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SUMMARY

Since 1990, midwestern United States satellite cities—small cities located on the fringes of larger metropolitan communities—have experienced dramatic shifts in the racial demographics of their African American and Latino populations. These population changes impact the strategic choices of nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities in these communities. Utilizing an embedded mixed-methods case study approach, this study examines strategic actions and choices of three agencies engaged in community development activities in a single midwestern American satellite city. The research aims to apply and, as appropriate, extend Oliver’s (1991) theoretical typology of organization responsiveness to the satellite city environment by incorporating strategic responses drawn from comprehensive community change models in community development literature.

The study results identify the racial change in Latino and African American populations, as well as a potential mismatch between social service agency headquarters and the geographic locations of the most profound racial changes. Environmental and institutional antecedents for responsiveness in these communities are examined, before identifying strategic programmatic responses displayed by the organization. Study results indicate that nonprofit agencies in this satellite city environment employ passive or adaptive strategies to responsively address program-related issues that arise as a result of racial demographic changes in their community. As racially based migration patterns continue to increase the minority populations in these communities, the study results will have implications for nonprofits and community service planning in these geographies.
INTRODUCTION

A. Overview

As urban metropolitan areas in the United States become increasingly diverse, nonprofit organizations engaged in community development and human service activities must address the varied needs of racially diverse community residents and stakeholders (Berrey 2005; Burayidi 2000; Qadeer 2003). Population projections from the 2010 decennial census estimate that by 2020, more than 30% of the residents of the 15 largest US metropolitan regions will be members of ethnic minority groups (Balcazar et al. 2014). This diversity reflects the steady increase in African American and Latino suburban residents between 1990 and 2010 (Orfield 2006; Johnson 2006). Similar increases in racial minority population have also been noted in small cities and towns surrounding large metropolitan regions in the United States, including New York, Los Angeles, Houston, and Chicago (Johnson 2015). In metropolitan Chicago alone, between 1990 and 2000, the Hispanic population doubled from 8% to 16%, while the White population declined from 71% to 60% (US Census Bureau 1990, 2000, 2010). In addition, research shows increased concentrations of Black and Latino populations in suburban Cook and Will Counties during the same time (Orfield 2006).

Since the 1990s, urban development patterns have contributed to significant racial and ethnic demographic shifts in entire urban metropolitan regions, challenging the infrastructure and institutions of communities located at the fringes of urban areas (Orfield 2006). These significant racial demographic changes in satellite cities herald notable challenges for community development institutions and systems in these areas.
Representing a distinct concept in urban planning landforms, satellite cities are small cities or towns located at the periphery of larger urban metropolitan areas (Taylor 1999).

Satellite cities are defined by the following other characteristics:

• Predate the metropolis’s suburban expansion
• Partially independent from major city economically and socially
• Physically separated from major city by rural territory or a major geographic barrier such as a large river
• Their own independent urbanized area, or equivalent
• Their own bedroom communities
• A traditional downtown surrounded by traditional “inner city” neighborhoods

(Taylor 1999)

Examples of satellite cities in Illinois include Aurora, Peoria, Rockford, and Joliet. Because these communities have fewer resources and more limited infrastructure than larger urban communities, they are challenged to appropriately respond to the changing social service and community development needs of their residents. Nonetheless, like their larger urban counterparts, satellite city community development systems must respond to community racial change through interventions and strategies that allow “distressed communities to thrive” (Auspos et al. 2010). These responsive changes and strategies are implemented throughout the community development system and involve many social actors, including government, funders, nonprofit organizations, and community constituents.

This dissertation explores how racial demographic change in a single midwestern satellite city affects the strategic programming choices of a particular social actor, nonprofit social and human service agencies engaged in community development activities and how and why these organizations respond to these externally driven challenges. The specific research question this project addressed is:
In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community?

The research question was examined via three specific sub-questions:

1. How did racial demographic change affect the social service landscape for nonprofits engaged in community development activities in Joliet from 2000 to 2010?

2. What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in the satellite city?

3. When confronted with racial demographic change in the satellite city, what strategic programming strategies do nonprofit community development organizations select to respond?

This study explored the response to these queries by uncovering the constructed relationship between the nonprofits, their strategic programing choices, and the racial demographic changes occurring in the organizations’ external environment. To examine the relationship, I applied elements of organizational development literature and community development literature to construct a framework for the phenomenon of nonprofit responsiveness to racial demographic change in a satellite city environment.

B. **Nonprofit Organizations and External Change**

To extend the understanding of strategic responsiveness to the specific case of nonprofit organizations in this environment, it is necessary to develop a common understanding of the history and work of the agencies featured in this study. Acknowledging the financial, legal, and cultural contexts in which nonprofit agencies operate, this study features nonprofit organizations that have distinct missions and conduct different community
development activities via their programs, including historic preservation, community organizing, youth development, disabilities-related housing, and educational support.

In the United States, nonprofit organizations operate in many contexts and undertake a variety of social and cultural activities. Because activities and constituents at these organizations may change over time, this dissertation utilizes the structural-organizational definition of nonprofit agencies proposed by Salamon and Anheier (1997). By their definition, a nonprofit organization is:

- Organizational, or institutionalized
- Nongovernmental
- Nonprofit, or not providing monetary benefit to their members
- Self-governing
- Voluntary

(Salamon and Anheier 1997)

In addition to these individual characteristics, US nonprofit agencies operate within a historical framework that is designed to provide legitimacy and accountability for their work. Current US nonprofit organizations participate in a wide variety of community development activities that were once controlled by the government or via religious charities (Hansmann 1987). These activities include housing, historic preservation, social welfare, cultural activities, job training, and economic development (Salamon and Anheier 1997). As nonprofit organizations began to adopt these governmental roles, their social function and programs advanced to focus on professionalized human service provision and community development needs. In return, the agencies received 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status and preferential access to government funding to fulfill these government-sanctioned roles (Salamon and Anheier 1997). As a result, nonprofits are considered by many scholars to provide distinct benefits to the
community and its residents, fulfilling community needs through direct-service social and cultural programs, operating within poor communities and encouraging public participation among marginalized community residents, and identifying emerging needs of the poor and disenfranchised, as well as being flexible, open to innovation, and less hindered by government bureaucracies and procedures.

In the disciplines of community and organization development, literature on nonprofit organizations and their social roles has largely utilized the political economy framework. In these disciplines, scholars have considered nonprofit organizations more agile and cost-effective in community development program efforts than private or government agencies. On the other hand, some scholars and policy makers have been skeptical of the nonprofit sector’s ability to effectively deliver community development services and their accountability to other social actors, including donors, government, and constituents. Views of nonprofits and their social legitimacy to engage in their work receive considerable attention in literature of various academic disciplines. This dissertation concentrates specifically on the strategic and operational choices these organizations make in response to external racial demographic change.

In the United States, nonprofit organizations are active in many social and human service fields. Community development nonprofits vary from the multiservice community development organizations to satellite agencies engaged in historic preservation efforts to agencies with a specific mission to serve disenfranchised community residents, like the settlement houses of the early 1900s. Structurally, nonprofits engaged in community
development activities also vary in size, constituency, outreach to constituents, donor relations, professionalization, and organizational structure (Shehada 2010).

The unique context of nonprofits engaged in community development activities in the satellite city provides a heuristic case for examining how these agencies respond to an external environment characterized by profound racial change. As in other satellite cities in the Midwest during the study period, Joliet’s nonprofit organizations were acting in a highly political environment characterized by decreases in available resources. The recession of the mid-2000s impacted the availability of community development funds and social services throughout the United States. This was especially true in Illinois, where the state budget lost both community development and social service funding during the period from 2005 to 2010. In fact, the 2009 Illinois state budget was noted for its cuts in several social and human service areas. Despite these constraints, there was profound growth in human and social service organizations in the satellite city area of the study as well as in smaller US communities during the years 1990 to 2010. As the Great Recession of the mid-2000s impacted Joliet, its nonprofit organizations adapted to the changes by restructuring programs, staffing, or their physical location. Nonprofit organizations in the area remained available to serve constituents by adjusting their programming to meet new consumer demands and changing funder requirements and forging partnerships to address external changes.

In the satellite city environment, nonprofit organizations fulfill important social service roles. When confronted with change, these nonprofits seemed to respond by “buckling down to serve consumers/constituents” (WGCIL staff member, interview). This response to profound
environmental demographic changes often preceded herculean efforts by agency and community leaders to maintain the agency’s programming for constituents. The drive of agency and community leaders to maintain programming in the face of dramatic community changes and unfavorable funding constraints led to this researcher’s interest in the topic and study.

C. Theoretical Frameworks for Responsiveness

This study applies and further develops an existing theoretical framework and typology for understanding how organizations strategically respond to external change. Existing research about the organization-environment relationship provides information about external pressures on organizations and how they may react to these pressures (Oliver 1991). The literature review for this dissertation couples organizational development and community development literatures into a single framework that examines these processes. Combining the two perspectives on organizational change allows for more thorough examination of a community development–related nonprofit organization’s interpretation of and reactions to environmental change. Because the different theoretical perspectives of these frameworks describe varying levels of uncertainty about other social structures and actors in the agency’s environment, the emergent framework provides a more comprehensive view of the nonprofit agency’s behavior. The premier existing organizational development framework for agency responsiveness to external change was developed in 1991 by Christine Oliver, who used a political economy framework for addressing external change that combined elements of institutional theory and resource dependence theory into a single behavioral typology. The first of these theories, institutional theory, emphasizes social expectations, norms, and values in the relationship between organizations and their environment. The environment in this case represents institutions, other
social actors, behavioral norms, and social expectations in the community. Institutional theory asserts that organizations are a product of this environment responding to change to maximize their influence and standing in their environment. However, the theory does not fully incorporate the dynamic relationship between nonprofit organizations and their environment when applied to the satellite city. Specifically, the theory fails to adequately address two areas in this environment: the organization’s dependence on and solutions to utilizing external resources to fulfill its mission and work, and the organization’s ability to adapt to ensure the survival of its mission and work. Both of these complexities can profoundly influence the organization’s legitimacy and survival within the community.

The second theory utilized in Oliver’s typology is resource dependence theory, which addresses the challenges associated with institutional theory more directly. This theory of addressing change builds on the context of open-systems theory, which postulates that, when faced with environmental change, organizations will partner with other social actors and institutions in the environment to ensure their own survival. Resource dependence theory describes a wide range of environmental responses based on the availability of fiscal resources, including suppliers and customers, to the organization. However, resource dependence theory does not focus on the role played by cultural or social expectation in the selection of behavior and partnerships. Because nonprofit organizations are culturally embedded, often based on ideological values, and seen as the protector of social and cultural values (DiMaggio and Anheier 1990), they must navigate competing and contradictory sociocultural values and expectations among their constituents and stakeholders. Thus, nonprofits must both provide resources and satisfaction to diverse groups of stakeholders to ensure their survival, social influence, and legitimacy in the community.
Many researchers have acknowledged the complementary nature of resource dependence and institutional theories. Oliver (1991) provided an analytical structure for examining interactions between nonprofit organizations and their external environments based on both institutional and resource dependence theories. Her analytical framework combined the predictors of organization environment, which will induce strategic responses from the agency, with the actual behavioral strategic responses of the organization, from passive to active. Oliver’s typology of responsiveness defined five environmental conditions that promote responses: constituents, cause, context, content, and coercion. She also delineated five strategic responses displayed by organizations confronted with external change: acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, denial, and manipulation. Based on a political economy framework, both institutional and resource dependence theories advance the idea that organizations engage with external social actors—whether people, organizations, or institutions—to maximize their resources or influence in their environment. However, in smaller environments with dwindling resources, these responses are often impractical. Within this more limited environment and with its emphasis on the political economy framework, Oliver’s typology may overlook certain specific responses of nonprofit organizations in the satellite city reacting to external environmental stresses such as racial demographic change.

Comprehensive community building initiatives (CCBI) theory, from community development literature of the early 2000s, offers a different approach to environmental change. In this perspective, various social players in the environment are viewed as contributors to a wider community. The CCBI perspective assumes that organizations will join together to define community challenges, create solutions, and enact strategies to address them (Auspos and
Kubisch 2010). Drawing from a social ecology framework, CCBI theory offers additional strategic responses that focus on coordination of resources with other social actors in the environment to collectively address external changes while maintaining agency goals and core competencies. Comprehensive community building initiatives literature focuses on the development of adaptive coordination between agencies, featuring tactics such as collaboration and capacity building to address external change and resulting programming challenges.

The combination of CCBI theory and Oliver’s typology creates a comprehensive framework that considers conflict between organizations as well as adaptive partnerships to respond to change. This framework is displayed in Figure 1.
In the above figure, the area within the dotted-line frame represents the combined analytical framework that will be built in Chapter II. The gray boxes display the environmental antecedents identified by Oliver that precede her response strategies, which will also be examined as part of this study.

D. Research Design Approach

The research design incorporates the development of a multi-tiered inquiry aimed at uncovering the extent of racial change in the environment and then focusing on organizational
conditions (antecedents) and strategic programming responses to this change. The overall research question guiding this study is:

In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community?

The research question will be answered using three phases of interrelated inquiry, described in TABLE I.

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Sub-Question</th>
<th>Primary Methodology</th>
<th>Units of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How did racial demographic change affect the Joliet social service landscape from 2000 to 2010?</td>
<td>Mixed-methods (geospatial and quantitative) case study</td>
<td>City of Joliet and its administrative districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in the satellite city?</td>
<td>Case study approach to identify institutional antecedents for responsiveness</td>
<td>Three sampled nonprofit agencies in the city of Joliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>When confronted with racial demographic change in the satellite city, what strategic programming strategies do nonprofit community development organizations select to respond?</td>
<td>Case study approach to identify strategic responses</td>
<td>Three sampled nonprofit agencies in the city of Joliet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research question explored was, “In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community?”

Utilizing a social constructivist research viewpoint, the mixed-methods research design featured a case study approach to examine the phenomenon of responsiveness to racial demographic change (Creswell 2016). The first research phase developed a case study of racial demographic change and the geospatial nature of nonprofit services in the satellite city of Joliet, Illinois, using quantitative and geospatial data. This research inquiry established the racial
demographic changes in the environment and provided evidence of a mismatch between nonprofit social and human services and the presence of racial minority populations in the area.

The second phase of research utilized qualitative interview data and organization/community documents to establish the environmental antecedents of nonprofit change. The third research phase employed qualitative interview data and organization/community documents and databases to explore the phenomenon of responsiveness to racial demographic change in these agencies.

The organizations were purposively sampled based on their community development programming activity, their participation in a local community planning process, and their engagement with African American and Latino constituents.

To guide the research design and analysis, the study utilizes a modified analytical framework based on Oliver’s association of organization characteristics with their responsiveness to external change (Oliver1991). In the dissertation’s literature review, Oliver’s model will be extended to include an additional organizational response from the CCBI theoretical approach. In addition to interviews with organization staff, the data collection included interviews with individuals in local government, nonprofit agencies, community leaders, and others. Agency and community staff, constituents, and leaders participated in focus groups to gather additional data. Organizations also provided documents and archives that supplied information about their strategic tactics. The data collection took place from October 2007 to January 2012.
These data were analyzed using a model of analytic induction where collected data were analyzed based on the research question, and the question was then extended based on analytical categories and observed organizational behaviors that were not identified in the existing framework. The phenomenological approach to data analysis of the organizations/cases included analysis of responsiveness within each organization. Conclusions were drawn from simultaneous analysis across all three organizations.

E. Outline of Dissertation

The dissertation unfolds in seven chapters. The current chapter provides the problem statement, briefly identifies background information on nonprofit agencies and the theoretical framework for the study, and provides an outline of the dissertation. Chapter II begins with a review of the relevant literatures, combining community change and organizational development traditions that have not previously been utilized in the same conceptual framework for responsiveness to external demographic changes. The relationship between organizations and their environment is described, presenting the political economy and social ecology frameworks and ultimately turning to resource dependence theory and institutional development theory. Oliver’s (1991) typology of responsiveness is presented, detailing the environmental antecedents and organizational strategic responses available to organizations confronted with external environmental stressors. Finally, the CCBI theory from community development literature is presented to introduce additional analytical categories for organizational responsiveness to external environmental change in smaller environments such as the satellite city.
Chapter III presents the three-part research design and approach, which relies on both
deductive and inductive analytical techniques. The research adopts a mixed-methods
phenomenological and case study approach to the project. The chapter also discusses the
selection of methodologies, data collection, and analysis techniques.

Chapters IV, V, and VI present the results for each research sub-question in the study.
Drawing from the US Decennial Census and National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS)
data, Chapter IV documents the changing racial terrain and social service landscape of the city of
Joliet from 1990 to 2010. The chapter also describes the two distinct analysis periods of the
study. Chapters V and VI introduce and present the results of the analysis of the phenomenon of
responsiveness in these organizations. Chapter V focuses on organizational antecedents of
responsiveness, filling an identified gap in Oliver’s framework of the organizational conditions
necessary to induce responsive strategies to external change. Chapter VI presents Oliver’s
models of responsiveness as they apply within and across the study organizations. Chapter VI
also identifies a new response strategy, adaptive coordination, which was previously unidentified
in Oliver’s framework.

Finally, Chapter VII analyzes the organizational responsiveness of the three Joliet
nonprofit community development organizations, and identifies commonly utilized response
strategies across satellite city agencies addressing racial change. The chapter concludes by
considering the significance of this research for policy and planning, as well as the theoretical
contributions of this work to community development, organizational development, and
nonprofit studies.
F. Summary

Since 1990, midwestern United States satellite cities—small cities located on the fringes of larger metropolitan communities—have experienced dramatic shifts in the racial demographics of their populations. The impact of these shifts has affected the strategic choices of nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities. This study explores the strategic actions and choices of three such organizations, extending Oliver’s (1991) theoretical typology to satellite city environments.
II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT

A. Overview

The nonprofit agencies and their strategies for responsiveness were studied during the implementation of a comprehensive community building initiative focused on improving the quality of life of racial minority residents of Joliet, Illinois. Most current literature about nonprofit organizations’ strategies and tactics when confronted with community change focuses on gentrifying urban neighborhoods and comprehensive community change efforts (Nyden et al. 1996; Davila 2002; Freeman 2008; Kubisch et al. 2008). This project aims to extend academic understanding of responsiveness to racial demographic changes by nonprofit agencies in satellite city environments by understanding the unique strategies and roles utilized by three specific nonprofit human service agencies attempting to navigate demographic and racial change in Joliet.

The literature review in this chapter extends existing analytical frameworks for responsiveness of nonprofit agencies and other social actors as they address racial change in their satellite city environment. The literature was selected to understand the existing theoretical and normative frameworks regarding the relationship between organizations—specifically nonprofit human service organizations—and their external environment. To develop an appropriate analytical framework for organizational responsiveness, the literature review utilizes three distinct traditions of scholarship that define the relationship between organizations and their environment. Current organizational theory, deriving from political economy models of behavior—institutional theory and resource dependence theory—provides a historical and
developmental understanding about relationships between organizations and their environment. Community development literature provides a conceptual framework with which to extend the existing understanding of the organizations’ responses to change in their external environment. Each of the literatures presents a distinct view of organizations and therefore a different understanding of responses to environmental change; when combined, they span a continuum of behavioral strategies with which these organizations approach racial demographic changes in smaller and nonurban communities.

Current theoretical models in organizational development literature largely adopt a political economy viewpoint to explain how organizations respond to external demographic changes. Two theories associated with the political economy viewpoint, institutional theory and resource dependence theory, form the backbone of a widely utilized general analytical framework developed in the 1990s by Harvard University business psychology professor Christine Oliver. Oliver’s model combined common theoretical traditions utilized in business psychology to understand behaviors and strategies organizations develop in response to external pressures. Since then, many scholars have applied Oliver’s model of responsiveness to a variety of organizations, including nonprofits, corporate firms, and health care organizations (De Silva 2014; Darnell 2008; Kostova and Roth 2002). This literature review presents the theoretical and analytical history of Oliver’s framework, including the political economy approach to change in nonprofit organizations. After presenting the development of Oliver’s model, the literature review presents a critique of the model and its application to community development organizations and the satellite cities.
One critique of Oliver’s model for organizational responsiveness is that it focuses on critical theory–based response patterns, which may not be applicable in smaller community environments and amidst rapid racial change. Thus, the literature review introduces additional responsive strategies associated with CCBI, a community development normative model. Drawn from community development theory, CCBI response strategies emphasize cross-sector alliances and coordination of programming efforts to address external environmental changes. When coupled, Oliver’s model and the CCBI framework describe a continuum of behavioral strategies from denial to collaboration to understand organizational responsiveness to changes in minority racial density in their communities.

Housed in business psychology literature, Oliver’s analytical framework of strategic responsiveness presents specific internal strategies used by nonprofits and other organizations to mitigate conflict in their external environment, from acquiescence to manipulation. Building on the theoretical assumptions of political economy, Oliver utilized resource development theory and institutional theory to understand environmental change. Oliver’s analytical framework, although useful for analyzing organization behaviors, does not acknowledge completely the need for partnerships with other agencies in program development and execution. I argue that the community development model of CCBI can be combined with Oliver’s framework to extend it to satellite city nonprofit human services organizations to understand additional strategic responses that emerge in the satellite city environment. Figure 2 provides an overview of the theoretical evolution of the proposed analytical model for this study.
The response strategies highlighted in Oliver’s framework draw from the political economy–influenced resource dependence and institutional development theories of organization behavior, presenting a competitive model of response to external change. These roles paint only a partial picture of the response strategies available to agencies in satellite cities, where limited environmental resources and infrastructure make cooperation and adaptation necessary (Auspos and Kubisch 2004; McArdle 2002; Orfield 2002; Reardon and Yun 2003). The roles for agencies in CCBI community change literature and projects suggest additional response strategies (and tactics) for human service agencies in these environments. These may include cooperative and adaptive strategies, such as collaboration, partnership formation, and capacity building. Ultimately, CCBI literature—related to community change
theories in community development literature—suggests strategic roles for nonprofit agencies in addition to those described by Oliver’s political economy–based model of responsiveness.

B. Organizations and the Environment: A Historical Overview of Hierarchical and Political Economy–Based Models

Many current organization development theories acknowledge that the external environment is an important consideration when studying nonprofit behavior (Meyer and Rowan 1977; Pfeffer and Salancik 2003; Connell and Kubisch 1998). These theories propose that an organization’s behavior is influenced by complex hierarchical relationships with many other environmental social actors (Meyer and Rowan 1977). However, until the 1960s, classic management theory emphasized closed-systems models, which focused almost exclusively on the internal environment and operations of organizations (Hatch 1997). Organizational behavior and development literature from the pre-1960 era depicted organizations as entirely separate from their surrounding environment (Suchman 1995). For the most part, those theories did not account for external socio-cultural influences on the operations or behaviors of the organizations. Instead, organizations were portrayed as rational machines designed for efficient production of social products (Scott and Meyer 1998).

In organization development and business psychology literatures during the 1960s, open-system, social ecology–influenced theoretical models replaced the accepted closed-systems models of organization behavior. In this era, theories of “loose coupling” and the “garbage can model” of decision-making advanced by Cohen et al. (1972) replaced normative theories of rationality that had dominated literature on organizational behavior (Shehada 2010;
Meyer and Rowan 1978). The new theories recognized the important influence of external factors on organization behavior (Hatch 1997). Introduced by Katz and Kahn (1966), open-systems theory was grounded in biology-influenced social ecology systems theory. In their 1966 book, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, Katz and Kahn argued that traditional closed-systems frameworks produced an artificially stable view of the organization that belied the dynamic influence of the environment. Further, they advanced the idea that modern organizations operate not according to traditional bureaucratic hierarchy, but with the dynamic characteristics of biological systems.

Operating in an ever-changing external environment, the organization must necessarily interact with that environment in a manner that promotes its internal resources, including power, money, and the environment. In this view, the community development system in which the organization operates is similar to a living biosphere, with organizations frequently exchanging materials, money, or resources across permeable boundaries within the system. In this context, to respond to change, the organizations in an environment will choose one of two strategic responses—accommodating the environmental change internally by changing their operations or mission, or attempting to influence the environmental change through externally directed operations such as advocacy or partnerships (Katz and Kahn 1978). This acknowledgement of environmental influence on nonprofit behavior foreshadowed a considerable shift in organization theory from the model of organizations as closed systems that were not concerned with their environments.
The acceptance of open-systems theories by the 1970s led the diverse literature about the relationship between organizations to be grouped into three theoretical perspectives: social ecology theory, resource dependence theory, and institutional theory. These theoretical frameworks primarily focused on analysis of the relationship between organizations and their environment, shifted from internal organization characteristics toward the effect of external events (Meyer and Rowan 1977). The initial effect of this shift appeared in contingency theory, a major theoretical stream that provided early understanding of organizations’ effectiveness in managing dynamic and multifaceted external environments.

Contingency theory posited that an organization’s structure is determined by its external environment (Meyer and Rowan 1977). Stable external settings foster static organizations that favor routine activities and hierarchical, bureaucratic forms. On the other hand, rapidly changing environments promote organic organizations characterized by flexible internal operations. Because these organizations are less specialized, they are able to adapt to changing external circumstances without the constriction of the formal and hierarchical structures of their more traditional counterparts (Meyer and Rowan 1977). However, by the 1980s, the debate between adherents of open-systems, closed-systems, and contingency theory was supplanted by an increasing recognition of the influence of environmental context on organization behavior.

Disagreeing with previous theories that emphasized the internal organizational structure, Meyer and Rowan (1977) contended that organizations are products of their environment and shaped by social and political influences (Shehada 2010). Hatch (1997) further advanced that an organization is an interactive “organism” that is both a product and a component of its external
environment. This shift eventually gave rise to three major theoretical streams that recognized the effect of environmental changes on organization behavior: resource dependence, institutional development, and social ecology theories, which eventually gave rise to CCBI theoretical streams. In the 1980s and 1990s, business psychology resource dependence and institutional development theories emphasized that organizations seek to maximize their own resources during times of change.

Also during the 1980s and 1990s, social ecology theory emerged in community development literature, acknowledging the importance of complex, multifaceted community solutions, organizational partnerships, and internal capacity building that could occur within organizations as a result of external community change. Resource dependence theory and institutional theory, both based on open-systems and political economy frameworks, form the backbone of Oliver’s framework for organizational responsiveness.

1. **Resource dependence theory**

The acknowledgement of external influences on the organization is a cornerstone of open-systems theories. In open-systems theories, organization choices and actions are deeply connected to the social context in which the organization operates. In this view, the environment is considered to strongly influence the organization’s strategic actions. Regarding open-systems theories, Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) stated:

> What happens in an organization is not only a function of the organization, its structure, its leadership, its procedures, or its goals. What happens is also a consequence of the environment and the particular contingencies and constraints from that environment. (p. 3)
In their definition, an organization’s external surroundings “encompass[es] every event in the world that may potentially have an effect on the organization’s activities (p. 3)”. As such, they identify three essential components of the relationship between the organization and its environment. These three components, as applied to the community development system of this research project, are depicted in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Pfeffer and Salancik’s (2003) organization-environment relationship in community development systems

The first component of Pfeffer and Salancik’s model of the organization’s relationship with its external environment is the vast system of organizations and individuals that work in the same environmental arena as the organization. In the case of this study, this arena is the
Joliet community development system. The second component comprises social actors with whom the organization directly works. Accordingly, the first and second components represent the organization’s transactional or influential behaviors. The final level is the “constructed environment,” the perception of the organization held by others within its environment (p. 63). Thus, the organization’s social environment is partially constructed by the organizations and other social actors in the community development system. This construction may not be known completely to the organization itself, creating a dissonance between the organization’s internal perception and the external reality (Hudock 1995). This discrepancy can influence how the organization interacts with the environment and how the organization understands its role and behavior within that environment (Hudock 1995; Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). Resource dependence theory offers insight into the factors that influence these relationships.

In Pfeffer and Salancik’s 2003 formulation of resource dependence theory, three factors can influence an organization’s decisions in regard to its relationship with the external environment:

1. **interdependence** between organizations and other social actors in the environment;
2. the organization’s **strategic choices** in response to the external environment; and
3. the **power** dynamics within the environment and the organization itself.

(Pfeffer and Salanik 2003, p.40–2)

These three themes, applied to nonprofits and environmental change, are applied below.

a. **Interdependence**

Interdependence in social systems is seen whenever one social actor relies on other actors in the system to obtain resources necessary for its survival and to achieve its goals
(Pfeffer and Salancik 2003, p. 40). An organization’s requirements for physical, fiscal, and information-based resources, especially during times of external change, when the environment and social actors are in a state of flux, mandate that the organization interact with external social actors. With each actor vying for resources amid environmental instability, defined by Pfeffer and Salancik to be “the degree to which future states of the world cannot be anticipated and accurately predicted” (p. 67), a network of interdependent social actors ensures the flow of these resources throughout the system.

During periods of profound external change, the social environments are in flux, with uncertain outcomes for any one social actor. These environments change with resources and as other organizations enter and exit the environment; existing organizations and other social actors must address their capability to respond to the changes and meet the demands of external social actors. Many organizations address these challenges by participating in multiple partnerships to avoid reliance on any one relationship. However, this strategy may produce competing requirements and alliances for the organization that create additional stress. According to Pfeffer and Salancik, an organization may be influenced by its dependence on particular social actors, compared to others, in its attempts to address competing demands or requirements of the environment. This range of interdependencies encompasses everything from contractual and formal relationships with accrediting organizations, governing bodies, and regulatory agencies to less formal programmatic and advocacy-based partnerships.

Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) identified three factors that determine how dependent an organization is on the resources of other organizations and the environment: the organization’s
reliance on the resources for its survival or maintenance; the relationship between its current and future stakeholders and the resources; and the availability of alternative resources, including the extent to which the resource is controlled by the organization’s partners. An organization’s vulnerability to environmental uncertainty is largely determined by its ability to navigate these changes of resource availability. Ultimately, to ensure its continuity in the environment, the organization must address resource changes within the environment in its programming and operations.

b. **Strategic decision-making**

Resource dependence theory also advances the idea that an organization may react to its environment through its strategic decision-making. Organizations adjust to environmental change either by changing their own behavior or attempting to change the environment. According to Pfeffer and Salancik, a prime result of organizational adaptation to the environment is *isomorphism*, similarity among different organizations in the system. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) further observed that organizations that participate in coalitions may change their goals and activities to accommodate changes within the environment. To such organizations, survival strategies include

- altering their purposes and domains to accommodate new interests, sloughing off parts of themselves to avoid some interests, and when necessary, becoming involved in activities far afield from their stated central purposes. (p. 24)

Financial resources and philanthropic strategies are two factors that drive the strategic choices of nonprofit social service organizations. When environmental conditions make charitable contributions scarce, these agencies may sacrifice their autonomy to ensure funding
for their survival (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003, p. 177). In the case of regulatory or compliance-based relationships, organizations may rely on “a variety of strategies . . . undertaken to somehow alter the situation confronting the organization to make compliance less necessary (Pfeffer 1982, p. 197)”. For example, during the study period in Joliet, nonprofit organizations and churches formed a coalition to develop the Quality of Life Plan for the Fourth and Fifth Council Districts with the City. This coalition continued as a way to allow community residents to work with the city after the study period.

Noncompliance with the demands of other partners can ensure autonomy over the organization’s strategic decisions related to adaptation to environmental change. However, this autonomy can threaten the organization’s survival or ability to serve its mission and constituents. Resource dependence theory provides a selection of potential organizational responses to demands of external social actors. An organization confronted by change in the environment may wish to individually control its resources (such as flagship programs) through outright ownership or acquisition. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) suggested that because this type of control may be difficult to achieve because of complex environments and/or associated costs, an organization may attempt to partially control access to the resources through mechanisms such as co-optation, joint ventures and programs, extended influence, and mergers with other groups (Aldrich and Pfeffer 1976; Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). Such partnerships with other groups enhance the organization’s social legitimacy, provide inroads to environmental information, and may facilitate the acquisition of further financial resources from funders and stakeholders. These agreements may influence continued mutual dependencies and increase the likelihood of social stability for all organizations involved via newly formed social
collaborations and partnerships (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). At the same time, entering into such collaborative agreements requires an organization to abandon some actual or perceived control of its internal environment and programs. The tension between the organization’s desire to control environmental resources and the uncertainty of interdependency influences its relationships with other actors in the social system. Additional strategies for controlling the environment are advocacy or co-opting of other social organizations and actors in the community.

c. **Power**

The third major theme of resource dependence theory is power. Resource dependence theory views social power as based on interdependency, with the organizations that control the most important and limited resources in the social system having the most power or social influence. Organizations that control resources are often able to enforce their interests and policies upon other social actors and organizations in the community development system; those that depend on other social actors for their survival are less able to wield their influence throughout the system.

Resource dependence theory asserts that connections with environmental resources ultimately influence the organization’s internal power dynamics. Internal social actors who can help reduce dependence on other organizations or mitigate external uncertainty have more power than those who do not offer these resources (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003).
The organization’s social legitimacy in the environment is also connected to the power dynamics. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) asserted that an organization’s choices depend on its ability to meet stakeholder demands. Thus, in this case, the perception of the organization’s efficiency depends on whether the demands of its stakeholders and other relevant social players are being adequately met (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003, p. 11) rather than on the traditional economic measure of expenses and revenue. Because nonprofit organizations rely on society’s value of their mission for their survival, the external view of their effectiveness becomes at least equated with social legitimacy and social acceptance. Yet the standards for such an evaluation vary among organization stakeholders, and these differences can create confusion about the degree to which organizations are considered effective in their work, both with the public and among the organization stakeholders. Regardless of these perception-driven assessments, a standard measure of an organization’s effectiveness and efficiency is whether the organization can maintain its form, key resources, and the support of key environmental stakeholders through external environmental change, continuing to fulfill its mission and serve its constituents.

2. **Institutional development theory**

The first writings on institutional theory appeared in the late 1970s, including contributions by researchers Scott, Meyer, Zucker, DiMaggio, Powell, and others (Beggs 1999; DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Meyer and Rowan 1977; Meyer and Scott 1992; Tolbert and Zucker 1983). Unlike resource dependence theory, which considers the organization to iteratively interact with the environment, institutional theory posits that as intrinsic parts of the environment, organizations are immediately affected by changes to their external surroundings.
The premise of institutional theory is that “institutionalized symbols, values, meanings, and rules . . . construct a cultural rationalization” for experiences (Scott 1994). In 1997, researchers Davis and Greve defined several components of social legitimacy, a key factor in institutional theory.

