

## ■ *Practitioner Paper*

# Building community? The characteristics of America's most civic cities<sup>†</sup>

Trent A. Engbers\*

*Political Science and Public Administration, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, Indiana, USA*

A tremendous amount is known about individual civic and political participation. Those who participate are more educated, more affluent and easier to mobilize. Yet, the social value of participation lies not in its individual impact but in democratically meaningful units such as local governments. Little is known about why some communities display vibrant patterns of participation while others are characterized by disengagement. This paper furthers this understanding by examining what corporate, political and nonprofit leaders in 10 America's cities see as fostering their civic life. This study finds that institutional factors unite those cities with the highest levels of participation. These include a strong corporate presence, mechanisms for mobilization, a strong community identity, public spaces, good government and investment in youth. This serves as a basis for fostering pro-civic policies. This is a practitioner-oriented paper that while grounded in research is designed to foster policy solutions rather than prove casual mechanisms. Copyright © 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

## INTRODUCTION

The last 40 years have seen an explosion of interest and knowledge of civic and political participation. There are countless centers, dedicated journals and even academic programs that are committed to improving our understanding of civic and political participation. However, the body of literature that has developed has focused significantly on determinants and impacts of *individual* participation. The study of civic and political participation has shed little light on what participation means at meaningful political levels such as cities or neighborhoods. This paper draws from qualitative interviews to identify the characteristics that unite America's most civic cities.

Individual participation is important. It is linked to advancement of personal interest, the development of obligation and duty, greater interest in social issues, the development of skills and the ability to

work with others (Galston, 2001). Yet, individual outcomes alone are insufficient to justify the investment of significant public resources in education and capacity building. Instead, these public policies are advanced on the collective grounds that an active and engaged citizenry is necessary to avoid the abuses of government and to foster a healthy democracy. The real threat of declining civic and political participation is not the loss of skills but the threat of 'fundamentally debasing our democracy' (Putnam, 1996, p 27). This is a view that has been validated both domestically (Bowles & Gintis, 2002; Nabatchi, 2007) and internationally (Nekola, 2006). And as has been noted in this journal, there is an interest among policy makers in improving the quality of this democracy (Bole & Gordon, 2009; Hartz-Karp & Briand, 2009).

Yet despite the community justification for participation, most of what is known about participation is rooted in the individual. A long tradition of influential research (Verba, Scholzman, & Brady, 1995; Zukin *et al.*, 2006) has come to much of the same conclusion about who participates. Individual participation is closely linked to education (Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, & Jenkins, 2002; Nie, Junn, &

---

\*Correspondence to: Trent A. Engbers, Political Science and Public Administration, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, Indiana 47712, USA.

E-mail: taengbers@usi.edu

<sup>†</sup>This research was supported by funding from the University of Southern Indiana Provost's Junior Faculty Research Fellowship.

Stehlik-Barry, 1996), income (Beck, 1982; Burns, Schlozman, & Verba, 2001) and ease of mobilization (Leighley, 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). Yet, it is unclear whether these same factors explain civic and political participation at politically meaningful levels. In other words, do community leaders point to high levels of income, greater educational achievement and vibrant civic groups and non-profits as the sources of their communities' civic health?

The following two sections will explore what is known about participation. The first section will briefly summarize some of the major predictors of individual participation, while the second section will review the much more limited but more important body of knowledge on social and community effects. Given that little is known about aggregate participation, this section will tend to focus on social and community effects on individual participation in order to better interpret how community level characteristics might influence civic character.

### Individual attributes and participation

Individual participation is fairly well understood. Education is the single biggest predictor of participation (Nie *et al.*, 1996) because it (1) provides skills, (2) instills a greater sense of duty and (3) provides experience with bureaucracies. Increasing education decreases information costs and increases moral pressure and electoral interest (Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). When one looks at voter turnout as a measure of education, there is a 45% difference in turnout between those who are college educated and those without a high school diploma (Nover, Godsay, Kirby, & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2010).<sup>1</sup> This appears to hold regardless of the form of participation or interest (Keeter *et al.*, 2002).

