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Abstract

THE IMPLICATIONS OF RESIDENCY WITHIN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE

by

Kelsey Bardini

Given the historical foundation of residency within social work it is important for social workers to reconsider how residency may be a benefit to community development practice. This qualitative study explores community developers who intentionally moved into the communities in which they work. The study seeks to find these community developer’s motivations for moving into their community as well as the perceived the benefits for their clientele. Content analysis using latent and manifest coding was used. The respondents were 10 self-identified community developers and intentional residents. Three themes emerged: 1) Resident community developers felt an increased awareness of the strengths and challenges within their respective communities; 2) Resident community developers were motivated by a spiritual belief or a moral imperative; 3) Resident community developers struggled to balance their concerns of safety with their moral obligation to social justice. Implications for social work practice and policy are discussed.
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Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Throughout the history of the profession, social workers have been involved in community organization, engagement, and development. Social work’s historical roots are found within the settlement house movement and the charitable organization society of the late 1800s, which developed in a time of massive growth and change in communities (Kropf, 2010; Trolander, 1987). As a response to this change, settlement house workers took up personal residence in struggling communities and served alongside the community working for change. The deep relationships that the first social workers (settlement house workers) were able to make with the community through taking up residence greatly affected their practice. It enabled settlement workers to see the intrinsic strengths of the community, to quickly discover the challenges, and to work alongside their clients as neighbors to promote the betterment of their community and of their own lives (Blank, 1998; Reyes, 2008).

Today, social work in communities looks somewhat different. Studies find that far less social workers engage in community development and those who do often do not take up personal residence within those communities (Whitaker & Arrington, 2008). Studies also find that, according to clients, community and neighborhood centers do not serve the most pressing needs of the community and tend to be out of touch with the community’s true challenges (Poole & Colby, 1999). There are assorted reasons for why community developers choose not to take up residence within the communities in which
they work. Some of these reasons include personal boundaries within the profession, safety, and the search for professionalism (Reyes, 2008).

Despite the fact that the majority of social workers now practice direct service work, social work does value, as a whole, the mezzo and macro levels of community engagement and some social workers still do choose to live in the communities in which they work. This study aims to explore the community of social workers that do still take up personal residence within the place they practice and how this choice is beneficial to the community and the worker.

**Background of the Problem**

At the time when social work was first beginning to take root, helping the poor and poor neighborhoods was a high-profile cause that attracted both money and volunteers from middle and upper-class neighborhoods. The interest of these volunteers was to reside among the poor and serve them as fellow citizens as opposed to “clients.” Their service would be in neighborhood centers that were called “settlements” (Husock, 1993; Trolander, 1987). Many believed that settlements should and would be fixtures of American life. Today, however, the term “settlement” has become little known, and remaining settlements from this time era are scarce. The United Neighborhood Houses of New York, one of three remaining city-based settlement federations, estimates there are now 300 only settlements nationwide in 80 cities (Husock).

In a 2008 study conducted by the National Association of Social Work (NASW) entitled *Social Workers at Work*, researchers found that only 14 percent of social workers listed advocacy as one of their main functions within their profession (Whitaker &
Arrington, 2008). This is a shockingly small number considering the historical roots of the profession. Additionally, social workers dedicated only an average of three percent of their week towards community organizing, policy and legislation development, or grant writing (Whitaker & Arrington). This is also unsettling considering community organizing and advocacy for one’s clients is listed in the NASW’s code of ethics as one of the primary professional goals of social work. The professional trend of social workers moving away from advocacy and towards clinical work is an important issue that social workers need to address about their profession and the security of its future.

These facts are not only threatening to the profession of social work and its values, but to the clients themselves. Advocacy is not only an ethical responsibility as a social worker, but also one of the core values that separates the profession from other, similar practices. This researcher will attempt to explore the historical backing for the practice of residency and a model of community development, which mirrors that of settlements. This is in an effort to explore the motivation for the practice as well as the perceived benefits for clients.

**Statement of Research Problem**

This research will study professionals working in community development or community organizing who take up personal residence in the same locational community that they serve. It aims to explore the motivating factors for organizers/developers moving into these communities, or remaining in these communities. In addition, it will also explore the possible challenges and benefits of taking up personal residency within specific locational community for professionals and for the community as a whole.
Purpose of the Study

This study aims to shed light onto those currently the exception to the norm of community development. The main objective is to find out the motivations for continued devotion to this type of practice as well as the challenges and benefits to the community members as a whole and the individuals personally. This will be accomplished by conducting exploratory, qualitative interviews, which will explore various factors that contribute to motivation for intentionally taking up personal residence within lower income areas, as well as the participants’ views on how their personal residence can be a challenge to, and also a benefit for the clients they serve. As this is an infrequently researched topic, this study will contribute information on the challenges and benefits of residency within community development practice and will hopefully encourage professionals who are in community development or community organizing to consider their personal residence and how it affects their work. In addition, it will inform social workers and community developers alike of the impact their residency has on their clientele.

Research Question

This study examines the following research question: What are the motivations for and perceived benefits of intentionally taking up personal residence within the community one serves?
Theoretical Framework

In this section, the ecological systems theory model and social relations/social capital model will be described. An application section for both theories will also be presented.

Ecological Systems Theory Model

The ecological systems perspective focuses on the interrelation of biological and environmental factors in human development over time. Bronfenbrenner (1992), the developer of ecological systems theory, asserts that “The characteristics of the person at a given time in his or her life are a joint function of the characteristics of the person and of the environment over the course of the person’s life up to that time.” (p.190). The ecosystems theory model not only recognizes the importance of the person in their respective environment, but also how time affects outcomes (Reyes, 2008).

Bronfenbrenner (1992) specifically developed the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and the macrosystem within the chronosystem. These systems have been reworked and developed into systems theory, which is heavily used in the profession of social work today. Bronfenbrenner studied the interrelational aspects of these various systems. His microsystem refers to face-to-face relationships one has with others. The mesosystem refers to the relationship of two or more microsystems, for example, the school and the health clinic in relationship to a child. The exosystem would be the school or healthcare office and their function within the community. The macrosystem refers to the overarching culture and economic climate of the society.
**Application of Ecological Systems Theory Model.** The ecological systems theory is often used in studies of neighborhoods and the relationships of individuals within societal and cultural context (Reyes, 2008). Neighborhood centers, community organizations, and settlement houses with employees who are active participants in the community can be seen through the lens of the ecological systems theory, and their work can affect how individuals relate to the various systems in their society. The theory assumes that people are affected by their environment and the community they live in, locationally, has a great impact on their way of being in the world. This therefore informs community development as a whole, and can specifically encourage residency within community development. If one takes up personal residence in the community they develop their knowledge of the macro, meso, and exosystems within the community. This knowledge would be similar to that of their clients’. They would also be able to interact holistically with their clients in multiple systems.

**Social Relations/Social Capital Model**

The social relations/social capital model provides an opportunity to assess neighborhood influences in terms of the social relations among the residents of a neighborhood or locational community. The theory was introduced by Coleman (1999) as an alternative to human, financial, and physical capital. Social capital is described as the relationship between or among persons that brings about action. Social capital could be referred to as the “Social glue that bonds neighborhood participants and provides an opportunity for advancement or progress towards a common goal” (Reyes, 2008, p. 34).
Studies that look at social capital often focus on the adult relationships within a locational community and an individual’s ability to network and share talents and opportunities with others. These relationships measure the amount of social capital that a community has, since social capital is made primarily on relationships between community members and community agencies and businesses.

**Application of Social Relations/Social Capital Model.** The social capital model would therefore assume that strong relationships between community individuals and community developers would strengthen a community’s social capital. Since building relationships, networking, and developing the inherent strengths of individuals through relationships are the main ways to strengthen social capital, the social capital of a neighborhood is going to be influenced and affected by strong leaders within the neighborhood. When community developers take up personal residency, they have the opportunity to become these strong leaders building deep relationships with community members and raising up leaders within the community. Residency could be the most natural and effective way to develop social capital.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are used throughout this project to discuss the affects of residency on community development practice.

*Community:* For the purpose of this study, community will be seen through the lens of locational or geographic communities. There are three essential elements of locational community: geographical area, social interaction, and common ties (Hillery, 1955). This
interdependence between the residents of a geographical area defines the “community” that this study focuses on.

**Community Organizing**: A process by which people in neighborhood organizations, associations, and churches join together to address social problems within their community, develop solutions, and implement these solutions over time (Brueggeman, 2010). Community organizing is driven by professionals who facilitate associations and organizations within communities, dedicated to change and to addressing the challenges of the community (Ewalt, Freeman, & Poole, 1998).

**Community Development**: A practice primarily directed at community members rather than professionals. Community development gives community members opportunities and supports to define their own community interests, define the assets that exist, the assets required, develop community capacity and governance, identify local leadership, and reform oppressive structures that are harmful to the community’s well-being. (Ewalt, Freeman, & Poole, 1998; Brueggman, 2010)

**Residency**: An established personal place of dwelling. Participant’s residency in a given locational community will be based on their understanding of the neighborhood that their home is in.

**Assumptions**

The assumptions that need to be considered when reviewing the study are: 1) Social workers and other professionals who work in lower-income areas are no longer personally residing within these communities. 2) Social work education, as well as mainstream American culture, does not have an intrinsic value towards intentionally
taking up residence in lower-income neighborhoods. 3) There may be an association between one’s personal place of residency and one’s professional practice, as well as one’s experience in the world.