[The] cognitive approach focuses on the [social] actors’ shared frameworks of interpretation, which allow them to acquire a common definition of the situation. Thus, legitimacy comes from adopting a common frame of reference consistent with the one that prevails in a social system. The normative conception is more evaluative in nature, and legitimacy takes on a moral tone—doing what others expect as appropriate for one’s role. The regulative view looks to formal and informal rules as constraining and regularizing behavior, and legitimacy consists in conforming to those rules. (Davis and Greeve 1997, p. 6)

In this view, organizations are bound by social norms, and values present in the external environment. For Scott, three interrelated factors influence the social legitimacy of organizations within their external environment: cognitive factors, the assumed frameworks of culture and social interpretation; normative factors, which include behavioral norms and social expectations, learned through education; and regulatory factors, which include codified regulations that are enforced legally or through sanctions (Scott 1994, 1995). Thus, organizations rely primarily on shared conceptions of social reality and on regulatory components for their social legitimacy (Scott 1994). Normative components become ingrained in social reality through education and other long-term value development (Meyer and Rowan 1977; Scott 1994; Zucker 1977, 1987). Finally, regulatory components eventually enforce normative and cognitive components of legitimacy (Scott 1994). Thus, social legitimacy of the organization ultimately becomes engrained in both organization development and the environment.
Organizational activities are “institutionalized” when social rules and norms are incorporated into the organization’s operations so well that they are invisible to other social actors and organizations in the environment (Oliver 1991). Changes in the environment often require that organizations adopt new practices and policies to replace previously institutionalized practices (Beggs 1999; Meyer and Rowan 1977; Tolbert 1985; Tolbert and Zucker 1983). Ultimately, organizations adopt these practices to replace previously accepted social norms, values, or constructions of reality. Organizations must tread a fine line between remaining legitimate and adapting to environmental change to survive. Without social legitimacy, environmental resources may become scarce, threatening the organization’s existence. Some organizations choose social conformity or denial of change to maintain their vital social status within the environment (Zucker 1987).

Organization stability and survival is enhanced by decision-making that enforces social legitimacy and conformity to the external environment (Beggs 1999; DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Meyer and Rowan 1977; Meyer and Scott 1992; Tolbert and Zucker 1983). However, this legitimacy is obtained at the cost of isomorphism and homogeneity within the external environment (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Scott 1994; Zucker 1987). According to Hawley (1986), isomorphism results in similarity between organizations that are bound by similar environmental pressures (DiMaggio and Powell 1983, p. 149). In isomorphism, the pressures and incentives present within the environment constrain the organization’s behavioral and strategic decision-making. Furthermore, the lack of response or strategic decision-making can unfavorably affect perceptions of the organization among other social actors in the environment,
disturbing the social networks on which the organization relies for its continued survival (Zucker 1987). Under the political economy framework, isomorphism can disrupt the organization’s power and social influence, threatening its very survival in the social system.

Within theoretical frameworks of social ecology, isomorphism enhances the natural selection of the most efficient organisms amidst social change. In this view, isomorphism results in less efficient organizations focused on legitimacy and prestige Zucker (1987). In striving to be more compatible with the environment, organizations may lose their unique qualities and distinct attributes. Organizations characterized by a common environment often have similar features, with diverse organization forms responding to similar needs within the environment. Furthermore, organizations responding to formal mechanisms of social control—legislation, regulatory changes, and interest-group activities—are at increased risk of losing their individuality via isomorphism (Meyer and Rowan 1977; Meyer and Scott 1992; Scott and Meyer 1998).

Organizations that do not succumb to the immediate environmental changes may use isomorphism to their advantage. For example, institutional theory predicts that organizations with unpopular goals and values will be more frequently challenged by environmental social structures and players (Zucker 1987). This prospect may influence the organization to seek alternative alliances, including with government or other regulatory bodies, to ensure its sustainability in a changing environment. These organizations enact control over the environment via their social networks to subtly influence the effect of the external environment on their strategic choices. The agencies may incorporate strategic choices, such as deliberate
nonconformity, compliance, or resistance to external requirements (DiMaggio 1994; Goodstein 1994; Meyer and Rowan 1977; Shehada 2010). According to Goodstein (1994), the strategic decision to resist external demands may ultimately serve the organization better than compliance or active change. The social ecology framework offers organizations an opportunity to maintain their unique characteristics while contributing to a broader social community through their decision-making.

Resource dependence and institutional theories are both useful for understanding the relationship between nonprofit organizations and their environments (Pfeffer 1982; Pfeffer and Salancik 2003; Oliver 1991; Zucker 1987). As theories of organization development or business psychology, both theories promote a distinct view of the limited options available to organizations faced with environmental change. However, both theories describe the environment as dynamic and multifaceted, with many social actors and institutions that must be navigated collectively and individually. They also assume that organizations have the capacity to respond to environmental changes dynamically and interactively, while considering demands of multiple social actors and institutions within the environment. Finally, both theories recognize that organizational responsiveness is essential to the organization’s legitimacy, social stability, and eventual survival during periods of environmental change. Although there are many similarities between the theories, there are some critical differences. These differences create the tension that gives rise to Oliver’s 1991 model for organizational responsiveness to change. This model forms the basis for the analytical model ultimately used in this research project.
3. The Case for Oliver’s Model

As outlined in the previous section, institutional and resource dependence theories share many common themes. To understand the effect of environmental pressures on organizations, institutional theory focuses on external pressures on the organization from the environment, whereas resource dependence theory focuses on the resources available to complete tasks or fulfill the organization’s mission to its constituents. In this way, resource dependence theory focuses on the internal pressure on organizations to provide consistent resources to complete their work. The external pressures described in institutional theory involve ensuring social legitimacy and survival for the organization via its reputation in the environment (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Meyer and Scott 1992; Scott and Meyer 1998). The power to control financial and material resources is a central concern in both theories. However, in resource dependence theory, power is measured by the ability to control resources, via ownership or social control, whereas institutional theory focuses on the organization’s influence on the environmental rules and beliefs related to the resources (Oliver 1991).

The differences between resource dependence theory and institutional theory are also witnessed in organizational behaviors to respond to the environment (Aldrich and Pfeffer 1976; Pfeffer and Salancik 2003). In resource dependence theory, organizations exert control over their internal behaviors and often choose active responses to environmental pressures, including controlling or co-opting their relationships with other social actors. These organizations utilize negotiations and power dynamics to ensure resources and mitigate uncertainty in the environment. In contrast, institutional theory finds more passive conformity to the challenge of
environmental expectations, including reproducing or imitating other social actors in the environment (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Oliver 1991; Zucker 1977, 1987).

Resource dependence and institutional theories have been openly criticized for their portrayal of the organization-environment relationship. By focusing on financial and other forms of capital, resource dependence theory overlooks the importance of social values, norms, and expectations in shaping the environment (Goodstein 1994; Meyer and Rowan 1977). Institutional theory is often criticized for not acknowledging strategic thinking and behaviors of organizations in response to the environment and other social actors.

Institutional theorists, by virtue of their focus, have tended to limit their attention to the effects of the institutional environment on structural conformity and isomorphism and have tended to overlook the role of active agency and resistance. (Oliver 1991, p.195)

During the 1990s, several organization development scholars combined institutional and resource dependence theories to explain the relationship between the environment and organizations within that environment (Ingram and Simons 1995; Oliver 1991). They argued that organizations can proactively examine their environment, and respond strategically by making strategic choices based on the resources, relationships, and other factors present internally in the organization or externally in the environment. Although these are not directly addressed by institutional or resource dependence theory, organizational responses can also encompass influencing the environment to address the organization’s needs as well.

In 1991, Christine Oliver combined institutional and resource dependence theory into one analytical framework for understanding organization responses to external change. Perhaps
most importantly, Oliver’s combined analytical framework of resource dependence and institutional theories focuses on the organization’s self-interest in selecting behavioral responses to change, balancing the passive responses described by institutional theory with the active and direct responses of resource dependence theory. For Oliver, combining the theories presented a wider range of responses based on strategic choices, environmental awareness, and organization position (p. 146). Oliver’s typology encompasses a range of strategic responses to the environmental change that run the gamut from ignoring to deliberately defying social expectations. Oliver’s five organizational strategies of responding to the environment--organized from passive to active--are acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, defiance, and manipulation. Oliver further identified three sub-responses within each strategy that encompass a passive mode, active mode, and reactive mode. TABLE II below summarizes Oliver’s framework and provides a definition for each strategy and its sub-strategies.
### TABLE II

**OLIVER’S FRAMEWORK OF STRATEGIC RESPONSIVENESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Response</th>
<th>Definition/ Mode</th>
<th>Sub-Responses</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiescence</td>
<td>Compliance with institutional norms/ demands</td>
<td>Habit, Imitation, Compliance</td>
<td>Unconscious norm consistency, Mimicking others’ behavior, Strategic following of norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Mitigation of conflicting institutional demands</td>
<td>Balancing, Pacifying, Bargaining</td>
<td>Negotiating an acceptable compromise, Conformity to an acceptable standard, Exchanging concessions between organizations and constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>No acknowledgement of institutional demands</td>
<td>Concealment, Buffering, Escaping</td>
<td>Symbolic compliance, without actual change, Reducing inspection or hiding reality from outsiders, Changing goals, activities, or physical location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>Challenging institutional demands</td>
<td>Dismissing, Challenging, Attacking</td>
<td>Ignore due to low cost or lack of congruence with mission, Challenge rules of the institutional environment, Attack values to enforce privileged position in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>Attempting to change institutional demands</td>
<td>Co-opting, Influencing, Controlling</td>
<td>Influence institutional elites through membership, Influence institutional beliefs and values, Exerting influence over social approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A full description of each strategy and sub-strategy as applied to the satellite city environment is explored in Chapter VI of the dissertation, responding to the research sub-question: When confronted with racial demographic change in the satellite city, what strategic programming strategies do nonprofit community development organizations select to respond?
The five strategic responses identified by Oliver are based largely upon the interconnectedness and dependency of organizations. Organizations choose specific strategies in Oliver’s framework to respond to institutional demands caused by environmental changes. In smaller environments, like satellite cities, the responses of nonprofit organizations may be constrained by limited resources. In these circumstances, organizations may be forced to actively adapt to changes to survive.

a. **Antecedents for responsiveness**

Oliver’s seminal work also provides an overview of institutional antecedents for responsive behaviors. Oliver (1991) argued that the organization’s capacity for recognizing external environmental change relies on five main institutional factors: cause, constituents, content, coercion, and context. **Cause**, the first institutional factor, reflects the external pressure that the agency feels. Oliver posited that external social actors can influence an organization to act upon environmental changes. She further argued that the pressure experienced by an organization as a result of external change leads the organization to choose a strategic response to ensure its social standing and viability in the environment. These external social actors, or **constituents**, exert pressures on the organization to acknowledge and respond to changes in the environment. These social actors may include clients, community, government, other organizations, or informal groups that operate in the same social arena as the organization. Often, the organization must address conflicting demands from various constituents, selecting one group’s preferred response over another’s. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) introduced the concept of dependency, suggesting that organizations respond more readily to constituents on whom they are more dependent for survival. The **content** of environmental demands may cause
an organization to evaluate the pressure in regard to its mission, programs, or values to select an appropriate response. Organizations may also submit to coercion by governmental mandates or widespread norms (voluntary diffusion) to be successful or to survive. Finally, organizations choose responses based on context, the uncertainty they have about the future as well as their relationships with other organizations in their social arena.

A limitation of Oliver’s organizational (institutional) antecedents to change is that they identify factors that are not in the direct control of the organization. All five factors—cause, constituents, content, coercion, and context—are entirely external to the organization. Thus, the pressure placed on the organizations by these components is not in the control of the organization, but enacted upon the agency. A similar view of antecedents for organizational responsiveness is found in adaptive systems theory, which identifies factors of agility, flexibility, recognition, reflection, and partnerships as internal organizational conditions that allow organizations to respond to external changes in the environment. These organizational and environmental conditions are explored further in Chapter IV in response to the second research sub-question:

What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in the satellite city?

Borrowing from social and population ecology theories, community development literature provides additional strategic responses with which to assess organization behavior. The next section of the literature review describes the social ecology approach and framework for understanding environmental changes, along with a summary of comprehensive community
change theories, which suggest additional responsive strategies for satellite city organizations confronted with environmental change.

4. **Social ecology frameworks and the comprehensive community initiatives theory**

Christine Oliver (1991) drew upon the political economy framework, deriving from institutional and resource dependence theories, to develop her analytical framework for organizational responsiveness to environmental change. Smaller communities have more limited infrastructure, organizations, and resources. In these environments, organizations may not be able to act passively or reactively to institutional demands but are required to adopt active strategies to respond to the changes. These adaptive behaviors add to the five institutional factors identified by Oliver based on political economy frameworks of change. To understand these strategies, this research incorporated ecology theories that were largely abandoned in organizational development theory during the late 1970s and reappeared in community development literature beginning in the 1990s.

As described above, all ecological models provide an alternative explanation of the relationships between the external environment and the organization. In organization development theory, Hannan and Freeman (1987) as well as Delacroix and Carroll (1983) provided important insight about the ecological model. The social ecology theoretical framework describes a process of “natural selection,” in which the most efficient and effective organizations survive during times of environmental change. Seeing organizations as similar to the organisms of bio-ecological scientific models, the theories of organizational responsiveness of these social ecology models focus on the types of and allocation of environmental resources.
that favor certain organizations in the environment over others (Hannan and Freeman 1987; Delacroix and Carroll 1983; Shehada 2010). Their ecological model centers on organization survival or extinction in response to an environmental challenge.

In the social ecology model, organizations with a particular form or function are considered a population within the environment (Hannan and Freeman 1987, p. 935). Populations of organizations, like other social ecology populations of people or systems, are classified by the type and amount of resources they require for their survival (Hannan and Freeman 1987, p. 946). In the social ecology model, the changes in the environment and organizations are considered long-term transformative events, taking place over an extended period of time of years to decades (Aldrich and Pfeffer 1976). As such, according to Singh and Lumsden (1990), organization ecology research often focuses on how the environmental change influences the rate of organizational adaptation, the rate of organizational extinction, and the rate of organizational change.

Social ecology approaches advance the theory that environmental change influences the characteristics of both individual organizations and the collective of the organization population. In the social ecology framework, the environment itself changes to accommodate or abolish the existing organizations in the social system (Hannan and Freeman 1987). In this model, organization adaptability may be limited by several internal constraints, including access to information about environmental changes, distribution of resources during environmental change, and social narrative about the change. Organizations may also face external challenges to environmental adaptation, such as legal or fiscal challenges related to entering the
environment for emerging partnerships, social legitimacy, and limited information about the extent of environmental change. However, when both the environment and organization’s resources favor adaptation, the organization will survive or change to meet the needs of the emerging environment. Otherwise the organization faces extinction from the environment (Hannan and Freeman 1987). In addition, social and organizational ecologists identify several variables—population size, resources, mission, organization size—that influence whether an organization will adapt to environmental change (Singh and Lumsden 1990).

Although social ecology promotes an interesting view of the relationship between organization and environment, critics of the theory question applying a biologically influenced model to social interactions (Bielefeld 1994; Zimmerer and Young 1999). Furthermore, critics cite the challenges of measuring outcomes in this view, owing to the limitations inherent in measuring extinction and change in social relationships (Zimmerer and Young 1999). Finally, according to social ecology, the natural selection of some organizations is based on ecological fitness, but little research has been conducted in business psychology literature on the criteria for such selection (Aldrich and Pfeffer 1976).

Derived from population ecology, social ecology theory is focused on organization form, internal structure, and competition over resources (Scott and Meyer 1998). Oliver largely ignored this approach in the development of her theory of organizational responsiveness, but the social ecology approach manifested in community development literature via comprehensive community initiatives/comprehensive community building initiatives, a framework advanced in the 1990s and 2000s for understanding the effect of deliberate and complex social programming
on various social actors in the community development system. The CCI/CCBI model builds on the social ecology approach by providing additional variables with which to analyze organization behavior.

a. **Comprehensive community initiatives, environmental change, and organizational responsiveness**

The Aspen Institute’s work on community change, deriving from Kellogg and other private foundation–sponsored research on comprehensive community initiatives in the 2000s, relies primarily on the social ecology framework to understand community change. In these models, communities are viewed as social systems; specific components of the system include governance, education, health, and social welfare. Each subsystem functions in tandem with other subsystems as they impact community life. In the language of community development literature, Jane Addams’s Hull House movement utilized multipoint interventions, which affected community responses in housing, recreation, workforce development, education, and social services (Knight 2004). In addition, Addams’s Hull House model relied on leadership development and advocacy as an appropriate response to address the ethnic changes that resulted from immigration at the turn of the 20th century (Knight 2004).

As a whole, the ecological model strives to develop “responsive communities” able to navigate external stressors to maintain “a productive balance between its inhabitants and their environment, allowing for change in an orderly and nondestructive manner, and providing essential daily requirements for its citizens” (Fellin 1987, p. 12). Changes in the community environment affect features of social life based on relationships among individuals, groups, and
systems, including social participation and mechanisms for mutual support (Warren 1983). Community-based organizations, including nonprofit agencies, play an important role in community responses to change. In ecologically based theories of change such as the CCBI model, racial community change is considered an environmental challenge, which requires adaptive changes in the community development social system. The CCBI model predicts that these changes will occur in three areas of organization behavior: partnerships, resource allocation, and capacity building.

1) **Partnerships**

One adaptive change in community organizations as a result of environmental change is emergent cooperative partnerships among community social actors to address mutually identified community challenges. A key feature of the CCI/CCBI model, then, involves adaptive partnerships between organizations, institutions, and individuals to address changing social needs of community residents. These partnerships are established through a variety of mechanisms, ranging from formal funding mandates to informal networks of neighborhood residents (Auspos et al. 2010). Roles in the partnerships are identified and negotiated based on the interaction of community members and other social actors in the community. These partnerships are predicated on the organization’s ability to ensure and maintain mutual support for completing partnership goals. Successful comprehensive community interventions include relationships that work “across geographies” at the community, regional, and national levels. In addition, successful CCBIs include partnerships encompassing “upward” and “downward” influences.
2) **Resource allocation**

Second, CCBIs support organizations responding to community change through increased access to community resources. In this arena, access to community resources can include social, economic, physical, human, and professional capital. Traditionally, community development literature has focused on access to social capital. This approach was considered particularly appropriate in underserved and multicultural communities, where there was a lack of economic capital and physical capital. Under the social ecology model, changes in civic and social capitals precede change in physical, human, and professional capitals (DeFillipis 2004). This reallocation of organization resources is predicted by the social ecology model. This model predicts changes in the structural landscape and resources of the community, including physical and economic capital as well as the social and economic capital in the community (DeFilippis 2013). In addition, the successful CCBI model requires that funding for the activities most important to the community be reflected in community structures and programs (Auspos et al. 2010). The reallocation of funding resources often predicates structural changes in the social landscape and organizational forms in a community (Auspos et al. 2010).

3) **Capacity building**

A third responsive strategy of the CCBI model involves building the capacities of organizations within the community development system. Organizational capacity building focuses on three areas: implementing work more effectively, broadening the scope of the organization’s work, and bringing community residents and their needs to center stage (Auspos et al. 2010). For example, Nyden and Maly (2000) discuss the establishment of school boards as integral to the formation of a community, creating adequate educational opportunities for
community residents, and supporting the socialization of individuals and the participation of community members in community life. Another form of capacity building in CCI/CCBI neighborhood planning is organization-level leadership development. In responsive communities, dynamic and effective community leaders often support the pathways to success. Responsive community development facilitates the development of these leaders and their ability to work in the community (Aspen Institute 2010).

The social ecology strategies of partnerships influenced by the above factors provides an additional category of organizational strategic responses based on the social ecology framework for understanding nonprofit agencies’ approaches to respond to environmental change. Thus, the strategy of partnership development may be combined with Oliver’s analytical framework to create a continuum of behavioral responses for organizations in satellite city environments. Figure 4 below depicts the resulting full analytical framework of responsive behavioral strategies to environmental change.
Figure 4. Full analytical framework for responsive behavioral strategies to environmental stressors

The dotted line in the above figure represents the division between the nonprofit agency and its external environment. The external environmental antecedents, represented by gray boxes and located in the most external “ring” of the figure, depict Oliver’s five named antecedents that promote organization responses. The lavender boxes located on the ring are the five institutional antecedents, or institutional/agency conditions, that promote responsiveness. The light blue strategic responses located within the dotted frame represent Christine Oliver’s 1991 typology for five political economy–driven responses that are outcomes of institutional and resource conditions.
dependence theories of Oliver’s framework combined with an additional response category derived from CCBI literature. The depiction of Oliver’s response strategies and the additional strategy derived from CCBI literature provides a comprehensive selection of observable response strategies discussed and implemented at organizations with which to analyze community-based nonprofit organizations in satellite cities.

Although the analytical model in Figure 4 provides six total responsiveness strategies, the social ecology strategy of adaptive partnership is not fully classified and characterized in community development literature on CCBI in satellite cities in a similar manner to Oliver’s typology for responsiveness as described in Table II on page 39. Using the extended analytical model, this dissertation will further explore the strategies for responsiveness in three nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities within a satellite city community undergoing massive demographic changes. The complete analytical model shown in Figure 4 will be used to examine the identified categories of responsiveness and the conditions that promote response selection in satellite cities.

C. Summary

This literature review developed a framework with which to analyze nonprofit community organizations in a satellite city undergoing significant racial demographic change. In particular, the framework was used to explore the strategic responses selected by these organizations to address the environmental stressors caused by such changes. In addition to the framework for understanding responses to environmental change, this literature review presents an extended model for analyzing nonprofit organizations in satellite city environments and their
responsiveness to demographic change. By combining organizational development/business psychology and community development literature, the literature review identified a new responsive strategy that organizations could utilize to respond to changes in the nonprofit environment.

To explore and further classify these organization response strategies to racial demographic change in a midwestern satellite city environment, this study used a mixed-methods research design incorporating techniques of quantitative data analysis, geographic information system mapping, and qualitative data analysis. These methods are described in Chapter III.
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

A. Overview

The research design for this project utilized a three-phase case study approach to exploring the response strategies of nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities in the midwestern satellite city of Joliet, Illinois. Using a combination of secondary quantitative data analysis, geospatial analysis methodologies, and qualitative methods, the study examines responsiveness to racial demographic changes in the satellite city communities from the period of 2007 through 2012.

B. Research Approach, Research Question, and Hypothesis

The research utilizes an embedded case study qualitative research design to study the primary research question. The case study employs a mixed-methods design for the project to address the research questions:

In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community?

The research employs the qualitative techniques of analytic induction for data collection, analysis, and interpretation of responsiveness strategies employed at three satellite city nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities. Analytic induction is a research technique that allows for the extension of established theories through an iterative process of examining the cases of development (Hammersley and Cooper 2012). This approach to analysis and creating findings is appropriate for this study, as it begins with an analytical
framework established in the literature review. As is typical in analytic induction, the overall goal of this project is to extend current knowledge about strategies of nonprofit responsiveness to the particular case of the satellite city environment in Joliet.

The analytic induction approach begins with a tentative definition of the phenomenon being studied and the question. To accomplish this goal, the development of the research design began with the analytical framework developed through the literature review in Chapter II and described in Figure 4 reproduced below.
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**Figure 4.** Full analytical framework for responsive behavioral strategies to environmental stressors
Existing community development literatures are relatively silent regarding the specific roles and strategies adopted by social service agencies in satellite city environments. Community development and nonprofit management literature are robustly populated with normative and theoretical models of organizational behavior when confronted with environmental stressors, but give little attention to the environmental context in which the agencies operate. Many of these models were based on urban organizations experiencing racial change in large urban neighborhoods; the literature provides little information on agencies located in environments outside the city.

Social service organizations in the satellite city face distinct challenges and constraints compared to urban agencies when engaging in community-wide multicultural planning to respond to racial change. However, most studies of social service agencies in the planning process focused on urban areas and corridors. I hypothesized that social service agencies in satellite cities—bound by more limited and differing resources, programming options, capacity, and relationships than urban environments—would behave differently than predicted by the political economy–based models of responses to community change advanced by organization development literature.

C. Site and Agency Selection

To understand the role of nonprofit agencies engaged in community development in developing responsive community planning for racial change, this project utilizes a mixed-methods, phenomenological case study of the community development system and nonprofit agencies in the satellite city of Joliet, Illinois. Joliet is a postindustrial, midsized city some 80 miles southwest of Chicago. Joliet was chosen because of its recent demographic shifts,
including an influx of low-income Latino\textsuperscript{1} and African American families into the community since 1990, as well as its completion of a community-wide planning process to address these changes. The Quality of Life planning process and its social actors—including institutions, residents, and community stakeholders—provided access to the community’s views about its current successes and challenges related to racial change in Joliet.

In February 2011, several area community centers, including the case study agencies, formed the Quality of Life Collaborative to “partner with the City of Joliet” to assist in implementing the plan and to strategically respond to community problems addressed in the plan. The summer of 2012 saw the formation of partnerships among community residents and city leaders to address quality of life issues in different city neighborhoods. I initially intended to develop an in-depth case study of a single agency, the Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living (WGCIL), to illustrate the challenges and choices faced by a single nonprofit agency engaged in community development activities in navigating responses for community change. However, Unity Community Development Corporation (Unity CDC or Unity) and the Cathedral Area Preservation Association (CAPA) emerged as organizations central to the community development system in Joliet. Over the study period of 2008 through 2012, it became apparent that data from CAPA and Unity CDC represented a form of social service responsiveness to community change distinct from that of WGCIL. Unity, as an umbrella organization of loosely connected neighborhood groups, broadly sheltered many distinct types

\textsuperscript{1} For the purposes of this project, \textit{Latino} individuals are those who have identified themselves as having Latino/Hispanic heritage on the census and other community identification forms (such as those at WGCIL/Unity CDC/ Quality of Life planning documents). For the most part, these individuals live in a small, distinct portion of the planning area, and are distinct from the Whites with no Latino ethnicity. Many of these Latino families migrated from the city/near suburbs, or are seasonal workers in the near-by agricultural industry.
of responsive strategies of individual neighborhood-level 501(c)(3)s engaged in social services.

During my data collection, Unity CDC could no longer be considered representative of the community development system as a whole. As these agencies transformed through the study period, their operations and strategies for responding to change became more well-defined and distinct. Although the organizations had been formed as partnerships among several community development actors within the Joliet community development system, during the planning and implementation of the multicultural planning process, the agencies’ actions and strategic choices showed difficult considerations and strategies that were unique to the satellite city geography. Organizational changes in specific elements of responsiveness during this period suggested a comparative analysis between the social service agencies would be necessary to understand commonalities and distinct elements of each agency’s roles and responsiveness.

The research design describes goals, strategies, and activities of three nonprofit agencies involved in the Quality of Life planning process and Quality of Life Collaborative—WGCIL, Unity CDC, and CAPA. According to its mission statement, the Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living is a community-based social service agency that “strives for equality and empowerment of all persons with disabilities.” As a Center for Independent Living, the agency maintains the federally mandated requirements of providing social services, including education/training, information and referral services, advocacy services, as well as traditional community development services like housing referral, transportation, and employment services. African American and Latino constituents represent about 15% to 20% of WGCIL’s
constituent population, although state funding requirements have caused the agency to focus their programming efforts on this population.

A second case study was conducted with Unity CDC. The mission of Unity is “to improve the quality of life of the historically underserved residents of the 4th and 5th Council Districts of Joliet by holistically addressing their needs in the areas of human services, employment, education and recreation, neighborhood organizing, small business development and transportation.” Programs currently supported by Unity include youth programming, recreational programming, academic support, a reading library, homework help, and the Unity Neighborhood Councils. Unity conducts and/or partners with several local organizations, including the City of Joliet, the National Hook-Up of Black Women, Crusade for Christ, the Quality of Life Collaborative, and CAPA. Unity constituents include the African American and Latino constituents of the 4th and 5th Districts.

The Cathedral Area Preservation Association (CAPA), the third organization examined in this study, is a dues-based neighborhood association that was formed “to preserve the integrity and character of houses in the cathedral area of Joliet” (R.D., CAPA). The Cathedral Area is home to Joliet’s historic mansions and cathedrals, many which were built in the 1800s. As a District 4 neighborhood association, CAPA was born of the same economic processes that created “disadvantaged” and “underserved” population areas in Districts 4 and 5. As manufacturing jobs dwindled in the Joliet area in the late 1970s, managers and supervisors from these companies also left the district. Over a period of 15 years, single-family, owner-occupied mansions in the area were partitioned into multifamily apartment buildings with “largely
absentee landlords.” Neighborhood deterioration and home abandonment eventually “overtook the charming and
historic character of the neighborhood.” CAPA was formed in 1981, when “a small group of concerned homeowners met to discuss preservation of the historic homes in the area” (R.D., CAPA).

Like Unity CDC, CAPA addressed concerns about community change through community organizing via the formation of a local neighborhood association. Unlike many of the neighborhoods in the area, the Cathedral Area had a reputation as a “wealthier community” with a “strong property tax base,” resulting in a warmer relationship with City Hall regarding the neighborhood’s concerns (K.J., Joliet Planning Department, interview). One of CAPA’s first initiatives was their now historical work with the City Hall to downzone the area homes from multifamily apartment dwellings to residential single-family homes. This successful venture over 20 years ago set the tone for the mutually beneficial relationship with City Hall that continues today (R.D., CAPA). More than 30 years after its formation, CAPA’s work echoes the organization’s original mission. Since 2000, CAPA programs have expanded to include initiatives related to widespread historic preservation, zoning, and community-city relationships. CAPA leadership is voluntary; board leaders are elected for annual renewable terms. Community volunteers staff all CAPA programs. The initial CAPA board, formed in 1981, had 13 members. The 2012 board consisted of 14 members, including 4 officers, 6 standing directors, and 4 at-large directors. Defined constituents of the organization include all residential homeowners in the Cathedral Area neighborhood of Joliet’s District 4.

A full description of all organizations, including their mission, constituents, and programs, may be found in Appendix A.
D. **Research Phases and Methodology**

The research design utilizes three distinct phases of data collection to develop a multilevel case of the strategic choices of nonprofit social service agencies in satellite city environments. As can be seen in TABLE III, each phase of data collection corresponds to the research question and analysis methods.
### TABLE III
RESEARCH QUESTION AND METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Research Phase/Goals</th>
<th>Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Analysis Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>How has racial demographic change affected the social service landscape for nonprofits engaged in community development activities in Joliet from 1990 to 2010?</td>
<td>Univariate analysis (SPSS)</td>
<td>US Census Bureau</td>
<td>Descriptive analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS mapping (ArcGIS)</td>
<td>American Community Survey data</td>
<td>GIS mapping/ geospatial analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive analysis of NCCS data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in satellite cities?</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
<td>National Center for Charitable Statistics data</td>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univariate Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured interview data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS Mapping</td>
<td>Community leader interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Life documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>When confronted with environmental change, in the satellite city, what strategic programmatic strategies do nonprofit community development organizations select to respond to rapid demographic changes?</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis using analytic induction</td>
<td>CIL Manager reports</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual report documents</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process and outcome evaluation data</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The research question was “In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community*
1. **Phase I: Joliet’s racial change and the social service landscape**

The first phase of the project addresses the changing landscape of community development organizations and racial change in Joliet. The research sub-question addressed by this phase of research is:

> How did racial demographic change affect the social service landscape for nonprofits engaged in community development activities in Joliet from 2000 to 2010?

The purpose of this phase of research was to examine the racial change occurring in Joliet. This first phase of research also aimed to uncover the impact of racial demographic change by studying the changing nature of community development services distribution amidst the background of current racial change.

Joliet is a rapidly expanding satellite city community, whose agencies and population are changing due to annexation of surrounding rural communities and migration from the city and inner-ring suburbs (Quality of Life Plan 2007). This expansion has resulted in a tripling of the residential population of the community in the last decade (K.J., Joliet Planning Department, interview, 2012). For this reason, it was important to understand the context of racial demographic changes in the community. I used census data to document these changes by administrative districts in the city, including the changing distributions of the minority populations within the rapidly changing Quality of Life planning area of Districts 4 and 5, which formed the original corridor of the city.
Since the early 2000s, several demographers have noted shifting population patterns in large metropolitan areas of the United States (Berry 2004; Johnson 2006). The use of census data to understand population patterns in satellite cities and their surrounding areas has been noted in several studies of racial change (Orfield 2006; Johnson 2006). Most current studies have relied on the decennial census to establish the basic changes in population. For this dissertation, I used census demographic data from 1990, 2000, and 2010 to provide a descriptive analysis of the community racial changes. The areas covered in this analysis encompassed the entire city of Joliet area, as well as select neighborhood-level planning areas (based on census tracts) in Districts 4 and 5 within Joliet. Together, these two data sources framed the racial change occurring in the entire city of Joliet and the Quality of Life planning areas in Joliet. Spatial analysis (mapping) helped describe the geographic differentiation of racial change on Joliet’s East Side and Districts 4 and 5 in the city’s central core.

2. Phases II and III: Examining organization responsiveness to racial demographic change.

For the second and third phases of research, I aimed to examine the organizational and environmental conditions that promoted responsive program planning by the organizations. I also aimed to identify that specific, strategic, responsive programming that satellite city organizations utilize to address racial demographic changes in their communities. The specific research questions addressed in these two phases were:
Phase II: What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in satellite cities?

Phase III: When confronted with environmental change, in the satellite city, what strategic programmatic strategies do nonprofit community development organizations select to respond to rapid demographic changes?

The research relied on existing agency data and documents. In addition, I conducted semi-structured, key informant interviews to examine how racial changes affected the community and organizations. The use of key informant interviews as a strategy for understanding racial change and its effects on suburban community development systems is well established in the literature. In Chicago, Nyden and Adams (1996) conducted interviews with community leaders and residents to understand the effects of racial change on racially integrated communities in Chicago. In addition, Ingrid Gould Ellen (2004) looked at role of suburban schools in supporting racially diverse communities. In this study, she interviewed school board members as key informants to understand the community change from the perspectives of the leaders who were experiencing demographic shifts in their community. Hoch et al. (1984) also interviewed community leaders to understand their perspectives on racial change and found that these perspectives were often different from those of constituents and residents.