After education, major differences in participation exist based on wealth or income. With the exception of religious participation, there are economic differences even after controlling for education between participants and non-participants in every form of activity (Galston, 2007). Those with higher incomes are better able to bear the costs associated with participation (e.g., financial giving and time off

work). Additionally, those from high-income families are more often socialized for participation (Beck, 1982; Burns *et al.*, 2001; Frey, 1971). Lastly, those with higher incomes are more productive, which helps offset the opportunity costs associated with participation (Frey, 1971).

### Participation and community effects

Not much is known about participation at the community level. Early in his career, Robert Putnam (1966) hypothesized that the nature of participation is influenced by community factors in three ways. First, entrenched community interests influence participation through mobilization. Second, individuals are influenced to participate through psychological attachment. As people interact, they want to become more like each other and thus develop similar participation habits. Third, social interaction results in conformity as individuals socially (as opposed to psychologically) attempt to blend in (Putnam, 1966). This appears to be empirically true as social interaction affects both individual- and group-based forms of participation. The more one interacts, the greater their exposure to social norms of participatory behavior and the greater exposure to opportunities for participation (Leighley, 1995).

Yet, the volume of research on the civic and political life of communities is trumped by the research concerned with individual participation. Even the literature that is concerned with social context such as the mobilization literature (Leighley, 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980) emphasizes how social effects impact individual participation and not aggregate participation. However, the body of literature on social conditions and participation does serve to demonstrate that social conditions impact participation in ways that might be relevant for understanding community-level participation patterns.

Prior research suggests that civic participation is more common in affluent neighborhoods, small communities and when encouraged by community institutions (Smith, 1994). Oliver (2000) found that people who live in large cities are less likely to contact public officials, attend community or organizational meetings, or vote. They are also less likely to be recruited and less interested in local affairs. Oliver's (2000) research also suggests that community homogeneity and income can influence individual levels of participation. Living in a homogenous community increases civic participation (Oliver, 2000). Greater racial interaction has led to a decrease in service groups. This comes from both greater acceptance, thus less need for identity-based groups

<sup>1</sup>The literature on participation is vast and the space constraints of this journal require some oversimplification of the literature. This section is intended to provide an introduction of the major determinants and not an exhaustive discussion. For example, more recent analysis has suggested that it is relative education and not absolute education that leads to involvement (Nie, Junn & Stehlik-Berry, 1996).

and alternatively from a loss of shared experience that diminishes organizational involvement. In either case, the result is an inability or lack of interest in working together to solve community problems (Putnam, 2007).

Oliver's (2000) findings on income confirm earlier work that found a link between mass participation and economic development (Nie, Powell, & Prewitt, 1969). By comparing participation rates between 'urban' and 'rural' communities in five countries, Nie *et al.* (1969) show a direct link between level of economic development and aggregate participation. This appears to be true because (1) there is a larger mobilized middle class and (2) the density of economic and civil society organizations increase opportunities for participation.

Another issue that has received significant attention is the role of secondary organizations. Advocates of the mobilization thesis (Leighley, 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980) would suggest that many national surveys such as those used to justify the resource model of participation ignore context and thus miss the impact of mobilization. As such, differences between participants and non-participants can be explained by access to opportunities and contextual clues. Among the places that these mobilization cues are received are from secondary organizations. They suggest that secondary organizations are important for participation in that they serve as a recruitment tool. Here, participants develop positive attitudes toward participation, improved civic skills and greater stimuli for mobilization (Baggetta, 2009; Leighley, 1995).

The impact of secondary organizations is particularly strong when these organizations draw from a

wide cross-section of the community. As secondary organizations become more heterogeneous, the community becomes better able to mobilize for collective action. Consequently, community institutions not only have an individual effect in creating opportunities for participation but a community effect in bringing people together to solve public problems (Safford, 2009).

Perhaps some of the most methodologically rigorous work to examine the impact of social context on participation has been conducted by Robert Sampson (1991; Sampson, McAdam, MacIndoe, & Weffer-Elizondo, 2005). Sampson and his colleagues found that civic activity is highly dependent on the social context. The density of social institutions has significantly more impact on civic activity than individual participation in membership organizations, social ties or the volume of neighborhood interaction.

