams.

C. **Actual Results:** In both Garry Jennings’ and Arlene Sanders’ political science courses, students were challenged to argue and defend various issues as they relate to the constitution. Most students were successful.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** Since students were successful, this teaching technique will continue to be used.

**BS in Criminal Justice**

**Outcome #1**

A. **Student Outcome #1:** Students will demonstrate their knowledge of the various criminological theories.

B. **Evaluation Procedure:** Students’ exams.

C. **Actual Results:** In Criminology and Juvenile Delinquency, students were exposed to and tested on these various theories. Most students, even if elementary, were able to discuss these theories.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** Since students were successful, this teaching technique will continue to be used.

**Outcome #2**

A. **Student Outcome #2:** Students will explain the philosophy of criminal justice.

B. **Evaluation Procedure:** Students’ exams.

C. **Actual Results:** In Criminal Justice Policy and Practice, Organization and Philosophy of Corrections, and Organization and Philosophy of Law Enforcement, students were exposed to the philosophy of the criminal justice system. Most students were successful in acquiring a basic understanding of the criminal justice system.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** Since students were successful, this teaching technique will continue to be used.
BS in Social Science Education
Outcome #1
A. Student Outcome #1: Students will be able to analyze social studies lessons, identifying strengths and weaknesses of pedagogical design.

B. Evaluation Procedure: Student portfolios.

C. Actual Results: In the Social Studies in the High School methods course, students are required to critique social studies textbooks and to develop a portfolio. All but two students were successful.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: These two students have been involved in an intense one-on-one learning experience with Dr. Hedy Richardson. Dr. Richardson has informed me that progress has been made and that appropriate actions will be taken in the future to identify these students earlier in the process.

Outcome #2
A. Student Outcome #2: Students will develop a teacher portfolio which passes the Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument (MTAI).

B. Evaluation Procedure: Student portfolios.

C. Actual Results: In the methods course, the same two students mentioned in outcome #1 encountered problems with completing the portfolio. However, the other students performed exceptionally well.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: An attempt will be made to identify these students earlier in the process.

MS in Criminal Justice
Outcome #1
A. Student Outcome #1: Students will identify the classical theorists and their theories in criminology.

B. Evaluation Procedure: Student exams.

C. Actual Results: In Theories of Criminal Behavior, students learn about the theories in criminology. All students were successful.

D. Use of Evaluation Results: Since students were successful, this teaching technique will continue to be used.

Outcome #2
A. Student Outcome #2: Students will compare and contrast the different rationales for punishment, i.e., retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation.

B. Evaluation Procedure: Student exams.
C. **Actual Results:** In Organization and Philosophy of Criminal Justice, students were exposed to the different rationales for punishment. All students were successful in meeting this outcome.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** Since students were successful, this teaching technique will continue to be used.

**MS in Community Development**

**Outcome #1**

A. **Student Outcome #1:** Students will examine the concept of community as moral discourse, economic discourse, and political discourse.

B. **Evaluation Procedure:** Field Work.

C. **Actual Results:** Evaluations during students’ field work indicated that all students were successful in meeting this objective.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** Since students were successful, this instructional technique will continue to be used.

**Outcome #2**

A. **Student Outcome #2:** Students will write and orally defend a project addressing a problem in community development.

B. **Evaluation Procedure:** Field Work, Research Papers, and Oral Exams.

C. **Actual Results:** Evaluations during students’ field work, 100% success on research papers, and passing oral exams showed that all students were successful in meeting this objective.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** Since students were successful, this instructional technique will continue to be used.

**MED in Social Sciences**

**Outcome #1**

A. **Student Outcome #1:** Students will demonstrate the ability to write social science papers, and to think critically by constructing a research project:

B. **Evaluation Procedure:** This outcome was assessed in the Social Science Research Methods course.

C. **Actual Results:** Most students were successful in accomplishing this objective.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** Since students were successful, this instructional technique will continue to be used.

**Outcome #2**

A. **Student Outcome #2:** Students will compare and contrast statistical techniques.
B. **Evaluation Procedure:** This outcome was assessed in the Quantitative Reasoning course by examining students’ exams.

C. **Actual Results:** Many students have difficulty understanding the different inferential statistical techniques.

D. **Use of Evaluation Results:** More emphasis will be placed on learning these statistical techniques.

VI. **UNIT GOALS FOR 2000**

**GOAL #1**

A. **Division Goal #1:** The Division of Social Sciences will acquire and use better technology in its classrooms—that is, Internet connections, projection systems, and other technological equipment in order to tap into the wealth of information available for instructors.

B. **Institutional Goal that supports Goal #1:** Goals #1, 2, 3, and 15.

C. **Expected Results:** Being able to use the latest technological equipment for the attainment of information will provide Delta State students the opportunity to increase their knowledge of the world and enhance their job skills.

D. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** This goal will be met if funds are available to obtain the needed technological equipment. After data projectors and other multimedia equipment are purchased and implemented in classes, surveys will be administered to students whose instructors have this type of presentational capability to get feedback on its success.

**GOAL #2**

A. **Division Goal #2:** The Division of Social Sciences will seek to significantly increase the participation of faculty in professional meetings and service activities, thereby necessitating a request for an increase in the division’s travel budget.

B. **Institutional Goal that supports Goal #2:** Goals #11, and 13.

C. **Expected Results:** Increasing the Division’s travel budget will help attract faculty who seek support for research and participation at professional meetings. In addition, it will help support the current faculty who want to maintain professional activity in their areas.

D. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** If the necessary funds are provided, the Division should be
able to bring in exceptionally qualified teachers and researchers. With these additional funds, current faculty also will be more active in participating in professional meetings. As the faculty become more involved with these meetings, the chair of the division will be calling on them to provide workshops for the Division and the University.

GOAL #3
A. Division Goal #3: The Division of Social Sciences will continue its move to establish increased collaboration with the Center for Community Development and other Centers which may be established in areas related to research, service learning, and public service. Faculty will be encouraged to seek outside funding to enrich programs through the Division and DSU's emerging centers of excellence.

B. Institutional Goal that supports Goal #3: Goals #5, 6, 11, 13, 14, 18, 20, and 21.

C. Expected Results: This will provide research opportunities for the social scientists in the Division and will create a joint effort on the part of the faculty in the Division and staff at Centers on campus in working with the citizens of the larger Mississippi Delta community.

D. Evaluation Procedure(s): This goal will be assessed by showing the increase in efforts between the Division and other Centers.

STUDENT OUTCOMES FOR 2000

BS Degree in Social Sciences

Major: Social Sciences

Outcome # 1
A. Student Outcome #1: Students will be able to discuss issues in anthropology, geography, political science, and sociology.

B. Expected Results: Most students should be able to participate in a basic discourse about these disciplines.

C. Evaluation Procedure(s): Students' portfolios will be examined to assess the attainment of this goal.

Outcome # 2
A. Student Outcome #2: Students will employ their knowledge of the scientific method by preparing papers in research methods using the appropriate methodological techniques.

B. Expected Results: Students will garner a better appreciation of scientific thinking processes. In addition, they will be equipped to find employment with organizations in
need of scientists with a research background.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** There will be follow-ups of BS graduates to determine if they have been employed in organizations where their research skills are being used.

**BA Degree in Political Science**

**Major:** Political Science

**Outcome # 1**

A. **Student Outcome #1:** Students will demonstrate the skills necessary to succeed in an increasingly global environment.

B. **Expected Results:** By studying politics, most students will be able to research and collect data and communicate findings clearly and effectively in their careers.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** The measurement of this objective will occur in a senior level capstone course. Faculty members will evaluate the students’ ability to write various types of papers and to think critically.

**Outcome # 2**

A. **Student Outcome #2:** Students will argue and defend an issue position in constitutional law.

B. **Expected Results:** Most students will develop critical thinking skills and the ability to apply concepts and theories of political science to new situations. Such preparation will better serve these students in the fields of law, journalism, politics, public administration, and education.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** Students’ portfolios and the Capstone Course

**BS Degree in Criminal Justice**

**Major:** Criminal Justice

**Outcome # 1**

A. **Student Outcome #1:** Students will demonstrate their knowledge of the various criminological theories.

B. **Expected Results:** Most students will better appreciate the relationships between criminological theory and problems faced by our criminal justice system and our contemporary society.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** Exams given in the Criminology and Juvenile Delinquency courses.
Outcome # 2

A. **Student Outcome #2**: Students will explain the philosophy of criminal justice.

B. **Expected Results**: Most students are expected to understand the causes and significance of crime and their relationship to criminal justice and public policy in our society today.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s)**: Exams in Organization and Philosophy of Criminal Justice and students’ portfolios will be examined to assess their attainment of this goal.

**BS Degree in Social Science Education**

Major: Social Science Education

Outcome # 1

A. **Student Outcome #1**: Students will be able select appropriate instructional goals.

B. **Expected Results**: Students will be expected to pass all portions of the PRAXIS exams and to successfully complete their student teaching experience.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s)**: Students will be required to pass the PRAXIS exams in general reading, writing and mathematics; professional knowledge; and the major content area. Passing scores are determined by the state of Mississippi. Students will be required to successfully complete a student teaching experience evaluated by the STAI and complete a detailed two week teaching portfolio.

Outcome # 2

A. **Student Outcome #2**: Students will demonstrate understanding of content-specific pedagogy.

B. **Expected Results**: same as outcome #1

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s)**: same as outcome #1

**Master of Science Degree in Criminal Justice**

Major: Criminal Justice

Outcome # 1

A. **Student Outcome #1**: Students will identify the classical theorists and their theories in criminology.

B. **Expected Results**: Most students should be able to explain the theories of criminology.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s)**: Students will be asked to identify the classical theorists and explain their ideas in an oral or written examination.
Outcome #2

A. **Student Outcome #2**: Students will compare and contrast the different rationales for punishment, i.e., retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation.

B. **Expected Results**: All graduates are expected to understand these differences in punishment.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s)**: Students will be asked in their oral and written examinations to explain how society punishes criminal violators and then how the correction system treats these violators.

Master of Science Degree in Community Development

Major: Community Development

Outcome #1

A. **Student Outcome #1**: Students will engage in field trips, field works, and community analysis projects to better understand the practice of community development.

B. **Expected Results**: All students are expected to gain an understanding for the practice of community development.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s)**: Graduate students in Community Development will have to prepare a practicum report.

Outcome #2

A. **Student Outcome #2**: Students will write and orally defend a project addressing a problem in community development.

B. **Expected Results**: Students will be qualified to participate in research activities devoted to community development issues.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s)**: Students’ practicum experience will be monitored by an on-site supervisor and the coordinator for the Master of Science in Community Development program.

Master of Education Degree in Social Sciences

Major: Master of Education in Social Sciences

Outcome #1

A. **Student Outcome #1**: Students will demonstrate the ability to write social science papers, and to think critically by constructing a research project:

B. **Expected Results**: Students should show the ability to integrate social science knowledge beyond theory to practical situations and make the necessary interdisciplinary connections.
C. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** Oral examinations and practicum reports.

**Outcome # 2**

A. **Student Outcome #2:** Students will compare and contrast statistical techniques.

B. **Expected Results:** Students will know when to use a t-test as compared to an ANOVA test when provided with a research question appropriate to one of these techniques.

C. **Evaluation Procedure(s):** Oral examination.

**VII. EQUIPMENT NEEDS**

The Division of Social Sciences request a **Computer Projector and Notebook Computer.** The application of multi-media technology to information systems in education is growing at a remarkable pace, fueled by Internet and WWW developments. An example of a computer projector system is as follows: A Sharp LCD Projection system, model XG-E1100U, is currently being used by some universities at this time.


1. **The Division of Social Sciences will acquire and use better technology in its classrooms—**that is, Internet connections, projection systems, and other technological equipment in order to tap into the wealth of information available for instructors.

2. **The Division of Social Sciences will seek to significantly increase the participation of faculty in professional meetings and service activities, thereby necessitating a request for an increase in the division's travel budget.**

3. **The Division of Social Sciences will continue its move to establish increased collaboration with the Center for Community Development and other Centers which may be established in areas related to research, service learning, and public service. Faculty will be encouraged to seek outside funding to enrich programs through the Division and DSU's emerging centers of excellence.**

4. **The Division of Social Sciences will use service learning modalities to connect faculty and students to community needs and enable students more field experiences appropriate to their major.**

5. **The Division of Social Sciences will successfully develop a new minor in Delta Studies.**

6. **The Division of Social Sciences will successfully develop a new minor or concentration in African American Studies.**
7. The Division of Social Sciences will cooperatively work with the registrar’s office to add “community service” activities to the official university transcript. Service learning is sweeping the Nation’s Universities and is already in place on transcripts at some Universities.

8. The Division of Social Sciences will seek support for increasing faculty and student participatory research endeavors with the local communities.

9. The Division of Social Sciences will seek financial support for graduate students.

10. The Division of Social Sciences will conduct a thorough review of all undergraduate and graduate course offerings and degree requirements to assure that the Division's curriculum will meet the needs of our students, especially those students who are majors in the Division.

11. The Division of Social Sciences will enhance its academic environment and build internal collegiality by implementing a formal monthly series of brown bag seminars so faculty and graduate students can present papers on research, on service learning projects, or concept papers on new programs for review and discussion by participants.

12. The Division of Social Sciences will continue to develop its Website as an informational resource for prospective students. Student recruitment is a high priority in the Division.
Social Science Budget

The Division requests an increase of $1000 in the Travel budget. It is an exciting time in the Division with more faculty presenting professional papers than in recent years. Abrahams, Brown, DeGraw, Jennings, Loewen, Nylander, O'Sullivan, Robinson, Routman, Sanders, and Richardson continue to be very active in professional organizations.

The Division requests funds for the purchase of software. In today’s technological world, Faculty must have access to software packages, such as SPSS, ARCINFO, and others, in order to increase the quality of instruction in the undergraduate and graduate programs.
### Delta State University

Unit Budget Plan
FY 2001 Budget
AS OF 07-MAR-2000

**ORGANIZATION:** 0387 Social Science  
**UND:** 10 Unrestricted General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>PRIOR YEAR</th>
<th>PHASE 1: ADJ BUDGET</th>
<th>PHASE 2: CHANGE</th>
<th>PHASE 3: APPROVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61200</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>517,416.00</td>
<td>665,768.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61400</td>
<td>Clerical &amp; Secretarial</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,410.00</td>
<td>15,495.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63000</td>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>132,237.00</td>
<td>144,102.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7400</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7520</td>
<td>Postage &amp; Post Office Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75220</td>
<td>Telephone Local Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,056.00</td>
<td>4,680.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75230</td>
<td>Telephone Long Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75240</td>
<td>Telephone Installation &amp; Maint</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75820</td>
<td>Dues</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>(-25.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75840</td>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75870</td>
<td>Computer Software Acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7600</td>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

See page 24 of the Division's Annual Report.
### Delta State University

**Unit Budget Plan**

**FY 2001 Budget**

**AS OF 07-MAR-2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION: 0387</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CODE: 10</td>
<td>Unrestricted General Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROGRAM TOTAL:</th>
<th>PRIOR YEAR</th>
<th>PHASE 1: ADJ BUD</th>
<th>PHASE 2: CHANGE</th>
<th>PHASE 3: APPROVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2000 Adj Budge</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUEST</td>
<td>AMOUNT 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>664,063.00</td>
<td>825,385.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td>15,956.00</td>
<td>16,805.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>-680,019.00</td>
<td>-842,190.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UND TOTAL:          | 664,063.00 | 825,385.00       | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | 15,956.00  | 16,805.00        | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | 0.00       | 0.00             | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | -680,019.00| -842,190.00      | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | 0.00       | 0.00             | 0.00            | 0.00              |

| ORGANIZATION TOTAL: | 664,063.00 | 825,385.00       | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | 15,956.00  | 16,805.00        | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | 0.00       | 0.00             | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | -680,019.00| -842,190.00      | 0.00            | 0.00              |
|                     | 0.00       | 0.00             | 0.00            | 0.00              |
VII. EQUIPMENT NEEDS

The Division of Social Sciences request a Computer Projector and Notebook Computer. The application of multi-media technology to information systems in education is growing at a remarkable pace, fueled by Internet and WWW developments. An example of a computer projector system is as follows: A Sharp LCD Projection system, model XG-E1100U, is currently being used by some universities at this time.


1. The Division of Social Sciences will acquire and use better technology in its classrooms— that is, Internet connections, projection systems, and other technological equipment in order to tap into the wealth of information available for instructors.

2. The Division of Social Sciences will seek to significantly increase the participation of faculty in professional meetings and service activities, thereby necessitating a request for an increase in the division's travel budget.

3. The Division of Social Sciences will continue its move to establish increased collaboration with the Center for Community Development and other Centers which may be established in areas related to research, service learning, and public service. Faculty will be encouraged to seek outside funding to enrich programs through the Division and DSU’s emerging centers of excellence.

4. The Division of Social Sciences will use service learning modalities to connect faculty and students to community needs and enable students more field experiences appropriate to their major.

5. The Division of Social Sciences will successfully develop a new minor in Delta Studies.

6. The Division of Social Sciences will successfully develop a new minor or concentration in African American Studies.

7. The Division of Social Sciences will cooperatively work with the registrar's office to add “community service” activities to the official university transcript. Service learning is sweeping the Nation's Universities and is already in place on transcripts at some Universities.

8. The Division of Social Sciences will seek support for increasing faculty and student participatory research endeavors with the local communities.

9. The Division of Social Sciences will seek financial support for graduate students.

10. The Division of Social Sciences will conduct a thorough review of all undergraduate
and graduate course offerings and degree requirements to assure that the Division's curriculum will meet the needs of our students, especially those students who are majors in the Division.

11. The Division of Social Sciences will enhance its academic environment and build internal collegiality by implementing a formal monthly series of brown bag seminars so faculty and graduate students can present papers on research, on service learning projects, or concept papers on new programs for review and discussion by participants.

12. The Division of Social Sciences will continue to develop its Website as an informational resource for prospective students. Student recruitment is a high priority in the Division.
Social Science Budget

The Division requests an increase of $1000 in the Travel budget. It is an exciting time in the Division with more faculty presenting professional papers than in recent years. Abrahams, Brown, DeGraw, Jennings, Loewen, Nylander, O'Sullivan, Robinson, Routman, Sanders, and Richardson continue to be very active in professional organizations.

The Division requests funds for the purchase of software. In today's technological world, Faculty must have access to software packages, such as SPSS, ARCINFO, and others, in order to increase the quality of instruction in the undergraduate and graduate programs.
Evidence for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
Albert B. Nylander, III
Chair, Division of Social Sciences and
Assistant Professor of Sociology
April 2000

I. Promotion to Chair of the Division of Social Sciences
I was promoted to the Chair position in August of 1998. When the former chair left for employment at another institution, a number of my tenured colleagues inquired about my interest in becoming the chair and indicated that they would support my application fully. Because of their encouragement and my own interest in bringing a new vision to the Division, I applied and was offered the position, which I gladly accepted.

The Social Science Division has seven degree programs with approximately 300 majors. Three programs are at the graduate level, which is the largest in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Division will triple its thesis production this academic year. Under my management, each program is and will continue to be revamped to ensure academic rigor. I have brought top-notch faculty from around the world to the Division. Recent hires hold Ph.D’s from Penn State University, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the University of British Columbia, Iowa State University, and the University of Calgary.

II. Professional Publications
In addition to the responsibilities of directing a Division with seven degree programs and approximately 300 majors, I have written and published the following peer reviewed articles, which list Delta State University as my institutional affiliation. Copies of the articles are attached.


III. Evidence of Outstanding Teaching
Teaching evaluations for years 1998 and 1999 reflect excellent ratings by students in the classroom. I have maintained a mean score of approximately 1 on all indicators. The evaluation instrument uses a Likert scale with 1 suggesting an excellent score and 5 indicating a poor performance.

I have taught the following courses at Delta State University: (1) Introductory to Sociology, (2) Racial and Cultural Minorities, (3) Secondary Social Studies Methods, (4) Social Science Research Methods, (5) Community Development Research Methods, (6) Quantitative Reasoning (Statistics), (7) Criminology, (8) Social Theory, in addition to supervising Student Teachers in Social Science Education.

IV. Program Revisions
As the chair, I created and served on a graduate curriculum committee to revise all graduate programs to reflect more rigorous standards with which faculty and students would be proud to be associated. The Master’s degrees in Community Development and Criminal Justice were given a completely new look. There was a consensus among the faculty that these changes were academically sound and not as watered down as the previous requirements.

V. Activities Related to Student Organizations (1999-2000)
I have provided service to Delta State University for academic year 1999-2000 through the following activities: served on the Teacher Education Committee; Delta State University Hall of Fame Committee; Proxy to the Faculty Senate; Faculty Representative, James Madison Foundation Fellowship; Planning for the Delta Center; Resource Coordinator for the Mississippi Teacher Fellowship Program; and Faculty Administer of Bolivar Civic Club Award.

VI. Association and Participation in Professional Organizations
(1) Received a prestigious honor by being named the 32nd President of the Alabama/Mississippi Sociological Society. Delta State University and the Division of Social Sciences will host the meetings in February 2002. Other Universities in Mississippi which have had Presidents are Mississippi State University, Mississippi College, University of Mississippi, Jackson State University, Tougaloo College, and Hinds Community College. This is the first President from Delta State University. The President of this organization alternates between Alabama and Mississippi every other year.


(3) Executive Committee Member, Alabama-Mississippi Sociological Association, February 25-26, 1999, Montgomery, AL.
(4) Participated in the Creation of a new Community Section at the Rural Sociological Association Meetings in Portland, OR, August 1998.

(5) Served as the Chair over the "Community Development" session at the 29th Annual Meeting of Alabama-Mississippi Sociological Association, February 27-28, 1998, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi.

VII. Community Service

(1) Presented Current Research Interests in the Effects of Religiosity on Adolescent Drug Use to The Exchange Club of Cleveland, Fall 1998.

(2) Presented Research in Community Development Involvement to the Brotherhood Breakfast Club of First Baptist Church, Fall 1998.

VIII. AWARDS AND HONORS

(1) Elected as 32nd President of the Alabama-Mississippi Sociology Association for year 2002. Will serve as President-Elect for 2001.

(2) Named Most Outstanding Doctoral Student at Mississippi State University by the International Honor Society, Alpha Kappa Delta, for year 1997-1998.


Albert B. Nylander, III

Current Position:
Chair, Division of Social Sciences &
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Delta State University
Cleveland, MS 38733

Education

Ph.D. Mississippi State University: May 1998. Dissertation title:
"Rural Community Leadership Structures in Two Delta Communities."

Furniture Industry in Northeast Mississippi from 1948 to 1994: A Social
Structural Analysis."

Education.

AREAS OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTEREST

Sociology of the Community  
Social Change and Development  
Sociology of Education  
Race Relations  
Survey Research and Qualitative Methods  
Theory

Professional Publications

Brown, Ralph B., Albert B. Nylander, III, Brayden G. King, and Benjamin J. Lough.
2000. "Growth Machines and Community Development in Two Racially Diverse Rural
Mississippi Delta Communities: A Monolithic Approach in a Complex Region." Special

Nylander, Albert B. III. 2000. "Graduate Student Experiences at the Social Science
Research Center." Chapter in Social Science Research Center: Celebrating 50 Years of
Excellence.

Effects on Adolescent Drug Use." Youth and Society. Under Review.