Studies of responsiveness have cautioned against relying exclusively on community leaders to understand a community issue. In their study of nonprofit directors, Kissane and Gingerich (2004) found that organizational leaders did not reflect the views of their local communities. In fact, they found that “nonprofit directors across neighborhoods held more
similar views with each other than they did with residents within their communities” (Kissane and Gingerich 2004). To address these concerns, I interviewed residential and neighborhood-level community leaders, including constituents of the case study agencies, in addition to nonprofit and civic leaders.

a. Interview sample

These interviews to develop the case study utilized a purposive sample with 35 key informants. The sample included key business leaders, neighborhood council members (community residents), nonprofit (social and human service) leaders, community development leaders, government leaders, and planners/community preservationists. The study included interviews with at least three members of each group to understand the community goals and planning process from distinct insider perspectives. In addition, I conducted a “snowball sample” by asking leaders to suggest other community members to interview for the project who may provide additional information about the interview topics. The snowball sampling method ensured that the perspectives of those who were not involved in the planning process were included in the research. The interviews were semi-structured and about one hour in duration. In addition, interviewees were asked to complete a one-page demographic survey including information about their age, race, income, length of residence in the city, and other similar information. An interview guide for the project is located in Appendix B. This information was used to categorize agency behaviors and choices. The goal of this phase of the research was to understand the specific strategies and actions employed by social service agencies to support responsiveness to racial change. To this end, the study design includes the development of case studies of two nonprofit social/human service agencies that participated in
the planning process. Case studies are research designs that “try to illuminate a decision or set of decisions, why they were undertaken, how they were implemented, and with what result” (Schram 1971).

Case study research designs have been extensively utilized in studies of community change in neighborhoods as well as in multicultural planning contexts (Bradshaw 1999; Boyd 2004; Patillo-McCoy 2007; Qadeer 2004; Sandercock 2003), making the method particularly appropriate for this study. Yin (2009) asserts that case studies are appropriate for revelatory situations, or situations where the researcher will explore an environment “previously inaccessible to scientific observation” (p. 49), such as the satellite city environment. In particular, case studies were a useful research strategy to address how and why nonprofit organizations engaged in the planning process or employed certain operational strategies in the context of the multicultural planning process.

The study examined the racial changes occurring in the community and the organizational strategies to address the changes. Thus, the case study design involved the use of multiple units or levels of analysis—both the community and the agency—to understand responsiveness more thoroughly in this environment. As a research design, the case study relied on a variety of research methods and techniques (Yin 2009). At the community level, the case study employed qualitative and quantitative data in the form of document reviews, key informant interviews, and descriptive statistical analysis. In addition, a case study was developed for each of the three agencies based on document reviews, database analysis, semi-structured interviews with agency staff and leadership, and participant observation of their
activities. TABLE IV below shows the materials used to develop cases for each agency and the information secured from these materials.

**TABLE IV**

CASE STUDY MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Joliet</td>
<td>Quality of Life Plan</td>
<td>Quality of Life Plan</td>
<td>Strategic planning documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with planning leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGCIL</td>
<td>Annual reports</td>
<td>Annual reports</td>
<td>Annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CIL Manager reports through 2009)</td>
<td>Staff interviews</td>
<td>Staff and client interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group data—2 groups (AA and Latino)</td>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity CDC</td>
<td>Quality of Life Plan</td>
<td>Staff interviews</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unity strategic planning documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unity neighborhood leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unity leadership/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Area Preservation Association</td>
<td>Quality of Life Plan</td>
<td>Leader interviews</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAPA strategic Planning documents</td>
<td>CAPA neighborhood leaders</td>
<td>CAPA leadership/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploration of the phenomenon of responsiveness relied on document reviews, participant observations, and interviews with agency leaders and constituent leaders. The document review included agency annual reports, meeting minutes, websites, and database reports that documented their agency activities. In 2007, Saxton et al. looked at agency documents, including websites and annual reports, to establish measures of partnership, accountability, and capacity building in nonprofit community foundations. In this study, the researchers looked at communication and reporting targeted at three levels of stakeholder involvement—interaction, transaction, and information—through a detailed textual analysis of their documents, including strategic planning documents, annual reports, and their website. Saxton et al. (2007) relied on a combination of inductive and deductive analytical techniques to understand responsiveness in these agencies to their donors, grant makers, and constituents. Beginning with the levels of stakeholder involvement, they extended their model to include additional stakeholders and activities.

In addition to interviews, three specific types of data were utilized to understand and assess agency strategies for addressing racial change in each of the cases. First, existing data from multicultural planning processes and internal agency evaluation documents were used to establish the formulation of the strategies as well as insights about how agency stakeholders viewed the racial change in their community. Second, records of activities, captured in a state-supported database or detailed agency records as maintained by the agency, were used to determine the responsiveness of agency activities and resources devoted to efforts related to components of responsiveness. While agency records and the activities database provide a detailed look at specific activities undertaken by the agencies, other qualitative methods such as
participant observation and key informant interviews were used to ascertain the social meaning of these activities within the context of responsive planning.

In addition to the document analysis, I utilized participant observations of public agency meetings with constituents and other stakeholders to better understand the social meaning and motivations for interactions between the agency and its constituents. According to Burawoy (1991), participant observations are a useful methodology for understanding how an external macro-level force—such as policies to address racial change in the community—affects the day-to-day lived experiences of the agencies and their stakeholders. The “participant observation can examine the macro world through the way the latter shapes and in turn is shaped and conditioned by the micro world, the everyday world of face-to-face interaction.” Participant observations of public and organization meetings with stakeholders provided context that could not be obtained from the document review alone, including the effects of the strategic choices on the various stakeholders present at the meetings. Finally, semi-structured interviews with nonprofit leaders and staff were used to further understand the hows and whys of agency strategies and actions. Document review and observation analysis forms can be found in Appendix C.

In this third phase of the study, the agency-level data were intended to capture individual agency responsiveness strategies to address racial change. The data collection process drew upon information generated during the day-to-day work of the agency, such as meeting minutes, database entries, and other agency information. Appendix D demonstrates a sample of agency data available for the analysis. The primary outcome of this analysis was an investigation and
extension of existing models (community development/social ecology frameworks) for agency responsiveness in the satellite city. This phase of analysis relied primarily on a strategy known as negative case analysis (Creswell 1998; Patton 2014). Negative case analysis, a technique used in analytic induction, utilizes both inductive and deductive techniques in the analysis of qualitative data. The negative case analysis method is particularly appropriate for theory-extension exercises (Burawoy et al. 2000; Creswell 2013). This qualitative approach is considered appropriate for exploratory research used to extend existing theoretical frameworks; my approach to the data analysis allows extension and revisions in the initially developed normative model of agency responsiveness as a result of analysis, based on the emerging conceptual structure in the data (Creswell 1998; Lincoln and Guba 1985). To employ negative case analysis, I began with the proposed model, identifying known elements of the model through data coding. Then, I turned to explaining the remaining elements of the model to extend the existing framework. As typical in this approach to qualitative analysis, the process involved coding and analyzing data, continually comparing specific incidents, refining concepts, and exploring relationships between various emerging themes in the data (constant comparison). The results of this analysis were triangulated with other data sources (e.g., agency documents, participant observation records, and agency database information) and across various social actors to establish verification and consistency in the research results.

b. Center for Capacity Building for Minorities with Disabilities Research

This study was completed as a byproduct of an outreach and evaluation project funded by the National Institute for Disabilities Dissemination and Research and completed for WGCIL. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living was a community-based partner
organization for this project, housed at the UIC Center for Capacity Building for Minorities with Disabilities Research (CCBMDR). Although CCBMDR’s grant focused on agencies serving individuals with disabilities, I approached the analysis of agency information and activities as representative of small grassroots nonprofit agencies the planning area rather than specifically focusing on the grant work of promoting outreach activities for racial minorities as they fulfilled their disabilities-related constituency and mission.

The principal investigator for the CCBMDR project was Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar, Ph.D.; I served as site coordinator and graduate research assistant from 2007 to 2010. The fieldwork for this occurred separately from the evaluation of organization outreach efforts, which concluded in fall 2009. My dissertation research partially relies on data collected through this evaluation, including the following:

- CIL Manager reports on agency operations
- Field notes maintained during the evaluation
- Participant observation notes from agency meetings

Although the project utilizes these data, the research questions for the dissertation represent a completely different inquiry from the evaluation questions for the CCBMDR project. The CCBMDR project focused on the effectiveness of recruitment strategies in the agency’s minority outreach program. In this dissertation, the evaluation data were used to focus on differences in the discourse about multiculturalism at both the community and the agency level, as well as to analyze the community demographics. Interview and process evaluation data were used to determine stakeholder attitudes and perceptions about racial demographic changes and associated outreach programming, as well as to establish the activities associated with each
strategy of the outreach program. Outcome evaluation data, including CIL Manager monthly reports and agency annual reports, were utilized to understand within-case differences between different strategies in place at the agency.

Because of the project’s relationship to CCBMDR, two institutional review board (IRB) protocols governed the data collection for this dissertation project. First, the dissertation project drew from existing data collected from an approved IRB for CCBMDR collected for this evaluation, including the following:

- Agency database reports on outreach and advocacy
- Agency staff and stakeholder interviews
- Process evaluation data including focus group data, meeting minutes, and interviews and agency-produced documents
- Planning process documents
- Participant observation notes

These data were collected primarily between 2007 and 2009, as a part of my work with CCBMDR and WGCIL. I received IRB approval to utilize this data, as well as approval from CCBMDR and WGCIL to use the information in my dissertation. A second, expedited IRB protocol (IRB # 2011-0059) was approved in 2011 and obtained continuing review approval in 2012 and 2013 to conduct key informant interviews with agency and community leaders, as well as to complete participant observations of agency activities at WGCIL and Unity CDC.

E. **Summary**

The mixed-methods case study approach utilized in this project provided an opportunity to understand the nature of racial change and strategies employed by nonprofit agencies as they respond to these changes in the satellite city of Joliet, Illinois. In
particular, the case study research strategy allowed me to explore the details of how and why certain strategies were considered important components of responsiveness to racial change. By utilizing both quantitative and qualitative techniques, the study aimed to uncover the extent of racial demographic changes in the community as well as to deeply understand responsiveness through participation in the multicultural planning process.

Chapter IV presents the rapid racial and population changes in Joliet, Illinois, as well as the changing racial terrain of the city of Joliet. There has been an explosion of social services accompanying this change, including shifts in the distribution of agencies throughout the community. This chapter aims to examine the environmental context of the community development system and nonprofit organizations in Joliet. The chapter begins by presenting the history and context of Joliet as a satellite city. Then, the chapter examines racially-based population changes against the social service landscape in Joliet over the last decade.
IV. THE RACIAL AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION

LANDSCAPE OF JOLIET, ILLINOIS, FROM 1990 TO 2010

A. Overview

This chapter describes the environmental context for responsiveness within satellite city of Joliet, Illinois. The specific research sub-question addressed in this chapter is:

How did racial demographic change affect the social service landscape for nonprofits engaged in community development activities in Joliet from 2000 to 2010?

This sub-question serves to establish the extent of racial change in the community in the decade preceding the interview data collection in 2011 to 2012. This chapter describes the racial demographics of the community using US decennial census data from 1990, 2000, and 2010. The racial demographic changes were analyzed geospatially using geographic information systems to understand the distribution of the change across Joliet’s administrative districts. Finally, the distribution of social service agencies as identified in 2010 NCCS data was mapped to show key areas of racial demographic change. This analysis was used to contextualize the key components of racial demographic change and identify the environmental context in which the case study agencies operate.

Demographic changes in Latino and African American populations in small midwestern communities have received considerable attention since the 2016 presidential election. In the middle and late 2000s, demographers and urban planners began to address the suburbanization of poverty in Latino and African American populations. Factors such as mixed- and scattered-site public housing, gentrification in many large urban communities, and the Great Recession
influenced low-income racial and minority population shifts away from large urban areas to suburban and small-town communities (Johnson and Lichter 2016). More recent studies have identified additional factors such as declining school systems, migrant work, and increased cost of living in urban environments as contributors to the migration of low-income families into these communities (Frazier 2010). In 2017, the increased number of Latino and African American families in the past decade was noted in both Planning Division statistics and local newspaper articles about social and education services (Joliet Herald, November 9, 2015). As such, Joliet’s demographic environmental changes establish the stimulus for the agencies’ programmatic responses in this study. They also provide an overview of the racial and environmental context to which nonprofit human and social service agencies are responding.

B. **Analytical Methodology**

The chapter begins with a brief historical overview of Joliet’s nonprofit social and human service organizations from 2000 to 2010. Next, the trends in community demographics during the study period are profiled using descriptive statistics, with statistical testing used to establish significant changes in minority populations. The US decennial census provided the most complete population data available for Joliet during the period between 2000 and 2010, as well as for the historical trends tracking data for 1990. Next, the chapter presents geographical analysis of racial change within Joliet’s five councilmanic districts based on the censuses of 1990, 2000, and 2010. Joliet’s councilmanic districts, like Chicago’s community areas, or neighborhoods, are key political representation and resource-allocation geographies. Across the study focus years, the most complete racial demographic data available for the city of Joliet were block-level data from US census. Since 2015, American Community Survey population
estimates have been available for the community, based on sampled survey data and population projections. However, area demographers have advised against combining the data from these two sources in analysis owing to differences in surveying methods and tracking (Johnson and Lichter 2016).

Finally, racial change data from 2000 to 2010 were used to develop the maps presented in the final section of the chapter. This section describes the social and human services landscape from 2000 to 2010, providing detailed maps and descriptive analysis of quantitative data. NCCS data, drawn from 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization I-90 filings, were combined with census data for these maps. Data presented utilize human and social service agency information from 2009 NCCS data on Joliet agencies active at the beginning of 2010, the same year as the decennial census. Throughout this chapter, quantitative data sources were supplemented with historical resources that provided insight about the Joliet’s changing environmental context.

C. **The Historical and Environmental Context of Joliet’s Social Service Agencies**

The racial demographic environment of Joliet changed considerably from 1990 to 2010. As organizations located within this landscape, nonprofit social and human agencies have both contributed to and been affected by changes in the environmental landscape of the city. As 501(c)(3) organizations with community-based missions, these agencies are required to fulfill their mission while responding to environmental changes in their surrounding community. In addition, these two decades introduced an increasingly challenging governmental regulatory environment in Illinois, with ever-expanding accountability mechanisms for agency programming and operations. Some these accountability mechanisms included the following:
• Detailed state-level program reporting about program outcomes for racial/ethnic minority population
• State mandates for programming to address specific needs of racial minorities in education services, disability services, youth programming and vocational services funded by the state of Illinois
• Specific state-level advocacy efforts undertaken by agencies and private foundations to introduce constituents to the legislative process and political leaders

These agencies have navigated demographic changes throughout Joliet’s history, but the recent dramatic shifts in the city along with increased accountability mechanisms added the potential to profoundly influence the agencies’ programming, including eradicating certain programs or causing agency closure.

Joliet’s racial demographics are intertwined with the history of the city. The first settlers in Joliet were French traders who settled along the Des Plaines River in the 17th century (Quality of Life Task Force 2007). The Rock Island Railroad providing transportation to Chicago and promoted additional economic development in the 1800s. By the mid-1900s, Joliet’s economy benefitted as it became a major shipping center located at the intersection of the new interstate highway system. From the 1940s to the 1970s, industry and manufacturing contributed to a robust economy in Joliet. Most of Joliet’s urban area was located at the banks of the DesPlaines River. However, by the late 1970s, there was a notable decline in manufacturing throughout America’s midwestern states, known as the Rust Belt (Quality of Life Task Force 2007). The impact of this shift was great in Joliet, which reported unemployment rates of 26% in 1983 at the height of these changes (Joliet City Council Notes, August 2013). As a result the West Side, including the City’s 4th ad 5th Districts experienced significant decline beginning in the early 1980s.
The demographic shifts of the 1980s and city expansion into the city’s newly developed East Side created an east-west division in the city. Located east of the Des Plaines River, the more prosperous East Side contained councilmanic Districts 1 and 3 and was known for its progressive development policies and better city services. In comparison, the West Side (west of the river) contained the Joliet’s historical urban core of Districts 4 and 5. Through 2000, these districts became increasingly known for their abandoned buildings, and crime (Quality of Life Task Force 2007).

Joliet’s racial demographics followed these historical patterns. African Americans had migrated to Joliet from the southern states in the 1940s, settling on the City’s West Side. Historically, African Americans have been the predominant ethnic group in District 4 & 5. By the 1970s, Latino immigrants pursuing jobs were also moving to the city from nearby areas. At the time of this study, the population Latino residents of Joliet had grown to almost a third of the total residential population of the City (U.S. Census, 2016).

D. Geographic Changes in Joliet, 1990–2010

The history of nonprofit organizations in Joliet follows the historical rise of farming cooperatives and labor unions, and the subsequent decline of farming and manufacturing industries during the latter half of the 20th century. From 2000 to 2010, the racial demographic changes that began in the 1990s were magnified. The city of Joliet is divided into five administrative districts, each represented by a councilperson with voting membership on Joliet’s city council, the city’s governing body. Along with favorable state and federal funding
mechanisms, city council policies stimulated urban growth in Joliet during the study period. From 1990 to 2000, the social and political landscape improved due to the local economy, city policies, and other factors that supported the city’s East Side growth (Quality of Life Plan, 2007). From 2000 to 2005, the city also accessed federal and state development funding that provided support for housing development and urban redevelopment. Also, the introduction of casinos in Joliet provided additional resources for urban development. These funds provided the basis for significant expansion west of existing city limits, large-scale commercial development, and extended neighborhood development beyond the city’s western borders. Downtown redevelopment became the hallmark of revitalization and development efforts during the early 2000s. Several urban revitalization plans and nonprofit as well as citizen-supported planning processes were involved in this effort. Large nonprofit organizations such as University of St. Francis, Joliet Junior College, and Silver Cross Hospital, been key participants in real estate development efforts in downtown, especially Districts 4 and 5. These districts became known for minority entrepreneurs and their successful businesses, including the Collins Street area, which is home to more than 25 Latino-owned businesses. Social and human services have also thrived in the area (Quality of Life Plan, 2007).

These trends changed with the US economic recession of the late 2000s. Several large institutions, including the city’s largest employer, Silver Cross Hospital, relocated from the central city Districts 4 and 5 to east side District 1. In addition, the housing development boom that had produced new subdivisions and economic growth in Districts 1 and 2 slowed considerably, with abandoned construction projects and large numbers of foreclosures in new developments. At the same time, Joliet began to expand its district footprint along its western
corridor, annexing nearby neighborhoods and unincorporated areas to supplement its tax base. Joliet’s 2012 councilmanic district map, used in this analysis, utilizes the most current district footprint and reflects these recent historical trends.

Figure 5. Joliet councilmanic districts, 2012

As seen above, the Councilmanic districts have irregular borders and do not utilize US Census geographies.
E. Analysis of Joliet’s Population

The total population of Joliet reported in the 2010 US decennial census was 147,433 individuals, of whom 136,509 lived within the five councilmanic districts. The discrepancy in the two numbers is due to the inclusion of several annexed neighborhoods located in unincorporated Joliet or outside the boundaries of the districts at the time of the 2010 population counts.\(^2\) TABLE V details the key demographic changes from 2000 to 2010 in Joliet from the Decennial Censuses of 2000 and 2010.

\(^2\) A councilmanic district redistricting plan began in 2013 to redefine these district boundaries based on US Census geographies. New district maps were released in March 2015 by the Joliet city council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOLIET POPULATION AND HOUSING INDICATORS, US DECENTENNIAL CENSUS, 2000 AND 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Percentage Point 2000-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>108,230</td>
<td>147,433</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52,623</td>
<td>72,892</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53,598</td>
<td>74,541</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 y</td>
<td>9,868</td>
<td>13,080</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19</td>
<td>24,633</td>
<td>36,639</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 64</td>
<td>60,011</td>
<td>85,399</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>11,709</td>
<td>12,315</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>74,311</td>
<td>99,494</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black alone</td>
<td>19,658</td>
<td>23,562</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino (any race)</td>
<td>19,572</td>
<td>41,042</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households</strong></td>
<td>36,182</td>
<td>48,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed household w/children</td>
<td>2,857</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder w/o husband</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household income</strong></td>
<td>$47,761</td>
<td>$61,744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families in poverty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in poverty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total housing units</strong></td>
<td>38,176</td>
<td>51,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>36,162</td>
<td>48,109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>25,472</td>
<td>35,417</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter occupied</td>
<td>10,710</td>
<td>12,602</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in TABLE V, the period from 2000 to 2010 experienced several key changes in Joliet’s demographic indicators. Changes in the population demographics were tested using a one-tailed $t$-test to note large changes in the census counts across periods. Using this method, there was a statistically significant increase in the number of Latinos and Whites in the area from 2000 to 2010; the Black population did not show a statistically significant increase, but added almost 4,000 households. There were also statistically significant changes in the number of households with children younger than 5 years from 2000 to 2010, as well as a statistically significant change in the number of households with children younger than 18 years.

Unlike many towns in Illinois that utilize US Census-based geographies, Joliet utilizes its own unique councilmanic district geographies for city and county resource allocation and political administration. Thus, this analysis fit US Census geographies to these specific geographies. Because of geographic boundary irregularities in Joliet’s councilmanic districts, the geospatial analysis required fitting census block groups into councilmanic areas. A block group is a US Census geographic unit composed of city blocks that represents between 600 and 3,000 people. Census tracts are composed of one or more block groups (US Census Bureau 2013). To analyze data within the Joliet district data, US Census block groups were allocated into Joliet’s district boundaries using the centroid method of block allocation (US Census Bureau 2013). Using this method, the block group was considered part of the district if the center of its geographic footprint intersected with the district boundaries (i.e., partial intersections of block groups that did not include the center were not included in the counts). This method provided a conservative estimate of population growth, while taking into account Joliet’s irregular and changing geographic boundaries.
TABLE VI displays the changes in Joliet’s population by depicting the number of block groups in each Joliet district area within the decennial census of 1990, 2000, and 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Block Groups 1990</th>
<th>Block Groups 2000</th>
<th>Block Groups 2010</th>
<th>Change 1990–2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, Districts 1 and 3 have a net increase of 16 block groups from the initial nine reported for these two districts in 1990. On the other hand, the central urban core of Districts 4 and 5 reported a net decrease of 15 block groups in 2010 from the initial 61 groups reported in 1990. Growth in Districts 1 and 3 occurred largely between 2000 and 2010, reflecting the increased residential development occurring in these areas; the loss of population in the central urban core followed largely from industrial losses affecting that area. These changes resulted in a net decrease of 4 block groups overall from 1990 to 2010. Between 2000 and 2010, the study period, there was a net increase in block groups in Districts 1 and 3, while Districts 4 and 5 remained relatively stable. These increases represent block group/ population growth in the eastern districts of the city.
F. **Racial Changes in Joliet from 1990 to 2010**

Racial demographic analysis of each district uncovers a slightly different story about population changes in the city. TABLE VII shows the racial landscape of Joliet in 2010 within the five councilmanic districts, as reported in the US decennial census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Latinos</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30,791</td>
<td>21,421</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>6,167</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25,809</td>
<td>16,999</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39,754</td>
<td>24,651</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>8,524</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25,191</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>12,698</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,888</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>147,433</td>
<td>78,159</td>
<td>24,007</td>
<td>41,042</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2010 population of Joliet, based on the five councilmanic districts active at the time, was 147,433. Whites (53.0%) were the largest racial group, followed by Latinos (27.9%) and Blacks (16.3%). The majority of the population in Districts 1, 2, and 3 were White. However, Latinos (n= 41,042) represented the largest racial group in District 4, which contains the city/county–recognized Collins Street District of Latino businesses. In District 5, Black (n= 9,235) and Latino (n=8,952) residents represented a slightly larger share of the population than Whites (n=7,366).

Joliet experienced considerable racial change between 1990 and 2010 in its three most prominent racial groups, non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, and Hispanics/Latinos. To
understand the extent of this change, US decennial census data for race in 1990, 2000, and 2010 are presented by councilmanic district. United States decennial census data were utilized for their comprehensive coverage of the Joliet population during 1990, 2000, and 2010. TABLE VIII shows the White, Black, and Hispanic population by Joliet councilmanic district in these years.

**TABLE VIII**

WHITE, BLACK, AND HISPANIC POPULATIONS BY COUNCILMANIC DISTRICT, 1990, 2000, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4417</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20249</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7991</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11560</td>
<td>5728</td>
<td>5908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13197</td>
<td>8615</td>
<td>3120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Districts 1-5 total</strong></td>
<td>57,414</td>
<td>16,320</td>
<td>10,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total population</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joliet’s Black population showed steady growth across the five councilmanic districts in the two decades. From 1990 to 2000, the Black population increased by 14.5%. In addition, the Black population increased by 14.4% from 2000 to 2010. Black population growth was distributed across Districts 1 through 3; Districts 4 and 5 saw a decrease in population. The Latino population, on the other hand, showed tremendous growth from 1990 to 2010. From 1990 to 2000, the Latino population grew by 91.3%. Similar growth was seen in the next decade: the Latino population grew by 98.5% from 2000 to 2010. The largest areas of growth were reported in District 4 and District 1; however, there is evidence of large percentage increases in Latino population in all five district areas during the 2000 to 2010 timeframe.

Census data indicators also point to key racial demographic changes during this period. For example, the Joliet median age increased from 31.0 in 2000 to 31.7 in 2010, indicating a slight aging of the population. In addition, the number children under 19 increased from 34.5% in 2000 to 33.7% in 2010. In addition, the number of families in poverty increased from 7.7% in 2000 to 12.1% in 2010. Such changes reflect an increased need for social/human services as well as other community development services in the Joliet area for these individuals.

G. Joliet’s Social Service Landscape

In 2007, a State of Illinois Department of Health and Human Services mandate required that organizations receiving department funding for social and human services represent the racial/ethnic distribution of their service area. From 2007 to 2009, nonprofit agencies were required to submit data on the racial distribution of the service providers in their reporting
systems as part of requirements for continued funding of their programs. Programming at the case study agencies affected by this mandate included youth programming, disability programming, and vocational programming. Although the mandate for reporting racial/ethnic distributions was removed in 2010, the practice of reporting racial/ethnic data for this funding affected programming considerations and development for agencies receiving IL-DHHS funding for their programs.

The proceeding analysis identifies the racial distribution of the location of social and human services in Joliet. The analysis is framed within Joliet’s councilmanic districts, reflecting the resource allocation geographies of the city council. The agency locations mapped in the study reflect the headquarters address and do not account for satellite offices located in other areas. The NCCS reports National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTTEE) core codes for each agency filing an I-990 tax form, classifying nonprofit agencies by their area of practice. This analysis focuses on the subcodes of social and human services, education, and historic preservation activities, reflecting the focus and mission of the agencies contained in this analysis.

Based on the selected NTTEE core codes of the NCCS data, there were a total of 73 reported social and human service, historic preservation, and education-related 501(c)(3) organizations within Joliet’s district boundaries in 2000. By the beginning of 2009, this number had decreased to 49 social and human service agencies, reflecting the recent fiscal hardships of the Great Recession and declining private funding for social and human services in the area.
The changing distribution of social service agencies by Joliet’s administrative councilmanic district is noted in TABLE IX.

### TABLE IX

**DISTRIBUTION OF JOLIET NONPROFIT AGENCIES BY COUNCILMANIC DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councilmanic District</th>
<th>Number of Agency Headquarters, 2010</th>
<th>Number of Agency Headquarters, 2000</th>
<th>Net Gain/Loss 2000–2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section demonstrates the distribution of Joliet’s nonprofit organizations within each councilmanic district in 2000 and 2010. A total of 49 organizations were reported within Joliet’s district boundaries at the beginning of 2010, representing a 48% decrease from the 73 agencies reported in 2000. Nine agencies in were located in unincorporated areas outside of the councilmanic districts. As seen in TABLE IX, almost three quarters (72.6%) of social and human service organizations were located in District 5 (n=27) and District 2 (n=10).

The following maps demonstrate the agency placement against racial change. Figure 6 shows the social service placement by administrative district against the White population change.
A net loss of White population was reported for all districts except for District 1. Only two social and human service agencies were located in District 1, despite an overall increase in the White population in this area. However, 29% of social and human service agencies were located in District 2, which reported a net decrease in its majority White population.

As reported earlier in this chapter, the Black population of Joliet steadily increased from 1990 to 2010. In addition, there was an overall net increase in Black population from 2000 to
2010. Figure shows the social service distribution by administrative district mapped against Black population change from 2000 to 2010.

Figure 7. Joliet social service agencies by councilmanic district, Black population change, 2000-2010

As seen in Figure 7, Districts 4 and 5 reported a net loss of Black population from 2000 to 2010. Approximately 58.9% of social and human service organizations were located in
District 5 (43.8%) and District 4 (15.0%). No social and human service agencies were located in District 1, despite an overall increase in the Black population in this area. However, 29.8% of social and human service agencies were located in District 2, which reported only a moderate increase in its Black population.

Based on this analysis, it appears that Joliet’s nonprofit agencies have also not responded to the net increase of Hispanic/Latino population in District 4 via their geographic placement. As reported earlier in this chapter, the Latino population of Joliet steadily increased from 1990 to 2010. In addition, there was a dramatic net increase in Latino population from 2000 to 2010. Figure 8 shows the social service distribution mapped against the Latino population change by councilmanic district.
As seen in the above figure, no district in Joliet reported a decline in Hispanic/Latino population from 1990 to 2000, reflecting the overall increase in Latino population throughout the city. The most significant population changes were reported in Districts 1, 2, and 3, which historically reported fewer Latino residents (City of Joliet, 2012). Districts 4 and 5, located in the central city corridor, reported only moderate growth—less than doubling—of the Latino population during this period. District 4 contained 17.8% of the nonprofit human and social service agencies in the area, while District 5 contained 43.8% of the agencies.
The period from 2000 to 2010 saw a decrease in the number of human and social service nonprofit agencies in Joliet. At the beginning of 2010 (based on 2009 filings), there were 49 social and human service agencies, a 48% decrease from 73 agencies that filed I-90 forms in 1990. While the city reported a loss of several notable agencies from Districts 4 and 5 to the East Side, there was a net loss of only 9 agencies. Social service agencies were largely located in the areas reporting net increases of Black population, including Districts 2 and 5. In addition, there was a net decrease in White population throughout the city, except for District 1. Only two social service agencies were located in this district. In 2009, only 14.2% of the agencies were located in District 4, which saw the greatest growth in Latino population.

H. Summary

Nonprofit human and social service agencies in Joliet are experiencing notable demographic changes in their surrounding environment. Overall, Joliet has experienced tremendous population growth since 2000. The population of the city increased almost 50% from 2000 to 2010. Within the administrative councilmanic districts, Joliet has experienced considerable growth in East Side District 1, as well as in District 4 within the central urban corridor of downtown Joliet. The population growth represents steady increases in White, Black, and Latino populations in Districts 1 and 3. However, there have been significant increases of Hispanic/Latino populations throughout Joliet, including significant increases in District 4 and District 2. Districts 2 and 5 have shown decreases in overall population during the same period. However, the distribution of social service agencies follows patterns of growth similar to the more established minority group of African Americans in District 2, while the
Hispanic/Latino District 4 had a net decrease in the number of agencies within its geographic boundaries.

The net decrease in social service agencies and racial shifts in Districts 4 and 5 were noted during several 2000 to 2010 public community planning processes. Most notably, the community-sponsored Quality of Life Plan (2007) and the Planning Division–sponsored Near West Side Development Plan (2013) referenced significant “racial shifts” (Unity CDC 2007) in the community and lack of growth in “anchor [nonprofit] institutions” (City of Joliet 2013) in certain District 4 and 5 community areas. Both community plans called for the city, residents, and other interested parties to address the quality of life in vital social, education, or other human services needs in these areas.

Joliet nonprofit human and social service agencies, 501(c)(3) organizations recognized by state and federal tax statutes, faced a changing community environment during 2000 to 2010. Demographic changes in the community required that the agencies develop responsive strategies for their programming while adhering to the requirements of a changing governmental environment. At the same time, regulatory and governmental changes midway through this decade further affected the operational and strategic choices available to these agencies in response to these changes. As described in Chapter III, all three agencies featured in the study are 501(c)(3) organizations located in Joliet which either currently or have historically provided social and human services to their constituencies. Each organization identified an interest in serving racial and ethnic minority constituents, either as a result of regulatory requirements, its expressed mission statement, or its charter for preserving the character of the community. Each
organization chose programmatic strategies to respond to the racial shifts in the Joliet environment.
V. INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS NECESSARY FOR RESPONSIVENESS

A. Overview

This chapter presents data and results regarding the institutional, or agency-level, conditions necessary for social service agencies to be responsive to racial demographic change in the satellite city of Joliet, Illinois. Specifically, the results and discussion in this section address the following research sub-question:

What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in the satellite city?

In this chapter, responsiveness is defined as “the ability of an organization to adaptively respond to its external environment in an appropriate manner” (Clippinger 1999). Clippinger further suggests that organizational responsiveness depends on both internal and external factors, or “response antecedents,” which influence the ability of the organization to identify external changes and develop adaptive responses to these changes. Organizational development literature identifies five antecedents—recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnerships—to developing operational or programmatic responses to change (Daft and Weick 1984; Goodstein 1995). The identified antecedents relate to several key structural dimensions of the organization, such as the organization charter, funding streams, governance structure, and programming focus. These organizational dimensions are deeply intertwined with the agency’s ability to structure its programmatic responses to racial demographic change, preceding Oliver’s response strategies. This chapter reviews the circumstances and agency conditions across these dimensions and their roles as precursors to agency-level programmatic responsiveness to the racial demographic changes.
As discussed in Chapter III, the presented results utilize 35 interviews conducted with agency staff, board members, and community members as well as historical agency documents and archived/current websites. The results were analyzed based on a semi-structured coding scheme (Miles et al. 2014). The data analysis began with coding the data using the conceptual framework developed in Chapter II on precursors to responsiveness.

B. Antecedents for Organizational Responsiveness

Organizational responsiveness depends on the ability of the nonprofit organization to adapt to the external demographic changes in its surrounding environment (Clippinger 1999). Literature on organizational responsiveness identifies recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnerships as the antecedents that influence responsiveness within organizations. These factors may be further classified as internal or external antecedents, which affect the ability of nonprofit community development–related agencies to respond to demographic changes in the satellite city environment. Internal antecedents include factors within the agencies’ immediate control, including organizational recognition of changes and the internal flexibility to address change. External antecedents, factors outside the direct purview of the organization, include partnerships and organizational agility. Together, these internal and external response antecedents contribute to an organization’s ability to identify and develop strategic programming solutions to external racial demographic change. The next several sections introduce each antecedent and the organizational dimensions that contribute to its influence on agency responsiveness.
1. **Recognition**

In 1984, Daft and Weick’s theoretical framework for organizational response to environmental change advanced that responsiveness was predicated on recognition and interpretation of those changes. In this framework, the organization’s visibility and interconnectedness with the community influenced its ability to recognize external changes. Building on Daft and Weick’s work, Goodstein (1994) suggested that the organization’s interpretation of environmental change was more significant to the organization’s responses than the environmental demands themselves. Thus, the responsiveness of an organization was not only based on the nature of the change, but could be influenced by a variety of organizational factors that could support or inhibit action. Recognition and interpretation of the change was paramount to identifying organizational response strategies.

