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INTRODUCTION

Make a random selection of any daily news editorial or news bulletin program which particularly focuses on world affairs. Casually follow its daily news reports for a week. You may be surprised at the many number of times that you would run into the term "interdependence." This term is often used to indicate that the big and the small countries of the world, the rich and the poor nation-states, the developed and the developing nations of the globe are increasingly becoming coupled in terms of the satisfaction of needs affecting human societies.

In international relations parlance, being coupled as used here refers to a strong linkage among nation-states in some spheres of activity. Need satisfaction implies the satisfactory solution of certain existent problems which pervade humankind. "Interdependence" as most frequently used, therefore, suggests that nation-states are the only units of international actors possessing the capabilities and competence to address humanity's problems. The implication is that countries alone can and do interact in the globe, international problems being those that only the nation-states act upon.
This misleading view of international relations stems from what has been described as the traditional paradigm. One seriously wonders if it is only countries that are interlinked in our mother earth. Quincy Wright cautions us to the contrary; there are certainly more pervasive interactions in this world than those that are only nation-state-to-nation-state. Yet General MacArthur's revealing words of wisdom urge us to beware of traditional mental maps. They may be obsolete, and therefore nothing more than mere imprisoning images...because, perhaps, old paradigms never die. As the Harvard scholar, Joseph Schumpeter (1947:12) would put it in his *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, social structures, types and attitudes are like coins that do not readily melt. Let me add that science structures, like the social ones, are like metal coins which may never melt. Once they are formed they persist, possibly for centuries.

A group of scholars who focus on transnational relations (e.g., Keohane and Nye; Mansbach, *et al*; Alger) has awakened to these words of caution. Some among this group strongly contend that the pure meaning of interdependence cannot be realized if the old and traditional national intellectual straightjacket is not thrown aside. They contend that if the paradigmatic myopia inherent in our intellectual straightjacket is demolished, people would develop a sense of real global awareness through appropriate exposure (e.g., appropriate educational experiences) and acceptance. With this awareness, the dividing line between domestic and international affairs, between the local and the global, will be blurred and recognized as unreal. People
everywhere will consequently be able to participate effectively, and with confidence, in the solving of the global problems which increasingly and continually jar their daily lives.

Thus, the transnational school recognizes that as human societies become more complex, human activities and their associated problems increasingly transcend national boundaries. Local transnational linkages become recognizable. And people become increasingly affected by various global concerns which intrude daily into their private lives.

Unfortunately, however, people tend to think of themselves as incapable and incompetent. As a result they are unable to handle the intrusions of global processes which affect their daily lives, mainly because they perceive that important international intercourse only happens in far away quarters, in places far removed from their own locality (Alger and Hoovler, 1978). Consequently, they do not even expect to take their stand in actively solving those global problems which affect them; they have learned to revere distant "experts" who they do not even know; they have learned to hold the unknown distant experts as venerable. They have learned to self fulfill themselves with their notions of self-incompetence.

A core problem emerges. How do we help people to effectively address these transnational problems which are constantly jarring their daily lives? Disparate bodies of literature suggest participation (e.g., Almond and Verba, 1965; Pateman, 1970; Mische, 1977; Alger, 1980).
"Participation"...for whom? What contributes to it? How can it be enhanced? This study intends to examine these questions by exploring the ways by which citizen participation in addressing transnational problems can be improved—by looking at the activities of those voluntary organizations in the Columbus locale, which engage in transnational interactions. In addition, this study hopes to produce helpful guides for any local professionals intent on fostering participation in organizational problem solving by helping to clarify what turns people on toward participation, and what turns them off from participating.

To accomplish these purposes, an attempt is first made by this study to seek out and tie several disparate, but relevant, bodies of knowledge into a testable model. The model so generated is next tested.