Nylander, Albert B., III (Co-author) "Mississippi State University School of Architecture: A Qualitative Evaluation", for the School of Architecture, Mississippi State University, Fall 1995.


**Professional Presentations**

**Papers**


Yuk-Ying Tung, R. Gregory Dunaway, Xiaoh auction, and Albert B. Nylander, III.
"An Examination of the Delinquent Peer Association Effect on Religiosity and
Adolescent Drug Use." Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Annual
Meeting, November 19-22, 1997, San Diego, CA.

"Comparing the Information Network Structure of Identified Rural Community Leaders
and Local Residents." Paper presented at the 60th annual meeting of the Rural
Sociological Society, August 14-17, 1997, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Brown, Ralph B., Xiaoh auction, Melissa Barfield, and Albert B. Nylander, III.
"Historical Decline of Community Satisfaction in U.S. Rural Communities: A
Multi-Regional Analysis of Birth Cohorts." Paper presented at the 60th annual meeting of
the Rural Sociological Society, August 14-17, 1997, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Nylander, Albert B., III, and Ralph B. Brown
"Familial Networks as an Economic Engine in the Upholstered Furniture Industry in
Northeast MS." Paper presented at the Southern Sociological Society Meeting, April 3-6,
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"How Different are They Really: Differences Between Identified Community Leaders
and Local Residents on Information Network Structure and Community Satisfaction and
Attachment." Paper presented at the Mid-South Sociological Society Annual Meeting,
October 31-November 2, 1996, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Nylander, Albert B., III, and Yuk-Ying Tung.
"Differences of Future Educational Expectations between Rural and
Urban Youth." Paper presented at the Mid-South Sociological Society Annual Meeting,
October 31-November 2, 1996, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Nylander, Albert B., III, Yuk-Ying Tung, and Xiaoh auction.
"The Effect of Religion on Adolescent Drug Use In America: An Assessment of Change,
Association, August 16-20, 1996, New York, NY.

Howell, Frank M. and Albert B. Nylander, III.
"Economic Diversity and Business Volatility in the Economic Growth of Local
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Annual Meeting, August 1995, Washington, D.C.
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Graduate Research and Teaching Assistant, University of Mississippi, University, MS, Fall 1992 through Summer 1994.

High School Teacher, Grenada High School, Grenada, MS, Spring 1992.

Other Professional Experience

1998 to Present:  
Chair of the Division of Social Sciences, Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi.

October 1998 to June 2000

Co-Project Director. Delta State University. This study, entitled “Networks of Interaction: The Structure of Community Leadership in a Rural Mississippi Delta Community,” examined the top 15 most influential rural community leaders in a Mississippi community. These leaders were interviewed to determine how each one, who is embedded in his or her own personal social network, embraces the larger leadership network within his or her community. These rural leadership networks were examined by documenting the social relations among identified community leaders. This technique provided an opportunity to focus on the structural aspects of community leadership and its relationship to community development. This research builds on a well established base of comparative data from two other rural Mississippi Delta communities.

July 1 to August 9 1997

Consultant. Delta State University. Data Manager for Dr. Jerry Robinson, Jr., on the Nature Conservancy Project, “Opinions and Behaviors of Landholders Regarding
Conservation Practices and Programs." A report for The Lower Yazoo Basin Project, Sponsored by the Mississippi Chapter of The Nature Conservancy, Jackson, MS.

July 1996 to August 1997

**Research Assistant.** Mississippi State University. Directed the Mississippi Delta Management Systems Evaluation Area (MSEA) project. Directing this project included constructing a survey and developing a sampling frame of farm operators in the Mississippi Delta to be interviewed about their adoption of best management practices to be implemented in their farming practices.

August 1996 to August 1997

**Research Assistant.** Department of Sociology, Mississippi State University. Identification of rural leaders and examination of their environmental attitudes for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Partners for Wildlife Initiatives.

July 1994 to June 1996

**Supervisor, Survey Research Unit.** Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University. Responsibilities for this position were as follows: 1) Supervising telephone interviewers, coders, and data entry personnel, 2) Coordinating activities involved in mailing out surveys, 3) Conducting proper organization of the unit's payroll and record keeping operations, and 4) Maintaining additional activities that were a part of the ongoing process of the survey unit. Gained tremendous experience with SPSS.

January 1994 to 1995

**Research Assistant.** Social Science Research Center. Assisted Dr. Frank Howell in examining the effects of employment diversity and business establishment volatility on economic growth among Mississippi counties from 1975 to 1993.
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**Research Assistant.** Department of Sociology, University of Mississippi. Assisted in researching and collecting data on numerous projects for Dr. Vaughn Grisham.
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Graduate Student Faculty Representative, Alpha Chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta, Mississippi State University, FY 1995-96.

Alpha Kappa Delta member, Mississippi State University, 1994-97.


**PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS**

Community Development Society (current)
Southern Sociological Society (current)
Mid-South Sociological Society (current)
Rural Sociological Society (current)
Alabama-Mississippi Sociological Association (current)
American Sociological Association (expired)
Alpha Kappa Delta
Pi Gamma Mu
HISTORICAL DECLINE OF COMMUNITY SATISFACTION IN U.S. RURAL COMMUNITIES: A MULTI-REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF SYNTHETIC COHORTS

Ralph B. Brown, Xiaohe Xu, John F. Toth Jr. and Albert B. Nylander III

ABSTRACT

Data from 56 non-metropolitan communities gathered at eight different points in time and in different regions of the United States were used to assess whether there has been a systemic decline in community in the United States over time and across regions? Two different community "ontologies" are discussed: community as a material place and community as a social experience. A common indicator of community satisfaction was used to measure residents' subjective evaluation of community as an experience in their respective towns. Multiple Classification Analysis of synthetic cohorts rep-
representing live year birth groupings was used to chart changes in levels of satisfaction. Both before and after statistical controls, a decline over cohorts since 1915 was observed. There has been a steady decline in satisfaction with the local community over time and across regions; each succeeding historical generation is less satisfied with their material communities' ability to create a positive community experience.

INTRODUCTION

Has there been a systemic decline in community over time and across regions in the United States? Since Wellman's (1979) watershed article "The Community Question," it has become common practice to oppose the position of a general loss of community through the expansion of urban forms and exchange economies. Wellman defines "The Community Question" as: "...the question of how large-scale divisions of labor affect the organization and content of primary ties" (p. 1201). The root of his argument is that modern life is not only "quantitatively" different from pre-industrial forms but "qualitatively" different as well. Consequently, the qualitative changes in the structure of primary ties must be examined as well as the quantitative. In modern urban society, community has been "liberated." Urban life "...affirms the prevalence and importance of primary ties but maintains that most ties are not now organized into densely knit, tightly bound solidarities...primary ties now tend to form sparsely knit, spatially dispersed, ramifying structures instead of being bound up within a single densely knit solidarity" (Wellman 1979, pp. 1206-1207). Thus, primary ties, though not localized into a closed communal system or even a neighborhood, remain important. However, secondary ties are important as well as they connect people to the resources of society (see Granovetter 1973). In this modern context, community is not lost, it simply manifests itself differently.

The classic expression of this "loss of community" thesis comes from Tonnies who stated:

Whenever urban culture blossoms and bears fruit, Gemeinschaft appears as its indispensable organ. The rural people know little of it. On the other hand, all praise of rural life has pointed out that the Gemeinschaft among people is stronger there and more alive; it is the lasting and genuine form of living together. In contrast to Gemeinschaft, Gemeinschaft should be understood as a living organism, Gemeinschaft as a mechanical aggregate and artifact (1887, 1963), p. 35).

Perhaps the most prominent contemporary target of the community lost opponents has been Robert Nisbet (1953) who argues that the prevailing theme of twentieth century human existence is the "quest for community." Through the development of the centralized political state, the sustaining relationships and functions of "intermediate associations" like the family, guild, and the local village community have been displaced, substituted by isolation, impersonal

relationships, and frustration. These former associations constituted "community" in their function as mediation points between individuals and society and by providing moral certainty through visible—because it was local—applications of authority. Nisbet (1953, p. 109) argues that "the conflict between central political government and the authorities of the state, village community, class, and religious body has been, of all the conflicts in history, the most fateful." Through this revolutionary shift, nation state and society have become synonymous. Even though they continue to physically exist, the functions of "intermediate associations" have been rendered obsolete, leaving only "atomized" individuals. Not surprisingly, and unlike other theorists (e.g., Hegel and Tonnies), Nisbet strongly rejected the idea that the state, or any other large contemporary institution, could act as a modern substitute for community.

No large scale organization can really meet the psychic demand of individuals because, by its very nature, it is too large, too complex, too bureaucratic, and altogether too aloof from the residual meanings which human beings live by. The state can exist popular enthusiasm, can conduct crusades, can mobilize on behalf of great "causes" such as wars, but as a regular and normal means of meeting human needs for recognition, fellowship, security, and membership, it is inadequate (Nisbet 1960, p. 82).

Commenting on the works of Nisbet and others, in 1960, Maurice Stein concluded that the sociological evidence signified the eventual "eclipse of community" in modern society.

There is one underlying community trend. Toward increased interdependence and decreased local autonomy. Park referred to this process as urban and metropolitan dominance...Lynd noted the parallel phenomenon of dominance by centers of technological diffusion...Warner dealt with this specifically in his discussion of the impact of absentee ownership...All of these studies during the 20s and 30s, then, show increasing standardization of community patterns throughout the country.Intimate life patterns became susceptible to standardized change (1983, p. 110).

Warren (1978, p. 52) picked up the charge with his "Great Change" hypothesis, arguing that a great change in community structure has occurred which "...included the increasing orientation of local community units toward extra community systems of which they are a part, with corresponding decline in community cohesion and autonomy." Community declines, is eclipsed, is changed, is lost. What if these scholars are right? What if there has been a general decline in community? Would we recognize it if we saw it? The question itself opens the proverbial "Pandora's Box" in community research. Though we may intrinsically know what community is when we experience it, as academics, we can't seem to define it. Thus, any scholarly attempts to address the question of community decline will rightfully first be reduced to questions of how community is defined and measured. We think a universal definition of community will forever elude community theorists though many have made noble attempts to be more precise in their definitions and
measurements of the concept (especially since George Hillery’s [1955] demonstration that conceptually community theorists are talking past each other).

Indeed, community theorists have tried to be more precise by defining away place or proximity as a necessary (if not sufficient) element of community (see for example Fischer 1982; Webber, 1963; Wellman & Girton 1979). They have also tried to be more precise by “bringing place back” (see Allen and Schlereth 1990), by linking community to neo-Marxist evaluations of changes in production and consumption regimes (Castella 1977, 1983; Logan and Molotch 1987; Pahl 1978, 1984), and finally, by identifying community as a “field” of interaction (Kaufman 1959; Wilkinson 1970, 1974, 1991). “Field” definitions may reflect a degree of accuracy in how communities—as places—are actually experienced in modern societies, but they fail to address the question of the spatial limit of the field.” Consequently, the theory betrays its promise of a more precise concept of community because its inability to delineate an appropriate sample frame limits its application.

Defining Community: Defining the Undefinable

The debate on how to define community is often split between two, rather restrictive in their assumptions, “either/or” conceptual camps. These camps are seemingly premised on two different ontologies of community: Community either exists as a material reality which occupies physical space and is therefore historically relative to “a place in time” (Rutman and Rutman 1984), or community is an unique social experience—a sense of social being. Defined as material community, community is a physical, spatially delimited entity which either is or is not present; for example, a town, a village, and so on. By this definition community occupies physical space and has historical specificity. This ontology of community is characterized by the use of the article “the”—the community. The community implies an objective entity that can be delimited and has an existence independent of subjective interpretations of it. Communities by this definition have material characteristics which, in specific historical contexts (i.e., they are dependent upon time and place); take on differing levels of desirability for their residents (see Murans and Rogers 1975).

Indeed, this definition of community constitutes the basis of the literature on community development, its rationale and techniques. For example, residents’ overall satisfaction with their community has often been viewed as a consequence of their evaluation of the services the town or city provides (see Herting and Guest 1985; St. John et al. 1986; Wasserman 1982). From this perspective, subjective feelings of, or toward, the community are likewise of (logical necessity) ontologically tied to the material characteristics of a particular time and space bound town or city. Yet, Murans and Rogers (1975) argue that despite the objective (material) conditions of a community, subjective interpretations of those conditions are what people act on. This insight necessitates another, more subjective, ontology of community.

Building on the tradition of Wirth (1938) and Zimmerman (1938), community is not viewed as a material entity per se, but as a unique human social experience which, similar to the first definition, is or is not present at a particular historical time and place. This second type of community ontology usually appears in discussions of community versus discussions about the community. The phenomenon of community clearly implies something that is experienced; a subjective phenomenon that is unique to human interpretation and social being. As a social experience, its ontology is not material. Yet, implicitly (to Wirth and Zimmerman) its existence remains dependent upon the demographic size, density and heterogeneity of a particular physical place. Consequently, community is not necessarily a physical entity, but rather something that happens—an experience. But it only happens where and when specific combinations of human and ecological factors unite in just the right degrees. In other words, community as a social experience is not the physical “place in time” itself but only happens in certain places at time. Thus, even in this ontology, community as a social experience is still dependent upon time and place. Community remains historically bound. Therefore, even though community itself does not occupy space, it must occur in a place; and these theorists contend that the types of places where community can happen are decreasing in number.

Inherent in Wirth’s and Zimmerman’s dichotomies (and in the works of those who would follow their tradition) is an assumption of linear social change where incremental increases in urbanization and urbanism create equal diminutions of community (see Kasarda and Janowitz 1974, for their discussion of the linear growth model of community attachment). Ultimately, in modern urban places, community (as a social experience) is displaced. It is lost. No scholarly efforts have been able to theoretically or empirically establish exactly where the threshold resides in the morphology of a material community when community as a social experience ceases to exist (see Redfield 1930, 1934, and 1941 for a noble attempt with his Folk-urban continuum; see also Lewis 1951, 1953 for critiques of this continuum and its empirical application).

Both of these definitions are founded upon related ontologies which suggest that, at a minimum, for community to exist, it is contingent on (in the case of community as a social experience), or must physically occupy (in the case of material community), space. From these perspectives, a dimension of place is theoretically and empirically appropriate and cannot be discarded. However, a focus on experience allows for the individual/community relationship to be studied across time (Bender 1978). It offers a more theoretically refined approach because community does not have to be viewed as an "either/or" phenomenon. Rather, community is a variable personal experience in the lives of individuals which occurs in the context of both time and space. For this reason, community as an uniquely human condition, has been, and will continue to be difficult to objectify. In essence,
individuals' experience of community is only as strong as they feel it to be. Because such feelings or evaluations are made in reference to others (particular or generalized) who occupy space at a particular juncture in time, the level of community experienced, no matter how individualized it may appear, will always be bound to time and place, and made in reference to the associations with objective or "imagined" (Anderson 1991) others. The social experience of community will always be historically specific! Therefore to ask if there has been a decline in the experience of community, the answer is "Absolutely," for the individual who believes so. Has there been a general or historical decline in the experience of community at an objective systemic level? Alas, this is more difficult to answer and requires a recognition of shifting contextual or historical realities.

Similar to the intrinsic sense claimed by Nisbet (1953) and others (see e.g., Coleman 1966; Milgram 1970; Redfield 1930, 1934, 1941; Reissman 1964; Short 1971; Vidich and Bensman 1958; and Warren 1978) that we have lost something—a sense, or the experience, of community—perhaps through these broad conceptual traditions scholars have lost something. The ontological base to these arguments is clear, something must first exist if it can be lost. The question is what have "we" lost? Perhaps "we" as post-Wellman scholars have lost perspective of what people actually expect of their material/spatially delimited communities (the places they live). In other words, maybe we have lost track of one of our own ontologies of community where community as a social experience is dependent upon the right historical mix of humans and ecological space. When Nisbet and others talk of the "loss of community" they are not referring to material communities being erased from existence. On the contrary, they are referring to the social experience of community—the timeless, boundless human experience of community. To answer the question of whether a systemic decline in the experience of community could be recognized, both ontologies of community must be acknowledged, examined, and perhaps modified.

Though we are willing to assume that community is a social experience which occurs in a place, we part ways with both ontologies at this point for we are not willing to accept community as a categorical variable—that is, that it either does or does not exist. Community must be viewed as a continuous variable, a social experience which is always present because it is part of the human experience, but which varies in degrees under different geographical, cultural, and historical circumstances. We see this approach to be more in tune with Tonnies' original conception of competing "wills" in all human experience. Thus one reason we believe community is so difficult to define is because it has become the ultimate paradox, by overtly recognizing our common sense of connectedness (something we would conceive of only if we first see ourselves as autonomous individuals), we affirm its ontology. And, anything that exists, by definition, can potentially be lost! We just disagree with the logical assumption that its existence can be misplaced in its entirety. Community is a human experience, a shared ideology and a social

condition (Hummon 1990) that occurs in greater degrees in certain places and at certain times.

Today, the experience of community is most celebrated in rural America. If community still happens, it is in this setting. In twentieth century American culture, rural America represents both a nostalgic place in time with its accompanying images of the positive human relationships that uniquely occur there and an affront to the rights and privacy of the individual (Hummon 1990). Hofstadter (1955) referred to the positive side of this ideology as the "agrarian myth," the idea that rural places represent a simpler time and place in our image of ourselves as Americans. A time and a place were the most virtuous of the American ethos are found. There was, however, another side to this rural folk hero besides the rugged individualist who had forged a nation. It was this same composite rural citizen who also knew the limits of the individualistic drive laying it aside to foster the democratic spirit of community. Alexis de Tocqueville (1960) marveled at rural Americans' ability to weave their individualistic desires with the needs of others to form "community." Community, by this prescription demanded vigilant volunteerism and commitment on the part of individuals to look beyond their own selfish desires. Thus building community was a major part of rural Americans' lives. From the Tocqueville's Democracy in America position, America was great because people in rural villages had the best of both sides of what it meant to be an American—rugged individualists yet devoted community servants. Even today, it is commonly held that the experience of community is nurtured and passed on to each generation primarily in rural America (Brown 1997). The experience of community is particular to time and place—it is culturally and historically dependent.

We are willing to assume that community, as a social experience, occurs in a place and that certain types of places, as influenced by their social, cultural, ideological, economic, and physical structures under specific historical conditions and circumstances, are more conducive to higher levels or degrees of community. Additionally, we are willing to assume that most people continue to expect their geo-political, spatially delimited, historically specific, material communities to provide them with the timeless, spatially boundless, ephemeral "social experience" of community. If defined and operationalized in such a way, could changes/shifts over time and across different global and local historical circumstances be recognized through common measures of the social experience of community as it relates to particular places? Again, quoting from Nisbet:

In large degree, the quest for community is timeless and universal. Nevertheless, the shape and intensity of the quest for community varies from age to age. For generations, even centuries, it may lie mute, covered over and given gratification by the securities found in such institutions as family, village, class, or some other type of association. In other ages, ages of sudden change and dislocation, the quest for community becomes conscious and even clamant. It is this in our own age (1953, p. 47).
Clearly, Nisbet does not place the ontology of community in the material—or spatial—community of the community developers. Such communities may have provided the context for the experience of community at different points in time (see Bender 1978). Whether or not they continue to do so is the problem of interest. What if people still view the material community as the locus for the social experience of community? Can a case be made that increasingly contemporary material communities are failing to meet people's expectations of the social experience of community? In other words, has Nisbet's "quest for community" turned into a failed social experience because of unmet expectations from our material communities? Have community scholars lost sight of "degrees" of community?

Bender (1978) argues that as more and more of the functions of everyday life (i.e., politics, economics, and mass culture) were pulled from the local community context (the material community), a general disassociation between the experience of community and the material community began to emerge.

Important economic and political elements of social life were torn from their communal context, reformed into segments of life with their own justification—that is, justification independent of community—and then added to a somewhat reduced gemeinschaft, producing an alternative and distinct social experience. Although there was an extraordinary expansion in the scope and influence of the market during the nineteenth century, more than a quantitative increase in market activities is involved; there was a qualitative change in the nature and role of the market. The abstract and translocal market increasingly challenged the family and community as a foundation for social order. Market and community became alternative and competing patterns of order. Social experience, as a result, was bifurcated. At the core of this division, especially after the Civil War, was the conflict between community and market, gemeinschaft and gesellschaft, as kinds of social interaction (Bender 1978, pp. 111, 113).

Therefore, we feel it is possible to measure how the expectations of the social experience of community have changed under different historical circumstances (global as well as local) as they are played out in real time and space bound empirical places—country-sides, villages, towns, cities, and so on. If the community liberated perspective is correct, there should be no decline in the experience of community over time and across place. If, however, Nisbet, Stein, and Warren, and so forth are correct, a relative decline in the levels of community over time and across place should be observed. Research has shown that generational differences are lasting beyond life-cycle differences (Ryder 1985). Therefore, one way to examine changing expectations of the spatial community's ability to continue to provide the experience of community, is to examine the opinions of different generations through an examination of different cohorts while controlling for age, location and other factors.

Historical Decline of Community Satisfaction in U.S. Rural Communities

METHODS

Data

Five sets of community survey data collected from people in 56 different non-metropolitan communities in Missouri, Mississippi, Utah, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Wyoming at eight different points in time (the earliest was gathered in 1982 and the latest in 1995) provided the data for this study. The various data sets ranged in size from 311 cases to 1673 cases. The number of people sampled in the various communities ranged widely from 1 to 493. The data set from Vermont and Massachusetts included respondents from many communities (38) while the other four data sets all concentrated on one to four communities. The Utah and Wyoming data sets examined four communities at three different time periods two years apart and thus represent twelve communities. Of the other four data sets besides Vermont and Massachussetts, the smallest number of people sampled in a single community was eighty five. All five data sets were combined across common variables to create one aggregated body of data with a total number of 4149 cases.

Using synthetic cohorts (Weeks 1992), we examined differences in one global measure of community satisfaction which was common to all five data sets. Since complete life-course data were not available in any of these five data sets, a synthetic cross-sectional cohort to illustrate the cohort approach was used. Five year synthetic cohorts were used as proxy representations of generations (Weeks 1992). This produced seventeen five year cohorts which corresponded to each respondent's year of birth. The earliest cohort included those respondents who were born in or before 1900 with 1888 representing the earliest birth year. The latest cohort contained respondents who were born after 1980. The 1980 and younger cohort naturally excludes respondents from the Utah and Wyoming data sets because all five data sets used in our study sampled only those who were 18 or over at the time of the survey.

We have argued that implicitly two very different ontologies of community can be found in the community literature: Community either exists as a material reality which occupies physical space and is therefore historically relative to "a place in time," or community is an unique social experience—a sense of social being—which is typically associated with a certain place in time. Both definitions are rooted upon ontologies which suggest that, at a minimum, community is contingent on (in the case of community as a social experience), or must physically occupy (in the case of material community), space. Therefore, how intensely a person experiences community, will always be bound to some degree upon time and place, and made in reference to the associations with objective or "imagined" others. Thus both ontologies of community are historically specific. In this light we identified a global measure of community satisfaction which was common to all five data sets that captured both ontologies. Respondents evaluated their
present material community—a place—with an ideal community of their own imagining. We assume that one of the potential factors that a respondent could consider in his or her ideal community is the overall "experience of community" they may derive from a particular place. In other words, how well does the material community meet a resident's demands for the experience of community?

