

FOLLOWING THE LEADER OR LEADING THE FOLLOWER?
EXPLORING THE EFFECTS OF MISSION-DRIVEN VS. LEADER-DRIVEN
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

By

Copyright 2013

Susan Keim

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Public Administration and the Graduate Faculty of
the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Chairperson John Nalbandian

Holly T. Goerdel

Marilu Goodyear

Bonnie Johnson

Kelly LeRoux

Date Defended: November 19, 2013

The Dissertation Committee for SUSAN KEIM

certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

FOLLOWING THE LEADER OR LEADING THE FOLLOWER?
EXPLORING THE EFFECTS OF MISSION-DRIVEN VS. LEADER-DRIVEN
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Chairperson John Nalbandian

Date approved: November 19, 2013

ABSTRACT

Emerging in the discussion of leadership is the separate and distinct concept of followership. Previously, followers were discussed more in relation to the leader, as if leaders were entirely responsible for the actions of followers, and the follower role was considered secondary to the success of the leader and the project. This research explores the motivation of followers who are independent actors and actively support the leader and the project. The concepts of and distinctions between mission-driven and leader-driven followership are examined through the lens of citizen engagement. Three hypotheses are tested using data gathered through self-administered surveys from neighbors who attended neighborhood association meetings in Kansas City, Kansas. Survey data give support to the relationship between mission-driven followership and increased citizen engagement. Mission-driven followers are more likely to attend more neighborhood association meetings and give more time to neighborhood activities than leader-driven followers. This research offers both practical and theoretical insights. Practically, mission-driven followers should be sought out and encouraged to volunteer in neighborhood associations and other nonprofit organizations, because they support the mission and are more likely to stay with the organization through changes in leadership. Theoretically, the addition of a quantitative analysis of mission-driven and leader-driven follower motivation to the conceptual discussion of leadership and followership contributes to the emerging scholarship on followership, specifically through neighborhood associations and the engagement of neighbors in them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My academic journey was encouraged by many individuals in multiple ways. I am forever thankful to and grateful for those who traveled along:

- Dr. Russell Getter: You saw my potential and convinced me to consider graduate school, not once, but twice. Your wisdom stays in my heart.
- Dr. Norm Yetman: Our very first conversation helped me decide to pursue my dream. You supported me every step of the way.
- Dr. Marilu Goodyear: Because of you, I read about this crazy concept called followership and it changed my life.
- Dr. John Nalbandian: Thank you for all you have done—saying yes to chairing my dissertation committee, remaining steadfast through difficult times, and pushing me for excellence every step of the way. Your guidance was invaluable.
- Dr. Kelly LeRoux: Your confidence in me, pep talks, and answering my questions even on weekends were just what I needed to cross the finish line.
- My dissertation committee: Drs. John Nalbandian, Holly Goerdel, Marilu Goodyear, Bonnie Johnson, and Kelly LeRoux—each of you provided valuable guidance and feedback throughout the process.
- Center for Research Methods and Data Analysis (CRMDA): Dr. Paul Johnson and my stats team—your ability to coach me through the data analysis alleviated my fears immeasurably.
- Drs. Leisha DeHart-Davis and Chris Silvia: Your early feedback shaped the data analysis and discussion.

- The faculty and staff at the School of Public Affairs and Administration: You collectively provide the framework, opportunities, support, and knowledge path for student learning.
- My students: Being in the classroom with you and experiencing your light bulb moments is truly one of my greatest joys. It is I who am taught by you.
- My parents: Dr. Richard and Betty Keim—you instilled the value of education and inspired me to follow my heart and dreams. Mom, you are always there for me, and, Dad, I know you are smiling down from heaven.
- My children: Paul and Jessica, and Elyse and David, you cheered me on and your unwavering support inspired me.
- Team Susan: My entire family and friends—with your love, encouragement, and patience, I never lost sight of my goal. Thank you for never losing faith in me. I love you all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Leadership.....	3
Followership	7
Citizen Engagement.....	13
Importance of this Research.....	21
2. METHODOLOGY	24
Research Hypotheses	24
Kansas City, Kansas Neighborhood Survey	25
Discussion of Hypotheses.....	28
3. DATA AND METHODS	31
Community Context.....	31
City-County Consolidation	34
Kansas City, Kansas, Neighborhood Associations	36
Descriptive Statistics.....	37
Dependent Variables	38
Independent Variables	43
Control Variables.....	44
4. DISCUSSION AND DATA ANALYSIS	48

Independent Variables	48
Control Variables	49
H1: Mission-driven Followers Are More Engaged in the Community than Leader-driven Followers	50
Model 1: Number of Meetings and Reason for Volunteering	50
Model 2: Number of Meetings and What Keeps Followers Involved	52
Discussion of Number of Meetings and Follower Motivation.....	54
Model 3: Amount of Time Spent and Reason for Volunteering	55
Model 4: Amount of Time Spent and What Keeps Followers Involved	56
Discussion of Amount Time Spent and Follower Motivation.....	59
Overall Discussion of H1	59
H2: Mission Driven Followers Will Perceive Greater Neighborhood Association Effectiveness than Leader-Driven Followers	60
Model 5: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and Reason for Volunteering	60
Model 6: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and What Keeps Followers Involved	61
Model 7: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and Reason for Volunteering	62
Model 8: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and What Keeps Followers Involved.....	63
Overall Discussion of H2.....	64

H3: Mission-Driven Followers Will Perceive Greater Overall Neighborhood Well-Being than Leader-Driven Followers	67
Model 9: Neighborhood Purpose and Reason for Volunteering	68
Model 10: Neighborhood Purpose and What Keeps Followers Involved	71
Overall Discussion of H3	74
5. CONCLUSION	77
Revisiting the Research Question	77
Significance of the Findings	79
Characteristics of Mission-driven Followership and Citizen Engagement	79
Neighborhood Association Effectiveness	80
Neighborhood Well-being	81
Implications of the Results.....	82
Mission-Driven Followership	82
Neighborhood Association Effectiveness	83
Neighborhood Well-Being.....	85
Implications for Leadership and Followership Theory.....	86
Implications for Leadership and Followership Practice	88
Future Research	89
Study Limitations.....	90
Final Thoughts	91
APPENDIX: NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY	93
REFERENCES	95

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Evolution of Followership Concepts	8
2. Public Involvement Spectrum in Decision-Making.....	20
3. Question 2. (Coded: <i>nummeet</i>)	39
4. Question 3. (Coded: <i>amttime</i>).....	40
5. Question 6. (Coded: <i>effectinvolve</i>).....	41
6. Question 9. (Coded: <i>issueseffctness</i>).....	42
7. Question 8. (Coded: <i>neighborhoodpurpose</i>)	43
8. Question 4. (Coded: <i>volunteer</i>).....	44
9. Question 7. (Coded: <i>keepsinvolve</i>)	44
10. Question 10. (Coded: <i>yrslived</i>)	45
11. Question 12. (Coded: <i>age</i>)	46
12. Question 13. (Coded: <i>race</i>).....	46
13. Question 14. (Coded: <i>gender</i>).....	47
14. Model 1: Number of Meetings Attended and Reason for Volunteering.....	52
15. Model 2: Number of Meetings and What Keeps Neighbors Involved	54
16. Model 3: Amount of Time Spent and Reason for Volunteering.....	57
17. Model 4: Amount of Time Spent and What Keeps Neighbors Involved.....	58
18. Model 5: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and Reason for Volunteering.....	61
19. Model 6: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and What Keeps Followers Involved	62

20.	Model 7: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and Reason for Volunteering	64
21.	Model 8: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and What Keeps Followers Involved	65
22.	Model 9: Neighborhood Purpose and Reason for Volunteering.....	71
23.	Model 10: Neighborhood Purpose and What Keeps Followers Involved	74
24.	Hypotheses and Findings	78

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is the idea of reciprocal leadership. There is also the idea of a partnership of following, of following the invisible leader—the common purpose.
Mary Parker Follett, 1928

Following the leader is a dated concept which explores the insignificant part played by the follower in relation to the leader. Followers were initially discussed only in concert with the leader, as if leaders were responsible for the actions of the followers (Burns 1978; Greenleaf 1970; Heifetz 1994; Rost 1993). The concept of followers as distinct from leaders, introduced in the late twentieth century, provided an entirely new way of thinking about leadership and those who follow the leader (Chaleff, 1995, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988). Rather than considering followers, at the very least, in a weak position as puppets of the leader, or, at best, in a mutually beneficial relationship, active followers are considered independent actors supporting the mission and the leader as well as their individual self-interest (Barnard, 1938). This research examines follower actions and will explore the major role followers play in the leadership equation. Without followers, most leaders would not be successful, and most projects would not be accomplished.

Until the twentieth century, leadership had been studied commonly through the lens of great man theories, which identified the innate leadership qualities possessed by what society considered great leaders such as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Mahatma Ghandi (Northouse, 2013). In the last 50 years, leadership studies have broadened to encompass concepts like servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1970), transformational leadership (Burns, 1978), civic leadership (Gardner, 1990), adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002;), leadership and followership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1968;

Burns, 1978; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; Hollander, 2007, 2009) and followership itself (Chaleff, 1995, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988, 2008). This movement represents the evolution of the approaches to leadership and the relationship of leaders, leaders and followers, and followers themselves within the construct of followership.

The concept of followership, introduced by Burns in 1978, opened an entirely new perspective on leadership. Rather than leaders and followers working together through the transaction of leadership, Burns saw leaders and followers working together in mutual growth through transformational leadership. Leader and follower mutually benefited in the transformation of leadership. Thus the power of followers in relation to leaders in the leadership equation was born. While the introduction of followership in leadership theory has not been without controversy (Heifetz, 2007; Kellerman, 2008; Rost, 2008), the concept of followership has gained a solid foothold (Chaleff, 1995, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988). But the study of followership has largely been qualitative and conceptual. And prevailing conceptual frameworks do not directly address followership and the motivation of followers in the citizen engagement movement—a growing and important context for the study of contemporary leadership.

In this dissertation, the concept of followership as an important part of civic leadership is examined, and the exploration employs empirical research. Using quantitative methodology, this research examines the relationship between the motivation of citizens in a follower role and their level of citizen engagement. This research will help us understand what motivates citizens to engage in their communities and will contribute to the emerging followership framework more generally.

Leadership

Contemporary leadership theory begins with Greenleaf (1970, 1977), and Burns (1978), who both explore the concept of leadership from a transformational perspective. Greenleaf, reacting to two decades of civil unrest and campus turmoil, focused on the leader as servant rather than the leader as dominator. As Greenleaf defines it, a servant leader serves others first and leads while serving. Through that service, the servant leader leads others and ensures that their needs are met. The act of servant leadership is fundamentally different from the traditional notion in which the needs of the leader and task accomplishment can be examined without viewing followers as independent actors. The difference is “in the care taken by the servant—first to make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 13). Echoing the notion of leadership as service, Hunter (1998) calls leaders to serve by identifying and meeting the needs of those being served. Servant leadership asks an individual only to perform tasks the leader is willing to perform, unlike the hierarchical leadership framework, which more often divides functions hierarchically with followers frequently expected to perform tasks the leader is not willing to do or which would encroach on valued leader tasks.

Burns (1978) addresses what he calls “the relational approach” to leadership. Rather than leadership being a transaction between individuals much like a buyer-seller exchange, Burns considers leadership a transformational relationship between individuals through mutual support of a common goal. Transformational leadership involves a conscious choice by the leader and follower working together towards real, intended social change in attitudes, norms, institutions, and behaviors. In this sense, transformational leadership is a symbiotic relationship in which both the leader and follower benefit.

Situational leadership theory, developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1977) and Fiedler (1964, 1971), argues that managers must use different leadership styles depending on the situation. In this framework, the leader must vary the leadership style based upon the situation, which includes the needs of the follower and the situational needs of the environment surrounding the leader and follower. The leader may adjust to the situation in a variety of ways: a telling and directing manner, selling and coaching, participating and supporting, or delegating tasks. In this sense, the effectiveness and ultimate success of the leader is dependent upon the approach the leader takes with the follower—dictated by the situation. While the situational leadership concept includes an early discussion of followership, its focus remains on the leader and the situational context; it does less to portray an independent role for followers.

Rost (1993) introduces the concept of influence relationships, suggesting that leadership is an “influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real change that reflects their mutual purposes” (p. 102). Rost confirms that the essence of leadership is the relationship between leader and follower as Greenleaf and Burns have described. In this sense, leadership includes a leader-follower relationship of influence in which they influence each other, or a sense of motivation and sharing common values, working together toward the common good. Rost, however, does not include the notion of independent followers in the leader-follower relationship. While the leader and follower share common values, the leader maintains a dominant role in the relationship.

Confirming the leadership work of Burns (1978), Hollander’s (2007) definition of leadership binds together leaders and followers actively involved in mutually desirable pursuits. Hollander calls this “inclusive leadership,” particularly as it encourages leadership practices that yield important relational elements between leader and follower, such as loyalty and trust. This

favors a balance of participation between leaders and followers in shared decision-making processes.

Whether leaders are viewed as transformational, transactional, or inclusive, some important common elements of good leadership that unite them, in achieving “positive results,” are respect for and attention to followers, their needs, and views, including the potentially useful information they can provide. (Hollander, 2009, p. 198)

In this description, followers are included in the concept of leadership but not in the action of leading.

Regardless of the type of leadership, Hollander indicates the importance of the leader paying attention to the needs of followers and that followers may potentially provide useful information and action for the leader. Hollander (2007) argues that leadership, either positive or negative, cannot be effective without actively engaged followers. However, no reference is made to the importance of followers to the success of the leader; while followers are included in his concept of leadership and may be seen in relation to the leader, their actions are not seen as independent of the leader.

The premise of leadership as an adaptive challenge versus a technical fix is an approach promoted by Heifetz (1994) and Heifetz and Linsky (2002). The common metaphor portrays adaptive problems as “clouds” in contrast to technical problems, which are seen as “clocks.” You fix clocks; you cannot fix clouds—sometimes you cannot even get your hands around them. Technical fixes are relatively easy—a clock can be repaired. Adaptive challenges are more complex; it is impossible to “repair” a “cloud” and in that sense, there is most likely not one correct answer but a series of possibilities and experiments to be considered in order to get your arms around the cloud. Adaptive leadership examines the difficult challenges encountered with non-technical problems or—even more challenging—problems which have both clock and cloud attributes.

By introducing the concept of adaptive challenges to the discussion of leadership, Heifetz addresses a dilemma that emerges when leaders face perplexing problems that defy standard responses. Often the challenge in community building and citizen engagement arises through common structures that rely on traditional notions of command and control. Heifetz's notion of adaptive work is built on the idea of engagement—engaging the problem, engaging the environment, engaging the people—all in experimental fashion in what often is a successive process of leadership and engagement. Civically engaged citizens face more adaptive challenges than technical fixes within a community. Perplexing community issues are adaptive challenges that often require bringing all the stakeholders to the table and managing the factions that emerge and argue against decision making solely by institutional actors—such as city or county officials. In an adaptive challenge, no single correct answer exists. Rather, a “better” answer is sought by bringing factions of civically engaged leaders and citizens together to negotiate among competing interests to find a collective answer which speaks to potential losses as well as gains in the community as it builds on common community goals and values.

I have combined the leadership concepts of Greenleaf (1970, 1977), Burns (1978), Rost (1993), and Heifetz (1994) to inform the research I am pursuing. I have included the following aspects of leadership in my approach:

- influence of the leader
- relationships between leader and follower
- mutual purpose, motivation and shared values of change between leader and follower
- engaged adaptive leadership addressing complex community problems
- servant leadership

In this study, I describe leadership as a relationship between leader and follower, incorporating what may be independent purposes, values, and motivations to create real change in situations that increasingly require adaptive work for the solution. This approach to leadership has proven to be complex in practice (Heifetz & Linsky 2002). A definition of successful contemporary leadership—at least in the community engagement context—takes into account not only the actions of the leader but also the response of the follower in relationship with the leader. But it also suggests that followers have their own motivation that may connect them independently to the task at hand. Given the importance of the followership concept, we now turn our attention to the research in that area.

Followership

Early works of the employee/employer dynamic touch on the leader/follower relationship through the cooperative system suggested by Barnard (1938), without specifically referring to employees or subordinates as followers. This discussion of followership focuses on more contemporary concepts of followership. While definitions of leadership have been explored throughout history, followership, as an independent concept, is more difficult to locate in the literature. Perhaps this is because the concept of adaptive work—built around a growing incidence of this kind of problem—is a recent development.