**Justification**

As social work in the mezzo and macro levels consistently grow and change, the need for more research in community organizing is valuable. This research will professionally benefit those who are interested in going into community development. It may also shed light onto the possible benefits that individuals and communities receive from having services given by professionals who are neighbors. As the profession continues to move more towards direct practice, this study can bring awareness to the potential benefits of mezzo and macro level engagement. Additionally, as outlined in the NASW code of ethics "Social workers' primary goal is to help people in need and to address social problems" (NASW, 2006, p. 5). This puts an ethical responsibility on social workers to put service of others over self-interest. With the continued schism within the profession over the roles of social workers and the importance of returning to the roots of the profession, (Specht & Courtney, 1994) there is a definite need for social workers to not only explore how residency can improve their practice professionally and benefit their clients.

**Delimitations**

This study is strictly exploratory and qualitative in nature and does not provide statistical information. Participants have been identified as those who have chosen to personally reside in the community they work in and identify as community organizers or
community developers in some capacity. Therefore, the participant variation is limited. In addition, participants were only located near the Sacramento, CA region. No particular considerations were made to broaden the age, ethnicity, religious affiliation or other variables between participants. The study results cannot be generalized to the entire social work population.

Summary

Chapter one discussed the background of the problem, the statement of the research problem, the purpose of the study, the theoretical framework, the definition of terms, the assumptions, the justification, and the limitations of this study. In chapter two, a review of the literature will be presented on the following thematic areas: the historical background of community development and social work practice, settlement houses and settlement house philosophy, contemporary models of community organization, current trends in settlements and residency based community programs, and faith-based models for community development. Professional boundaries and their relationship with residency as well as gaps in the literature will be addressed. Chapter three will include a description of the theory and how it applies to the study. In Chapter four, the data analysis will be presented. Finally, in chapter five, conclusions and implications of the study will be discussed.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In this chapter, relevant literature and historical background associated with community development and social work residency will be presented. There are seven sections. The first section will present the historical background of community development and its relationship with social work practice. The second section will specifically address settlement houses and settlement house philosophy. The third section will include a discussion of contemporary models of community organization and current day community based organizations. The forth section will describe current trends in settlements and residency based community programs. The fifth section will focus on faith-based models of community development and outreach. The sixth section will address professional boundaries and social work residency, and finally the seventh section will be a discussion on the gaps in the literature.

Historical Background of Community Organization within Social Work Practice

Throughout the history of social work, since it’s early inception in the 1800s, there has been an inextricable link between the roots of social work practice, community engagement, and the development of the separate fields of professional social work and community organization. Social work’s roots in community practice take place within the Progressive Era (1885-1915). During this time, macro social workers saw the entirety of social work as their practice area, rather than just a subset or small population.
Progressive social workers engaged individuals and groups, but more importantly, they conducted research to help improve communities (Trolander, 1987).

Social workers in the Charitable Organization Society (COS) and Settlement House Movement engaged individuals’ right within their own neighborhoods (Trolander, 1987). Friendly visitors of COS worked to develop what is similar to today’s models of home visitation or case management. Settlement houses addressed the community as a group and provided a wide range of services for all different areas of their neighbors’ lives.

Early social workers were highly engaged in activism within their communities and they worked on child labor laws and laws that would benefit and protect the immigrant and low-income populations that they served. (Kropf, 2010) Social workers worked within the democratic process and also within social policy and social movements.

In the 40 years that followed the Progressive Era, the profession of social work struggled to define and refine its goals and values (Brueggemann, 2010). Many social workers adopted the medical model of the time and favored casework to community development and macro level work. During this time, macro level social work came to be known as “Community Organizing” which is defined as “The practice of working within the neighborhood and societal levels to bring about social reform” (Brueggemann, p. 154).

Up until this time, settlement workers were the main providers of community-based social services, and up until the 1930s, settlement house community organizing
was seen as the most effective form of community organization (Brueggemann, 2010; Kropf, 2010; Trolander, 1987). The Great Depression of the 1930s however provided for a crisis in national economy, which led other models of community organizing to emerge. Faced with the extent of desperation that the nation experienced, the Settlement House neighborhood organizing approach began to lose its effectiveness. Saul Alinsky, a research sociologist, came onto the scene at this time with a new and more assertive style of community organizing that would change the way people achieved power (Brueggemann, 2010; Trolander, 1987).

Following the Great Depression, in the 1940s and 1950s, social workers engaged in planning, administration, and social policy (Brueggemann, 2010). Community organizing and community development programs sprang up in colleges and universities throughout the nation in which the organizing practices and theories developed by community organizers such as Alinsky, were used. However, an integrated arena of macro social work practice had not been clearly identified and the field of macro level social work became more vulnerable.

In 1955 the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) was formed and it officially recognized group work and case management as its official practices (Brueggemann, 2010). It was not until 1962 that the NASW picked up community organization as an official practice of social work. Due to the fact that community development and community organizing had taken its own shape during this time, social workers seemed to be left behind.
During the 1960s when great political change was occurring, community organizers used radical approaches often seen as incongruent with social work values, and by the time social workers were called to join into the movement, they were a bit too late (Trolander, 1987). Today the field of community organization and social work are blended together in many ways and contribute towards each other. The majority of social workers still enter the direct practice fields of social work, but macro practice continues to expand and become more integrated with the entirety of social work.

Settlement Houses

Settlement houses developed in response to the desperate living conditions of the poor at the end of the 19th century have been a foundation in social work practice in the United States (Kropf, 2010; Trolander, 1987). As the nation’s industry evolved at the time, cities were presented with the challenges of large increases in population and congested tenements filled with immigrant laborers. This led to the formation of slum neighborhoods.

Modeled after Toynbee Hall in London in 1886, the Neighborhood Guild was established and the first settlement houses in the United States were specifically developed to address the issues of poverty and social injustice (Husock, 1990). Soon after, Jane Addams developed one of the nation’s most famous and prominent settlements, Hull House in Chicago in 1889. New York, Boston, and Chicago became home to a variety of settlements, which increased in number from six, in 1891 to 74 in 1897 (Husock). By 1913, there were 413 settlements in 32 states (Husock, 1993).
Contrary to the mission of other community engagement organizations of the time, the settlement house movement focused on advocacy for social reform rather than charity (Kropf, 2010). The settlement workers took a unique stance—seeing the people they work with as neighbors rather than clients. The settlement house workers moved into the poorest neighborhoods with the intention of becoming good neighbors; residency became one of the primary characters and distinguishing practices of settlement workers (Trattner, 1999).

As time progressed, the ideology of settlements had shifted and as social work professionalized “neighbors” became “clients” (Davis, 1973). This dramatic shift marked, for some the end of the settlement house movement. Social work as a profession began to focus more on the medical model, the MSW degree, and therapeutic direct practice (Trolander, 1987).

**Settlement Movement Philosophy**

Social work is rooted in two movements: the settlement house movement and the charitable organization society movement (Brueggemann, 2010; Kropf, 2010; Tronlander, 1987). While charitable organizations focused on the responsibility of the individual to attain a better life, the settlement house philosophy focused on social responsibility and social reform (Haynes, 1999; Trattner, 1999). One could further distinguish between the two traditions because settlement houses featured citizens who were called “participants” while charitable organizations focused on “clients” who were recipients of their services. Additionally, settlements viewed their participants as neighbors, since they resided (in terms of locational context) in the same neighborhood.
The advocacy in which settlements engaged in was for the common good of the neighborhood, not the client. In recent years, the profession of social work has been challenged to revisit its origin of settlement work (Chesler, 1996; Haynes, 1999; Husock; 1993; Jacobson, 2001).

The pioneers of the settlement movement, such as Jane Addams of Hull House, Graham Taylor of Chicago Commons, and Mary McDowell of the University of Chicago viewed social reform as the basis of their work (Hayes, 1999). This reform was not accomplished for the community, but with the community. Settlements were places in which discussion of social issues and plans for reform ensued among neighbors. Social justice issues such as child labor, workers rights, and living conditions in poor neighborhoods were taken on by the settlements with the intent of developing strategies to improve life within the community. The settlements served as vehicles of social change rather than temporary remedies to mitigate poverty (Hayes; Husock, 1993).

Florence Kelley, a Hull House worker and activist, dedicated a great deal of her years at the Hull House to advocacy and activism with the community and on behalf of the clients it served (Sklar, 1995). Kelley probably had the largest single share of shaping social welfare history in the United States during the first thirty years of the century. Under Kelley’s influence, the Hull House turned decidedly towards social reform on behalf of labor law legislation, women’s issues, temperance, and anti-sweatshop legislation among others (Sklar). The Hull House’s activity in advocacy, legislation, and lobbying set precedence for other Settlement houses of the time and made advocacy a primary component of the social work profession (Sklar).
As the profession has continued to grow and change, different priorities have emerged within it. In an effort to professionalize social work and to make it competitive with similar fields, a push was made to make social work more clinically based (Trolander, 1987). Mary Richmond’s *Social Diagnosis*, written in 1917, was a first look at social work through the medical model rather than through a communal approach, like Jane Addams’. Mary Richmond pushed social workers to look at the individual as the cause of their own problems, rather than the society at large (Kropf, 2010).

At this time, Addams however became involved in the politics of the Progressive movement (Specht & Courtney, 1994). This was a commitment that “pro-profession” social workers, like Mary Richmond, made no secret of their distaste in community development. In addition, most social workers saw her tireless opposition to the entrance of the United States in World War I as unpatriotic. Addams eventually became a Nobel Peace Prize laureate, but her direct influence on social work’s rise to professionalism was marginal. Nevertheless, her ideas have absorbed into and remained part of the identity of social work, even if they have taken the rather disembodied form of “values” that are rarely integrated into practice (Specht & Courtney). Therefore, a split developed between the individual-therapeutic and clinical slant of the profession and the justice and social change goals set in motion by settlement workers. As such, the history of the profession shows a relentless, if not entirely linear, ascent of the therapeutic approach in training and education as well as practice (Specht & Courtney).
Contemporary Models of Community Development

In this section two contemporary models of community development will be discussed, Asset Based Community Development and the Ross House Meeting model.