Respondents were asked the following: "Imagine the ideal community in which you would like to live. On a scale from X to Y, with X being the farthest from your ideal and Y being closest to your ideal, where would you rank your present community?" Possible scores across the five data sets ranged from 1 to 5, from 1 to 7, and from 1 to 11. Consequently, they were standardized for comparability. The standardized scores ranged from a low of −2.71 to a high of 2.64. We examined the standardized measure using 17 synthetic cohorts across 56 different non-metropolitan communities extracted from five different data sets at different points in time and in different regions of the United States. The following hypothesis was derived from the literature and the above data:

**Hypothesis 1.** Community satisfaction is a proxy of how well one experiences community as a social condition in a specific place—a town, city and so on. The ability of a material community to adequately meet residents' social experience of community has declined. Therefore, a relative decline in community satisfaction across cohorts for all places measured will be observed.

**Statistical Approach**

Multiple Classification Analysis (or MCA, see Andrews et al. 1973) was used to test for historical changes in community satisfaction as measured by the global indicator of community satisfaction ("Ideal Community") in rural America. The MCA procedure under ANOVA in SPSS was utilized to estimate the observed and adjusted means of the dependent variable, "Ideal Community," for categories of the predictor variables (synthetic cohorts) and six selected covariates. In MCA multivariate analyses, the observed means are the average values of the dependent variable ("Ideal Community") for each synthetic cohort (or historical generation). The adjusted means are the average values of the dependent variable "Ideal Community" for the categories of birth cohorts after controlling for demographic and compositional differences in the population. Gender, race, marital (or union) status, respondents' age and length of residence were statistically controlled. Because we used multiple data sets collected from different regions a variable indicating survey locations was also controlled. To compare compositional similarities or dissimilarities, both observed means (without controls) and adjusted means (with controls) were charted.

**Table 1.** Observed and Adjusted Means and Number of Cases for Ideal Community for Seventeen Birth Cohorts (n = 4149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHORT (Year)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Observed Mean</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&gt;=1980</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

Table 1 shows the MCA results for the observed and adjusted means as well as the number of cases for each of the seventeen cohorts for the dependent variable "Ideal Community." However, it is difficult to envision trends in sequential data by looking at tabular data. Therefore, the data were charted allowing easy observation of changes across all 17 cohorts.

Figure 1 shows the chart the observed means of the MCA. As can be seen, there is a marked and steady decrease in the mean scores beginning with the 1915 synthetic cohort (mean = .62) continuing until the 1975 cohort (mean = -.15) where another large decrease occurred. Figure 2 shows that after controlling for gender, race, marital (or union) status, respondents' age, length of residence and survey region, a similar relative decline of community satisfaction with their local community holds for all cohorts after the 1915 cohort (1915 mean = .68 and the 1975 mean = -.27). Finally, Figure 3 shows the charted lines for both analyses—with and without controls—superimposed on each other. There is very little divergence between the two lines. Thus, with and without statistical controls for potential heterogeneities in individuals' age, gender, marital status, race, place of residence, length of residence and region of country, two similar and somewhat
monotonically declining curves were observed. Therefore, addressing our hypothesis: There has been a steady decline in relative community satisfaction with the local community over time and across regions, showing that each succeeding historical generation (synthetic cohort) is less satisfied with their material communities' ability to create a positive community experience.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The data show there has been a decline in community over time and across regions in the United States. Our indicator measured the subjective elements of community in reference to a physical place. In this regard, we were able to examine the decline of "community" while acknowledging two different ontologies of community from the literature. Therefore, going beyond Wellman's conclusions, community has not just changed the way it manifests itself, there has been a systemic decline of the experience of community as it is measured by diminishing levels of rural community satisfaction. Though Wellman has identified a very important aspect of change in community, it does not necessarily invalidate those he has critiqued. The problem is (as always with "community" studies) one in semantics, what Wellman means by "qualitative" differences is quite different from how we have used the term. Both applications are proper. Wellman's analysis captures many objective differences between how people form primary structures now ver-
also reflect this new optimism. At the 1965 cohort an increase in community satisfaction is observed which continues into the 1975 cohort. There is a sharp dropoff between the 1975 and 1980 cohorts. Though only seven cases are in this last cohort, the trend mirrors Putnam's (1995) work on cohorts where he found an across the board decline in community participation during the 1980s. Still, due to the small number of cases we approach this last dip in the line with caution.

We end where we started, too feel that "[T]he quest for community is timeless and universal" (Nisbet 1953, p. 47). Though the structure may have changed as Wellman argues, people will always find themselves rooted in place and time. Community, both as a place and an experience, captures this notion of historical specificity. Over time, has the place of community become less able to supply the emotional and social needs for the experience of community? It appears that this may be the case. Will community as a social experience be eclipsed? No, community as an experience is not and never can be a dichotomous variable.
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NOTES

1. Even today, reconstruction of community at the nation state level remains a common theme in the social science literature. Anderson (1991) in his analysis on the rise of nation states and nationalism notes that such efforts are largely the results of an attempt to imbue the nation with personal, yet shared meaning. Modern nation states become in Anderson's words "Imagined Communities."

2. We recognize that even though some changes are global in scope (e.g., the nassification of markets and cultural forms, see Brown 1993; Brown et al. 1996; Vidich and Bensman 1958) every local community continues to maintain its own unique elements and identity.

3. Our data had no metropolitan comparison. We recognize this limitation. However, rural places are ubiquitously seen as where community still happens. Consequently, in a search for declines in community, examination of non-metropolitan areas was seen as an appropriate approach.

4. We have no way of knowing what particular aspects of or about community respondents were imagining when responding to this question. We assume that each person has their own personal "ideal" in mind when they envision "community." If, however, community is a subjective experience of social being what is being imagined by each individual is irrelevant to our analysis. What is important is whether or not there has been a systemic decline in the aggregated subjective evaluation of local communities' ability to meet residents' ideal image of community.
5. Only one covariate was significantly associated with the dependent variable ideal community. That was age. Clearly in a biracial association age and cohort will be highly correlated. Therefore, in the MCA procedure we used the experimental method for selection of controls. In this method covariates are adjusted for other covariates in the model.
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COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RURAL COMMUNITY LEADERS' AND RESIDENTS' INFORMATIONAL NETWORKS

By Ralph B. Brown and Albert B. Nylander III

ABSTRACT

A demarcation must exist between community leaders and non-leaders; leaders must have followers. Typically, community leaders are identified through specific attributes, positions, skills, etc.—element in the psychology of community leadership development. However, to create sustainable leadership and community development, communities need to consistently mobilize resources through collective action. To do this, an established system of information networks and a method for allocating organized efforts in the community need to be in place. Thus, besides functional leaders, communities also need a functional leadership structure—the sociology of community leadership. We examined the network density, size, and organizational memberships of identified community leaders and other residents in two rural Missouri communities. Leaders had larger, more dense, and diffuse networks, and more organizational memberships than other residents. The structure of community leadership is as important and real as the psychology of leadership and a key to developing sustainable community development strategies.

INTRODUCTION

An obvious, though subtle, implication of contemporary rural community leadership is that a demarcation exists between leaders—typically identified through their specific attributes, positions, skills, etc.—and non-leaders. Leaders
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must have followers. Developing active leadership and encouraging citizen involvement (followers) in community activities have long been viewed as the key to community sustainability (see Christensen, 1982; Youmans, 1990, p. 5). Leadership training programs have become an increasingly popular rural development strategy in developing local leaders, designed to improve their effectiveness and increase public involvement in rural development activities (Cook, Howell, & Weir, 1985; Martin & Wilkinson, 1985). Such programs however, typically focus on identifying and honing the unique characteristics of individuals (Cary, 1989; Langone & Rohs, 1995). In short, they focus on the psychology of rural community leadership while largely ignoring its sociology—the structure of rural community leadership.

Increasingly, researchers have moved beyond simple interpretations of leaders as “born” or a “special breed.” Leadership is situational and, thus, to a certain degree context-specific and always more complex than monolithic appeal to personal attributes. A variety of theoretical perspectives have been advanced in an attempt to capture this complexity. Situational contingency theory (Fiedler, 1967), for example, argues that leaders develop their skills through a variety of activities contingent to their own lives and community (see also Bass, 1990; Dyer & Williams, 1987; Rost, 1991). The transformational theory of leadership development also attempts to get at this complexity. Leadership is a relationship between people who are seeking individual or mutual goals. To achieve their own goals leaders need followers. In the pursuit of goals, both leaders and followers are transformed: followers by leaders motivating them to do more than they expect of themselves, and leaders, by having to accommodate the values, interests, and concerns of followers with their own (Bass, 1985). From this perspective, leadership is more conceptual—how the relationship between the various parties is perceived then acted upon—than operational. In other words, there are no strict rules or stages to leadership development; leaders develop out of unique contexts and relationships. Consequently, Rost (1991) argues that all are “doing” leadership through their involvement in the emerging relationship.

Despite moving beyond simple appeals to personal characteristics, situational theories still fall short in some very critical respects. They are too context-specific, too relative. They often fail to recognize that community leadership is not only influenced by structural variables but also reproduces its own structure in the community. Analytically, structural characteristics are independent of the personal characteristics of people and thus are more enduring than the personalities involved. Consequently, they are to a certain degree generalizable and predictable. The overt relativity of situational theories leaves few options for community and leadership developers to apply as generalizable theory for their craft. Thus, although leaders' personal attributes may influence the outcome of specific community projects, situational theories may account for the context of the activities and relationships in community leadership development; effective and sustained rural community leadership also depends on the perpetual organization of the community and its leadership structure (perhaps more so than on the personal qualities of leaders—trained or untrained; see Brown, 1991). Therefore, even though leadership structures are in part created and maintained by a community's own unique makeup and the unique personalities of its leaders, specific components of leadership structure are potentially generalizable to all communities (Brown, 1991). One of the most important of these components is the leaders' ability to mobilize resources and generate collective action at the community level (Heekathorn, 1993; Ryan, 1994). This ability depends largely on the quality of connections to others both inside and outside of the community (Jenkins, 1983; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; McGranahan, 1984; Wellman & Berkowitz, 1988). Indeed, O'Brien, Hassinger, Brown, and Pinkerton (1991) have shown that the viability of a rural community can be predicted by how well-identified leaders are connected to each other and/or to other members of the community and beyond. Thus, to create sustainable development at the rural community level, communities must be able to consistently mobilize resources through collective action (Luloff & Swanson, 1990). To do this, a well-established system of information networks and a method for allocating organized efforts in the community need to be in place (Brown, 1991). In short, the community needs both functional leaders and a functional leadership structure.

Resource Mobilization and Leaders' Networks

Much of rural development can be seen as a problem of resource mobilization and leaders' networks (Brown, 1991; Luloff & Swanson, 1990). Necessary resources for successful community development activities include those internal and external to the community (O'Brien et al., 1991). External resources include government and foundation funding, contacts with potential employers, and access to information about potential options for a community. To access these resources, a community and its leadership must build “bridges” to link with the outside world (Allen & Dillman, 1994; Granovetter, 1973). Leaders often serve as these “bridges” or, at the very least, must have strong ties with community members who do so. Internal resources include the capacity of persons within the community to devote time and resources to communal activities. Communities must mobilize internal resources to strengthen “bridges” with external institutions. Thus, considerable resources for self-improvement exist if internal resources can be mobilized and sustained (O'Brien et al., 1991). Social support is particularly critical in small towns where leadership is understaffed and burn-out is a serious problem (Youmans, 1990). Good leaders may always be able to mobilize people for short-term projects; however, without considerable amounts of community support they cannot sustain efforts over time (S.-A. 1989).
The ability of small towns to mobilize external and internal resources for rural development activities depends in large part on the social networks of their community leaders and other residents. The ability of any group to mobilize resources is affected by the number and type of ties between its own members and between other groups (Freudenberg, 1986; Straits, 1991). Through their networks, leaders need to know what support can be sought from whom and at what stage of the mobilization effort. In other words, leaders' networks must connect them into the "right" people—those who will give the largest return to the organizer for his/her resources spent—not just the right number of people (Brown, 1991; Marwell, Oliver, & Prah1, 1988; Oliver & Marwell, 1988). Access to networks may vary by the race, gender, education, and income of individuals; even so, there remain substantial differences in the capacity of individuals and groups with identical demographic and socioeconomic characteristics to develop and sustain networks (Fischer et al. 1977).

At a minimum, three network characteristics of community leaders are most likely to affect a small town's ability to mobilize resources: network diversity, network density, and network size. The diversity of social characteristics of persons within social networks can be expected to have an important impact on resource mobilization. O'Brien et al. (1991) and Wall (1989) both found that communities with women in their leadership structure were more viable than similar communities that did not have women represented. Communities and leadership structures characterized by factions or cliques will encounter more difficulty in organizing public projects. However, a certain amount of conflict should be expected among leaders in communities that draw their leaders from many sectors of the community (Geertsen & Madsen, 1986). Those communities whose leadership structure allows the inclusion of women and other minorities also should have more conflict evident among their leaders. However, they also should be more viable than those communities whose leadership structures do not house many women or other minorities, as these people can tap into a variety of network linkages that white males simply have little access to.

The second network characteristic is density or the intensity of association among network members. Most high- and low-density networks may hinder collective action. Members of highly dense networks may be isolated from large segments of the community, while low-density networks may preclude coordinated action (Granovetter, 1973; Wellman, 1981). However, persons with dense networks may be more likely to discuss public and community issues (Allen & Dillman, 1994; Straits, 1991). Granovetter (1973) argues that strong intimate networks of interaction among individuals are not as important as weak or "loosely coupled" ones for diffusion of information and capitalizing on opportunities created by access to information.

The contention here is that removal of the average weak tie would do more 'damage' to transmission probabilities than would that of the average strong one. This means that whatever is to be diffused can reach a larger number of people, and traverse greater social distance (i.e., path length) when passed through weak ties rather than strong (Granovetter, 1973, p. 353).

Thus, a community with many weak ties in its leadership network structure should be able to disseminate the information and resources necessary to organize collective action better than one oriented more toward strong personal ties. Marwell et al. (1988), however, argue that the existence of weak ties per se do not make it easier for certain communities to organize collective action, but the distribution of these ties. Through computer-simulated models of networks they found that highly centralized weak ties in a community were better for organizing collective action than any other type of network pattern. Centralized networks are "concentrated in a few individuals rather than being spread more evenly across the whole group" (p. 506)—a small number of people who know most everybody (Leaders!) versus a large number of people who know only a few others.

The final network characteristic is network size. The larger a community's leadership networks are, the wider variety of information and support are available for use in community projects. Larger networks also may be more adaptive and less likely to be overloaded (Granovetter, 1973; O'Brien et al., 1991).

If there is a clear demarcation between rural community leaders and citizens (followers), this should be evident in the information network structures of both. In other words, some fundamental differences in diversity, density, and size between the information networks of community leaders and those of the larger community population should be found. Leaders should show a more diffuse information network structure than the average person as the role of leader requires the incumbent to tap into and access a large and diverse amount of information that may be of use to the community. It should be composed of strong rather than weak ties. Severe limitations to the amount, quality, and timing of the potential information flow would occur if leaders had very tight-knit, thus limited, network structures.

Brown (1991) also found that rural community leaders in his case study played prominent roles in the various community organizations—Rotary Chamber of Commerce, even religious institutions such as the Knights of Columbus. In effect, the organizations gave stability to a shifting leadership structure and formalized weak ties among leaders due to incumbency, not personality. These organizations also provided a format for presenting and passing on information to other parties. Thus, when information finally reached the typical community resident it had already been sanctioned and legitimized. Therefore, differences in participation in community organization also should be observed between community leaders and the larger community population— these can act as a formal source of weak ties.
Is there a clear demarcation between rural community leaders and the citizenship? Do leaders stand alone not only in their personal abilities and psychological traits but in the structure of their networks and participation in community organizations as well? These questions will be explored here.

**Research Methods**

Data were drawn from a study of two rural trade-center communities in northeast Missouri: Brian and Winder (pseudonyms). Both communities have populations of just over 1,000 residents (see Brown, 1993; Brown, Hudspeth, & Odom, 1996; O'Brien et al., 1991; Pinkerton, Hassinger, & O'Brien, 1995, for other applications and explanations of these two data sets).

In the two communities, local residents and leaders were interviewed and many identical questions were asked in both surveys. For the community residents, a randomized cluster sample was taken and personal interviews conducted with self-identified male and female household heads (see Brown, 1993). Street segments in each community were identified and randomly sampled. All households on both sides of the sampled street were entered into the interview pool. In total, 311 interviews were completed (147 in Brian and 164 in Winder), representing an 85 percent completion rate (Brown, 1993).

To identify the leadership structure of Brian and Winder, a positional-reputational method was used to select 15 leaders from each of the two communities for a total of 30 leaders interviewed (O'Brien & Hassinger, 1992). In each community, lists were made of persons who held positions in organizations, public offices or committees, businesses, religious groups, educational organizations, professions, and other identifiers of potential leadership (O'Brien & Hassinger, 1992). Nineteen categories of potential leadership positions were developed to identify individuals who might be regarded as leaders (O'Brien et al., 1991). Seven informants representing key institutional areas of the community—business, local government, agriculture, education, newspaper, religion, and community history—were asked to select the 15 most influential leaders (defined in the following way: "...influential from the point of view of leading others and getting things done or being able to stop projects which others have started" [O'Brien et al., 1991, p. 704]) in their community. The seven lists of 15 were combined to produce one list of the top 15 leaders determined by those people identified the most frequently by the informants. After identification of the top 15 leaders, face-to-face interviews were conducted with each leader identified in the two communities. There were no refusals.

The next step was to merge the two data sets—community residents and the top 15 community leaders—along common variables. Some variables were recorded to assure they were all in the same direction in both data sets. Other variables were available in one data set but not the other. The racial and gender make-up of the identified leaders informational networks, for example, were not ascertained. Consequently, we simply were not able to construct a comparable and adequate network diversity variable in this study though we recognize it is an extremely important aspect of network structure to measure. But alas, our comparison across these two groups was constrained by our data.

Nine indicators of network characteristics and organizational membership (all treated as separate dependent variables) were examined through hierarchical linear regression analysis. Eight of the nine indicators were composite variables constructed through additive indexes, with the one exception being the variable that measured network size. Also, eight of the nine indicators were used to examine specific network characteristics, with the ninth variable measuring total organizational memberships. The eight network indicators were utilized in the following way: seven measured different aspects of network density and one measured network size. The composite network indicators were constructed by combining the appropriate responses from the following questions adopted from the General Social Survey network module: "From time to time, most people discuss important matters with other people. These may be family members, friends, professional people, such as doctors or clergy, or business people. Looking back over the last 6 months—who are the people with whom you discussed matters important to you? Please tell me only their first names or initials." Network density was measured by the following seven indicators: 1) whether network incumbents lived within the community or within 15 miles; 2) the total amount of kinship ties identified in the network; 3) the total amount of friendship ties identified in the network; 4) the total amount of business or professional ties identified in the network; 5) whether or not network incumbents knew each other, and if so, how well; 6) how long the respondent had known the named network incumbents; and 7) how often the respondent speaks to his/her network incumbents. The first four indicators examined the types of ties—weak or strong—respondents had with their network incumbents, while the last three examined aspects of interaction with network incumbents. Finally, network size was measured by how many people respondents identified in their network up to five incumbents.

The nine indicators utilized as dependent variables were analyzed using hierarchical linear regression analysis. Four blocks of independent variables were independently entered into the regression equation to assess their relative contribution to explained variance for each of the nine indicators. The first block included six demographic characteristics as controls: the age, education, employment status, marital status, race, and gender of the respondent. The last four of these control variables were all coded as dummy variables. The second block of variables measured the respondents' social ties to the community through two indicators: years of residence in the community, and how many of the respondents' relatives lived within the community or within 15 miles.
third block of variables simply measured whether or not the respondent was one of the identified 30 leaders from across the two communities. It was anticipated that this third block would explain the greatest amount of variance in the regression equation as it represented the key variable of interest—the difference, if any, between identified community leaders and all other respondents. The final block—Community Differences—was entered into the regression equation as a final control to ascertain whether there were differences between the two communities as a whole and between the identified leaders from Winder versus those from Brian across the nine indicators. It contained two dummy variables: All respondents from Winder coded as 1, and all identified leaders from Winder; again coded as 1.

FINDINGS

Findings for the first four of seven indicators of Network Density—types of ties are reported in Table 1. For three of these four indicators, identified community leaders had a significant effect. The first indicator measured how many of the respondent's network incumbents were connected to them through a neighbor or friendship tie. In all four models the only personal characteristic that had a significant effect across all four models was education. Those with higher education had more neighbors or friends in their networks. Another very interesting finding is that gender was a significant predictor of how many neighbors and/or friends are in the network in the first two models. In other words, males who were not identified as leaders were more apt to have more friends and neighbors in their networks. By implication, identified leaders—both male and female—were just as likely to have neighbors and friends in their networks. Two other interesting findings show that identified leaders in general and respondents from Brian were more likely to have neighbors and/or friends in their networks than were non-identified leaders and respondents from Winder. This was the only indicator in which an association was observed between one or both of the community differences measures and network structure. A total of 10% variance was explained in the final model.

The second indicator of the four displayed in Table 1 examined the total amount of kin-ties in the network. There was literally no significant indicators in any of the models. Thus, it appears that for these two communities the number of kin-ties in the informational networks of residents and identified leaders does not account for differentiation in network structure either across communities or identified leaders versus general residents.

Perhaps the most interesting, and indeed expected, finding was that identified leaders in both communities had far more professional ties with the incumbents in their networks than did the other respondents. The four models for the indicator. Professionals in Networks, show that older people had more
Education was a significant predictor in all four models. More educated respondents talked with network members more often. As for social ties, years of residence in the community had a positive effect. Those who have lived in the community longer speak more often with their network members than those who have been in the community a shorter time. Perhaps the most interesting result is that leaders clearly speak with their network members more often than other members of the community speak with their network incumbents. The final model explained 9 percent of the variance. No differences were observed between Brian and Winder respondents or Winder leaders and all others.

The seventh and final indicator of Network Density (the third reported in Table 2) was duration of networks, or how long has the respondent known the network incumbent. Again, the most obvious finding is that identified community leaders have known their network incumbents longer than other community residents have known their incumbents. An examination of the changes in Adjusted R² show that explained variance jumped from under 2 percent to 13 percent when leaders were added to the model. When identified community leaders were added to the equation in model 3, age became significant and education was no longer significant. Younger leaders appear to have known their network incumbents longer than others. It also appears that education is an important predictor of network duration for those not identified as leaders. For identified leaders, this is not the case. Finally, no difference was found between Winder and Brian or between identified leaders from Winder and everyone else.

Across six of the seven indicators of Network Density identified community leaders had significantly different network structures than did other community members. On only one occasion was a significant difference observed between Winder and Brian respondents or between identified leaders from Winder and all other respondents on explaining Network Density. Brian residents had more neighbors and friends in their networks than did respondents and leaders from Winder. Given these results, we must assume that the observed network density of leaders is fairly universal across both communities.