Chaleff (1995, 2009), Hollander (2007), Kellerman (2008), and Kelley (1988) have provided the most descriptive free-standing definitions of followership. Chaleff proposes the notion of powerful followers supporting powerful leaders. Hollander argues the inclusivity of the leader with the followers. Kellerman suggests followership is a mutual relationship and response between subordinates and superiors. Kelley characterizes followers as actively engaged independent actors. While Chaleff sees much less of a hierarchy in the leader-follower

relationship, Chaleff and Kellerman agree that the actions of followers are critical to the success of leaders. Finding followership an outmoded concept and demeaning to those who support the actions of the leader, Heifetz (2007) and Rost (2008) disagree with this portrayal of followership.

One can see from Table 1, as Chaleff (1995, 2008) argues, the concept of followership is as complex as the concept of leadership.

Table 1

Evolution of Followership Concepts

Rost 2008	Heifetz 2007	Kelley 1988	Kelley 2008	Kellerman 2008	Chaleff 1995 and 2008
Definition					
Only people active in the leadership process are followers.	Leader-follower dichotomy is demeaning to followers.	Followers are actively engaged independent actors.	Followers are actively engaged independent actors.	Followers are aligned on level of engagement from feeling and doing nothing to passionately committed and deeply involved.	Followers share common purpose with leader, believe in mission and want leader and organization to succeed.
Characteristics					
Followership is outmoded concept.	Follower is called to action in support of leader or specific purpose.	Followers are: Self-managed, Committed to organization, Give 100%, Courageous credible and honest.	Followers are divided into categories: Sheep-passive. Yes-people. Alienated. Pragmatics. Star followers.	Followers are divided into different types: Isolate. Bystander. Participant. Activist. Diehard.	Followers have courage to: Assume responsibility. Serve. Challenge. Participate in personal and organizational transformation. Take moral action.

Kelley (1988) asked several important questions of followers, and in doing so, he provides the first comprehensive observation of the qualities of effective followers:

- Self managed,
- Committed to the organization
- Give one hundred percent to the organization effort
- Courageous, credible and honest

Kelley differentiates the role of the follower from the role of the leader, suggesting that “Followership is not a person but a role, and what distinguishes followers from leaders is not intelligence or character but the role they play” (Kelley 1988, p. 146). Rather than seeing the leadership role as superior to the role of the follower, Kelley sees the roles of leader and follower as equal but involving different activities. Effective leaders have the vision, interpersonal skills, verbal capacity, organizational talent, and desire to lead. Effective followers have the ability to work well with others, to see the big picture of the roles of both leader and follower, and the ability and desire to participate in a team effort for a greater good.

In his later work, Kelley (2008) outlined five basic followership styles:

- The sheep, who are passive and look to the leader for direction
- The yes-people, who say yes to the leader and look to the leader for guidance
- The alienated, who think for themselves and provide negative energy throughout the process by finding ways every solution will not work
- The pragmatics, who work to maintain the status quo
- The star followers, who think for themselves, provide active and positive energy and an independent evaluation of the outcome

The first four followership styles outlined do not necessarily describe active and independent followers. The star followers are the engaged and courageous followers proposed by Chaleff (1995, 2009).

While Chaleff acknowledges formal leadership as having final accountability and authority vested in an elected or appointed leader, he views the leader and follower as responsible to each other for their actions. “This is a partnership. Both sides must be proactive. If we have followers who are partners with leaders, we will not have leaders who are tyrants” (Chaleff, 1995, p. 14). The follower has just as much responsibility as the leader for the success of actions. It is up to the leader and follower to determine whether or not the responsible actors are held accountable for their actions.

Five main qualities or dimensions of followership are examined by Chaleff (1995, 2009):

- The courage to assume responsibility
- The courage to serve
- The courage to challenge
- The courage to participate in personal and organizational transformation
- The courage to take moral action

Similar to Kelley (1988, 2008), Chaleff places an emphasis on the need for courage in formation of the leader/follower relationships. In addition, he discusses the need for followers to engage in courageous acts that could be perceived as challenging the leader. Courage also implies risk. Being a good follower is risky because a follower is responsible to the leader as well as to the mission of the organization, is willing to serve the leader, is willing to challenge the leader, and is transformational at times. Above all, the courageous follower knows when it is time to leave the organization, when the values of the leader and his or her values no longer match, and when the follower would be in the way of the leader and the organization. Both authors see followers in independent roles, as partners with rather than subservient to leaders.

Within this discussion, Kelley's description of star followers is similar to Chaleff's (1995) discussion of courageous followers.

Leadership, as defined by Kellerman (1999) is the effort by leaders, who may or may not hold formal positions of authority, "to engage followers in the joint pursuit of mutually agreed-on goals. These goals represent significant rather than merely incremental change" (p. 10). This definition clearly includes followers as a significant and separate piece of the leadership equation—especially within the concept of adaptive work. Kellerman's definition of leadership is similar to those of Burns and Rost except for the inclusion of followers in the actual definition. Kellerman views followers as an important piece of the leadership puzzle. She indicates that the concept of followership is separate and equally as important as the concept of leadership (Kellerman, 2008). Kellerman, however, uses followership to imply a relationship or rank between subordinates (followers) and superiors (leaders), and a behavioral response of the follower to the leader.

Kellerman's observation of followership as a separate and equally valid concept clashes with views of Heifetz (2007) and Rost (2008) because they see the leader-follower dichotomy as demeaning to followers. They take issue with any description that elevates leaders to a higher position than followers when the actions of followers are so critical to the success of the leader and the project. Heifetz's argument is centered largely around language rather than actions. Heifetz's irritation at the use of the term follower is threefold. First, he believes leader/follower is a dyadic construct which puts authority in the hands of the leader and eliminates the authority of the follower. Second, a follower called to community involvement, no matter the type of involvement, is considered an act of leadership rather than an act of followership. And finally, the inflation of a leader's super powers—the notion of the "heroic" leader—renders followers

impotent. Similarly, with the postindustrial definition of followership—collaborative leadership—Rost (2008) finds no use for the word follower. Rather, he proposes the use of a word such as collaborator, participant, or contributor. These words connote more of a partnership between leader and follower than does the word follower. Just like Heifetz, Rost does not dispute the actions of followers, but rather the use of the word follower and the mental images triggered by its use.

The concept of followership is contentious at the moment with the disagreements captured in Heifetz's (2007), Kellerman's (2008), and Chaleff's (1995, 2009) work. While Kellerman (2008) focuses her entire book, *Followership*, on the study of followership, Heifetz (2007) is critical of the leadership-followership dichotomy because of the hierarchy, power, and control that leadership suggests over followership. In a sense, one might say Kellerman is working in a more descriptive frame while Heifetz borders on the normative. For example, in part, Heifetz is wary of the use of the word, "followership" because of the negative connotations that are implicit with the use of the word. Leaders are perceived as strong and powerful, while followers are perceived as too weak to be leaders. Kellerman acknowledges the questions swirling around the use of followership and has continued on her path of research, clearly staking her claim that followership is important to leadership and followers are critical for leaders to accomplish tasks. Kellerman also suggests that while followers have less power, authority, and influence than their superiors, in the end, followers have the ability to make or break the leader, which gives power back to the follower.

While followership is relatively new to the discussion of leadership, and disagreements have arisen in the literature, it is the perfect time for me to weigh into the discussion of leadership and followership through the perspective of citizen engagement in local communities.

Many of the studies of followership are qualitative; some are descriptive, and others are normative. The only quantitative study of followership identified in this research was Dixon's (2003) examination of workplace followership. Based on Chaleff's (1995, 2008) five courageous follower behaviors, Dixon developed the Followership Profile. Through workplace surveys, Dixon concludes that follower behaviors are measurable and occur within the technology- and engineering-based organizations he surveyed. These followership behaviors are found at all levels of the organization and increase at higher levels in the organization. While Dixon's (2003) study corroborates Chaleff's notion of followership, it does so within the institutional anchors of the workplace as Barnard (1938) described early on, rather than in the grassroots sphere of citizen engagement, an important and emerging leadership context.

Combining the definitions of followership from Chaleff (1995, 2009), Hollander (2007), and Kellerman (2008), for the purposes of this study, I propose the following definition for followership. Followership involves active support—followers choosing to support the leadership position and the purpose of the organization or project. While followers are in a relationship with a leader, they are independent actors and actively make decisions on roles to provide support. These actions can range from problem definition through the success of the project.

Citizen Engagement

Approaches to studying citizen engagement range from the historical approach provided by Skocpol and Fiorina (1999), the rational choice approach examined by Fiorina (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999), and the social capital approach argued by Robert Putnam (2000). It is interesting and perhaps not coincidental that citizen engagement became an important topic in political science and public administration in the late 1990s. With the passing of more than 50 years since

the civil rights movement and the shifting to more grassroots citizen engagement activities in communities, scholars began to examine a different approach to citizen engagement in local communities. Furthermore, it appears that the complexity of citizen engagement parallels the development of the concept of adaptive work.

Through a historical lens of citizen engagement, Skocpol and Fiorina (1999) examine changing organizational patterns, shifts in social and political activity, and the changes in the relationships between elites and ordinary citizens. These shifts from the women's suffrage movement to the civil rights movement and beyond are examples of civic groups' use of mass protests, money, bureaucracy, politics, and the courts to achieve women's right to vote in 1920 and the civil rights acts of 1964 and 1965.

Through a rational choice model, Skocpol and Fiorina (1999) examine the unintended effects and incentives of what is called "the dark side" of citizen engagement. Rational choice scholars wrestle with the question of negative unintended consequences of citizen engagement and ask the question—do they outweigh the positive consequences of citizen engagement? Are the consequences of extremism, such as a small group of fanatics in the Westboro Baptist Church in Topeka, Kansas, just part of the price one pays to include citizen engagement for the greater good? As Fiorina explains, citizen engagement is reflective of the larger community if those engaged are a diverse representation of the larger community. However, problems with representativeness arise when citizen engagement is largely voiced by minority or homogeneous viewpoints rather than majority or diverse viewpoints.

Understanding the historical and rational choice approaches to citizen engagement is important in the overall discussion of citizen engagement; however, the social capital approach is more consistent with and reflective of my examination of planned citizen engagement—

engagement as a tool rather than a movement. The term *social capital* was originally coined by Coleman (1988) to indicate manners in which social ties and shared norms can enhance economic efficiency and help individuals participate more successfully in society. Social capital parallels “the concepts of financial capital, physical capital and human capital—but embodies in relations about persons” (Coleman, 1988, p. S118). The important elements of social capital in any social setting are trust and reciprocity. For example, it is important for individuals to trust each other’s actions as much as it is for neighbors to reciprocate neighborly actions to one another. Neighborly mutual action may include small caretaking activities such as watching each other’s houses or watering the garden while a neighbor is on vacation, which goes a long way to build trust among neighbors.

In a comprehensive study of citizen engagement, Robert Putnam (2000) brought talk of citizen engagement into living rooms of actual citizens engaged in their communities. Through the examination of civic decline in organized groups since the 1960s, the study expanded the discourse for proponents of neighborhoods and citizen involvement in terms of an individual’s ability to become involved in their community and ways to imagine a better future. Putnam combined Coleman’s social capital theory and de Tocqueville’s (1835/2012) concept of voluntary associations to explain how social capital in the United States has been eroded, particularly since the 1960s. Putnam sees the unraveling of social connections and declining social trust in the United States as attributable to the challenges of democracy and governance.

After highlighting the decline of citizen engagement in social organizations, Putnam (2003) examined civic organizations throughout the United States that were flourishing. According to Putnam and Feldstein’s (2003) expanded explanation of social capital, individuals and neighbors who regularly interact with one another face-to-face are more able to work

together to solve collective problems. The face-to-face interaction helps individuals gain social trust, which Putnam believes has a natural spillover effect into trust in government. Putnam finds that communities with higher levels of social capital also have higher levels of trust in government, suggesting that states high in social capital have more effective and innovative governments. A higher level of voter turnout occurs with citizens who are more engaged in the democratic process.

Against the background of social capital and citizen engagement theory, examining the actual study of citizen engagement is useful for this research. Mathews (1999) examines a deliberative public democracy, one that relies on public deliberation as a way to inform both representative government and citizen action. Mathews claims Americans feel estranged and disconnected from the political system, perhaps caused not only by citizens' lack of confidence in institutional performance but the inability of institutions and administrators to relate to the public. While Mathew's premise concedes that it is up to the citizens to take control of their government and make a difference in politics, he uses a broad definition of politics that can involve democracy and governing of the people.

Mathews (1999) discusses a new politics in which people rather than politicians have to make the difference. Mathews believes it is people working together in a deliberative process that is critical to effective politics. The deliberative process is at the same time a trust-building exercise. The deliberative process can also be apparent in voluntary organizations that Putnam describes as the local Rotary Club, bridge club, neighborhood group, PTA, and the like. As Mathews explains: "People become a public when they acknowledge their interconnectedness and the consequences of their ties with others—over extended time" (Mathews 1994, p. 203). These are exactly the definitions of social ties and culture that define social capital.

In Mathew's terminology, citizens cannot reclaim politics through a deliberative process without meaningful social ties and time to engage with others in neighborly activities. These are similar to Putnam's terms of trust and social capital. In addition, Fiorina (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999), believes that the cure for citizen disengagement is more citizen engagement, which is consistent with Mathews' concept of a deliberative process of citizen engagement in which individuals can share their ideas in an open environment to build bridges of understanding and increase social capital and trust.

Chrislip (2002) highlights the importance of engaging citizens in meaningful and planned collaborative processes with tangible results and provides the counterbalance to Mathews' concerns of citizen disenfranchisement. This is the creation of civic communities in which trust and reciprocity are the norms and collaborative processes thrive. Epstein, Coates, and Wray (2006) provide a model of core community skills—engaging citizens, measuring results, and getting things done—which, as an evaluation process, goes hand-in-hand with Chrislip's collaborative leadership process to engage citizens in meaningful community processes that provide results for the entire community. Shared governance is a rubric within which the concept of citizen engagement can be located.

A standard definition of citizen engagement is

a fundamental right of all citizens to have a say in the decisions that affect their lives. Citizen participation policies and programs reflect a basic adoption of this principle and extend a “standing ovation to citizens to engage in policy development and decision-making activities.” (Lukensmeyer & Torres, 2006, p. 9)

As Leighninger (2006) explains, this participation ranges from one-way communication of local government with residents all the way to citizens engaged directly with local government officials in the process of shared governance. Leighninger examines current citizen engagement structures within communities and their quest to develop shared civic, bureaucratic, and political

governance and a new form of democracy. The openness of local governments and administrators to engage in the community building process has provided new avenues for citizens to participate in the open process (Nalbandian, 1999). City officials have the unique ability to promote citizen engagement by encouraging connections among residents in neighborhoods and providing a common neighborhood and community thread for residents to advance participation.

Citizen engagement generally promotes a sense of community among residents and between residents and city staff. Arnstein (1969) suggests a continuum between levels of citizen engagement from nonparticipation and manipulation of the powerless within a community to citizen control exhibited by the powerful within a community. High levels of citizen engagement through partnerships and delegated powers provide a unique power sharing relationship between citizens and city officials. In a similar vein, Denhardt and Denhardt (2006) indicate the ability of citizens to exercise civic responsibility provides a closer relationship with others and increases the feeling of community and belonging. In this sense, it is a relationship that is advanced, not just among neighbors, but also among neighborhoods and officials in city hall.

Svara and Denhardt (2010) created a table highlighting the continuum of citizen engagement from information gathered in one-sided local government-administered surveys to empowerment of citizens to engage in final decision-making authority with local government. It incorporates the entire spectrum linking citizen and city staff involvement in citizen engagement. Beyond informing and consulting, the actions of inclusion, collaboration, and empowerment involve citizens in the activities of citizen engagement. City officials are able to work directly with the public to involve citizens in local policy and decision-making. In their “Public

Involvement Spectrum on Decision-Making,” Svava and Denhardt bring together a broad range of approaches that allows citizens together to share information with each other and with officials through the process of service delivery and policy and program decision-making. As one moves from the function of “inform” to “empower,” one can see how concepts like adaptive work and leader-follower relationships become more salient.