Outline of Chapters

Chapter 1 lays out the conceptual foundations of this study. It begins with the genesis of the traditional paradigm, and proceeds to underscore the intellectual spirit of the 1970s, from which the focus on transnationalism emerged. The relationship between transnational problem solving and participation is established. A model for enhancing participation is formulated. The choice of a focus on Columbus voluntary organization (VO) activities is justified. A framework for analyzing VO activities is presented. The hypotheses are derived, and the methodology of research summarized.
Chapter 2 introduces the Columbus locale, explores the transnational voluntary agency population and the problem solving foci of the VOs in the community area, and identifies the few agencies on which this study mainly focuses. The method of VO selection is discussed. An introductory profile of the VOs is presented.

Chapters 3-5 each focuses on one or more of the hypotheses (or groups of hypotheses) derived from the conceptual background. Hypotheses are explored according to the order in which they are numbered. Explorations include data collection, measurement and item analysis, data analysis and/or interpretation.

Chapter 3 starts with an introduction which takes a look at how all data analyzed from chapter 3 till the end of the study were collected. The chapter then moves on to examine dialogue, the directive approach, consciousness-building and the level of consciousness. The focus, here, is on the first hypothesis.

Chapter 4 looks at the relationships between consciousness level and the feeling of efficacy (i.e., the second hypothesis); and between efficacy level and the level of participation (i.e., the third hypothesis).

Chapter 5 investigates the relationships between preference perception and participation, trust and participation levels, and levels of efficacy and trust. Thus, chapter 5 respectively explores hypothesis 4.1, hypothesis 4.2, and hypothesis 5.

A brief epilogue follows as chapter 6. This concluding section starts with a summary of the empirical findings, and then goes beyond
these to highlight some issues that emerge from this study. These are all capped, thereafter, by the relevant policy recommendations suggested by this study.
Chapter 1

THE CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

**Historical Preludes: The Origins of the Traditional Paradigm**

Any realistic treatment of the genesis of what has come to be called the "traditional" paradigm ought to begin in the year 1648, when two treaties were signed: the Treaty of Osnabruck, and the Treaty of Munster. The former was between the Holy Roman Empire and Sweden. The latter was signed between the empire and France. The product was what is known today as the Peace of Westphalia. Its result was the birth of the modern nation-state as a recognized, autonomous entity in the international system. Its creation was a concept (the "state"), which has for centuries remained the single dominating unit of analysis for most practitioners, and scholars of international interactions.

The transformation of the pre-1648 international system into one of nation-states was not a sudden occurrence. Rather, it resulted from a gradual evolutionary process, rooted in medieval times, during which the revived imperial institution of the dead Roman empire joined forces with the triumphant vitality of the Church to found what became officially known, in A.D. 962, as the Holy Roman Empire (Parry, 1968). But let there be no mistake: the geographical and political aggregate which
came to be called the Holy Roman Empire was neither holy, Roman, nor even an empire. Instead, it was a rather peculiar characteristic of medieval society, born of feudalism, and based on a hierarchical agricultural economic system in which the few landed wealthy lorded it over the people while being, in turn, subordinates of the emperor and the pope. It was a strictly vertical, funnel-type structure of command relationships, which Bloch (1961:443) describes as having exhibited "far reaching restrictions of social intercourse."1

However, the military basis of feudalism and its strictly vertical structure was soon to be eroded by the discovery of gunpowder and the firearms. Following this erosion, the foundation of the Holy Roman Empire was severely rocked. The Italian city-states thus arose (1100-1300). The city-states could now enlist soldiers paid with money. Serf/vassal services were no longer needed for military security.

The relations among the city-states of Italy were the first manifestations of "interstate" politics. By the mid 15th century, balance of power and "state" diplomacy were still evolving among the city-states. The Holy Roman Empire was not yet completely dead, although power struggles now existed between Pope and Emperor. The kings of Europe took advantage of the conflict to snatch power and autonomy from both. Consequently, monarchical absolutism gained in strength, while the imperial model of international politics was

