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Problem

• Community Development efforts are often tied to federal or state funding.
  • Change in objectives/goals
  • Transformation of groups (Lauria, 1986)

• Limited effectiveness

• Social capital as an alternative resource that frees organizations from these limitations
  • Do groups that do not rely on financial capital utilize social capital?
• Do volunteer organizations with non-hierarchical structures utilize social capital?
• Explore how organization form influences use and creation of social capital.
Literature review
Food Not Bombs

• Consensus, Non-violence, Vegetarianism (Crass, 2000; Heynen, 2010)

• Volunteer organization

• Utilization of public spaces

• Anarchist principles
  • Non-hierarchical
  • No authority (Crass, 2000)
  • Mutual aid (Kropotkin, 1922; Gould, 1997)
Social Capital

- **Trust** (Putnam, 2000; Coleman, 1988; Torch & Valenzuela, 2011)
  - Strong vs Weak ties (Granovetter, 1973)
- **Reciprocity** (Torch & Valenzuela, 2011)
  - Obligation vs Expectation (Coleman, 1988)
- **Civic Engagement** (Tocqueville, 2007; Kay, 2005)
  - Volunteerism, presence of community organizations (Temkin & Rohe, 2010)

---

Figure 1: Open (a) and Closed (b) networks

Figure 2: Strong vs Weak Ties: --- = Weak; ___ = Strong
Note. From "The Strength of Weak Ties" by Mark S. Granovetter, 1973, American Journal of Sociology, 78(6), p. 1365.
Types of Social Capital

• Bonding: close intra-community ties usually between homogenous groups (Putnam, 2000; Schneider 2006; Brisson & Usher, 2005)

• Bridging: social relationships that connect outside resources (Putnam, 2000; Kay, 2005)
Social Capital and Community Development

- Increase cities abilities to provide public housing (Temkin & Rohe, 2010)

- Increases a neighborhoods ability to remain stable over time, residency and property values (Temkin & Rohe, 2010)

- Lack of social capital makes an area more likely to have more crime and a desire to leave the area (Kay, 2005)

- Areas with high amounts of social capital also have high community participation (Kay, 2005)

- Facilitates support networks for community organizations (Keyes et al, 1996)
Research Question

• Do volunteer organizations with non-hierarchical structures utilize social capital?
Methodology
Methodology

• Embedded multiple case design study
  • Literal replication (Yin, 2014)

• Examine each case for presence of social capital using the elements of trust, reciprocity, and civic engagement.

• Provide examples of relationships that exhibited bonding and bridging social capital
Case Study & Selection

- Criteria for case study:
  - Active FNB that meets on a consistent basis
  - Reasonable driving distance
  - Preferably in close proximity to a college/university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Active FNB</th>
<th>Location Distance</th>
<th>College Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>123 miles</td>
<td>GA Tech, GSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville, NC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89 miles</td>
<td>UNCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>240 miles</td>
<td>CofC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey

- 15 Questions
- 5 point likert scale or Y/N
- Delivered in person
- Convenience Sampling: active members that were willing to participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anne E. Casey Foundation, Putnam, Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Torch &amp; Valenzuela, Temkin &amp; Rohe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Putnam, Tocqueville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Form</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Putnam, Kay, Granovetter, Coleman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview

- Interview Protocol
- Questions attempted to highlight
  - Group goals and objectives
  - Utilization of resources (internal/external)
  - Organizational structure
    - Leadership roles
    - Individual responsibilities
Examples of Trust, Reciprocity, and Civic Engagement

- Participant Observation
- Interviews
- Survey
- Vignette
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Participant Observation

• Visiting and participating with these groups is vital to understanding how the relationships in the group play out.
  • Perceived less as intrusive foreigner (Weiss, 1994, 19)
• More fluid examination of social relationships than focus group
• Guided Observation
• Social equivalent of ground truth

Atlanta: Woodruff Park
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Case Study Analysis

• Case analysis of presence of Social Capital elements: Trust, Reciprocity, Civic Engagement, and Organization Form
  • Case Vignettes
    • Examples and evidence from interviews and participant observation
  • Creation of indices
  • ANOVA analysis on survey questions.