In Table 2, effective citizen engagement in local communities, beyond the citizen perspective in decision-making, is more complex. This approach incorporates activities that support the interconnectedness of social ties, trust, and reciprocity of social capital, as Putnam (1999) suggests. Included are the decision-making partnerships as examined by Svava and Denhardt (2010) with the production of tangible community results emphasized by Chrislip (2002) and Leighninger (2006). From the citizen perspective of citizen engagement, citizens want to know they have been heard, experience two-way communication, and see their input reflected in the outcome of local level decisions. Examples of effective citizen engagement are active neighborhood associations which produce regular activities or events for neighbors; community leadership programs which provide community knowledge and produce community events or activities; local elections for school bonds; and sales tax increases which produce successful results; or local planning which reflects citizen input in the final decision-making process. This approach to effective citizen engagement would naturally include the interaction of citizens with fellow citizens (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2006) as well as citizens participating in community conversations and planning with city staff, as described by Nalbandian (1999). Building community through effective citizen engagement is partly relationship-building between neighbors and partly among neighbors and city officials.

Table 2

Public Involvement Spectrum in Decision-Making

	One-Way Communication to/from Citizens (Information Exchange)		Citizen Engagement (Information Processing and Involving Citizens in Shaping Local Government)		
	Inform	Consult	Include/ incorporate*	Collaborate	Empower
Goal:	Provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities, and/or solutions	Receive and respond to citizen comments, requests, and complaints Obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions	Work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood by staff and the public and considered	Partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution	Place final decision-making authority in the hands of citizens

Note. *The term “engage” is used for this column in Lukensmeyer and Torres (2006). Adapted by Svava and Denhardt (2010) from “Public Involvement Spectrum” in Lukensmeyer and Torres (2006, 7, Table 1) who in turn credit the original work of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) in developing the scale.

Citizen engagement, for the purposes of this study, is very simple. It is active engagement of citizens within their communities. However, the simplicity of the definition hides the range of complexity suggested in Svava and Denhardt’s (2010) chart. For example, that engagement could be helping in a child’s school, volunteering at a nonprofit organization, attending a neighborhood association meeting, attending a city council meeting, or simply voting in elections. Or it could include a complex community conversation about land-use planning or metro-wide economic development strategies. The common ingredient is the act of citizens engaged in their communities with the hope of making their communities better places to live, work, and play. Citizen engagement in this manner can range anywhere on the continuum from

information-gathering to empowerment to act. It is citizen action, however large or small, that is important.

The emerging concept of followership, while contentious, fits well within the study of citizen engagement. The act of followership is similar to the act of citizen engagement. Individuals can choose to act as followers and support the mission of the organization just as they may choose to engage with the community or local government in support of or in opposition to local actions. Or they can be engaged citizens, considered non-followers, working against collective community action. Those individuals thwart activities agreed upon by the larger public, much like the actions of the members of Westboro Baptist Church. In either case, the individuals are choosing the engagement as either followers or citizens.

Importance of this Research

The concept of citizen engagement is important to the study of leadership and followership within local communities. My premise is that successful citizen engagement occurs within a community through the building of effective relationships between leaders and followers. The study of leadership and followership within the context of citizen engagement provides an important new perspective because the roles and responsibilities are not as structured as they are in typical organizations where hierarchy defines much of the relationship. Neighborhood associations generally function outside the bureaucratic hierarchy of city hall; however, there is a subtle organizational structure in which, as Tullock (1965) and Brehm and Gates (2002) suggest, individuals have defined roles in order to accomplish their tasks. Neighborhood association officers and volunteers are autonomous actors and while not paid or closely supervised, still loosely adhere to a weak organizational structure. Studying citizen

engagement provides a more fluid context—an adaptive context—with which to explore the emerging concept of followership.

This study of followership and leadership also assumes that leaders come from the ready pool of followers rather than a pool of existing leaders. Howell and Mendez (2008) suggest that virtually all individuals spend some amount of time as followers. Leaders and followers have shifting roles. People, particularly members of a team, enact fluid leadership roles (Burke, Fiore & Salas 2003). In this sense, followers consciously support leaders from the beginning of the project because the leaders actually began as followers. This concept will be examined more thoroughly as the research progresses.

As noted above, the literature on leadership theory does not reflect, to any great extent, the important role of followers within the study of leadership. While the literature on followers does discuss the role of followers in relation to leaders, the discussion of followership is relatively new and not comprehensive. Missing from the literature is a significant quantitative examination of leaders and followers working together. It is my contention that citizen engagement is the missing variable when studying leadership and followership, especially because community building involves adaptive work where traditional definitions of leadership lack the explanatory power they might have in a more hierarchical setting. Adding citizen engagement as an element of the discourse will expand the explanatory power of leadership and followership concepts.

While several books have been written on followership, through my review of literature, I found only one methodological study published on work place follower behavior and no studies of followership motivation using the context of citizen engagement. An opportunity exists to contribute to the research on leadership, followership, and citizen engagement from a

quantitative perspective, and in the process, to develop a better understanding of followership in concept and practice.

Through the lens of civic engagement, I want to determine if mission-driven followers are distinct from leader-driven followers. Does the distinction involve how often mission-driven followers are engaged and the perceived effectiveness of neighborhood associations? This can be contrasted with the traditional view of leader-driven followership through frequency of involvement and perceived effectiveness of neighborhood associations.

This research is important beyond the leadership-followership world of study. Examining leadership and followership through the context of citizen engagement at the local level brings a fresh approach to the examination of citizen engagement within communities. A unique opportunity exists to keep the public administration perspective in mind while examining new ways to reflect active citizen engagement within local communities.

In chapter 2, I will more precisely identify the problem this research is designed to address, including a list of the hypotheses and the rationale for each. Chapter 2 describes how I designed and implemented the research. Chapter 3 examines the data and methods used in this research. In chapter 4, the research findings are presented and their significance is established in light of the hypotheses. In the final chapter, I discuss the significance of the findings in the broader context set out in this chapter, and I propose a future research agenda.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Unanswered questions in leadership studies focus on the independent actions of followers. The literature proposes that followers are an independent force in the collective activities of citizens, particularly in neighborhood associations, but it does not address what motivates followers. This research focuses on followership in the civic context and proposes to assess conditions under which followers exhibit autonomous action. The fundamental proposal to be tested is whether mission-driven followers—motivated by the goals and work of the neighborhood and its association—are more civically engaged and over a longer period of time than those who are motivated by their connection to a particular leader of the neighborhood association.

Grassroots neighborhood association activity is an indicator of involvement and lends itself to an examination of followership within the context of civic engagement. Gauging followers' engagement, activity, and perception of neighborhood association effectiveness and well-being will be established through self-administered survey questions. These questions indicate the amount of time spent and activity with the neighborhood association and will more clearly reveal the motivation of the followers as well as the extent of their civic engagement.

Research Hypotheses

Using the concepts of followership and civic engagement, the hypotheses consider the motivation of members of neighborhood associations—why they are involved and what keeps them involved in their neighborhood.

H1: Mission-driven followers are more engaged in the community than leader-driven followers.

H2: Mission-driven followers will perceive greater neighborhood association effectiveness than leader-driven followers.

H3: Mission-driven followers will perceive greater overall neighborhood well-being than leader-driven followers.

Kansas City, Kansas, Neighborhood Survey

Members of neighborhood associations in Kansas City, Kansas, population 145,786, were surveyed for this research. Kansas City, Kansas, is a city comprised of clearly defined urban, suburban, and rural areas with diversity of age, gender, race, and socioeconomic status in its neighborhoods. The city embraces the diversity in and among its neighborhoods (Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, 2011).

The mission of neighborhood associations is generally neighborhood preservation and improvement. In this study, members of neighborhood associations are all unpaid volunteers. The members of the association provide the leadership and manpower for the organization. City staff support is minimal—meaning only basic neighborhood resources like technical office support, supplies, meeting space, and general community information are provided by the city to the neighborhood associations. Additionally, the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department provides a community policing liaison to each registered neighborhood association. In essence, the all-volunteer directed neighborhood associations provide their own leadership, self-management, activity, and membership for their organizations and, therefore, provide a suitable context for exploring the concept of followership.

According to the Kansas City, Kansas Liveable Neighborhoods department, which works closely with the neighborhood groups, over 150 registered neighborhood associations exist in the city. Each of these neighborhoods has a team of officers (president, vice president, secretary and

treasurer) that are registered with the city and are regarded as active neighborhood associations. Neighborhood meetings and activities occur for the groups on a regular basis. Members and officers who attend neighborhood association meetings are all volunteers.

To better understand follower motivation within the context of civic engagement in neighborhood associations, I administered a 14-question survey from January to June, 2011. Survey questions asked residents who attend neighborhood association meetings about their involvement in the neighborhood association. The survey asked residents questions about their roles, time dedicated to the neighborhood, attendance, and reasons for participating in the neighborhood association. These questions also addressed the level of involvement of the individuals. Some residents are very involved in their association and others simply attend meetings periodically. Others attend meetings only when there is a crisis in the neighborhood.

This research assumes that the level of resident involvement in their neighborhood association indicates the level of commitment to their neighborhood. Survey questions permit measurement of citizens' perceptions of neighborhood association effectiveness, involvement, motivation, and demographics. The survey is designed to determine whether a neighborhood association member was leader-driven or mission-driven to participate in neighborhood activities. Individuals who are leader-driven tend to participate only in activities when the leader asks. They are not self-motivated to attend events just for the good of the neighborhood; rather, their intent is to support the neighborhood leader.

Mission-driven individuals participate in neighborhood activities not only when the leader asks but, more likely, because they believe in the mission of their neighborhood and want to volunteer their time and talents to help the neighborhood no matter who the leader may be.

These individuals could also be interested in protecting positive actions in the neighborhood and promoting neighborhood improvements.

With the help of the Liveable Neighborhoods Department, I identified active neighborhood associations with regular meeting days and times. Of those I contacted, I received permission to visit 25 neighborhood association meetings that represented every zip code and large neighborhood area within the city. Some groups, while active, did not have regular meetings. In other instances, meetings were cancelled due to lack of attendance. The neighborhood president at the individual neighborhood meetings introduced me and explained that I was interested in neighborhood associations in Kansas City, Kansas. By being introduced by the president, a level of trust was created for the association members because the president sanctioned my activity. If the leaders of the neighborhood associations trusted me enough to allow me to come to a neighborhood meeting, residents reciprocated that trust and were comfortable enough to answer the survey questions for me.

The survey was self-administered. I handed out the surveys to the residents, who individually completed the surveys and returned them to me at the meeting. They were filled out anonymously in order to maintain confidentiality. The intent of surveying individuals who attend neighborhood association meetings was to measure follower motivation of those neighbors engaged enough to attend a neighborhood association meeting. This study does not address questions about why individuals are not engaged in their communities. Only individuals who attended neighborhood association meetings or volunteered in their neighborhood were asked to participate in this research.

Most residents were very willing to share their neighborhood experience. The 396 surveys completed during the neighborhood meetings resulted in a 99% response rate. Only four

individuals of 400 refused to answer the survey questions; Appendix A shows the survey completed by residents living in active neighborhood associations.

Discussion of Hypotheses

To determine whether mission-driven followers are more engaged than leader-driven followers in H1, I have divided association member motivation into categories reflected in questions 4 and 7 by asking whether the primary reason for involvement is a better neighborhood or the leader, and if what keeps individuals involved is a better neighborhood or the leader. Questions 2 and 3 address involvement through the number of meetings a member attends and the amount of time invested in the neighborhood activities beyond attending meetings.

In H1, the dependent variable of time is reflected in questions 2 and 3. Question 2 is coded *nummeet*—how often individuals attend neighborhood meetings. Question 3 is coded *amttime*—how much time individuals spend on neighborhood activities. These indicate the number of meetings and amount of time neighbors contribute to their neighborhood activities. This measure of time will indicate the level of engagement neighbors have in their neighborhood association. In this case, the more meetings residents attend and the more time residents spend on activities in the neighborhood, the more engaged residents may be in their neighborhood associations.

Also in H1, the independent variable of follower motivation is captured in questions 4 and 7. Question 4 is coded *volunteer*—why individuals volunteer in their neighborhood. Question 7 is coded *keepsinvolve*—what keeps volunteers involved in their neighborhood. Determining why neighbors volunteer time and stay involved in their neighborhood association will indicate follower motivation and determine whether an individual has a tendency to be mission-driven or leader-driven. Those who are mission-driven may be more likely to respond to

issues concerning the neighborhood, and those who are leader-driven will be more likely to respond to the leader.

Demographic control variables from questions 10-14 will be used to determine the importance of *yrslived*—how many years an individual has lived in their neighborhood, *age*—year of birth, *race*—ethnicity (white, African American, Hispanic, Asian, and other), and *gender*—male or female. These variables will show the influence of any demographic differences on the independent and dependent variables.

H2 and H3 propose that mission-driven followership is associated with perception of greater neighborhood association effectiveness and overall neighborhood well-being. For both hypotheses, follower motivation will be evaluated as in H1. Association member motivation was divided into categories reflected in questions 4 and 7 by asking whether the primary reason for involvement is a better neighborhood or the leader, and if what keeps individuals involved is a better neighborhood or the leader.

Perceived neighborhood association effectiveness, while not an indicator of follower motivation, does demonstrate a level of follower engagement. The distinction, using mission-driven followers and their degree of engagement in their neighborhood, can be contrasted with traditional leadership-driven followership through the frequency of member involvement and the perceived effectiveness of neighborhood associations. To examine H2, follower motivation is reflected in survey questions 4 and 7. Involvement is captured in questions 6 and 9. These questions will explore the potential relationship between the amount of time members spend working with their neighborhood association and their perceived effectiveness level of the neighborhood association within their neighborhood.

In H2, the dependent variable of involvement is indicated in questions 6 and 9. Involvement is coded as *effectvinvolve* and *issueseffectness* and will be used to determine the perceived level of neighborhood association effectiveness. The independent variable of follower motivation, in questions 4 and 7, is coded as *volunteer* and *keepsinvolve*. These variables will indicate whether follower motivation through mission-driven or leader-driven followership is associated with the perception of greater neighborhood association effectiveness. Demographic control variables from questions 10-14 will be used to determine any variability related to demographics.

Similarly, to evaluate H3, mission-driven followership is associated with a perception of greater overall neighborhood well-being. Survey questions 4 and 7 capture follower motivation. Question 8 indicates the perceived primary purpose of the neighborhood association. This purpose relates to the overall well-being of the neighborhood association—whether the neighborhood is perceived as safer, friendlier, more attractive or more of a voice in city politics. These categories indicate the general livability of the neighborhood, which differs from perceived neighborhood association effectiveness and the ability of the neighborhood association to handle challenges for the betterment of the neighbors and neighborhood. General neighborhood livability refers to quality of life issues of safety, neighborliness, and beauty rather than neighborhood association effectiveness.

For H3, the dependent variable of neighborhood well-being is captured in question 8 coded as *neighborhoodpurpose*—what is the primary purpose of your neighborhood association—and will be used to determine neighborhood well-being. The independent variable of follower motivation is indicated in questions 4 and 7, coded as *volunteer* and *keepsinvolve*. It will be used to determine follower motivation and to establish whether mission-driven or leader-

driven followership is associated with the perception of greater neighborhood well-being.

Demographic control variables from questions 10-14 will be used to determine any variability related to demographics.

As discussed in each hypothesis, demographic questions of ethnicity, gender, age, years lived in the neighborhood, and zip code will be considered to make a more complete picture of the motivation of followers and their perception of neighborhood association effectiveness. The research will show whether variables of age, years lived in a neighborhood, ethnicity, and gender have any influence on the relationship between follower motivation and the dependent variables. These variables will define groups for comparison to determine whether mission-driven and leader-driven followership have independent effects on the engagement of followers.

Chapter 3 provides the community context for this study and the descriptive statistics of the data. A brief overview of the community and general description and discussion of the data is given.

CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODS

Community Context

To better understand the culture of the neighborhood associations in the city, it is important to have a historical and governmental perspective of Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County. Comprised of cities within a city, the towns of Armourdale and Wyandotte City were officially consolidated into Kansas City, Kansas in 1886. The foundation of the city was built upon the unique and diverse cultures of such separate communities as the towns of Argentine, Rosedale, Turner, and Piper, which were all eventually annexed (City of Kansas City, Kansas, 1976). As Crenson (1983) suggests, the heritage of each community and neighborhood is so strong that these communities are still referred to by their neighborhood identity rather than collective city identity.

Contributing to neighborhood identity, diversity was aligned primarily by ethnicity, income, and race. Established in the early 1900s, the original Eastern European immigrant communities of Strawberry Hill, Russian Hill, and Polish Hill; African American neighborhoods in the Northeast; and Mexican immigrant communities of Argentine and Armourdale were all located in the urban core east of I-635. According to the 1990 census, the urban core of these Kansas City, Kansas, neighborhoods had 21% more poverty-level income households than suburban areas. In addition, 85% of white residents living below the poverty line lived outside the urban core ring bounded by I-635 (Gotham, 2002). Even today, white residents live primarily in the suburbs west of I-635, while Asians, African Americans, Hispanics, and other immigrants lived within the urban core.