Asset Building Community Development

Asset building is an emerging theme in community revitalization and development. Within social work practice, it is often defined broadly to include all the potential resources of a community—also called “strengths” or “social capital” (Reyes, 2008). This terminology, or perspective, for community development is based off of the model developed by John Mcnight and John Kretzmann in the 1980s (Reyes). McKnight and Kretzmann made a discovery in the South End of Chicago that has fundamentally affected how we think and act in communities. Their observations—that low-income communities had a high level of individualized, associational, and institutional assets that were either untapped or undertapped—were critical to a mind shift on how communities change and what the role of residents is in that change (Reyes).

Through this discovery, Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) was birthed (Reyes, 2008). The main tenets of ABCD are simple. People and communities have resources, strengths and assets or social capital that can be utilized both individually and communally to address the challenges that the community faces. ABCD disassociates place and circumstance from individual capacities. New and creative ways are used to incorporate the capacities of people, the culture of the community, and the existing buildings and space (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1996).
Asset-based community development has allowed people and places to fundamentally debunk the notion that people who are poor and live in poor neighborhoods are only clients to be served and not resourceful community members (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1996). Furthermore, it has allowed individuals in urban neighborhoods and rural areas to see themselves differently. Low-income residents now think about how they could develop leadership capacity amongst the talented and skilled individuals in their own community or neighborhood rather than looking outside for an external source. The concept of ABCD challenges communities to think about what they have rather than what they do not, and to come together as neighbors rather than have a client and service. It encourages community developers to build up leadership within the community, essentially “working themselves out of a job” and being replaced by members of that actual community, or other cases, joining the community and become leaders and neighbors (McKnight & Kretzmann).

The Ross House Meeting Model

Developed by Fred Ross in the 1960s, the House Meeting Model was used and perfected by the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) (Brueggemann, 2010). ACRON organized around southern African Americans who did not have a sense of place or commitment to a particular locality. The house meeting became an indispensable tool.

House meetings are evening sessions held in poor communities in which 6-12 people focus on particular challenges in the community and begin to develop a pre-organizational infrastructure. A community organizer, who is not necessarily a member
of the community, often holds these meetings. They are held in a community member’s home or a common location. These meetings are based on what the community members desire to see change within their community (Brueggemann, 2010).

After needs are identified, members of the committee participate in “door knocking” (Brueggemann, 2010). Door knocking, or solicitation, is one of the main tenets of Ross’ model. It gives other community members face-to-face interaction with the organizers and helps rally them together for a common cause. After door knocking happens, an organizing committee is formed to decide on the issues to address, and to develop a plan to address them. In addition, a community council is created and officers are elected into the council. This is a great way to identify leaders within the community.

The Ross House Meeting Model is a way to engage community members to take ownership of their own communal needs and to identify strong leaders within the community (Brueggemann, 2010). It is not specifically or solely based on the assets or strengths of the community, as we see in Asset Based Community Development, however, it does share similar aspects to ABCD, such as an emphasis on empowering leaders and using the natural talents and abilities of the community.

**Contemporary Settlements and other Residency Based Community Engagement Programs**

Within the last twenty years there has been a call for social workers to turn back towards their community activism roots in settlement houses and neighborhood centers (Specht & Courtney, 1994). In 1913, a publication called the Handbook of Settlements listed some 413 settlements in 32 states (Husock, 1993). Today, United Neighborhood
Houses of New York, one of the three remaining city-based settlement federations, estimates there are now 300 settlements nationwide in 80 cities (Husock). Landers (1998) suggested that approximately 900 “bustling social service centers” known as community houses, neighborhood or community centers, are “today’s settlements” (p. 3). However, the United Neighborhood Houses of New York’s estimated 300 settlements are viewed as “survivors” from the era (Husock). It has been suggested that these settlements survived by adapting to changes in the policy environment such as offering government-funded programs like child care and drug treatment services. Husock conducted one of the few studies of contemporary settlements with his analysis of 14 settlements in 11 cities. He found that settlements continued to provide an array of services to a broad cross section of citizens in specified geographic areas. Some programs were problem-focused, and others aimed to maintain the well being of individuals and their communities. While some settlements were heavily dependent on public funds, the average level of government support was 33.4%. United Way was the major funding source.

Koerin (2003) also did a study on contemporary settlement houses and neighborhood centers. Of the 82 settlements she sampled only four had been created within the last 25 years. These findings suggest that the settlement movement has lost its popularity within current social service trends. Koerin also found that 56% of the centers served several neighborhoods, as opposed to one specific one. As with traditional settlements, Koerin’s study found that 60% of settlements engaged in multiple levels of practice with multiple populations focused on community needs rather than specific problem areas.
Kraus and Chaudry (1995) studied New York’s 37 settlement houses, which served over 200,000 people annually, providing prevention, treatment, recreation, and cultural programs. Government funding represented 85% of their revenues. Kraus and Chaudry noted that settlements often resembled their funders—“with specialized staff, organized by categorical programs, who often answer more to the rules and regulations of their funding agencies than to changing neighborhood conditions” (p. 34). Apart from these few studies, there is little information about contemporary settlement houses/neighborhood centers.

In their book titled *Settlement Houses Under Siege*, Fabricant and Fisher (2002) describe the financial climate from the inception of settlement to present day, documenting the implications of settlements taking up government granted funding. They found that as settlements relied on government funds more heavily they were forced to change their program to identify more categorical populations and problem areas. This led to settlements focusing more on individual service, rather than on communal interests and non-categorical services.

In discussing whether settlements really work, Husock (1993) noted the challenges of assessing settlement services. He asserted that many times anecdotal information is relied upon when assessing settlement efforts. While there is a wealth of information about the history of settlement houses and their social contribution, as well as the contributions of their workers—such as Jane Addams—there is no research on the participants or the workers themselves or the perceived benefits to their community. In
addition there is little research on current settlements, seeing as settlements have
decreased in numbers significantly since their heyday.

The United Neighborhood Houses (UNH) Community Building Initiative had
been documented in a series of articles in conjunction with Chapin Hall. The UNH is a
coalition of 38 settlements in New York City with a total of 310 locations. Seven case
studies document the community building initiatives for several of the settlement houses
in the network. In one example, the University Settlement of New York worked with
other agencies and communities to revitalize a local park located in the lower east side of
Manhattan (Hirota, Brown, & Martin, 1996). The goal was to remove illicit activity such
a gang loitering, drug solicitation and prostitution, and to reclaim the park for families
and children. The endeavor was successful, and now the settlement and other local
agencies frequently host activities for the community in the park.

Each of the case studies’ documents provide concrete examples of community
building which is one of the fundamental missions of settlements. The community
building achievements are documented from the perspective of the settlement staff.

In an ethnographic study of Chicago’s West Town youth initiatives, Chapin Hall
researchers focused on five of the six settlements that were part of the Youth Options
Unlimited (YOU) network, a collaboration of 10 agencies providing services to 12-18
year old youth in the West Town neighborhood of Chicago (Halpern, Barker, & Mollard,
2000). The YOU program provided transportation for youth between settlements and
other services that were offered in the program, such as medical care from the local teen
health clinic. Whether or not teens were affiliated with a gang, the neighborhood in
which they lived was not seen as safe due to the large amount of gang activity. Teens were unable to cross gang borders without risking the threat of violence. The YOU program provided transportation across these borders safely and specifically worked with the youth on both sides of the boundaries to forge relationships with one another.

Halpern, Barker, and Mollard (2000) found that many of the settlement house programs in the YOU network were comprised of drop-in services and structured activities aimed at engaging youth and preventing gang activity and gang promotion. More often than not, the youth programs in these settlements had little funding and untrained staff with inadequate space or materials. Nonetheless, they found that the settlements provided respite for the teens from the streets and a place where they could be themselves. Likewise, the youth participants trusted the settlement workers and developed strong relationships and alliances with them. The settlements provided a “home away from home” with kind neighbors and a safe environment for the youth to go.

**Faith Based Community Development**

A number of faith-based models of community development have come about over the years. These models, while similar to other models of community development, often include residency as a key component of their theoretical framework. Two of the most popular models are Christian Community Development (CCD) developed by John Perkins in the 1960s, and Congregation Based Community Organization (CBCO) developed by Saul Alinsky in the 1950s (Perkins, 2007; Posadas, 2007). Both models of community development have strong roots in their respective faith backgrounds, Christian and Jewish, and therefore place a higher emphasis on certain practices than a
more secular model. This section will discuss these two models, as well as include a section on Saul Alinsky, as he had a large impact on not only CBCO but also the field of community development as a whole.

**Christian Community Development**

Christian Community Development (CCD) was founded by John Perkins in the 1960s as a model of engaging communities through Christian based practices (Perkins, 2007). Perkins and his wife relocated to Mendenhall, Mississippi and began to work in community development in there. Through their experiences, Perkins developed the basic tenets of CCD.

The three “R’s” of CCD developed by Perkins are: relocation, reconciliation, and redistribution (2007). Relocation is simply living among the people of the community. Perkins believed relocation was important, not only because it modeled Jesus within the Christian faith, but also because it broke down barriers and power dynamics between the “us” and “them” of community development. The “us” would be defined as the community developers, and the “them” as the community members. When commuting into a community to serve it, an “us and them” power dynamic quickly occurs. Relocation and residency soften this dynamic, making simply an “us.” Perkins believed that community developers should have a personal stake in the community (Perkins, 1989). This personal stake was achieved through relocation.