The combined results for Network Size and Organizational Memberships are found in Table 3. By far the most important and dramatic relationship involves identified leaders, who have much larger networks (as measured by the number of people named in the name generator up to five incumbents) than did other respondents. When leaders were factored in in model 3, age became a significant predictor, with younger identified leaders having larger networks. Education and marital status also fell out of the equation as significant predictors when identified leaders were added. The total amount of variance explained increased dramatically when identified leaders were added to the equation, jumping from 6 percent to 45 percent. No differences were observed between the two communities and between identified leaders from Winder and all others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Estimated Effects of Personal Characteristics, Social Ties, Leaders, and Community Differences on Network Size &amp; Organizational Memberships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Variables are: Age (years), Education (years), Married, Single, Children (1), Number of Children (1), and # of Children (1). Leader, Community (Winder, Brian), and Total.
Similarly stark differences were found in total organizational memberships of respondents and identified leaders. Although personal characteristics (older, married white males with high levels of education dominated the ranks of community organizations, especially in Brian) accounted for the majority of variance explained (25% in model 1), identified leaders added an additional 9 percent (from .270 adj R^2 in model two, to .362 adj R^2 in model three). In the final two models, those who had lived in the community a longer period of time and who had more relatives in the area also were more likely to be a member of more community organizations than were other residents. Finally, identified leaders in Brian were more likely to be members of more organizations than were leaders in Winder. This was the only other indicator to show a significant relationship between one or both of the community differences measures and the dependent variable being examined.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

Something must differentiate leaders from followers. Past research on community leadership has concentrated on the psychology of this divide—on leaders’ personality traits and context-specific circumstances. Our argument is simple. If one of the factors which separates community leaders from followers is the former’s ability to mobilize resources for the benefit of the community, this issue can be examined and potentially exploited as a community development strategy in at least two fundamental ways: 1) concentrate on those with the “right personalities” (i.e., those with leadership traits), or help develop these traits through “leadership training” exercises in others—the psychology of community leadership; or 2) concentrate on the informational network structure of leaders—the sociology of community leadership. It is our contention that the only sustainable strategy is the latter since it does not wholly rely on the community’s ability to routinize individuals’ charisma and personal traits or the ability to create them in a new generation of potential leaders. In other words, personalities are tied to a particular person. If the community has depended upon the personal abilities of a particular community leader or leaders as the primary source of their ability to mobilize resources in the past and present, when that person (or persons) is no longer available (for whatever reason) the community’s ability to mobilize resources over a variety of conditions and across time—sustainability—is greatly diminished. On the other hand, if what separates leaders from followers also can be established sociologically (i.e., differences in their network structures), such differences can more easily be institutionalized at the community level as they have characteristics independent of the personalities who occupy places in them (see Granovetter, 1973; Marwell et al., 1988). Community leadership trainers/developers need to recognize the generalizable differences between the networks of leaders and others—followers.

It is possible to imbue all of the right personality traits into a new generation of community leaders; at the same time, however, these new leaders may not inherit or develop the type of network structure that will allow successful resource mobilization at the community level. In other words, the psychology of community leadership development may be a necessary but not a sufficient cause in sustainable community leadership. Indeed, the role of leadership personalities may be very crucial in the early stages of community leadership formation. Somewhere the hat must be passed to a new generation if the community is to continue to successfully mobilize its resources. If each new generation of leaders must “start from scratch,” the community’s ability to move beyond basic levels of resource mobilization would be greatly impaired. If, however, particular network linkages are institutionalized and thus imbued with a sense of permanence, new leaders will not have to start over every time there is a change in leadership. Brown’s (1991) study of Winder (Rivertown, as it is referred to in the 1991 study) clearly demonstrated that personalities were a key issue early in the formation of a unique leadership structure in the community. However, the community had become a successful model of community resource mobilization over the years because it had institutionalized many of its key practices and contacts—and its leadership networks—primarily through formal community organizations. Consequently, successive generations of leaders already had a well-established structure to step into. This also gave the entire community a sense of continuity, a shared history of a place “that gets things done.”

Our analysis showed that in eight of the nine indicators identified community leaders had significantly different network structures and more organizational memberships than did other community residents. The only exception was the number of kin-ties in the network. Clearly, in both communities the network structure of the identified leaders was different from that of other respondents. Community leadership definitely goes beyond personal psychological traits. It also can be demarcated by sociological variables—network structure. Identified leaders’ networks were simultaneously denser and more diffuse as well larger than were those of other residents. Identified leaders also belonged to more organizations in the community.

Identified leaders’ networks were denser in terms of frequency of communication with length of time they had known, and how well they knew their incumbents. However, they were much more diffuse in terms of the types of ties that characterized their relationship with their various network incumbents. For two of the four measures which measured types of ties (weak or strong), leaders had more weak than strong ties with their incumbents. They tended to have more professional/business ties and their incumbents were more likely to live outside the community area. On the other hand, they also classified their ties as neighbors or friends more often than did the other respondents. The arguments of Wellman (1981) and Granovetter (1973) that more diffuse...
networks are important for the effective transmission of information appears to apply to leaders in this study. Their network structures were more clearly composed of “weaker” ties than were the other respondents. They also belonged to more community organizations which, according to Brown (1991), was one way community leaders in Winder used to institutionalize weak ties over time. At the same time, the arguments of Allen and Dillman (1994) and Straits (1991) also appear to apply to the leaders in this study in that persons with more dense networks may be more likely to discuss public and community issues. The leaders in the two communities talked with their network incumbents more often than did the other respondents; they had known their incumbents longer and felt closer to them. Thus, when compared with the literature presented on resource mobilization and the importance of network density and size and organizational memberships, the findings show the two communities’ leaders are indeed different from their followers where it counts. Though we did not establish any differences of consequence between the two communities or between leaders from Winder versus all other respondents, the patterns observed through the various regression analyses indicated that differences in identified leaders’ networks versus those of other community residents were fairly universal.

In conclusion, our intent is not to devalue the importance of the psychological aspects of community leadership. Undoubtedly, these are very important and many communities have benefitted greatly by leadership training programs and/or by the emergence of charismatic leaders over the years. We do feel, however, that it is important to emphasize to community development practitioners and community leadership trainers that an entirely different set of aspects—sociological aspects—may have just as much to do with successful community leadership development as the personalities of the leaders themselves. Indeed, we feel that if sustainable community leadership is desired, these sociological aspects are even more important to recognize and foster than psychological ones as they become part of the overall structure, and thus the makeup, of the community itself.

Two final issues need to be addressed: limitations and applications. We would like to have assessed the direct effects of differences between identified leaders’ network structures on the two communities’ ability to mobilize resources for community development efforts. To accurately assess this, however, objective differences between the communities themselves on concrete mobilization efforts must be the dependent variable, with the various indicators of network structure of the two different sets of identified leaders the primary independent variable. Unfortunately, the nature of our combined data sets did not provide for the necessary measures of resource development efforts. Additionally, there were only two observed differences between the two communities or the identified leaders from Winder: the number of neighbors or friends in the network, and the number of organizational memberships. In both cases, identified leaders and residents from Brian had more than identified leaders and respondents in general from Winder.

Who determines if the community network structure should continue to meet modern society demands? To paraphrase, “Networks Happen.” On a day-to-day basis, most people do not think of their personal interactions with others on a structural level. Networks are forged on a one-to-one basis, yet have measurable consequences in the aggregate. People rarely think of the effects of their networks on any given issue. They are rarely even aware of the constitution of their networks as social entities. This requires the application of abstract theory and systematic analysis. The role of the community developer is to understand the dynamic of the leadership network structure for a community’s ability to mobilize resources, and advise accordingly. In other words, it requires dispassionate analysis of the network paths independent of the personalities that occupy network positions to determine if the network could be more effective in mobilizing resources.

Can this be done by various stakeholders in the community itself—i.e., leaders and followers, as stipulated by transitional leadership theories? Only to the degree these individuals can divorce their own personal agendas (personality) from the larger issue of network efficiency. This presents an interesting dilemma and runs somewhat counter to transitional theory while reemphasizing the practical role of applied research and of the community developer who is somewhat separate from the community. After analysis, a community developer can offer advice on how to make the existing leadership network more efficient in mobilizing resources. However, even though the network itself has measurable characteristics independent of the personalities who occupy it, any planned adjustments to that network must invariably deal with those personalities! The role of the community developer therefore has not changed—it has always been that of advisor and information disseminator. Consequently, the types of relationships the community developer has with others in the community may be the most important variable in this equation.

Ultimately, what the various actors do with the information provided by a community developer is still up to them. How objective that information may be will be contingent on the community developer’s relationships with others in the community. One final caveat. Concentrating on the structural dimensions of community leadership in no way diminishes the concept of self-determination at the community level; it enhances it by saying, “Here are the consequences of this type of a network arrangement—this type of structure. If you don’t like them, here is how they can be changed to achieve a different consequence.” Is the trade-off worthwhile to the various stakeholders involved? Also, that has always been the question in induced change and community development!
NOTES

1. The apparent discrepancy between professional/business ties, incumbents living outside the community area, and neighbors/friends can be explained by the fact that professional associates may be friends as well but not necessarily neighbors. The aggregation of the neighbors' friends category makes it impossible to ascertain this but it does seem to be a reasonable explanation given the other findings.
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Abstract

Residents and identified community leaders from two rural Mississippi Delta communities were studied to determine the extent to which diverse groups of this region advocate the same needs of, perceived attitudes toward, and approaches within, community development. Five assumptions concerning community development in the racially diverse Mississippi Delta, a region argued to have a patronage approach to economic development and social opportunities, were empirically examined through cross-tabulations, exploratory factor analysis, and independent sample T-tests. Virtually no difference across race, gender, income, owning additional property (other than a house) in the region, and leaders versus non-leaders in their needs, attitudes and approaches were found. All groups adhere to a monolithic “growth machine” approach which appears to perpetuate a patronage system in the region. To avoid political and economic elites from dominating community development agendas, more emphasis needs to be placed on local community betterment than community economic development potentially giving rise to different voices in the community.
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Introduction

To what extent do the diverse groups of the rural Mississippi Delta, an area some have argued uses an elite patronage approach to economic development and social opportunities (Duncan, 1999; Gray, 1991), advocate the same needs of, perceived attitudes toward, and approaches within, community development? Intuitively, extreme differences across local groups should engender different needs, attitudes, and approaches to local community development. However, in a context of extreme diversity, punctuated by social inequality, where differences are ascribed and shape life-chances, attitudes of patronage from a powerful class of community decision-makers may circumvent the individual needs of less powerful groups. Further, ambiguities built into the concept of community development itself may facilitate the acquiescence of various groups’ agendas to the unidimensional vision of a hegemonic group who seeks local economic growth opportunities which disproportionately benefit them.

At least five different assumptions can be identified from the above discussion which were explored empirically in this research: 1) Ceteris Paribus, different groups should display different needs, attitudes and approaches to local community development; 2) because all things are not equal, not only can powerful groups enforce their views of community development, they can persuade others to adopt them as well; 3) in a highly diverse, and stratified setting, generic economic growth does not necessarily benefit everyone equally; 4) powerful groups have a direct interest in local economic growth and will advocate it as a generic community development
strategy; and 5) in cases like those described above, relative consensus on community
development needs, attitudes, and approaches across diverse groups may be a reflection of one
group’s hegemony and not symbolic of the incorporation of different groups into the community
development process.

*Defining and Applying Community Development in a Highly Diverse Population*

When put into practice, the concept of community development is fraught with paradoxes and internal tensions. While advocating preservation it champions change. It works under the rubric of universal axioms while recognizing that local context is not only the target of purposeful action but that which shapes it. In acknowledging local context, it also identifies the human diversity within it by attempting to address the potentially different needs, attitudes, and approaches toward community development of each group. Yet, its strategies are often stated in universal terms—at a community level—even when *variability across different groups within the community is assumed*. These tensions are particularly acute in highly diverse rural populations (see Christenson, 1980; 1989; Summers, 1986) where community development efforts have typically meant rural industrialization (Kuehn et al., 1979; Smith et al., 1978; Dorf and Emerson, 1978; Deaton, 1981; Luloff and Chittenden, 1984; Williams et al., 1977; Till, 1981; Lloyd and Wilkinson, 1985; Summers, 1986), and to a lesser extent, attracting retirees (Pulver, 1986; Bender et al., 1985; Summers and Hirschl, 1985; Glasgow and Beale, 1985 Brown and Deavers, 1987; Brown, 1988; Gardner, 1988; Cook, 1990; Glasgow, 1990).

Christenson and Robinson (1989 p. ix, 3 our emphasis) define the concept of community development in the following way:
The idea of community focuses on people and their opportunity for proactive or reactive approaches to changing conditions throughout the world or their own backyards. *The idea of development implies improvement, growth, and change...* The primary goal of community development is to help people improve their social and economic situations. The underlying philosophy is to help people become subjects instead of objects, acting on their situation instead of simply reacting to it...It primarily is concerned with people as stimulators of social action processes. It focuses on the humanistic contributions to social and economic well-being.

They further state that: “However, change which improves the lot for some does not necessarily improve the lot for all. Change is not neutral. And people approach change depending on their place in the social structure, their access to resources, and their organizational skills” (p.xi). Consequently, community development efforts can result in a redistribution of goods and resources among a community’s elite (Christenson and Robinson, 1989).

The goal of community development to improve the lot of everyone is rarely met. Indeed, Summers et al., (1976), have demonstrated that rural industrialization rarely benefits those in the community who are in most need. Jobs tend to go to in-migrants leaving the unemployed, underemployed and poor—unemployed, underemployed and poor (see also Logan and Molotch, 1987; Summers and Branch, 1984). Additionally, others have found that local residents often disagree on the efficacy of economic development initiatives (Wilson 1989; Brown 1991). Residents who perceived that initiatives were successful were more likely to be in
a position to benefit from them.

Both Christenson and Robinson's definition of community development and the above research imply that, "depending on their place in the social structure, their access to resources, and their organizational skills" (p. xi), people will perceive different needs, adopt different attitudes, and apply different approaches to community development issues. It may also be assumed that they will disproportionately benefit from local community development efforts. An assessment therefore, of relative structural positions, resources, and organizational skill, of different groups in a community should not only reveal community diversity but also relative benefit derived from local development agendas. Also embedded within Christenson and Robinson's definition are statements of universality: "The idea of development implies improvement, growth, and change...The primary goal of community development is to help people improve their social and economic situations" (p. ix; 3). Are there some needs of, perceived attitudes toward, and approaches within, community development that are so institutionalized into the larger community's fabric that regardless of potential or expected differences across groups, most members of the community hold them in common even if they may not benefit equally from them? This is the question we address. Specifically, is the ideal of economic growth so fundamental to the concept of community development in the rural Mississippi Delta, due primarily to the hegemony of one group, that it pervades all groups in the community even if it may not be in their best social and economic interests?

Growth Machines

How does a hegemonic group of local elites orchestrate the community development agenda of a highly diverse community? One way is to utilize networks of common interests and
structural positioning, or "growth machines". Growth machines (Logan and Molotch, 1987) refer to "...the small, property owning segment of a community likely to derive direct financial benefit from community growth" (Gale, 1991 p.108). A growth machine is typically a loosely federated group of elites who may not always agree on the particular details of growth oriented projects but who all agree with the general orientation of continued economic and population growth in their community. Therefore, what defines a growth machine is the coalescing of efforts and agendas among elites to create economic and population growth in a community. By definition, growth machines can form independently of the formal structures of city government and/or the community leadership. They cannot, however, work independent of these structures. Favorable zoning laws, floating of bonds, and other legal necessities to creating opportunities for economic expansion must pass through the formal and legal channels of the community. Consequently, participants in growth machines attempt to influence political structures to work in their favor, i.e., in favor of pro-growth policies. They also try to muster support for their agendas from the larger populace. In the rural Mississippi Delta, however, where patronage relationships between powerful large money families and everyone else have apparently dominated the region since its settling in the 1830s (Gray, 1991; Cobb, 1992; Duncan, 1999), there is little to inhibit the development and functioning of powerful local growth machines. In patronage systems, the goals of an elite class are typically espoused by the larger public as well since, as Duncan (1999) explains, this is perhaps the only system they know. Additionally, in her study of a rural area in the Mississippi Delta, Duncan found that generational life-chances and social and economic opportunities tended to be tied to one's recognition of, and willingness to participate in, the elite white patronage system (1999, p.84, 94). She argues that failure to do so
often closes opportunities for one’s self and one’s family members as well.

Growth machines hold a position of economic and political power. The "basic hypothesis [behind the growth machine is] that all capitalist places are the creations of activists who push hard to alter how markets function, how prices are set, and how lives are affected” (Logan and Molotch, 1987 p. 3). Because markets are human creations they are subject to people's interpretive values. By directly controlling the local markets and community development issues, elites can wield considerable influence over the value-orientations of the local residents, particularly when concerned with economic growth. The source of the growth machine’s power is that they are better situated structurally than others to alter markets and hence, to alter the values of community residents. Comparable to Gaventa’s (1995) “third dimension of power,” growth machines are capable of “influencing, shaping, or determining [the residents’] very wants” (p. 18).

Logan and Molotch (1987) argue that there are two primary ways to interpret value and utilize space in modern capitalistic society: "use" or consumption and "exchange" or profit making. The status of place in a developed capitalistic economy, is primarily determined by profit making potential--exchange value. Some places are attractive for their profit potential and others for the particular use values they provide--a generational home for example. An interaction of both is typically the case. Local hegemony through growth machines can occur when one group is in a position to dictate the economic and political terms of both local exchange and use values.

A less hegemonic condition occurs when one group can only dictate local exchange values. Those who are in a position to organize for exchange related goals are typically better
equipped to obtain them than those who attempt to organize for use related goals. Exchange value goals are already legitimated by an institutionalized political/economic structure (Offe, 1985; Lo, 1990). Those who wish to pursue use value goals must mobilize extensively to establish their legitimacy. Thus much of their resources base is expended in the mobilization stage. Duncan (1999) found that when black Mississippi Delta residents in her study area tried to mobilize for better schools and other services they paid the high cost of social and economic ostracization by blacks and whites alike. She further found that "...the very wealthy planter elite and the comfortable, upper-middle-class whites" (p. 74) saw their social situation in their small Delta town akin to "paradise," while the poor, mostly black population found the same place as oppressive. The hegemony of the Delta elite in Duncan's study stems from the fact that they can extract and control both use and exchange value from the community while the poor struggle to secure even their own use value of a home.

Growth machines are especially effective in small communities where key actors who comprise them have near complete access to the workings of the community and can thus effectively influence decisions in their favor (Duncan, 1999; Brown, 1991; Gale, 1991; Krannich and Humphrey, 1983). Additionally, it is also assumed that growth machine members do tend to be prominent figures in their communities due to their growth or pro-business agendas (Logan and Molotch, 1987). In her study, Duncan claims that "everyone—white and black, professionals and school dropouts—can name the top five or so families that run things" (1999, p. 74, 75). Not only is it expected that the leaders who "run things" will have strong growth machine attitudes and agendas, but given an apparent patronage system prevalent in the rural Mississippi Delta, the larger citizenry should share them as well.
Other research from the rural Mississippi Delta supports the above conclusions. Nylander (1998) found that identified white leaders in two rural Mississippi Delta communities clearly followed an elite power structure model (see Hunter, 1953) and black leaders a much more diffuse issue-oriented leadership structure more characteristic of Dahl’s (1961) pluralistic model. Lyson (1988) states that present-day Mississippi Delta economies were created by the rural white elites, and accordingly, economic development in the Delta is controlled to the degree that human development needs are kept to a minimum. Brown and Warner (1989) and Williams and Dill (1995) have also suggested that this same rural white elite controls much of the behavior of blacks through financial dominance in banking, wholesale, and retail, and also through the legal, educational, and political life of the community (see also Gray, 1991 and Duncan, 1999).

Nylander (1998) found that both the black and the white leaders in the two rural Mississippi Delta communities he studied agree that who controls the most highly valued resources are the ones most likely to “get what they want” in the community; and land was the most valued local resource. He also found that black leaders were dependent on the white leaders who had more political power through their individual wealth and ownership of land in the community. White leaders often commented on the fact that because black leaders did not own land they had little say in local affairs. Therefore, applying Logan and Molotch (1987) and Offe’s (1982) logic to Lyson’s (1988), Brown and Warner’s (1989), Gray’s (1991), Williams and Dill’s (1995), Nylander’s (1998), and Duncan’s (1999) analyses of the rural Delta, it can be assumed that an economic elite is in position to “get their way”; better than in most other places while the black majority typically falls into step. Such conditions are ideal for the workings of an entrenched growth machine approach to local community development.
How does one do community development among the diverse populations of places like the rural Mississippi Delta? Race and history must be taken into consideration. Race is a factor in all community development agendas in the rural Mississippi Delta. But race and other differences due to structural position apparently does not mean that each group articulates different needs, attitudes and approaches to community development as stated in assumption number one presented in the Introduction section. Historical context of a local community must be taken into consideration when articulating community development axioms. Thus, assumptions number 2, 3, 4, and 5 from the Introduction are also supported by the literature specific to both economic development, when carried out by growth machines, and to the rural Mississippi Delta. An empirical examination of the validity of these assumptions with data gathered in two rural Mississippi Delta communities follows.

*Methods:*

*Site Selection:*

Two rural communities from the Mississippi Delta were examined. Both communities are the principal communities and county seats of their respective counties and in 1990 had populations of less than 2,500. Though some light industry exists in the area, agriculture and transfer payments remain the primary sources of income. While Mississippi’s median household income is the lowest in the nation at $22,952--compared to the U.S. average of $31,241--the statistics are even worse for the Mississippi Delta region. In the two communities’ respective counties, the median household income was below $16,000, with a poverty rate higher than 30 percent (U.S. Census Bureau, 1994). In 1990, unemployment levels for the two counties were
11.7 percent and 13.1 percent. Arguably, these two rural communities are characteristic of other rural Mississippi Delta communities their size in terms of racial and socioeconomic makeup (Brown, Xu, Toth, and Nylander, 1998).

Both leadership structure data (gathered in 1996-7) and general community-wide data (gathered in 1994-5) were gathered. In both cases, respondents answered a battery of questions on community development attitudes.

**Identification of Leaders:**

Leadership data were taken from Nylander's (1998) study which was conducted in the same two communities selected for the community-wide surveys used in this research. Using a positional-reputational method (see Trounstine and Christensen, 1982), the top 15 most influential leaders from each of the two communities were identified and interviewed. Thus, a total of 30 leaders were interviewed.

In each community, lists were made of persons who held positions in organizations, public offices or committees, businesses, religious groups, educational organizations, professions, and other categories of potential leadership. In this initial stage, 75 potential leaders were identified in one community and 57 in the other. These names were generated by asking local citizens on the streets, in businesses, and government offices to give names of people they considered to be leaders in the community. Names were also collected by reading the local newspapers and then conversing with some of the people who had been identified in the papers. In this first stage, each name was listed along with his/her current work position. Because members of minority groups (blacks and women) have been historically disfranchised in the
Mississippi Delta, efforts were made to specifically identify potential leaders from all groups. Names were listed in random order.

Next, seven informants from each community were selected. Using a list of all suggested leaders' names that had been compiled during the initial visits to the two towns, these informants representing key institutional areas of their community—business, local government, agriculture, education, newspaper, religion, and community history—were asked to choose the 15 most influential leaders in their community, based on their perception of who could get things done or stop things from being done in the community. In both towns, the seven informants were racially diverse and represented a spectrum of views on power and influence in the community. Informants tended to rank leaders of the same race higher than leaders from the opposite race.