Although these theoretically suggested factors influenced recognition of environmental change, mission awareness played a more important role in the study’s featured organizations. All three of the case study organizations had visibility and connections with community, and all of the organizations and their leaders recognized the profound racial demographic changes occurring in Joliet. However, each organization perceived and understood these changes distinctly within its own context.

As a primarily mission-driven organization, WGCIL strongly identified with its core mission of providing programming “for and with those with disabilities” (WGCIL staff member, interview, 2011). Although the organization actively participated in the Quality of Life
planning process, WGCIL identified community racial demographic changes as a concern for their organization only when it affected their constituents and programs.

There have been many changes in the community with Black and Latino families moving into the Will and Grundy counties. However, the IEP [individualized education program] support program was our first time seeing it on a large scale. I guess we knew about it from what was going on around here, but that was the first time it applied to our work. (M.T., WGCIL staff member, interview)

The focus of the organization on its constituents was directly linked to WGCIL’s mission statement, which clearly delineates its constituents as individuals with disabilities, as well as its programming mandate to serve the needs of constituents with disabilities. As a result, external racial demographic changes were ultimately considered to be a crisis endangering the organization’s ability to fulfill its mission.

Organizations with place-based missions like Unity CDC and CAPA recognized external changes more quickly than those with constituency-driven missions like WGCIL. Unity CDC framed the external changes similarly to WGCIL by recognizing that available services were inadequate for their constituents. However, constituents for Unity were identified based on their residency in Districts 4 and 5, whereas constituents for WGCIL were primarily identified based on their condition of being disabled.

For the CAPA organization, constituents were defined within the organization as residents of Joliet’s Cathedral Area, specifically, homeowners in the city’s affluent historical
areas. The Cathedral Area Preservation Association was also focused on its mission to improve the property values through increasing appreciation for historic preservation in its surrounding community. The organization was originally formed over concerns among affluent property owners about property values and neighborhood decline. The organization fought back against these trends by utilizing local community legislation, including the zoning process.

The changes in the community also changed the fabric of community activity. There were more renters, more absentee landlords, more liquor stores, more riffraff. We fought back with the system—downzoning and commercial zoning away from schools and homes. It was a fight and it still continues. But look at our community now. (R.D., CAPA president, interview, 2010)

Since its inception, CAPA’s mission was historic preservation and maintenance of property values in the Cathedral Area. The organization’s leaders became aware of change in the community when it affected their immediate surrounding environment and threatened the mission of historic preservation and maintaining property values.

Yes, there are changes in our area. You know there have been many new people in the area . . . renters, families with kids, Hispanic families. . . . This isn’t always good for the neighborhood. With many homeowners and families moving out of the area since the recession, there are absentee landlords and riffraff floating into the CAPA area. This all affects the beauty and character of our community. (R.D., CAPA board member, interview, 2012)

For CAPA leadership in the mid-2000s, recent demographic changes brought renewed concern for maintaining neighborhood stability.

Our organization has always supported maintaining community pride . . . we want to keep our neighborhood the way it has been for decades. Look around—it is something special. We will use
whatever means we have—the zoning board, working with other like-minded groups, working with legislators. . . . There have been changes around us, but we need to keep doing what we are doing. (B.N., CAPA board member, interview, 2012)

Community development activity involves deep connections with the external environment as defined by the organization. As community development organizations, the three case study agencies were all focused on the external environment as a part of their daily activity. Each organization, to some extent, was aware that changes were occurring in the local environment. However, the organizations differed in their ability to clearly recognize the effect of external change on their own work. Organizations with externally influenced missions, such as WGCIL, viewed the external racial change as a concern that could have an effect on their programming. On the other hand, organizations with locally driven missions and local constituencies experienced racial demographic changes as an immediate need that demanded the organizations’ attention and adaptability.

Sure there have been changes around [Joliet]. We have all seen them. However, it has only begun to affect our work [at WGCIL] recently—we have done a lot more with youth, like the legislative internship and IEP [individualized education program] support. (K.T., WGCIL staff member, interview, 2011)

The organization’s recognition of the racial demographic change depended on several factors including its defined mission and constituency. As the case study organizations engaged in community development activities, each organization and its staff clearly identified that external demographic changes had occurred in their community. However, the circumstances of the recognition relied on both the organization’s relationship with its mission and its relationships with its constituents and other stakeholders in the community.
2. **Flexibility**

Organizational flexibility also influences an organization’s ability to adaptively address environmental change (Wright and Snell 1998; Zajac et al. 2000). Organizational flexibility consists of two distinct components, internal and external flexibility. In this literature, *internal flexibility* is defined as the ability of the organization to adapt to the environment, whereas *external flexibility* is the influence of the organization on the environment that can reduce or mitigate the impact of environmental change on the organization (Ansoff and Brandenburg 1971; Zajac et al. 2000). Organizational flexibility is closely tied to organization systems that provide necessary resources, processes, and managerial functions to address change (Ansoff and Brandenburg 1971).

Aaker and Mascarenhas (1984) argued that for organizations to adapt and navigate environmental changes, organizational flexibility must become a deliberate part of their strategy. The organizations featured in this study displayed both internal and external flexibility when faced with racial demographic changes in their environment. In a display of internal flexibility, the case study organizations altered their internal operations, processes, and resources to address the needs of their constituents amidst the changes. The organizations’ internal flexibility was displayed in adjustments to programming policies and staffing resources to better cope with their resources.

Internal flexibility directly influences an organization’s ability to respond to racial demographic changes occurring in its external environment. In the case study organizations, the staff and agency personnel were key factors for identifying and responding appropriately to
programmatic changes in the environment. Organization structures, another component of organizations’ internal flexibility, influence its ability to respond to external changes. Staffing structures, human resources, contractual obligations, and similar factors determine whether or not an organization responds to these changes in a timely and appropriate manner. This structural flexibility allowed Unity CDC to launch new summer recreation and afterschool programming for large numbers of youth by reorganizing its mission, staffing, and operations to respond to community needs and new funding priorities. In another case, staffing structures contributed to structural flexibility at WGCIL. As with all of the case study organizations, WGCIL staff’s connection to the community had a strong influence on the organization’s responsiveness. Many agency staff at all three case study organizations were hired for their position because of their connections in the Joliet community. In some cases, the individual staff member’s personal involvement or commitments in the community led to identification of profound demographic changes in that community. In other instances, staff recognized the changes as they fulfilled their community outreach duties with their employers. Often, lack of services or unequal distribution of resources in the community for their constituents led these staff members to advance recognition of these changes in their professional work at the agencies.

Organization and history and traditions can also contribute to the internal flexibility of an organization. For example, CAPA historically worked with city departments to address community concerns. Thus, CAPA’s tradition of working with both the neighborhoods and the city led to the city formally identifying this channel of community and interacting more
frequently with minority populations in Districts 4 and 5 via Unity’s neighborhood councils (city employee and CAPA director, interview, 2012).

CAPA is a good example of what can be done with [Unity’s] neighborhood councils. They have insight into the community and what it needs—they can really help take the message to residents and get their input. (K.J., city planning department employee, interview, 2012)

The Cathedral Area Preservation Association’s tradition of working with the city resulted in new roles and nonprofit programming partnerships related to addressing community racial demographic changes. Similarly, WGCIL’s long tradition of serving Joliet individuals with disabilities was a critical component to recognizing the racial change occurring in the community. Staff members began to recognize changes in their service population within certain areas of the community early in the organization’s process of responsiveness. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living’s consumer focus ultimately resulted in a formal outreach program for minorities with disabilities as well as an organization-wide community-organizing program that focused on minority consumers and their needs (WGCIL, Annual Report 2012).

Organization internal programming policies and decisions—when thoughtfully considered based on constituent needs and organization resources or relationships—can be considered part of the organization’s structural flexibility. In one of the case study organizations, the agency determined that it would not engage in transportation issues needed by the community because of the liability and direct costs associated with the program. In another case, the agency tried to implement a direct-service program but found the staffing and
regulatory requirements too difficult to fulfill, leading to a policy to not provide an afterschool care program.

They have so many requirements. It was too hard for our little organization to manage everything. School districts have many people to make sure the regulations are working—we were having to throw out good food; we’re not able to meet the health and sanitation requirements. We decided that feeding the kids was too much and shut our program down. (M.W., Unity Executive Director, interview)

3. **Reflection (organizational learning)**

Reflection, or the structures to support organizational learning and development, is another precursor to organizational responsiveness. During times of organizational change, responsiveness relies on the transfer of critical knowledge and information among social players within the environment to support the organization’s interests. Organizational structures and strategies that support learning and reflection contribute to the organization’s ability to adapt to demographic environmental change.

A key driver of organizational reflection and learning opportunities was the structure of the organization. As grassroots community-based agencies, Unity CDC and CAPA’s organization structures included a wider reach of decision-making and authority. The constituents of CAPA included wealthy residents of Joliet’s Cathedral Area, whereas Unity CDC served the entire geographic area of Districts 4 and 5. Both organizations operated via a volunteer and coalition-based decision-making structure in which each constituent had a single vote. On the other hand, WGCIL maintained the traditional structures of a hierarchical nonprofit organization with an executive director and clear reporting structures. The agency was governed by a traditional nonprofit board and executive director. These organizational governance and
decision-making structures influenced the agencies’ methods of learning and reflection about racial demographic changes.

In all the case study organizations, organizational learning about racial demographics was supported via three structural factors at the organization: leadership, organization processes, and community engagement. Together these factors provided an opportunity for each individual agency to learn and reflect about external racial demographic changes as they affected the agency. In addition, the agencies could utilize organizational learning to craft their own strategic responses to these changes.

a. Leadership

All three case study organizations possessed executive leadership that encouraged organizational learning. Regardless of organizational structures, the leaders of the three agencies encouraged organizational learning as a means of understanding community change. Leaders within these agencies supported learning by supporting investigative activities and inquiry that allowed agency staff, stakeholders, and/or constituents to consider the changes in their day-to-day work and lives.

Leaders within the case study organizations shared many common qualities that supported and encouraged their organization’s exploration of racial demographic change. For example, all of the organization executives were native or long-term community residents and recognized for their work on behalf of city residents. These deep connections with the
community drove the leaders’ desires to better understand the changes and how they would affect their constituents.

I have lived in Joliet all my life—I got married, went to school here, raised my family here. But the area is very different from when I was growing up. There are new people, new needs...it is important to understand them, for myself and my family, for the neighborhoods, and for the organization. So we can advocate better for everyone. (R.D., CAPA board member, interview, 2012)

As a result of their native and/or long-term connections with the community, these leaders sought deeper understanding of challenges to the community and their organization caused by the changes.

I went to a few community meetings, but all you have to do is look around. The services and investment in the [Districts 4 and 5] areas is not the same as on the East Side of the city. It was important during the Quality of Life process to work with residents to bring attention to it. (D.J., Joliet Quality of Life Task Force member, interview, 2008)

Ultimately, the organization leaders’ inquisitiveness allowed staff and community constituents to address the concerns directly by supporting appropriate learning opportunities and engaging with community stakeholders to learn about the changes and their effect on the agency.

All organization leaders sought to diversify their sources of opinion. For both CAPA and Unity CDC directors, participation in the 2007 Joliet Quality of Life planning process was the vehicle to understanding the profound changes in their community.

We had seen changes—Collins Street has had Latino families for about a decade. However, until it was all laid out in the Quality of
Life planning process, I don’t think we really knew how the community and our groups were affected. (M.W., Unity CDC director, interview, 2013)

Because the structures of these organizations distributed decision-making across their constituent neighborhood councils, the leadership also relied on a broad spectrum of community input to understand the community change.

For WGCIL, key stakeholders included well-regarded community leaders. As a CIL, the organization had already defined community constituents with disabilities among its staff and leadership. The executive director of the organization had a visible disability, identifying her as a member of the constituency. As such, leadership at WGCIL relied more specifically on high-visibility stakeholders to obtain input about community change.

b. Organizational learning processes

The deep connections that the leaders shared with the community led them to promote agency processes to understand the effect of external change on the community. Largely, racial demographic changes were affecting the external environment within Joliet. The agency mandates regarding their constituency and the role of experts in understanding community change were paramount to their approach to organizational learning processes.

The Quality of Life planning process was an externally driven process relying on professional planners and social researchers to gather community data and develop recommendations for the plan. In this process, the role of the community agencies was to assist in surveys and information gathering about neighborhood conditions. In addition, the agencies
provided forums for public comments—and thus results—on the expert-formed research and recommendations. Thus, community members shaped the meaning and recommendations of the planning process.

On the other hand, WGCIL only minimally participated in the Quality of Life planning process. Instead, the agency and leaders turned to internal focus groups led by staff and UIC researchers to better understand the effect of racial demographic changes on their programming and agency operations. From the beginning, WGCIL’s approach to organizational learning was agency centric. Local African American and Latino community leaders were invited to participate in WGCIL agency-sponsored focus groups with UIC researchers to better understand the effect of changes on their unique constituency.

The focus groups were a better way for us to meet our specific needs. Although we didn’t know exactly what we would find, doing them here [at WGCIL] was a powerful way to understand how to reach newer consumers and grow our programs for African Americans and Latinos. (M.T., WGCIL staff, interview, 2013)

As a result of their clear, CIL-defined constituency, WGCIL promoted organizational learning via direct engagement with the community on their own terms and in their own space. On the other hand, CAPA and Unity CDC utilized an extensive community planning process to vet a professionally created Quality of Life Plan, creating action plans that could indirectly affect their agencies as social actors within the geographic area.

c. **Community engagement for understanding demographic changes**

All of the case agencies engaged external stakeholders in order to understand racial
demographic changes. Agency leaders and staff viewed external community engagement as a positive method for learning about and interpreting community change within the context of their agency and its work. The local knowledge of community members was considered vital to making sense of data collected about demographic changes within the community.

The Neighborhood Councils—that was our contribution [to the Quality of Life planning process]. Now everyone—the city, other councils, the alderman—wants to come to the meetings to get Black and Latino resident input. (M.W., Unity CDC director, interview, 2013)

Unity CDC and CAPA engaged community members in data interpretation in a different manner than WGCIL. The participation of neighborhood residents of varying income levels and races, largely supported by CAPA and Unity CDC’s organizing efforts, provided an “authentic voice” (D. J., planning process leader, interview, 2012) to the local planning process. Multiple community meetings allowed the planning process and the Quality of Life Task Force to validate data with knowledge and experiential input from local community residents. For WGCIL, engagement of high-level community stakeholders was also an attempt to authenticate the experiences of its staff. In this case, the professionalized voices of key community leaders served to verify the consumer experiences.

The reflection formalized through organizational learning was indicative of the organization’s structure. Contributors to the reflection process, including leadership orientation to change, the organizational reflection process, and community engagement, were influenced by the structure of the three case study agencies.
4. **Agility**

Organizational agility, or the speed with which the organization can respond to changes, is also a precursor to responsiveness (Goldman and Nagel 1993). On recognition of the external change, responsive organizations engage in knowledge transfers and strategic initiatives to address the change. Organizational agility is intertwined with both organization flexibility and recognition. As with these previously mentioned response antecedents, agency resources largely determine the ability and speed with which the community development organization recognizes external change and develops adaptive programming (Goldman and Nagel 1993).

Three organizational factors uncovered in the study have an impact on organizational agility: funding mechanisms, governance structures, and the organization charter. The organization charter, also known as the organization’s bylaws, is a formal document and affects both the recognition of external demographic changes and the agility of the agency to respond to these changes. As outlined in the recognition section, all three organizations featured in this study served racial and ethnic minority constituencies. However, each case study organization recognized the demographic changes at different times, in part due to its mission and constituency focus as outlined in its bylaws. The case study organizations maintained different funding portfolios and organization governance structures, which influenced their ability to respond swiftly to changes in the external environment.

a. **Funding portfolio**

The nature and diversity of nonprofit funding has a dramatic influence on programming and structure of the organization (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003), Organizations with diverse
funding portfolios that allow for both program and operational support can often respond swiftly to changing constituency needs and environmental changes. TABLE X lists the types of funding utilized by the agencies in 2012.

### TABLE X

**FUNDING PORTFOLIOS FOR 3 ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding streams</th>
<th>WGCIL</th>
<th>Unity CDC</th>
<th>CAPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal–State CIL Funding</td>
<td>City/State Funding Program Fees</td>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Housing and Social Service funding</td>
<td>State-level funding for after school programs</td>
<td>Programs (Wine Walk, This Olde Housewalk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundation Funding</td>
<td>Neighborhood Council fees</td>
<td>Private donations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Individual Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A full description of agency programs, constituents, and funding is available in Appendix E. The relationship between the funder and agency is complex, involving fiscal oversight and impact/outcomes monitoring. The relationship is best described on a continuum of collaboration, in which the funder and organization become more interdependent as they fulfill programming-related partnerships.

As shown in TABLE X, WGCIL had more diverse funding streams of federal, state, foundation, and private donors than the other agencies. A formal 501(c)(3) with a traditional nonprofit structure, WGCIL maintained a diverse funding portfolio, including private donors, local government and corporate funding sources, state funding for disability services, and
national funding. The diversity of funding streams allowed WGCIL to identify changes in the environment according to their own agenda and by defining their own resources. Although Illinois state funding mandates at the time required that the agency “serve the needs of a representative population,” (P. H., WGCIL Executive Director, interview) the methods of defining this “representative population” and its needs were largely left to the agency. The agency director also indicated that a state funder requirement to better incorporate Latino and African American consumers in the agency’s work was an important impetus for the agency to define and adapt to community changes.

Well, you know, the state really started this whole thing [the African American and Latino outreach]. The community changed and they wanted us to reflect it in our work. The trouble is, we didn’t know how to get started on our own. (P.H., WGCIL executive director, interview)

For WGCIL, understanding racial demographic changes meant extending their organization’s capabilities through a strategic partnership with the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Center for Capacity Building for Minorities with Disabilities Research. This partnership allowed the agency to address community changes using outside consultants who were familiar with the both the state requirements and with using a participatory outreach process, building the agency’s capacity to address community change through their programs and outreach effort. This partnership provided federal funding and technical assistance from university experts that addressed the diversity of consumers in CILs, supporting the agency’s mandate to respond to racial demographic changes in the area. Furthermore, WGCIL’s diverse funding portfolio of local foundations, regional funders, and private donors supported outreach with operational support, which paid for staffing related to minority outreach.
For Unity CDC and CAPA, funding for nonprofit responsiveness to racial change was limited by less diverse funding portfolios. Both of these organizations relied on donations from their members and local community organizations, as well as organization-sponsored community funding events for program funds. Over four years, Unity CDC’s portfolio was supplemented by a one-time grant from the city-county for unrestricted operating funds and a one-time grant for afterschool programming.

On the other hand, CAPA relied primarily on membership dues from local residents and This Olde Housewalk, its annual event, to fund the organization. As a result, the organization’s recognition of racial change was closely tied to homeowners’ views about the issue.

Many of these beautiful homes were split into multi-family apartments in the 1980s and 1990s. Absentee landlords and less stable residents resulted in an overall community decline in the area. CAPA was how the homeowners fought back, with zoning changes and by working with the city and community to instill appreciation for these beautiful houses. (B.N., CAPA director, interview, 2012)

For homeowners in the Cathedral District who were also CAPA members, only the demographic changes affecting home value and the historical significance of the neighborhood were important. One CAPA member explained the changes and their effect on the community.

As the new residents, particularly renters and the “minorities” come into the community, they may bring undesirable elements like pawn stores and liquor stores. There is also just more community instability with these new folks—it can affect our property value and the general flow of this grand historic area. We want to preserve that with our membership in CAPA. (R.T., community member, interview, 2011)
The relationship between funders and nonprofit organizations drives the agility of a nonprofit’s responses to racial demographic change by providing the agency’s monetary resources for development.

b. **Organization governance structure**

The nonprofit community development organization’s governance structure is another important component of its agility. In nonprofit literature, *governance* often refers to the roles and responsibilities of the board of directors (Osterman 2010). Stone and Ostower (2007) describe the board of directors as the primary body within the organization with fiduciary and legal functions. Furthermore they identify a wide range of roles for the board including (Dean and Bowen 1994; Harris 1989; Houle 1989; Kramer 1981; Miller-Millesen 2003; Widmer and Houchin 1993):

- Overseeing financial management and ensuring adequate resources are in place
- Assuring basic legal and ethical responsibilities are met
- Ensuring that the activities of the organization align with its mission
- Making long-range plans and establishing major organizational policies
- Hiring and overseeing the chief executive officer
- Representing the organization to the environment in general as well as to key constituencies

(Stone and Ostower, 2017)

The implementation of new programming affects several areas of organizational governance, which in turn affects the rate at which policies are implemented. In nonprofit literature, governance models describe the relationship between the board of directors and the staff of the organization. All nonprofit boards maintain a fiduciary responsibility, provide strategic oversight, and develop governance structures that align with the organization’s stated mission.
Recognition of the need for responsive programming occurred in all three organizations, sometimes at the staff level and sometimes at the board level. In many cases, the demarcation between board and staff was blurred, especially at the geographically focused community development organizations. Adoption of new programming responses relies on both the formal and informal mechanisms of the organization’s decision-making, influencing the speed with which such changes can be implemented. Stone and Ostrower (2007) posited that four facets of the nonprofit board may affect the agility with which organizations can implement new strategic initiatives related to public policy: the composition of the board, board structure, board-staff relationships, and the board’s overall effectiveness. These components of the governance structure influence the organization’s agility to implement significant programming changes resulting from externally influenced organization policy changes.

Drawing on previous theoretical frameworks from nonprofit and public policy academic literature, Stone and Ostrower’s (2007) framework states that board composition is the most critical element of the organization’s ability to implement new policy and programming, as well as the organization’s ability to interface effectively with external sources regarding these changes. For these types of activities, board composition included representation of the organization’s constituency within its leadership. For all three case organizations, the board of directors was representative of the constituencies as defined in the organization’s mission. For Unity CDC, the inclusion of African American and Latino residents in its board of directors meant the organization recognized and immediately addressed the challenges of the minority constituents in its geographic area.
Our board leaders and other representatives are the Neighborhood Councils—they are the people who live and work in Districts 4 and 5. It’s their lives, their families, and their own communities that bring them here [to Unity CDC]. (S.S., Unity CDC executive director, interview)

The community residents who were a part of Unity’s board of directors encouraged the organization to adopt programming policies that addressed changing demographic community needs. For example, the proliferation of youth in the community led the Unity board of directors to identify methods of youth engagement during out-of-school time. The Unity board created relationships to develop a baseball field with area civic and business leaders, a summer sports recreation program, and an afterschool homework help program. These sports and reaction program activities were implemented within the first year of the organization’s charter.

For WGCIL, the organization’s CIL charter indicated that at least half of the board of directors should be individuals with disabilities. Thus, the WGCIL board of directors did not as easily recognize the profound community demographic changes. For agency leaders, the external demographic changes were not nearly as relevant as the concerns that were articulated by constituents with disabilities.

Racial and other changes in the community? Yes, I suppose there have been some changes, but they really do not affect us. We are focused on serving the outlying consumers who can’t come into town—in outlying Grundy County and our current consumers in Will County, too. (P.H., WGCIL executive director, interview, 2010)

The relative focus on the needs of their current consumers meant that WGCIL’s leadership did not quickly recognize new programming needs that resulted from the core
changes. In 2011, organization began to investigate intensive school-based programming for high school students with disabilities, many of whom were coincidently African American or Latino. As these programs grew and the agency participated in school and legislative development programs with these students, the organization eventually hired community organizers for these programs. The process of adopting widespread programmatic change took more than 10 years to realize at this agency, in contrast to the one year required at Unity CDC.

1) Governance structure

The board of directors’ governance structure is another element of the organization’s ability. The governance structure, as outlined in the nonprofit charter, is also an important component of organization agility. Nonprofit literature identifies four distinct types of governance structures within nonprofit boards of directors: the patron model, the collective model, the policy model, and the management team model. The three case study organizations displayed characteristics of the collective model of governance.

The collective management model of governance was the primary structure for the boards of directors of all of the nonprofits in this study. This model of governance is characterized by

…a shared sense of purpose, an exceptional level of commitment by all group members, a willingness to accept personal responsibility for the work of others, and an ability to compromise. When working well, the organization benefits from the direct involvement of front-line workers in decision-making and the synergy and camaraderie created by the interaction of board and staff. (O’Reilly 2015)
Drawing on the common purpose of the CIL mission, WGCIL engaged in a collective form of governance, in which the decision-making is by consensus and all governance decisions are shared. Although the organization retained a staff and board separation, the board was required to have half of its members with disabilities. The motto of the disabilities movement, “Nothing about us, without us,” was alive and well, influencing trust among board members and the speed with which they could react to changes in the environment.

The executive director is really involved as a volunteer in the community. She really knows what is going on. If she says something is important and worth paying attention to, we better pay attention. She has her finger on the pulse . . . you saw her volunteer award from the city, didn’t you? (C.F., WGCIL consumer, interview)

The trust in the executive director and other board members with disabilities allowed the organization to quickly gain board support for large-scale community development initiatives like housing reintegration and community organizing in response to demographic shifts.

Operating from a grassroots and place-based perspective, Unity CDC and CAPA also adopted a collective form of governance. In these cases, there was little hierarchy among organization members, who also comprised the board of directors. Unity CDC adopted its board structure from its predecessor, CAPA, and was driven by a voluntary board under the leadership of one executive staff member.

Unity has learned a thing or two from us and how we do things. It is an evolution but it is working. We have volunteers and folks contribute what they can—time, resources or money. Everyone pitches in. (B.N., CAPA volunteer, interview, 2012)
The literature suggests that there are two challenges associated with the collective model of governance. The first challenge of the collective model is its reliance on compromise to make decisions. The element of compromise is an intrinsic component of the model and often develops from a strong ideological commitment among the members, in this case to the disability rights movement. At WGCIL, the board of directors’ governance structure sometimes made compromise difficult among board members, hindering responsive programming. One example of this was related to providing transportation to events for consumers with disabilities. Although both community leaders and consumers recommended transportation programming, the board was not able to reach consensus regarding the program. The board members all agreed that transportation was a needed program for minority consumers, but disagreed about liability issues and hiring issues related to the program proposal, barring its implementation at the agency.

Another shortcoming often cited with this board governance structure is lack of accountability structures. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living, however, was also funded by state and federal dollars. The funding for these programs required extensive data entry of accountability measures, minimizing the requirements for the board to engage directly with day-to-day programmatic accountability.

We [staff] have to enter all of our program data into CIL Manager [software program], staff time and dollars spent on the program as well as outcomes. Sometimes it feels like it is too much [to do], but it does allow the support to continue for our work. (K.M., WGCIL staff, interview, 2010)

In an instance involving Unity CDC, organizational accountability was minimized when the organization changed structures after the departure of the first executive director. The lack
of progress on the Quality of Life Plan was attributed to the non-local resident director’s influence.

Well, you know [the first executive director]. He rubbed folks the wrong way. We had to rebuild relationships with the city after he left. We reformed the whole structure of the councils; everyone is new. (M.W., Unity CDC executive director, interview, 2013)

After the departure of Unity’s first executive director, the organization’s work with the city and its programming changed dramatically. Where the organization was initially working with the city to build housing for minorities, the agency eventually adopted youth and recreation programming. Through this transition, much blame for the agency’s financial situation and relationship with the city was placed on various members of the agency. With limited programming oversight, the agency did not have appropriate mechanisms to maintain its minimal state funding for youth afterschool programming. Eventually, after several years, the organization re-emerged as a donation-funded grassroots neighborhood coalition. The strength of the neighborhood leaders and their existing relationships minimized the accountability for the failure of the housing program, but also allowed the organization to reinvent its work as a neighborhood community coalition.

Nonprofit organization agility is influenced by the decision-making structures of the board of directors. In this study, the collective model of board governance employed by the case study nonprofit agencies contributed to the slowed responsiveness of the agencies to demographic changes. Perhaps other management and governance structures, such as a management model or policy-based model, would allow more agility in responses to external change and environmental stressors.
2) **Agency charter/bylaws**

A third element of organization agility is the nonprofit bylaws or charter. In Illinois, the organization charter must be filed with the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Development. The organization bylaws are the formal guidelines outlining the mission, decision-making process, and structures of the organization. The charters of the three case study agency organizations contributed to their missions by further defining the mission, constituency, structure, and programs of the organization. Furthermore, the articles of incorporation affected the agility of responsiveness by further identifying the decision-making structure of the agency and the overall organization governance.

As a member of a network of 400 federally established Centers for Independent Living, WGCIL subscribes to the CIL model by conducting programs and advocacy work related to self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities (interview, WGCIL executive director, 2012). Rising out of a CIL and local disability rights movement, the organization’s board of directors was established in 1985. In 2007–2008, the organization had 15 staff members; there were 13 staff members in 2012. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living board of directors has varied in size from 12 individuals in 2007 to 18 members in 2012. Per CIL regulations, at least half of the board of directors and staff include individuals with disabilities (interview WGCIL executive director, 2012).

As a local Center for Independent Living, WGCIL subscribes to the three tenets of CIL philosophy as evidenced in its mission statement. (See Appendix A for description of the CIL mission at WGCIL).
As people with disabilities and their advocates, the Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living strives for equality and empowerment of persons with disabilities in the Will and Grundy County areas. We inform persons with disabilities of their rights, educate them about their responsibilities, provide support services, promote advocacy, and raise community awareness about disability issues. (WGCIL Annual Report 2012)

For the past 30 years, WGCIL’s work has focused on the four program focus areas for CILs: peer support, information and referral, individual and systems advocacy, and independent living skills training. The programs themselves have varied from housing support for adults and the elderly, to educational support for youth with disabilities, to vocational referrals to state and local advocacy for disability services and legislation. The organization considers state and federal funding priorities as well as consumer needs and desires in its program development efforts; however, the specific programs may change (P. H., WGCIL executive director, interview, 2012). According to WGCIL leadership, these programmatic changes were predicated on “maintaining the fine balance of responding to emerging consumer need, while keeping the [organization’s] doors open and being true to CIL goals” (P.H., WGCIL executive director, 2012).

Unity CDC and CAPA were organizations with place-based missions. The organization charters were developed after the formation of place-based community coalitions. Like the WGCIL and Unity CDC, CAPA addressed concerns about these issues through community organizing via the formation of a local neighborhood association. However, unlike many of the neighborhoods in the area, the Cathedral Area had a reputation as a “wealthier community” with a “strong property tax base,” resulting in a different relationship with city hall regarding the neighborhood concerns (interview, Joliet city employee, interview, 2012). In addition, Joliet’s
city hall was eager for the restoration of high home values as a result of better-maintained property. One of CAPA’s first initiatives was their successful work with the city government to downzone the area for residential single-family homes from multifamily apartment dwellings. This successful venture more than 20 years ago resulted in a positive relationship with city hall that continues today (K.J., City of Joliet planning director, interview, 2011).

More than 30 years after its formation, CAPA’s current work echoes its original purpose. Since 2000, CAPA programs have expanded to include several additional initiatives related to historic preservation and community-city relationships. Leadership in CAPA is voluntary; board leaders are elected for annual renewable terms. All CAPA programs are staffed by volunteers; there is no paid staff. The initial CAPA board, formed in 1981, had 13 members. The current 2016 board consists of 14 members, including four officers, six standing directors, and four at-large directors.

The CAPA board of directors and members are required to follow the organization bylaws document that established the mission, policies, and main objectives of the organization’s work. Because CAPA leaders serve annual voluntary terms, adherence to the bylaws is considered an essential part of the organization’s operations among its leaders (interview, B. N., CAPA member, interview). The CAPA organization has had the following consistent mission statement for the past 40 years:

The Cathedral Area Preservation Association shall be dedicated to preserving, maintaining, and promoting Joliet’s Cathedral Area. The organization shall strive to develop a prosperous community through the education of historic preservation and promotion of respect for old homes. (CAPA website, www.jolietcapa.net, 2012)
In 2012, CAPA’s programming focused on six core areas detailed in the current bylaws: (1) zoning, (2) housewalk, (3) membership, (4) newsletter, (5) marketing, and (6) welcoming. Each program area is appointed a “standing director” who sits on the organization’s board.

As stated in the organization’s mission statement, Unity CDC defines its constituents as “underserved” residents of Districts 4 and 5. According to the current Unity CDC executive director, this constituency includes “the African Americans and Latinos who were hardest hit by the changes in Joliet historically and with the recent [2007] recession” (M. W., Unity executive director, interview, 2007).

In addition, the organization’s constituency includes “the city and others with an interest in the planning area” (Unity CDC Mission Statement, www.unitycdc.org). This component of the mission statement has resulted in a complex and changing relationship between Unity and the municipality. In 2007, Unity was engaged in housing development planning with the economic development and housing development departments within the city. According to Unity CDC leaders, the relationship between Unity CDC and the City of Joliet was adversarial at that time because the agency’s program was viewed by the City as competition. In 2007, Unity’s most visible programs were a burgeoning housing development program, along with first-time homeowner education, financial education, and a construction plan for low-income housing development. These programs were led by the then-CEO of Unity CDC, a former retiree from outside of Joliet who had extensive experience in housing development and construction for low-income communities. Initially, the city provided vacant lots to assist the community development efforts, and the organization enjoyed some early victories, including the development of a

By the end of 2008, Unity’s relationship with the city had deteriorated amidst the fiscal recession, and no housing was constructed by Unity. Although approximately 100 individuals accessed the pre-housing programs, none was placed in housing. The CEO was accused of not acting in Joliet’s best interest, “not understanding the Joliet way,” and was ultimately fired from the leadership of the organization (M.W., Unity CDC executive director, interview, 2012).

A local Joliet resident retiree was recruited for a volunteer executive director position with Unity CDC in 2009. This individual had been very active in Joliet’s neighborhood councils program since the development of the Quality of Life Plan. The neighborhood councils program was elevated to the major activity of the organization, with appointed neighborhood leaders and regular meetings of each of 17 neighborhood communities. Unity struggled to some extent to find its “premier” objectives and programs, but was able to incorporate the visions of its various stakeholders and neighborhood groups to redevelop and rebrand its purpose (M.W., Unity executive director, interview, 2012). Eventually, Unity was able to develop partnerships with diverse organizations, including local colleges and universities, the city’s neighborhood services and planning departments, and various community leaders, to establish a neighborhood-based leadership development program and support its community programming.
For each study agency, the charter defined the constituencies and the programming focus. As a formal legal document, the charter was the most important guide for prescribing the methods with which the agency connected with the environment.