Wyandotte County, Kansas, spans 156 square miles of urban, suburban, and rural areas. Of that area, Kansas City, Kansas, consists of 128 square miles, which is 82.1% of the total area in Wyandotte County (Unified Government Research Division). The city's overall population consists of: 49.32% male, 50.68% female, 40.2% white, 26.3% black, 27.8% Hispanic, 2.6% Asian, .5% American Indian, .1% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 2.5% other race (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). With these demographic characteristics, Kansas City, Kansas, is considered a minority majority community, with more nonwhite than white residents.

Besides the diverse population of Kansas City, Kansas, the governance structure of Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County is unique. From the mid-twentieth century up to the turn of the century, Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County were plagued by political corruption and a declining population. During that time, neither the three-member Wyandotte County Commission, nor the three-member Kansas City, Kansas, City Commission hired any professional staff or enacted any of the city or county management reforms that had begun to sweep the country in the mid-twentieth century (Frederickson, 1980). Power was tightly held by a few city and county officials, and both jurisdictions were considered firmly part of the Democratic political machine. In 1982, Kansas City, Kansas, voters changed their form of government from a three-member commission to a seven-member city council with a professional administrator. That shift began the professionalization of the city. However, even the addition of professional management did not completely curb the corruption of public officials.

In 1994, despite the governance change, a number of city officials were investigated by the FBI in a bribery scheme involving a strip club owner. Mayor Joe Steineger and his aide were charged in U.S. Federal Court with accepting a \$4,000 bribe for favorable consideration of adult

entertainment, but, both were subsequently acquitted. In addition, three council members were called to testify before a federal grand jury on suspicion of a money-for-votes bribery scheme to reject an anti-adult entertainment ordinance (O'Connor, August 14, 1994). A city staff member was also indicted by the same federal grand jury for bribery when strip club building code violations were overlooked.

Throughout that time of city governance changes, the Wyandotte County government structure remained a three-member commission. Commissioner Clyde Townsend was convicted of extortion in a kickback scheme on November 7, 1989, and he was sentenced to two years in prison (Hirschman, November 9, 1989). With a failed 18-month appointment of a county manager from 1991-1993, the three part-time commissioners kept control of county government in the hands of a few and continued to feed the political machine. Rumors of widespread corruption still surfaced within the county. The economy of the city and county suffered as the population declined; residents were frustrated by perceptions of government corruption as well as by the lack of economic development and high property taxes.

City-County Consolidation

By 1995, most of Wyandotte County had been annexed, and less than one percent of the county was unincorporated, indicating an overlap of traditional city and county services. With the promise of increased governmental efficiency and economic activity and development, voters approved the functional consolidation of Kansas City, Kansas and Wyandotte County in 1997 (Leland & Wood, 2010). According to Leland and Thurmaier (2006), Kansas City, Kansas and Wyandotte County became one of only 37 cities and counties in the country to successfully consolidate from 1805 to 2003. City-county consolidation is a rare feat, especially in a city and county known for good old boy politics and a Democratic machine. The formal name of the

consolidated government is the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, which is commonly referred to as the UG, referring to “Unified Government.”

Along with increased economic development and tax reductions, another consequence of city-county consolidation was the professionalization of the county government. County governance was shifted to a nine-member county commission with a mayor/CEO and a professional county administrator. In this governmental structure, elected officials concentrate on setting policy through the local budget and ordinances. The county administrator implements the policy set by the elected officials (Frederickson & Smith, 2003). With more checks and balances instituted and power diffused in the new consolidated form of government, no corruption charges have been leveled against any county commissioners or employees since its inception in 1997.

On the day voters approved consolidation, the city was contacted by the International Speedway Corporation (ISC) about a site for expansion. Consolidation provided a one-stop shop for economic development. Developers no longer needed to receive plans approval and building permits from both the city and county. With consolidation, the UG was able to streamline the process of eminent domain, and construction for the speedway began in 1998. In addition, the UG purchased 400 acres of farmland adjacent to the race track and created a tourism district that included The Legends, a destination shopping area that supports additional development in the county (Leland & Wood, 2010). With the speedway and the tourism district, economic development in western Wyandotte County has increased dramatically.

Since consolidation, Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, have experienced an economic resurgence, population stabilization, and the subsequent rebirth of the community.

The consolidation process was closely followed by local, state, and national media. Five years after consolidation, enough successes were realized that *Governing* magazine reported,

while the move [consolidation] helped the combined governments cut their workforce and trim property taxes four years running, it also had a less tangible but no less crucial impact: The periodic scandals that had beset both county and city governments came to an end. (Gurwitt, 2002, p. 25).

According to Leland and Thurmaier (2010), city-county consolidation stabilized the population loss and improved the economy through increased retail sales and increased rooftops. UG tax records indicate that in 1997, total taxes on the farmland that now comprises the tourism district was \$15,000. In 2007, the taxes levied on that property were \$7,000,000. Today, a more stable economic environment prevails in the city.

Kansas City, Kansas, Neighborhood Associations

Participation in neighborhood associations has increased steadily since 1995 when Mayor Carol Marinovich took office, and it continued after consolidation occurred. When the campaign for consolidation began in 1995, Marinovich used the opportunity to strengthen neighborhoods. To signify the importance of neighborhoods to the UG and the community, Mayor Marinovich created the Liveable Neighborhoods Department to encourage neighborhood growth. The office was originally located in the Mayor's office, signaling the importance of the department to the mayor. During her administration, the Neighborhood Resource Center was created so neighborhood groups could receive assistance and training with technical issues facing neighborhoods. Before Mayor Marinovich took office, there were fewer than 50 registered neighborhood associations. That number grew to over 150 while she was in office (C. Marinovich, personal communication, September 5, 2012).

The creation of the Neighborhood Resource Center formalized the relationship between city community development departments and neighborhoods. According to the 2011 Liveable

Neighborhoods Resource Guide, Liveable Neighborhoods works closely with the Community Development Department and the Neighborhood Resource Center, which includes Rental Licensing and Inspection, Code Enforcement, and Community Policing, to create a strong neighborhood presence. These departments actively support the volunteer work of neighbors with professional assistance in property ownership, rental licensing, and safety.

Descriptive Statistics

With a strong history of very diverse neighborhoods and the growth of neighborhood associations, Kansas City, Kansas, was a logical choice to examine the motivation of citizens to become involved in their neighborhoods and neighborhood associations and their perception of association and engagement effectiveness. In this research, motivation is conceptualized as those who are mission-driven and those who might be leader-driven followers. The large geographic expanse of the area, clearly defined neighborhoods with active neighborhood associations, and vast socioeconomic status differences between neighbors and neighborhoods provide a rich contrast with which to explore the concept of followership. This research addresses the motivation of followers through the civic engagement context of neighborhood associations where neighbors would naturally interact with each other (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2006). As Chaleff (1995, 2009) suggests, only those individuals who attend neighborhood association meetings would be considered active followers. Because of their attendance, these Kansas City, Kansas, neighbors are the ones who choose to be engaged as active followers.

What follows is a descriptive statistical discussion of dependent and independent variables as well as a description of the survey population, which will also be used as control variables. This presentation of descriptive statistics is limited to questions relevant to dependent and independent variables associated with the proposed hypotheses.

Dependent Variables

Based on the hypotheses, the dependent variables are:

Extent of engagement. Engagement is reflected in questions 2 and 3 with descriptive statistics provided in Tables 3 and 4.

Neighborhood association effectiveness. Effectiveness is reflected in questions 6 and 9 with descriptive statistics provided in Tables 5 and 6.

Neighborhood well-being. Well-being is reflected in question 8 with descriptive statistics provided in Table 7.

Table 3 summarizes the data from question 2—how often do you attend neighborhood meetings. Of the 394 neighbors who responded, 41.62% attend 10 or more meetings per year. In a year, over 33% attend 5-10 meetings, 9.9% attend 3-5 meetings, 13.45% attend 1-2 meetings per year, and 11.68% attend no meetings. Considering that neighborhood associations meet monthly at the most, unless a neighborhood crisis has occurred, attending 10 or more meetings a year is a large commitment of time and energy to the neighborhood. The percentage of individuals in the midrange of attending meetings was also high. Almost 75% of those who attend neighborhood meetings do so regularly. As the Liveable Neighborhoods Department describes neighborhood attendance, individuals who attend 1-2 meetings are most likely either interested in a specific neighborhood issue, have a basic neighborhood curiosity, or were asked by the leader, otherwise they would not attend the meetings. Individuals who indicated they attended no meetings were most likely compelled to attend this one particular neighborhood meeting because of a contentious or hot button neighborhood issue without committing to any engagement in additional neighborhood association activity. Therefore those neighbors

indicated no meetings as their response. Overall, the attendance at neighborhood meetings is very high, indicating individuals are actively engaged in their neighborhood associations.

Table 3

Question 2. (Coded: nummeet) (How often do you attend neighborhood meetings?)

Number of meetings	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No meetings	46	11.68	11.68
1-2 meetings per year	53	13.45	25.13
3-5 meetings per year	39	9.90	35.03
5-10 meetings per year	92	23.35	58.38
10+ meetings per year	164	41.62	100.00
TOTAL	394	100.00	

Table 4 captures the data from question 3—how much time do you spend on neighborhood activities. Of the 395 responses, the percentage distribution of time is fairly even across all categories. Individuals who spend no time on neighborhood activities is 19.24%. Neighbors who indicate they spend time on neighborhood activities only when the leader asks is 22.03%. Neighbors who spend 1-2 hours per month is 24.30%. Neighbors who spend 3-8 hours is 17.97% and over 8 hours is 16.46%. Over 58% of the neighbors spend at least 1-2 hours per month helping the neighborhood, meaning these individuals give time to neighborhood concerns on a regular basis.

Table 4

Question 3. (Coded: amtttime) (How much time do you spend on neighborhood activities?)

Amount of time spent on neighborhood activities	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
None	76	19.24	19.24
Only when the leader asks	87	22.03	41.27
1-2 hours per month	96	24.30	65.57
3-8 hours per month	71	17.97	83.54
8+ hours per month	65	16.46	100.00
TOTAL	395	100.00	

Table 5 summarizes the results from question 6—since the time you have been familiar with your neighborhood association, how would you rate its effectiveness in involving neighbors? There were 378 responses. Of those who responded, 11.64% feel their neighborhood association is not very effective in involving neighbors, 49.47% believe the neighborhood association is somewhat effective in involving neighbors, and 38.89% think the neighborhood association is very effective in involving neighbors. More than two-thirds of the neighbors indicate that their neighborhood association is at least somewhat effective in involving neighbors in neighborhood issues and activities. This signifies an 88.36% level of moderate to high engagement of neighbors within the neighborhood associations. Neighbors strongly suggest their neighborhood associations are effective in involving neighbors.

Table 5

Question 6. (Coded: effectvinvolve) (Since the time you have been familiar with your neighborhood association, how would you rate its effectiveness in involving neighbors?)

Effective involvement of neighbors?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not very effective	44	11.64	11.64
Somewhat effective	187	49.47	61.11
Very effective	147	38.89	100.00
TOTAL	378	100.00	

Table 6 summarizes the result of question 9—since the time you have been familiar with your neighborhood association, how would you rate its effectiveness in dealing with neighborhood issues? There were 374 respondents, with over half (55%) rating their neighborhood association as very effective in dealing with neighborhood issues. More than a third (38.50%), indicated their neighborhood association was somewhat effective in dealing with neighborhood issues. Only 6.15% did not consider their neighborhood association very effective in handling neighborhood issues. Thus, the overwhelming preponderance (93%) of the respondents suggested that their neighborhood association is somewhat or very effective in dealing with neighborhood issues. As Tables 5, 6, 8, and 9 indicate, those who attend neighborhood association meetings and volunteer their time also view their neighborhood associations as effective in involving neighbors and dealing with neighborhood issues.

Table 6

Question 9. (Coded: issueseffectness) (Since the time you have been familiar with your neighborhood association, how would you rate its effectiveness in dealing with neighborhood issues?)

Effectiveness in dealing with neighborhood issues?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not very effective	23	6.15	6.15
Somewhat effective	144	38.50	44.65
Very effective	207	55.35	100.00
TOTAL	374	100.00	

Table 7 highlights results from question 8—what is the primary purpose of your neighborhood association. Only 301 respondents answered the question. The lower response may indicate that neighbors are not necessarily clear about the defined purpose of the neighborhood association and were hesitant to answer the question. This may point to a lack of mission clarity for the neighborhood association.

Half of the respondents indicate their neighborhood association’s primary purpose is to make their neighborhoods safer. Approximately a third of the respondents feel the purpose is to make their neighborhoods a friendlier place to live. Approximately 8% of the respondents thought the purpose of their neighborhood association was to make the neighborhood more attractive, and another 8% thought the purpose was to give the neighborhood a voice in city politics. There were 2% who responded “other.” From information provided by the Liveable Neighborhoods Department, KCK Community Policing and Liveable Neighborhoods appear to be actively addressing neighborhood safety in their support activities with the neighborhoods. This could be why making neighborhoods safer was rated so highly.

Table 7

Question 8. (Coded: neighborhoodpurpose) (What is the primary purpose of your neighborhood association?)

Primary neighborhood purpose	Freq.	Percent
Make neighborhood safer	150	49.83
Make neighborhood friendlier	93	30.90
Make neighborhood more attractive	26	8.64
Give neighborhood voice in city politics	25	8.31
Other	7	2.33
TOTAL	301	100.00

Independent Variables

Based on the hypotheses, the independent variable is:

Follower motivation. Mission-driven and leader-driven followership motivation is determined by responses to questions 4 and 7. Tables 8 and 9 provide descriptive statistics used to divide the survey participants into the two groups.

Table 8 captures the results of question 4—which better describes the primary reason you volunteer your time with your neighborhood association. With 367 respondents, 89.92% indicated they believe in their neighborhood and want to strengthen it and 10% volunteer their time because the leader asks them.

Table 8

Question 4. (Coded: volunteer) (Which most often describes the primary reason why you volunteer your time with your neighborhood?)

Why volunteer?	Freq.	Percent
Leader asks me	37	10.08
I believe in my neighborhood	330	89.92
TOTAL	367	100.00

Table 9 summarizes the results from question 7—what keeps you involved in your neighborhood association. Of the 374 respondents, 86.90% indicated they wanted their neighborhood to be a better place to live, and 13.10% suggested that neighborhood leaders keep them involved in their neighborhood associations.

Table 9

Question 7. (Coded: keepsinvolve) (What keeps you involved with your neighborhood association?)

What keeps you involved with neighborhood association?	Freq.	Percent
Neighborhood leaders	49	13.10
Want neighborhood to be a better place	325	86.90
TOTAL	374	100.00

Control Variables

Demographic variables in this research are years lived in the neighborhood, age, race, and gender. These are determined by responses to questions 10, 12, 13, and 14. Tables 10-13 provide descriptive statistics of the survey population.

Representing the demographic questions asked, Tables 10-13 give an overview of the survey population. These are considered control variables. As question 10 in Table 10 indicates, there is a wide range of years neighbors have lived in their neighborhoods. The minimum amount of time lived in the neighborhood is one year, and the maximum amount of time is 82 years. The mean is 25 years, which indicates a substantial amount of stability in the neighborhoods. Individuals living in an area for 25 years would create significant relationships with other neighbors, perhaps even raising their families and retiring in those neighborhoods.

Table 10

Question 10. (Coded: yrslived) (Approximately how many years have you lived in your neighborhood?)

How many years lived in neighborhood	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Years lived	383	25.13577	19.94803	1	82

In question 12 as shown in Table 11, individuals were asked their year of birth. This was phrased as such to determine the actual age of each respondent. The average age of the neighbors is 58 years, with the oldest person at 93 years of age and the youngest person at 16 years of age. At age 58, neighbors may have spent their entire adult life in one neighborhood and have a vested interest in the neighborhood's success. While there is a great difference of 77 years between the oldest and youngest neighbor, with the average age of 58, those attending neighborhood association meetings tend to be older rather than younger, which is consistent with the tenets of the civic engagement literature that suggests older adults are more civically engaged than younger adults, especially with neighborhood activities and voting (Putnam, 2000).

Table 11

Question 12. (Coded: age) (What is the year of your birth?)

Year of birth	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Birth year	382	58.59	16.05048	16	93

With 396 responses in question 13, Table 12 indicates over 72% of the neighbors are white. There are 15.15% who are African American, 7.58% who are Hispanic, .25% who are Asian, and 4.55% who indicated other. To put this in perspective, approximately three-fourths of the respondents are white, and one-fourth are nonwhite, which is considerably different from the demographics of the city as a whole.