After all informants selected their top 15 leaders, the seven lists for each town were then combined to produce one list of 15 leaders for each community, determined by those people identified most frequently by the seven informants. Face-to-face interviews were then conducted with each leader identified in the two communities.

General Survey:

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with residents from both communities who had been identified and selected using a randomized cluster sample. A sample frame for the two communities was constructed by mapping the streets in each town and identifying each residence located within the city limits and, using State Highway Department County Maps, identifying all residences within a 10 miles radius of each city's center. Within the city limits, each town was partitioned into quadrants, which also roughly represented racial and economic divisions in the
two towns, with each street being assigned a number and divided into sections according to its actual number of blocks. To select the sample, streets from each quadrant were randomly drawn. After each street was selected, a number representing a street block or segment was also randomly drawn. All households on selected blocks were contacted for interviews. Interviewers interviewed the household member over 18 years of age whose birthday fell closest to the date of the interview. This process was repeated until a minimum of 75 respondents were interviewed in each town's city limits.

In the hinterlands, all land survey "sections" that fell (whole or in part) in the ten mile radius were identified and all residences in them enumerated. Sections were randomly selected and every household within the selected sections entered into the final sample. This was repeated until a sample of at least 50 respondents was achieved in each community's hinterland. In one community 141 respondents were interviewed in the city and 54 in the hinterland. In the other community 76 respondents were interviewed in the city and 63 in the hinterland for a combined sample of 334, representing a total response rate of 88%. The median age of the sample was 45 and the average respondent had a high school diploma and an income between $10,000 to $14,999. Interviews were conducted by local school teachers and research assistants who were generally matched with the racial characteristics of those in the selected areas to which they were assigned (Weiss 1977).

Analysis:

Table 1 displays frequencies for Race, Gender, Income, Property Ownership, and Leaders. There were 144 white respondents constituting 39% of the sample, and 205 black respondents constituting 56% of the sample. These figures are in line with the Census data for
the two respective counties. There were 138 (38%) males and 212 (58%) females who responded to one of the two surveys (leaders or general community). The frequencies on income are revealing. One hundred twenty seven (or 35%) of respondents made less than $10,000 in total household income. On the other extreme, 48 (13%) made over $50,000. The table also shows that 259 (71%) of the respondents did not own any other property besides a home, while 80 (22%) did so. There were 30 identified leaders and 336 citizen respondents. To further explore these findings in relation to each other (i.e., race, gender, property ownership, and leader/non-leader), cross-tabulations and Pearson Correlations were calculated.

“Tables 1 and 2 about here”

Table 2 reports cross-tabulations for the key variables in the study. There were 80 white males (23%), 58 black males (17%), 64 white females (18%) and 147 black females (42%). An examination of income by race clearly shows the economic disparities of the region as mediated through race. Combining the bottom two categories, 26 whites (21%) had incomes below $10,000 while over half (53%) of the black respondents did so (n=94). On the other extreme, 56 whites (45%) had incomes over $35,000 compared to only 12 (7%) of blacks. Again combining the bottom two categories, an examination of income by gender shows that 38 males (30%) had incomes lower than $10,000, while 82 females (47%) did so. Combining the top two categories 46 males (37%) had incomes greater than $35,000 and only 22 (12%) of the females did as well. Telling of the potential economic interests in the community, 87 (65%) of the whites had no other property in the community other than their home while 160 (84%) of the blacks did not have other property. On the other side of this issue, 46 (35%) of the whites did own other property while only 31 (16%) of the blacks did so. Sixty eight percent of females owned no extra
property. When property ownership was cross-tabulated with income, it was clear that those with higher incomes are also the ones who own additional properties in the community. Looking at the top two income categories, nearly half of all respondents (49%, n=33) who owned land made over $35,000. Even more revealing, looking only at those who made over $50,000, twenty five, or 37% of all additional land holders fell into this top bracket.

"Table 3 about here"

An examination of only those identified as leaders (see Table 3) shows that only 6 of the 30 were black. This is in an area whose general population is 60% black. Only 3 of the 30 leaders were female and all three were white. Only one leader of the 30 made less than $10,000 and he was black. Three of the 6 black leaders made less than $20,000, with 2 of the remaining 3 making over $50,000. All three white women leaders made over $50,000. Looking at property ownership, 15 white leaders reported owning other property while only 2 black leaders did so. Five of the 24 white leaders did not respond to this question while 2 of the 6 black leaders did not respond.

Considering all cases, Pearson Correlations for the above relationships show that race was statistically and negatively correlated with income at the .05 level of significance (−.511). Race was also statistically significant and negatively correlated with property ownership (−.212). It was also statistically significant and negatively correlated with (−.241). Gender and income were also statistically and negatively correlated with income, indicating that males had higher incomes (−.273). It was also statistically and negatively correlated with property ownership, indicating that males were more likely to own additional properties (−.240). Finally, gender was also statistically and negatively correlated with leadership (−.317). Not surprisingly, property
ownership and income were statistically and positively correlated at the .05 level (.367). So too was leadership and property ownership (.320) and leadership and income (.435).

The descriptive statistics clearly show a bipolar social structure both in the larger population and the leaders who “represent” it. Does this bipolar structure carry over into the different groups’ perceived needs, attitudes and approaches to community development as well?

To address these issues, Exploratory Factor Analysis and Independent Sample T-Tests were conducted on eleven generic community development indicators. Utilizing a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, the eleven indicators were presented as generic statements on needs, attitudes and approaches to community development.

A series of seven Exploratory Factor Analyses were conducted to examine the eleven community development indicators and how they would load as factors for 1) all cases 2) whites 3) blacks 4) males 5) females 6) leaders, and 7) non-leaders. In all cases, results were forced into a three factor solution using a Varimax Rotation procedure. It was anticipated that if all groups hold similar views on needs, attitudes, and approaches to community development, the seven different analysis should look very much the same. For each of the first two factors in the seven analyses, Alpha Reliability scores were calculated to assess the reliability of the factor as an index. Results are reported in Table 4.

"Table 4 about here"

When all respondents were considered, one factor emerged consisting of four items: improving local business, attracting industry, getting government help, and a community must grow if it is to survive. Given the items which loaded onto it and their relative strength, the factor is clearly indicative of a growth machine approach and had an Alpha Reliability score of
.65. As can be seen, the second factor was unreliable with an Alpha of .49. The factor analysis for white respondents showed they had the same factor loadings as all respondents above. This was interesting given the fact that whites represent only 40% of the sample. Again, the same growth machine factor is evident with an Alpha of .69 and an unreliable second factor of .49. Black respondents also varied little from the overall sample results. Three of the four black factor loadings were the same as above with the only exception being instead of improving existing businesses, the fourth factor was getting many people involved early in a project. Again, the second factor is meaningless. Factor loadings for male respondents looked nearly the same as the previous ones. The same three factors common across all respondents, whites and blacks were also found in males. Males had an Alpha score of .72. Once again, the second factor was unreliable. The factor loadings for females were identical to those for blacks. This was not surprising given the modal category of respondents was black female. The Alpha score for females was .68. As with the previous analysis, the second factor was unreliable. When the 30 leaders were analyzed, the same three factors that had loaded on to males previously, also loaded onto leaders. The Alpha Score was .77 for this first factor with a more respectable second factor Alpha of .58. Finally, non-leaders were analyzed. The results were the same as all respondents; four factors indicative of a growth machine approach. The Alpha was .67.

The factor analyses revealed a very monolithic view of community development issues. In each of the seven analyses, only one reliable factor emerged; and it was indicative of a growth machine approach to community development. We had anticipated commonality across a first factor measuring growth machine views; we did not, however, anticipate that no reliable second factor would emerge across any of the subgroups. In fact, we had anticipated quite the opposite.
We felt secondary characteristics common to each subgroup would manifest themselves in a second and perhaps even third factor. Clearly, the view of community development in these two rural Mississippi Delta communities is monolithic and represents the white residents’ perspective. All measured subgroups adhere to this growth machine approach with virtually no variation.

While the Factor Analysis examined the potential differences in broad views of community development, we wanted to examine what differences, if any, could still be identified across each of the eleven indicators of community development for the various subgroups. Specifically, were there differences in needs, attitudes, and approaches as measured by the eleven indicators separately? Independent Sample T-Tests were used to examine these potential differences. Results are reported in Table 5.

“Table 5 about here”

Community development needs were indicated by the following questions: 1) financial help from the state of Mississippi and or the federal Government is necessary for this community to develop effectively in the future; and 2) in order to maintain their quality of life, rural communities must be willing to increase their taxes. The only significant difference observed was between income categories in relation toward government help. The 127 individuals who made less than $10,000 advocated a greater need for help (mean = 4.22), while the remaining 233 had a mean of 4.04.

Respondent attitudes toward community development were measured with the following questions: 1) the best way to develop our community is to develop the businesses which are already in the community, 2) the best way to improve our community is to attract industry, 3)
preserving our rural lifestyle should be a primary goal of this community, and 4) a community has to grow if it is to survive. Those making less than $10,000 were more likely to feel that preserving rural life should be a primary goal of the community with a mean score of 3.93, while those with a higher income had a mean of 3.63. Interestingly, given the above relationship between income and preserving rural life, community leaders believed preservation of rural life was even less important, showing a mean of 3.30, with non-leaders having a higher mean score of 3.77. Both of these findings are reflective of a growth machine approach and attitude. Leaders and those who make more income see less value in remaining “rural”. The last category displaying a significant difference in community attitudes was race. Whites thought that attracting industry was slightly more important with a mean of 4.38, whereas blacks had a mean of 4.23.

Different approaches toward community development were examined through the following questions: 1) when it comes down to it, if you want something done in this town you have to do it yourself, 2) I am willing to help in community affairs if asked, but I am not usually willing to initiate projects, 3) I think we should let things in the community take their course, 4) I like to bring in outside experts when dealing with a community problem, and 5) In the early stages of a community project, it is good to have as many people involved as possible. Significant differences were found in four categories—gender, income, leadership, and race. Females were more likely to agree that a successful task must be accomplished by themselves and they were more willing to help in projects than they were to initiate them (means = 3.78 and 3.60 respectively). Males displayed a lower score of 3.40 and 3.36 on these two, indicators. Individuals making under $10,000 were more likely to agree that one should let things in the
community take their own course, (mean = 2.77) compared to those making over $10,000 (mean = 2.39). Those making less money were more likely to agree that development was best accomplished through outside experts, and with the early involvement of many people in development projects. Their respective means were 3.81 and 4.11 compared to the means of 3.16 and 3.90 for higher income categories. Blacks were more likely to agree that if you wanted something done you had to do it yourself with a mean of 3.80 compared to a mean of 3.38 for whites. This was also the case for helping but not initiating community projects, with a mean of 3.61 for blacks and a mean of 3.35 for whites. They also felt that things in the community should be allowed to take their own course, with a mean of 2.80 for blacks and 2.17 for whites. Community leaders were more willing to initiate projects than others with a mean of 3.57, compared to 2.77 for non-leaders. Not surprisingly, they did not agree that things should be allowed to take their own course in the community (mean = 2.60, non-leaders = 1.73). In general, blacks, females, and those with lower incomes showed greater attitudes of detachment, if not defeatist attitudes on these indicators.

The T-Tests showed that 14 significantly different pairs could be identified out of a possible 44. Finding strong patterns across these fourteen pairs is difficult due to the paucity of significantly different means. There were only four pairs where two or three significantly different means were identified. Those who took more of a hands-off attitude and felt things in the community should take their own course were more likely to be poor, non-leaders, and blacks. Those who indicated they were likely to help in, but not initiate projects, were likely to be females, non-leaders and blacks. Those who said that if you want to get something done you must do it yourself were mostly females and blacks. Finally, those who felt that preserving rural
life should be a top priority were the poor and non-leaders.

Discussion

The findings show that when doing community development in rural Mississippi Delta communities with diverse populations like the two we studied, one must consider more than just the diversity of the population. In our study diversity did not translate into a diverse approach to community development. A white hegemonic power structure appears to articulate and control opportunities and shape the development agenda for the rest of the population. Consequently, community development that is germane to diverse populations cannot work from generic axioms alone, it must take into consideration the local context of that diversity. In other words, our findings illustrate that to concentrate simply on the diversity of the population as the most important factor would be to overlook that that diversity must be contextualized.

In conducting the leadership interviews, we feel confident, that like Duncan (1999), the top movers-and-shakers were identifiable by everyone in the community. Therefore, those identified as leaders in the data are representative of this power structure. This group has substantial economic interest in the community as indicated by the other property variable, they strongly advocate a growth machine approach to development as illustrated in the factor analysis, and they seem to be able to enforce their views of community development on the larger population. Consequently, in these racially diverse rural Mississippi Delta communities, relative consensus on community development needs, attitudes, and approaches across diverse groups appear to be a reflection of the white elite’s hegemony and not symbolic of the incorporation of different groups into the community development process. As the literature suggests (Logan and Molotch 1987), a hegemonic leadership structure that bases its power on the exchange value of
land is less likely to institute community development that benefits the needs of a diverse population.

So, where are the access points for community development practice in a context like that we examined in the rural Mississippi Delta? Community development, as stated by Christenson and Robinson (1989), must address differential access to resources and opportunities. This will always be context specific; and community leaders will typically have more access to local resources. A primary argument in community development is that "functional" leaders will concentrate their efforts on behalf of the larger citizenry rather than simply acting in their own individual interests, a problem which often, Garkovich (1989) argues, threatens the well-being of the community. Clearly in these two rural Mississippi Delta communities, leadership is more patronage than service based, where rural communities which are effective in solving problems most often have leaders who are skilled in involving a diverse group of actors in decision-making activities (Israel and Beaulieu 1990). These leaders do not impose their values on the community; rather, they create a unified environment within it (Grisham 1992). Effective leaders will still view the community as an environment that can be manipulated and seek to effect changes within it (Wilkinson 1972), but their actions will not simply be patronage based.

Because rural community leadership and community development both employ "manipulation" of the community and its structure to achieve desired results, who formulates the leadership or elite of a community and their orientation toward community development will always be critical issues in community development agendas. In other words, if rural community leaders' ideals get buried in ambient growth machine attitudes and activities, ironically, residents may lose their voice in development for "the greater good." As Polanyi (1944, p.34) pointed out over 50 years
ago: “But it also hints at the tragic necessity by which the poor man clings to his hovel, doomed by the rich man’s desire for a public improvement which profits him privately.”

In an attempt to influence political and economic structures to their favor, growth machine coalitions may package their agenda under the larger rubric of “Community Development” with the implied secondary mantra that “everyone benefits” as the community develops economically (Logan and Molotch, 1987). Residents, therefore, may be swayed by market processes and institutionalized power structures to hold pro-growth values even when the type of economic growth advocated may not benefit them. In our study of a hegemonic elite in the rural Mississippi Delta, community development appears to have become synonymous with growth machine attitudes and agendas across all segments of the community. To avoid political and economic elites from dominating community development agendas from a growth machine perspective, more emphasis needs to be placed on local community betterment than community economic development thus giving rise to different voices in the community (see Christenson and Robinson, 1980).
References


Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Pacific Northwest Regional Economic 

Development". In Community Development in Perspective, James A. Christenson and 

Campbell (eds.) American Society and Politics: Institutional, Historical, and Theoretical 

Community Development Society 21(1):102-114.


Portrait of the Mississippi Delta eds. Arthur G. Cosby, Mitchell W. Brackin, T. David 
Mason, and Eunice R. McCulloch. Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State 
University.

Press.


Table 1. Frequencies for All Respondents for Race Gender, Income, and Extra Property Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Variables</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Extra Property Ownership</th>
<th>Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Cross-Tabulations for All respondents for Race Gender, Income, and Extra Property Ownership (Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Variables</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Extra Property Ownership</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80 (56)</td>
<td>64 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 (28)</td>
<td>147 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;$5,000</td>
<td>11 (9)</td>
<td>39 (22)</td>
<td>14 (11)</td>
<td>36 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-$9,999</td>
<td>15 (12)</td>
<td>55 (31)</td>
<td>24 (19)</td>
<td>46 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td>8 (6)</td>
<td>33 (19)</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
<td>23 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$19,999</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>22 (13)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>22 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$24,999</td>
<td>15 (12)</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>16 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>14 (11)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>10 (8)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td>15 (12)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;$50,000</td>
<td>41 (33)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>37 (30)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Variables</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Extra Property Ownership</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Property Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-$9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$19,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis, Two Factor Solutions (F1 and F2) and Alpha Reliability Scores for All Cases, Whites, Blacks, Males, Females, Leaders, and Non-Leaders (Indicators used in Factor Construction are Bolded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Indicators</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Non-Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve by developing existing businesses</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best development through industry</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government help is necessary for development</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving rural life is primary goal</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support tax increase to maintain quality of life</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community must grow in order to survive</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To accomplish something, must do it yourself</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to help but not initiate projects</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community should take its own course</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop best through outside experts</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early community projects best to involve many</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALPHA RELIABILITY**

| .65  | .49  | .69  | .49  | .77  | .35  | .72  | .48  | .68  | .22  | .77  | .58  | .67  | .57  |
Table 5. Independent Sample T-Tests of Community Development Attitudes, Compared by Gender, Income, Community Leadership, and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Community Leader</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Less $10,000</td>
<td>More $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x$ n</td>
<td>$x$ n</td>
<td>$x$ n</td>
<td>$x$ n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve by developing existing businesses</td>
<td>3.87 138</td>
<td>3.94 207</td>
<td>3.95 127</td>
<td>3.89 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best development through industry</td>
<td>4.25 138</td>
<td>4.31 210</td>
<td>4.30 127</td>
<td>4.27 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government help is necessary for development</td>
<td>4.02 138</td>
<td>4.18 208</td>
<td>4.22 127</td>
<td>4.04 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving rural life is primary goal</td>
<td>3.66 136</td>
<td>3.79 204</td>
<td>3.93 126</td>
<td>3.63 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support tax increase to maintain quality of life</td>
<td>2.78 137</td>
<td>2.82 204</td>
<td>2.93 124</td>
<td>2.74 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community must grow in order to survive</td>
<td>4.00 138</td>
<td>4.12 208</td>
<td>4.15 125</td>
<td>4.01 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To accomplish something, must do it yourself</td>
<td>3.40 136</td>
<td>3.78 206</td>
<td>3.72 125</td>
<td>3.59 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to help but not initiate projects</td>
<td>3.36 137</td>
<td>3.60 206</td>
<td>3.58 123</td>
<td>3.46 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community should take its own course</td>
<td>2.50 133</td>
<td>2.56 200</td>
<td>2.77 124</td>
<td>2.39 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop best through outside experts</td>
<td>3.23 133</td>
<td>3.51 197</td>
<td>3.81 121</td>
<td>3.16 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early community projects best to involve many</td>
<td>3.99 134</td>
<td>3.94 197</td>
<td>4.11 122</td>
<td>3.90 222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Pairs are Bolded and Underlined. ***p<.001 **p<.01 *p<.05 min=1 max=5
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Areas of Specialization: Dr. Robinson is known around the world for his creativity in developing and implementing practical programs in rural community and organization development and in social psychology. His wide-ranging, interdisciplinary approach to programming led to appointments in three colleges at the University of Illinois--Agriculture, Medicine, and Liberal Arts and Sciences. His programs in social psychology are designed to help adults understand their behavior and work more effectively with others. He was the first Extension Specialist in the nation to advocate the learning and action-research module approach to organizational and community development. Many of his modules became regional and national Extension publications. They include leaders' guides, slide sets, participant texts and workbooks, comic books, videos and audio tapes. His process skills program in Organization Development and Human Relations has been adopted by nearly every land-grant university and many institutions abroad.
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**Other Professional Positions**: Robinson served as Director of Research, and Associate Professor of Sociology at Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX, 1996 - 1971; Co-Director of the Gulf Coast Consortium on Problems of School Desegregation, 1967 - 1971. He was Visiting Professor of Rural Sociology at Cornell University (1977-78), North Carolina State University (summer, 1975); Adjunct Professor in Sociology, University of Houston, (1968-72) and at Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, (1974). He has traveled to 49 states and to many foreign countries while serving as a consultant to more than 200 organizations around the world.

**Honors and Awards**: Among his numerous awards are: (1) **The Distinguished Rural Sociologist Award**, The Rural Sociological Society, 1999 to acknowledge his contributions in research, teaching, public service and public policy; (2) **The Senior Faculty Award for Sustained Excellence in Extension and Public Service**, University of Illinois College of Agriculture, 1994; (3) **The North Central Regional Distinguished Service Award**, Epsilon Sigma Phi, The National Honorary Extension Fraternity, 1993; (4) **The Distinguished Service Award**, Epsilon Sigma Phi, (Illinois Chapter) 1993; (5) **The Award for Outstanding Achievements in Rural Community Development in Illinois**, Illinois Institute for Rural Affairs, and Illinois Rural Affairs Council, 1992; (6) **The Innovative Program Award**, Community Development Society, 1992; (7) **The Innovative Program Award**, Illinois Cooperative Extension Service, 1992; (8) **Award for Sustained Excellence in Extension Programs**, Illinois Cooperative Extension Service, 1991; (9) **The Award for Excellence in Extension and Public Service**, the Rural Sociological Society, 1987; (10) **The Community Development Society Career Achievement Award**, 1987; (11) **Governor's Award for Distinguished Service to the People of South Carolina**, 1987; (12) **The Superior Service Award**, United Stated Department of Agriculture, 1984; (13) **The Paul A. Funk Recognition Award**, University of Illinois College of Agriculture, 1984; (14) **The Distinguished Service Award**, the Community Development Society of America, 1979; and (15) **Award for Outstanding Achievement**, United States Forest Service, 1981.

**Professional Memberships**: Robinson is a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Gamma Sigma Delta, Sigma Xi Delta, the Community Development Society, the Rural Sociological Society, the Mississippi Economic Development Council, the University of Illinois President's Council, and others.
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Present Positions

- **Distinguished Professor of Rural Sociology,**
  Division of Social Sciences, and Faculty Associate,
  Center for Community Development, Delta State University, January 1, 2000, to date

- **Professor Emeritus, Rural Sociology and Sociology,**
  Departments of Agricultural Economics and Sociology,
  College of Agriculture, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and College of Medicine
  University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, September 1, 1994 to date

Fields of Professional Interest

- **Rural sociology and social psychology** — developing and implementing education and research programs in sociology of rural communities, organization development, leadership development, and human relations for public and private sector organizations

- **Community and economic development** — human resource development, leadership development, organization development, and economic development in rural areas

- **Conflict management** — developing and implementing educational programs in public and private organizations dealing with disputes related to the use of natural resources and environment issues

Professional and Fraternal Memberships

- Alpha Kappa Delta
- Illinois Development Council
- Community Development Society
- Epsilon Sigma Phi
- Gamma Sigma Delta
- Life Member, University of Illinois Alumni Association

- North American Speakers's Bureau
- President's Council, University of Illinois
- Rural Sociological Society
- The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
- Sigma Xi
Previous Positions

- **Director**, Center for Community Development and Professor of Social Sciences, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS, August 1994 - December 1999

- **B. F. Smith Chair for Economic and Community Development**, Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi, August 1994 to July 1996


- **Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociology**, College of Arts and Sciences and College of Agriculture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1974 - 1994.

- **Associate Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociology**, College of Arts and Sciences and College of Agriculture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1971 - 1974.

- **INTERPAKS Associate**, Office of International Programs, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1982 to date.