5. **Partnerships**

The final motivator for responsiveness among nonprofit organizations engaged in community development work is their internal and external partnerships. Partnerships ensure the external flexibility of organizations by influencing external social actors and change the external environment via their own actions. Engagement of external social actors was important to establishing the organization’s role within the community. The case study organizations engaged in several forms of external flexibility to address the racial demographic changes, including reliance on partners and stakeholders to influence the external environment.

Adopting external organization advisors was one type of partnership demonstrated in this study. Both formal and informal advisors influenced the ability of the case study organizations to recognize the demographic changes in their surrounding environment. Agency advisors served as a gauge to understand the motivations and pulse of the community and its needs. This was especially true when the organization’s mission was not based in the geographic community or the organization had less formal ties to the geographic constituents. These partners, especially those whose work was related to the case study organization’s mission, served as both advisors and direct influencers for the organization’s relationships its constituents and community.
For example, WGCIL drew on African American and Latino community leaders who were informal advisors to build a stronger outreach program for these communities. The staff member who worked in this area stated:

It was a really good idea to have the African American leaders (outreach focus) group. Who would have known that Charles and the other leaders had such faith in and connections to our organization? They were “right on” with what they said about the way to approach the community—through elders and the organizations. They will be good ambassadors for our work in the community. (M.T., WGCIL staff, interview, 2012)

Unity CDC relied on relationships with formally established neighborhood councils of residents to recognize and address demographic community changes. At Unity CDC, the primarily African American leadership engaged Latino community partners to establish cross-racial collaboration that would benefit both groups. At the time of this engagement in 2010, a growing Latino population on Collins Street was largely unrecognized by the city and county governments.

As a result of this cross-racial coalition and internal partnerships, both African American and Latino partners were able to advance agendas of their respective communities. In the case of Unity CDC, partnership activity also helped the organization to gain credibility and viable connections to important political constituencies, resulting in access to government resources and leaders for this collaborative alliance.

Finally, external organization partners served as liaisons between the case study agency and other organizations. For example, the City of Joliet’s neighborhood community
development director worked with CAPA’s board of directors to support the inclusion of diverse voices in community planning. The community development director regularly attended CAPA meetings and made the community aware of important local policy decisions that would affect their community. One important consequence of this relationship with an external partner was that CAPA was recognized by city leaders for its connections with local government agencies, providing additional legitimacy for the group.

You know, CAPA does a really good job of this. Other organizations can use them as a model and learn a thing or two from how they have worked with the City and our [Neighborhood Planning] department over the years. (A.M., neighborhood services planning official, City of Joliet, interview, 2011)

Organization partners served as important allies for recognizing and understanding community change. External partners served the case study organization in a formal capacity through contractual relationships or through informal advisory/liaison relationships that benefited the organization. Thus, in Joliet, the organizations utilized strategic partnerships to both identify changes and influence the community regarding their strategies and work as they developed their internal responses to the demographic changes in the community. Together, strategic and structural flexibility contributed to the ability of an organization to address and respond to racial demographic change.

C. Institutional Antecedents in Case Study Organizations

The analysis and results for this study chapter aimed to address the second research sub-question in the study:
What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in the satellite city?

The results presented in the previous sections of Chapter V aim to explore the presence of five institutional—or agency-level—response antecedents of recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnership within the case study organizations. The presence of these antecedents, when examined across all three case study organizations, provides additional insight regarding the basic conditions for community development organizations and practice to support the development of strategic responses to racial demographic change in the satellite city environment.

To this end, TABLE XI demonstrates the presence of the five organizational antecedents, along with their subcategories, across the three organizations analyzed in this study.
### TABLE XI
PRESENCE OF ANTECEDENTS AND SUBTYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent Subcategory</th>
<th>Antecedent Characteristics</th>
<th>WGCIL</th>
<th>Unity</th>
<th>CAPA</th>
<th>All Orgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Local constituency focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National coalition driven mission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary agency community type</td>
<td>Place-based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition-based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Organization history/tradition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-community connections</td>
<td>Staff- community connections</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal program policies</td>
<td>Easily flexible/ changed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not easily flexible/changed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Organizational leadership characteristics</td>
<td>Deep community connections</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement of community stakeholder/ advisors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning processes</td>
<td>Internally driven</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Externally-driven (Q of L Plan)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>Formal process for engagement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agility</td>
<td>Primary funding structure</td>
<td>Consideration of funder requirements and needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary governance structure</td>
<td>Collective management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission-based board selection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter/ bylaws</td>
<td>National-network based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place-based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>External advisors</td>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City/county partners</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State/national partners</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constituents/consumers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in TABLE XI, all five institutional antecedents appeared across the three study organizations featured in this study. Place-based missions, common in nonprofit organization engaged in community development activities, were critical to the recognition of place-based demographic changes within the organization’s surrounding environment. Community connections and organization history/traditions appeared in all three organizations as antecedents of flexibility. Third, the antecedent of reflection was supported by strong leadership with deep ties to the local community. These leaders and agencies also shared a commitment to organizational learning through community engagement strategies and engagement in local and organization-level planning processes. The agility, or speed, with which the organizations could respond to environmental changes was driven by both funding considerations and the collective model of governance at all three agencies. Finally, partnering with external advisors such as community leaders and agency constituents/consumers was also a common antecedent across the studied agencies.

Based on the analysis of common factors at the three case organizations, the organizational antecedents that must be present for a satellite city community development organization to respond to environmental change are as follows:

- **Recognition:** Place-base mission/constituency
- **Flexibility:** Organization history/traditions, staff connection to community
- **Reflection:** Leadership connections to community, community engagement processes
- **Agility:** Collective governance structure, consideration of funding requirements
- **Partnerships:** Incorporation of stakeholder/partner/advisor input and counsel regarding environmental change; Consideration of external constituent and partner needs and requirements
Together, these organizational characteristics support satellite city community development nonprofits’ ability to recognize and select appropriate responses to external changes in their environment. The emergence of these common institutional factors across the studied agencies warrants further exploration in future studies to uncover the required institutional conditions that support community development responsiveness within this environment.

D. Summary

This chapter identifies institutional antecedents that promote engagement in responsiveness to racial demographic changes in nonprofits engaged in community development activities in the satellite city environment. Five institution factors—recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnerships—are identified as internal characteristics that support nonprofit responsiveness to racial demographic change. Several of these characteristics, noted in the previous section, were common in all of the nonprofit organizations in this study. Other individual characteristics of the antecedents, like the engagement of specific partnerships and recognition of the environmental changes, varied across the organizations. However, together these antecedents paint a picture of organization features that support responsiveness. The next chapter examines the combined framework for responsiveness as developed in Chapter II, including the environmental (external) factors that precede responsiveness and six strategies of responsiveness as applied to the three satellite city nonprofit agencies.
VI. STRATEGIC RESPONSIVENESS TO ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

A. Overview

This chapter presents data and results from analysis regarding agency activities and behaviors that contribute to social and human service agency responsiveness to racial demographic changes in a satellite city environment. Specifically, the results and discussion in this section addresses the research question:

In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community?

As discussed in Chapter II, Oliver identifies an organization development theoretical framework for organizational responsiveness to changes. She argues that organizational responsiveness largely adheres to a political economy framework, where the surviving organization’s programmatic strategy is characterized by the survival or dominance of the most fit organization over competing organizations that are less suited to the environmental change. In this framework, Oliver identifies five strategic organizational responses to environmental change: acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, defiance, and manipulation. This chapter describes the utilization of these responses as well as additional responses employed by the satellite city agencies in their development of programming strategy and responses to external demographic changes.

Similar to the previous chapter, the presented results utilize 35 interviews conducted with agency staff, board members, and community members as well as historical agency documents
and archived and current websites. The study drew its analysis from three agencies, WGCIL, Unity CDC, and CAPA. The results were analyzed using a semi-structured coding scheme developed from Oliver’s framework of responsiveness (Miles et al. 2014). The data analysis began with coding the data using the conceptual framework developed in Chapter II for organizational responsiveness.

After coding the data, several analytical strategies—making comparisons, clustering, and identifying plausibility—were utilized to build a logical chain of evidence for the conceptual coherence of the analysis (Miles et al. 2014). Data triangulation was utilized to confirm observations by matching up agency documents and records with the results of the interviews. The final conceptual framework utilized data-vetting sessions, agency documents, and program records, in addition to the interview results, to triangulate data for the trustworthiness and fidelity of the results (Creswell 2014).

B. Oliver’s Environmental Antecedents

Oliver (1991) identified five environmental antecedent that precede organizational responses to external change. These environmental antecedents are similar in some ways to the organizational antecedents identified in the previous chapter. Thus, Oliver’s five antecedents—constituents, cause, content, context, and coercion—serve to define the specific relationship between the environment and the organizations that will influence the latter’s ability to respond to any changes in the environment. These antecedents focus on the environment and environmental changes, not organizational conditions, to identify conditions that promote responsiveness at the agencies.
1. **Constituents**

In the satellite city context, the constituents of community development organizations are represented by the target groups that agency serves: the local and county government entities engaged in community planning, the local nonprofit organizations and foundations that support community development work, as well as other organizational relationships. In addition to these specific social actors, many institutional relationships and forces influence the organization’s operations in its local environment. One of these forces is social and cultural expectations. Within all case study organizations, there was recognition of the importance of serving the local population and an awareness of inequity in service distribution in the community. Furthermore, interview respondents from all three organizations identified the profound racial changes in the community as a key feature of the external environment. As described by one organization staff member:

> There have been dramatic changes in the community in the last 20 years. There are more Hispanics than ever before. They are shifting the makeup of that whole area by Collins Street. It is showing up in our schools, agencies, and our own [agency] programs, we even have an outreach coordinator for Spanish-speakers now. (M.T., WGCIL staff, interview, 2012)

For most interview respondents, the recent racial changes in the Joliet environment only highlighted the existing geospatial mismatch between services delivery and the local minority population, extending the problem to the new families that were settling in the region.

> They just don’t have as many services for the kids and families in this area. Most agencies—even the hospitals—are moving out of
the area. Kids aren’t being served—there just isn’t much for them to do. We want to help with that. (B.G., Unity CDC board member, interview)

In this manner, the experiences of organization stakeholders reflected the institutional environment; thus, the institutional environment directly affected the programmatic operations of the organizations. Racial change was a central feature of the satellite city environment during the study period. Starting with the Quality of Life Plan, several comprehensive community planning processes during this era, both citizen and government-led, pointed to the significance of racial changes in the community and its institutions.

There have been several comprehensive planning processes [since the Districts 4 and 5 Plan]. These plans capture what these changes mean to the community, its organizations, and its people from all districts. (K.J., City of Joliet employee, interview, 2011)

Community racial change also heralded challenges to the nonprofit community development organizations in the area. In the midst of these changes, Unity CDC chose to expand its programmatic activities to more deeply reflect the community. Another organization, WGCIL, increased its lobbying efforts and aligned with similar national and statewide organizations, changing programmatic focus from minority-focused programming to a broad overall focus on community organizing and coalition building. However, even without expansion of programming to state or national levels, all of the organizations were affected programmatically by the dramatic racial changes occurring in the immediate environment. Organization leaders often cited programming challenges resulting from external environmental pressures related to the demographic changes. “Our new constituents and existing residents are not being well served [by current programs],” indicated one local leader. “Any programming
changes will require that we all wake up and smell the coffee. Joliet looks different now and has different needs. Until we embrace this, we can’t serve the community.”

2. **Cause**

*Cause*, the second antecedent in Oliver’s framework, is a result of both legitimacy and efficiency. Resource dependence and institutional theory extensively describe the effect of efficiency on an organization and its social environment. In both resource dependence and institutional theory, all organizations operate in legitimacy-seeking systems. Gaining legitimacy in resource dependence is a function of resource mobilization, whereas social worthiness is the central component of legitimacy in institutional theory. Nonprofits, like other organizations in the community development system, are striving for legitimacy. Within the studied satellite city system, nonprofits operated within complex, local, and broadly determined social and political norms. In turn, environmental expectations, also known as norms, can serve to legitimate the organizations. One expectation within the political system of the satellite city, the expectation of deep community ties and residency, raised questions about the legitimacy of one case study organization.

The [former] executive director was not from around here. He didn’t understand how things worked. He was thought to be trying to compete with the City and it didn’t go down well. Eventually, it became a big liability—no one would talk to us. No one would work with us. He had to be let go for the cause. (M.W., Unity CDC executive director, interview, 2011)

The case study organizations and their directors gained legitimacy through their profound community ties. All of the organizations had leaders and directors who were lifelong community residents. Furthermore, all of the organizations were known for their work on behalf
of the community, voluntary activities, and service to the disenfranchised that would benefit the social, political, economic, and physical landscape of the community. Although the organizations had little direct political or economic influence, the organizations were seen as legitimate voices of the community because of the clout of the directors and their active participation in community development activities for many years. Furthermore, the organizations had established legitimate relationships with funders and government that supported their economic viability over many years.

3. **Content**

For **content**, compliance with institutional pressure is more likely when the content of organization and stakeholder interests is aligned (Oliver 1991). This environmental content was apparent in the evidence gathered for the study. Stakeholder goals before the Quality of Life planning process were consistent with community goals of addressing inequality in community provisions in a comprehensive plan. The first planning document, released in its entirety in 2007, described two environmental conditions that drove changes in the nonprofit landscape in Joliet: the first was the description of the historical racial and demographic changes; the second was a new comprehensive plan to address the inequalities in community development service provision areas such as affordable housing, education, youth development/recreation, and social services.

There are many important areas of the plan; it was our job to ensure that the community as a whole makes progress by working with other stakeholders, the city, the funders, and others. (S.S., Unity CDC executive director, interview, 2010)

The alignment of content ensured that organizations were able to recognize the racial
change consistently and enact a community-wide response to the change, ensuring consistent recognition of the change and a cohesive community response to the change.

4. **Context**

The public awareness of these environmental conditions, or context, led to an eventual reshaping of the expectations of the case study organizations. Coupled with changes in the funding landscape, participation in and implementation of the Quality of Life planning process led to a shift in the legitimacy, status, connections, diversity, and demands upon the case study organizations. As stakeholders, including the city government, funders, and constituents, began their informal and formal evaluations of the organizations’ programming in light of these shifting requirements, the nature of organizations themselves began to change.

The nonprofit funding stream often raised questions among observers and community members about the legitimacy of nonprofit community development organizations and their programs. One source of questioning was reliance on local casino foundations, which were responsible for providing more than half of the local nonprofit funding in the community. The reliance on the so-called vice-driven dollars of these entities raised concern among community members and other stakeholders. A second concern with legitimacy occurred when the community began to rely on external donors and professionals to fund these efforts. These donors and professionals were seen by community members to have differing agendas from the community itself.

One of the challenges [at the organization] before my tenure was trying to match the policies and the programs that were happening in Chicago. The whole focus on building affordable housing—like a developer—without the city was a big fail. This was pushed by
partners and funders who were not from our city. (M.W., Unity CDC executive director, interview)

Diversified funding streams—private donors, government funding, and local foundations—were considered by organizational stakeholders and staff alike to provide more flexibility and independence in programmatic decision-making. Financial independence was also connected with accountability mandates in which funders required data entry and financial reconciliations to promote their interests in programming. These mandates affected the efficiency with which the programs could address new community concerns. Financial independence from undesirable funding streams and efficiency was a critical part of organizational context, resulting in the organizations gaining legitimacy in their programming.

Research participants responded differently to queries about whether institutional resource dependence indicated that the funders either directly or indirectly dictated programming strategy at the nonprofit community development organization. Several respondents indicated that all nonprofit community development organizations were too quick to adopt funder-driven or externally driven requirements instead of conducting thorough needs assessments and community-driven planning processes to uncover community needs systematically. Furthermore, several research respondents felt that agencies and their staff with ties to other communities and/or resources were not supporting improvement of their own community. For this group of respondents, nonprofit community development staff were often focused on “staff development” and advancement at the expense of their constituent community members and residents. These concerns increased for all community stakeholders when evidence emerged about the conflict between the City and Unity CDC in the plan
implementation. Organizations participating in the Quality of Life Plan were bound to the Unity CDC director’s implementation of the District 4 and 5 plans, which shifted to externally supported housing development funds; the city-county government directly provided over $300,000 in start-up funding for the implementation of the plan. However, interviewed respondents felt that the director’s shift to large-scale housing development reflected a shift away from the community and grassroots origins of Unity CDC and the Quality of Life Plan. Although the Quality of Life planning process was initially a means for addressing community inequality, the shift to housing eventually resulted in the City blocking access to land and other developmental resources and eventually developing its own comprehensive plan, dismantling legitimacy of Unity CDC in the city environment for many. However, others viewed all work related to the Quality of Life implementation as serving the community. These individuals advocated another role for the organization, in which Unity would serve as the “voice of the people” in community decision-making. This view ultimately led to a restructuring of Unity’s programming to address direct-service community needs and re-established the organization’s legitimacy in the community.

5. **Coercion**

Coercion, the last of Oliver’s environmental antecedents for organizational responsiveness, was felt throughout the community organizations and their constituencies. The varied interests and needs of the community development organizations’ constituents as they related to the environmental change served as another coercive force in the development of the organizations. In all cases, the organizations were formed to serve the needs of their immediate constituents, whether racial minorities, individuals with disabilities, or community
homeowners. Serving the needs of the identified constituents was paramount to the establishment of these organizations. However, the fall of the housing market and the effects of the 2007–2008 recession introduced significant change into the environment, with additional migration into the city bringing further racial change, a decrease in homeownership tax bases, and significantly reduced funding bases of all types. The effects of these forces were seen in the emergent relationship with the case study agencies and governmental agencies responsible for community planning, including the planning division and zoning board–land use departments in the city. Over the course of the study, new relationships and mechanisms for establishing and renegotiating legitimacy emerged between community development nonprofits and these government entities.

For Oliver (1991), uncertainty and interconnectedness were the two most important topics related to context. The demographic changes in the environment, coupled with financial uncertainty caused by the recession and State of Illinois budgetary concerns, created uncertainty in the organizations’ external environment. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) described environmental uncertainty as “the degree to which future states of the world cannot be anticipated and accurately predicted” (p.67). The description of racial demographic changes by a member of the local planning department as “the main instigator of social, political, and economic issues” in the geographic area validated this definition. In addition, although racial changes may have been the main source of uncertainty, the result of the racial change was a community divided by physical location (Districts 4 and 5) into a community of haves (Districts 1 and 2) and have-nots (Districts 4 and 5) without cohesive interconnectedness.
During the course of this study, the case study nonprofit organizations engaged in intensive exchanges with other social actors in the satellite city community. The nonprofit role reflected different power exchanges between the government and agencies that reflected the environmental antecedents. Over the course of study, the relationship between the nonprofits engaged in community development activities and the local governmental organizations proceeded through four distinct phases: advancement, hostility, tolerance, and acceptance. In the earliest stages after the development of the Quality of Life Plan, the city government advanced nonprofits with community development agendas as the ideal implementers of the plan. The City provided major funding for the establishment of Unity CDC to oversee the plan’s implementation. At this time, the city viewed the nonprofit organization as a conduit to local populations and community stakeholders who held vital community development information.

However, under the direction of a newly hired Unity executive director, nonprofit organizations supported and developed a land-use and affordable housing strategy to advance the plan’s implementation in the highest-impact areas. During this era, from 2009 to 2011, the relationship between the City and nonprofit organizations was hostile and contentious. The City viewed nonprofit community development and housing programming initiatives as challenging their housing and development functions and responded with open hostility, withdrawing resources such as low-cost land and government support for development work, including zoning issues, undertaken by the nonprofits. This deteriorating relationship affected programming for those nonprofits who engaged most heavily in housing-related work with the City; however, the diminished perceptions of nonprofit and extragovernmental community
development accountability affected all agencies engaged with the community negatively.

In 2011, there was a turnover of the executive directors in two of the case study agencies. The new executive directors of the organizations were lifelong local residents who were born and lived in the community. This turnover marked a new relationship between nonprofits and the local government in which the local government directed desirable roles for the organizations in city development efforts. In this era, the agencies became known as the voice of people and promoted City interests and projects to the community. The predominant relationship between nonprofits and the city government was truce, in which nonprofits no longer openly critiqued government roles and policies, but rather promoted their efforts among the constituents. In this era, nonprofit organizations were viewed as pragmatically legitimate because they offered access to community members and provided community services that the government could not afford to provide, especially in critical disadvantaged districts.

The issue of power played an important role in the environmental context of the satellite city. Although the city government had no direct regulatory authority over the nonprofit organizations, it played a strong influential and regulatory role in two of the case study organizations, Unity CDC and CAPA. The City had less direct influence on the third case study agency, WGCIL. For all of these organizations, the City played an important role, as cordial relationships with local authorities are essential to community development activity. In the case of Unity CDC and WGCIL, the City was directly responsible for providing critical funding for their community development–related activities. The role of the nonprofit community development organization started as a means to critique the government’s handling of social
service and community provisions. However, the organizations were required to maintain cordial relationships with the critical governmental actors in the community development system. Eventually, the nonprofit agencies silenced their voice and critiques of governmental actions to maintain their legitimacy. As a result, power shifted to the local government actors who dictated the appropriate roles for these nonprofits, even dictating the nonprofit messages to their constituencies about community development efforts and players.

The community members relied on these nonprofits to negotiate with local government and other social actors on their behalf, but nonprofits engaged in many other roles and facets of community life as well. In their role in the Quality of Life planning process and community development, nonprofits shaped physical space via their involvement in housing development, historic preservation, transportation services, and community organizing. In this satellite city community, nonprofit organizations were also deeply involved, either directly or indirectly, in the political and social life of the environment. For community members, the role of these agencies included advocate, intercessory, and shape-shifter of physical space. In turn, nonprofit programming and activities—including the very nature of the agency work—was shaped by their involvement in community life.

Community organizing is not just a program or philosophy. Organizing has become how we do business. (P.H., WGCIL executive director, interview, 2012)

Although most social actors in the satellite city consider nonprofit organizations passive actors in the physical realm of community development, the case study organizations were far from passive social actors. Instead, they played an important role in advancing civic participation
in their constituent base. Unity CDC and CAPA both actively participated in formal government through the zoning and neighborhood services commissions for the City of Joliet. Although the organizations refrained from taking a political stance, they participated informally in civic events and voting-related activities by mobilizing their grassroots constituent base to participate in civic activities.

Many nonprofit organizations were involved in the Joliet Quality of Life planning process. However, the case study nonprofits had different levels of experience in dealing with governmental agencies and planning processes for environmental change. Both Unity CDC and CAPA became directly involved, contributing to collective efforts to create programming that could influence and redirect the implementation of the planning process as well as future relationships with social actors in the area. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living was less directly involved in the planning process and civic affairs with the City of Joliet. Yet, WGCIL’s programming created a vital voice for youth and citizens with disabilities in the community.

Before the Quality of Life planning process, there was very little coordination of efforts in community development among nonprofit organizations in the area. At this time, nonprofit organizations were relatively weak participants in the satellite city environment and had relatively little power for agenda setting. However, this dynamic shifted over the course of the study. As one interviewee pointed out, donors and civic leaders alike were utilizing the case study organizations to address the needs of the community. The Quality of Life planning process provided the organizations with the structure and support needed to coordinate community
development efforts, creating a process of competition and collaboration similar to a true community development marketplace. The unified stance among nonprofit organizations in these planning processes created additional negotiating power for the sector with local government and other social actors. The nonprofit organizations were able to leverage the interdependence of the satellite city’s community development system to create physical and infrastructural advantages for their work.

C. **Strategic Responsiveness**

The five organizational antecedents uncovered in the previous chapter—recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnerships—precede organizational responsiveness. In the satellite city community development system, organizations demonstrating favorable characteristics of the antecedents would be more likely to identify, select, and enact the strategic responses to external change. Furthermore, organizations displaying strategic responses to racial demographic changes relied on their interpretation of response antecedents and developed appropriate strategic responses for their program-related decision-making.

As described in the Chapter II literature review, organization development literature identifies five strategic responses to external change. First identified by Christine Oliver in 1991, the five responses strategies comprise the dominant framework for the organization’s decision-making to address change. In this framework, organizations struggle for a competitive advantage over similar groups when confronted with environmental changes. In satellite city environments, the range of organizational behavior extends to include adaptation to the change, introducing new strategic responses into Oliver’s framework. This chapter will describe the five strategic
responses in Oliver’s framework as demonstrated in the organization’s programming, and then present additional emerging response categories that encompass organization behaviors extending beyond this framework.

D. Strategic Responsiveness in the Case Study Organizations

The organizations featured in this study are seminal organizations in the Joliet nonprofit and community development landscape. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living’s programming provided social services, community organizing, and housing services for individuals with disabilities. The Cathedral Area Preservation Association developed civic engagement and historic preservation for residents of Joliet’s District 4 Cathedral Area. Although arriving in Joliet some 20 years later than the other organizations, Unity CDC developed social services, youth development, and housing services as they implemented the Joliet District 4 and 5 Quality of Life Plan. The three organizations also supported programming that connected disparate institutions in Joliet’s community development system, including churches, government agencies, and neighborhood groups.

Oliver’s model of strategic responsiveness relies on resource dependence and institutional pressures as drivers of organization responses to external change. This dissertation asks what strategies community-based human service agencies—specifically those engaged in community development activities—select as they respond to economic and political pressures from external stakeholders as well as how and why they select these responses. In her 1991 framework of responsiveness, Oliver presented typology of five possible strategies, based on the political economy framework, that organizations demonstrate when responding to external environmental
stressors. They are arranged in ascending order, from the most accommodating to the most strategically powerful. TABLE XII provides the overall framework of the strategies as they align with Oliver’s typology.

**TABLE XII**

OLIVER’S TYPOLOGY OF STRATEGIC RESPONSIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Response</th>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Organizational Power Relative to Others</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiescence</td>
<td>Habit</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unconscious norm consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Mimicking others’ behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Balancing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negotiate an acceptable compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacifying</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Conformity to an acceptable standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Exchanging concession between organizations and constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>Concealment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Symbolic compliance, without actual change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buffering</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Reducing inspection or hiding reality from outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escaping</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Changing goals, activities, or physical location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Ignore due to low cost or lack of congruence with mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Challenge rules of the institutional environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attacking</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Attack values to enforce privileged position in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>Co-opting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Influence institutional elites through membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influencing</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Influence institutional beliefs and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Exerting control over social approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Oliver’s framework, three tactics, manifestations of each strategy, are presented in ascending order of intensity. Habit, imitation, and compliance are the tactics associated with the strategy of acquiescence. The strategy of compromise includes tactics of balancing, pacifying, and bargaining. Avoidance is associated with tactics of concealment, buffering, and escaping. Defiance as a strategy includes tactics of dismissal, challenge, and attack. Manipulation is divided into the tactics of co-optation, influence, and control. This research will examine organizational responsiveness utilizing Oliver’s typology from the least direct response of acquiescence to the most direct response of manipulation.

Austin’s (2002) description of nonprofit human service organization stakeholders includes clients, funders, agency employees, government and policy makers, other nonprofit organizations, the media, and the general public (pp. 60–1). In this research, neighborhood/community residents living within the geographic area of the organizations will also be considered stakeholders. The settlement house predecessors of community development organizations often defined the organizations as equal collaborations between the founders and community residents (Salamon and Anheier 1997; Webber 2012). However, as in the case of two of the case study organizations, community development organizations are often founded and staffed by middle-class and upper middle-class community residents as well as external stakeholders (Davis and Powell 1967).

In this section, responsive behaviors and strategies that clearly utilize Oliver’s typology are addressed, from acquiescence to manipulation. In the next section, additional strategies or responses are presented that appeared frequently within the case study organizations, but were
not explained by Oliver’s typology. These strategies—including cooperation, capacity building, and collaboration—deviate from the institutional and resource dependence frameworks of Oliver’s typology. The research will argue that these three new responses demonstrate a social ecology framework, which may be anticipated in smaller geographic areas such as satellite cities. As described in previous literature, the Quality of Life planning process—a comprehensive community initiative—advances these strategic responses of nonprofit human service organizations in Joliet. In this manner, the strategic responses in this environment extended beyond political economy–driven pressures to models favoring adaptability.

1. **Acquiescence**

Oliver considers acquiescence to be the most immediate and least contentious response to external pressures. In her discussion of acquiescence, she identified that acquiescence relies “on the organization’s conscious intent to conform, its degree of awareness of institutional processes, and its expectation that conformity will be self-serving to organizational interests (Oliver 1991, p.153)”.

Drawing on institutional theory, Oliver defined **habit** as an “unconscious or blind adherence to preconscious or taken-for-granted rules and values,” and **imitation** as “the conscious or unconscious mimicry of admired or accepted institutional models” of external stakeholders. **Compliance**, a resource dependence tactic, is defined as “conscious obedience to or incorporation of values, norms or institutional requirements of external stakeholders” (p. 152). Oliver further states that acquiescence and compliance are the most commonly used strategic responses and tactics, which was also seen in the data for this study. As the most commonly used tactic of responsiveness, acquiescence was often at the forefront of agency strategies to address
racial demographic changes. Compliance was the most frequently appearing tactic in the case study organizations, and was utilized in several manners by the agencies.

First, compliance was used to advance agency legitimacy to funders. Agency appearance and image was the reason for this type of compliance. In one example, the agency director reminded staff and constituents to “dress up” appropriately when participating in legislative events or funder-site visits. In another, a case study agency conducted regular open houses so funders, potential clients, and government agency stakeholders could see their site. A third director reminded clients, staff, and interns that they represented the agency to visitors and should conduct themselves appropriately at work and outside work. During interviews, all three case study agency directors described the effect of “appearances” on funders and other stakeholders.

The cleanliness and appearance of the [agency] offices is important, but so is the appearance of consumers [clients] in the community. They are our ambassadors and directly impact funding decisions and evaluations of our agency. (M.T., WGCIL staff, interview, 2012)

Second, compliance affected programming strategies when responding to legal regulations and institutional requirements. Community centers serving food must adhere to public health requirements. In addition, city health departments have the legal authority to prevent centers from serving food if they do not meet specific hygiene standards. Public health and state safety regulations about food handling affected programming decisions at Unity CDC. The public health observations led to a temporary sanction of the afterschool youth program due to noncompliance with specific regulations for food preparation and disposal. These food service
requirements led to perceived waste of food by agency staff, and ultimately the food service program was closed.

Third, compliance was used to create goodwill among community members through community development programming. At WGCIL, the agency hired an outreach director who was Hispanic to lead Latino outreach efforts. African American outreach was conducted by current African American agency staff with deep ties to those communities. During internal staff meetings, the director indicated that although state funders were requiring outreach to these particular communities, the connections made by these staff would assist in the development of programming to better serve all consumers. Before these efforts, center consumers were predominantly elderly and European American; recent demographic shifts in the community led to more requests for programs to serve Latino and African American youth and young adults. In discussion, the center director referenced recent criticisms that the center was not adequately serving the predominantly African American and Latino neighborhoods in the surrounding community. The renewed emphasis on outreach to African Americans and Latinos helped to develop the center’s sensitivity to the cultural needs and expectations of the surrounding neighborhood.

Finally, compliance with funder expectations was considered an important component of the agency’s maintenance. Center directors continually found methods to align programming with funding expectations while maintaining their agency vision and mission. In several instances, directors found ways to align their programs with new funding expectations that did not significantly change the nature of their programs. One example is the recreation program at
Unity CDC, which met the needs of youth development, recreation, and educational programming in the Quality of Life Plan driving the agency mission. At first, the program was conceived afterschool programming and allowed the agency to access out-of-school programming funds that were offered by the Illinois State Board of Education. However, compliance issues with food service and youth homework time eventually caused the agency to shift programming. The resultant program was a summer sports league that circumvented the food service needs of afterschool programming as well as required homework time. In discussing the shift in programming, the agency director described the shift as follows:

“The afterschool program was just hard—so many requirements and rules. The kids were not getting much from the adults after all of that. However, the summer program has been very successful—they [kids] enjoy it; the adult coaches enjoy it. The funders’ money is being put to good use. (M.W., Unity CDC executive director, interview, 2012)

The youth program was already aligned with Unity’s mission and vision, but the agency chose to shift to a more manageable summertime program that also met funder requirements.

In the case study agencies, acquiescence was witnessed in various levels of institutional power, from meeting funder expectations to acknowledging organization inability to address requirements. From these multiple positions, acquiescence had a profound effect on program development and maintenance at the agencies.
2. **Compromise**

When submission to institutional pressures is not feasible or appropriate, organizations will resist pressure to change. *Compromise* is defined by Oliver (1991) as “the thin edge of the wedge [of responses] to resist pressures” (p.152). Oliver indicates that compromise can be utilized tactically in three ways. *Balancing* is the “... organizational attempt to achieve among or between multiple stakeholders and internal interests” (Oliver 1991, p. 153). Second, agencies that employ *pacifying* as a tactic may oppose pressure but generally attempt to placate the source of pressure (p. 154). Third, “[b]argaining is a more active form of compromise than pacifying. Bargaining tactics involve the effort of the organization to exact some concessions from an external constituent in its demands or expectations” (p. 154). The study data indicate that balancing and bargaining were the second most used of Oliver’s responses to external changes in the case study agencies.

Compromise can take several forms, from balancing contradicting interests to bargaining for the agencies’ programming interests with stakeholders. In one case, the Unity CDC executive director had received city funds to implement the more than 82 recommendations in the Quality of Life Plan. The City had provided additional funding to develop agency infrastructure and the neighborhood councils program, but the agency director wished to start a housing development fund to generate income for the company. “Go big or go home,” the director said when describing his perspective. However, the City considered housing development its own purview and thought its own neighborhood development plan superseded the Quality of Life recommendations for housing development. As the agency had limited funds and program personnel, the executive director and staff discussed whether to launch their own housing
development program. The dilemma was resolved when the agency and City decided to integrate their efforts, with the City providing vacant lots and the agency providing needed manpower to develop the land, providing jobs and housing development. Thus, the Quality of Life Plan—central to the agency’s mission—and constituent needs were balanced against the City’s expectations. Bargaining was also utilized to address the City’s expectations at staff and board meetings.