Table 12

Question 13. (Coded: race) (What is your ethnicity?)

Ethnicity	Freq	Percent	Cum.
1=White	287	72.47	72.47
2=African American	60	15.15	87.63
3=Hispanic	30	7.58	95.20
4=Asian	1	0.25	95.45
5=Other	18	4.55	100.00
TOTAL	396	100.00	

In question 14 with 388 responses, as Table 13 suggests, 58.76% of the respondents are female, and 41.24% are male. This contrasts with the demographic makeup of the city, which shows a 51% female and 49% male breakdown. There are 17.52% more women than men who responded to the survey. While this study does not address gender issues in neighborhood associations, my experience conducting the survey bears note for explanation. The leaders in

most of the neighborhood association meetings I attended were female. Of the 25 neighborhood association meetings I observed, there were 22 female neighborhood association presidents and three male neighborhood association presidents. Only 12% of the association presidents were male. In Kansas City, Kansas, neighborhood associations, women appear to participate in neighborhood activities more often than men.

Table 13

Question 14. (Coded: gender) (What is your gender?)

Gender	Freq.	Percent
0=Female	228	58.76
1=Male	160	41.24
TOTAL	388	100.0

In this chapter, the community context was described, including an overview of the neighborhoods, governmental structure, and demographics of Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County, which is important in understanding the character of the research area. The descriptive statistics detailed the independent, dependent, and control variables used in this research. Chapter 4 examines follower motivation and involvement through statistical analysis of the variables described within the context of civic engagement in Kansas City, Kansas.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND DATA ANALYSIS

An ordered logit regression model is recommended when distances between ordinal variables are unknown (Long & Freese, 2006). In addition, the use of ordinal variables in linear regression models such as ordinary least squares (OLS) do not produce reliable results when linear regression model assumptions are violated. Since distances between the variables are not equal, Long (1997) recommends using specifically designed ordered logit regression models for ordinal variables. For H1 and H2, the ordered logit regression model was used. In H3, each category of the dependent variable for neighborhood well-being was considered unordered or nominal. A multinomial logit regression model was used to provide an estimate for a separate binary logit in each pair of categorical outcomes (Long & Freese, 2006). Two or more discrete outcomes are available in the models. For all models, with the probability for error at .001 there is 99% confidence the findings did not occur by chance; with the probability for error at .05, there is 95% confidence the findings did not occur by chance; and with the probability at .1, there is 90% confidence the findings did not occur by chance. For all probabilities for error at greater than .1, the models are not considered statistically significant.

Independent Variables

In all three hypotheses, two independent dummy variables were used to measure follower motivation: reason for volunteering in the neighborhood and what keeps you involved in the neighborhood. Reason for volunteering was coded 0=the leader asked and 1=believe in my neighborhood. What keeps you involved was coded 0=the leader asked and 1=believe in my neighborhood.

Control Variables

In all three hypotheses, control variables were used to measure the number of years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race. Years lived in the neighborhood measured the number of years an individual lived in the neighborhood. Initially, the variable of age was also used to determine the age of the respondents. A multicollinear relationship was found between the variables of age and years lived in the neighborhood. Multicollinearity exists when at least two variables are correlated, which provides redundant information in the model (Wooldridge, 2000). The high correlation is not surprising, since age indicates the age of the respondent, and years lived indicates the number of years a respondent has lived in a neighborhood. In this sense, age and years lived did not have enough variance between the variables to set them apart. For this research, given the long amounts of time individuals have lived in their neighborhoods, the logical assumption is the older an individual is, the longer that person has lived in the neighborhood. To avoid multicollinearity, the variable of age was dropped as a control variable. The number of years lived in a neighborhood is more important to the hypotheses as it relates to neighborhoods and can signify both age and years lived in the neighborhood.

The control variable of race, which includes white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and other was recoded into a dummy variable as 0=all other races and 1=white. The data in more specific nonwhite categories of race were too sparse to provide for adequate significance unless they were collapsed together into a dummy variable. This allowed for a less specific and larger comparison of race in the model between nonwhite and white.

The control variable of gender, which includes female and male, was coded 0=female and 1=male. No adjustments were made to this variable.

H1: Mission-driven Followers Are More Engaged in the Community than Leader-driven Followers

As stated in the opening paragraph, H1 uses two separate dependent variables—number of neighborhood meetings attended per year and the amount of time spent on neighborhood activities per month, and two separate independent variables of follower motivation—why individuals volunteer in their neighborhoods and what keeps them involved in their neighborhoods.

Model 1: Number of Meetings and Reason for Volunteering

Model 1 for H1 was tested using the dependent variable of the number of neighborhood association meetings individuals attend per year and the independent variable, which describes the primary reason for volunteering. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race.

In Model 1, the ordered logit regression model indicates significance ($X^2 = 42.64$, $n = 352$, $p = 0.0001$). The null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and dependent variables, can be rejected. More specifically within the model, independent variable becomes involved because of mission ($b = 1.33$, $p = 0.001$), and control variable years lived in the neighborhood ($b = 0.03$, $p = 0.001$) are statistically significant. For the other control variables of gender and race, p scores are not significant in this model. This demonstrates mission-driven follower motivation is higher the more meetings neighbors attend and the longer individuals have lived in their neighborhood. Mission-driven followers show more citizen engagement in their community because they attend more neighborhood meetings and have lived in the neighborhood for a longer period of time.

Using the odds ratio, the odds are 3.1 times greater that individuals will attend meetings if they believe in their neighborhood and are mission-driven rather leader-driven followers. The odds are 1.03 times greater that individuals will attend meetings the longer they have lived in the neighborhood. This indicates neighbors who have mission-driven follower motivation are more likely to attend neighborhood association meetings the longer they have lived in the neighborhood and they want their neighborhood to be a better place to live (Leighninger, 2006; Putnam, 2000).

The number of years lived in a neighborhood may indicate several age- and time-related issues. The older individuals are, the more time they may have to volunteer in their neighborhood, and the more invested they are in the various aspects of their neighborhood. The more time individuals have to volunteer because they are retired, the more they are able to attend neighborhood association meetings and activities. As Putnam (2000) indicates, individuals over 60 years of age are more likely to volunteer than those under 60 years of age. While previous generations declined in volunteerism after age 50, today, baby boomer volunteers of retirement age are healthier and more active, and consequently have discretionary time to volunteer later in life. This retirement-age citizen engagement is seen in the neighborhoods.

The social capital of bridging and bonding could be another explanation for the high statistical significance of mission-driven followership and years lived in the neighborhood (Putnam, 2000). Bonding social capital is important to reinforce strong ties in homogeneous groups, while bridging social capital provides linkages to weak ties in diffuse networks. Those who live in the neighborhood may experience both the bonding of social capital with strong homogeneous neighborhood of next door neighbor ties and bridging social capital through all the

overall neighborhood activities and usual comings and goings of individuals within the neighborhood over the years (see Table 14).

Table 14

Model 1: Number of Meetings Attended and Reason for Volunteering

Independent Variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
Reason for Volunteering	1.33 (0.35) ***	3.105***
Years Lived	0.031 (0.01) ***	1.031***
Gender	-0.061 (0.20)	.9409
White	0.119 (0.26)	1.1260
Constant	-0.816 (0.44)*	-.816*
Pseudo R Squared	0.0501	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-466.628885	
Wald Chi-Square	42.64	
N observations (# of meetings)	352	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two- tailed test.

Model 2: Number of Meetings and What Keeps Followers Involved

Model 2 for H1 was tested using the dependent variable of the number of neighborhood association meetings individuals attend per year and the independent variable which describes what keeps volunteers involved in their neighborhood association. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race.

In Model 2, the ordered logit regression model indicates significance ($X^2 = 37.84$, $n = 357$, $p = 0.0001$). The null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and dependent variables, can be rejected. More specifically within the model, the independent variable keeps involved because of mission ($b = .673$, $p = 0.027$), and control variable years lived

in the neighborhood ($b = .029$, $p = 0.001$) are statistically significant. For the other control variables of gender and race, p scores are not significant in this model. This demonstrates mission-driven follower motivation is higher the more meetings neighbors attend and the longer individuals have lived in their neighborhood. Mission-driven followers stay involved and continue to be more engaged in their community by attending more neighborhood meetings the longer they have lived in the neighborhood. Once again, the mission of the neighborhood association and the social capital provided by the neighborhood association along with the high correlation of years lived in the neighborhood keeps mission-driven followers more engaged in their community than their leader-driven neighbors (Leighninger 2006; Putnam 2000).

Using the odds ratio, the odds are 1.96 times greater that individuals will attend meetings if they stay involved because they are mission-driven rather leader-driven followers. The odds are 1.03 times greater that individuals will continue to attend meetings the longer they have lived in the neighborhood. This indicates neighbors are more likely to stay involved and attend neighborhood association meetings because they have lived in the neighborhood a long time and they want their neighborhood to be a better place to live (Leighninger 2006; Putnam 2000). Neighbors who have mission-driven follower motivation and have lived in the neighborhood for a longer period of time are more likely to be engaged in their community than leader-driven followers.

Table 15

Model 2: Number of Meetings and What Keeps Neighbors Involved

Independent variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
What Keeps Neighbors Involved	0.673 (0.30) **	1.960**
Years Lived	0.029 (0.01)***	1.030***
Gender	-0.071 (0.20)	.9313
White	0.243 (0.26)	1.2750
Constant	-1.212 (0.40)***	1.212***
Pseudo R Squared	0.0402	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-481.35723	
Wald Chi-Square	37.84	
N observations (# of meetings)	357	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two- tailed test.

Discussion of Number of Meetings and Follower Volunteer Motivation

From the results suggested in Models 1 and 2 for H1 using the number of meetings attended per year as the dependent variable, there is significance in both models with the independent variables of reason for volunteering, and what keeps individuals involved in the neighborhood. It appears the mission-driven reason individuals initially become involved in their neighborhood—because they believe in their neighborhood and want to make it a better place to live—remains consistent over time. The mission of the neighborhood association appears to keep individuals involved in their neighborhood, as well. Neighbors who are more likely to initially become involved in the neighborhood because of their mission-driven follower motivation appear to stay engaged because of the mission.

The number of years lived in the neighborhood has a highly significant correlation in both models. After neighbors are involved in the neighborhood association and have lived in the neighborhood for a significant amount of time, mission remains important. Mission-driven followers who have lived in their neighborhood for a long time appear to continue to stay engaged in their neighborhood because of the mission of the neighborhood association.

The greater amount of time spent in a neighborhood would allow for increases in social capital built as well as maintaining mission-driven follower motivation. As Putnam (2000) suggests, older individuals volunteer at a higher rate and are more active in organizations than younger people. The good citizenship of social capital is part of their generational make-up, and these retirees have been more active in voting, volunteering, and trusting neighbors than the previous generation, which correlate with greater neighborhood involvement.

In both models, race and gender do not appear to have an influence on whether mission-driven followers are more engaged in their community than leader-driven followers. Kansas City, Kansas, is a very diverse community with a large number of active neighborhood associations, and perhaps because of this diversity and high citizen engagement, race and gender are not important factors in the results of this research.

Model 3: Amount of Time Spent and Reason for Volunteering

Model 3 for H1 was tested using the dependent variable of the amount of time individuals spend on neighborhood activities per month and the independent variable which describes the primary reason for volunteering. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race.

In Model 3, the ordered logit regression model indicates significance ($X^2 = 30.37$, $n = 353$, $p = 0.0001$). The null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and

dependent variables, can be rejected. More specifically within the model, the independent variable reason for volunteering ($b=1.257$, $p = 0.01$) and the control variable years lived in the neighborhood ($b= .015$, $p=0.003$) are significant. For the other control variables of gender and race, p scores are not significant in this model. This demonstrates mission-driven follower motivation is higher the more time is spent on neighborhood activities and the longer individuals have lived in their neighborhood. Mission-driven followers show more citizen engagement in their community through the large amount of time they spend on neighborhood activities and the long period of time they have lived in the neighborhood.

Using the odds ratio, the odds are 3.52 times greater that individuals who believe in their neighborhood—mission-driven followers—will spend more time on neighborhood activities than leader-driven followers. The odds are 1.01 times greater that individuals will spend more time on neighborhood activities the longer they have lived in the neighborhood. This is consistent with previous social capital findings and indicates neighbors who have mission-driven follower motivation are more likely to spend more time on neighborhood activities because they have lived in the neighborhood a long time and they want their neighborhood to be a better place to live (Leighninger, 2006; Putnam, 2000).

Model 4: Amount of Time Spent and What Keeps Followers Involved

Model 4 for H1 was tested using the dependent variable of the amount of time spent on neighborhood activities per month and the independent variable, which describes why neighbors stay involved in their neighborhood. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race (see Table 16).

Table 16

Model 3: Amount of Time Spent and Reason for Volunteering

Independent Variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
Reason for Volunteering	1.257 (0.28) ***	3.515***
Years lived	0.015 (0.00) ***	1.015***
Gender	0.146 (0.19)	1.158
White	0.293 (0.24)	1.340
Constant	-0.255 (0.33)	-.255
Pseudo R Squared	0.0272	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-542.91291	
Wald Chi-Square	30.37	
N observations (# of meetings)	353	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two- tailed test.

In Model 4, the ordered logit regression model indicates significance ($X^2 = 15.76$, $n = 358$, $p = 0.0001$). The null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and dependent variables, can be rejected. More specifically within the model, the independent variable keeps involved because of mission ($b = 0.550$, $p = 0.086$) is significant, and the control variable years lived in the neighborhood ($b = 0.013$, $p = 0.007$) is significant. For the other control variables of gender and race, p scores are not significant in this model. This demonstrates mission-driven follower motivation continues and is higher the more meetings neighbors attend and the longer individuals have lived in their neighborhood. The more likely individuals are to be mission-driven followers, the more likely they will attend more neighborhood meetings and have lived in the neighborhood for a longer period of time.

Using the odds ratio, the odds are 1.73 times greater that individuals with mission-driven follower motivation will stay involved and spend more time on neighborhood activities. The odds are 1.02 times greater that individuals will spend more time on neighborhood activities the longer they have lived in the neighborhood. This indicates neighbors are more likely to stay involved and attend neighborhood association meetings since they have lived in the neighborhood a long time and they want their neighborhood to be a better place to live (Leighninger 2006; Putnam 2000).

Once again, the mission of the neighborhood association and the social capital provided by the neighborhood association, along with the high correlation of years lived in the neighborhood, keeps mission-driven followers more engaged in their community than their leader-driven neighbors (Leighninger 2006; Putnam 2000) (see Table 17).

Table 17

Model 4: Amount of Time Spent and What Keeps Neighbors Involved

Independent Variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
What Keeps Neighbors Involved	0.550 (0.32) *	1.732*
Years lived	0.013 (0.00)***	1.014***
Gender	0.084 (0.19)	1.087
White	0.347 (0.24)	1.415
Constant	-0.766 (0.38)**	-.7655**
Pseudo R Squared	0.0140	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-559.60676	
Wald Chi-Square	15.76	
N observations (# of meetings)	358	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two- tailed test.

Discussion of Amount of Time Spent and Follower Volunteer Motivation

From the results suggested in Models 3 and 4, using the amount of time an individual volunteers in a neighborhood association per year as the dependent variable, there is significance in Model 3, with the independent variable, reason for volunteering and significance in Model 4 with the independent variable, what keeps neighbors involved in the neighborhood association. Mission-driven followers become engaged and stay involved in their neighborhood association and are willing to volunteer more time in their neighborhood association because they believe in their neighborhood and want to make it a better place to live. The reason individuals initially are engaged and what keeps them involved with their neighborhood association is also correlated to years lived in the neighborhood. As discussed previously, Putnam (2000) suggests the social capital gained when living in a neighborhood for a long period of time may also play a part in what keeps individuals involved in their neighborhood association.

Overall Discussion of H1

Throughout the discussion of H1, a common theme is the general significance of mission-driven followers showing more citizen engagement than leader-driven followers. Mission-driven followers appear to be more engaged and stay involved by attending more meetings and volunteering more time in neighborhood activities than their leader-driven neighbors. These mission-driven followers are most likely to be older and have lived in their neighborhoods for longer periods of time.