- **Affiliate Professor of Rural Sociology**, College of Medicine at Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1983 - 1994.

- **Visiting Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociology**, Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development and Department of Rural Sociology, Cornell University, 1977-78

- **Visiting Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociology**, Department of Adult and Community College Education, North Carolina State University, Summer 1975

- **Visiting Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociology**, Southern Illinois University School of Dental Medicine, 1974-75

- **Director of Research and Associate Professor of Sociology**, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX, 1966-71

- **Professor of Education Administration, Associate Professor of Sociology (Adjunct)**, University of Houston, 1968-72

- **Associate Professor and Co-Director**, Institutes on Desegregation Problems, Gulf Coast University Consortium: Houston Baptist University, Prairie View A. & M. University, Rice University, Texas Southern University, University of Houston, and University of St. Thomas, 1967-71
Administrative Experience

1994-99  **Director, Center for Community Development, Delta State University (DSU), Cleveland, MS.** Developed the conceptual and organizational framework for the Center for Community Development and most of its program. The Center was created by the DSU President in August of 1994. From an initial staff of an administrative secretary and two graduate research assistants and a total budget of $150,000 in 1994, the Center grew to a staff of 30 persons in September of 1999. The annual budget for FY 2000 exceeds $3,000,000. In 1997, the University provided $476,000 to purchase and renovate a building to house the Center. Director, Delta Partners Initiative, a seven-year program funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for $1,882,000. Also, responsible for three AmeriCorps programs which received more than $6.5 million in funding, with 12 professional staff and 220 full-time Corps members serving in the Delta region -- The Mississippi Delta Service Corps, with 70 members; The Delta Reads Partnership, with 50 members; and America Reads Mississippi, 100 members.

1993-94  **Director, Laboratory for Community and Economic Development, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois.** Responsible for working with faculty as programs are developed and implemented. Supervise ten academic professionals, graduate research assistants and clerical staff.

1990-94  **Program Leader - HELPING RURAL COMMUNITIES PREPARE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,** a program funded by RURAL PARTNERS and The W.K. Kellogg Foundation for more than $4,232,000. Responsibility for the work of campus staff, 44 authors and 63 Rural Community Development Coordinators as 20 community action modules are developed, tested and implemented in 10 counties. Coordinate all activities with a statewide Program Advisory.

1966-94  **Group Leader or Principal Investigator.** Worked with more than 25 faculty and 30 graduate students in 30 programs with outside funding exceeding $5,000,000.

1978-79  **Chairperson - Extension Programs Committee, Dept. Ag. Econ, University of Illinois**

1993-94 & 1971-81  **Chairperson - National and regional committees for: Rural Sociology Society; The Community Development Society; and U.S.D.A.**

1968-71  **Director of Research - Houston Baptist University, Houston, Texas.** Administrative responsibility for all research programs, all grants and contracts.

1968-70  **Co-director - "Gulf Coast Universities Institutes on Desegregation Problems," Houston Baptist University, Prairie View A&M University, Rice University, Texas Southern University, University of Houston and The University of St. Thomas. Co-leader of bi-racial faculty with 18 professionals as desegregation training programs were developed and implemented in 24 Gulf Coast school districts.

1966-  **Consultant - Developed and implemented more than 200 consulting projects in organization development, community development and human relations.**
Research Experience

1968-71  Director of Research - Organized and directed campus-wide research program at Houston Baptist University. Chairperson of University Research Council. Responsible for developing, funding, staffing and managing the University Research Center.

1966-94  Principal Investigator and/or Project Director - Nine major research grants totaling over $850,000 from U. of I., N.I.M.H., U.S.D.A., S.B.A., U.S.F.S. and Hogg Foundation. Projects concerned with: (1) effects of social science training programs on attitudes and behaviors of youth and adults; (2) prevention of man-caused forest fires, diffusion and adoption of recommended forestry practices; and (3) projects in community development, community involvement and community stratification.

Teaching Experience

► Train-the-Trainer workshops: First Extension Specialist in the national Cooperative Extension system to advocate the use of "complete learning module educational packages" in educational programs for adults and youth. Led more than 34 state, regional, and national workshops of three to six days length for 1400 college faculty, county agents, professional educators, and trainers on effective classroom (workshop) teaching.

► Undergraduate level: Leadership development, social psychology, sociology of community, research methods, sociological theory, and introduction to sociology.

► Graduate level: Developed curriculum for new Master of Science in Community Development at Delta State University which was approved in Spring of 1995. This program had more than 30 students in the fall of 1998. Teach courses in organization development; community development in theory and practice; sociology of community, leadership development; and guest lectures at the University of Mississippi.

At the University of Illinois College of Medicine: taught methods for teaching stress management, life style management, and conflict management to medical students and faculty in the College of Medicine.

Directed research and/or served on thesis committees for approximately 20 students at masters and doctoral level at Delta State University, University of Houston, and University of Illinois.

► Continuing education: Led more than 1100 workshops for adults on subjects related to leadership and organization development, conflict management, human relations, etc.

► Faculty development and teacher training: Led numerous seminars and workshops for faculty in secondary, higher and continuing education on effective classroom and workshop teaching styles, including: (1) North Central Regional Colleges of Agriculture "Symposium on Improvement of Teaching;" (2) Faculty development workshops on effective teaching--Iowa State University; Spoon River College; Tuskegee Institute; Carl Sandburg College; Louisville Public Schools; Indianapolis Public Schools; Houston Public Schools; Training Institute, U. S. Department of State; and others.
Other Committee and Administrative Work

- Member of the following CES and Department of Agricultural Economics Committees: (1) Program Evaluation, (2) Communication Support, (3) Staff Development, (4) Promotion, (5) Seminar, (6) Grievance and (7) Social.

- Member, NCR Extension Sociology Committee, 1978-83, Chairperson, 1975-77.

- Chairperson, College of Agriculture Faculty Meetings Committee, 1987-88. Selected and sponsored on-campus guest lectures by outstanding scholars in all disciplines.

- Member, University of Illinois, MILLERCOM Committee, 1972-75.

- Faculty member, SORF (Student Organization Resource Fund), University of Illinois. A committee which allocated more than $300,000 per semester to support enrichment programs through student organizations on the campus, 1988-1991.

- Member, DSU Research Committee, Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi College</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Sociology and English</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton, MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>B.D.</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>General Agriculture</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>M.R.E.</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State, MS</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabbatic leave for study of</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conflict and stress management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabbatic leave for independent study of conflict and stress management</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honors, Awards and Positions in Professional Organizations

1999 - 2000
Guest Editor, Special Issue of The Journal of The Community Development Society. Topic "The Practice of Community Development with Diverse Populations"

1999
"Distinguished Rural Sociologist," Presented by the Rural Sociological Society "in recognition for career contributions in research, teaching, extension work, public service, and public policy."

1994
"Senior Faculty Award for Excellence," College of Agriculture, University of Illinois

1993-94
Chairperson Economic Development Section, The Community Development Society

1993
"North Central Regional Distinguished Service Award," Epsilon Sigma Phi, The National Honorary Fraternity of Extension Professionals.

1992
"Innovative Program Award," University of Illinois Cooperative Extension Service, for program HELPING RURAL COMMUNITIES PREPARE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

1992
"Distinguished Service Award," Epsilon Sigma Phi, Alpha (Illinois) Chapter, a National Honorary Fraternity of Extension Professionals.

1992
"Innovative Program Award" from The Community Development Society (CDS) for the RURAL PARTNERS®/Kellogg program HELPING RURAL COMMUNITIES PREPARE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

1992
Award for "Outstanding Achievements in Rural Community Development in the State of Illinois" from the Illinois Rural Affairs Council, the Illinois Institute for Rural Affairs, and RURAL PARTNERS®.

1991
"Award for Sustained Excellence in Extension Programming," University of Illinois Cooperative Extension Service. Selected for this award by a committee of peers "in recognition of creative and effective work in the Cooperative Extension."

1987
"Award for Excellence in Extension and Public Service" from The Rural Sociological Society - "Given in recognition for contribution in application of the discipline for education and training among rural and farm people and for innovative techniques in enabling teachers to teach others." Second person in history of Rural Sociological Society to receive this award.

1987
"Community Development Career Achievement Award" from The Community Development Society. Given in recognition of "outstanding contribution to community development in the United States through teaching, research and administration."

1987
Elected to The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, University of Illinois Chapter.
1987  "Governor's Award, State of South Carolina for Distinguished Service to the State and Its Citizens" for helping to develop and implement four state-wide Rural Development Leader Schools, 1983-86.

1985  "Merit Award" from Association of Illinois Soil and Water Conservation Districts in recognition for outstanding contributions in organizational management skills to soil and water conservation programs.

1984  "Paul A. Funk Recognition Award" for "outstanding service to agriculture which has brought honor and distinction to the College of Agriculture, University of Illinois." Selected for this $3,000 award by a faculty peer committee.

1984  "Superior Service Award," United States Department of Agriculture in "recognition of meritorious contributions to farm families and agribusiness professionals for programs on stress, conflict, leadership and other human relations concepts."

1982  "Achievement Award," Country Companies Insurance, in recognition efforts on "Managing Stress and Your Health."

1981  "Outstanding Achievement Award in Forest Fire Prevention" from U.S. Forest Service for development of training materials on "Interpersonal Communications" for professional foresters.

1981  "Arkansas Traveler Award," from Governor Frank White of Arkansas in recognition of communications program for Arkansas Fire Academy.


1979  "Distinguished Service Award," The Community Development Society.

1976-79  Member, Board of Directors, The Community Development Society.


1975-77  Chairperson, Development Committee, Rural Sociological Society.


1972  Sigma Xi, Honorary Scholaristic Research Fraternity, University of Illinois.


1973-77  Member, Miller Lecture Committee, University of Illinois.


1974-75  Chairperson, Communications Committee, Community Development Society.
1969-70 President, AAUP Chapter, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX.

1964 Alpha Kappa Delta, Honorary Scholastic Fraternity, Mississippi State--Vice President and Program Chairman.

1962-65 N. D. E. A., Graduate Fellowship, Department of Sociology and Rural Life, Mississippi State University.

1958 Winner, National Intercollegiate Dairy Cattle Judging Contest. Placed as follows as a member of the L.S.U. team: (1) 1st place individual in Jerseys, (2) 3rd place individual in oral reasons, all breeds, and (3) 4th place individual in Holsteins.

1958 First place team, Dairy Cattle Judging, Southwest Exposition, Dallas, Texas, and Mid-South Fair, Louisiana State University.

1958-59 Vice President, Dairy Science Club, Louisiana State University.

1957-59 Academic Scholarship, College of Agriculture, Louisiana State University.

1953-54 President, College Dormitory Council, Mississippi College.

1952 Degree of American Farmer, Future Farmers of America.

1951-52 State Secretary, Mississippi Future Farmers of America.

1951 State Farmer, Mississippi Future Farmers of America.

1950-51 President, Southwest Region, Mississippi Future Farmers of America.

1950 Governor's Award, Superior Farming, Mississippi Future Farmers of America.

1950 Silver Emblem Award, Future Farmers of America.

---

**Personal**

- Grew up on a small farm in Mississippi; active in Future Farmers of America while in high school and college.

- Hobbies -- developing cartoons, jogging, landscaping, fishing, travel, and photography.

- Tree farmer--owner and operator of 200 acres forest land in Mississippi, since 1980.

- President and primary shareholder, Robinson Associates International, Inc., Cleveland, MS.

- Married to Barbara Jean Byrd Robinson of Brookhaven, MS since 1961, parents of five children and eight grandchildren.
Major Extension and Public Service Programs

Organization Development and Human Resource Development, 1971 to Date

Most professionals in Colleges of Agriculture in land grant universities and many agribusiness professionals possess excellent technical skills on problems related to agriculture. Many, however, have limited training in process skills - behaviors and attitudes essential for working effectively with others. Introduced process skills to the Extension Service at the national level in 1972 and has devoted a major portion of his time to developing educational materials on process skills in a learning module format. Process skills are defined as skills essential for understanding, developing and internalizing attitudes and behaviors for effective management of people, small groups and organizations.

As the first advocate learning modules in Cooperative Extension for effective leadership development, Robinson has received $300,000 in funding from ES, USDA to develop and implement three national "Special Needs" projects: (1) Process Skills in Organization Development - 1971-73; (2) Process Skills in Human Relations - 1971-75; and (3) Winning Behavior Skills - 1975-79. The latest program received top rating among 160 competing proposals for funding. While leading the work of 12 graduate students and 7 faculty, he:

- Taught three national and three multi-state, week-long, train-the-trainer workshops for 170 specialists from 38 universities during 1973-78. Since 1973 over 140,000 process skills bulletins, 900 teacher guides and 2100 slide/tape sets have been distributed to Extension staff in America and around the world.

- Taught over 35 process skills workshops, 5 days each, for all levels of Extension staff in Illinois, for administrators of park districts, church leaders, agribusiness leaders, school administrators and business leaders.

- Taught hundreds of one-day workshops for CES staff, farm groups, chambers of commerce, agribusiness leaders, churches, hospitals and administrators and volunteers in other public service organizations on subjects such as leadership styles, motivation, communication, games, prejudice, team skills and change.

- Provided materials and consulting support to 38 universities in the U.S. and many persons overseas who continue to use Process Skills materials. Many universities require in-service education for all their Extension staff in process skills using these materials as the text.

- Designed and implemented an organizational development program during 1992-1994 for the Board of Directors, Executive Council, top management and middle managers in Aunt Martha's Youth Service, Inc., Matteson, IL.

- Mississippi Delta Service Corps, Delta Reads Partnership, and America Reads Mississippi. Conceptualized framework, wrote proposals, and directed three major AmeriCorps programs with 210 Corps members, 1998-2000. Corporation for National Service and Delta organizations have provided funding in excess of $6.5 million. Post service educational scholarships for Corps members exceeded $1.9 million.
Rural and Community Development, 1971 to Date

Robinson’s theoretical and operational approach to community development is through organization, leadership and human resource development. Among major activities in this area are:

- Guest Editor, Special Issue, The Journal of the Community Development Society, 2000
- Assisted the USDA in planning and conducting 11 National Rural Development Leadership Schools for over 1,200 participants. Received the highest evaluation given to faculty by participants at all 11 schools, 1974-76.
- Provided process assistance to counties on rural development and helped Logan County, IL obtain an industry which provided 400 jobs, 1979-81.
- As Program Leader, Robinson conceptualized the RURAL PARTNERS®/Kellogg program around a comprehensive and innovative approach to rural development which was funded by 14 RURAL PARTNERS® and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The program, HELPING RURAL COMMUNITIES PREPARE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT was implemented in 10 rural counties with $4,232,000 funding and in-kind contributions. A menu of 20 community action modules, developed by 44 authors, was implemented by 63 Rural Community Development Coordinators throughout rural Illinois.
- Led the initiative to have RURAL PARTNERS®: The Illinois Private/Public Partnership for Rural Community Development which was designated as the State Rural Development Council and $220,814 funding the from National Rural Development Initiative FY 1994-95.
- Conceptualized procedures for outreach meetings and strategic planning workshops, and conceptualized the framework for the strategic plan for the Mid-Delta Empowerment Zone Alliance, created a model for developing, implementing, evaluating the program, and helped write proposal selected by President Clinton as one of three Rural Empowerment Zones in 1994. $40,000,000 in funding was obtained to build community and create economic development in the Mid-Delta Region, April - June 1994.
- In collaboration with Mississippi State University, Delta Council, and community groups in the Mississippi Delta, Robinson wrote the first draft of The Delta Strategic Plan for Social and Economic Development in the fall of 1994.
- Conceptualized, wrote, obtained funding for and currently directing The Delta Partners Initiative, a comprehensive, seven-year rural development program funded for $1,882,000 by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Alcorn State University, Delta State University and other partners. Program areas are: community development, leadership development, local government, and informing public policy in the Delta region, 1994 - to date.
Served as principal investigator, *Banker Perceptions of the Small Business Administration*. $10,000 funded by the SBA, 1981-82.

**Stress and Conflict in Community Groups and Agribusiness, 1968 to Date**

These are times of much dispute among community groups and in agribusiness. Because of the severe competition for resources and the economic situation, many people are experiencing conflicts. The stress which often follows, impairs their physical, emotional and mental well-being. The following programs and activities have been completed since 1968:

- Authored the first North Central Regional Extension bulletins on *Conflict Management* (1972) and *Stress Management* (1973).

- Chaired the NCR Sociology Committee which sponsored the first North Central Regional workshop on *Conflict Management*, 1975-77.

- Prepared a *Conflict Management Training Program for Extension Professionals*, published by Northeast Regional Center on Rural Development, Cornell University, 1977-78. Program remains in use today after several printings.

- Authored texts, workbooks, home study kits and teacher's kits on *Conflict Management* and on *Stress and Wellness* for extension educators and other professionals. More than 50,000 persons have attended workshops using these materials. These educational programs have been adopted for use in more than 125 organizations throughout the world.

- Prepared an educational program for the U.S. Department of State on *Situational Diplomacy* which is used around the world to teach Foreign Service Officers, 1979-81.

- Consulted with reporters and writers in the preparation of articles about conflict or stress for the following media: *The Wall Street Journal; U.S.A. Today; Newsweek; The New York Times; The Chicago Tribune; Farm Journal; Successful Farming*; National Public Radio; United Press International; CNN; Associated Press; and others.

- Lectured on *Conflict Management* at the first national workshop on *Hazardous Waste Management* sponsored by ECOP, St. Louis, Missouri, 1989.

- Developed and implemented a national "Train-the-Trainer" program for the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies in cooperation with Michigan State University on *Communication and Dispute Resolution*, 1990.

- Conducted laboratory training workshops on *Conflict Management and Environmental Issues* in the Department of Primary Industries and the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, 1990.

Conducted 24 workshops on Conflict, Motivation, Leadership, and Stress Management for community leaders and public officials in Tunica County, Bolivar County, Washington County, and Yazoo County, Mississippi, 1995-1997

**Management Training for Soil and Water Conservation Districts and others, 1980 to Date**

The human problem is a major barrier to more effective programs in soil and water conservation. As a result, Robinson has:

- Taught **Leadership Styles in Soil Conservation** at Annual Meetings of State Association and 15 districts, 1980-82 and at the National (NACD) Meeting in Honolulu, HI, 1982.

- Secured grant of $90,000 from Illinois Department of Agriculture with John van Es to develop and implement an educational program on **Organization Management Skills in ISWCDs**, 1983-85.

- Developed four learning modules and taught 10 teams of trainers who conducted over 40 workshops for 1200 SWCD Directors throughout Illinois, 1984-86.

- Received endorsement from the Board of Directors of the National Association of Conservation Districts (NACD) in 1987 to seek funding with their sponsorship for a national program on **Organization Management Skills for SWCD Directors**.


- Lectured in every province in Australia on **Creating Local Leadership for Soil and Water Conservation Programs**, and conducted nine team building workshops of two days length in each province, summers of 1988 and in 1990.

- Conceptualized and conducted research project for the Mississippi Chapter of the Nature Conservancy on "The Knowledge, Opinions and Behaviors of Landholders Toward Conservation in the Lower Yazoo Mississippi River Basin," 1997.

**Illinois Farm Family Research Panel, 1981 - 1985**

There is a great need for long-term in depth insight about the effects of change on family farmers and people in agriculture.

- Conceptualized the idea for an ongoing, long-term research panel of over 600 Illinois commercial farm families; submitted the idea to Department of Agricultural Economics for approval, and served as Chair of the Illinois Farm Panel Research Committee for three years.

- Assisted in securing funding from the Illinois Water Resources Center for the first wave of data collection on soil and water conservation.
International Program Development: Organization Management Skills For Professionals in Developing Nations, 1984 to Date

Many problems experienced by leaders of Extension organizations in developing nations have their roots in human relations. Programs in this area include:

- Obtained $91,460 funding through USDA, AID through a Title XII strengthening grant for three learning/training modules on Organization Management for Extension Workers in Developing Nations, 1984-85.

- Developed and taught learning modules for more than 250 international professionals during on-campus INTERPAKS short courses on: (1) Team Building, (2) Leadership Styles, (3) Conflict Management, and (4) Organizational Management Styles. For nine consecutive years, since 1985, these sessions received the highest evaluation rating given by program participants to more than 10 faculty who taught in the program.

- Presented paper at International Conference on the Theory and Practice of Extension at the National School of Agriculture, Meknes, Morocco, June 1987.


Agribusiness Management Mini-Courses, 1979 to Date

Many small agribusinesses, especially those not affiliated with large companies, have difficulty keeping abreast of the latest available information in accounting, marketing, business management, long-range planning, advertising, personnel management and financial management. Because of the recognized need for the Cooperative Extension Service to provide technical assistance:

- Developed a memorandum of understanding between the College of Agriculture and the Executive Development Center in the College of Commerce for a series of mini-courses for agribusiness professionals in 1979 and served as Department Group Leader for the series of mini-courses in cooperation with the Executive Development Center, 1979-84.

- Developed idea for and secured funding for first module in a video-guided home study course Farming on Friendly Terms. Purpose of the course is to enable all adult farm family members to be effective participants in the management of the farm business and the farm family. This learning module was endorsed by the North Central Regional (NCR) Farm Management Extension Committee as a official NCR refereed publication.
Publications

Books Authored or Edited

Christenson, James A. and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Eds.
(Reprinted in 1991 as a paperback.)

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Shawchuck, Norman, Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. and Roy A Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Christenson, James A. and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Eds.
(Reprinted in 1982 as a paperback.)

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford
Chapters in Books

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
2000 "Empowering Graduate Students Through Participation in Community Development Research" Social Science Research Center: Fifty Years of Reflections. (working title). Mississippi State University. Forthcoming next spring.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Christenson, James C. and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and James A. Christenson
1980 "In Search of Community Development," Chapter 1 in Community Development in America. Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, pp. 3-17.
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Action Research and Learning Modules in Print

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Henize Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Aaron Ridenour

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Heinze Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Henize Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Henize Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Henize Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Henize Silvis


Phillip D. Phillips, Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Greg Niemann, and Ray Rakers

---

1 All action research modules and learning module in this section, pages 16 -20, were reviewed by panels of academics from land grant universities in the North Central Region, by national panels of reviewers, or by community and economic development practitioners in Illinois before they were published.
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., and Anne Heinze Silvis

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., and Anne Heinze Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Henize Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Henize Silvis, Ed.

Tait, John L., Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., John van Es and Joe Somerset

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Heinze Silvis, Ed.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford.

Phillips, Phillip, Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Wallace Biermann and Eric Canada

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Louis DiFonso

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., Ben Peyton and William A. Donahue

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Heinze Silvis
1989  *Interpersonal Communications in the Family and Farm Business.*

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy O. Walker
1988  *A Stress Test.* (Designed for IBM PC and compatible machines). Police Training Institute, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1987  *Conflict Management for Soil Conservation Service Field Staff.* Study Guide. SCS Technical Service Center, Fort Worth, Texas.
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1985  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1985  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1985  

van Es, John, and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
1984  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and John van Es
1984  

van Es, John and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
1984  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Philip A. Marcus
1984  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and M.L. Doolittle
1982  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1981  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1978  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1977  

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1975  
*Games in Community Groups.* North Central Regional Extension Publication No. 36-11, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL. March, 37 pp.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1975  
*Prejudice in Community Groups.* North Central Regional Extension Publication No. 36-10, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL. February, 32 pp.
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., Roy A. Clifford and Joke DeWalle

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Workshop and Teacher's Guides

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Louis DiFonzo

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., Phillip Phillips, Wallace Biermann and Eric Canada
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., John Tait, John van Es and Joe Somerset

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Heinze Silvis

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Heinze Silvis

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Anne Heinze Silvis
1984 Organizational Management Skills Leader's Kit for Soil and Water Conservation District Directors. 300 color slides, audio tapes and 250-page programmed instructor's guide. University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., Violet Malone and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Publications in Professional Journals and Trade Magazine Articles

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Freiberg, Karen (with Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.)