The second “R”, reconciliation speaks of reconciling people of different cultures, faiths, genders, and classes to one another through the practice of CCD (Perkins, 2007). CCD aims to reconcile people to one another, seeing as many things cannot be
accomplished when people are pitted against each other. Similar to the tenets of restorative justice, CCD focuses on mediation, reconciliation, and victim offender dialogue.

The third “R”, redistribution, focuses on the just distribution of resources among a community (Perkins, 2007). Similar to the tenets of asset based community development, CCD seeks to build social capital and distribute resources among a community, focusing on the communal strengths and “assets.”

In 1989, Perkins gathered a conference of other Christian community developers and established the Christian Community Development Association (CCDA) (Perkins, 2007). The CCDA continues to educate and improve community developers and communities alike.

**Congregation Based Community Organizing**

Basing itself on the works of Saul Alinsky, Congregation Based Community Organizing (CBCO) is not a specific model of community development, but rather a collection of various faith based organizations and worship centers that align themselves with similar values on community development (Posadas, 2007). CBCO focuses the majority of its efforts on raising political consciousness within low-income communities and building up leaders from within those communities to advocate for communal needs.

CBCOs has a few defining characteristics. First, it is faith based (Posadas, 2007). While Many Christian congregations participate in CBCO, CBCO also incorporates the Jewish and Islam traditions into its practices. Alinsky, one of the main theorists behind CBCO, was a Jewish man whose faith values greatly influenced his views of community
engagement. In addition, at the heart of CBCO, the respective scripture and values are upheld.

Second, CBCO is broad based, meaning that it includes interfaith aspects to it as well as local schools and neighborhood centers of varying faiths and values (Posadas, 2007). CBCO inherently values partnerships with a variety of different neighborhood organizations coming together to serve the greater good of the community.

Third, CBCO is locally constituted (Posadas, 2007). While there is a national CBCO movement, one of the values of CBCO is individual assessment of each neighborhood, looking at the specific needs and strengths of that given place. Also, CBCO is “multi-issued” (Posadas). The CBCO model looks at a variety of different needs of a community rather than focusing on one specific problem area or one specific population within the area. It bases its services on the inherent strengths and needs of the community. Finally, CBCO is professionally staffed (Posadas). CBCO values professionals bringing in education and experience into neighborhood to help raise up the leadership within the neighborhood, and then to let that neighborhood rely on its own leadership rather than that of professionals.

Saul Alinsky

Some credit Alinsky with the development of community organization as a whole. Others find his works unfounded, challenging, and rebellious without proper action plans and lacking guidance (Posadas, 2007; Trolander, 1987). Either way, Saul Alinsky was a man with a profound character and a profound idea for organizing communities and seeking change (Posadas). Born in 1909 to an Orthodox Jewish Family in Chicago IL,
Alinsky studied archeology at the University of Chicago. His plans to become a professional archeologist were changed due to the economic Depression of the 1930s. Alinsky later stated “Archeologists were in about as much demand as horses and buggies” (Posadas, p. 784). Soon after completing school, Alinsky began working as an organizer with the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO). The CIO was a great place for Alinsky to begin to develop ideas and practice for organizing. He did not stay with the labor movement long, as he became interested in general organizing in the slums of Chicago.

In the 1930s, Alinsky organized the Back of Yards neighborhood in Chicago (Horwitt, 1997). This neighborhood was made infamous by Upton Sinclair’s novel *The Jungle* for its horrific working conditions and union stock yards. Alinsky is most famous for his work in the Back of Yards Neighborhood, developing the Back of Yards Neighborhood council and challenging congregations, neighborhood centers, and settlement houses alike to change their way of organizing.

In fact, Alinsky became one of the major critics of the settlement movement as settlement workers moved out of the neighborhoods that their respective settlements were located in (Horwitt, 1997). Alinsky critiqued the settlement movement of desiring social control. This argument had a strong founding considering that the settlement movement desired to continue to model their same structure of practice in advocacy for the neighborhood. However, as settlement workers moved out of their communities settlements became less and less relevant (Horwitt).

In his 1941 article *Community Analysis and Organization*, Alinsky states that it is:
A rare phenomenon today to discover a community organization in which the indigenous interest and action groups of the community not only participate but also play a fundamental role in that organization. Even where the possibility of organizational work of this character has evidenced itself, it has not been accomplished by any significant understanding of the social forces involved in the functional nature of a community or of the socioeconomic strata of the community and its corresponding implications (cited in Horwitt, 1997, p. 2).

Alinsky’s continual criticism and ideation about community development and community work have led to a number successful movements and a long and rich legacy (Horwitt, 1997). “Alinsky championed new ways to organize the poor and the powerless that created a backyard revolution in cities across America” said Horwitt (1997, p. 82). Alinsky’s contributions to the field of community organizing have influenced Cesar Chavez, Delores Huerta, Hilary Clinton, and Barack Obama. Alinsky’s contributions to the field of community organizing continue to provide some of the main tenets to the practice and continue to inspire organizers throughout the world (1997).

**Professional Boundaries and Community Development Challenges**

Within the field of social work, there is a debate over the appropriate positioning of social workers in respect to their clients (Pugh, 2007). As Pugh begs the question, when addressing rural social work and its dual relationships, should social workers be insiders or outsiders in their communities? (2007) The debate over positioning centers on the challenges of maintaining professional boundaries as well as serving the client to the best of the practitioner’s abilities. Michael Ungar (2004) in his article about
postmodernism and social work practice, states that “Social workers who apply postmodern theory to their work are encouraged to examine their positioning in their communities…Attention to positioning as professionals makes them aware of their place in the associational life of their communities” (p. 488).

Ungar (2004) relays that even though ethical practice in modern day social work dictates that clear boundary lines are drawn between social workers and clients, “a postmodern sensibility leads social workers to challenge the artificiality of such distinctions” (p. 489). Social workers are both professionals within their community as well as community members and are “privileged participants in the same discourse as clients” (p. 489).

Proximity to clients and the idea of being an “insider” in a client’s community has its obvious benefits. Social workers will develop a better understanding of their client’s needs and strengths. They will be able to have a better working knowledge of community leaders and systems in which their clients engage with on a daily basis. In addition they will have a vested interest in enhancement on community resources (Ungar, 2004).

The implication of a focus shift from working with communities to working “in” communities, or essentially from being an outsider to being an insider, can be seen in communities where leaders are raised up within their community or where organizers relocate into said community. As Collier (1993) showed in his work with agrarian families, farmers who live in rural communities and reach out for help can feel their privacy being seriously threatened: “A farmer opposed to revealing problems to an
outsider who is obviously a social worker will be more comfortable with someone who visits and can be consulted without displaying to the rest of the community that he or she is asking for help” (p. 72). This reflects the importance of social work positioning and a conscious awareness of it.

Historically speaking, after the heyday of the settlement movement, social workers have maintained an “outsiders” stance on positioning, seeking professionalism and the least harm to their clients (Pugh, 2007). Often times this stance on positioning comes from social workers not wanting to have “dual relationships” with clients. The concept of dual relationships emerged in psychotherapy and counseling journals as a way to define when workers have relationships with their clients outside of their professional helping relationship (Pugh).

While often times certain kinds of dual relationships are seen as highly unethical within the profession, there are other dual relationships that often naturally happen within rural communities (Pugh, 2007). When discussing living in small rural communities, practitioners often report that:

Just as neighbors are often my clients, so also I am often theirs. When I go to a shop or for professional advice or to see my child’s teacher, I am quite likely to run into someone I know as a client. The roles are reversed. Now I am the seeker and they are the helpers (Pugh, p. 1407).

The concept of role reversal within the professional context often happens within smaller contexts or within residential social work programs such as settlement houses.
The National Association of Social Work (NASW), while holding that often times dual relationships are challenging, also states that: “Social workers practicing in rural areas must have advanced understanding of ethical responsibilities. Not only because dual relationships and multiple relationships are unavoidable but also because the setting may require that dual or multiple relationships be used and managed as an appropriate method of social work practice” (NASW, 2003, cited in Galbreath, 2005, p. 107).

Gaps in the Literature

While there is a great deal of historical background surrounding community development, community organizing, and the settlement house movement, there is little data to rely on the effectiveness of these programs (Reyes, 2008). One reason for this may be the lack of a push for empirical evidence within the practice of social work during this time in history. One can theoretically see how settlements and community organizing practices were beneficial to communities; however, there is not a great deal of data from programs that existed within the progressive era.

In addition, residency in social work is not something that has been studied much at all. This researcher found that some of the only contemporary literature surrounding social workers living in the same locational communities as their clientele was that which surrounded rural social work. There is something to be noted for the lack of social work related material in community organization and development as the vast majority of social workers are moving into more clinical, direct practice work and therefore are focusing their researcher efforts into those fields. When studies were found that looked at social workers’ personal place of residency, they focused mostly on the idea of dual
relationships and the challenges of this type of practice rather than the potential benefits. There were no studies that explored intentional residency within lower-income communities, such as those within the settlement movement.

Due to the fact that social workers are changing specific focuses, this researcher noticed that across studies, there were very small sample sizes and that the samples were not taken from a diverse population ethnically, or among gender or background. In addition, studies did not focus on the motivating factors for social workers to move into the neighborhoods in which they work, but seemed to gloss over those individuals who made this choice. In his study of settlement houses and his call back to a more settlement based type of practice, Huscock (1993) noted the lack of empirical evidence. In addition, Huscock’s study, and others that have looked at neighborhood and community centers, are solely quantitative and are aimed more at finding the similarities between the remaining settlements, neighborhood, and community centers and projects.