• Synthesis of survey, participant observation, & interview data
Findings
Group Operations

- Food Procurement
- Group meeting in morning
  - Food Prep
  - Cooking
  - Transportation
- Station Set-up
  - Serving
  - Conversation
- Breakdown and Cleanup

Asheville: Group 2

Atlanta: Teardown
Atlanta
Asheville Group 1
Asheville Group 2
Charleston

Pictures courtesy of: Woody Jesus
Survey Results
1. I would ask group members for help outside of group operations.
3. I consider fellow group members friends.
4. People in my organization can be trusted.
5. People in my organization share similar values.
6. In general, one can trust other people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would ask group members for help outside of group operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I consider fellow group members friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>People in my organization can be trusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>People in my organization share similar values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In general, one can trust other people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing responses from different groups](chart.png)

- **Atlanta (n=6)**
- **Charleston (n=10)**
- **Asheville Group 1 (n=7)**
- **Asheville Group 2 (n=8)**
2. People in my organization are willing to help outside of group meetings
7. I often find myself lending items to members of the group.
8. Members of the group equally participate in the organization.
9. Members in the group take turns with important tasks.
10. When someone does something beneficial to me, I am prepared to return the favor when this was not agreed upon in advance.
2. People in my organization are willing to help outside of group meetings
7. I often find myself lending items to members of the group.
8. Members of the group equally participate in the organization.
9. Members in the group take turns with important tasks.
10. When someone does something beneficial to me, I am prepared to return the favor when this was not agreed upon in advance.
11. In the past 12 months, have you volunteered or helped out with activities in your community? (Excluding Food Not Bombs.)

13. I regularly participate in community organizations (1-2 times per month). (Excluding Food Not Bombs)
11. In the past 12 months, have you volunteered or helped out with activities in your community? (Excluding Food Not Bombs.)

13. I regularly participate in community organizations (1-2 times per month). (Excluding Food Not Bombs)
The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on each question responses. All but two questions returned a p-value greater than 0.05. Questions 7 & 13 fail to reject null hypothesis that groups are significantly different. Question 7: Individual reciprocal actions. Affected by groups of individuals who live together in both Atlanta and Asheville Group 1. Question 13: Regular participation in outside organizations.
Interviews & Participant Observation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Hierarchical</th>
<th>Evidence of Trust</th>
<th>Evidence of Reciprocity</th>
<th>Evidence of Civic Engagement</th>
<th>Utilization of outside resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group was non-hierarchical. The majority of group members were close friends and no individual had authority over other group members. There was a small group of individuals that did the majority of the food procurement and organizing. The meals were created using consensus decision making.</td>
<td>The group members did trust each other although they had an inherent distrust against authority figures (police, city government), EX. Members trusted other members to work on self prescribed tasks such as cooking, cleaning, or organizing supplies. The group did use reciprocal actions. 5 out of 6 group members either agreed or strongly agreed that they often lend items to other members of the group. EX. Group members helped a local non-profit deliver food during the week in order to obtain access to the non-profit’s extra food resources.</td>
<td>Many of the group members participated in community organizations outside of Food Not Bombs. Ex. Several group members also participated in CopWatch and Occupy. 5 out of 6 participants stated they regularly participate in community organizations.</td>
<td>The group had connections to a local non-profit that distributed food to the community (Purple House). The group also had relationships with local businesses and were given extra food to serve. Ex. Group had a mutually beneficial agreement with food connection. They volunteered time in exchange for produce.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group used a non-hierarchical organizational structure to ensure participant equality. Each member could act independently to create a meal and stay as long as they could. Group members access to resources and experiences identified them as non-authoritarian leaders.</td>
<td>The small group trusted that other group members would help with operations. 6 out of 7 group members agreed or strongly agreed that people in their FNB could be trusted. EX. Group members trusted other group members to make food pick-ups before the group met to cook. Reciprocity was evident between group members. 6 out of 7 participants agreed or strongly agreed they often lend items to other members of the group. Ex. Group members that couldn’t participate for the whole day would come and devote as much as time as they could to group operations.</td>
<td>Ex. The groups connection to the university facilitated community participation because the school required service hours. Group members also worked with local bike-share and repair organization. In 6 out of 7 regulariy participated in community organizations outside of FNB.</td>
<td>The group used connections to local food co-op and grocery stores as primary method of food procurement. These connections were established between group members and individuals working at the outside organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group was non-hierarchical but did have members that shared more responsibility than others. These core members were responsible for obtaining the majority of food served during group operations. However, members would often bring prepared dishes made from their own resources to share at the park. No individual had authority over other members.</td>
<td>The group had high amounts of trust between group members. Group members shared similar characteristics such as age and school membership which helped establish trust. Ex. A group member allowed for other group members to use his truck even though he wasn’t going to be present. He trusted other members with his property. Reciprocal actions were performed by group members throughout group operations. Ex. Participants would take turns with important roles such as making sure people’s meals didn’t burn, cleaning the kitchen, and obtaining cleaning supplies from downtown businesses. Also people that were served in the park would help clean the dishes at the cleaning station the group set up in the park.</td>
<td>5 out of 8 group members do not regularly participate in community organizations outside of FNB. However, 100% have volunteered or helped out within the past 12 months.</td>
<td>The group had access to food through a relationship with a local grocery store. Additionally, the group had connections to downtown businesses that gave them access to their kitchen cleaning supplies and fresh water. These connections were established between individuals in other groups and between organizations. The group also had access to university resources such as the industrial kitchen which functioned as the primary meeting and cooking facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group had high amounts of trust between group members. Group members shared similar characteristics such as age and school membership which helped establish trust. Ex. A group member allowed for other group members to use his truck even though he wasn’t going to be present. He trusted other members with his property. Reciprocal actions were performed by group members throughout group operations. Ex. Participants would take turns with important roles such as making sure people’s meals didn’t burn, cleaning the kitchen, and obtaining cleaning supplies from downtown businesses. Also people that were served in the park would help clean the dishes at the cleaning station the group set up in the park.</td>
<td>The previous interactions the group members had had with each other created some level of trust within the group. 100% (10 out of 10) of the group members considered fellow group members friends. Additionally, 100% agreed that people in their organization could be trusted. Ex. Group members trusted other group members to be present and help with group operations. Group members also trusted the public in helping set up the serving station and help load and unload resources from vehicles. Reciprocal actions were evident in the Community Potluck were less than other groups. Although individuals often showed up with dishes made from personal resources only 20% agreed that they often lend items to other members. 60% (6 out of 10) felt that group members equally participated in the organization but 80% agreed that participants shared important tasks. Ex. Individuals would bring meals made from personal resources to share with the group and people in the park. The group members actively participate in community organizations. Group members have connections to the Occupy Movement, the ACLU, and housing advocacy groups in Charleston (Tiny House Project). 90% (9 out of 10) of group members regularly participate in community organizations.</td>
<td>Outside resources were obtained through connections with non-profits such as Crisis Ministries. This resource gave a majority of the food that was served. However, the group used internal resources also to provide food.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Structure