Shaw, Daniel G. (with Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.)

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1983 "Helping Your Clients Cope With Stress," Agri-Finance. Skokie, IL.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and James D. Preston

Preston, James D. and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Noland, James R., Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. and Edwin Martin

Monographs

Buehler, Laurie and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
1982  Attitudes of Illinois Bankers Toward the Small Business Administration. Final Report, Grant #0500-81-01, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL. 68 pp.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Melissa Dunn

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Nancy Henderson
1971  An Evaluation of "Crossover Teachers" by Fifth and Sixth Grade Pupils. (Research Monograph, Report No. 7.) Research Center, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Nancy Henderson
1971  Interpersonal Relationships of Teachers in Desegregated Schools. (Research Monograph, Report No. 6.) Research Center, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1970  Prejudice and Other Attitudes Among Black and White Teachers. (Research Monograph, Report No. 5.) Research Center, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX.

Creswell, John L. and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
1970  A Study of the Effects of Inductive and Deductive Teaching Techniques in Elementary Mathematics. Final Report, Research Center, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and William Crittenden
1970  The Effect of Participation in a Desegregation Institute Upon the Attitudes and Behavior of Black and White Teachers: A Before-After Study. (Research Monograph, Report No. 3) Research Center, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX.
Crittenden, William B. and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
1969 A Comparison of Characteristics of Black and White Teachers at the Beginning of an Institute on Problems of School Desegregation in Houston. (Research Monograph, Preliminary Report No. 2.) Research Center, Houston Baptist University, Houston, TX.

Baird, Wesley A., Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. and Arthur Jones
1969 Beliefs and Practices of Selected Rural Residents Toward Forest Conservation and Management. Report 28, A Research Monograph published by the Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University Center, Mississippi State University in cooperation with Southern Forest Experiment Station, U.S. Forest Service, USDA.

Book Reviews

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Newsletters, Slide sets, Audio and Video Tapes, etc.

Phillips, Phillip, Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Eric Canada, Wallace Biermann and Steve Warren

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr., A. H. Silvis, and Bill Creswell, III

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1988 Conflict Management for Soil Conservation Service Field Staff. Slide/tape set. SCS Technical Service Center, Fort Worth, TX.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1986 Farm Stress: Methods for Teaching Its Management. Video tape lecture. Continuing Medical Education. Marshfield Medical Foundation, National Farm Medicine Center, Marshfield, Wisconsin. 50 minutes. VHS.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1982 Stress And How To Live With It: A Home Study Kit. Successful Farming, Meredith Corporation, Des Moines, Iowa. (A Study Guide and six hours of audio tapes.)

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford
1977 Winning Behavior Skills Audio Cassette Tapes. WBS-4, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.
Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr. and Roy A. Clifford

Papers and Publications by Delta State University, since 1994

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1995  "Social, Economic and Demographic Characteristics of the Mississippi Delta and High Road Indicators of Change." Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1996  "Community Actualization: Is It a Feasible Goal for Community and Economic Development in the Mississippi Delta?" Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1996  "An Operational and Theoretical Model for Developing, Implementing and Evaluating The Delta Partners Initiative for Leadership, Community and Economic Development." Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Robinson, Jerry W., Jr.
1998  Development is Everybody's Business: The Art and Science of Writing Proposals. Publication No. 98 - 3. Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Doctoral Dissertation

1966  "Residential Stratification in Old City: Its Substantive Meaning and Predictive Value," Sociology Department, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS.

Master's Thesis

1964  "The Development of Forestry in Carroll County, Mississippi," Sociology Department, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS.
Major Consulting Projects Since 1968

1996-1997 - The Nature Conservancy, Lower Yazoo Mississippi River Basin Project
   Designed and directed an action research project of landholders in the six-county region to determine the knowledge, opinion and participation of landholders in conservation programs.

1994 - Mid-Delta Empowerment Zone Alliance, Mississippi Delta
   Helped design and develop Mid-Delta Empowerment Zone proposal to the USDA for a ten-year $40 million grant for eight census tracts in a six-county area in the Mississippi Delta. Responsible for developing and leading community outreach efforts, for strategic planning and for developing the conceptual framework for developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the effort if the proposal is funded by the USDA. Proposal was one of three Rural Empowerment Zones selected for funding by President Clinton in December of 1994.

1992 - to date, Aunt Martha's Youth Service, Inc., Matteson, IL
   Designed and currently helping to implement an organizational development program in collaboration with the Board of Directors and Executive Council and implemented a long-range leadership and management training program with top and middle management.

   Developed a proposal for leadership and management education which was approved by U.S.A.I.D. Led the "Directorate of the Department of Agriculture" through a workshop to develop (1) a mission statement, (2) goals and management objectives for all divisions, and (3) needs assessment for training on leadership and management.

1988-90 - Soil Conservation Services Branch, Department of Primary Industries and University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

1987 - National Training Center, Soil Conservation Service, USDA, Fort Worth, Texas
   Developed a training module on Conflict Management for SCS Field Office Personnel with study guide, text/workbook, slide tape set and teacher's guide.

1986 - Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Alexandria, Virginia
   Developed and implemented a customized program on Stress and Wellness for central administrative staff, regional office staff, and more than 450 Senior Rank Review Officers. Conducted 16 two-day workshops at eight locations throughout the nation.

1985-89 - Farmland Industries, Farm Credit Bank Services, Marshfield (WI) Clinic, American Farm Bureau, Soil Conservation Service, USDA and Others
   Developed educational programs with student and teacher material on Stress and Wellness for agribusiness professionals and farm families. Implemented this program in over 75 major organizations throughout the U.S. and Canada.
1983-87 - Department of Rural Development, State of South Carolina
Helped Governor's Office design and implement five state-wide "Rural Development Leaders Schools." Trained facilitators and gave at least two lectures at each school. Received highest rating among all faculty for lecture on "Community Conflict" at all five schools.

1983-84 - Country Companies Insurance, Bloomington, Illinois
Developed course on Managing Stress and Your Health. Taught five health educators to teach this course to Country Companies Insurance staff and policy holders.

1981-82 - Forest Service, USDA
Developed course on Interpersonal Communications. Included developing conceptual framework, writing text material, learner activities, trainer's guide, developing visual aids and audio tapes. Taught 112 professional foresters to teach the course to U.S. Forest Service professionals throughout the nation. Received "Outstanding Achievement Award" for this program from USFS.

1977-80 - Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.
Developed course on Situational Diplomacy. Work included travel to U.S. embassies and consulates for research to develop case studies, and the conceptual framework, writing text material, learner activities and trainer's guide with visual aids. Conducted three "Train-the-Trainer" workshops at the Foreign Service Institute, Arlington, VA to enable staff to teach the course which was implemented in U.S. embassies and consulates around the world.

1971-79 - Land Grant Universities; Extension Service, USDA; and National 4-H Center, Washington, D.C.
Implemented educational programs on Organizational Development, Human Relations and Winning Behavior Skills (see publications), and taught over 180 Extension professionals from 38 Land Grant universities to teach these modules to others. Major clients included - Cornell University, Michigan State University, University of Missouri, University of Arkansas, Mississippi State University, Oregon State University, Pennsylvania State University and North Carolina State University.

1973-75 - Rural Development Service, USDA
Helped design, develop and implement 11 "National Rural Development Leaders Schools" which were held throughout the nation. Worked as a group leader and gave two lectures at each of these schools. Received the top rating among all faculty for both lectures at all 11 schools.

1968-71 - Public School Systems in Houston, TX; Louisville, KY; Indianapolis, IN
Advised the Public School Boards and Administrator on problems related to desegregation. Developed plan approved by Boards for administration, faculty and student desegregation. Wrote several grants for Houston which were funded for over $2.5 million by U.S. Office of Education (ESAP) to facilitate desegregation. Recommended the establishment of two model inner-city magnet high schools--one trade and industrial school and one fine and performing arts school.

See pages 27 and 28 for list of all clients since 1966.
Complete Client List Since 1966

Associations and Professional Groups
- American Bankers Association
- American Rural Health Association
- American Farm Bureau Federation
- American Recreation and Parks Assn.
- Association of Administrators in Ambulatory Care Centers
- Association of Administrators in Home Economics
- California Farm Bureau
- Delta and Pine Land Company
- Eastern Virginia Medical Authority
- Girl Scouts of America, USA
- Illinois Assn. of Home Economics
- Illinois Assn. Mutual Insurance
- Illinois Assn. of Soil and Water Conservation Districts
- Illinois Bankers Assn.
- Illinois Corn Growers
- Illinois Farm Bureau
- Illinois Grain Dealers
- Illinois Livestock Assn.
- Illinois Park and Recreation Assn.
- Illinois Pork Producers
- Illinois Ready Mix Concrete Assn.
- Illinois Crop Improvement Assn.
- Illinois Seed Dealers Assn.
- Illinois State Florist Assn.
- Indiana Bankers Assn.
- Indiana Farm Bureau
- Iowa Bankers Assn.
- Iowa Farm Bureau
- Iowa Institute of Corporation
- John Schuller, Ph.D., Psychologist
- Kansas Farm Bureau
- Kansas Fertilizer & Chemical Inst.
- Kentucky Farm Bureau
- Kentucky Poultry Assn.
- Maryland Farm Bureau
- Mattin and Johnson
- Michigan Assn. of Home Economics
- Mississippi Commission for Volunteer Service
- Mississippi Farm Bureau
- Missouri Institute of Cooperation
- National Feed Ingredients Assn.
- National 4-H Council
- Nature Conservancy
- North Dakota Bankers Assn.
- New York Farm Bureau
- Oklahoma Farm Bureau
- Professional Farmers of America
- Robert Morris & Associates
- Rural Youth, USA
- South Dakota Bankers Assn.
- Texas Farm Bureau
- Utah Farm Bureau
- Victor Wojmar, M.D.
- Western Association of Fisheries and Wildlife Management
- Wisconsin Farm Bureau
- Wisconsin Chapter, Community Development Society
- Wyoming Bankers Assn.

Business and Industries
- Agri-Education Consultants
- Agri-Finance (Magazine)
- Agricultural Speakers Network
- Allerton State Bank
- Applied Management Research
- Arcadian Corporation
- A.O. Smith Harvestore
- Bank of Cooperatives, St. L.
- Black Hawk PCA Assn.
- Busey Bank, Urbana, IL.
- Carle Foundation Hospital
- Consolidated Communications
- Country Companies, Inc.
- Countrymark, Inc.
- Curry Communications Group
- Delta and Pine Land Company.
- Elanco, Inc.
- Farm Credit Bank of Springfield, MA.
- Farmland Foods, Inc.
- Farm Credit Bank, Baltimore
- Farm Credit Bank, Louisville
- Farm Credit Bank, Wichita
- Farm Credit Corp. of America
- Farmland Industries, Inc.
- Farmers Commodities Corp.
- Farm Medicine Center, Marshfield, Wisconsin
- Federal Intermediate Credit, Bank of St. Louis
- Fed. Land Bank of Jackson
- First Nat. Bank of Sterling
- Funk Seed Company
- Greenvue Nurseries
- General Telephone Electronics
- Heinhold Hog Markets, Inc.
- Heinhold Commodities, Inc.
- Indiana Farm Bureau Insurance
• Illinois Bell
• John Hancock Insurance Co.
• Louisville Bank of Coops.
• Management Learning Labs
• Micro Switch, Inc.
• National Assn. of Conservation Districts
• National Bank of Fairbury, IL
• North American Speakers Bureau
• Octrain, Inc.
• PCA, Grundy Center, Iowa
• Roberson Corporation
• Solihogrow, Inc.
• Soyland Power Cooperative
• State Bank of Freeport
• St. Louis Bank of Coops.
• Swiss Valley Farms
• Vigortone Ag. Products
• Washington Manufacturing Co.
• Wisconsin Center for Coops.

Colleges and Universities
• Auburn University
• Belleville Area Community College, Belleville, IL
• Carl Sandburg Community College, Galesburg, IL
• Chemeketa Community College, Salem, Oregon
• Danville Community College
• Golden Gate University
• Iowa State University
• Kansas State University
• Kentucky State University
• Lincolnland Community College, Springfield, Illinois
• Memphis State University
• Michigan State University
• Mississippi State University
• North Central Regional Center for Rural Development (Iowa State University)
• North East Regional Center for Rural Development (Penn State)
• Northwest Community College, Powell, Wyoming
• Ohio State University
• Oklahoma State University
• Oregon State University
• Ouchita Baptist University
• Pennsylvania State University
• Prairie View A&M University
• Purdue University
• Sam Houston State University
• Southeast Missouri State Univ.
• Southern Illinois University
• Southern Regional Center for Rural Development (MS. State U.)
• Southwestern State Univ. of MN
• Spoon River Community College, Canton, IL
• Texas A&M University
• Tufts University
• Tuskegee Institute
• University of Arkansas
• University of Connecticut
• University of Delaware
• University of Florida
• University of Guam
• University of Houston
• University of Illinois - Alumni Association
  College of Engineering
  College of Medicine
  College of Veterinary Medicine
  Dad's Association
  Department of Leisure Studies
  Executive Development Center
  Illini Union Board
  Mom's Association
  Office of Continuing Education
  Office of Student Affairs
  Police Training Institute
  Vice Chancellor's Office Student Affairs
• University of Kentucky
• University of Maine
• University of Minnesota
• University of Missouri
• University of Mississippi
• University of Nebraska
• University of Queensland
• University of Tennessee
• University of Texas-Arlington, School of Nursing
• University of Virginia, Eastern Medical Authority
• University of Wisconsin
• West Virginia University

Government Agencies
• Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District
• Federal Deposit Ins. Corp.
• U.S. A. I. D.
• U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, SEA and RDS
• U.S. Dept. of Education
• U.S. Forest Service
Government Agencies, (cont.)

- U.S. Dept. of Labor
- U.S. Dept. of State
- Illinois Dept. of Agriculture
- Illinois Dept. of Children and Family Services
- Illinois Dept. of Commerce and Community Affairs
- Illinois Dept. of Labor
- Illinois Dept. of Transportation
- Illinois Rural Affairs Council
- National Park Service
- Ministry of Agriculture, Foods and Coops; Sri Lanka
- State of South Carolina:
  Depts. of Mental Health, Social Services & Health, Dept. of Rural Development
- State of Mississippi
  Dept. of Human Development
- U.S. Small Business Admin.
- Ministry of Agriculture:
  Alberta, Canada
  Manitoba, Canada
  Nova Scotia, Canada
  Ontario, Canada
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs
  Ontario, Canada
- National Conservation Program,
  Australia
- Urbana Park District
- Champaign Park District

Other

- Aunt Martha's Youth Service Agency
  Park Forest, IL
- Champaign Public Schools
- Education Service Center of Texas, Regions VI and VIII
- Farm Foundation
- Houston Independent School District
- Indianapolis Public Schools
- Leyden Public Schools
- Lower Yazoo Basin Project
- Mid-Delta Empowerment Zone Alliance, Central Mississippi Delta
- Urbana Public Schools
- Village of Park Forest, IL
- Village of Wordridge, IL
- Louisville Public Schools
- Development Alternatives Incorporated, Washington, D.C.
Research Projects, Training Grants and Contracts

2000 - 2003  Toward Excellence and New Policy from Delta Partners' Participatory Research (pending)
(1) Written and to be directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Submitted and currently under review: National Research Initiative Competitive Grants Program,
Rural Development, USDA
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development, Delta State University

1999 - 2002  Graduate Fellows in Community Development at Delta State University
(1) Written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: The Robert Hearin Foundation, Jackson, MS
(3) Requested for: Division of Social Sciences and Center for Community Development, Delta State
(4) Amount funded: $45,000, for three $5,000 fellowships per year for three years

1999 - 2000  Delta Partners Initiative Youth Program
(1) Written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. with input from staff in the Center for Community Development
(2) Funded by: Mid-South Delta Consortium
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development, DSU, in collaboration with division of student
affairs at DSU, Coahoma Community College, Mississippi Delta Community College, and
Mississippi Valley State University.
(4) Amount funded: $75,868 for eighteen months

1998 - 2001  America Reads Mississippi
(1) Developed and written by: John Dirks and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Corporation for National Service and the Mississippi Commission for Volunteer Service,
with 200 AmeriCorps Members serving low resource schools throughout Mississippi
(3) Requested for: Office of the Commissioner, Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning, Center for
Community Development, Cleveland, MS, and Mississippi State University
(4) Amount funded: $3,860,748, September 1, 1998 - August 31, 2001

1998 - 2001  Community Development Demonstration Program in West Tallahatchie County
(1) Written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. with input from staff in the Center for Community Development
(2) Funded by: Mid-South Delta Consortium, Pine Bluff, Arkansas
(3) West Tallahatchie Community and Economic Development Foundation
(4) Amount funded: $75,000 at $25,000 per year for three years

1997  Furnishings, Art and Equipment for the Delta Development Center
(1) Written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Union Planters Bank and Short Line Manufacturing
(3) Requested for: The Delta Development Center, the building housing the Center for Community
Development
(4) Value of equipment, furnishings, and art donated exceeds $55,000

1997 - 2000  Lower Mississippi Delta Service Corps, Inc.- A Tri-State Program for Arkansas, Louisiana and
Mississippi
(1) Developed and written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. and Maggie Heyn, with input from staff.
(2) Funded: Corporation for National Service and Lower Miss. Delta Service Corps, Inc. with 220
AmeriCorps Members serving community organizations in the Tri-State Delta region.
(3) Requested for: Lower Mississippi Delta Service Corps, Inc., Greenville, MS
1997 - 2000 The Delta Reads Partnership
(1) Developed and written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Professor Hines Cronin, DSU
(2) Funded by: Corporation for National Service and the Mississippi Commission for Volunteer Service with 50 AmeriCorps Members serving in six, low-resource Delta schools
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development and School of Education, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS

1997 - 2000 Mississippi Delta Service Corps/AmeriCorps
(1) Developed and written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., with input from Center Staff.
(2) Funded by: Corporation for National Service and Lower Miss. Delta Service Corps, Inc.
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS
(4) Amount funded: $2,250,000 - September 1, 1997 - August 31, 2000.

1997 - 1999 Multi-Media Technology for the Delta Development Center
(1) Written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Four casinos in Tunica County, MS
(3) Requested for: The Delta Development Center, Delta State University
(4) Cash donated to date: $50,000

1995 - 2001 The Delta Partners Initiative
(1) Developed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Director, Center for Community Development
(2) Funded by: The W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, MI and Collaborating Partners
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS
(4) Amount funded: $1,800,000 for six years.

1996-1997 Mississippi Delta Service Corps/AmeriCorps
(1) Developed and written by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Director with input from Center staff.
(2) Submitted to: Corporation for National Service and Lower Miss. Delta Service Corps, Inc.
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS

1995-1996 Mississippi Delta Service Corps/AmeriCorps
(1) Developed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Director, Center for Community Development
(2) Funded by: Corporation for National Service and Arkansas Dept. of Human Services
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS
(4) Amount funded: $200,800, for September 1995 - August 1996

1994-95 Seed-Money Grant for Leadership, Community and Economic Development
(1) Developed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Director, Center for Community Development
(2) Funded by: The W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, MI
(3) Requested for: Center for Community Development, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS
(4) Amount funded: $82,000 for one year. Intent was to plan and develop a long-term program

1993-94 National Rural Development Initiative and Illinois Rural Development Council
(1) Developed by: RURAL PARTNERS*: The Illinois Private/Public Partnership for Rural Community Development, Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Principal Investigator.
(2) Funded by: The National Rural Development Initiative through The E.R.S., USDA.
(3) Requested for: Laboratory for Community and Economic Development to support the work of RURAL PARTNERS* as the State Rural Development Council
(4) Amount funded: $110,814 for first year. Intent is for funding to continue through FY1996
1993-94 **Poverty in Illinois**
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Principal Investigator
(2) Funded by: University of Illinois Research Board; Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station; and Illinois Cooperative Extension Service.
(3) Requested for: Laboratory for Community and Economic Development
(4) Amount funded: $44,000

1993-94 **Business Retention and Expansion**
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Principal Investigator
(3) Requested for: Laboratory for Community and Economic Development
(4) Amount funded: $10,000

1991-94 **Helping Rural Communities Prepare for Economic Development**
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Governor's Rural Affairs Council
(3) Requested for: Five Community Colleges and University of Illinois Cooperative Extension Service
(4) Amount funded: $250,000

1992-94 **Helping Rural Communities Prepare for Economic Development**
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Governor's Rural Affairs Council
(3) Requested for: Laboratory for Community and Economic Development
(4) Amount funded: $44,000

1990-94 **Helping Rural Communities Prepare for Economic Development**
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: W.K. Kellogg Foundation and RURAL PARTNERS®
(3) Requested for: Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, Cooperative Extension Service and RURAL PARTNERS®
(4) Amount funded: $750,000 - W.K. Kellogg Foundation
3,000,000 (cash match from state and county organizations)
$3,750,000

1990-94 **Helping Rural Communities Prepare for Economic Development**
(1) Written and to be directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Soyland Power Cooperative; General Telephone and Electric; Illinois Bell; and Consolidated Communications
(3) Requested for: Department of Agricultural Economics
(4) Amount funded: $104,500

1987-89 **Farming on Friendly Terms**
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Extension Service, USDA and University of Illinois CES
(3) Requested for: Department of Agricultural Economics
(4) Amount funded: $30,000

1986 **Stress and Wellness for FDIC Administrators and Bank Review Officers**
(1) Written and implemented by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
(3) Requested for: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(4) Amount funded: $35,800
1984-86  Organizational Management Skills for Extension Professionals in Developing Nations
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: U.S. Agency of International Development, Title XII and University of Illinois
(3) Requested for: Department of Agricultural Economics
(4) Amount funded: $47,000

1982-84  Strengthening The Skills of Illinois Soil and Water Conservation Districts for Soil and Water Quality Management
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. and John van Es
(2) Funded by: Illinois Department of Agriculture and Cooperative Extension Service, University of Illinois.
(3) Requested for: Department of Agricultural Economics
(4) Amount funded: $31,200 - University of Illinois
$40,260 - Department of Agriculture
$91,460

1981-82  Interpersonal Communications for U.S. Forest Service Contactors
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: U.S. Forest Service, Southern Region
(3) Requested for: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(4) Amount funded: $44,000

1981-86  Increasing Use of Computer-Assisted Farm Management Programs
(1) Written by: Professor Delmar F. Wilken and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., consultant
(2) Funded by: W.K. Kellogg Foundation
(3) Requested for: Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois
(4) Amount funded: $550,550

1980-81  Situational Diplomacy for Foreign Service Officers
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State
(3) Requested for: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(4) Amount funded: $18,000