Compromise often relies on the tactic of balancing disparate interests. In another example occurring later in the study period, the City turned to Unity CDC when asked to gather community input about local utilities. The city government wanted to maintain positive relationships with the community and the utility company, which were at odds over the construction work. In this case, Unity CDC provided a conduit for gathering public input, allowing the City to “save face” with the community while gathering community input. In this way, the City was able to provide balance for the City interests and community interests. As a result of this compromise, Unity CDC’s programs became the voice of the people of District 4 and 5 in government-related issues.

Compromise is also used to foster agency reputation with stakeholders. At a staff meeting, the CAPA executive director explained her reasoning for providing technical assistance to Unity CDC.

We have such vast experience working with the City as a stakeholder. We are clearly better at it [than Unity]. We don’t need to be greedy with our expertise. In the end, all neighborhoods will benefit from our working together. (R.D., CAPA executive director, interview)
The director went on to describe Unity’s desire for technical assistance and support from CAPA in regard to working with the City, as well as the perception among some residents that CAPA was “holding on” to the relationships. Through sharing their expertise in working with the City, CAPA attempted to balance the agency’s reputation with the neighborhood’s needs. The actions also appear to be an attempt to pacify neighborhood residents and Unity CDC.

Pacification was utilized as a tactic by the agencies when working with local political leaders and city workers. After the ousting of the first executive director at Unity CDC, stakeholders asked the neighborhood councils to identify a leader who would serve the interests of the local government and the neighborhoods. As the previous director was from outside the community, the City and neighborhood residents felt a local leader would be a better fit to serve these interests. The Unity executive board asked the leader of the neighborhood councils, a retiree who was a lifelong resident of the community, to become the new executive director. Although this person lacked experience in nonprofit management and community development, the selection pacified both the city and community residents who felt the former director did not understand the community processes or needs. When the new director discussed the shift and process, he expressed regret that some community and government leaders need to be placated and needed to be reminded of serving their constituents.

Initially, many staff discussions about strategy utilized elements of both avoidance and compromise. Eventually these discussions tended toward compromising tactics that were less confrontational than those initially planned. In these instances, informal collective bargaining was utilized to leverage constituents’ interests. At WGCIL, bargaining was employed per its CIL
history and mission when the agency used “community organizing as a method of business” (M.T., WGCIL program director, interview, 2012). When one of its major funders switched funding interests to community organizing, WGCIL found new programming venues for its advocacy work and community-organizing programs throughout the entire programming portfolio to maintain the funding and relationships. The agency bargained with both stakeholders by minimizing its housing development programming and expanding community organizing to youth programming, advocacy, and other existing programs to access new funds. In this compromise, the agency engaged in new programming to teach community-organizing principles to all its staff, leaders (boards), and constituents. By hiring a local community organizer and providing organizing opportunities for its constituents, WGCIL was able to stay true to its CIL roots in organizing while accessing new funds and constituents. Consequently, WGCIL would maintain control over its programs and incorporate programs per its mission, while maintaining funder interest. Some tactics employed by the agencies would contain elements of avoidance, discussed in the next section, and bargaining. For example, a Unity CDC partner indicated that afterschool programming was reimbursed at a higher rate if the children were “at risk” or eligible for the free and reduced lunch program. Thus, the grant labeled its target population as at risk to access these funds.

3. **Avoidance**

Avoidance, according to Oliver (1991, p. 154), is “the organizational attempt to preclude the necessity of conformity, buffering themselves from institutional pressures, or escaping from institutional rules or expectations.” Avoidance was further divided into tactics of concealment, buffering, and escape. Avoidance was difficult to detect in the data gathered for this study, as it
would indicate intentional disregard of stakeholder interests and pressures. As a result, initial considerations of avoidance by agencies were resolved by utilizing less confrontational tactics, such as compromise. Throughout the study, there was only one clear example of avoidance cited by the agencies, in the form of escape. Unity CDC withdrew from housing development programming efforts in response to pressures from local government leaders. Ultimately, the organization focused more intensely on social, youth development, and other services. Deeper analysis shows that this decision was also made to appease city leaders via manipulations and compromise to maintain critical and long-standing relationships with the city. In describing this, a local planning division staff member indicated that

> housing, transportation, and commercial building, those are functions of government. It is best left to the government. Unity should really be more directly involved with the community. That was their history . . . the voice of the community, you know. (A.M., staff, Joliet Planning Division, interview)

Avoidance of housing development activities might have been Unity’s initial response, but the organization was also used to acquiescing to city demands regarding appropriate programming goals for the organization.

4. **Defiance**

Defiance is another strategic response that is difficult for organizations to admit openly. Oliver (1991) holds that “defiance is a more active form of resistance to institutional pressures” (p. 156). It involves tactics of “challenging, or attacking institutional rules, pressures, and values of stakeholders. Both Unity CDC and WGCIL employed defiance based on their institutional histories of community organizing. Dismissing, or ignoring institutional rules and
values, is a strategic option that organizations... exercise when the potential for external enforcement of institutional rules is perceived to be low or when internal objectives conflict dramatically with institutional values and requirements” (Oliver 1991, p. 154). In Oliver further asserts that organizations engaging in activities such as community organizing may

…challenge institutional pressures by going on the offensive in defiance of these pressures and indeed may make a virtue of their insurrection. Attack is distinguishable from challenge as a tactic of defiance by the intensity and aggressiveness of the organization’s active departure from institutional pressures and expectations (Oliver, 1991, pp. 156–7).

Community organizing encourages defiance against social and institutional pressures (Stoecker 2003). However, the exclusive use of defiance by the case study agencies to resist stakeholders was very limited in the study. Organizing efforts typically gave way to compromise or bargaining. The most overt example of defiance came from one agency director: “The university people came to tell all the state-funded agencies don't kid yourself, don’t fool yourself, outcome-based funding is not scientific research. It was really true with our program—it is hard to get people with disabilities and multiple barriers into employment and independent living. There are so many issues to work through—one simple grant isn’t going to change much. (K.M., WGCIL program director, interview, 2011)

This director shared these thoughts with other agencies and the funder while acknowledging that her opinion was not always well accepted by philanthropic organizations. However, she also indicated that she often tempered her opinion when it came to funders who were resistant to the idea. “I have two spiels about outcomes,” she explained, “depending on
what they are more open to hearing.” In this case, her response started as defiance but eventually acquiesced to the predominant demands and opinions within the funding community.

5. **Manipulation**

Oliver (1991) describes manipulation as having three tactics: co-optation, influence, and control. She writes, “manipulation is the strongest response to [stakeholder] pressures because it is intended to actively change or exert power over the content of the expectations themselves or the sources that seek to express or enforce them” (p.166). Manipulation utilizes purposeful and opportunistic tactics to co-opt, influence, or control agency stakeholders. The intended effect of co-optation tactics is to “neutralize institutional opposition and enhance legitimacy” (Oliver 1991, p. 157). Influencing tactics, states Oliver, “may be more generally directed toward institutionalized values and beliefs or definitions and criteria of acceptable practices or performance” (Oliver 1991, p.157). Controlling tactics, by comparison, are “specific efforts to establish power and dominance over the external constituents that are applying pressure” (p. 157).

Co-optation was the tactic of manipulation most frequently employed by the case study agencies. Unity CDC used this strategy when it hired a local resident as executive director of the agency to ensure support for its mission and city interests. Leadership was often a place of co-optation, as WGCIL’s charter stated that half of the agency board must be composed of persons with disabilities. Captured in the CILs’ signature phrase, “Nothing about us without us,” this requirement ensured that the agency retained sight of its interest and mission in the disabilities movement. Through the development of the African American Leadership Council and the
Hispanic Leadership Councils that advised the agency on outreach and programming for these groups, WGCIL stayed true to this mission. Similarly, CAPA’s entire board consisted of homeowners in the area, including those with connections to city government and local leaders. For all of the agencies, these influential board members were present to obtain access to resources and occasionally to influence funders and the general public to support the agency’s positions and programming. For Oliver, the second tactic of manipulation, influence, involves “. . . tactics [that are] more generally directed toward institutionalized values and beliefs or definitions and criteria of acceptable practices or performance” (1991, p. 158). If community organizing is an overall example of manipulation, then advocacy is an example of the tactic of influence. Throughout the study, agencies and their stakeholders alike engaged in countless efforts to advocate for the centers and their programs with the city, government agencies, funding agencies, and constituents. Influence was employed to emphasize the critical role the centers played in the community, their connections with constituents and community residents, and their long-standing role as conduits to community resources within the local and state government.

The case study organizations’ history with the government entities in Joliet was an important part of their work. All agency directors were cognizant of their visibility in government roles and activities. When a CAPA executive committee member was asked about his role on the zoning board, he responded with examples of rezoning the CAPA area for single-family homes, a recent attempt to minimize liquor stores and pawn shops in the area, and the agency’s increasing role of voicing citizen concerns for all of Joliet’s citizens regarding zoning and community welfare matters beyond CAPA’s boundaries. “They [the city council] are used to
working with us,” he explained, “for the last twenty years.” He articulated the needs of the neighborhood in the hope that city council representatives would understand the significant negative impact their proposals would have on the center and its surrounding area. The executive committee member talked about advocacy work he and other CAPA members conducted on behalf of the community.

In my role I advocate on behalf of the neighborhood and community members. CAPA members would be there to support the issue and make public comments. The issue of decreasing [neighborhood] patrol officers and business licensing was an obvious connection with work on the zoning council. Neighborhood safety and property values are tied to these issues. When the city was determining its budget priorities, I would submit comments about programing and community interests, and the needs of community members. (B.N., CAPA executive committee member, interview, 2012)

In the discussion, the CAPA executive committee member acknowledged that he would contact district council representatives to advance his view. “Joliet is a small town,” he stated. “The personal touch is important to make things happen.” These strong working relationships were important to addressing many community issues with the city. Consistent face-to-face interactions were an important component of advocating and working on behalf of the community.

During the period of observations and interviews, Joliet and the neighborhoods were faced with a large problem. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development filed a federal lawsuit claiming discrimination regarding Evergreen Terrace, a Housing Authority of Joliet public housing complex. When this agenda item was discussed at Unity CDC and CAPA, there was much discussion about how the Evergreen Terrace projects should be dismantled or
should allow more Latino families. One neighborhood council member announced that Evergreen Terrace “. . . should maintain its legacy of African American tenants,” allowing newer and larger housing developments to recruit the larger Latino families into the area. During this discussion, Unity neighborhood council members demonstrated controlling language when discussing HUD’s negotiations with the Joliet housing authority. One resident of the area, an attorney, argued, “Evergreen Terrace land is valuable. The Feds just want it for developers who will threaten the fabric of the community. This is not about race or racial equality.” He further recommended that the director and board refrain from discussing the issue with the city council representatives who served on the Joliet housing authority board in order not to attract opposition to the community plan. At the initial board meeting there was perhaps an hour’s discussion of how to renegotiate a mortgage with HUD, that agency board members’ knowledge of the issue should not be discussed with anyone else, whether they could rely on their council representative to assist them, and how they might counter any mayoral, city council, or city administrative opposition.

Later community meetings revealed more dissension. However, there was still the intention that Evergreen Terrace should determine its own fate. The attorney negotiated an agreement to keep Evergreen Terrace under its current management plan with the community for another 30 years. Subsequent interviews with two current board members provided insights into their perspectives. Both wanted to work with their city council representative to get her assent and present it to the mayor for his support. There seemed to be little reason to believe the City would challenge the plan. Rather, it appeared that the community had devised a reasonable
arrangement that would not cost local taxpayers money, would avoid a federal lawsuit, and would not increase costs to the community.

Oliver (1991) considers controlling to be “specific efforts to establish power and dominance over the external constituents that are applying pressure on the organization” (p. 158). The data reveal two instances where centers engaged in control as a specific tactic. The first involved Unity CDC, whose leadership engaged in discussions about how to renew its mortgage with HUD so that Evergreen Terrace would not revert to city ownership. It was an effort to plan ahead and remain in control of the process. The second instance of control was during a citizen meeting with specific discussion of how to obtain permission from the City to hold a large event. Board discussion involved statements about who on the board knew which city administrator, what arguments they would raise on the center’s behalf, and how to engage other stakeholders on the center’s behalf.

E. Adaptive Coordination: An Emergent Response Strategy

Several programmatic responses were uncovered in this study that were not part of Oliver’s original typology of five responses (1991). Rather than drawing to the political economy institutional and resource dependence theories, the emergent strategy and its tactics reflect adaptation and partnerships of the social ecology framework. Operating in a satellite city environment, the case study organizations demonstrated adaptive behaviors that involved coordinating agency and programming resources to survive change. These behaviors involved agencies sharing or pooling resources with other agencies to fulfill their mission or meet the needs of their current constituents. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978, 2003) state:
Organizations coordinate in many ways—co-optation, trade associations, cartels, reciprocal trade agreements, coordinating councils, advisory boards, boards of directors, joint ventures, and social norms. Each represents a way of sharing power and a social agreement that stabilizes and coordinates mutual interdependence. (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003, p. 144)

Pfeffer and Salancik believe that shared power in coordinated efforts between agencies offers strategic benefits to both organizations. These strategic benefits include providing essential information needed by the agencies, offering communication between the organizations, legitimating power with the connecting agencies, and establishing and maintaining commitments of support from essential stakeholders (p.145). The structure of the partnership in adaptive cooperation is based on the power structure between the two organizations, and reflects the role of these organizations in the allocation of these resources.

As a strategic response, adaptive coordination follows a similar typology to other Oliver responses. Three strategic behaviors of coordination observed include cooperation, collaboration, and capacity building. Like the other strategic responses in Oliver’s framework, these responses each reflect the level of power or engagement of the case study agency in the activities and relationship. Cooperative relationships are those in which the case study agency is a passive partner. The contribution of resources may be limited or the case study agency may contribute indirect resources such as the use of name or logo. Collaborative relationships are those in which both partners contribute resources to the effort. In capacity-building efforts, one partner imparts knowledge or skills to another, enhancing their resources through the effort.
1. Cooperation

In cooperative nonprofit relationships, the case study agency has limited authority and resources to contribute to the partnership. One example of a cooperative relationship was seen in Unity CDC’s participation in the Black Pride Parade and Picnic in Joliet. Unity lent its logo and name to the citywide event sponsored by local government. The organization also advertised the event to other local agencies and residents. However, there were no expectations of fiscal sponsorship of the event as there was for other agencies.

Increasing civic pride and participation among residents is a big contribution of WGCIL to this event. And it’s a great party. (B.G., WGCIL board member, interview, 2011)

Through cooperative relationships, the case study agency advances its mission without investing significant programming and staffing resources. When mission and programming objectives of the organizations align, this form of coordination can benefit both agencies by increasing the visibility and influence of both agencies in the community. The Black Pride Parade activity benefitted both the City, which wanted additional visibility among residents of Districts 4 and 5, and provided vital attendance and connections between Unity CDC residents and community members. Before the Black Pride Parade of 2012, there were limited and conflicted relationships between Unity’s constituency and city and county government leaders as a result of the Quality of Life planning process. For Unity leadership, the Black Pride Parade was “a chance to come together as residents of Joliet. For the city to be part of the community and the community to be part of the city” (B.G., Unity CDC board member, interview).
2. **Collaboration**

The second type of adaptive coordination observed in this research was collaboration. Guo and Acar (2005) defined *nonprofit collaboration* as “what occurs when different nonprofit organizations work together to address problems through joint efforts.” In this type of cooperative adaptation, organizations contribute social capital and resources in equal measure to develop their strategic programmatic responses to change. According to interview respondents, programmatic collaboration among the case study organizations occurred as a result of shared recognition of needs among clientele or when directly mandated by funders to address common needs among constituents. In one case, state funders mandated that WGCIL develop programming for Latino and African American constituents with disabilities. This mandate led to new programming partnerships with the school district and Hispanic Center staff to develop new programming to serve these populations. The staff and board of WGCIL supported these efforts by hiring African American and Spanish-speaking Latino staff members. In addition, the local school district held disability fairs in partnership with WGCIL featuring resources and programs. At least 10 local schools participated in these efforts. These fairs led to youth-centered disabilities rights and legislative internships at WGCIL.

Although initially mandated by funders, these efforts enhanced both agencies’ abilities to meet the needs of their constituents. The resource fairs enabled both WGCIL and its cooperative partner to contribute key resources to the effort. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living contributed staff members and programmatic expertise, and the school district and the Hispanic Center contributed space and potential constituents. The Hispanic Center eventually embraced the idea of collaboration, offering WGCIL staff permanent space in its building.
In collaborative efforts, both the case study agency and community center participate equally in decision-making and program development, necessitating coordinated communication among staff members. Regular contact between collaborative partners is mandatory, according to WGCIL staff members.

We communicate with them with everything that we do. If we have an illness or sickness here, we communicate with the school and staff. We communicate with them with about everything. At the beginning of the year the teachers give us homework lists, what kids are in each group, what days they have what homework. The teachers communicate with us as best as they can. We try to make sure that we help facilitate families and kids to attend school events, so whether it’s a parent meeting, there are community events, and there we just try to keep that open line with contact. We communicate frequently with the principal and the social workers. And every day we're communicating with the secretaries to find out what kids were absent. (M.T., WGCIL staff, interview, 2012)

Another example of a collaborative partnership was seen in Unity’s work with the Neighborhood Services Division of the City of Joliet Community Development Department. Representatives of the neighborhood services group and local police department would attend monthly meetings of the Unity neighborhood council. This partnership and coordination benefitted the police department and the City, helping them understand community concerns directly, and benefitted the neighborhood council, which could address their concerns for community leaders. In this way, Unity facilitated improved relationships with residents and city leaders.

Initially, the neighborhood councils were critical of community collaboration with the police department, bemoaning the loss of a regular beat police officer in local communities.
Unity CDC’s current director indicated that during the recession police officers were deployed differently, removing a local resource that had been particularly helpful to residents and community improvement efforts.

If the officer’s here and visible, I think that in and of itself is a deterrent. I’ve always liked the Officer Friendly concept, where the police officer gets to know the kids and families. Hands out baseball cards, pushes kids on the swings, whatever kind of thing like that happens. And along with that also knows who the trouble makers are, keeps pretty close tabs on it. (M.W., Unity CDC executive director, interview, 2011)

Unity’s relationships with the community leaders and the neighborhood councils were paramount in facilitating this interaction. Interviewed Unity leaders and city officials indicated that relationships and communication with the community improved as a result of participation in neighborhood council meetings.

Among satellite city nonprofit organizations, collaborative coordination relies on shared resources and communication between the case study agency and its partners. In adaptive coordination, both agencies contribute resources and influence to programming efforts, resulting in shared power. Such power can have direct impact on existing programs or influence future programming efforts of the agencies.

3. **Capacity building**

The final type of adaptive coordination seen in community groups was capacity building. There is not a universal definition of capacity building in the nonprofit sector, but a 2001 report by the Urban Institute defined capacity building as organizational endeavors that “first, enhanced the organization’s ability to fulfill its mission,” and “secondly . . . improved the quality of life for
the community” (Urban Institute 2001). Around the same time, CCBI literature in community development further defined capacity building as activities that “strengthen parties’ ability to work together for their mutual benefit by providing them with the skills and tools they need to define problems and issues and formulate solutions” (Kubisch et al. 2010). Thus, in community capacity-building adaptive programming, the case study organization contributed resources, knowledge, or skills that would both advance its mission and extend the community’s capacity to address its challenges.

One example of capacity-building cooperative relationships was seen in the organizational learning engagements. These learning engagements allowed organizations to build community capacity to address the needs of the organization while serving its mission. For CAPA and Unity CDC, organizations with geographically defined grassroots constituencies, the place-based Quality of Life planning process provided an opportunity to contextualize community impressions about the racial demographic changes in their community. Engagement in the Joliet Quality of Life planning process promoted their understanding of community change and provided opportunities for critical reflection about the organization’s role in responding to the changes.

The Quality of Life planning process was an externally driven process relying on professional planners and social researchers to gather community data and develop recommendations for the plan. In this process, the role of the community agencies was to assist in surveys and information gathering about neighborhood conditions. In addition, the agencies provided forums for public comments—and thus results—on the expert-formed research and
recommendations. Thus, community members shaped the meaning and recommendations of the planning process.

On the other hand, WGCIL only minimally participated in the Quality of Life planning process. Instead, the agency and leaders turned to internal focus groups led by staff and UIC researchers to better understand the effect of racial demographic changes on their programming and agency operations. From the beginning, WGCIL’s approach to organizational learning was agency-centric. Local African American and Latino community leaders were invited to participate in WGCIL agency-sponsored focus groups with UIC researchers to better understand the effect of changes on their unique constituency.

The focus groups were a better way for us to meet our specific needs. Although we didn’t know exactly what we would find, doing them here [at WGCIL] was a powerful way to understand how to reach newer consumers and grow our programs for African Americans and Latinos. (M.T., WGCIL staff, interview)

As a result of its clear CIL-defined constituency, WGCIL promoted organizational learning via direct engagement with the community on its own terms and in its own space. On the other hand, CAPA and Unity CDC utilized an extensive community planning process to vet a professionally created Quality of Life Plan, creating action plans that could indirectly affect their agencies as social actors within the geographic area.

All of the case agencies engaged external stakeholders to understand the racial demographic changes. Agency leaders and staff viewed external community engagement as a positive method for learning about and interpreting community change within the context of their agency and its work. The local knowledge of community members was considered vital to
making sense of data collected about demographic changes within the community.

The neighborhood councils—that was our contribution [to the Quality of Life planning process]. Now everyone—the city, other councils, the alderman—wants to come to the meetings to get Black and Latino resident input. (M.W., Unity CDC executive director, interview, 2011)

Unity CDC and CAPA case study agencies engaged community members in data interpretation in a different manner than WGCIL. Participation of neighborhood residents of varying income levels and races, largely supported by CAPA and Unity CDC’s organizing efforts, provided an “authentic voice” (D. J., Quality of Life Planning staff, interview, 2012) to the local planning process. Multiple community meetings allowed the planning process and the Quality of Life to validate data with knowledge and experiential input from local community residents. On the other hand, WGCIL’s engagement of high-level community stakeholders was also an attempt to authenticate the experiences of its staff. In this case, the professionalized voices of key community leaders served to verify the consumer experiences.

Across all agencies, local knowledge was paramount to understanding the role of the agency and its capacity to address racial demographic change. Stakeholder recruitment was an important part of these activities, and included constituents, clients, community leaders, funders, and board members. Human service organizations need clients in order to continue. Hasenfeld (1983) noted that human service organizations are designed to “protect, maintain or enhance the personal well-being of individuals . . . they are mandated—and thus justify their existence—to protect and to promote the welfare of the people they serve.” Community centers need to attract service users or clients to their programs. Community outreach became a central focus of the
programmatic strategy and capacity building as community leaders addressed demographic change.

We just introduced ourselves and asked people to come and visit us. We had community meetings within the first month. Listening to the residents was the biggest thing. Being accountable to them. Many of the center programs were for elementary school–aged children. Those from the immediate vicinity were the most likely to use it. However, children from families where English was not the first language or where there had been a suspicion of authorities were less inclined to participate unless staff devoted time to meeting with the parents (M.T., WGCIL staff, interview, 2012).

Engaging the increasing Spanish-speaking population was important to capacity-building partnerships for all case study agencies. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living hired a Latino staff member with contacts in the community to engage in outreach efforts. As the agency adopted a community-organizing approach to their work, they hired a bilingual Spanish-English organizer to promote their organizing efforts. On the other hand, Unity CDC and CAPA relied on existing relationships with Spanish-English bilingual residents in the neighborhood. These relationships led to additional programming referrals. The Unity CDC director explained, “because of our ability to work with the Spanish-speaking populations, more and more referrals came to us from the schools, from the community. . . . The outreach efforts went beyond word of mouth. Our people went to the middle and high schools. Every time a space is empty, the school feeds us another kid from that neighborhood [for the recreation program].”

Capacity-building efforts at the agencies also extended to recruiting agency leaders and advisors. The African American Leadership Group at WGCIL was a result of partnerships between UIC’s CCBMDR and WGCIL. Invited community leaders assisted the agency’s
programming and recruitment efforts. Unity CDC also advanced internal leadership among its Latino resident leaders, further building the capacity of the agency to directly address the programming necessary for this population.

Capacity-building efforts at the agency extended agency capabilities through cooperative partnerships with agencies and constituents. Whether participants or drivers of capacity-building efforts, the case study agencies increased organizational learning and ability to serve constituents and advanced their mission through these efforts.

F. Multiple Strategic Responses

Oliver’s (1991) model presents the response strategies as mutually exclusive, with only one response engaged by the agency per external pressure. However, the study data present a more complex picture of strategy selection within agencies that often changed over time. Center directors and board members frequently deliberated about the best strategies to employ in particular situations. While they considered using more aggressive strategic responses, in the end they often settled on less aggressive ones such as compromise or acquiescence. Other times, a combination of strategies would be discussed and utilized to respond to external pressures.

The HUD deliberations with Unity and various community stakeholders relied on a variety of responses to address the HUD lawsuit and renegotiate a new mortgage with HUD. There was discussion of negotiating or bargaining with the city, but only after negotiating or bargaining with HUD. Some of the initial discussion provided evidence of plans for concealment, an avoidance tactic. As Oliver noted, “Concealment tactics involve disguising
nonconformity behind a facade of acquiescence” (1991, p. 154). Once a new mortgage or contract with HUD had been finalized, there would be room for Unity to bargain with the city regarding the lawsuit and community well-being. In any event, these deliberations showcased a variety of agency roles and strategies to address an environmental crisis in the Joliet area that benefitted the agency and its constituents. Similarly, the adoption of community organizing as “a way of doing business” was important to both ensuring WGCIL’s survival and addressing crises in the environment.

G. Environmental Antecedents and Response Strategies by Organization

This chapter addresses the research question:

In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community?

The results presented in the previous sections of Chapter VI, similar to those in Chapter V, highlight the presence of Oliver’s five environmental antecedents of constituents, cause, content, context, and coercion within the case study organizations. The chapter also presents the results of analyzing the presence of the Oliver’s response strategies of acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, defiance, and manipulation. The preliminary investigation of the presence of these antecedents and strategies, presented across all three case study organizations, can provide additional insight regarding the environmental conditions and response strategies which coincide with responsiveness to racial demographic change among nonprofit organizations conducting community development activities in the satellite city.
TABLE XIII demonstrates the presence of the five environmental antecedents, along with their sub-types, across the three organizations analyzed in this study:

**TABLE XIII**

**PRESENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANTECEDENTS BY ORGANIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Antecedent Sub-Category</th>
<th>WGCII</th>
<th>Unity</th>
<th>CAPA</th>
<th>All Orgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td>Awareness of importance of serving local constituents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of inequity in community social service distribution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>Gaining current legitimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical legitimacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Alignment between agency and public (government/community)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversified community funding structures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adherence to funder expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adherence to constituent expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Environmental uncertainty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental interconnectedness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in TABLE XIII, Oliver’s environmental antecedents were present in all the case study agencies. However, in some instances, such as content and cause, aspects of the antecedent (such as gaining current legitimacy in the cause antecedent or adherence to funder/constituent expectations in the context antecedent) may not have been observed across all the agencies.

TABLE XIV describes the presence of Oliver’s five response strategies across the three case study agencies.
Responsiveness is preceded by environmental characteristics (TABLE XIII above) and institutional characteristics (Chapter V, TABLE XI) that support the identification of environmental change and the development of institution-level responses to the agencies. All agencies in the study demonstrated the institutional antecedents of recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnerships; while the environmental antecedents of constituents, cause, content, context, and control were also present in the external environment for all three agencies.

The studied agencies all displayed strategy and behavior representing the most frequently utilized response strategies of acquiescence, control, manipulation, and adaptive coordination. Institutional antecedents related to reflection, flexibility, agility, and partnerships clearly preceded the development of these responsive strategies in the studied community development organizations. Furthermore, in the case of the studied community development organizations, these commonly observed institutional antecedents were most often associated with passive
response strategies of acquiescence and compromise in Oliver’s framework. Manipulation, while initially discussed at all three organizations, often gave way to these more passive strategies and was selected as a strategy much less frequently than other strategies. Adaptive coordination, the emergent social ecology–based response strategy in this research, leverages the same institutional antecedents in a different manner than suggested by Oliver’s framework. The same institutional antecedents of flexibility, agility, and partnerships support the development of cooperative, collaborative, and capacity-building responses within the community development system. In this case, the strategy benefits both the organization and its partners in a social ecology framework.

H. Summary and Extension of Oliver’s Framework

The data presented in this chapter address the research question:

In a midwestern satellite city environment, what are the specific strategies that nonprofit human service agencies engaged in community development activities utilize to respond to racial demographic change in their surrounding community?

This question is intended to identify and classify the strategic programming responses that satellite city nonprofit organizations employ to address racial changes within the satellite city environment, along with an examination of Oliver’s five identified environmental conditions that support responsiveness. Oliver argued that organizational responsiveness largely adheres to a political economy framework, where the surviving organization’s programmatic strategy is characterized by the survival or dominance of the most fit organization over competing organizations that are less suited to the environmental change. In this framework, Oliver
identified five strategic organizational responses to environmental change: acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, defiance, and manipulation.

Although Oliver’s five categories of strategic responses present diverse programming responses, they are more common in large urban environments where multiple organizations compete to offer similar services to similar constituents. In these urban areas, environmental change results in stress to the agency and community, leading to competition for funding and resources. The political economy framework, on which Oliver’s theory is based, views the resulting changes in the organization as “programmatic triumph” of community development agencies that are better suited to address community racial demographic changes. However, interpretation of organizational behavior using a political economy framework is inadequate in the resource- and constituency-limited environment of the satellite city, where similar programs and constituencies must often work together to ensure survival of community development organizations.

Building on Oliver’s strategic responsiveness framework, this research identifies that the five responses of Oliver’s framework must be extended in the smaller, resource-limited environment of the satellite city. My research analysis points to emerging strategic responses that reflect a social ecology framework and emphasize organizational adaptation to change. This extended framework includes an additional response strategy, which I have named cooperative adaptation and three sub-response tactics based on the social ecology framework: cooperation, collaboration, and capacity building. These three newly identified response strategies are deeply entwined in an adaptive programmatic response strategy to address racial demographic change.
By leveraging response antecedents from the previous chapter and environmental antecedents, satellite city nonprofit agencies select adaptive responses that allow them to build stakeholder relationships and programmatic partnerships that will mutually benefit their work and the agencies’ position in the community. TABLE XV below shows a complete framework, as well as analytical examples of behavior/ rationale, for responsive strategies and tactics examined in this study.
### TABLE XV

**FULL TYPOLOGY OF STRATEGIC RESPONSIVENESS WITH EXAMPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Response</th>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Organizational Power Relative to Others</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Analytical Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiescence</td>
<td>Habit</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unconscious norm consistency</td>
<td>Adherence to established program strategies or expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Mimicking behavior</td>
<td>Copying behavior/policies at similar organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Strategic following of norms</td>
<td>Adherence to funder requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Balancing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negotiating an acceptable compromise</td>
<td>Compromising while meeting needs of various stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifying</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Conformity to an acceptable standard</td>
<td>Deferring to the needs of one stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Exchanging concession between organizations and constituents</td>
<td>Offering resources from both partners to form a solution to emerging constituent needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>Concealment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Symbolic compliance, without actual change</td>
<td>Did not appear in data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Reducing inspection or hiding reality from outsiders</td>
<td>Did not appear in data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaping</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Changing goals, activities, or physical location</td>
<td>Withdrawal of program or participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>Dismissing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Ignore due to low cost or lack of congruence with mission</td>
<td>Did not appear in study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Challenge rules of the institutional environment</td>
<td>Community organizing strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacking</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Attack values to enforce privileged position in public</td>
<td>Did not appear in study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>Co-opting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Influence institutional elites through membership</td>
<td>Hiring of local staff members and executive director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing</td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
<td>Influence institutional</td>
<td>Advocacy-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XV displays organization behaviors from Oliver’s framework and presents the adaptive responses developed by the case study agencies to support the argument that adaptive responses to racial demographic change are a viable strategy to address racial demographic change in satellite city nonprofit agencies engaged in community development activities.

Addressing environmental, institutional, and agency responses across the three case study agencies provided insight into the external constraints guiding agency behavior and choices. While all the agencies displayed the each antecedent for responsiveness, the form of these antecedents could vary based on funding structure, partnerships, mission, leadership, governance structure and other agency characteristics. Ultimately, these unique relationships and characteristics influenced the selection of agency response strategies than their history or the community development traditions.
Furthermore, extending Oliver’s framework to include adaptive responsiveness provided a unique opportunity to examine a unique response strategy common to all of the case study agencies in the environment. Another notable finding was that agency responsiveness in the satellite city environment tended to engage more passive response strategies including acquiescence and compromise. The studied agencies, even when beginning program responses to active resistance strategies such as manipulation and defiance, ultimately compromised or acquiesced to external demands. Active response strategies in many cases ultimately gave way to regulatory and/or funding pressures to adhere to requirements. An agency executive summarized the dilemma of choosing response by saying…“At the end of the day, we have to stay in business to serve our constituents. We can’t do that if we don’t comply or get along with others (TB, interview).
VII. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND LIMITATION OF RESEARCH

A. Overview

This research study aimed to examine the strategies that satellite city nonprofit agencies engaged in community development activities select to respond to rapid racial demographic changes in their surrounding environment. The theoretical framework incorporated Oliver’s (1991) strategic responses to environmental pressures and the CCBI framework. The study utilized a case study to approach the research question. The resulting comprehensive analytical model for responsiveness appears below.
This chapter will explore these findings within the context of the research question as well as community development and organizational responsiveness literature. In addition, the chapter will support the development of research conclusions and policy implications, discuss the limitations of this study, and identify future research questions. The research analysis provided the following insights regarding the three research sub-questions.

**Sub-Question 1:** How did racial demographic change affect the social service landscape for nonprofits engaged in community development activities in Joliet from 2000 to 2010?
From 1990 to 2010, there was profound racial demographic change in the study area, particularly among the Latino population. While there was a decrease in overall White population, the city of Joliet saw a 300% increase in its Hispanic population from 1990 to 2010 and the Black population remained relatively stable (US Census Bureau 2015). From 2010 to 2015, the estimated Black population grew from 18.1% to 18.4% (City of Joliet 2015). During the same period, the Latino population increased from 18.4% to 27.1% (City of Joliet 2015).