In addition to good citizenship and time spent in the neighborhood, Chrislip (2002) suggests neighbors can build informal networks of cooperation and collaboration to achieve results in the neighborhood. The social capital web of trust and reciprocity woven over time may play a role in creating social capital where neighbors have lived for a number of years. As the

demographics indicate in Table 10, for an individual who has spent up to 82 years living in the same neighborhood, the neighborhood association mission may become second nature. This helps develop the informal networks of cooperation and collaboration over time.

The control variables of gender and race were used to determine if there was any correlation of these variables with mission-driven followers and citizen engagement. These control variables do not appear to influence the outcome of any of the models in H1. This is consistent with the lack of discussion of gender and race in followership and citizen engagement literature.

H2: Mission-driven Followers will Perceive Greater Neighborhood Association effectiveness than Leader-driven Followers

H2 uses two separate dependent variables, how individuals rate the effectiveness of their neighborhood association in involving neighbors and how individuals rate the effectiveness of the neighborhood association in addressing neighborhood issues.

Model 5: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and Reason for Volunteering

Model 5 for H2 was tested using the dependent variable effectiveness in involving neighbors and the independent variable which describes the primary reason for volunteering. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race.

In Model 5, the ordered logit regression model does not indicate significance ($X^2=6.87$, $n=350$, $p=0.1427$). The null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and dependent variables, cannot be rejected (see Table 18).

Table 18

Model 5: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and Reason for Volunteering

Independent Variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
Reason for Volunteering	0.733 (0.36) **	2.082**
Years lived	0.007 (0.01)	1.007
Gender	0.159 (0.21)	1.172
White	- 0.053 (0.25)	.9486
Constant	-1.265 (0.41)	-1.265
Pseudo R Squared	0.0105	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-331.13325	
Wald Chi-Square	6.87	
N observations (# of meetings)	350	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.
 ***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two- tailed test.

Model 6: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and What Keeps Followers Involved

Model 6 for H2 was tested using the dependent variable effectiveness in involving neighbors and the independent variable which describes what keeps neighbors involved. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race.

In Model 6, the ordered logit regression model does not indicate significance ($X^2=2.88$, $n=355$, $p= 0.5642$). There is no statistical significance in the model and the null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and dependent variables, cannot be rejected (see Table 19).

Table 19

Model 6: Neighborhood Association Effectiveness in Involving Neighbors and What Keeps Followers Involved

Independent Variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
What Keeps Neighbors Involved	-0.096 (0.30)	0.909
Years lived	0.008 (0.01)	1.007
Gender	0.175 (0.21)	1.191
White	-0.120 (0.24)	.887
Constant	-2.028 (0.37)***	2.028***
Pseudo R Squared	0.0044	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-337.71992	
Wald Chi-Square	2.88	
N observations (# of meetings)	355	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.
 ***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two- tailed test.

Model 7: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and Reason for Volunteering

Model 7 for H2 was tested using the dependent variable effectiveness in resolving neighborhood issues and the independent variable which describes the primary reason for volunteering. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race.

In Model 7, the ordered logit regression model indicates moderate significance ($X^2=8.96$, $n=343$, $p=0.0419$). The null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and dependent variables, can be rejected. More specifically, within the model, the independent variable reason for volunteering ($b=.6570$, $p = 0.065$) and the control variable years lived in the neighborhood ($b= .010$, $p=0.082$) are significant. For the other control variables of gender and race, p scores are not significant in this model. Effectiveness in resolving neighborhood issues is

likely associated with mission-driven followership and the longer individuals have lived in the neighborhood. Individuals appear to be more likely to perceive greater neighborhood association effectiveness if they are mission-driven and have lived in the neighborhood for a longer period of time.

Using the odds ratio, the odds are 1.93 times greater that individuals will perceive their neighborhood is effective in issue resolution because they believe in their neighborhood and have mission-driven follower motivation. The odds are 1.01 times greater that individuals perceive their neighborhood is effective in issue resolution the longer they have lived in the neighborhood.

In this model, followers who engage in their neighborhood association because they believe in the mission are more likely to perceive their neighborhood's effectiveness at issue resolution. This, coupled with the years lived in the neighborhood, also supports Putnam's (2000) social capital research. The older individuals are and the more time they have spent in the neighborhood, the more likely they are to be more familiar with the neighborhood and to have observed some of the issue resolutions that occurred. These neighbors have a sense of trust that the neighborhood and neighbors will be able to resolve the neighborhood issues effectively.

Model 8: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and What Keeps Followers

Involved

Model 8 for H2 was tested using the dependent variable perceived effectiveness in resolving neighborhood issues and the independent variable which describes the primary reason for volunteering. Control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race. In Model 8, the ordered logit regression model does not indicate significance ($X^2=6.04$, $n=350$,

p= 0.1959). The null hypothesis, that there is independence between the independent and dependent variables, cannot be rejected (see Table 20).

Table 20

Model 7: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and Reason for Volunteering

Independent Variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
Reason for Volunteering	0.657 (0.37) *	1.929*
Years lived	0.010 (0.01) *	1.009*
Gender	- 0.320 (0.22)	.726
White	0.111 (0.26)	1.117
Constant	-2.271 (0.48)***	-2.271***
Pseudo R Squared	0.0174	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-280.64247	
Wald Chi-Square	8.96	
N observations (# of meetings)	343	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two- tailed test.

Overall Discussion of H2

To provide an understanding of what neighbors may see as effective, respondents were simply asked how they would rate their neighborhood association at effectiveness in involving neighbors and dealing with neighborhood issues. Responses were very effective, somewhat effective or not very effective at dealing with neighborhood issues or involving neighbors. While social capital and followership literature does not examine effectiveness per se, the question of whether neighbors perceive their neighborhood association as effective and if that effectiveness has a relationship with their mission-driven followership was asked to determine if an individual’s perception of neighborhood association effectiveness is related to mission-driven

followership. The results indicate that mission-driven followers are not moved to join or stay involved in a neighborhood association because of its effectiveness in involving neighbors (see Table 21).

Table 21

Model 8: Neighborhood Association Issue Effectiveness and What Keeps Followers Involved

Independent Variable	B (SE)	Odds Ratio (SE)
What Keeps Neighbors Involved	-0.304 (0.33)	0.738
Years lived	0.010 (0.01)*	1.010
Gender	-0.277 (0.22)	0.758
White	0.092 (0.26)	1.097
Constant	-3.052 (0.47)***	-3.052***
Pseudo R Squared	0.0108	
Log Pseudolikelihood	-289.28793	
Wald Chi-Square	6.04	
N observations (# of meetings)	350	

Notes. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two-tailed test.

Effectiveness in resolving neighborhood issues is only moderately important for mission-driven followers to become involved in the neighborhood association, and it is not a factor in what keeps individuals involved in the neighborhood association. Because the statistical significance is only moderate in Model 7 and not significant at all in Models 5, 6, and 8, effectiveness is not an important factor for mission-driven follower motivation and does not distinguish between mission-driven and leader-driven followership.

Beyond the limitations of the cross-sectional study administered at one time point, the data present a rough approximation of reality. Neighborhood effectiveness involving neighbors

and resolving issues has not been an important measure in the citizen engagement literature. Chrislip (2002) discusses the importance citizens place on being heard by their local government rather than whether departments or organizations are perceived as effective by government or citizens. In the evidence from Putnam's (2000) social capital research, individuals do not indicate perceived effectiveness as a measure for involvement.

As discussed in Chapter 3, more than 55% of the neighbors rate their neighborhood association as very effective in resolving neighborhood issues. Regardless of mission-driven follower motivation, followers believe their neighborhood associations are effective. This notion of neighborhood effectiveness may stem from the responsiveness of local government to the neighborhoods. Berry, Portney and Thomson (1993) found that neighborhoods that have an official place at the community table are more effective. "Neighborhood associations are thus seen as the true voice of neighborhood sentiment, and administrators regard them as legitimate and effective participants in city politics" (Berry et al., 1993, p. 288). In Kansas City, Kansas, the Liveable Neighborhoods department is the vehicle through which neighborhood associations are able to come to the community table and receive neighborhood resources to make their neighborhood associations more effective.

Individuals are more likely to become involved because they are mission-driven and believe in the mission or in the cause of an organization. Whether or not that organization is perceived as effective appears to have little bearing on volunteerism and mission-driven followership. In this research, it appears that effectiveness is not a fundamental need of mission-driven followers. What seems necessary is that neighbors believe in their neighborhood and want to make it a better place to live, which is why individuals seem to become involved in their neighborhood activities. While effectiveness may be slightly important for mission-driven

followers in issue resolution by neighborhood associations, individuals will continue to stay involved in their neighborhood association because they are mission-driven followers rather than because of neighborhood association effectiveness.

The control variables of gender and race were used to determine if there was any correlation of these variables with mission-driven followers and neighborhood association effectiveness. These control variables do not appear to influence the outcome of any of the models in H2. This is consistent with the lack of discussion of gender in race followership and citizen engagement literature. The diversity of Kansas City, Kansas, as previously discussed, may also contribute to the lack of significance of gender and race in the model.

H3: Mission-driven Followers Will Perceive Greater Overall Neighborhood Well-being than Leader-driven Followers

In the survey, Question 8 asked, “What is the purpose of your neighborhood association?” Individuals could answer one of five different nominal and unranked categories of neighborhood well-being, which were: 1. Make my neighborhood safer; 2. Make my neighborhood a friendlier place to live; 3. Make my neighborhood more attractive; 4. Give my neighborhood voice in city politics; and 5. Other. Because the Other category was so small at $n=7$, it was dropped from the model. In H3, each category of the dependent variable for neighborhood well-being is unordered, and a multinomial logit regression model was used to estimate the outcome categories.

H3 uses four categories of the dependent variable of neighborhood purpose as previously discussed. The independent variables are follower motivation of reason for volunteering and what keeps you involved in your neighborhood association. The control variables are years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race. The results for both models show that neighborhood

safety is the largest response and is the base outcome. With active community policing in the Kansas City, Kansas, neighborhoods, and Community Policing Officers attending most neighborhood association meetings, safety is a neighborhood purpose that many neighbors would be likely to choose.

Model 9: Neighborhood Purpose and Reason for Volunteering

Model 9 reports the likelihood of individuals indicating neighborhood purpose of friendliness, attractiveness, or voice in city politics as compared to neighborhood safety and the independent variable, reason for volunteering. The overall model is significant ($X^2=31.33$, $n=266$, $p=0.018$). Specifically in the category of neighborhood friendliness ($b=1.157$ and $p=.01$), white neighbors are more likely to believe the neighborhood purpose is to make the neighborhood friendlier than nonwhite neighbors. The independent variable, reason for volunteering, and the control variables of years lived in the neighborhood and gender are not significant in this category. In the category of neighborhood attractiveness, individuals who have not lived in the neighborhood for long ($b=-0.029$, $p=.05$) and who are male ($b=1.008$ and $p=.05$) are more likely to consider neighborhood attractiveness as the purpose of the neighborhood association. The independent variable, reason for volunteering, and control variable, race, were not significant in this category. In the category of voice in city politics, mission-driven followers ($b=-1.637$ and $p=.01$) are less likely to consider their neighborhood's purpose as a voice in city politics. The control variables years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race were not significant in this category.

Measures of relative effect, such as a relative risk ratio or odds ratio, indicate the outcome of one group relative to the outcome of the other group. As suggested by Bruin (2006), the relative risk ratio uses the exponentiated multinomial logit coefficient to provide an estimate

of relative risk. For a unit change in the predictor or independent variable, the relative risk ratio of the outcome relative to the referent group, which in this model is neighborhood safety, is expected to change by a factor of the respective parameter estimates of neighborhood friendliness, attractiveness, and politics, given the variables in the model are held constant (Bruin, 2006).

Neighborhood safety was used as the baseline for the relative risk ratio. For whites relative to nonwhites, the relative risk for residents believing the purpose of the neighborhood association is to make the neighborhood friendlier, would be expected to increase by a factor of 3.18, holding all other variables constant at their means. In the category of neighborhood attractiveness, for individuals who have lived in the neighborhood a shorter amount of time relative to those who have lived in the neighborhood a long time and believing that the purpose of the neighborhood association is to make the neighborhood more attractive, would be expected to increase by a factor of .971, holding all other variables constant at their means. Also in the category of neighborhood attractiveness, for males relative to females, the relative risk for residents believing the purpose of the neighborhood association is to make the neighborhood more attractive would be expected to increase by a factor of 2.74, holding all other variables constant at their means. In the category of voice in city politics, for mission-driven followers relative to leader-driven followers, the relative risk for residents believing the purpose of the neighborhood association is to give the neighborhood a voice in city politics, would be expected to decrease by a factor of .195, holding all other variables constant at their means.

The questions posed in this hypothesis were to determine if mission-driven followership was significant in a feeling of neighborhood well-being through safety, friendliness, attractiveness, and political voice. The baseline of safety indicates that neighbors perceive

neighborhood safety as neighborhood well-being. With safety as the first topic on most Kansas City, Kansas, neighborhood association meeting agendas, it follows that neighbors are most familiar with neighborhood safety as a purpose for neighborhood associations.

In his social capital research, Putnam (2000) points to high social capital neighborhoods as cleaner, friendlier, and safer. In this research, whites were more likely to consider neighborhood purpose and well-being through a friendlier neighborhood as compared to a safer neighborhood. According to Putnam (2000), friendship is an important component of social capital. Friendship creates the trust between neighbors and the reciprocity of neighbors taking care of each other. Both are important components of social capital.

The question of why whites consider neighborhood purpose as friendlier is more difficult to explain. Leadership, followership, and citizen engagement literature do not address race in neighborhoods in any systemic manner. Putnam (2000) does indicate that the erosion of social capital has influenced all races although less social trust is more prevalent among African Americans. Perhaps whites are looking to neighborhood friendliness as a bridging or bonding of social capital and a way to reach out to nonwhite neighbors.

In the category of neighborhood attractiveness, individuals who lived a shorter amount of time and who are male are more likely to consider neighborhood purpose and well-being through a more attractive neighborhood as compared to a safer neighborhood. In social capital terms, these individuals follow Putnam's (2000) definition of individuals who are most likely to make things happen in the neighborhood. They are more likely to be men who have an informal social connectedness and spend time working on community projects. It stands to reason that these individuals, in particular, would work to make their neighborhood more attractive and consider attractiveness more important than safety because of the social connections they create.

In the category of voice in city politics, mission-driven followers are less likely to consider their neighborhood well-being or purpose as a voice in city politics as compared to neighborhood safety. Putnam (2000), Matthews (1999), and Skocpol and Fiorina (1999) point to overall declining political knowledge and interest at the national level. Voter turnout and grassroots political activity are decreasing. With the diminishing activity in politics at any level, a voice in city politics is not considered a significant purpose for neighborhoods even with mission-driven followers.

Table 22

Model 9: Neighborhood Purpose and Reason for Volunteering

Independent Variable	Neighborhood Safety versus					
	Friendly		Attractive		Politics	
	B (SE)	RRR	B (SE)	RRR	B (SE)	RRR
Volunteer	0.094 (0.478)	.9103	0.226 (0.778)	1.2541	-1.637 (0.546)***	.1945
Years Lived	-0.003 (0.007)	.9972	-0.029 (0.448)***	.9712	-0.011 (0.013)	.9894
Gender	0.098 (0.292)	1.103	1.008 (0.448)**	2.7408	0.429 (0.470)	1.5356
White	1.157 (0.406)***	3.181	-1.365 (0.578)**	1.210	0.613 (0.587)	1.8466
Constant	-1.365 (0.578)**		-1.952**		-0.881 (0.800)	
Pseudo R Squared	0.0527					
Log Pseudolikelihood	-286.14489					
Wald Chi-Square	31.33					
N observations	266					

Notes. Multinomial logit with safety as the base category. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. ***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two-tailed test.

Model 10: Neighborhood Purpose and What Keeps Followers Involved

Model 10 reports the likelihood of individuals indicating neighborhood purpose of friendliness, attractiveness, or voice in city politics as compared to neighborhood safety and what

keeps followers involved. The overall model is significant ($\chi^2=21.66$, $n=271$, $p=0.0415$). Specifically in the category of neighborhood friendliness ($b=.9431$ and $p=.014$), white neighbors are more likely to believe the neighborhood purpose is to make the neighborhood friendlier than nonwhite neighbors, as compared to neighborhood safety. The independent variable, what keeps neighbors involved, and the control variables of years lived in the neighborhood and gender are not significant in this category. In the category of neighborhood attractiveness, individuals who have not lived in the neighborhood for long ($b=-.0244$, $p=.022$) and who are male ($b=1.1360$ and $p=.013$) are more likely to consider neighborhood attractiveness as the purpose of the neighborhood association as compared to neighborhood safety. The independent variable, what keeps neighbors involved, and the control variable, race, are not significant in this category. In the category of voice in city politics as compared to safety, mission-driven followers ($b=-1.1344$ and $p=.021$) are less likely to stay involved in the neighborhood if the purpose is voice in city politics than neighborhood safety. The control variables of years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race are not significant in this category.