This study will aim to look at individuals who intentionally and consciously make the choice to reside where they work because they feel like it has benefits to themselves, as well as their practice. This study will also focus on participants found in a more urban setting, as they will all reside within the Sacramento, CA area. In addition, the qualitative nature of the study will explore deeper into motivating factors associated with this type of practice, and it may serve as a glimpse into a not very well researched area of service within the professions of social work and community development.
Summary

In this literature review, the historical background of community organization as it pertains to social work practice was discussed. There was also a description of contemporary models and theories of community organization and development, including a section, which focused on faith based community development. Settlement houses and the settlement movement and philosophy were specifically discussed as they related to residency and social work practice. Finally, professional boundaries were examined as they relate to community work. Gaps in the literature were also addressed. In the next chapter, the methodology is presented.
Chapter 3

METHODS

Introduction

This chapter details the research design of the study. It looks at the criteria for selecting participants, the description of the sampling population, and the sampling method. Additionally, it will explore the data collection instrument, data gathering procedures and data analysis. Human subject’s concerns and confidentiality will also be described.

Research Question

The purpose of this study is to explore the motivations, challenges, and benefits of taking up personal residency within the community that one works. The research focuses specifically on community organizers and developers as a sub-group of the professional social work population. These themes are explored with this specific research question: What are the motivations for and benefits of intentionally taking up personal residence within the community one works?

Research Design

This study uses an exploratory qualitative design, specifically content analysis, to identify emergent themes within the responses of participants. Due to the fact that this topic of study remains infrequently researched, qualitative research allows for the researcher to identify previously unknown and emergent themes about the topic (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). Additionally, qualitative research allows for the researcher to explore a
specific population’s worldview and opinions. This gives a more holistic view of the population and explores the topic in a deeper way.

The theoretical framework of social constructionism supports the qualitative research method due to the fact that it assumes that subjects construct their social world and are influenced by media, family, culture, and other social pressures and dominant paradigms within our society. Qualitative research can explore these issues with participants more “in depth” than a quantitative study can. Qualitative studies can also help participants break down the social construction of their world and to analyze certain parts in more detail (Royse, 2004).

Qualitative interviewing was used as the sole method of collecting data for the study. The qualitative interviewing design is “flexible, iterative, and continuous, rather than prepared in advance or locked in stone” (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 318). This allowed for the interaction between the participants and this researcher to develop on its own. A specific set of questions was covered, and those questions facilitated the conversation, however emergent topics were explored.

Content analysis was the method chosen to analyze the transcripts of data collected from the qualitative interviewing. Content analysis is a method used to discover patterns within the participants’ responses to the interview questions. There are clear benefits to using content analysis for data analysis. The first is that it is unobtrusive to researcher participants; second, content analysis is inexpensive and does not require special equipment or skill; and third, content analysis allows for the researcher to not
only look at the visible surface data provided by the participants, but to also identify the underlying meanings and patterns (Rubin & Babbie, 2011).

Content analysis allows for the coding of both manifest and latent content. Manifest content is the visible and apparent content of communication. For example the number of times a specific word or phrase is used, or the number of minutes dedicated to specific topic. Latent content is the underlying meaning of the communication. Latent content analysis seeks to understand the overall meaning of the commutation by reviewing it in its entirety and making an assessment to find emergent themes between participants and their relationship to the study as a whole. (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). This study employed both techniques.

The main disadvantage to using content analysis is that all of the data must be transcribed in order to analyze it. This can be a tedious process for the researcher. Additionally, content analysis is limited to the examination of recorded communications—it cannot analyze information such as body language or facial expressions. Another weakness is that qualitative research is not often taken seriously by academics, which makes obtaining the funding the study or getting the research published difficult (Royse, 2004). Statistical data cannot be derived from this design since there are no experiments or surveys used.

**Study Participants**

The study included 10 participants. All of the participants self-identified as professional community organizers, community developers, social workers, or employees of community agencies within the community where they lived. All of the participants
lived within 15 miles of the Sacramento, CA neighborhood. They also self-identified as residents of four different locational neighborhoods within the Sacramento area. These neighborhoods were Del Paso Heights, South Natomas/Gardenland, Oak Park, and Alkali Flats. Of the 10 participants, three were male and seven were female. Eight of the 10 participants identified as White or Caucasian for at least 50% of their ethnic identity. All of the participants were college educated with a bachelor’s degree and 50% had a master’s or post-graduate degree.

**Sampling Method**

The sampling method used to gather participants was a snowball sampling method. The sample size was 10. The criteria of the participants were two fold. First, participants needed to be employed in community development or organization. This means that they needed to work for an agency that’s population base was focused on a specific geographical location. The second criteria that participants needed to take up personal residency within the geographical location that their agency targeted. Participants may have chosen to relocate to that area, or may have lived in that area by coincidence. This was not a factor taken into account. This researcher began by identifying potential colleagues or acquaintances that fit the criteria of the study. Additionally, this researcher asked colleagues if they knew of anyone who fit the criteria of the study. Once a few participants were located, they were asked if they could refer the researcher to other people who matched the criteria.

This snowball sampling method offers advantages and disadvantages over other types of sampling procedures. This method is generally cheaper, faster and easier to
conduct than most (Royse, 2004). However, one potential challenge that arises is, depending on the relationship a participant has with the researcher, the participant may fabricate answers or exaggerate statements. For example, there may be a tendency for some socially related participants to answer according to how they might want to be viewed by the interviewer as opposed to giving more truthful responses. This can be controlled in some respects by the nature of the topic and each participant is assured of the confidential and anonymous nature of the interview.

**Instrumentation**

The measurement instrument used in this study is a set of interview questions developed by the researcher after reviewing literature related to the topic. Certain themes were explored based on researcher interest as well as literature review and exploration. These interviews took place at the respective agencies that the participants worked at. The location of the interview was a public place in which the participant chose. That particular location was chosen because it was the natural environment of the participants. The purpose of interviewing the participants in their natural setting was to make them feel as comfortable and at ease as possible, and to gain a real understanding of their personal experiences. In addition to the ten questions within the interview, subjects were often asked clarifying questions or follow-up questions to help them elaborate on certain subjects more, or to draw out emergent themes that the researcher identified.

An open-ended interview was conducted with each of the ten participants. The measurement instrument included ten questions related to the main themes of the research exploring the participants’ motivations and decision-making, as well as the personal
challenges and benefits experienced. Additionally, the research instrument contained questions about the participant’s opinions and touched on how their community viewed their choices as well. At the end of the interview, demographic information was taken to explore potential relationships between age, ethnic identity, income, and the motivating factors of the participants.

Interviews with open-ended questions have several advantages and disadvantages. Legard, Kegan and Ward (2003) claimed that open-ended interviews are useful because knowledge about the social world gets constructed through the interview. Open-ended interviews add depth, detail and explore a very personal level of experience (Patton, 1990). This type of interview is also very helpful in minimizing interviewer bias (Patton). The questions within this study were written prior to the interviews. During the interview, the questions were asked by this researcher in the same wording and in the same order as seen on the questionnaire.

This method of interviewing also has several disadvantages. First, due to the fact that the questions have already been prewritten, there is little room to explore emergent themes that come up outside of the questions (Patton, 1990). In addition, individual differences cannot be taken into account using this instrument.

Another problem with qualitative research is that the interview largely on the professional and personal qualities of the individual interviewer (Legard et al., 2003). The validity of the research depends on the competence and skill of the researcher as the researcher wrote the instrument. It is the responsibility of the researcher to be familiar with the topics that are discussed throughout the interview. This researcher took into
account the literature surrounding the topic as well as professional opinions while developing the research instrument, which gives the instrument some face-validity.

**Data Gathering Procedures**

Data was gathered through individual interviews with the participants of the study. When potential participants were identified, this researcher made a phone call to these participants inviting them to participate in the study. If the participant agreed, a time was set up with the participant to go through the interview and digitally record it. Participants were interviewed in a public place, such as their personal place of business or a local business. Before starting the interview, participants were informed of the procedures of the study and asked to sign a consent form.

This researcher occasionally responded to questions with clarification or follow up questions, but made sure not to answer any questions for the participants so that their unique answer could be expressed. Upon completion of the interview this researcher turned off the digital recorder, thanked the participant, and kept a copy of the consent form in a secure location.

**Data Analysis**

Once the interviews were completed, all raw data was analyzed. The audiotapes for each interview were transcribed. The interview data was reviewed after the transcriptions were completed. This researcher used content analysis to look for similarities and differences among the responses, and common themes that stood out through the interviews. Both latent and manifest analyses were also conducted.
Protection of Human Subjects

Before conducting interviews, a human subjects application was submitted for review to the Human Subjects Committee of the Division of Social Work. The study was approved as “Minimal Risk.” Before participating in the interview, all participants were given a consent form to sign outlining the procedures of the study. All participants were consenting adults 18 years or older. This researcher verified with the participants that if emotional or mental health challenges were triggered by participation in the study, that counseling services were available at for free or a minimal cost. These services were listed on the consent form that the participants signed before the interview began. Interviews were conducted in public places that were approved by the participants. All participants consented to being audio taped and were informed that they could withdraw from the interview at any time or choose not to answer any question.

All audiotapes were stored in a secure location in the researcher’s home. The interviews were transcribed in a private room in the researcher’s home and were destroyed once that transcription was finished. The electronic transcriptions were stored on a flash drive that was also in a secure location in the researcher’s home. All data was destroyed upon completion of the project.