Secondary organizations are not the only community institutions to affect a community's civic and political life. Marquis and colleagues found that corporate location in a community creates social benefits. Corporations become embedded in the communities in which they reside and become responsive to the needs and social norms of those communities (Marquis, Glynn, & Davis, 2007). Moreover, corporate location increases the number of nonprofit and civic organizations. Likewise, corporate governing boards have spin-off effects that result in greater nonprofit health (Marquis & Davis, 2004).

Given the focus of this paper on understanding what characteristics unite America's most civic cities, a full exploration of the causes of civic and political participation is impossible. Regardless to

Table 1 Known and proposed predictors of individual and community participation

	Individual level predictors	Group/contextual predictors
Understanding individual participation	Education Wealth Race Social network Employment status Age Religiosity	Neighborhood characteristics Number of secondary organizations Population
Understanding community participation	Racial composition Education level Average age Percent retirees Unemployment rate	Number of secondary organizations Population Local tax revenue Other institutions Nature and size of private sector

The items listed in Table 1 are not exhaustive. Individual characteristics such as religion, religiosity or attention to politics are demonstrated predictors of individual participation. Likewise, school quality and the presence of public spaces are commonly hypothesized variables of interest. This table only reflects the variables used in the quantitative model or findings that emerged from the qualitative research or their individual counterpart.

say that much is known about individual participation. This is particularly true in terms of individual level predictors (Table 1: row 1). However, how these factors affect aggregate participation patterns is under-studied. Aggregate participation is an important question because it strikes at the heart of democratically healthy communities. Previously, scholars have tended to study only half the picture. This paper attempts to fill in the gaps of what might be missing from the second half of that picture (Table 1: row 2) and to identify policy interventions that can improve civic and political life.

## STUDYING CIVIC CITIES

To better understand what unites America's most civic cities, this paper uses qualitative interviews to examine the in-depth experience of living in these communities. This paper constructs 10 case studies to examine how citizens experience their community's civic life. Cases are drawn from 10 cities using a 'most different' strategy. Five of the cities (Augusta, GA; El Paso, TX; Jacksonville, NC; Lafayette, LA and Naples, FL) exhibit low levels of civic and political participation, and five of the cities (Cincinnati, OH; Iowa City, IA; Provo, UT; Wichita, KS and Santa Rosa, CA) exhibit high levels of participation across all measures. Civic cities were those that were characterized by unusually high levels of volunteerism, civic group membership, voter turnout, news media consumption and participation in other political acts (i.e., discussing politics, displaying signs).

Forty interviews were conducted with leaders in these cities. Archival research used to identify respondents that reflected a diverse range of perspectives from nonprofit leaders, political activists and business leaders. Interviews were conducted over the phone and were recorded and transcribed for later analysis. These semi-structured interviews ranged in length from 35 to 90 minutes with the modal interview being about 1 hour and explored issues of economic success, community civic change and shifting demographics.

## EXPLANATIONS FOR COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION LEVELS

While one should be careful about drawing causal inferences from qualitative interviews, the following factors were found in all of the high civic and political cities and were absent in most of the low civic cities.

### Strong corporate presence

Overwhelmingly, the biggest predictor of participation reported by respondents was the involvement of the private sector. As suggested by Marquis and colleagues (Marquis & Davis, 2004; Marquis *et al.*, 2007), a healthy economy and the presence of a primary corporate benefactor appears sufficient for ensuring a highly civic community. This impact is felt from both corporate leadership and financial investment.

The presence of major corporate citizens shapes the community through direct investment in the city's quality of life. Many respondents were aware of this issue as suggested by the respondent who stated, 'You want businesses that are willing to invest in the community (R1).' In Wichita, Cargill Corporation is the largest corporation in the urban core. Cargill is regularly 'courted by other states', but they have 'bought into the plan (R2)' of where Wichita is going. They have financially supported the development of downtown and invested in their own downtown facilities to improve the quality of life in the area.

Similarly, Cincinnati has 'been designated by the state of Ohio as a hub of innovation for consumer goods because of the headquarters here of Procter and Gamble. Actually Cincinnati has a large number of Fortune 500 companies including Macy's, Fifth Third [Bank] and PNC Bank (R3)'. Moreover, the 'five largest employers have been the same over the past 20 years (R4)', creating continuity and sense of place for these companies and those that they employ. These companies were described as 'good corporate citizens facilitating any lending (R4)' that is needed to help the community thrive.