1Interestingly, some of this quality of the "funnel" or "pyramid" structure of decision making is also to be found in the "traditional" paradigm. Consequently, we will also note later that this paradigm indeed restricts social intercourse. See, e.g., Alger and Hoovler, 1978; Alger, 1979:3-10.
gradually being eclipsed. The French monarchy, for example, swallowed up the Italian city-states by 1494. The Reformation of the early 16th century further attested to the growing dissatisfaction of the people with the Church, while at the same time giving more power to the absolute monarchs. Thus did the gradual evolutionary process continue, until its eventual culmination in the Peace of Westphalia, thereby bringing an end to the Thirty Years' War of religion that had devastated the European society. Thereafter, the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor completely lost their control over the affairs of states; and thenceforth the international system would be seen as a society of legally existing nation-states—each enjoying sovereign jurisdiction over well-defined territories. Thus, in 1780, Jeremy Bentham coined the term "international" to describe what he observed as the predominant mode of interaction in the global system.

The Traditional Paradigm: Fact and Farce

Historical data thus suggests that for more than three centuries, international relations have been dominated by exclusive focus on country-to-country interactions. The preoccupation has been with nothing else besides the nation state. The Peace of Westphalia had designated the state as the society's sole distributor of economic wealth, the stabilizer of economic relations, the bearer of democracy, the one-handed seeker of peace with the outside world, and as the single protector in times of aggression. Apparently, the divine-right
monarchical argument of the 16th-17th centuries (which bequested unto
the kingdom the divine prerogative of handling all territorial affairs)
buttressed this mystification of the state.

This traditional, state-centric paradigm has also been described
(e.g., Wolfers, 1962) as the "billiard ball" model. It predominantly
sees international relations as being very power-oriented. A reflection
of this is the classical balance of power system conceptualized by Hans
Morgenthau.

The paradigm not only assumes that nation states are the most
significant actors in the international system, but also assumes that
they are homogeneous entities within which there are no differences in
needs, cultures and interests. They are further presumed to be
impenetrable, being supposedly impervious to the variety of external
influences that accompany the flow of information, people and goods
beyond national boundaries.

As a result of these premises, the traditional paradigm has had
several critical revisitations. Scholars have increasingly recognized
that times have greatly changed since 1648, and that the influences of
people, technology, cities and communications have to a large extent
modified the nature of international relations. Quincy Wright (1955:4)
had led the way with his question: "Is it only nations that are
related?" In answer, Wright (1955) clearly shows that international
relations pervades not only the activities of states, but also an
immense variety of other actors and activities.
More recently, this thesis has been carried further in different ways by many well known, learned persons. That the unitary notion of national activities is inadequate emerges to be a central theme for these scholars. Deutsch (1966:5-26) suggests that emphasis be removed from unitary governmental policies to "issue areas." Rosenau (1969) suggests that we shift attention to the actual policy making process by focusing on "linkage group" interactions. Allison (1971) urges us to look more closely at models of "bureaucratic politics" in order to fully understand the nature and quality of national policies.

Revealed by this body of literature is the fact that policies on a variety of issues such as housing, education, population and health may be coordinated and integrated. But pressure from different regional groups, governmental agencies and departments, and interest groups exist within any country. These differing groups often have very diverse and conflicting priorities. Under the pressure, incoordination, or even contradictory policies may also be produced.

All these indicate a challenge to the traditional "billiard ball" model. Beyond this, however, they have also awakened scholars to the need to explore more fully the broad spectrum of international interactions, and their sources, foci, impact and significance. This intellectual awakening reached an unparalleled mark during the decade of the 1970s and culminated in the consolidation of the new breed of scholars who describe their field of inquiry as "transnational," rather than "international" relations.
The Transnational School

Transnational relations, as a field of inquiry, emerged in response to the growing need for a thorough exposition of what actually constitutes the nature and dynamics of international relations. The actual sources, foci, impact and significance of the various activities which occur within the global totality begged for further exploration. The predominant, traditional, state-centric model inadequately explained all global relations in terms of the nation state. There was thus the need to attempt placing the international activities of other actors—such as the multinational corporations, transnational corporations, inter-governmental organizations, inter-nongovernmental organizations, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals—alongside those of the nation states. This is what the transnational school has started to do.