Summary

This chapter focused on the methodology used to implement this research. It explored research design in qualitative studies and their benefits and limitations, study population and sampling selection characteristics, the instrumentation, data gathering
procedures, data analysis, and human subjects protections. In the next chapter, the data will be analyzed.
Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The study consisted of ten interviews conducted with Sacramento, CA area residents who self-identified as professionals in the field of community development, as well as residents of the community in which they worked. The main purpose of the study was to investigate the following research question: What are the motivations for and perceived benefits of intentionally taking up personal residence within the community one serves? The purpose for exploring this issue was to find out more about residency, community development, and the relationship between the two. The participants were asked questions about what their motivation for moving into their respective communities were, how their education and spiritual practices played a role in that decision, how they felt their choice benefited them personally as well as their clients, and how their choice of residence presented a challenge to them personally as well as to their clients. The following themes were consistent throughout most of the interviews: 1) Community Awareness as a Resident; 2) Spiritual Motivation; and 3) Safety vs. Social Justice. The 10 participant’s responses will be discussed throughout the remainder of the chapter, in each of the thematic sections, and they will be given pseudonyms. The pseudonyms are: Hannah, Kelley, Don, Andrea, Pam, Rick, Dana, Rachel, Luke and Lana.
Demographic Information

Of the 10 participants, three were male and seven were female. Eight of the 10 participants identified as White or Caucasian for at least 50 percent of their ethnic identity. All of the participants were college educated with a bachelor’s degree. Half of the participants had a master’s or post-graduate degree. 70 percent (7) of the participants were married and had children. All the participants earned an income between $20,000-40,000 per year.

Community Awareness as a Resident

One of the most prominent and emergent themes presented throughout the study was that of increased awareness as a resident of the community. All 10 of the participants noted that because they live in the community, they have a deeper understanding of the community’s needs, challenges and inherent strengths. One participant, Hannah, a community developer who leads college students in urban renewal experience projects, when asked about the benefits of her residency presents for her clients. She responded by saying:

There is a great meshing of where I work and my neighborhood. I can find resources for students easily and I don’t think that this would happen anywhere else.

Kelley, a director of a local non-profit that runs programs for children and youth responded by saying that:

It’s [residency] helped us to decide what services we want to provide because I have a better understanding of what the challenges and strengths of the
community are…now that my son plays basketball and I see how crummy the
city’s basketball league is, we’re considering starting one through our
organization too.

A third participant, Lana, responded that:

Living in a community in which we focus on social justice issues facing our
clients and drawing from work experience definitely increase my personal
education and understanding. Also I benefit not just from my work experience,
but also from the experiences of my community members. This will in the long
run help me in working with my clients.

These responses help to articulate meaning to the theories of proximity and client
awareness. Blank (1998), in her interviews with settlement workers during the early
1900s, found that settlement workers have similar experiences. She stated, “Our
philosophy is distinct, it is to build community, with and not just for neighborhoods. We
work with neighborhoods to develop their strengths, not just to provide services.” (p. 1).
Blank notes that settlements at the time evolved into what the community’s needs were.
While at one time there was not a need for English classes, as the community changed,
settlement houses began to provide those services. These services were identified through
settlement workers who took up residence in these areas and had intrinsic knowledge of
the community.

One participant, Kelley, when talking about her children and schooling noted that:
Part of my philosophy, up until now, has been to put my kids into the
neighborhood schools…because we are resourced and we have access to
resources that are leaving the school, but, it’s been a battle…I feel like I am the only person who cares about the schools here. I have to constantly be working, constantly be advocating, and it’s isolating. This is part of the reason why we formed the parent action team. I personally, as a resident, needed support from my neighbors to better these schools! And, in the same way, we also get to empower parents and natural leaders in the community. It’s beautiful to see these two things happening simultaneously.

It is this knowledge of the community that resident community developers believe not only gives them the upper hand professionally, but also benefits their clients. Participants believed that this deep knowledge of the community was necessary for the authenticity of their practice. One participant Rick, another director of a community based agency, said:

I am not high and mighty just because I started a nonprofit or because I have an MSW. I am just one of the many faces in this neighborhood that cares. I am a leader and a partner. I am a neighbor too. Authenticity is too important to pass up in this kind of work.

As discussed in Chapter one, the ecological framework can help to explain the connection participants feel with their community and how their involvement in their community and their awareness increases with their physical proximity to the community (Johnson & Rhodes, 2010). This finding was not only consistent among many participants, but also was cited as a benefit for them personally and professionally.

A study by Ungar, Manual, Mealy, Thomas, & Campbell (2004) looks at the concept of “community guides,” which are defined as natural leaders that are non-
professionals within communities. Ungar et al. point out that these community guides have deep understanding of their communities due to their indigenous knowledge. Community guides are able to have vertical and horizontal integration within their communities while professionals have “otherness” and boundary considerations. In addition, these community guides are immersed in the daily life of the community and therefore create bridges between the people and the agencies. Community guides gain a great deal of their strengths for community development from their indigenous knowledge and residency within the community. While participants in this study are professionals, they seem to wear multiple hats within their community. Some look down on this, saying it proliferates dual relationships (Loewenberg, Dolgoff, & Harrington, 2000), however, others find that social workers taking on multiple roles within a community can be of benefit. Ungar et al. believe that community guides would “argue that the success of their work is attributed to their multiple affiliations within the community” (p. 559).

One participant, Dana, reflected on this by saying that:

I think the community appreciates the staff that lives here. We know the area and we’ve been here for years. The community respects us.

Another participant, Pam, who works with the homeless population and lives in transitional housing responded in a similar way saying:

It breaks down a barrier. People know that I’ve been there, and in some ways I’m still there. Because I have been there and live among it, I know what this
community needs. I can reach people in a special way, more than the average community organizer.

This deep and intrinsic knowledge seems to only come from the residency and personal experience of the participants themselves. As Pam said, it allows her to reach people in a special way and provides for her a unique ability and skill to her professional self.

**Spiritual Motivation**

A second emergent theme within the data was that of spiritual motivation. When asked the final question of the survey, “Have spiritual beliefs played a part in your decision in your decision to live where you do? If so, how?” All participants said “yes,” and then went on to explain the ways in which they were affected spiritually by living in their community, and also how it was a motivation to do what they did. As discussed in the literature review in chapter two, there are a number of community organizing models that come out of the Christian faith that emphasize residency. One of these is that of John Perkins (2007) who states that community developers must identify so closely with the needs of the community that residency is the only way to make that possible. Perkins points out that Jesus came and inhabited the earth and essentially took up residency among the people. In this same respect, community developers who are Christian should follow suit.

Throughout the New Testament, there is a call to the church to serve the poor and to extend compassion to the “least of these” (Carpenter, 2008). As a result, during the progressive era and before, there had been a massive surge of church funding and church movement in the remediation of destitution and in compassion to the poor. It is this
ideology that motivated settlement houses in the first place. However, with fewer individuals involved in church and we have seen a shift from the church being the main provider of aid to government agencies and non-profits (Carpenter).

When asked about her spiritual motivation, Andrea, a participant who lives in an intentional community with other community developers, responded:

Spirituality is a huge part of the community I live in, and I knew that before going into it. I am a very spiritually curious person…I need help figuring out what is important to me and what spirituality can offer me. I knew that living in a community would help me with that.

In this case, Andrea moved into the community to explore her spirituality and to develop a more spiritual relationship. She did not necessarily move into the community under spiritual conviction, but rather under curiosity. For other participants their spiritual conviction was a motivating factor. One participant Don, commented:

Essentially it (spirituality has played the whole role in why I moved here. There have been significant times when I have felt called to live in a neighborhood like this and love people here...A local leader in the community described this neighborhood to me as a “corridor of neglect.” When I heard this it broke my heart and I knew I just had to be there.

A third participant, Rick, responded saying:

I think that I wouldn’t be here if I didn’t have a deep spiritual passion for it. Like I said, this work is definitely not for everyone. It’s not glamorous, frilly, or fabulous
in any way. I get why people don’t want to do it. You have got to have a deep spiritual desire for it.

It is this deep spiritual conviction that participants resonated with and reported as a motivating factor. Some participants clearly noted a calling or the modeling of Jesus as a clear and precise motivation. Others said it was a deep feeling. Either way, all of the participants noted that there was a deep motivating factor in their spirituality.

Literature suggests that spiritual motivation to care for the poor is found across religious backgrounds and is a dominant theme within a multitude of spiritual backgrounds (Cnaan, Kasternakis, & Wineburg, 1993). Dalton (2006) suggests that human beings, regardless of religious or faith background, often feel a moral imperative to help those who are less fortunate than they are. He suggests that often times this moral imperative arises in people during their college or young adult years. It is also at this time in life that data suggests people are more frequently making choices about their spirituality (Parks, 2000). Dalton suggests that through community service, people often connect with a deeper sense of self and can engage in exploring religious or spiritual themes within themselves that they might not have been able to do prior to engaging in community service. Dalton’s work indicates that as people continue to serve the moral imperative to serve can be backed with a spiritual foundation and that a “Commitment to social justice requires an individual to not only help the poor and needy but also to take personal responsibility to change the social conditions and structures that create such human problem” (p. 7).
This research is significant because 100% of the participants in the study are college graduates, and eight of the 10 participants are over 30 years old. This indicates that, according to Dalton, they have already experienced the time in their lives in which the average person explores their spirituality. Therefore, they made choices on how their spirituality would affect the way they participate in community service and their commitment to social justice.