El Paso and Augusta likewise have corporate citizens that are involved in their communities. One economic development agency suggested that '80% of our funding comes from the private sector (R5)'. Likewise, one respondent (R1) noted 'we are really seeing a whole lot of efforts and initiatives with regard to volunteering by our major corporate citizens'. Yet none of the respondents identified key corporate actors who provided civic and political leadership. The closest that one got to primary corporate drivers was a respondent (R8) in Augusta who discussed the importance of AT&T and Georgia Power for their economic and civic life, but both of these companies are located 150 miles away in Atlanta. In the low civic cities, the institutions that were repeatedly mentioned as driving economic and civic life were governmental interests. Both communities were heavily influenced by their military bases (Fort Bliss and Fort Gordon) and by their major universities (University of Texas-El Paso and the

Georgia Health Science University). These institutions play an important role in the community and lead to higher qualities of life, but were not described as having the same civic impact as corporate actors.<sup>2</sup>

### Mobilization mechanisms

Participation increases in communities with a strong and easily recognized mobilization mechanism. Mechanisms differ from community to community but may include labor unions, community invested religious congregations or formalized neighborhood associations.

Among the case studies, those communities with greater levels of participation had an easily recognizable mobilization mechanism. For Provo and Cincinnati, this takes the form of neighborhood associations. Consider that Cincinnati is 72 square miles and has 52 neighborhoods each with its own distinct and recognized community council. These councils are the primary means of public improvement and have a significant say in the policies that affect the neighborhood. Moreover, the size of the neighborhood makes interfacing with others simple. As one respondent put it, 'We have 335,000 people and 52 neighborhoods. That averages about 6,000 people. It is small enough that [it] lowers the barriers to entry. There are more positions available, and more chances to participate (R6).'

Wichita respondents were less optimistic about their neighborhoods' abilities to aggregate public opinion and provide opportunities for public decision making. Rather, several respondents indicated that churches were the primary mechanism for civil as well as religious participation. In some instances, religious groups were even involved in the economic development activities of the community. One example of this was when a group from the Church of God in Christ approached the city about an urban redevelopment project. The city had been donated a 50,000 square foot grocery store, with little insight with what to do with it. The 'church came forward with a proposal for a kind of a little mini-mall. Transformed it instead of a big box deal we had corridors with little shops hanging off of it and then we leased it to them and they subleased

<sup>2</sup>While none of the respondents in Augusta identified a select group of corporate agents who contributed to the civic and political life of the community, one respondent (R3) did note that several of the sectors led to a higher quality of life. Specifically, he stated 'the medical community is huge for the city. We have 12 hospitals and when you consider that quality medical care is important .... The military sector, Fort Gordon's impacts can't be understated [based on the] the spin off effect. And they are a great community partner as is the medical community.'

to the individual stores (R2).'

This is not an isolated occurrence as churches appear active in many aspects of Wichita's civic and political life. None of the respondents in low civic cities identified a mechanism beyond traditional town hall meetings or one-to-one grass roots mobilization that facilitated broad-based action.

### Community identity

Not surprisingly, communities with a strong sense of community identity exhibit higher levels of civic and political involvement. This was often associated with significant racial or religious homogeneity; however, it has also been fostered with public policies that build strong community institutions (e.g., museums and sports teams), branding initiatives and programs that attempt to foster and retain local talent.

This is indicative of the psychological attachment that has been linked to greater levels of participation (Putnam, 1966). Respondents in the high participative cities volunteered a connection to the city identity that they believed fostered involvement. For example, a respondent in Santa Rosa remarked 'I do believe it's the culture of the community. I don't know where it started or how it started, but everybody feels ownership to give back' (R10). Perhaps a more illustrative counter example came from Naples. A community leader (R11) commented that 'It's a place. It's not a community. .... what we have to do is to try to get people to think community wide to effect a balance among those competing interests, and that's a challenge because we have different kinds of people, more than you might have in Chicago. You've got all kinds of problems and exciting things in Chicago, but you've got a flavor, you've got a culture, you've got your own songs, you got Rom Emmanuel and Frank Sinatra and all the stuff with the Daileys, and the Bulls team, and you've got a ... whole cache. We don't have that here.'