- Ideal formation of non-hierarchical organization
- Shared responsibilities through cooperation
• No formal authority ascribed to leadership roles

• Rotational leadership & ‘Bottomliner’

“The ‘bottomliner’ is a consensual supervisor. Over time people have settled into roles because of their knowledge base. Someone knows how to make a stir-fry whereas another person knows how to make the stew.”

-Atlanta Participant

“It is a mixture of constructive chaos and delegation. This method can create situations where we forget some stuff though.”

-Atlanta Participant

“What needs to get done, gets done without any set responsibilities for anybody. People do what they see needs to be done for as long as they want to or can.”

-Charleston Participant
• Hierarchy: “social division of labor among units specializing in different tasks (Donnelly, 2006, 141).”

“Humans are unreliable so structure is important and comfortable for the group. Structure is necessary to get stuff started, people are hesitant to take a boss role. It encourages people to participate to their fullest capacity.”
– Atlanta Participant
Bonding Social Capital

• All groups utilized bonding social capital
  • Shared resources
  • Pooled network of resources

• Negative externalities of exclusionary practices
  • “It is stressful on core people, it burns them out. When it becomes stressful it becomes easier and easier to not want to come.” – Asheville Group 1 Participant
  • Groups tend to “fall back on familiar ties” (Gittel & Vidal, 1998, 175).

• Consensus facilitates creation of bonding social capital
  • Equal participation
Bridging Social Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple House, Local Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenLife Grocery, French Broad Food Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenLife Grocery, Local Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Ministries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• All Groups utilized outside resources to operate effectively
• Weak ties with local grocery stores and non-profits
• Relationships primarily relied on friendship or professional acquaintance
“We have a symbiotic relationship with our food providers because we get the food they can’t use and they get rid of trash that they would have to pay to have removed. We make it beneficial to them. Our connections happen because of the convenience of it for the providers but it still helps us.”