In fact, six of the participants responded that their college years were important in shaping their spiritual identities. Hannah said that:

I developed my spiritual identity throughout college and this is where I began to have a heart for social justice. I don’t think my formal education played a role in my choice, per se, but my extracurricular education through church and community outreach definitely fueled the decision.

While participants in this study did not specifically identify their spiritual or religious affiliations, many of them seemed to speak of Jesus’ influence in their lives as part of their decision. Regardless of religious affiliation, however, we can see that spiritual motivation is a definite factor for these participants.

**Safety vs. Social Justice**

The third theme that came up throughout the study was that of safety. While there was not a specific question regarding safety, the majority of participants responded that they were concerned for their personal as well as their family’s safety in their neighborhood. When responding about this concern, a second theme arose in the responses. Participants felt conflicted with their concern for their safety. They felt like
even though they were nervous about safety, they were morally obligated to pursue social justice in their community and therefore could not leave.

Studies show that environmental factors within a neighborhood play a huge role in a person’s well being. In lower-income neighborhoods, there is often a lack of access to fresh food, parks and open-air areas, and adequate health care. Safety is also a concern. Growing up in a lower-income neighborhood increases the likeliness of one participating in gang activity, being robbed, or being the victim of a violent crime (Mulvey, 2002). In addition, it is the poorest communities that are most likely to have schools that are only marginally able to meet the needs of their students (Kozol, 1991).

Within lower-income areas, there is a larger amount of drug use, domestic violence, and crime. A third of inner-city children have witnessed a homicide by the age of 15 (Bell, 1991). Another factor that detracts from the well-being of residents within a community is the lack of social density. Social density refers to “the degree to which an environment contains a diversity of roles for children to learn from and for their parents to draw from.” (Garbarino, Galambos, Plantz, & Kostelny, 1992, p. 208) These factors can, and often do, discourage people from intentionally moving into lower-income areas. In addition, knowing these facts about schooling and the affects on the well-being of children can make it challenging for one to raise a family in these types of neighborhoods.

Another factor, which might hinder one’s feeling of safety within their community, is lack of trust. Studies show that a lack of trust for one’s neighbors was significantly and positively associated with below average self-rated health (Bjornstrom, 2011). When
one’s safety is threatened it can create an emotional stressor that can decrease one’s emotional and physical health. Bjornstrom found that older individuals and the college educated are less likely to distrust their neighbors than those that are younger and those that have less than a high school education respectively. African Americans and Latinos are more likely to distrust their neighbors than whites. Family income is negatively and significantly associated with distrust.

This is significant because the majority of the participants in this study identify as white and college educated. This may be a positive thing for these participants, as they may be less likely to experience distrust in their neighbors, which may help them to pursue their moral obligations to their community with more fervor. On the other hand, they may have a more challenging time getting residents of their neighborhood to trust them.

A Participant, Rick, when speaking of the challenges he faced in his community, noted that:

Safety at times [can be a challenge]. Especially with a young family. Before kids I rarely felt unsafe, now, at times, I am definitely concerned. We’ve had our house robbed a couple of times, which sucks.

Kelley seemed to feel similar:

There are things that are frustrating to us, where I start to think, is my kid getting the same experience as he would in a more affluent neighborhood? Probably not. It makes me wonder, is this worth it?

One participant, Pam, when reflecting on the personal challenges of the community said:
It’s loud, it’s crowded, it’s not safe, there are a lot of drugs and alcohol and it’s a triggered community. It not easy being around that as a person in recovery myself.

Data collected by the US Census Bureau (2011) on housing trends and well-being indicates that in 2006 the majority of Americans, 84%, feel safe enough in their neighborhood that they do not feel they need to move away. The percentage of Americans living below the poverty line that feel safe in their neighborhood is significantly lower however, only 65%. In addition only 65% of those who are unmarried with children feel safe enough in their neighborhood that they would not like to move out of it. Data collected by the Metropolitan Philadelphia Indicators Project (MPIP) in 2005 suggests that safety is the number one concern for individuals and families when choosing a place to live. The second is housing costs. Keeping this data in mind, it makes sense that the majority of participants expressed concerns about their safety in their neighborhoods.

In a similar thread, another participant, Dana, stated that sometimes she thinks:

Why can’t I just have what I deserve? Like, I don’t want to sound conceited, but I have a master’s degree and my other friends with master’s degrees, even MSWs, make more than me and have nicer cars, and live better lives. Sometimes, because of the way society is structured and the message of success society provides for us, I feel like living here is not successful. But social work, true social work, is why I am here…it can be a very fulfilling life choice.

Bjornstrom (2011) found that unfavorable comparisons lead those with a lower position to experience negative emotions that cause stress and detrimentally impact health and
well-being. This is important for individual health, and also because their results may
detract from community level social resources. This finding is relevant because it shows
that comparisons within a community can cause negative emotions and effect not only
community developers within the community, but also the clients that they serve. Often
times, participants in the study found that they were comparing themselves to not only
their peers outside of the community, but also to their fellow community members.

While reflecting on the safety of the neighborhood, these same participants also
stated things that seemed to recant or justify their initial concerns for safety and well-
being in their neighborhoods. Rick said:

I can’t live a life of dualism. I have to be authentic to the work and to my practice.

This is one of the reasons why I still live here. I still believe that we (the agency) do
an extremely important job in this community and we’ve become irreplaceable. I
have to do this work, despite the challenges.

Dietez & Johnson (2010) in their article Rethinking Boundaries, state that clients
report more often than not that they appreciate their therapists and social workers to be
“real” with them, and to be authentic inside and outside of practice. Clients reported
distaste in professionals who maintained too tight or rigid of boundaries.

Pam, after expressing concern for her safety and her recovery said that:

In time I think I might leave…but then again maybe not. This community is my
family. It’s my love and passion. I’ll take a more “slummy” neighborhood for the
trade off of a great job that I love and a family
This contradiction of values was not only fascinating, but also vulnerable and very human. As participants expressed, taking up residency intentionally in a lower income neighborhood is not without challenge. Often times these challenges seems to come from within. They come from a deep place within the participants’ hearts where they start to break down and wonder, as one participant said, “*It is worth it?*” The theme of self-sacrifice in the face of societal norms has seemed to become quite personal for the participants and is likely to be a struggle that will stay with them as they continue to choose this type of work.

**Summary**

In this chapter the three most prominent themes found in the data were discussed. They were: community awareness as a resident, spiritual motivation, and safety vs. social justice. The next chapter is a description of the conclusions and recommendations. The limitations of this study and the implications for social work practice and policy will also be discussed.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the three themes found within the data of the study and how they relate to one another, as well as to community development practice as a whole. This chapter will also present the study’s limitations and provide recommendations for future studies and implications for the policy and practice of social work.

Conclusions

This research aimed to answer the question: What are the motivations for and perceived benefits of intentionally taking up personal residence within the community one works? Three themes emerged from the research to answer this question. One theme, community awareness as a resident, addressed what participants identified as strength and a perceived benefit for their clients. The second theme: spiritual motivation, related specifically to participant’s motivations for intentionally living in the neighborhood in which they do. The third theme that emerged: safety vs. social justice, addressed the challenges of living within the community and the internal struggle of the participants to stay motivated to live in these neighborhoods despite the challenges they present.

As discussed in chapter four, community developers reported that one of the major benefits of taking personal residence within their community was the knowledge of the ins and outs of the community. It is important for community developers to have a deep knowledge of what their community needs are, what its strengths are, and how to
best challenge it to grow and change (Brueggman, 2010). For the participants in the study, residency provided an intrinsic knowledge of the community’s strengths and challenges. Some of the participants reported having changed the services of their agencies due to what they discovered as residents of the community. It is this same knowledge that settlement workers used to base their services. It is also this same knowledge that motivated Florence Kelley and Jane Addams to advocate for rights for the marginalized during the Progressive Era (Sklar, 1995). This theme in the research a potential benefit for clients who receive services from community developers. As individuals, these clients may be able to connect more with their social workers and communally, the neighborhood may be able to receive services that are more specific to the emergent needs of the community.

The second theme, spiritual motivation, revealed that a sense of “calling” is something the majority of the participants experienced. Often times, people feel a sense of moral obligation or imperative that stems from their religion (Dalton, 2006) and this moral imperative may be one of the motivating factors for participants. In addition, the participants who did report having spiritual motivation to intentionally take up personal residence in their community noted it was a very personal choice, one in which many would not feel called to do. This theme revealed one of the major motivations for this type of work. It also revealed that intentionally moving into a community cannot be taught or “mustered up,” but must be felt within the person.

As the research in this study suggests, there are professional benefits to residency for community developers, and there is also a spiritual motivation that is common among
participants, however a question seemed to still remained for participants: Is it worth it? This question spawned the third theme, which emerged in the data: safety vs. social justice. Resident community developers throughout the study noted the amount of self-sacrifice required in order to maintain their residency in the community. There was an internal battle of societal norms vs. moral obligation and safety vs. social justice. For participants, there were concerns about safety, health, and the well-being of themselves and their families. Given the research on the challenges that low-income communities face with health, crime, drug activity, and education, (Bell, 1991; Kozol, 1991; Mulvey, 2002) it is appropriate for participants to have concerns. As participants discussed their fears and concerns about their communities, they also juggled a sense of responsibility and moral obligation to their community. In the end, for many participants, it was their calling and their moral obligation to the work that “made it worth it.”