### Public spaces

Dense social connections appear to be important in mobilizing public action. This requires public spaces that encourage discourse. Public spaces that encourage cross-class interaction appear to be particularly impactful; thus, public spaces should be free or low cost. Santa Rosa is a good example of this in the sense that they, like Provo, have a well-developed park system that is dispersed widely throughout the community ensuring everyone a place to gather and interact. However, unlike Provo, their interaction is

less cross-class because all of the parks except one charge for parking. A proposal surfaced a few years ago to install meters at the last free park, and this was met by public outcry by the citizens who believed that it was sufficiently important to ensure park access and interaction for those who may not have the means to afford it.

This is in contrast to the highly segmented characteristic of Naples. As one respondent explained (R12), 'The biggest challenge we have is that we have about 424 residential clusters. Many of them are gated, some are not. Many of the people...perhaps 1/4 are here only part time, meaning they are only here half the year, but they pay taxes and they vote. The biggest challenge we have is connecting the dots and getting those people to participate in community activities in a general nature, of a general cross cutting policy nature.' While Naples has impressive public spaces, they fail to draw a cross section of the community that is divided by residential identities.

### Good government

Citizens are most engaged in communities where they see government functioning responsibly. This includes being scandal free, cooperative and non-partisan in administration and effective. Initiatives that celebrate good government employment and bipartisan cooperation increase faith in the political system necessary for fostering participation.

This finding was supported more by its absence than any particular comments found in those cities with high levels of civic and participation. Rather, respondents in low civic cities were much more likely to volunteer the negatives of their cities' administration or elected officials. One respondent in Naples (R12) described its government as 'small', 'elite' and 'wealthy'. In Lafayette, people felt as though 'the government was trying to benefit certain private developers or landowners that were trying to develop property'. While respondents were almost universally optimistic about Augusta's new mayor, attitudes toward the Augusta commission were less positive. Rather they remarked that '[government policies] made it very difficult for the Augusta commission to get things accomplished' (R13) and that 'and as much as we would like to try and say we are past a lot of the racial issues that we had in the 1960's there is still some vestment of that that rears its ugly head now and again and it plays out on the Augusta commission' (R8).

### Youth services

Communities that invest in opportunities for youth participation have long-term increases in civic and political participation (Bole & Gordon, 2009). Socialization through youth groups, scouts, recreation leagues and other volunteer and community-based opportunities is an investment in future participation for the community.

Respondents in high civic and political communities were much more likely to identify a positive role and structured programs for youth. While all communities had these programs, they were seen as more positive and as having more effect in the high civic and political communities. Take, for example, the Tomorrow's Leaders Today (TLT) program in Santa Rosa. For over 20 years, TLT has been providing leadership development and career readiness programs to the Santa Rosa community. They boast that 75% of program participants continue to volunteer after the program ends (<http://www.tomorrowleaderstoday.org/interested-students/why-tlt/>). One respondent (R14) noted that as part of a partnership with TLT, his daughter's school 'had so many hours of community service that they have to do them as a 6<sup>th</sup> grader'. In contrast, respondents in the low civic and political cities were more likely to describe their education system as 'struggling' or that youth groups were 'less important than they used to be' (R15).

### Discussion

While past research on civic and political participation has considered the impact of mobilizing institutions on civic capacity, little attention has been given to the diversity of institutions and community level policies that might influence civic and political participation. Likewise, there is limited research on the role of the private sector and community elites in fostering civic and political participation. These findings are surprising given the overwhelming amount of evidence behind traditional resource and mobilization literature.

The policy implications of this research suggest cities wishing to improve their participation levels should target building institutional capacity and the development of private sector leadership. Increased levels of engagement, in addition to their intrinsic public value, also have positive benefits for the economic wellbeing and stability of a community (Safford, 2009).

Given the qualitative nature of this paper, these results should be applied cautiously. Future research should test these findings using large

datasets that consider measures of a wider range of institutions including corporate capacity, youth programs, governance quality and the scope of public spaces. Hierarchical modeling may be particularly effective in this regard because of its ability to bring together individual and social characteristics into a unified model.