Neighborhood safety was used as the baseline for the relative risk ratio. For whites relative to nonwhites, the relative risk for residents believing the purpose of the neighborhood association is to make the neighborhood friendlier, would be expected to increase by a factor of 2.5, holding all other variables constant at their means. In the category of neighborhood attractiveness, for individuals who have lived in the neighborhood a shorter amount of time relative to those who have lived in the neighborhood a long time and believing that the purpose of the neighborhood association is to make the neighborhood more attractive, would be expected to increase by a factor of .976, holding all other variables constant at their means. Also in the category of neighborhood attractiveness, for males relative to females, the relative risk for

residents believing the purpose of the neighborhood association is to make the neighborhood more attractive would be expected to increase by a factor of 3.11, holding all other variables constant at their means. In the category of voice in city politics, for mission-driven followers relative to leader-driven followers, the relative risk for residents believing the purpose of the neighborhood association is to give the neighborhood a voice in city politics, would be expected to decrease by a factor of .322, holding all other variables constant at their means.

As in the previous model, neighbors consider neighborhood well-being a safe neighborhood. This model points to Putnam's (2000) social capital research on neighborhoods that are cleaner, friendlier, and safer. Once again, whites were more likely to consider neighborhood purpose and well-being through a friendlier neighborhood as compared to a safer neighborhood.

Consistent with the previous model in the category of neighborhood attractiveness, individuals who lived a shorter amount of time, and who are male, are more likely to consider neighborhood purpose and well-being through a more attractive neighborhood as compared to a safer neighborhood. These men are new to the neighborhood, want to create social connections, and are willing to jump into neighborhood activities, such as mowing parkways and minor home repairs, to ensure their overall neighborhood is attractive (Putnam, 2000).

In the category of voice in city politics, mission-driven followers are less likely to stay involved in their neighborhood if they consider their neighborhood well-being or purpose is a voice in city politics as compared to neighborhood safety. As Putnam (2000) suggests, individuals are less involved with government and the interest of a neighborhood voice in city politics is waning.

Table 23

Model 10: Neighborhood Purpose and What Keeps Followers Involved

Independent Variable	Neighborhood Safety versus					
	Friendly		Attractive		Politics	
	B (SE)	RRR	B (SE)	RRR	B (SE)	RRR
Volunteer	0.156 (0.431)	1.1683	-0.130 (0.586)	.8780	-1.134 (0.491)**	.3215
Years Lived	-0.003 (0.007)	.9972	-0.024 (0.011)**	.9759	-0.014 (0.012)	.9864
Gender	0.034 (0.288)	1.1034	1.136 (0.457)**	3.1144	0.330 (0.441)	1.3909
White	0.943 (0.383)**	2.5679	0.289 (0.544)	1.3344	0.446 (0.542)	1.5613
Constant	-1.368 (0.579)**		-1.895***		-1.033	
Pseudo R Squared	0.0401					
Log Pseudolikelihood	-295.87918					
Wald Chi-Square	21.66					
N observations	271					

Notes. Multinomial logit with safety as the base category. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. ***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1; two-tailed test.

Overall Discussion of H3

The most significant finding in H3 is that neighbors perceive a safe neighborhood as neighborhood well-being. As previously examined, safety is a topic of great discussion in neighborhood association meetings in Kansas City, Kansas. Community policing officers usually attend every active neighborhood association meeting. With safety first on the agenda for neighborhood associations, it follows that safety would be the primary indicator of neighborhood well-being in this study. It is not clear if a friendly, attractive, or politically active neighborhood could contribute to the feeling of safety or how people decide their neighborhoods are safe.

Perceptions of neighborhood safety vary greatly with socioeconomic conditions in the neighborhoods. What is consistent, as suggested by Loukaitou-Sideris (2006), is that neighborhood safety is more of a concern for women than men. In the present research, minority women, women who live in poor neighborhoods, and older women in general, typically have a higher level of fear in their neighborhoods than other women. With women having a general concern for safety because they are women, it is no wonder neighborhood safety is most important to neighborhood well-being.

As compared to the category of safety in both Models 9 and 10, the independent variables of reason for volunteering and what keeps followers involved are not significant except when mission-driven followers indicate they do not want their neighborhood association to have a voice in city politics. Today, individuals who believe in the mission of the neighborhood and are considered mission-driven followers, care more about neighborhood safety than neighborhood friendliness, attractiveness, or politics. This belief in their neighborhood and wanting to make it a better place to live entices them to become involved and stay involved in their neighborhood regardless of age, length of time in the neighborhood, gender, or race.

The control variables of years lived in the neighborhood, gender, and race were used to determine if there was any correlation of these variables with mission-driven followers and overall neighborhood well-being. These control variables do not appear to influence the outcome of any of the models in H3. For the variables of gender and race, except for race in the category of neighborhood attractiveness, this is consistent with H1 and H2. For the most part, gender and race consistently have no relationship with mission-driven followership and citizen engagement throughout the study. This is compatible with the lack of discussion of gender and race in followership and citizen engagement literature. As previously discussed, the diversity of

Kansas City, Kansas, may also contribute to the lack of significance of race and gender in the models.

The control variable of years lived is statistically significant in both H1 and H2. Its lack of significance in H3 indicates that years lived in a neighborhood is not important to neighborhood purpose and well-being. Citizen engagement rooted in its more traditional trust and reciprocity form of social capital outweighs even the time spent living in a neighborhood. Neighborhood friendliness and neighborhood attractiveness are not significant in this model. This closely resembles citizen engagement literature, which does not highlight either neighborhood friendliness or attractiveness as important components of social capital. More traditional forms of citizen engagement, such as voting, appear to have very little connection to neighborhood friendliness and attractiveness.

The success of building civic community more often occurs through the process of increasing citizen engagement through social capital activities of trust and reciprocity, which expand to bridging the weak ties of social capital through a community that broadly supports democracy and good governance (Chrislip, 2002; Putnam, 2000). Besides safety, significance in the model rests with mission-driven followers who are less likely to want their neighborhoods to have a voice in city politics. Historically, citizen engagement sparked the suffrage and civil rights movements. Through the strong ties and weak ties of social capital, women, blacks, and eighteen-year-olds fought for their right to vote and to have a voice in politics within the United States (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999). The decrease in neighborhood and grassroots political engagement has eliminated a voice in city politics as a general purpose for the neighborhood associations. The next chapter addresses these findings as well as implications of this study and its contributions to the literature.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study has shown a positive relationship between mission-driven followership and citizen engagement. In particular, mission-driven followers are more engaged in their neighborhood associations and communities than leader-driven followers.

Up to this point, research on the concept of followership has been largely limited to discussions of the actions and choices of followers—not what drives them. Followers are described in a series of characteristics from sheep and isolates to star followers and diehards (Kellerman 2008; Kelley 2008). These concepts describe follower actions rather than follower motivation.

This study examined follower motivation to determine why some individuals are more engaged than others in their neighborhood associations. Mission-driven followers—those who choose to be followers—choose to support the leader, choose organizations in which to volunteer, and are more likely to be the courageous, diehard, star followers that Chaleff (2009), Kellerman (2008), and Kelley (2008) describe. These individuals want to be involved and select the organizations in which they engage. Mission-driven followers do not need to be coerced or strong-armed by the leader of the organization to be involved. They readily volunteer and stay involved because they believe in the mission of the organization.

Revisiting the Research Question

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Are mission-driven followers more active and engaged in their neighborhood associations and do they tend to stay more involved in their neighborhood associations than leader-driven followers?

2. Do mission-driven followers perceive more neighborhood association effectiveness than leader-driven followers?

3. How does neighborhood association purpose and well-being influence mission-driven follower motivation?

Results discussed in the previous chapter shed light on all three of these questions. Table 24 restates the hypotheses proposed and whether each hypothesis was supported.

Table 24

Hypotheses and Findings

Hypothesis	Findings
H1: Mission-driven followers are more engaged in the community than leader-driven followers.	Supported
H2: Mission-driven followers will perceive greater neighborhood association effectiveness than leader-driven followers.	Not significant
H3: Mission-driven followers will perceive greater overall neighborhood well-being than leader driven followers.	Partially supported

The survey utilized in the present research examined mission-driven follower motivation of 400 respondents in 25 Kansas City, Kansas, neighborhoods. Regarding research question 1 in H1, there is a direct relationship between mission-driven followers and citizen engagement. Mission-driven followers are more likely to become involved and stay involved with their neighborhood association if they believe in its mission and want to make their neighborhood a better place to live. In both cases, mission-driven followers are motivated by the mission of the neighborhood association.

The second research question, which addresses neighborhood association effectiveness, is examined in H2. Mission-driven followers perceive neighborhood association effectiveness in resolving neighborhood issues but do not perceive neighborhood association effectiveness in keeping neighbors involved in the resolution of neighborhood problems. There appears to be no follower motivation preference when it comes to the perceived effectiveness of neighborhood associations in involving or keeping neighbors involved in their neighborhood associations. In general, mission-driven followers do not volunteer because of their neighborhood association's perceived effectiveness in involving neighbors or resolving issues. Rather, mission-driven followers are engaged because they believe in their neighborhood and want to make it a better place to live.

Research question 3 is addressed with H3. Results show that neighbors are less likely to be mission-driven for any neighborhood association purpose other than safety. Mission-driven followers are not motivated by neighborhood friendliness or attractiveness. Mission-driven followers are even less likely to be engaged in their neighborhood association if their neighborhood's purpose is a voice in city politics. Except for neighborhood safety, the purpose of the neighborhood association does not appear to be significant to mission-driven followers.

Significance of the Findings

Up to this point, follower motivation has not been investigated. The findings of this study show that mission-driven followers are more engaged in neighborhood association activities than leader-driven followers.

Characteristics of Mission-driven Followership and Citizen Engagement

The results of the neighborhood survey indicate that mission-driven followers are more engaged in their community through neighborhood association activities than are leader-driven

followers. This engagement includes attending more neighborhood association meetings and spending more volunteer time in the neighborhood than leader-driven followers. Mission-driven followers are more likely to attend neighborhood association meetings and volunteer because they believe in their neighborhood and want to make it a better place to live. Mission-driven followers are also more apt to become involved and stay involved than leader-driven followers.

For either recruiting or retaining followers, understanding that mission-driven followers become involved because of the organization's mission and stay involved because of that mission provides neighborhood association leaders important information to consider when recruiting neighborhood association members. Individuals who are mission-driven are more likely to volunteer and support the neighborhood association than leader-driven followers. They are also more likely to stay involved than their leader-driven neighbors. With the social capital influence of years lived in the neighborhood as a consideration, neighborhood associations could enhance their citizen engagement with neighbors if they implement new ways to keep mission-driven followers involved over time. Many future research avenues of mission-driven followership can be explored in this regard.

Neighborhood Association Effectiveness

There is no relationship between perceived neighborhood association effectiveness and mission-driven or leader-driven followers. No relationship was found to exist between those who stay involved in their neighborhood association because of mission and neighborhood effectiveness. However, when it comes to resolving neighborhood issues, mission-driven followers perceive greater neighborhood association effectiveness than leader-driven followers. Because mission-driven followers are more involved in their neighborhood associations than

leader-driven followers, this perception is important since it loosely connects mission-driven followers and neighborhood association effectiveness.

This lack of importance of effectiveness seems illogical and may be worth examining further. It does not make sense that people would give of their time to an organization that may not be considered effective in managing funds, programs, or volunteers. At the same time, mission-driven followership appears to trump formal designations of effectiveness. A question of the disconnect between effectiveness of the organization and making a difference in volunteer service exists from the findings in this research and could be explored more fully.

Neighborhood Well-being

Neighborhood purpose and well-being are not associated with mission-driven followers except when it comes to neighborhood safety. In fact, the most significant finding is that mission-driven followers are more likely to become involved with their neighborhood association and stay involved if the neighborhood association's purpose is not to have a voice in city politics. These mission-driven followers are following the national trend of less citizen engagement in politics at any level (Putnam 2000; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999). While neighborhood safety is paramount for most neighbors, neighborhood friendliness and attractiveness do not influence mission-driven followers, and mission-driven followers are only likely to become involved and stay involved in their neighborhood associations when a voice in city politics is not associated with the neighborhood's purpose.

Implication of neighbors' seeming lack of interest in neighborhood friendliness, attractiveness, and politics may not be as significant as it may appear. The Kansas City, Kansas Community Resource Center and Liveable Neighborhoods Department concentrate a great deal on neighborhood safety in service delivery to the neighborhood associations. This may be the

neighborhood association role most neighbors are most familiar with and nothing more. The lack of interest in a neighborhood association voice in city politics could be related to the previously discussed national decline in citizen political engagement or perhaps the general frustration individuals have with Congress, which trickles down to the local level. These questions and the significance in the overall model call for additional evaluation on mission-driven followership and neighborhood purpose.

Implications of the Results

There are three primary implications for leadership, followership, and citizen engagement. Mission-driven followers are more likely to spend time with neighborhood association meetings and activities; they are not influenced by neighborhood association effectiveness; and they are more likely to consider neighborhood safety with regard to neighborhood purpose.

Mission-driven Followership

The primary importance of these findings is that it validates the concepts of mission-driven and leader-driven followership within the study of followership. Through the lens of mission-driven vs. leader-driven followership, neighborhood association leaders and others who are involving followers in activities would most likely want to choose mission-driven followers for their organizations because of their overall commitment to mission. Neighborhood leaders and associations who are able to entice individuals with organizational mission, will find those individuals who want to become involved as well as stay involved because of the organization's mission.

Understanding mission-driven and leader-driven follower motivation in neighborhood associations and other citizen engagement activities will assist leaders and organizations as they

recruit volunteers for activities. Often, the disconnect between volunteer motivation and the mission of the organization leads to failure, no matter how engaged the leader is within the organization. The ability of organizations to match mission and follower motivation will greatly enhance the follower motivation within the organization. This mission match will enable organizations to recruit more volunteers who care about the mission of the organization rather than those who say yes just because the leader asks. Mission-driven followers who choose to volunteer because of the mission are more likely to be more engaged and stay more involved than their leader-driven counterparts. Not only will this make for more engaged volunteers, organizations will have less costs in time and resources invested in recruiting and training volunteers. Those who are mission-driven followers will most likely stay longer with the organization and be more involved than leader-driven followers.

The concept of mission-driven followership can go well beyond the neighborhood associations. For example, the Kansas Leadership Center's Place Based Team has just determined their criteria for providing technical support to local community leadership programs in Kansas (Chrislip & O'Malley, 2013). The criteria include programs that have mission-driven followers. This suggests that organizations that are able to discern the difference between mission-driven and leader-driven followers are able to understand that mission-driven followers are more engaged in their communities and organizations than leader-driven followers.

Neighborhood Association Effectiveness

Neighborhood association effectiveness has limited importance to mission-driven followers. Perceived neighborhood association effectiveness appears to make a difference only for mission-driven followers who believe their neighborhood association is effective in resolving neighborhood issues. As previously discussed, individuals who are mission-driven are more

likely to believe in their neighborhood association and trust that the neighborhood association will resolve issues. Otherwise, perceived neighborhood association effectiveness itself is not something neighbors seem to consider.

For example, a 1995 study of neighborhoods in Wyandotte County, Kansas, confirms that neighborhood association effectiveness is not important to individuals involved in their neighborhoods. The study highlighted many positive stories of successful neighborhood associations and developed criteria for working neighborhood associations (Kamberg, 1995). The criteria had four themes: (a) Hopeful housing conditions, (b) Good neighboring stories, (c) Positive youth/adult interaction, and (d) Common fabric of neighborhood identity. These criteria discuss activities within the neighborhood associations that answered the question: why do neighborhoods work? Nowhere in any of the discussions of successful neighborhood associations was the subject of effective neighborhood associations found. The reason individuals are mission-driven followers is because they believe in their neighborhood and want to make it a better place to live, not to measure neighborhood association effectiveness.

These criteria are more in sync with social capital concepts of trust and reciprocity and bridging and bonding, as previously discussed (Putnam, 2000). Good neighborhood stories, positive youth/adult interaction, and a common fabric of neighborhood identity all point to the trust and reciprocity involved in day-to-day neighborhood life as well as the bonding of social capital within the neighborhoods. Neighborhood association effectiveness is not a consideration of neighbors; rather, believing in the neighborhood and wanting to make a difference carries greater significance for neighbors. It may be that these variables have some causal link to neighborhood association effectiveness over time, but that is not clear from the research results in this study.