- Asheville Group 1 Participant

- Cooperative agreements and Evolution of Relationships
- Negative Effects
  - Strong reliance on outside resources restricts autonomy
Bridging Cont’d

• Many groups operated or partnered with additional community projects
  • CopWatch
  • Occupy Charleston
  • Really Really Free Market
  • Mobile Library
  • Boy Scouts
  • Crisis Ministries
  • Tiny House Project
• Cases fall into two categories
  • High Bonding & High Bridging
  • High Bonding & Low Bridging
Summary of Findings

• All groups have evidence of Trust, Reciprocity, and Civic Engagement.
  • Individual reciprocal actions show the greatest variance between groups
• All organizations utilize social capital although relationships are unique to organization.
• Organizational structure (consensus, lack of formal hierarchy) facilitates bonding social capital.
• Hierarchy exists but there is no ascribed authority to leadership roles, they function as facilitators.
Conclusion
• FNB & Community Potluck utilize and create social capital
• Function as an effective community development program
  • Community generators
    • Make activism more accessible for public
  • Allow businesses & other organizations to participate
  • Free to communities they serve
SUNDAY, AUGUST 25, 2013

RALEIGH CITY COUNCIL / DOWNTOWN RALEIGH
[Updated] Feeding the homeless in Raleigh barred by cops until Mayor and Council intervene.

Posted by Bob Geary on Sun, Aug 25, 2013 at 1:25 PM

A brief update, 6 pm: Food Not Bombs did bring food and they were allowed to distribute it. The Raleigh police stood down after Mayor Nancy McFarlane and numerous Council members intervened today with Police Chief DeeDee Brown and Acting City Manager Perry James. Councilor Mary-Anne Baldwin is pulling issue into her Law & Public Safety Committee meeting — the Council majority must vote to put it there which they will do. Adventure of the "feeding" can be viewed here. I think the lockout is not over yet.
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City To Ban Street-Corner Feedings of Homeless
March 14, 2012 11:30 PM
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Orlando Activists Arrested For Feeding Homeless In Defiance Of City Ordinance

Las Vegas Makes It Illegal to Feed Homeless in Parks

City To Ban Street-Corner Feedings of Homeless

Related Tags: Ben Franklin Park, homes, homeless, homelessness, Love Park, Michael Nutter, Philadelphia, Project HOME, Sister Mary Scullion
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PHILADELPHIA (CBS) — Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter has announced a ban on the feeding of large numbers of homeless and hungry people at sites on and near the Benjamin Franklin Parkway.

Orlando Activists Arrested For Feeding Homeless In Defiance Of City Ordinance

First Posted: 06/11/12 03:12 AM EDT | Updated: 06/11/12 08:12 AM EDT

Follow 1: Feeding The Homeless, homelessness, Food Not Bombs, Activists, Arrested for feeding homeless, Arrested for Feeding The Homeless, Feeding The Homeless, Food Not Bombs, Orlando Food Not Bombs, Arrested, Food here

Food Not Bombs volunteers and guests gathered in their new location within Finsay Park for the first time Sunday. (photo by Alan Wallace)

One such group, Food Not Bombs, has been serving meals to those in need on Sundays at Finsay Park since 2002. While they have been issued a permit under the newly enforced rules, he said since its issuance it has meant some changes, leaving some members unhappy and saying they’re being unfairly targeted.

Jeff Eaton, director of the Columbia Parks and Recreation Department, told CNN that it’s the first time they’ve applied for a permit under the new ordinance, which was recently approved by city council.

South Carolina city requires fees and permits to feed the homeless

Published time: February 25, 2014 10:49

Jeff Eaton, director of the Columbia Parks and Recreation Department, told CNN that it’s the first time they’ve applied for a permit under the new ordinance, which was recently approved by city council.

Coca-Cola is your source for free news and information in Columbia and the Midlands.

The city of Columbia began enforcing in February an ordinance on the books since 2007. It requires that groups or individuals wanting to use a city park for events to be attended by 25 or more people to apply for a permit from the city (Columbia Code of Ordinances Section 15:2).
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The city of Columbia began enforcing in February an ordinance on the books since 2007. It requires that groups or individuals wanting to use a city park for events to be attended by 25 or more people to apply for a permit from the city (Columbia Code of Ordinances Section 15:2).
Further Research

• More FNB groups would provide a larger sample size for better inferential statistics between variables
  • There are over 400 FNB globally
• Broader geographic extent might highlight impact of legislation
• Analysis of political barriers that these groups face could help cities and other groups work together.
• Analysis of the transformative effects of social capital compared to that of financial capital.
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QUESTIONS