Despite the cautiousness of these results, this study does illustrate that although the scholarship of civic and political participation has come a long way over the past 40 years, the focus on individual level participation masks what community leaders believe make their community special. If a healthy democracy requires engaged citizenry, then fostering community capacity must move beyond individual attributes to community-level characteristics.

## BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Trent A. Engbers is an assistant professor of Public Administration at the University of Southern Indiana. His research focuses on social capital, public leadership, and economic development. His research has appeared in *Social Science Quarterly*, *Religion and Politics Journal*, *Public Administration Review*, and the *Journal of Leadership Education*. He lives in Evansville with his wife, Kimberly, and their three children.

## REFERENCES

- Baggetta M. 2009. Civic Opportunities in associations: Interpersonal interaction, governance experience and institutional relationships. *Social Forces* 88(1): 175–199.
- Beck PA. 1982. Pathways to participation. *The American Political Science Review* 76(1): 94–108.
- Bole BE, Gordon M. 2009. E pluribus unum: Fostering a new era of citizenship by teaching civic engagement and healthy civic discourse. *Journal of Public Affairs* 9: 273–287.
- Bowles S, Gintis H. 2002. Social capital and community governance. *The Economic Journal* 112(483): F419–F436.
- Burns N, Schlozman KL, Verba S. 2001. *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Frey BS. 1971. Why do high income people participate more in politics? *Public Choice* 11: 101–105.
- Galston WA. 2001. Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 217–234.
- Galston WA. 2007. Civic knowledge, civic education, and civic engagement: A summary of recent research. *International Journal of Public Administration* 30: 623–642.
- Hartz-Karp J, Briand MK. 2009. Institutionalizing deliberative democracy. *Journal of Public Affairs* 9: 125–141.
- Keeter S, Zukin C, Andolina M, Jenkins K. 2002. *The Civic and Political Health of the Nation: A Generational Portrait*. Pew Charitable Trusts: Philadelphia, PA.
- Leighley JE. 1995. Attitudes, opportunities and incentives: A field essay on political participation. *Political Research Quarterly* 48(1): 181–209.
- Marquis C, Davis GF. 2004. Golfing alone? Local corporations, elite cohesion and community social capital, 1986–1988. Working Paper.
- Marquis C, Glynn MA, Davis GF. 2007. Community isomorphism and corporate social action. *Academy of Management Review* 32(3): 925–945.
- Nabatchi T. 2007. Deliberative democracy: The effects of participation on political efficacy. Indiana University. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- Nekola M. 2006. Political participation and governance effectiveness: Does participation matter? In *Democratic Governance in the Central and Eastern European Countries*, Rosenbaum, A, Nemeč J (eds). NISPAcee: Bratislava; 393–406.
- Nie NH, Junn J, Stehlik-Barry K. 1996. *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Nie NH, Powell GB, Prewitt K. 1969. Social structure and political participation: Developmental relationships, II. *The American Political Science Review* 63(3): 808–832.
- Nover A, Godsay S, Kirby EH, Kawashima-Ginsberg K. 2010. *Electoral Engagement and College Experience*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement: Medford, MA.
- Oliver JE. 2000. City size and civic involvement in metropolitan America. *The American Political Science Review* 94(2): 361–373.
- Putnam RD. 1966. Political attitudes and the local community. *The American Political Science Review*: 60(3): 640–654.
- Putnam RD. 2007. E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30(2): 137–174.
- Putnam R. 1996. Robert Putnam Responds. *The American Prospect* 25(March–April): 26–28.
- Safford S. 2009. *Why the garden club couldn't save Youngstown: The transformation of the rust belt*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Sampson RJ. 1991. Linking the micro- and macro-level dimensions of community social organization. *Social Forces* 70(1): 43–64.
- Sampson RJ, McAdam D, MacIndoe H, Weffer-Elizondo, S. 2005. Civic society reconsidered: The durable nature and community structure of collective civic action. *American Journal of Sociology* 111(3): 673–714.
- Smith DH. 1994. Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 23(3): 243–263.
- Verba S, Schlozman K, Brady H. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Wolfinger R, Rosenstone S. 1980. *Who Votes?* Yale University Press: New Haven, CT.
- Zukin C, Keeter S, Andolina M, Delli-Carpini MX, Jenkins K. 2006. *A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen*. Oxford University Press: Cary, NC.