This concept extends beyond the discussion of neighborhood associations. A similar discussion is going on nationally about the effectiveness of United Way agencies. Volunteers usually give their time because they believe in the mission of the organization and not because they consider the organization's effectiveness, which ranges from percentage of dollars raised in campaigns that are used for administration to outcome and output measurements. If volunteers want to read stories to school children or help with Meals on Wheels, for example, mission holds greater importance than effectiveness—perhaps in large measure because effectiveness is presumed.

Organizations managing effectiveness for budgeting and funders may also want to consider follower motivation for attracting and keeping volunteers. With an apparent disconnect between formal metrics of organizational effectiveness and follower motivation, individuals who volunteer may care more about the mission of the organization than how effective the organization is from an objective assessment of outputs and outcomes. Speaking the mission-driven language of followers may help increase volunteerism within the organization.

Neighborhood Well-being

Beyond neighborhood safety, overall neighborhood well-being is not significant to mission-driven followers. Neighbors trust each other to watch out for each other and keep their neighborhoods safe. In general, since the roles and purposes of neighborhood associations are so broad, neighborhood purpose and well-being may be much more individualized to mission-driven followers. The breadth of well-being lends itself to the greater social capital concepts of bridging and bonding than more limited notions of neighborhood purpose. As Putnam states, “Strong ties with intimate friends may ensure chicken soup when you are sick, but weak ties with distant acquaintances are more likely to produce leads for a new job” (Putnam, 2000, p. 363).

Mission-driven followers benefit from the strong and weak ties of social capital within their neighborhoods because they are engaged rather than because of the neighborhood association's purpose.

In addition, the Liveable Neighborhoods Department was largely created to address the lack of safety that neighbors were feeling in their neighborhoods and continue to focus many resources on neighborhood safety. Even with that information, additional questions may be raised related to friendly and attractive neighborhoods. Do friendly and attractive neighborhoods contribute to the feeling of safety? Neighbors may have a variety of interpretations of the meaning of safe neighborhood. While safety stood out from friendly, attractive, and voice in city politics variables, it does not tell us how people decide if their neighborhood is safe.

Implications for Leadership and Followership Theory

The addition of mission-driven and leader-driven follower motivation, through a quantitative lens, to the conceptual discussion of leadership and followership, contributes to the emerging scholarship on followership, specifically through neighborhood associations and the investments of neighbors in them. With so few quantitative studies of followership conducted, this study of follower motivation can be inserted into the overall conceptual discussion of followership. Understanding this motivation of followers will help leaders encourage the activity of mission-driven followers in the range of follower engagement. Star followers, as Kelley (2008) describes, may indeed be mission-driven followers who believe in their organization and want to make it better. Sheep, or unengaged followers (Kelley, 2008) are more likely to be leader-driven followers who are engaged only because the leader asks, and the leader usually must continue to ask to get these followers to engage even in a limited way. Actions of followers may be more easily predicted and followers may be more easily engaged through

mission-driven and leader-driven follower designations rather than a general followership typology.

This research may be able to connect broadly to other citizen engagement activities and nonprofit organizations and their followers. From the research, it appears that mission-driven followers would be more desirable as reliable followers and volunteers than leader-driven followers. Attracting and retaining volunteers is a challenge in the nonprofit sector. Volunteer turnover is approximately 20% per year, which results in a large drain on organizational resources, especially for small nonprofit agencies (Hager & Brudney, 2004). With this high turnover of volunteers, nonprofit agencies either spend precious dollars on volunteer recruitment every year, which results in limited resources in other areas, or they go without volunteers when there is not enough money available to train them. A new approach of sustainable volunteer energy is necessary “to attract people into volunteering and keep them volunteering over the life course” (Brudney & Meijs, 2009, p. 576). This new approach could include an examination of mission-driven followership. These followers are not likely to be motivated by the formal measures of effectiveness of the associations or organizations they are committed to—even though they are working towards that goal.

Organizations that can attract mission-driven followers as volunteers will most likely have those volunteers for longer periods of time than leader-driven followers. Mission-driven followers are likely to be more engaged and stay with an organization throughout transitions of management, whereas leader-driven followers engaged because of the leader will most likely not stay with the organization when leadership changes. This mission match of mission-driven followers and organizations can ultimately save organizations significant time and resources in volunteer development and retention, since these followers will more likely provide stability and

longevity in the organization. Those who are leader-driven may provide a short-term solution, but also a revolving door of new volunteers who constantly need orientation and training. Seeking mission-driven followers will provide more engaged volunteers and more stable followers over time.

Implications for Leadership and Followership Practice

The connection of mission-driven followers to increased citizen engagement is clear in neighborhood associations in Kansas City, Kansas. Up to now, there has not been any quantifiable data to suggest that individuals who believe in their neighborhood and want to make it a better place to live are more likely to become engaged and stay involved in their neighborhood associations than leader-driven followers. While neighborhood leaders and volunteers may have some followers who are more engaged than others, they did not have a quantifiable reason to suggest the difference in follower involvement.

Leaders may have a hunch, but not know exactly why some neighborhood associations are vibrant with activities and active followers while others barely exist and beg volunteers to participate in neighborhood activities. Traditional leadership literature points to the leader as critical for the success of an organization or project but does not consider the actions of the followers as critical to the leader (Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky 2009). Followership literature and this study suggest that mission-driven volunteers make an important difference by actively supporting the organization and consequently the action of the leader and the organization.

This study gives neighborhood leaders the concept of mission-driven followership as a tool that can be used to recruit and retain volunteers. Often, when neighborhood association leaders complain that they cannot get anyone to do anything for the neighborhood, the cause may be there are more leader-driven followers who show up when the leader asks as opposed to

mission-driven followers who volunteer because they believe in their neighborhoods.

Neighborhood association leaders could begin the process of attracting mission-driven followers by emphasizing purpose and goals of the involvement—perhaps with an emphasis on neighborhood safety— instead of relying on the difficult process of continually asking leader-driven followers for support.

Importantly, this could also be the case more broadly for nonprofit organizations that rely on followers or volunteers to provide staffing for their organizations. As previously stated, nonprofits and other civic groups who use volunteers as board members or in service delivery functions, should consider recruiting mission-driven followers for their volunteer opportunities. Volunteers who believe in the organization’s mission and want to make it better will most likely be more actively engaged in the organizations they support.

Future Research

Delineating the difference between the autonomous actions of mission-driven and leader-driven followers is the beginning of a new thread of research in followership. With the success of this research, a deeper dive into mission-driven followership including a mixed methods study is warranted. The examination of followership through neighborhood associations, nonprofits, and other groups promoting citizen engagement provides a description of followership which avoids the constraint of focusing on supervisor/subordinate relationships. This same follower population can be used to develop a measurement of follower motivation so scholars do not rely solely on the typology of followers provided by Chaleff (2009), Kelley (2008), and Kellerman (2008).

Beyond the possibilities of more sophisticated followership typologies, future research could lead to development of a mission-driven followership index similar to Arnstein’s (1969)

ladder of citizen participation and Svava and Denhardt's (2010) spectrum of citizen engagement. Mission-driven followership may be more nuanced than a two-fold categorization into mission-driven or leader-driven followers. In that respect, developing a mission-driven followership measurement will inform followership research in the broader dimensions of mission-driven followership and perhaps relate to the citizen engagement continuum from one-way citizen information to citizen engagement empowerment. We may find that actively engaged mission-driven followers support the leader and the mission in concert with each other or that leaders are not a consideration in mission-driven follower motivation. Future research may be able to answer those questions.

Involving leaders in the research of followership could offer an interesting perspective on follower motivation. Leaders observe follower actions and may be able to discern follower motivation to their benefit. Leaders who are able to identify follower motivation may be able to increase the pool of engaged followers active in any given project. In addition, it may be valuable to determine if leaders can distinguish between mission-driven and leader-driven followers. Given the attractive relationship between leader-driven followers and the leader, it may be that leaders would be naturally inclined to minimize the importance of mission-driven followers rather than support them.

Given these possibilities, the area I would be most interested in exploring further is involving leaders in the study of followers. While leaders most likely are able to see the difference in productivity between mission-driven and leader-driven followers, leaders may also co-opt leader-driven followers because of their loyal support rather than their engaged followership. More effective leaders may be able to use the support of engaged mission-driven followers to the benefit of themselves and their project.

Study Limitations

This study was the first empirical venture into research in the concept of mission-driven followership. To begin with, there is limited literature and quantitative studies on followership by which to underpin this research. The neighborhood survey was devised with the use of followership and citizen engagement literature and personal experience working in neighborhoods. In order to engage neighborhood association members, the survey had to be short and to the point in order for neighbors to complete the survey, which limited the number and types of questions asked. While there are some questions that could have been asked differently, especially for coding purposes, the survey did address the critical questions to determine mission-driven follower motivation.

The questions in the survey forced respondents into answering with either a leader-driven or mission-driven follower response. There could be a broader range of followership motivation that exists somewhere between mission-driven and leader-driven. The goal of this project was to quantifiably establish mission-driven and leader-driven followership. As suggested earlier, future research could develop a measurement of follower motivation.

Final Thoughts

This dissertation examined a new concept of mission-driven and leader-driven followership, which I believe is important to the continued study of followership. A survey was developed for this study and administered to 400 neighbors in 25 neighborhood associations within Kansas City, Kansas. This effort took a significant amount of time to coordinate with neighborhood association leaders and to attend 25 different neighborhood association meetings. The result produced a primary source survey of original questions.

Because the concept of mission-driven followership was significant in the research, the examination of mission-driven followership will continue. This firmly places mission-driven followership within the discussion of the relationship between leaders and followers. The growing literature on followership, while it does not displace the importance of leadership, continues to highlight the importance of followership in actively choosing to support the leader and the mission of the organization.

APPENDIX

NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY

Please check one box for each of the following questions:

What is your role in your neighborhood association?

- Neighbor
- Neighborhood association officer
- Neighborhood association volunteer
- Other _____

How often do you attend neighborhood meetings?

- 10 or more meetings per year
- 5-10 meetings per year
- 3-5 meetings per year
- 1-2 meetings per year
- No meetings

How much time do you spend on neighborhood activities?

- None
- 1-2 hours per month
- 3-8 hours per month
- More than 8 hours per month
- Only when the leader asks me

Which better describes the primary reason why you volunteer your time with your neighborhood?

- I believe in my neighborhood and want to strengthen it
- The leader asks me

How many neighbors typically attend the neighborhood association meetings?

- Many neighbors attend meetings
- Some neighbors attend meetings
- A few neighbors attend meetings
- Only the neighborhood officers attend meetings

Since the time you have been familiar with your neighborhood association, how would you rate its effectiveness in involving neighbors?

- Very effective at involving neighbors
- Somewhat effective at involving neighbors
- Not very effective at involving neighbors

What keeps you involved in your neighborhood association?

The neighborhood leaders

I want my neighborhood to be a better place to live

Additional comments _____

What is the primary purpose of your neighborhood association?

Make my neighborhood safer

Make my neighborhood a friendlier place to live

Make my neighborhood more attractive

Give my neighborhood a voice in city politics

Other _____

Since the time you have been familiar with your neighborhood association, how would you rate its effectiveness in dealing with neighborhood issues?

- Very effective dealing with neighborhood issues
- Somewhat effective dealing with neighborhood issues
- Not very effective dealing with neighborhood issues

Approximately how many years have you lived in your neighborhood?

What is the zip code of your residence?

What is your year of birth?

What is your ethnicity?

White

African American

Hispanic

Asian

Other _____

What is your gender?

Male

Female

REFERENCES

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Berry, J. M., Portney, K. E., & Thomson, K. (1993). *The rebirth of urban democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Brehm, J., & Gates, S. (2002). *Working, shirking, and sabotage: Bureaucratic response to a democratic public*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Brudney, J. L., & Meijs, L. (2009). It ain't natural: Toward a new (natural) resource conceptualization for volunteer management. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38, 564-581.
- Bruin, J. (2006). *Newtest: Command to compute new test*. UCLA Statistical Consulting Group. Retrieved from <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/ado/analysis>
- Burke, C. S., Fiore, S. M., & Salas, E. (2003). The role of shared cognition in enabling shared leadership and team adaptability. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 103-116). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burns, J. M.. *Leadership*. (1978). New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Chaleff, I. (1995). *The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Chaleff, I. (2009). *The courageous follower*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler.
- Chrislip, D. D. (2002). *The collaborative leadership fieldbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chrislip, D. D., & O'Malley, E. (2013). *For the common good: Redefining civic leadership*. Wichita, KS: KLC Press.
- City of Kansas City, Kansas. (1976). *Roots: The historic and architectural heritage of Kansas City, Kansas*. E. R. Callendar Printing.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Psychology*, 94, S95-S120.
- Crenson, M. (1983). *Neighborhood politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- de Tocqueville, A. (2012). *Democracy in America*. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund.

- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2006). *The dance of leadership*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Dixon, E. (2003). An exploration of the relationship of organizational level measures of follower behavior. Dissertation. University of Alabama, Huntsville, AL.
- Epstein, P. D., Coates, P. M., & Wray, L. D. (2006). *Results that matter*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fielder, F. E. (1971). Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76(2), 128-148.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 149-190. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Frederickson, H. G. (1980). *New public administration*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Frederickson, H. G., & Smith, K. B. (2003). *The public administration theory primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gardner, J. (1990). *On leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Gotham, K. F. (2002). *Race, real estate, and uneven development: The Kansas City experience, 1900-2000*. Albany, NY: State of New York Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Gurwitt, R. (2002, November). Action figures: Public officials of the year 2002. *Governing: The Magazine of States and Localities*, 16(2), 21-35.
- Hager, M. A., & Brudney, J. L. (2004, June). *Volunteer management practices and retention of volunteers*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belnap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Heifetz, R. (2007). The scholarly/practical challenge of leadership. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership* (pp. 31-44). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23(21), 26-34.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organization behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Hirschman, B. (1989, November 9). Commission to resign. *Wichita Eagle*.
- Hollander, E. P. (2007). Relating leadership to active followership. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership* (pp. 57-66). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hollander, E. P. (2009). *Inclusive leadership: The essential leader-follower relationship*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Howell, J., & Mendez M. (2008). In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organization*, pp. 25-40. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hunter, J. C. (1998). *The servant*. Roseville, CA: Prima Publishing.
- Kamberg, M-L. (1995). *Why neighborhoods work*. Kansas City, KS: Wyandotte County's Economic Development Council Neighborhood Cooperative.
- Kellerman, B. (1999). *Reinventing leadership: Making the connection between politics and business*. Albany, NY: State of New York Press.
- Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Kelley, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business School Review*, 66(6), 142-149.
- Kelley, R. E. (2007).
- Leighninger, M. (2006). *The next form of democracy*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Leland, S. M., & Wood, C. (2010). Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery in local government: The case of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas. In S. M. Leland & K. Thurmaier (Eds.), *City-county consolidation: Promises made, promises kept?* (pp. 245-270). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2006). *Regression models for categorical dependent variable using stata*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2006). Is it safe to walk? Neighborhood safety and security considerations and their effects on walking. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 20, 219-232.
- Lukensmeyer, C. J., & Torres, L. H. (2006). *Public deliberation: A manager's guide to citizen engagement*. Armonk, NY: IBM Center for the Business of Government.
- Mathews, D. (1999). *Politics for people*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Nalbandian, J. (1999). Facilitating community, enabling democracy: New roles for local government managers. *Public Administration Review*, 59, 187-197.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Connor, P. (1994, August 14). Grand jury studying campaign donations to KCK Councilman Frank Corbett is fourth council member under investigation. *Kansas City Star*.
- Putman, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D., & Feldstein, L. M. (2003). *Better together*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Kelly, R. E. (2008). Rethinking followership. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Blumen, J. (Eds.). *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organization* (pp. 5-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Rost, J. C. (2008). Followership: An outmoded concept. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Blumen, J. (Eds.). *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organization* (pp. 53-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Skocpol, T., & Fiorina, M. P. (Eds.). (1999). *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Svara, J. H., & Denhardt, J. V. (2010, May 18). *Promoting citizen engagement and community building*. (White Paper Proposal).
- Tullock, G. (1965). *The politics of bureaucracy*. Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press.
- Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas. (2011). *Welcome to Wyandotte County neighborhoods*. Kansas City, KS: Author.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). American fact finder. *ACS demographic and housing estimates*. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml

Wooldridge, J. M. (2000). *Introductory econometrics: A modern approach*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.