These themes in the research suggest that resident community developers may continue to be outside the norm. In a climate where community development is a profession that is not growing, but rather declining as social workers become more clinical and focus on micro populations (Specht & Courtney, 1994), we can see that intentionally taking up residency in a low-income area is something that must come from the heart. In a society where there is a strong draw towards material possession, wealth, and financial success, one cannot expect that the average person interested in community development would want to make the sacrifice of their well-being, safety, and health to take up residency in the community in which they work. However, we see that not only do participants in this study believe there are professional benefits for themselves through
residency, but they also believe that there are benefits for the clients with which they work as well.

**Recommendations**

There are two main recommendations that this researcher has. The first is for future research, and the second is for community development practice. They are presented below.

**Future Research**

This research is a good starting point for future research surrounding the implications of residency in community development practice. While this study focused mostly on professionals and their motivations, it did explore what these professionals felt like were the potential benefits for their communities. Further research could be done that interviewed community members about their thoughts on professionals who live within their community as opposed to professionals who do not take up personal residence within their communities. In addition, further research could be conducted to see if residency plays an impact in specific areas of community development. For example, do resident community developers engage in advocacy more? Do they change their services more frequently? Do they engage in more or less community and program assessment? How exactly are they different? A comparative study would be beneficial for further research on the topic.

Finally, while there are not many known, functioning settlement houses with residents in them, further research could be carried out to examine how community and neighborhood centers differ from these settlements in the services they provide and the
implementation of these services. This would, however, require a deep analysis of settlements and settlement records, which may be difficult for researchers to obtain.

Community Development Practice

Community development, as mentioned in chapter 2, is a very broad field that encompasses professionals from social services, health, educators, political activists, and others. The research collected through this project can guide professionals in the field of community development to consider their personal place of residence and how it affects their practice. While the research may not call professionals to intentionally move into lower-income urban areas, it may help them to see how residency can be an asset to them professionally.

In addition, professionals already on the fence about relocating may feel more empowered to move into their respective neighborhoods or communities after reviewing the research. This research may also inspire community developers to reach out to resident leaders in their communities and to use these leaders in increasing ways due to the fact that their residency presents a great strength to them. Finally, in education, community development as a whole can be taught more frequently throughout social work. Settlement house philosophy, especially that which pertains to residency, ought to be included more frequently in social work education as it can have an impact on the client experience.

Limitations

The main limitations to this study are the sample size and type. The sample size, 10 participants, is rather small and cannot be used to generalize any findings. In addition,
the sample is taken from the Sacramento, CA geographic area and only consisted of community developers living in four self-identified neighborhoods. The sample was not ethnically diverse, as over half of the participants identified as White. Finally, the study focused solely on professionals. Any identified benefits to the community are only benefits perceived by these professionals, not by the clients that receive the services. Therefore, while this study does a good job answering the question of motivation for residency, it cannot fully answer the question of the communal benefits of residency.

Implications for Social Work Policy and Practice

As stated earlier, social work practice can definitely benefit from this research in the area of social work education. There has been a call in recent years for social workers to examine their historical roots and reframe their professional goals to be more in line with serving community needs on a mezzo and macro level (Huscock 1993; Specht & Courtney 1994). This is something that, historically, was achieved by residency. With that in mind, it may be time for social workers to begin thinking about residency more seriously and to research its potential benefits.

On the micro level, building healthy helping relationships with clients is one of the core values of social work (NASW, 2006). Residency may be an important tool for community developers to use to continue to develop personal relationships with individuals that are meaningful and beneficial to these individuals. In addition, residency may help community developers to identify community leaders, and to engage and challenge these individuals with greater responsibility within the community or neighborhood.
Research shows that social workers engage in far less advocacy on a political level than they have in the past (Whitaker & Arrington, 2008). Taking into account the high levels of advocacy conducted by resident social workers during the settlement heyday, it may be time for social workers to assess how well they know the needs of their clients and how willing they are to advocate for these client’s needs. Does residency have to take place in order for social workers to have a true understanding of their client’s needs?

Finally, in regards to professional boundaries, research shows that sometimes clients are accepting and embracing of seeing their workers in “real life.” (Dietez & Johnson, 2010) There can be an exchange of goods and resources among people that can dignify clients and respect the human and social capital of a community (Pugh, 2007). Social workers need to continue to assess their perceptions of appropriate boundaries within practice and challenge old notions of boundaries that may not serve their clients well.

The National Association of Social Work (NASW) code of ethics holds that social workers need to maintain professional boundaries in the area of dual relationships in order to protect clients from exploitation due to the power dynamic between client and practitioner. Amended in 1996 to include this phrasing regarding dual relationships, the code holds that social workers in residency settings “Must have advanced understanding of ethical responsibilities. Not only because dual relationships and multiple relationships are unavoidable but also because the setting may require that dual or multiple
relationships be used and managed as an appropriate method of social work practice” (NASW, 2003, cited in Galbreath, 2005, p. 107).

In addition, the code of ethics also reinforces that "Social workers' primary goal is to help people in need and to address social problems" (NASW, 2006, p. 5). This goal is to be set above personal or professional ambition and gains. Finally, the code of ethics states that:

Social workers understand that relationships between and among people are an important vehicle for change. Social workers engage people as partners in the helping process. Social workers seek to strengthen relationships among people in a purposeful effort to promote, restore, maintain, and enhance the wellbeing of individuals, families, social groups, organizations, and communities (p.3).

We see that through the strong relationships built between clients and resident community developers, residency does not inherently become a boundary violation, but can honor the client’s dignity and the importance of a strong helping relationship. Social workers and community developers who do choose to take up personal residence in their community need to be cognizant of professional boundaries and the power dynamics of their relationships with community members at all times.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the understanding of the motivation for community developers to take up personal residency within the communities they work. It was also meant to explore the perceived benefits of residency for the clients themselves. The research suggests that community developers who take up personal
residency within the community they work have a heightened awareness of the community’s strengths and challenges. This is not only a benefit professionally for the workers, but also a benefit for the clients. The study also suggests that spiritual motivation is a factor in the choice to intentionally take up residence. It suggests that, despite this intentional choice, community developers’ feel morally challenged to remain in their communities due to concerns for safety and the well-being of themselves and their families. Therefore, there is a need for additional research into the benefits of residency for the clients as well as client’s perceptions of the benefits they experience from resident community developers. Further research could also be employed to explore how resident community developers differ from non-resident community developers.
APPENDICIES
APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

1. What were the initial reasons that motivated you to move into the community?
2. What are the things that keep you staying in the community?
3. What do you find are the benefits for living in this community personally?
4. What do you think are the benefits for the clients that you work with?
5. How does living in this community benefit your social work or community development practice?
6. How does living in the community present a challenge to your social work or community development practice?
7. What are some of the challenges of living within the community personally?
8. What are some of the challenges your residency presents to the community members?
9. Has your education played a part in your decision to reside where you do? If so, how?
10. Have your spiritual beliefs played a part in your decision to live where you do? If so, how?

Demographic information

1. Age (Over 35 or Under 35)
2. Gender (Male/Female)
3. Ethnic Background (African American, White/Caucasian, Native American, Latino/Hispanic, Asian American, Pacific Islander, Other)
4. Education level (Less than High School, High School Grad, Some College, Bachelor’s Degree, Master’s Degree, Ph.D or other higher education)
5. Marital Status (Single, Married, Divorced, Separated)
6. Income ($0-$20,000; $20,001-$40,000; $40,001-$60,000; $60,001-$80,000; $80,001-$100,000; $100,001 and above)
APPENDIX B

Consent to Participate in Research

You are invited to participate in research study that will be conducted by Kelsey Bardini, a graduate student in the Division of Social Work at California State University, Sacramento. The study explores the motivation for and perceived challenges and benefits of taking up personal residency in the community in which one works.

Procedures:

After reviewing this consent form and agreeing to participate in the study, the researcher will conduct a personal interview with you. This interview will be taped and later transcribed. After the tape is transcribed, it will be destroyed. As a participant you can decide to skip any questions you do not wish to answer or to stop the interview at any time.

Risks:

The discussion of some topics in the interview may elicit an emotional response when recollecting or discussing specific experiences or challenges related to your residency.. Listed below are two mental health service referrals which may be accessed by the participant at a minimal or no cost.

La Familia Counseling Center
5523 34th Street
Sacramento, California  95820
(916) 452-6301

National Crisis Services Hotline
1(800) 273-8255

Benefits:

By being a part of this study you may gain further insight into the benefits and motivations behind taking up personal residency within the community you have chosen. Additionally, you will help to add to the body of knowledge surrounding community development practice and strategies.

Confidentiality:
All information obtained from this study is confidential and every effort will be made to protect your anonymity. Your responses on the audiotape will be anonymous. Information you provide on the consent form will be stored separately from the audiotapes in a secure location. The researcher will transcribe all audiotapes. The researcher’s thesis advisor will have access to the transcriptions for the duration of the project. The final research report will not include any identifying information. All of the data including the transcripts will be destroyed upon completion of the project or by June 2012. A pseudonym will be given to you to protect your identity.

**Compensation:**

Participants will receive a $10 gift card to Starbucks for their participation in the study.

**Rights to Withdraw:**

Participants have the right to withdraw at any point or to not answer any question(s) in the interview.
Consent to Participate as a Research Subject

I have read the descriptive information on the Research Participation cover letter. I understand that my participation is completely voluntary. My signature indicates that I have received a copy of the Research Participation cover letter and I agree to participate in the study.

Signature: _____________________________________________________________
Date: _________________

I _________________________________________________ agree to be audio taped.

Signature: _____________________________________________________________
Date: _________________

If you have any questions you may contact me at (831)227-0642 or email me at k.bardini@yahoo.com

Or, if you need further information, you may contact my thesis advisor:

Maria Dinis, Ph.D., MSW

c/o California State University, Sacramento

916-278-7161
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