The Hispanic population increase in Joliet is part of a trend of rapid racial demographic change in small cities in America’s Midwest (Brookings Institute 2015). As of 2015, Joliet’s Hispanic population is the sixth largest in the state of Illinois (Voorhees Neighborhood Center 2017) and represents 27% of the total population of the city (US Census Bureau 2015). Joliet media has recently noted the effect of this population shift on the need for social and educational services, including more services for students with disabilities and bilingual services (Joliet Herald 2016).

Racial demographic change produces environmental stress for organizations. In the research results in Chapter IV, one manifestation of environmental stress is based on geospatial mismatch between available community development and human services resources (agencies) and the target constituents. The perceived mismatch of services for African American and Latino residents in Districts 4 and 5 was further exacerbated by the move of several key social service institutions out of these districts. These factors resulted in community stress to the residents of these districts as well as the case study organizations, which attempted to fill these service gaps via their programming and strategic policies.
Further, as community racial demographics changed from 1990 to 2015, emergent constituent social service needs differed from historical service needs. For WGCIL, their target population of individuals with disabilities changed from historically White, elderly community residents to African American and Latino families and youth. During the course of the study, the programming approach and services changed dramatically to address the needs of these emerging constituents. In Joliet, these service and geospatial mismatches were addressed via formal community-wide planning processes, including the Quality of Life planning process, as well as directly by each of the case study agencies.

**Sub-Question 2: What institutional antecedents must be present for organizations to develop strategic responses to racial demographic change in the satellite city?**

Strategic responsiveness relies on institutional as well as environmental antecedents before the organization can identify and select appropriate strategic responses to change. Oliver’s (1991) framework identified several environmental antecedents—constituents, cause, content, context, and coercion—that preceded an organization’s ability to respond to external changes in the environment. However, there are also several agency conditions, or institutional antecedents, that precede the organization’s ability to respond to environmental changes. Response antecedents are internal and external organizational conditions such as recognition, flexibility, agility, reflection, and partnerships that predispose the agency to identify and respond to external environmental conditions.
Sub-Question 3: When confronted with racial demographic change in the satellite city, what strategic programming strategies do nonprofit community development organizations select to respond?

Satellite city environments have more limited resources and infrastructure than urban environments, influencing new responsive programming strategies to address external change. The predominant framework for organizational responsiveness to external change, developed by Oliver (1991), suggests that responses to demographic change are inherently conflicted, following a political economy paradigm. However, in a satellite city environment, there are more limited resources and infrastructure, with each organization serving a unique mission or constituency. To maintain services, community relationships, and mission, satellite city nonprofit agencies must develop adaptive responses that coordinate their efforts with those of other organizations. As a result, these agencies engage in additional strategic tactics of cooperation, collaboration, and capacity building that reflect both adaptive cooperation and a social ecology framework for responding to environmental change.

Power dynamics and agency influence are embedded in the selection of response strategies. However, satellite city agencies do not always seek to maximize their own power or influence by implementing programming and strategic responses to change. In addition to using nonprofit decision-making to maximize their influence in the community, nonprofit agencies strategically select programming responses taking into account their constituents’ needs and agency mission. In some instances, agencies may share their influence or power or build another agency’s internal capacity to respond to demographic changes to address overall service needs. In addition, agencies may modify or change their strategic programming responses over time as relationships and stressors evolve.
Responsive strategies are dynamic methods of addressing external changes. Strategic responses are not mutually exclusive and may change over time. Agency approaches to respond to external pressures may change over time. In addition, the agency may initially select direct and influential strategies, eventually adopting more passive strategies to address environmental conflict. Furthermore, the study period showed multiple instances of political economy strategies such as denial or acquiescence giving way to collaborative relationships of adaptive cooperation.

B. Discussion

Racial demographic changes in midwestern American satellite cities

Since the 2016 presidential election, considerable public and scholarly discourse has emerged regarding racial demographic changes in small-town and rural America. As the United States becomes increasingly diverse, the rapid influx of racial diversity into these geographies has been noted to stress existing local institutional and decision-making infrastructures. This stress has implications in community development, as communities address these changes holistically; organizational development, as social service agencies and community institutions respond to these changes; and nonprofit studies, as these organizations create internal environments to support responsive programming strategies. This section will focus on the policy implications of the study findings in each of these areas.

The rapid influx of Latinos in satellite cities in midwestern America has resulted in new social service, education, and human service needs. In Joliet, these needs were addressed historically through local community planning processes. The focus on comprehensive
community planning in satellite cities and other small towns within metropolitan regions peaked in the early 2000s, eventually giving way to “smart growth” planning. According to the US Environmental Protection Agency (2013), comprehensive community planning processes can help small communities “throughout the United States looking for ways to strengthen their economies, provide better quality of life, and build on local assets.” In Joliet, the comprehensive Quality of Life planning process took place from 2004 to 2007 and aided the community’s initial recognition of and subsequent development of coordinated responses to racial demographic changes in its minority population. Joliet’s implementation of the comprehensive community planning process was symptomatic of overall criticisms of these planning processes. The widespread and vague recommendations of the planning process were difficult to coordinate and measure, leading to frustration and abandonment of the plan. However, the process of identifying and coordinating community responses was an important legacy of this process. Subsequent government and nonprofit local planning processes further supported coordinated strategic responses to respond to targeted needs, enhancing smart growth by identifying appropriate and coordinated responses to needs defined in conjunction with the community.

The rapid influx of Latinos, as well as an overall growth in the city’s minority populations, has had a notable impact on the case study environment. In 2016, an article in the Joliet Herald News described the effect of the profound Latino growth on the Joliet school system. In a state where more than half of enrolled school-aged students were Hispanic, the Joliet school system had seen a notable growth of Hispanic students in both its school districts. In the article, the school system was providing required bilingual services to Spanish-speaking students but also working with the local nonprofit community development organization, the
Spanish Community Center, to understand and communicate emerging needs (Joliet Herald News 2016). Nonprofit organizations like the Spanish Community Center were an important part of responding to rapid racial demographic change, providing resources and programming to support the school district’s work with the Latino population. Similarly, the nonprofit organizations Unity CDC and CAPA in this study were vital community liaisons for the City’s efforts to incorporate community voices—including those of African Americans and Latinos—in their programming, community building, and other community-based efforts.

C. **Organizational Factors Related to the Selection of Strategies**

As discussed in the literature review, Oliver’s typology acknowledges environmental antecedents for responsiveness, but does not focus on organizational factors that may influence the organization’s ability to select responsive strategies. Borrowing from literature on responsive systems, Chapter VII explores organizational conditions that influence the organization’s selection of responsive strategies to change. By analyzing responsiveness at the tactical level, the results of this research question provided insight into how and why different agencies may enact vastly different strategic responses to similar stimuli.

As described in Chapter VII, responsiveness is preceded by the following agency characteristics: recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnerships. All three agencies studied demonstrated these characteristics. The agencies also displayed instances of the most frequently occurring response strategies of acquiescence, control, and manipulation. In the case of organizations engaged in community development activities, the antecedent factors lend themselves easily to the use of these specific tactics. In particular, the antecedents of flexibility,
agility, and partnership favor the above strategies. In the case of nonprofits engaged in community development activities, the named antecedents directly lend to more passive activities of acquiescence and compromise. Manipulation appears as a selected strategy, but much less frequently than the others.

Oliver describes manipulation as a response strategy that involves exerting pressure over external stakeholders and managing the subsequent negotiations between organizations. The research provides two strong examples of the case study agencies utilizing control as a result of their partnerships, flexibility, and agility. In the case of negotiations with HUD, Unity CDC selected manipulation as a strategy to ensure that community voices were heard in negotiations with the agency. Similarly, WGCIL engaged in control of state lawmakers when it utilized legislative advocacy interns and community-organizing tactics to ensure that Springfield legislators interacted with members of its constituency before critical legislative votes. Finally, CAPA engaged in control tactics with the city zoning committee by organizing area residents to protest liquor and other licenses. Control tactics most often emerged when the agencies were focused on advancing their constituent needs within limited timeframes, often as the result of immediately looming external actions, such as legislative voting or required response time.

Although an important component of decision-making, the antecedent factors of reflection and recognition did not appear as readily in data for manipulation as a responsive strategy. The antecedent of recognition, however, was important as agencies were required to recognize the immediacy of the issue prior to engaging a response strategy. Also, characteristics of organizations that encouraged organizational reflection and learning—such as established
leaders and deep community connections among staff and leaders—were implicit in all three case study organizations. The case study organizations all displayed the antecedent factors for engagement with racial community change before or during their selection of strategic responses.

D. Nonprofit Organizations Engaged in Community Development

Overall, the study results indicate that nonprofit social service agencies in small-town environments utilize Oliver’s strategies of responsiveness to address racial demographic changes in their surrounding environment. These organizations tended to draw upon strategies of compromise and acquiescence most frequently. Both of these strategic responses placed the agency in a less dominant position in relation to other social actors in the environment. Across the agencies, acquiescence and compromise were utilized in multiple forms, including compliance with legal or funding demands, meeting constituent or stakeholder expectations, and formulating goodwill gestures. From the perspective of the agencies, these tactics could be employed enthusiastically or with reservation, depending on environmental context.

Acquiescence and compromise tactics were observed at all three case study agencies, but the most commonly utilized tactic in Oliver’s spectrum of responsiveness was compliance. Compliance was used to meet food safety regulations, work with city and state government, incorporate constituent expectations for programming, and meet funding requirements. Agency rationales for engaging in acquiescence as a strategy included meeting expectations, balancing contradictory interests, bargaining, pacifying political stakeholders, and advancing their agency publicly. On the other hand, compromise as a strategic response often involves dissent and
deliberation among agency personnel and stakeholders, requiring a more dominant responsive posture than acquiescence.

As noted in the results, the case study agencies often discussed utilizing active strategies of avoidance or defiance, but eventually selected more passive strategies. This finding aligns with Hasenfeld and Abbott’s (1992) argument that human service organizations are highly dependent on their environments for resources and legitimation. Using avoidance or defiance may be viewed as conflict-inducing or evasive by external partners and stakeholders, threatening vital agency relationships and challenging existing social hierarchy in the environment. Acquiescence and compromise, inherently more submissive strategies, present the agency as less combative to external partners and stakeholders (Proehl 2002). For nonprofit agencies, pressure tactics of defiance and compromise may backfire by undermining their community influence and access to external resources controlled by their partners and stakeholders. Although the case study organizations may have ultimately selected avoidance or defiance, they most often switched strategies to ones more socially acceptable, such as acquiescence or compromise.

A final responsive strategy frequently utilized by the case study agencies in their programmatic responses to environmental change is manipulation. In Oliver’s framework, manipulation involved tactics of co-optation, influence, and control. Co-optation, the use of influential persons to advocate for resources or support, was often used in the selection of organization leadership and boards of directors. All of the case study agencies selected executive directors with deep connections to the community as well as the ability to attract grant resources. A second tactic of manipulation, influence, was defined by Oliver as the “shaping of values and
criteria” (Oliver 1991). Both Proehl (2002) and community development activist-scholar Stoecker (2003) described the use of influence tactics within nonprofit agencies engaged in community development activities. These tactics include coalition building, rational persuasion, community organizing, and inspiration. Participation of the case study agencies in local community planning processes included using their organizational influence to gain community/constituent participation and support implementation of Quality of Life Plan recommendations. Control, the final manipulation tactic, is defined as the domination of institutional processes to influence desired outcomes. While less utilized among the case study agencies, Unity’s participation in the Evergreen Terrace controversy represented an attempt to control deliberations between HUD and the city.

In summary, strategies most often engaged by the case study organizations were acquiescence, compromise, and manipulation tactics of co-optation and influence. Acquiescence and compromise were used quite frequently by all of the case study agencies. In addition, manipulation tactics of co-optation and influence were utilized by the case study agencies as well.

Nonprofit organizations have an important role identifying and responding to dramatic racial change in the satellite city environment. However, Oliver’s model, as well as the resource dependence and institutional theories upon which it is based, focused on environmental conditions that precede organizational responsiveness. The role of nonprofit organizations as intermediaries between civic leaders and community members is a central part of responsive changes to external pressure. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) suggest that nonprofit organizations
can support this role internally by developing policies and practices to advance their own organizational learning and flexibility in conjunction with other stakeholders. Effective responsiveness strategies require agencies to develop their practices based on both local knowledge and best practices in community development. The organizations in this study incorporated community knowledge in their strategic responses in several ways. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living invited community leaders to advise on programming in focus groups and then invited these community leaders to serve on its board. Unity CDC incorporated community leaders in their administrative structure via the neighborhood councils. In both cases, the nonprofit organization and its leaders were willing to incorporate this local knowledge to adapt to changes in the environment.

In Oliver’s model of responsiveness, institutional development and resource dependence strategies are utilized extensively by nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities, the intermediary role of nonprofits in satellite cities requires that organizations engage cooperatively in those communities. As intermediaries between community constituents/residents and civic/social leaders in the development of responsive strategies to change, nonprofit organizations in satellite city environments utilize strategic, cooperative partnerships to further their missions and constituents’ needs. Community development and nonprofit studies has vast literature on various types of partnerships, including government-nonprofit-community; nonprofit-funder-community; nonprofit–private business–community; and nonprofit-nonprofit-community partnerships. Reflected in the emergent response category of adaptive coordination, these partnerships result in many benefits to nonprofit organizations, including cost savings, enhanced programming, increased ability to serve constituent needs, and
potentially expanded community influence. However, as suggested in the extended model, the organization must carefully consider its resources and influence when entering the partnership to ensure that its strategic requirements are meeting the agency’s and its constituents’ needs.

Capacity building is perhaps the most promising responsive tactic uncovered during this study. A great deal of comprehensive community change literature emerged in the early 2000s related to various forms of agency partnerships as a desirable result of adaptive cooperation among nonprofit agencies. However, the social ecology–based literature on nonprofit organizations did not consider issues of agency influence or power in determining the appropriate strategic choices for adaptive cooperation.

E. Extending Oliver’s Model of Strategic Responsiveness

The study results indicated that adaptive coordination was an important strategy for all of the case study agencies. All of the agencies participated in relationships with external organizations and stakeholders. Cooperative relationships were featured in resource dependence theory and comprehensive community development literature, but were not clearly described in Oliver’s model of strategic responsiveness. Although coordination was not articulated as a strategy in Oliver’s typology, its three tactics of cooperation, collaboration, and capacity building were frequently noted in this study analysis.

“Organizational environments are collective and interconnected,” according to Oliver (1991, p. 147). Institutional theorists have argued that pressures exist for organizations to comply with social expectations in the environment. The research presented in this dissertation provides ample evidence of interagency coordination to achieve program goals and meet social
expectations of partners. Resource dependence theory, on the other hand, posits that agencies must adapt to change and are confined by limited resources. This is especially true in small city environments. In these situations, coordination with other agencies and stakeholders can be essential to their continued work and survival.

Our case study agencies, like all nonprofit organizations engaging in community development work, were intrinsically connected with their environments. Based on her research on large organizations, Oliver (1991) stated that organizations are concerned with maintaining legitimacy, dependent on their constituents, and those operating in interconnected and uncertain context have a greater likelihood of adopting passive strategies of acquiescence and compromise. This hypothesis was supported in this research, where acquiescence and compromise were the most frequently noted response strategies.

Oliver (1991) indicated that agencies do not advance strategic manipulation if they are concerned about legitimacy, dependent on constituents, or not interconnected with their environments. However, the case study organizations utilized manipulation tactics to address racial change in their external environment, although slightly less frequently than they used less confrontational tactics. In particular, influence and co-optation were utilized frequently, while control was less directly applied.

Overall, the results of this research support the idea that nonprofit agencies engaged in community development activities adopt distinct response strategies for addressing external racial demographic change.
F. **Nonprofit Organizations and Community Development Literature**

The literature review in Chapter II indicated that nonprofit organizations are affected by economic and political influences that result in major program or mission shifts. All three of the case study organizations had—either in the period before or during the research study data collection—experienced notable programming and/or mission shifts their work. For Unity CDC, the organization realigned its programming focus from housing to youth/recreation services. The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living’s shift to community organizing, “as a way to do business,” represented a new era in advocacy-based and legislative programming for its consumers and stakeholders. Similarly, CAPA’s role in city zoning and Unity leadership heralded new collaborative and cross-neighborhood efforts and stakeholders beyond historic preservation of the Cathedral Area. Because all three organizations had long histories in the community, these major shifts were even more notable.

In community development literature, nonprofit organizations were first noted in Progressive Era settlement house writing, where they provided social support in addition to neighborhood services like education and recreation. These community organizations were also involved in political activism on behalf of low-income neighborhood residents and others. This model of engaged community activity has been only partially retained in modern nonprofit agencies. In 1966, Kirchner and Rowan’s report on local community action agencies found they provided direct services and promoted client participation in internal decision-making, but they did not promote activism in the community. Similarly, Trolander (1975) and Entin (1987) found that agencies suspended political action when confronted with funder criticism. In the current research, the case study organizations received local or state-level government funding. This
relationship with government funders had an impact on their selection of response strategies to racial change. For Unity CDC, acquiescence and compromise were most often selected as the response strategy in their programming. Because much of Unity CDC’s initial funding to implement the Quality of Life Plan was supported by grants from the City of Joliet and Will County, these stakeholders were intrinsically valued in decision-making about programs. In discussions about programming strategy, Unity leadership always considered the local government’s direction and input, even altering their programmatic direction based on city guidance.

Unity’s response to these types of pressures echoes the findings of Bernstein’s (1989, 1991) studies of human service organization managers’ strategic choices as they implemented government-funded contracts. In Bernstein’s work, managers implemented a range of strategic responses to respond to external challenges, including avoidance, negotiating, and networking. Similarly, Heimovics et al. (1993) examined effective nonprofit managers to understand their responses to critical external events. They noted that the most effective nonprofit managers employed political action and community-organizing tactics when responding to external changes in the environment.

Furthermore, community development activist-scholar Randy Stoecker (2003) highlighted the critical role that nonprofits play in facilitating communication between civic leaders and local communities. Stoecker suggests that organizations move from service delivery to critical roles as facilitators of communication. The other two case study organizations, CAPA
and WGCIL, which did not have contractual relationships with the city, readily embraced community organizing and political action tactics to educate and challenge external change.

Community development literature identifies a critical role for nonprofit organizations beyond service delivery. This literature places nonprofit organizations in an intermediary role between community members and other community stakeholders such as funders and government leaders. Nonprofit organizations choose to respond with political action or minor programming adjustments; their role is important to ensure responsive connections between community leadership and their residents/constituents.

G. Study Limitations

This study has some limitations that must be considered when interpreting the findings. The first of these limitations is the generalizability of the results from the single environmental setting of Joliet to other satellite cities or small towns. This study focused on three nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities. Several funders and community members were invested in the missions and programming of these organizations. In addition, these organizations had unique missions within their satellite city environment. While the organizations collectively demonstrated a broad range of responses to the racial demographic changes in their community, it cannot be assumed that the community or agencies are representative of all midwestern American small towns or satellite cities.

A second limitation was the extended period of fieldwork required to complete the study. Over the five-year course of data collection, differential access was granted to observe agency
activities and internal organization materials. At two of the agencies, there was a turnover in executive leadership and various staff members left the agencies during the course of the study. All agency executive directors and board presidents were interviewed, as well as agency staff members, community leaders, and civic leaders who accepted an invitation to participate. A total of 35 individuals were interviewed for the study, including ten who were interviewed multiple times over the course of the study. During the study period, two individuals died and were not able to complete interviews that had already begun.

In addition, some agency staff members and community leaders were not able to respond to questions about organizational planning and strategy as well as community changes. Over the course of the study, it became clear that the board and executive directors often selected strategic and policy responses for the agency. Interviews were still completed with staff members, but some interviews were not relevant to the analysis. Instead, while some agency directors limited access to staff meetings, agency board and council meetings were public and provided extensive information required for the study. These meetings often paved the way for subsequent interviews with community and organization leaders.

The sampling strategy employed for the study was a third limitation. Convenience sampling of local organizations engaged in community development activities—based on their participation in the Quality of Life planning process—was used to select the three case study organizations. All three organizations were well established (at least 20 years old) and had deep ties to civic leaders and their respective communities. Furthermore, the three agencies’ participation in the Quality of Life planning process indicated their willingness to engage with
the community. Randomized selection or criteria-based selection of the organizations could have produced different results.

Finally, the case study agencies varied dramatically in the types of evidence available and accessible for triangulating qualitative research findings. While one agency provided unfettered access to its detailed programming database, the others did not have such databases or did not maintain detailed records of their day-to-day activities. For these agencies, printed and online newsletters, websites, and publicity materials provided information to triangulate with interview data. Annual reports provided a further basis for understanding programs and major agency strategies during the course of the study.

The described study limitations provide opportunities to address the research questions using more robust methods and research designs. However, the existing study provided rich data for analysis and drawing conclusions about responsiveness to racial demographic change across the small city environment. In addition, the research findings and limitations provide opportunities for further research.

H. Future Research Directions

Based on the results of this research, there are several available avenues for future research regarding responsiveness to racial demographic change in small American cities. The results of 2016 US presidential election, partially attributed by policymakers and media to the influence of immigration and racial change in small midwestern towns and cities, highlights the need for continued scholarship about demographic changes in these communities (Brookings
Institute 2015; Johnson and Lichter 2016). About 25 years ago, small towns typically had less than 15% of their population identify as African Americans and Hispanics/Latinos. Now these racial groups account for between one-third and half of the population in many small towns. The increase in Hispanic and African American residents in small-town America has resulted in changes to infrastructure requirements, governance, and institutions in these communities, and has the potential for broader political and social impact. Given the increased attention on small cities, additional research could focus the impact of these changes on other types of organizations or stakeholders in this environment. To date, no research has explored a single strategy across a variety of organizations within a single environment. This research could provide further insight about the nature of collaboration or compromise across a single group.

Another line of research could explore the role of nonprofit organizations as intermediaries in community change. As modern nonprofit neighborhood and community development centers have increasingly abandoned their historical roots of political activism and community organizing, further research could focus on the reasons for choosing compromise and acquiescence as the most frequent strategies for responding to change. Grønjberg (1993) and Fabricant and Fisher (2002) have examined organizations’ responses to economic change only; further studies could focus on the impact of racial change on community development and neighborhood organizations.

Finally, the emergent response strategy of adaptive coordination has provided some insight into how organizations in resource-limited environments may adjust when confronted with external change. New research could pursue these findings further to classify and develop
this response strategy to external pressures. In addition, examining institutional and environmental antecedents to further understand validate and establish causality could further extend the research findings for this environment in the future.

I. Conclusion

Racial demographic change in small city environments introduces strategic pressures in these communities. In particular, the profound racial changes in small midwestern cities have impacted their infrastructure and institutions. As minority populations continue to experience dramatic growth outside the urban core, responsiveness of community stakeholders and institutions to these pressures will become increasingly important to public policy. To respond to these pressures, nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities must alter their programs and activities to respond to the changing context, constituents, and coercion in the small city environment. For these organizations, certain organizational antecedents, uncovered in all of the case study agencies, precede their responsiveness to racial demographic changes. The case study agencies, as community development organizations with long histories in the community, already possessed the antecedents of recognition, flexibility, reflection, agility, and partnerships that allowed them to identify and respond to racial demographic changes in their small city environment.

At the organization level, satellite city nonprofit organizations engaged in community development activities select certain response strategies—acquiescence, compromise, and manipulation—over other strategies in Oliver’s typology. In the resource-limited environment of the small city, nonprofit organizations are more likely to engage in efforts of adaptive
coordination with other stakeholders. However, of these strategies, only manipulation points to the historical role of nonprofit organizations in community development. The results suggest that in response to racial change, nonprofit organizations are choosing conservative responses, which do not impact their influence, relationships, and standing with their stakeholders. However, this conservative approach to change may conflict with the intermediary role that these organizations fulfill between the community and other social players in the environment. Regardless of the approach that they take in managing external change, nonprofit organizations play a vital role in responding to community change. This nonprofit role in mediating community change indicates that organizations engaged in community development activities can provide vital support for community change, via responsive programming and intermediary roles, in small city environments.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Descriptions of Agency Mission, Constituents, Funding, and Programs

This appendix introduces the three nonprofit social and human services organizations that were engaged in community development activities during the study periods of 2007 through 2009 and 2011 through 2013. The organizations for the study were selected by a purposive-sampling technique to represent three distinct types of community development organizations. The selected organizations for the study, all with district missions, represent “ideal types” of organization activities engaged in community development programs and outreach activities to African American and Latino residents of Joliet.

The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living (WGCIL) is a mission-driven organization that arose out of federal legislation to serve persons with disabilities. Its constituency is not defined by race. The Unity Community Development Corporation (Unity CDC or Unity), was a community development center, resulting from a cross-religious partnership–community planning process to improve the quality of life and services for residents of the two most impoverished Joliet administrative/councilmanic districts. The third organization, the Cathedral Area Preservation Association (CAPA), originated as a dues-based neighborhood association in an affluent area, organized primarily to address neighborhood concerns related to historic preservation, beautification, and the “retention of property value” (CAPA member, interview, October 12, 2012).

As distinct types of organizations engaged in these specific community development
activities, the case study organizations had distinct considerations and employed distinct
responses to racial demographic changes in their surrounding community. This appendix provides
a detailed history of each organization, including the vision/mission/objectives, organizational
structure, and flagship programming initiatives that could influence its responsiveness to racial
demographic changes. In addition, the organization’s formal and informal programmatic outreach
to minority populations is described to provide context for analyzing organizational
responsiveness to racial demographic changes throughout the dissertation. Each organization’s
awareness and responses to the changes in the community will be classified, especially focusing
on their programmatic outreach to African Americans and Latinos in their constituent groups,
using the extended framework of organizational responsiveness.

A. Case 1: A Federal- and State-Funded Mission-Driven Organization

The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living (WGCIL) engaged in both formal and
informal programmatic outreach activities targeted to African-Americans and Latinos in Joliet.
Funded mainly by state-grants and federally allocated provisions for disabilities, WGCIL is part
of a network of Center for Independent Living centers that emerged as part of the disabilities
movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The mission of these Centers for Independent Living is similar
across the more than 400 CIL organizations throughout the county: to foster knowledge and
conditions that optimize independent living and self-sufficiency among persons with disabilities
(CIL director, interview. October 15, 2007). WGCIL programs and related outreach to African-
Americans and Latinos in the area are described to characterize the organization’s programmatic
responses to these changes.
Organization History and Structure

The Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living has been an advocate for self-sufficiency among individuals with disabilities in Joliet since 1985. Similar to the approximately 400 Centers for Independent Living across the nation, WGCIL traces its organizational roots to the American Disability Rights movement. (WGCIL website, accessed March 15, 2015). The Disability Rights movement began in the late 1960s, with widespread community organizing and protests that occurred parallel to the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The protests associated with the Disability Rights movement coalesced into a large-scale local mobilization to address the physical and social barriers facing the community, such as unequal education opportunities for disabled children and barriers to performance. The protests and lobbying culminated in a 1972 march on Washington, resulting in the 1973 Disabilities Rehabilitation Act, extending civil right to those with disabilities.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) further extended these rights by mandating equal access and resources for vocational training. In 1975, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act provided equal access to public education to disabled children. “This legislation specified that every child had a right to an education and mandated the full inclusion of children with disabilities in mainstream education classes, unless a satisfactory level of education could not be achieved due to the nature of the child’s disability” (www.disabilityresourcesforhighereducation.org, Accessed March 17, 2017). The Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 integrated children with disabilities into regular classes in education institutions and promoted Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for public school students with disabilities (www.disabilityresourcesforhighereducation.org, Accessed March 17, 2017).
The independent living movement originated in the fight for these two pieces of legislation and reflected three guiding principles in its work with individuals with disabilities, which would become the main tenets for the Centers for Independent Living:

- Comprehensive programs most effectively meet the needs of people with disabilities
- People with disabilities are the best experts on their lives
- The strongest and most vibrant communities are those that include and embrace all people.


As a member of the federally established Centers for Independent Living Network, WGCIL also subscribes to this mission statement by conducting programs and advocacy work related to self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities (WGCIL executive director, interview, October 4, 2012). The organization’s board of directors was established in 1985. In 2007 and 2008, the organization had 15 staff members; there were 13 staff members in 2012. WGCIL is governed by a Board of Directors, which has varied in size from 12 individuals in 2007 to 18 members in 2012. Per the CIL regulations, at least half of the board of directors and staff include individuals with disabilities (WGCIL executive director, interview, October 4, 2012).

**Organization Mission and Objectives**

As a local Center for Independent Living, WGCIL subscribes to the three previously mentioned tenets of CIL philosophy as evidenced in its mission statement.

As people with disabilities and their advocates, the Will-Grundy Center for Independent Living strives for equality and empowerment of persons with disabilities in the Will and Grundy County areas. We inform persons with disabilities of their rights, educate them about their responsibilities, provide support services, promote advocacy, and raise community awareness about disability issues. (WGCIL Annual Report, 2012)
For the last 30 years, WGCIL’s work has focused on the four program focus areas for CILs: “(1) peer support, (2) information and referral, (3) individual and systems advocacy, and (4) independent living skills training” (WCGIL Annual Report, 2012). The programs themselves have varied from housing support for adults and the elderly to educational support for youth with disabilities to vocational referrals to state and local advocacy for disability services and legislation. The organization considers state and federal funding priorities as well as consumer needs and desires in its program development efforts; however, the specific programs may change (WGCIL executive director, interview, October 4, 2012). According to WGCIL leadership, these programmatic changes are predicated on “maintaining the fine balance of responding to emerging consumer need, while keeping the [organization’s] doors open and being true to CIL goals” (WGCIL executive director, interview, October 4, 2012).

**WGCIL Programs and Consumers, 2008-2009 and 2012**

WGCIL reported several key program initiatives during 2008-2009, including each of the four program areas of “education, referral, advocacy, and peer support” (WGCIL, 2008-2009 Annual Report). These program areas reflect the CIL model and derive from six core programmatic focus areas defined by the National Center for Independent Living (WGCIL, 2008–2009 Annual Report). As part of the CIL organization network, WGCIL staff participates in the CIL National Annual Meeting as well as state and Chicago-area CIL meetings for professional development regarding CIL trends and requirements (Tisdale, interview, October 5, 2012). During, 2008-2009, WGCIL saw an increase in both consumers and available services
over previous years. Table I depicts the number of consumers served by WGCIL across several major programs and initiatives highlighted in the 2008-2009, representing the agency’s impact on the disability community in Will-Grundy counties.

Table I. Numbers Served by Select Program, WGCIL 2008-2009 Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGCIL Program Initiative</th>
<th>Number Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct-service program (case management)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative internship</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Serenade</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplified telephone distribution</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and referral</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WGCIL’s largest program in 2012, by number of consumers served, was their Information and Referral program. Information and referrals for disability-related resources and services were provided to “just over 2,000 disabled individuals” (WGCIL Annual Report, 2008-2009).5

In 2007-2008, WGCIL only maintained demographic data on its direct-service program. During this program year, the agency served 130 direct-service consumers, defined by the

---

4 In the CIL movement, constituents/clients are referred to as “consumers.”
5 WGCIL did not maintain demographic information consumers in non-direct-service programs.
organization as “a case file was opened and an independent living advocate on staff at the Center worked closely with individuals who chose to have ongoing resources and programs provided for the development of particular skill, achievement of particular goals, etc.” (WGCIL Annual Report, 2007-2008). The racial distribution of the 130 direct-service consumers is reported in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Race of WGCIL consumers, 2008-2009, N=130](image)

Over half (53.1%) of the 130 direct-service WGCIL consumers were Caucasian (White) in 2008-2009. In addition, 27.7% of consumers were African American (Black) and 18.5% of consumers were Hispanic/Latino. The relatively strong percentage of African American and Latino consumers during this year was the result of an intensive agency focus on minority recruitment.
As a result of state- and federal-level mandates to ensure representation of minorities among funded institutions, WGCIL launched specific programming with the University of Illinois at Chicago Center for Capacity Building for Minorities with Disabilities Research (CCBMDR) to support the creation of an outreach plan for African-Americans and Latinos. The agency also hired an African American outreach coordinator and a Hispanic outreach coordinator to ensure that programming information was distributed to these groups. These efforts resulted in notable increases among minority staff and constituents.

Age-based demographics also provide a notable view of WGCIL consumers in 2008-2009.

![Pie Chart showing age distribution of WGCIL consumers, 2008-2009 (N=130)]

Figure 2. Age of WGCIL consumers, 2008-2009 (N=130)

Figure 2 shows that about 81.5% of WGCIL consumers in 2008-2009 were adults between the ages of 20 and 59. Only 10% of consumers were between 0 to 19 years old. Based on the demographic profiles for direct consumers in 2008-2009, the majority of WGCIL’s long-term consumer engagements were with Whites and adult consumers.
The WGCIL consumer demographic categories had changed notably by 2012, particularly in its direct-service programs. In 2012, WGCIL reported programming hours in the areas of “information and referral, independent living skills training, peer-counseling services, personal assistant services, and assistive technology” (WGCIL, 2013 Annual Report). In 2012, WGCIL served 2,000 consumers with disabilities in a variety of programs. Program highlights from 2012-2013 are described in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGCIL Program</th>
<th>Number of Consumers Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and referral</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent living skills training</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counseling Services</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal assistant services (new)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive technology (amplified telephone program)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative internship/ advocacy</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community reintegration</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Mentoring Day</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information and referrals continued to be the most utilized program area, with 584 telephone customers served. However, WGCIL also added several new programs in community reintegration, transportation, and mentoring. In addition, case management/direct services programs were branded “individual services” and tracked for consumer engagement. Two
hundred seventy-three consumers participated in WGCIL’s individual programs in 2012, an increase of 110% since 2007.

The racial distribution of WGCIL consumers shifted since 2007-2008, as community organizing and integration programs increased awareness of center activities in minority communities (WGCIL executive director, interview, October, 14, 2012). Error! Reference source not found. details the racial demographics of WGCIL consumers in 2012.

Figure 3. Race of WGCIL consumers, 2011-12, N=273

Whites continue to be the dominant race among WGCIL consumers, with a slight decrease since 2007 for both Black/ African American consumers (22.3% from 27.3%) and
Latino consumers (7.3% from 18.3%). In 2011, WGCIL adopted a community-organizing focus for all its programming and outreach efforts (WGCIL, Annual Report 2011-2012). The agency views community organizing as a “means to build alliances and awareness among key target groups (persons with disabilities, government leaders, social service allies, Catholic churches and other religious entities, those living in poverty and civic leaders who can advance our [disability rights] cause” (WGCIL, Annual Report 2011-2012). Under this model, the Center will make “community organizing . . . as major part of how it conducts business.” In 2012, the Center hired a full-time community organizer to advance this programmatic goal.