The transnational group of scholars has therefore emerged to be the most critical of the state-centric, billiard ball paradigm. Keohane and Nye, Mansbach, Ferguson and Lampert, and Chadwick F. Alger have been the most influential of this group all through the last decade. Put together, their major theme is that "international" transactions go beyond the simplistic "inter-nationes" interpretation to include

2That is, between or among countries; occurring specifically only between or among nations.
such interactions that may be nonterritorial, non-governmental, subnational, organizational, local/city/metropolitan, or even interpersonal.

Keohane and Nye (1971:380) take the lead by defining world politics as interactions between any significant actors possessing autonomy, control of substantial issue-related resources, and participating in relations across state lines. They further stipulate that an actor's position is "classifiable in one of three categories--governmental, intergovernmental, or nongovernmental" (1971:334). Each of these is further subdivided into units and subunits to form a 6-celled matrix of actors (Figure 1.1). Thirty-six patterns of interactions may possibly occur among the six actors. Keohane and Nye construct these into a matrix of interactions to better illustrate what they mean by transnational relations, and the nature of world politics (Figure 1.2).

This is definitely an effort to transcend the state-centric "level of analysis problem" of international relations by broadening the spectrum of actors to include some of those of transnational origin. For example, in considering the international relations of the Nigeria-Biafra war, we can now not only view the interactions of the two governments directly concerned (Biafra and Nigeria). But, in addition, we can also view such interactions as the Commonwealth<---Nigeria, Shell British Petroleum<---Biafra, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)<---Nigeria, and so on.
### Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Governmental</th>
<th>Intergovernmental</th>
<th>Nongovernmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Central Control</strong></td>
<td><strong>A</strong> States as Units</td>
<td><strong>C</strong> International Organizations as Units</td>
<td><strong>E</strong> Transnational Organizations as Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B</strong> Governmental Subunits</td>
<td><strong>D</strong> Subunits of International Organizations</td>
<td><strong>F</strong> Subunits of Transnational Organizations; also Certain Individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
A + C = \text{Actors in the state-centric paradigm}
\]

\[
B + D = \text{Actors in transgovernmental interactions}
\]

\[
E + F = \text{Actors in transnational interactions}
\]


**Figure 1.1** Actors in World Politics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>A States as units</th>
<th>B Governmental subunits</th>
<th>C International organizations as units</th>
<th>D Subunits of international organizations</th>
<th>E Transnational organizations as units</th>
<th>F Subunits of transnational organizations; also certain individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IS = Interstate interactions  
TG = Transgovernmental interactions  
TN = Transnational interaction  
TG + TN = Transnational relations  
TG + TN + IS = World politics interactions  


Figure 1.2: Bilateral Interactions in World Politics.
Nevertheless, the work of Keohane and Nye exhibit some serious flaws. They clearly differentiate state activity (governmental) with its associated intergovernmental activity, while the nongovernmental activity area is less differentiated. Figure 1.1 reveals that governmental activity is differentiated into four cells (A, C, B, D), while nongovernmental activity is constricted into only two cells: E, F. Perhaps two more cells, an "inter-nongovernmental" unit, plus its subunit ought to be added. Moreover, one regretably wonders why Keohane and Nye make no provision for including sub-national units as actors. This is where Mansbach and his colleagues go beyond Keohane and Nye.