1980-81  A Pilot Program in Rural Development, A Cooperative Effort Between the Small Business Administration and the Cooperative Extension Service
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Small Business Administration, Chicago Regional Office
(3) Requested for: Department of Agricultural Economics
(4) Amount funded: $11,020

1975-78  A Winning Personal Skills Program for 4-H Youth: A Multi-State Cooperative Extension Service Project
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Special Needs Projects, ES, USDA
(3) Requested for: University of Illinois and six cooperating Land Grant universities
(4) Amount funded: $134,660

1974-75  Community College Consortium for Rural Development in Western Illinois
(1) Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2) Funded by: Illinois Community College Board
(3) Requested for: Carl Sandburg Community College and Spoon River Community College
(4) Amount funded: $48,600
1974-75  Supplemental Grant To 1971-73 Process Skills Project
Amount funded:  $12,000 - University of Illinois
              $8,950 - Extension Service, USDA
                $20,950

1971-74  Process Skills in Organization Development and Human Relations
(1)  Written and directed by:  Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2)  Funded by:  Extension Service, USDA
(3)  Requested for:  Dept. of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois
(4)  Amount funded:  $86,200 - C.E.S., USDA
                  70,000 - University of Illinois
                  $156,200

1971  In-service Training Program on Problems of School Desegregation
(1)  Written by:  Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Consultant and Administrative Staff of Indianapolis Public Schools
(2)  Funded by:  USOE, Title IV, February 1970
(3)  Grant to:  Indianapolis Public Schools
(4)  Amount funded:  $100,000

1969-70  Inductive vs. Deductive Teaching Strategies in Mathematics
(1)  Written by Dr. John Creswell, Principal Investigator, and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Project Director
(2)  Funded by:  USOE, Region VII
(3)  Granted to:  Houston Baptist University
(4)  Amount funded:  $9,400 - for 18 months

1969-70  An In-service Training Program for 1000 Cross-Over Teachers
(1)  Written by:  Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. and James Noland, Consultants
(2)  Funded by:  USOE, Title IV
(3)  Grant to:  Houston Independent School District
(4)  Amount funded:  Phase I, Spring 1970 - $200,000
                  Phase II, Fall 1970 - 168,000
                  $368,000

1970-71  European Area Studies Training Grant
(1)  Written by:  Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Dr. Robert Parker
(2)  Funded by:  USOE, Institute for International Studies
(3)  Grant to:  Houston Baptist University
(4)  Amount funded:  $13,850

1968-71  Mental Health of Teachers and School Desegregation
(1)  Written and directed by:  Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2)  Funded by:  NIMH, Center for Studies in Metropolitan Mental Health
(3)  Granted to:  Houston Baptist University
(4)  Amount funded:  $236,000 for 4 years

1968  A Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation For East Texas Teachers and Administrators
(1)  Written by:  Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Consultant
(2)  Funded by:  USOE, Title IV
(3)  Granted to:  Sam Houston State University
(4)  Amount funded:  $53,000 for one year
1968  A Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation for 70 Administrators From Gulf Coast Area of Texas
(1)  Co-Written and Co-Directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. and James R. Noland
(2)  Funded by: USOE, Title IV
(3)  Granted to: University of St. Thomas and Houston Baptist University
(4)  Amount funded: $41,000 for one year

1968  An Empirical Evaluation of the Houston Youth Court: A Seed-Money Grant
(1)  Written by: Dr. A.E. Kannwischer and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2)  Funded by: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health
(3)  Granted to: Houston Baptist University
(4)  Amount funded: $3,750

1967  Mental Health of Teachers and School Desegregation: A Proposal For A Seed-Money Grant
(1)  Written and directed by: Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
(2)  Funded by: The Hogg Foundation of Mental Health, the University of Texas
(3)  Granted to: Houston Baptist University
(4)  Amount funded: $2,750

1967  Advanced Institute on Problems of School Desegregation Training Grant
(1)  Written by: James Noland and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., Co-Directors
(2)  Funded by: USOE, Title IV
(3)  Granted to: University of St. Thomas, Texas Southern University, and Houston Baptist University
(4)  Amount funded: $39,000
CURRICULUM VITAE

Garry Jennings
SSN: 180-42-3442
gjenning@dsu.deltast.edu

OFFICE ADDRESS:
Division of Social Sciences
201F Kethley Hall
Delta State University
Cleveland, MS 38733
tele: 662.846.4107
fax: 662.846.4016

HOME ADDRESS:
1612 Terrace Road
Cleveland, MS 38732
tele: 662.846.1836

ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS:

Ph.D. University of Maryland August 1991
M.A. University of Maryland August 1986
B.A. University of Maryland May 1981 (Political Science / English / cum laude)

EXPERIENCE:

Associate Professor, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS, 1998-present.
Assistant Professor, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS, 1994-1998.
Assistant Professor, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, 1991 to the present.
Instructor, Saint Mary’s College, Notre Dame, IN, 1987 to 1990.
Assistant Instructor, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, (Summer Session 1987).
Assistant Instructor, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, (1986-1987 Academic Year).
Assistant Instructor, University College University of Maryland, College Park, MD (Fall 1982 to Spring 1986).
Graduate Research and Teaching Assistant, University of Maryland, College Park, MD (Spring 1982 to Spring 1986).
Undergraduate Advisor, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, College Pack, MD (1984-1985).

OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

BOOK REVIEW:


TEXTBOOK:


BOOK MANUSCRIPT:

Supreme Court Authority and the Lower Federal Courts: Judge John J. Parker and the Fourth Federal Circuit

MANUSCRIPTS CIRCULATED

"The Amicus curiae Brief in State Courts, 1950-1964" (State Constitutional Commentary and Notes).

"Participants, Issues and Beneficiaries: The Amicus Curiae Brief in State Courts" (Judicature).


WORKS IN PROGRESS:

"Correlates of Amicus Brief Submission in the State Courts, 1950-1964:

CONFERENCE PAPERS:


"Diffusion of Innovation in Equal Protection Litigation in the Sixth Circuit," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, November 1988, Atlanta, GA.


"Liberal Political Theory and the Concept of Judicial Innovation," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1987, Chicago, IL.
OTHER CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES:


Chair and discussant, "Averroes and the Concept of Medieval Islamic Philosophy," a panel organized for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August-September, 1987, Chicago, IL.

COLLOQUIA:


TEACHING INTERESTS:

Classical-Medieval Political Theory  Renaissance to Modern Political Theory  Economic and Political Rationality
Constitutional Law  Civil Rights - Civil Liberties  Judicial Process / Behavior
Research Methods  Introduction to Political Science  Public Policy
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RESEARCH INTERESTS:

Democratic Theory
Liberal Theory
State Constitutional Law
Economic and Political Rationality
Amicus Curiae Activity
Law and Economics
The Fourteenth Amendment

RESEARCH TOOLS:

Classical Greek (Attic dialect)
LEXIS/NEXIS
experience with public records & documents
demographic and industrial & manufacturing indexes
Latin (plus a modest understanding of Medieval Latin)
WESTLAW
technical legal journals, court records & case reports
quantitative methods SPSS-X, SPSS-PC+, SAS

AWARDS:


Graduate Research Award, Graduate School, University of Maryland; 1987

Graduate Assistantship, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, 1982 - 1986.

Meritorious Service Award, Library of Congress, 1983

Full Scholarship, University of Scranton (undergraduate school)

DEPARTMENTAL AND COLLEGE SERVICE:

Saint Mary's College:
Advisor, Peer Advising Group: 1988-89 Academic Year
Departmental Secretary: 1989-90
Senior Thesis Director: 1988-90

Illinois Benedictine College:
Kucera Lecture Series Committee
Library Advisory Committee
Wingspread Honors Fellowship Advisory Committee
Earlenborn Scholarship Committee
Senior Thesis Director: 1990-1991
PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP:

American Political Science Association
Southern Political Science Association
Mississippi Political Science Association
American Classical League

OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Manuscript reviewer, The Review of Politics
Manuscript reviewer, Southeast Review of Politics

REFERENCES:

Prof. Herman Bele, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

Prof. Charles E. Butterworth, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 (301) 405-4156.

Prof. M. Margaret Conway, Department of Political Science, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611 (904) 392-0248

Prof. Cecil L. Eubanks, Chair, Department of Political Science, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-5433 (504) 388-2141

Prof. Wayne McIntosh, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 (301) 405-4156

Prof. Karen O'Connor, Chair, Department of Political Science, American University, Washington, DC.
ADDENDUM TO CURRICULUM VITAE

1. Evidence of Outstanding Teaching.
   a. Teaching Evaluations.

   Two banks of teaching evaluations reflect excellent ratings by students in the classroom (see attached copy of results from latest evaluations)

   b. Innovative Instructional Methods.

   Although not new, the use of primary texts in the classroom has been instrumental in the success of all my courses. For example, Plato's *Republic*, Thomas Hobbes's *The Leviathan*, or John Locke's *The Second Treatise of Government*, Webpages developed for courses.

   (1) The first website used in a course was for PSC 431: *Ancient to Medieval Political Theory*. The website contained links to sites dealing with Ancient Greek history, poetry and myth. The center piece of the website was an English translation of Homer's *Iliad*, a required reading for the course. This was the first electronic text used at Delta State.

   (2) PSC 441: *Civil Rights Law* included Internet resources, including the full text versions of U.S. Supreme Court cases. Some of the cases date from early in the 19th century, some are as recent as the October 1996 Term of the U.S. Supreme Court.

   (3) E-mail Access. Through the use of e-mail, students have virtually 24-hour access to the instructor. Several assignments in the past have included use of e-mail responses to questions distributed over the Internet.

iii. Political Science: Critical Thinking and Writing Across the Curriculum.

   (1) PSC 103: *Introduction to Political Science* aims at getting students to consider the relationship between critical thinking and citizenship, and to do this primarily through writing assignments. Specifically, the course poses questions about relationships among community, authority, tradition, and freedom. Students are required to write eight papers during the semester.

   (2) The webpage for PSC 103 provides access to course topics, literature used in class, and listings of paper topics.

   iv. PSC 498: Seminar in Political Science, offered for the first time in Spring 1998, has an accompanying webpage which is under construction. Currently, the webpage lists the schedule for completion of the senior research paper and suggestions for writing. Future revisions will include links to resources, including examples of work by former students.

c. Course Development and Revision.


   v. Honors Course / New Course, "Democracy on Trial: The Public / Private Distinction in Modern Liberal Democracy."


   vii. Revised Courses, Constitutional Law was broken into two courses: "PSC 446: Constitutional Law" and "PSC 444: Civil Liberties/Civil Rights."

   viii. Revision of the Political Science Curriculum, Autumn 1994. This report recommended the revision and reorganization of courses in Political Science.
d. Courses Taught to Date (across 8 semesters).

i. Introduction to Political Science
ii. American National Government
iii. Ancient to Medieval Political Theory
iv. Renaissance to Modern Political Theory
v. American Political Thought
vi. The Judicial Process
vii. Constitutional Law
viii. Civil Liberties / Civil Rights
ix. Civil Rights Law
x. Internship for Paralegal Studies
xi. Special Topics in Political Science
xii. Seminar in Political Science: Capstone Course in Political Science
xiii. The Classical Tradition (Great Books Committee Course)
xiv. Media Law and Politics
xv. American Political Theory (Honors Program Course)

e. Activities Connected to Student Organizations.

i. Founded The Agora, official Political Science student organization at Delta State. ii. Pre-Law Advisor
iii. Pre-Law Club, revived during the Autumn 1997 semester.

(1) Pre-Law Club Activities.

(a) Minority Recruitment Day, Mississippi College School of Law, Spring 1998.

Evidence of Student Success.

Although Political Science at Delta State focuses on developing well rounded students it also tends to be the major of choice for students headed to law school. Though the numbers are low, students who have graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Political Science have attended the following schools of law: Mississippi College School of Law (Michelle Scoggen), the University of Mississippi (John Cox, Roger Kirk), and the University of Alabama, University of Memphis (Roger Kirk). Two graduates stand out as very successful: Sean Shurden, who now attends William and Mary College of Law in Williamsburg, Virginia, and Cynthia Parson, who attends Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee. Both worked very closely with me and are now in top 20 law schools. Mr. Shurden and Ms. Parson are just two examples of what Delta State students can do, given the proper attention, guidance, and rigorous course work.
g. Scholarly Work on Teaching in the Discipline of Political Science.


h. Faculty Development Activities for Improvement of Teaching.

Workshop on Advanced Quantitative Analysis in Undergraduate Courses, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 12-15 August 1996. Work focused on advanced topics in quantitative analysis, including Logit and Probit models. ii. "Putting Your Course on Line." Autumn 1997, Delta State University. This distance learning course provided information for faculty in two groups: those who are novices in using course websites; and those who were interested in upgrading their existing websites.

i. Faculty Development Activities for Improvement of Advising.


2. Evidence of Scholarly Activity.

a. Research Project.

The Ayers Grant. Early in the Spring 1997, Delta State University funded research focusing on the Ayers litigation. The grant, totaling almost $3500.00, has provided original text and secondary sources for PSC 492: Civil Rights Law. It has funded the collection of scholarly works on the history of race relations, federal statutory law dealing with racial discrimination, and related areas.

(1) A book manuscript is now in progress as a result of this grant.

b. Scholarly Papers.
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c. Grant Work.

"The Community as Family: An Old Idea for a New Age," grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Mississippi Endowment for the Humanities. Funding was awarded for a series of lectures developed out of research on the families in the late twentieth century. The series of lectures focus on how the liberal democratic form of government conditions family life. The lectures were as follows:

(1) "The Public/Private Distinction and the Family in Modern Democracy," Mississippi Delta Community College, June 1995.
(2) "The Role of Government and the Family in Modern Democracy," Clarksdale City Community Center, Clarksdale, Mississippi, July 1995.

ii. Other Scholarly Activity.

(1) Manuscript Reviewer, *Southeastern Political Review*.
(3) Panel Chair, "The Uses of Symbolic Politics," Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Political Science Association, Jackson, Mississippi, February 1997

d. Professional Development.

i. Advanced Research.

(1) Visiting Faculty Scholar, University of Notre Dame Law School, July 1998.
(2) Visiting Faculty Scholar, University of Notre Dame Law School, May 1997.
(3) Visiting Faculty Scholar, University of Notre Dame Law School, May 1996.

3. Evidence of Other Contributions, Accomplishments, and Service.

a. Service and Contributions to Delta State University.

i. Faculty Workshops Taught.

"Appropriate Technology in the Classroom," Faculty Development Workshop, University Faculty Senates Association, Education Resource Center, Jackson, Mississippi, Autumn 1997.
"Building Webpages for Courses," Faculty Development Workshop, Delta State University, Spring 1996. "Using the Internet," Faculty Development Workshop, Delta State University, Autumn 1995.
ii. Faculty Lecture.


iii. Guest Lectures in Courses.

(1) "The Origins of Equal Protection of the Laws," for Prof Vicki Hartley, Division of Social Sciences.
(2) "Dialectical Materialism," for Prof William McLandisborough, Division of Social Sciences.
(3) "The Critical Rationalism of Sir Karl Popper," for Prof Elizabeth Sarcone, Division of Languages and Literature.

iv. Speakers Brought to Campus.

(1) James W. Smith, Associate Justice, Mississippi Supreme Court, Spring 1996.
(2) Michael Malone, Professor of Law, Mississippi College of Law, Autumn 1995.
(3) Mike Moore, Attorney General, State of Mississippi, Spring 1995.

v. Faculty Service.

Positions Held:

(a) Secretary, Faculty Senate, 1997-1998.
(b) Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, 1997-1998.
(c) Chair, Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, 1997-1998.
(d) Secretary, Faculty Senate, 1996-1997 Session.
(e) Senator, Delta State University Faculty Senate, 1995-1997
(f) Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation of Administrators, 1995. Developed the instrument currently used to evaluate administrators at Delta State.
(g) Chair, Academic Achievement Committee, 1996-1997.
(h) Campus representative, Truman Scholarship.
(i) Campus representative, Mississippi Academy of Sciences, Summer 1997.
(j) Campus representative, "The Congress to Campus Program," a program in which former members of Congress take up residence and teach for a semester.
(2) Committee Work.

(a) Founding Member, Great Books Committee.
(b) Faculty representative, Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity.
(c) Member, Academic Affairs Committee, 1996-1997.

(i) Began research on the frequency of repeated courses at Delta State University.
(ii) Co-authored Faculty Senate response to recommendations by Special Commission on Desegregation of Higher Education in the Mississippi Delta.

(3) Other Faculty Governance Activities.

(a) Campus Representative, Annual Faculty Governance Convention, American Association of University Professors, Autumn 1996, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

vi. Membership in Professional Organizations.

(1) American Political Science Association
(2) Southern Political Science Association
(3) Southwest Political Science Association

vii. Service to Professional Organizations.

(1) Member, Committee on Outstanding Scholar/Teacher in Political Science, American Political Science Association. There are only two other political scientists from across the country on this committee, one from Wesleyan University, the other from Northwestern University.
(2) Secretary, Mississippi Political Science Association, 1998-1999 term.
(3) Webmaster, Mississippi Political Science Association
(4) Executive Committee, Mississippi Political Science Association.

viii. Paid Consultation.
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Selection Committee, James Madison Foundation Fellowship, Washington, DC.

Directed study of the DeBartolo Building at University of Notre Dame, Summer 1997. This trip
included the video tapping of classrooms, labs, equipment and tools used in the equipping of
Notre Dame’s celebrated teaching technology building.
(2) Currently developing webpage for the Division of Social Sciences.
(3) Assisted the School of Nursing in constructing their School webpage in coordination with the Delta
Health Education Partnership.

(4) "Campaign 1996 Forum," a group of colleagues who debated the merits of candidates and party positions
in the 1996 General Election; the edited tape of this event was broadcast on local television.
(5) Member, Delta Choral Union (bass/baritone section).

(a) Participated in Annual "Ice Cream Social" Concert, Summer 1997.
(b) Participated in "Carmina Burana," for official opening of the Bolognese Performing Arts
Center, Autumn 1996.
(c) Participated in Annual Christmas Concert, 1996, First Baptist Church, Cleveland,
Mississippi.
(6) Introduced Senator Thad Cochran during his 1996 visit to Delta State.

a. Service to Institutions of Higher Learning.

(1) Presentation, "Knowing That, Knowing How, and Knowing Why: The Use of the Internet,"
Institutions of Higher Learning 1997 Technology Retreat, Jackson, Mississippi.

4. Awards, Honors, and Other Recognition.

a. Awards.

Russ Hardin Foundation Award for Outstanding Use of Technology in Teaching, Spring 1997
($1000.00).

5. Other Service.

a. Public Guest Lecture.

"The Public/Private Distinction and the Effects on Community," Calvary Episcopal Church,
Cleveland, Mississippi, Autumn 1997.
b. Community Service.

i. Assisted John Banks, Technology Teacher at Cleveland High School, in developing webpage for Cleveland High School.

ii. Choir Member, First United Methodist Church, Cleveland, Mississippi (including occasional flute accompaniment of the choir).

iii. Assistant Coach, Girls' Softball, Summer 1996.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 96</th>
<th>Yennings</th>
<th>( n = 12 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2, 1, 2, 1, 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2, 1, 2, 1, 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4, 1, 2, 1, 1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PSC 446  Jennings  Fall 96
Written Comments

1) I feel that there ought to be a prereq of another of your classes for this class. Other than being disappointed at the attitudes of some of my fellow students. I enjoyed this course. I feel Dr. Jennings is doing a great job in teaching this class (presenting the material).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 3, 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 3, 1, 2, 2, 1, 3, 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 3, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 2, 1, 1, 1, 5, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 2, 1, 1, 1, 6, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 2, 1, 2, 3, 1, 9, 2, 1, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 8, 2, 1, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 6, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 3, 1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Comments

1) Mr. Jennings is a good teacher, but I feel that he needs to be at a BIG university up north.

2) Brilliant mind and well-versed in Pol. Theory
<p>|    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17.|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1...., 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</th>
<th>2...., 1, 1, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>3...., 1, 2, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>4...., 1, 2, 2, 2, 1</th>
<th>5...., 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</th>
<th>6...., 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</th>
<th>7...., 1, 1, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>8...., 1, 2, 2, 2, 1</th>
<th>9...., 1, 1, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>10...., 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</th>
<th>11...., 1, 2, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>12...., 1, 1, 2, 2, 1</th>
<th>13...., 1, 1, 1, 3, 1</th>
<th>14...., 1, 1, 1, 3, 1</th>
<th>15...., 1, 2, 2, 2, 1</th>
<th>16...., 1, 1, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>17...., 1, 2, 3, 1, 1</th>
<th>18...., 1, 1, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>19...., 1, 2, 1, 2, 1</th>
<th>20...., 1, 1, 1, 3, 1</th>
<th>21...., 1, 1, 1, 3, 1</th>
<th>22...., 1, 2, 2, 1, 1</th>
<th>23...., 1, 3, 1, 3, 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 1, 1, 3, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 2, 1, 3, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 4, 1, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 3, 1, 3, 1, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1, 47</td>
<td>1, 53</td>
<td>1, 12</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1, 06</td>
<td>1, 24</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td>1, 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written comments

(1) Best professor here by far at BSU.
**Delta State University**

Unit Budget Plan
FY 2001 Budget
AS OF 07-MAR-2000

**ORGANIZATION:** 0387 Social Science  
**FUND:** 10 Unrestricted General Fund

| PROGRAM: 0161 General Academic  |
| ACTIVITY: Activity not budgeted  |
| LOCATION: Location not budgeted |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT:</th>
<th>061200 Faculty</th>
<th>061400 Clerical &amp; Secretarial</th>
<th>063000 Fringe Benefits</th>
<th>07400 Travel</th>
<th>075 Postage &amp; Pos: Office Charges</th>
<th>075220 Telephone Local Service</th>
<th>075230 Telephone Long Distance</th>
<th>075240 Telephone Installation &amp; Maint</th>
<th>075820 Dues</th>
<th>075840 Subscriptions</th>
<th>075870 Computer Software Acquisitions</th>
<th>07600 Commodities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIOR YEAR</td>
<td>1999 517,416.00</td>
<td>2000 Adj Budget 665,788.00</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUEST .00</td>
<td>AMOUNT 2001 .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 1: ADJ BUD</td>
<td>2000 Adj Budget 15,495.00</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUEST .00</td>
<td>AMOUNT 2001 .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 2: CHANGE</td>
<td>144,102.00</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUEST .00</td>
<td>AMOUNT 2001 .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 3: APPRV</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUEST .00</td>
<td>AMOUNT 2001 .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUEST .00</td>
<td>AMOUNT 2001 .00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**

- [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION: 0387 Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUND: 10 Unrestricted General Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR YEAR</th>
<th>PHASE 1: ADJ BUD</th>
<th>PHASE 2: CHANGE</th>
<th>PHASE 3: APPROVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2000 Adj Budget</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUEST</td>
<td>AMOUNT 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>2000 Adj Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td>664,063.00</td>
<td>825,385.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>15,956.00</td>
<td>16,805.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net</td>
<td>-680,019.00</td>
<td>-842,190.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUND TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>2000 Adj Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td>664,063.00</td>
<td>825,385.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>15,956.00</td>
<td>16,805.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net</td>
<td>-680,019.00</td>
<td>-842,190.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATION TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>2000 Adj Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td>664,063.00</td>
<td>825,385.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>15,956.00</td>
<td>16,805.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net</td>
<td>-680,019.00</td>
<td>-842,190.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>