As shown in Figure 4, the age distribution of WGCIL’s consumers also changed significantly from 2007 to 2012.

![Figure 4. Age of WGCIL consumers, 2012 (N=273)]
The majority (60.5%) of WGCIL consumers were 20 to 59 years old, representing a 20.0% overall decrease since 2012. However, the age group of 5 to 19 years increased 209% from 7.7% in 2007, to 23.8% in 2010. The dramatic increase in the percentage of WGCIL school-age consumers with disabilities reflects “an increase in [WGCIL’s] awareness and responsiveness to the needs of disabled children in schools and the community. (Tisdale, email, October 6, 2012). WGCIL staff recognized the shift in disability needs from elderly adults toward school age children as early as 2007. “Many of our service requests are coming from families with children who need assistance navigating school IEP [individual education plans] services” (Hanson interview, October 14, 2007).

**WCGIL Outreach Programs and Programming**

In 2007–2008, WGCIL reported programming in the areas of “education, advocacy, information and referral, and peer counseling.” The agency identified key program areas in its Annual Report in these four defined areas. By the 2008–2009 Annual Report, the total number of reported program areas had increased to 29 programs in five different areas of “independent living skills, training and enhancement, information and referral, individual advocacy, and systems advocacy” (WGCIL 2008-2009 Annual Report).

In 2007, the WGCIL executive director and staff engaged in a two-year effort for outreach planning with UIC-CCBMDR to help identify needs and engage in community outreach to new constituents, including African-American and Latino consumers. UIC-CCBMDR’s
outreach planning focused on specific engagement and needs assessment exercises and the development of programming and outreach tactics to increase awareness of disability resources in African-American and Latino communities. The collaborative effort between CCBMDR and WCGIL was intended to increase awareness of WGCIL and its services among minorities with disabilities, and their providers, throughout the WGCIL geographic area. The WGCIL-CEA outreach efforts reflected an identification of target consumers and increased agency outreach attention to a changing consumer base and their allies/stakeholders. These target consumer groups were identified in the 2009 Annual Report:

1. Youth and families
2. Adults, senior, and veterans with all types of disabilities,
3. Elected officials, state, and local government agency staff on key advocacy issues,
4. Community leaders, and
5. Related agency collaboration. (WGCIL 2009 Annual Report)

With the implementation of this effort, considerable changes were realized in numbers of [WGCIL] African-American and Latino consumers, as well as youth and children [consumers] by early 2008” (Tisdale, interview, October 12, 2012). Figure 5 shows the race of WGCIL consumers as reported in 2009 Annual Report, after the implementation of this effort.
Between 2007 and 2009, the total number of WGCIL consumers increased by 48 individuals, from 130 to 178. This increase in consumers was attributed to growth in programs as well as an increase in awareness of community services (executive director, interview, October 6, 2012 and program staff, interview, November 2, 2012). The racial distribution of these consumers also showed notable changes. African American consumers increased from 27.7% of consumers in 2009 to 35.4%, reflecting the work with CCBMDR (program manager, interview, October 7, 2012). On the other hand, after a brief increase in 2008, the overall Latino consumers decreased from 18.5% to 4.5% of the consumer population, after the retirement of the Hispanic outreach coordinator in December 2008 (executive director, interview, October 16, 2012). The age distribution of the consumers also shifted with the implementation of the CCBMDR outreach program, with school-aged (5-19 years) children increasing to 10% of the 178 consumers in 2009. This increase reflected the growing number of families with disabled
children who were part of the WGCIL consumer base since 2000 (executive director, email, November 14, 2012).

By 2011, WGCIL’s outreach approach changed to community organizing as “a means to build alliances and awareness within key target groups (persons with disabilities, government partners, social service allies, Catholic churches and other religious entities, those living in poverty, and civic leaders.” The adoption of this approach was seen as a “return to the roots of the independent living movement” (Tisdale, interview, October 2, 2014) and “a way to fulfill our mission and the spirit of independent living [movement]. This outreach approach both generalized the previous focus of outreach for specific target groups (minorities and youth) into ‘persons with disabilities,’ and ‘those living in poverty,’ while emphasizing programmatic focus on partnerships with constituent allies and organization, including “government partners, social service allies . . , and civic leaders.” The agency hired a community organizer and engaged in community organization training for staff, leadership, and consumers. “Individual advocacy” and “institutional advocacy” became the focus of programming efforts at the agency, with over 4,000 hours of devoted staff time (WGCIL 2012 Annual Report). At the same time, African American consumers fell to 24.7% of the total direct-service consumers. School-aged children remained relatively constant at 9.8% of the population served. However, the programming for children included enrollment in advocacy and community organizing programs such as Legislative Internship, Disability Mentoring Day, and Community Organizing Training rather than individually focused activities such as IEP support (program manager, interview, October 13, 2012).
In 2012, the Agency’s programming reflected an emphasis on “systems” and “individual” advocacy. The 2012 Annual Report featured several key programming initiatives that specifically addressed advocacy for consumers, the independent living movement, and disability rights. These programs included “(1) legislative internship, (2) a new Catholic Campaign for Human Development community organizing grants, (3) Disability Mentoring Day, (4) community organizing training for board and staff, as well as (5) the hiring of a staff community organizer (www.wgcil-org.com, accessed on April 30, 2017).

The agency director and staff believe that the emphasis on systems advocacy and community organizing in programming represented “return to the core values of the CIL movement and mission.” The director and board chairperson, in particular, noted that the agency returned to these core values in part as a result of “funder requests, strategic partnerships, and increased knowledge of the important mission and requirements of the CIL movement.”

Summary

Case 1, WGCIL, is a mission-driven direct-service nonprofit human and social service organization. Over the course of the study period, the organization remained consistent in its independent living mission, while changing programming and operational frameworks. Early in the study period, the organization’s constituency and programs represented the interests of a stable and elderly community. However, with the demographic changes in the area, the organization’s programming adapted to the needs of the new constituency while retaining its emphasis on CIL interests.
B. Organization 2: A Neighborhood-Based Community Development Organization

Unity Community Development Corporation (CDC), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization was formed to “to improve the quality of life of District 4 and 5 (Unity CDC)” in Joliet, Illinois. District 4 and District 5 contain the majority of African-American and Latino populations within the City of Joliet. Unity CDC was founded after an extensive “Quality of Life” community planning process in these districts to ensure that results of the planning process were realized in the “underserved” and “minority” populations of the geographic area. In the beginning, In the beginning, Unity CDC was funded mainly through local and state-level government grants and support from many community leaders and residents. By 2012, the organization was largely supported through membership fees and private foundation funding sources. The mission of Unity CDC has always been to support and improve the quality of life for Districts 4 and 5, but the scope of their outreach and programming focus has changed through the study period. The organization’s programming and outreach focus to Joliet’s changing constituencies in this geographic area is characterized below.

Organization History and Structure

Unity Community Development Corporation began advocating for the “underserved and minority” populations of District 4 and District 5 as group representing the interests of local religious congregations. With the motto “Strength in Unity,” Unity’s predecessor group JACOB (Joliet Areas Church-Based Organizing Body) had a more than 20-year history of regularly meeting and developing community organizing plans and tactics to address important matters in these districts. (Unity Leader, interview, October 15, 2007). At the time of the Quality of Life planning process, JACOB was the “key link” to the community residents and religious
organizations. As a result, the group became an important actor in the Quality of Life planning process, with full membership on the eight-person Quality of Life Task Force, which was responsible for the planning process and the development of the Quality of Life Plan (former Unity executive director, interview, October 14, 2012).

Key components of the Quality of Life planning process were leadership interviews with clergy, neighborhood resident and business surveys, and public community meetings. As a member of the Task Force, JACOB was “instrumental in ensuring that the participation and voice of neighborhood residents was a vital part of the planning process” (Unity leader, interview, November 12, 2007). Furthermore, JACOB and Quality of Life Leaders worked to establish a neighborhood council, an umbrella group for neighborhood residents in the Planning District, “to disseminate information related to the planning process and other neighborhood-related successes/concerns” (Unity leader, interview, November 12, 2007). Over the 3-year development of the Quality of Life Plan, JACOB adopted a role of mediator between Joliet’s civic and business leadership and its community residents in Districts 4 and 5.

Unity CDC traces its origins to JACOB’s involvement in the Quality of Life planning process, including the role of the neighborhood councils in resident mobilization and participation in the planning process. At the conclusion of the Quality of Life planning process in 2007, the resident and community involvement had extended well beyond the scope of religious congregations. As a result, Joliet city-county leaders, community residents, and the Quality of Life Task Force voted to establish Unity CDC to ensure the “implementation of the 82
recommendations of the Quality of Life Planning Process” (Unity executive director, interview, November 12, 2007).

**Organization Mission and Objectives**

In 2007, Unity CDC was launched with the following stated mission and objective:

To achieve implementation of the Quality of Life Plan for Joliet Council Districts 4 and 5, Unity CDC will share direct responsibility for implementing most of the proposals of the Plan, and its members will track progress on those proposals for which Unity CDC will not have direct implementation responsibility. Unity CDC will have a range of functions and specific tasks, but its core mission will be to serve as the organization that has the trust of the community and the backing of the City to see that the multi-faceted Quality of Life Plan is carried out. ([www.unitycdc.org](http://www.unitycdc.org), accessed June 28, 2009).

With the agency’s origins in the Quality of Life planning process, the organization’s board of directors was established in 2007. The first executive director, a church-based housing developer, was hired in 2008, along with a part-time administrative assistant. In 2007-2009, the organization had 8 volunteer and paid employees; there was one volunteer director in 2012. The agency staff has always included a cadre of community-based volunteers, including retirees and community volunteers who supported its programming and efforts in several programming areas identified in the Quality of Life Planning Process, including:

- human services and employment,
- education and recreation;
- residential housing and commercial and industrial development,
- neighborhood organizing;
- small business development; and
- transportation.

([www.unitycdc.org/about](http://www.unitycdc.org/about); accessed June 18, 2015)
By 2012, WGCIL’s mission statement incorporated the agency’s work in the six functional areas of the Quality of Life Plan.

The mission of Unity CDC is to improve the Quality of Life of the historically underserved residents of the 4th and 5th Council Districts of Joliet by holistically addressing their needs in the areas of human services and employment; education and recreation; residential housing and commercial and industrial development, neighborhood organizing, small business development and transportation. (www.unitycdc.org/about; accessed June 18, 2015)

WGCIL is governed by a board of directors, which has varied in size from 12 individuals in 2007 to 10 active members in 2012. The agency efforts in both time periods were largely driven by volunteers and other community members. The agency budget was $350,000 at the end of 2007, and the staff numbered 3 full-time and 5 volunteers. During this time, the agency rented office space from a local business owner. By 2012, the agency budget was $70,000 and there was a volunteer executive director who provided oversight of the day-to-day mission of the organization. The agency had relocated to the Unity-operated Center for Working Families in a closed school property rented from Catholic Charities of Joliet.

**Unity Constituents and Programs, 2007**

Unity’s 2007 mission statement made the organization responsible for the implementation of the 82 recommendations of the District 4 and 5 Quality of Life Plan. “Unity CDC will have a range of functions and specific tasks, but its core mission will be to serve as the organization that has the trust of the community and the backing of the City to see that the multi-faceted Quality of Life Plan is carried out.” (www.unitycdc.org/about, accessed June 25, 2015). To this end, Unity CDC originally adopted responsibility for eight key focus areas of the Quality of Life planning process in its organization charter. These focus area are highlighted in Table.
The eight key program areas identified by Unity CDC reflected the outcomes of the 3-year government, resident, and community leader–driven Quality of Life planning process. During 2007-2009, Unity CDC worked to establish its core mission as “the organization that has the trust of the community and backing of the City” to fulfill the promises of the planning process, primarily on behalf of the District 4 and 5 residents. As a result, Unity CDC leaders viewed the organization’s constituency as “primarily, the underserved residents of District 4 and 5” and “secondarily, the City and others with an interest in the planning area” (Unity leader, interview, November 25, 2008). As stated in the organization’s mission statement, Unity CDC defines its constituents as “underserved” residents of District 4 and 5. According to the current Unity CDC Executive Director, this constituency includes “the African Americans and Latinos who were hardest hit by the changes in Joliet historically and with the recent [2007] recession” (executive director, interview, November 12, 2007).

In addition, the organization’s constituency includes “the city and others with an interest in the planning area” (Unity CDC Mission Statement, www.unitycdc.org, accessed July 1, 2015). This component of the mission statement has resulted in a complex and changing relationship between Unity and the municipality. In 2007, Unity was engaged in housing development planning with the economic development and housing development departments of the city. According to Unity CDC leaders, the relationship between Unity CDC and the City of Joliet was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III. Unity CDC Focus Areas
adversarial in 2007 because the City viewed the agency program as competition. In 2007, Unity’s most visible programs were a burgeoning housing development program, along with first-time homeowner education, financial education, and a construction plan for low-income housing development. These programs were led by the then-CEO of Unity CDC, a retiree from outside of Joliet who had extensive experience in housing development and construction for low-income communities. Initially, the City provided vacant lots to assist the community development efforts and the organization enjoyed some early victories, including the development of a corporate-sponsored baseball field on vacant land and the establishment of the African American Pride Parade.

By the end of 2008, however, Unity’s relationship with the City had deteriorated amidst the fiscal recession and no housing was constructed by Unity. Although approximately 100 individuals accessed the pre-housing programs, no one was placed in housing. The CEO was accused of not acting in Joliet’s best interest, “not understanding the Joliet-way,” and was ultimately fired from the leadership of the organization (current executive director, interview, January 12, 2012).

The first executive director had been very active in Joliet’s neighborhood councils program since the development of the Quality of Life Plan. The neighborhood councils program was elevated to the major activity of the organization, with appointed neighborhood leaders and regular meetings of each of 17 neighborhood communities. Unity struggled to some extent to find its “premier” objectives and programs, but was able to incorporate the visions of its various stakeholders and neighborhood groups to redevelop and rebrand its purpose (Current Unity
executive director, interview, January 12, 2012). Eventually, Unity was able to develop partnerships with diverse organizations, including local colleges and universities, the City’s Neighborhood Services and Planning Departments, and various community leaders, to establish a neighborhood-based leadership development program and support its community programming.

**Unity Constituents, Outreach, and Programs: 2010-2012**

From 2009 to 2012, Unity struggled amidst the recession and organizational challenges. The housing development program was never realized and participation in the neighborhood council programs deteriorated. Ultimately, the first executive director resigned due to “hassles with the City regarding the housing development program” (Unity executive director, interview, January 12, 2012). Unity community leaders and the city ultimately collaborated in hiring a local executive director who had been active with the neighborhood council program. “A local man will understand how things happen in Joliet,” explained a City of Joliet employee (city employee, interview, February 13, 2012). The organization moved from its original space downtown to an elementary school campus rented from the Diocese of Joliet. Leaders touted the move as positive, resulting in more opportunities for “connecting local residents [of District 4 & 5] with the city and neighborhoods” (city employee, interview, February 13, 2012).

By 2012, Unity had established a reputation as “the voice of the people,” with a unique ability to organize community residents for the benefit of local city initiatives. “I think Unity should stick to their core strengths—their relationship with the community. They have been an important partner for several city council and neighborhood initiatives,” said a planning department-based city employee. “Their reach into the various resident groups and community
leaders is far beyond what we (the City) can do by ourselves.” At the same time, Unity expanded its recreational portfolio to include a summer sports league serving 350 children and an afterschool program that served over 400 children during the school year. Both programs were staffed by community volunteers and supported by state and federal “afterschool and out-of-school” time (Unity executive director, interview, November 12, 2014).

Unity’s recruitment at this time occurred through the neighborhood councils. By the end of 2012, there were 12 established neighborhood councils representing several key neighborhoods in District 4 and 5. Each neighborhood council had a chair and vice-chair, who established neighborhood priorities and objectives, set regular community meetings, and worked with city leaders and Unity leadership to establish two-way communication channels between the City and residents (planning department employee, interview, October 12, 2013). After facilitating weekly or biweekly meetings of their own neighborhood council, the chair and vice-chair attended monthly Unity CDC meetings in which they reported neighborhood successes and challenges to the Unity leadership and community leaders. These monthly “Unity meetings” provided resources for collective action, as well as information to the City about community needs. One early “win” for the neighborhood councils and Unity in 2012 was a resident-led collective action against a corporate-supported electrical rate-hike in the City.

Unity’s individual neighborhood councils and its role as an “umbrella” organizer and leadership facilitator of these councils has had a tremendous impact on its relationships with the City and the resident constituents since 2012. City leaders and Unity CDC estimate that the work of the active councils has served all District 4 and 5 residents in areas of recreation, economic
development, and youth development as a result of the work on the councils. In addition, the councils and Unity CDC have had an active voice in recent important municipal initiatives like Councilmanic Area Re-Districting in 2015 and the election of Unity CDC Secretary Betty Gavin as Councilperson for District 4 in 2014.

**Summary**

Unity CDC is a traditional community development corporation with strong ties to its geographically defined constituency in Joliet’s Districts 4 and 5, as well as stakeholders who may be helpful to the advancement of this constituency. The organization was established in 2007 as the result of a three-year community planning process to “improve the quality of life for the underserved residents in Joliet Districts 4 & 5.” In 2007, the organization’s mission was to provide “oversight to the implementation of the Quality of Life planning process, providing a voice and accountability to the residents of the District.” Programming and outreach during this era was large-scale, including housing development, recreational construction, and the launch of community programs such as the African American Pride Parade. At this time, Unity was planning several large-scale programming initiatives and provided few direct-service programs, but recruited 10 people into its financial education and homebuyer education programs before the programs were terminated. However, by 2012, the mission had shifted and the focus became community youth programming, community organizing, and small business incubation. Recruitment for these programs occurred via word of mouth and was supported by the neighborhood program structure, which encouraged the communication of vital initiatives from Joliet civic leaders to neighborhood residents. At this time, 2012, Unity CDC served more than 5,000 community residents of Districts 4 and 5. At this time, the organization became known as
“the voice of the people,” offering critical connections between the City and Districts 4 and 5 for programming from zoning feedback to community development to social services that could “improve neighborhoods and the quality of life for community residents of Joliet’s Districts 4 and 5” (planning department employee, interview, October 12, 2013).

Organization 3: A Historic Preservation Neighborhood Membership Organization

The Cathedral Area Preservation Association (CAPA) is a dues-based neighborhood association that was formed “to preserve the integrity and character of houses in the area Joliet” (CAPA president, interview, October 2, 2012).” The organization was formed in 1981 when “a small group of concerned home owners met to discuss preservation of the historic homes in the area” (CAPA president, interview, June 1, 2012). The economic changes of the 1970s and 1980s led to the division of the area’s historic single-family homes into multifamily rental units. As a result, the neighborhood began to show signs of neglect and deterioration. In its initial years, the purpose of CAPA was clear to the area neighborhood homeowners, and it remains intact today: “to preserve and protect the Cathedral Area from further deterioration and decline” (CAPA website, www.capajoliet.net, accessed March 15, 2015).

Organization History and Structure

The Cathedral Area is home to the city’s historic mansions and cathedrals, many which were built in the 1800s. As a District 4 neighborhood association, CAPA was borne as a result of the same economic processes that created “disadvantaged” and “underserved” population areas in Districts 4 and 5. As manufacturing jobs dwindled in the Joliet area in the late 1970s, the managers and supervisors of these companies also left the district. Over a period of 15 years,
single-family owner-occupied mansions in the area were partitioned into multifamily apartment buildings with “largely absentee landlords.” Neighborhood deterioration and home abandonment eventually “overtook the charming and historic character of the neighborhood.”

Like the WGCIL and Unity CDC, CAPA addressed concerns about these issues through community organizing via the formation of a local neighborhood association. However, unlike many of the neighborhoods in the area, the Cathedral Area had a reputation as a “wealthier community” with a “strong property tax base,” resulting in a different relationship with City Hall regarding the neighborhood concerns (Joliet city employee, interview, February 13, 2012). In addition, Joliet’s City Hall was eager for the restoration of high home values as a result of better-maintained property. One of CAPA’s first initiatives was their successful work with city hall to downzone the area for residential single-family homes from multi-family apartment dwellings. This successful venture, over 20 years ago, resulted in a positive relationship with city hall that continues today (CAPA executive director, interview).

CAPA’s current work—more than 30 years after its formation—echoes its original purpose. Since 2000, CAPA programs have expanded to include several additional initiatives related to historic preservation and community-city relationships. CAPA leadership is voluntary; board leaders are elected for annual renewable terms. All CAPA programs are staffed by volunteers; there is no paid staff. The initial CAPA board, formed in 1981, had 13 members. The current board consists of 14 members, including four officers, six standing directors, and four at-large directors.
**Organization Mission and Objectives**

The CAPA board of directors and members are required to follow the organization bylaws document that established the mission, policies, and main objectives of the organization’s work. Because CAPA leaders serve annual voluntary terms, adherence to the bylaws is considered an essential part of the organization’s operations among its leaders (CAPA member, interview). The CAPA organization has had the following consistent mission statement for the past 40 years:

The Cathedral Area Preservation Association shall be dedicated to preserving, maintaining, and promoting Joliet’s Cathedral Area. The organization shall strive to develop a prosperous community through the education of historic preservation and promotion of respect for old homes. (CAPA Website, www.jolietcapa.net, 2012)

CAPA’s core mission statement has remained unchanged since its formation. In 2012, CAPA’s programming focused on seven core areas detailed in the current bylaws: (1) zoning, (2) housewalk, (3) membership, (4) newsletter, (5) marketing, and (6) welcoming. Each program area is appointed a “standing director” who sits on the organization’s board. CAPA’s core program areas are the zoning and housewalk programs. Since the early 1990s, the CAPA zoning program has worked to downzone over 1,300 properties to single-family homes, resulting in property appreciation of 75% in the area (CAPA president, interview.). CAPA’s This Olde Housewalk program is their major fundraiser. The annual program features four to seven houses in the area, which are opened to the public for a day. Area businesses provide refreshments and support, and CAPA members support the event throughout the day. As a membership organization, CAPA primarily considers its core mission and emerging member needs regarding this mission in its program development efforts (CAPA president, interview, October, 4, 2012). “We are, first and foremost, about maintaining the character of our community through historic preservation and education,” explained CAPA’s president. “While this includes our work with other organizations,
we must take a careful look at our programs and initiatives to make sure they are getting us to this goal.”

**CAPA Constituency and Programs, 2009 and 2012**

CAPA leadership considers their primary constituency to be “voting members”—by definition, the residents of the area—of the organization, with a secondary constituency extended to all residents of the Cathedral Area. CAPA’s current membership rosters included “over 600 Cathedral Area residents, friends, and supporters of historic preservation” ([www.capcajoliet.net](http://www.capcajoliet.net), accessed July 10, 2015). Membership numbers have been maintained since 2005. In 2009, the Cathedral Area was home to 4,818 residents. By 2012, this number had risen to 5,214 residents. In 2009, CAPA reached over 4,000 individuals through its various programs. Demographic data were not maintained on the specific consumers, but demographic characteristics were computed for the community. The racial distribution of the Cathedral Area is reported in Figure 7.
Over 73.5% of the CAPA area residents were Caucasian (White) in 2008-2009. In addition, 27.7% of residents were African American (Black) and 18.5% of residents were Hispanic/Latino.

Age-based demographics also provide a notable view of WGCIL consumers in 2008-2009.
Figure 8 shows that the majority of CAPA residents in 2009, about 81.5%, were adults between the ages of 20 and 59. Only 10% of residents were between 0 and 19 years old. Based on the demographic profiles for direct consumers in 2008-2009, the majority of the Cathedral Area residents were White adults with higher income than the average Joliet income.

The recession saw a large turnover in single-family homes in the area, with several of the area’s homes being divided into apartments once again. In addition, absentee ownership was renewed, with net residential movement out of the area. This change prompted CAPA to fight zoning and absentee landlords anew, using additional strategies, such as partnerships with other Joliet neighborhood organizations and promoting their role in neighborhood beautification among developers and zoning violators.

Cathedral Area residential demographics only changed slightly by 2012. In 2012, CAPA reported programming areas related to their core mission of neighborhood beautification and
historic preservation (www.capajoliet.net, accessed June 26, 2015). In 2012, CAPA had about 6,000 members including residents from the area and their supporters.

The racial distribution the CAPA area continued to be largely Caucasian (“White”) shifted since 2007-2008, as community organizing and integration programs increased awareness of center activities in minority communities (WGCIL Executive Director, 10.14.12). Figure 9 details the racial demographics of WGCIL consumers in 2012.

Figure 9. Race of WGCIL Consumers, 2011-12 (N=273)
White consumers continue to be the dominant race among WGCIL consumers, with a slight decrease since 2007 for both Black consumers (22.3% from 27.3%) and Latino consumers (7.3% from 18.3%). Since 2010, the Cathedral Area has seen considerable change in several notable institutions. In 2010, Silver Cross Hospital, a key local employer, moved from District 4 to the city’s East Side.

In 2011, WGCIL adopted a “community organizing“ focus for all its programming and outreach efforts (WGCIL, Annual Report 2011–12). The agency views community organizing as a means to build alliances and awareness among key target groups (persons with disabilities, government leaders, social service allies, Catholic churches and other religious entities, those living in poverty and civic leaders who can advance our [disability rights] cause“ (WGCIL, Annual Report 2011–12)
APPENDIX B: Interview Questions

**Potential Questions about Community Change**
1. Please provide your name and the name of your organization
2. What is your organization’s mission? What are its main programs?
3. Who does your organization serve?
4. How has Joliet changed in the last decade? What types of changes were there in District 4 & 5?
5. Have the changes in Joliet presented any challenges to the community? How?
6. How did the community respond to these changes? What strategies did the community employ?

**Potential Questions about Multicultural Planning Process**
7. Are you aware of the Quality of Life planning process for Districts 4 & 5? How did the planning process come about?
8. What aspects of the Quality of Life planning process did your organization participate in? Did your organization have any specific responsibilities/ accomplishments related to the Quality of Life planning process?
9. How did the Quality of Life planning process come about? Who were the main players?
10. How did you find out about the planning process? How did you receive information about activities and progress of the plan?
11. Who participated in the planning process? Do you feel that there was a high degree of participation in the planning process from local residents and organizations?
12. How did the planning process include the residents? Social service agencies? Your organization?
13. What do you believe is the role of social service agencies in community planning? What was the role of social service agencies in this planning process?
14. What was the process for determining the recommendations of the plan? How was your agency involved?
15. What were the most important recommendations of the plan for your agency? Why?
16. Please take a look at the recommendations of the plan for social services. How did these plans affect your agency?
17. After the planning process, were there any changes in your agency regarding:
   - Partnerships
   - Resources/ Capital
   - Leadership
   - Partnerships
   - Capacity- Building
   - Programs/ Services
   - Constituents
18. What were the benefits of participating in the planning process for your agency?
19. What were the challenges of participating in the planning process for your agency?
Potential Questions for Agency Staff/ Leaders

1. What do you believe is the role of social service agencies is in the community?
2. What do you believe is the role of your agency in the community?
3. What is the role of social service agencies?
4. Does your agency engage in providing social services to a diverse constituent base? How is the constituent base diverse?
5. What community activities does your agency engage in?
6. What types of community planning has your agency participated in? How?
7. How do you feel about your agency engaging in community activities?
8. Do you think your agency should do less or more community activities?
9. How has your agency changed since participating in the Quality of Life planning process?
   o Partnerships
   o Resources/ Capital
   o Leadership
   o Partnerships
   o Capacity- Building
   o Programs/ Services
   o Constituents
10. Why do you work at your agency? (i.e., social mission, resources, programs/services)
11. Are you involved in outreach to African-Americans and Latinos?
12. How has outreach changed at your agency since 2007?
13. What are the benefits of participating in community activities for your agency? Drawbacks/ Challenges?

Planning Process

1. How long has your agency been in this community?
2. How many African- American constituents do you have?
3. How many Latino constituents do you have?
4. What types of programs/services does your agency offer these constituents?
5. How does the agency engage these constituents?
6. Have the changes in the community impacted your agency? How? When did you first notice these changes?

Community-Planning Participation

7. What types of community activities does your agency participate in?
8. Has your agency engaged in any community-wide planning processes? What was the agency’s role in this process?
9. Why did your agency become involved in the planning process?
10. What aspects of the process did you participate in?
   a. Survey
   b. Community Meetings
   c. Town Hall Meetings
   d. Implementation Meetings
11. Have you been involved in any other community-wide planning processes in this community?
12. What types of community activities did you participate in?
13. Has participation in community planning activities had any impact on your agency? What?

**Agency-Level Planning**
14. Has your agency engaged in any internal planning for racial changes in the community?
15. Why did you decide to plan for the changes? What caused you pay attention to these issues?
16. In the outreach and advocacy programs, how did your agency plan in response to community racial change, in regard to:
   a. Relationships
   b. Resources/ Capital
   c. Capacity- Building
   d. Programs/ Services
17. What about in other programs? What is the benefit to your agency for participation in community planning processes?
18. What are the drawbacks to this organization for participating in community planning process?
19. Did your agency engage in any specific planning/programming for Latino/ African-American constituents in the last several years? How?
20. How did the agency determine who would participate in the internal planning?
21. Were there any differences between this plan and previous planning processes at your agency?

**Agency Change**
22. How are decisions about changes in the organization made?
23. How influential is your agency politically in the local community, state, nationally? Can you provide an example of a time where you used the agencies influence to accomplish a program goal? Something for your constituents Describe an instance where your agency was able to negotiate a resource for their constituents as a result of participating in community activities…

**Expected and Received Benefits of Participation in Community Planning?**
24. What is the benefit to your agency for participation in community planning processes?
25. What are the drawbacks to this organization for participating in community planning processes?
26. What is the benefit to your agency for participation in internal planning processes for change?
27. What are the challenges to this organization for participating in internal planning processes for change?
### Document Review Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name:</th>
<th>Document File Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Date:</td>
<td>Author:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Question(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Findings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which Analysis Chapters?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: Sample CIL Manager Output

Will Grundy Center For Independent Living Joliet, Illinois

Report By Staff

Community Services Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Attend:</th>
<th>Units:</th>
<th>Hours:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community and Systems Advocacy</td>
<td>22-Aug-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one on one meeting for the week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Education/Public</td>
<td>09-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended meeting with Will County Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>09-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered applications for Disability Mentoring Day to Lincoln-way High School.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>10-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with students at Lockport High School to discuss Disability Mentoring Day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Systems Advocacy</td>
<td>11-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted Low Vision Support Group at Center. Community guest speaker participated guest speaker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Action Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>Met regarding Next Steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>Conducted Woman's Support Group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>Attended meeting for Disability Mentoring Day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Sep-03</td>
<td>Cornerstone Services / Joliet</td>
<td>Met with Clients at Cornerstone for a presentation about careers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>Conducted Low Vision Support Group at Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>Attended Operation Jose Meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-03</td>
<td>CCDI / Bolingbrook</td>
<td>Gave presentation at CCDI meeting yesterday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td>Set up an information table at Wal-Mart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community and Systems Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep-03</td>
<td>Will Grundy Center For</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Met** regarding Next Steps.
- Conducted Woman's Support Group.
- Attended meeting for Disability Mentoring Day.
- Met with Clients at Cornerstone for a presentation about careers.
Conducted the Next Steps Meeting.

Community and Systems Advocacy 23-Sep-03 Legislator Meeting / 3 4.00 1.00

Attended meeting with the Senator in his local office.

Community and Systems Advocacy 24-Sep-03 Legislator Meeting / 4 4.00 1.00

Met with State Senator at her office.

Community and Systems Advocacy 25-Sep-03 Will Grundy Center For 2 6.00 1.50

Met with Congressional staffer regarding Mentoring Day.

Community and Systems Advocacy 25-Sep-03 Will Grundy Center For 8 6.00 1.50

Attended tour of Dieke Center.

Community Education/Public 26-Sep-03 Transition Planning Committee / 20 6.00 1.50

Gave presentation regarding Mentoring Day

Community and Systems Advocacy 26-Sep-03 Will Grundy Center For 6 5.00 1.25

Met regarding Operation J.O.S.E.

Community and Systems Advocacy 29-Sep-03 Will Grundy Center For 7 4.00 1.00
APPENDIX E: Nonprofit Leaders Contributing to the Study

**Staff Members**

- Pam Heavens, WGCIL Executive Director
- Festus Fabiola, WGCIL Program Director
- Mary Tisdale, WGCIL Advocate
- Maria Christina Hansen, WGCIL Advocate
- Keylly Tisdale, WGCIL advocate
- Mac Willis, Unity CDC Executive Director
- Stan Smith, Unity CDC Executive Director
- Bob Nachtrieb, CAPA Zoning Director

**Board Members**

- Denise Winfrey, President
- Val Rand, Vice President
- Charles Fuqua
- MaryAnn Pinkney

**Outreach Advisors**

- Charles Lewis
- Tempe Bates
- Denise Winfrey
- Father Ray Lescher
APPENDIX F: Community Leaders Contributing to the Study

Unity CDC
Mac Willis, President Unity CDC
Stan Smith, Former Executive Director Unity CDC
Charles Jones, Former President Unity CDC / Lewis University
Ouida Jones, Former Staff member Unity CDC

Nonprofit and Community Leaders
Tom Sutter, YMCA
Kathy Kaiser, Community Leader
Bettye Gavin, National Hookup of Black Women Tempie Bates, Harvey Brooks Foundation
Raymond Bolden, Retired Judge
Rev. Hector Edwards, Mt. Olive Church
Father Ray Lescher, Sacred Heart Church Bishop
JE Moore, Christ Temple Church
Henry Morris, Housing Authority of Joliet
Maria Pedraza, Mt. Carmel Church
Eugenia Prowls, Joliet Junior College
Michael Vincegeurra, University of St. Francis
Linda Weatherspoon, Preston Heights Neighborhood Association

Government
Pete Saunders, City of Joliet
Susie Barber, Councilwomen District 4
Warren Dorris, Councilman District 5
Alfredo Mesilio, Jolet Neighborhood Services

Businesses
Annette Leck, Chicago Speedway
Charles Hanus, Will & Grundy Central Trade AFL
Russ Slinkard, Joliet Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Alma Martinez, Latino Business Group
Greg Hill, Indicom Electric Company Barbara Ladner, Pace
Steve Randich, Harris Bank
Frank Quigley, Empress Casino Joliet JD Ross, Will-Grundy Medical Clinic

Community Planning and Preservation
David Chandler, Center for Neighborhood Technology
Rebecca Darley, Cathedral Area Historic Preservation Association