Mansbach, Ferguson and Lampert (1976) prefer to conceptualize international relations in terms of relations within a "global system" which they describe as being "complex" and "conglomerate." In this "complex conglomerate system," international relations occur when "situationally-specific alignments of different actors, using a variety of means to achieve complementary objectives" are formed (Mansbach, et al., 1976:42). These scholars identify six different actors, each defined in terms of four issue areas (physical protection, economic, public interest, group status). As Figures 1.3 and 1.4 portray, the six actors not only include interstate governmental, interstate nongovernmental, and nation-state governmental actors like Keohane and Nye. They also include governmental noncentral (regional, parochial, or municipal), intrastate nongovernmental (Ford Foundation, Oxfam, Turkish and Greek Cypriot communities), and individuals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PHYSICAL PROTECTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>ECONOMIC</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC INTEREST</strong></th>
<th><strong>GROUP STATUS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSTATE GOVERNMENTAL</strong></td>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>GATT</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSTATE NONGOVERNMENTAL</strong></td>
<td>Al Fatah</td>
<td>Royal Dutch Petroleum</td>
<td>International Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATION-STATE</strong></td>
<td>Turkish Cypriot Government Officials</td>
<td>U.S. Dept. of Commerce</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENTAL NONCENTRAL</strong></td>
<td>Confederacy</td>
<td>Katanga</td>
<td>New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRASTATE NONGOVERNMENTAL</strong></td>
<td>Jewish Defense League</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL</strong></td>
<td>Gustav von Rosen</td>
<td>Jean Monnet</td>
<td>Andrew Carnegie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 1.3: Actors Defined by Membership and Principal Task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSTATE GOVERNMENTAL</th>
<th>INTERSTATE NON-GOVERNMENTAL</th>
<th>NATION-STATE</th>
<th>GOVERNMENTAL NONCENTRAL</th>
<th>INTRASTATE NON-GOVERNMENTAL</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN-NATO (1950)</td>
<td>UN-International Red Cross (Palestine)</td>
<td>EEC-Franco-phone - African states</td>
<td>OAU- Biafra</td>
<td>Arab League-AI Fatah</td>
<td>Grand Mufti of Jerusalem-Arab League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell Oil-ESSO (1972)</td>
<td>USSR-Comintern (1920's)</td>
<td>IBM-Scotland</td>
<td>ITT-Allende opposition (Chile)</td>
<td>Sun-Yat-sen-Comintern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENTAL NONCENTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium-Katanga (1960)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 1.4 Alignments in a Complex Conglomerate System.
Mansbach, et al., thus avoid classification for centrally controlled and subcontrolled actors by avoiding groupings into units and subunits. Actors do not have to be centrally controlled or subcontrolled in order to interact in the global environment. Secondly, these scholars recognize the vitality of subnational actors which Keohane and Nye neglected. Their work is therefore a clear step beyond that of Keohane and Nye.

Yet Mansbach, et al. fail to differentiate the group of actors which they subsume under the nation-state category. For example, we may have nation-state governmental, as well as nation-state nongovernmental actors. Besides, these scholars fail to clearly distinguish noncentral nongovernmental (i.e., parochial nongovernmental) actors from those that are "governmental noncentral" (i.e., parochial governmental). Moreover, like Keohane and Nye, the "state-loaded" nature of their analytic structure—as revealed by their terminology (intra-"state"..., nation-"state"..., inter-"state"..., etc.) portrays the same "good ole" orientation to the "good ole" state-centric myth. This is borne out all the more by Mansbach, et al. (1976:26), when they categorically asserted that "national governments remain the principal actors in the contemporary global system."

Apparently there are some spectres of truism in the age-old dictum which cautions that old paradigms never die. Even those who have undertaken some of the best known efforts to reconceptualize international relations seldom escape the imprisoning grips of the
nation state unit of analysis. Lord Acton was definitely right—and
tremendously full of insights—when he offered us some words of caveat:
indeed, "there is no error so monstrous that it fails to find defenders
among the ablest of men." This is where C.F. Alger and his followers
offer us a spirited and remarkable point of departure.

The Transnational School and Problem-Solving

In his inaugural message as the President of the International
Studies Association (ISA) in the spring of 1978, Alger (1978:1) charged
us to share with him our suggestions and comments with respect to ways
in which we can enhance our competence to help many more people—in the
context of their own local community—to become more self-conscious,
responsible and more efficacious citizens with respect to international
issues in the local community and region, in their own nation and in the
global polity. But he did not simply leave us with this challenge.
Neither did he simply forsake us to the existing intellectual frameworks
of Keohane and Nye, and Mansbach, et al. To meaningfully address his
charge, he was aware that we needed some more far-reaching intellectual
lenses in order to be able to see the world as it really is. We cannot
possibly help others better their competence in international matters
without first being ourselves competent in them. Similarly, we cannot
improve our competence in those matters if we do not have a thorough and
realistic understanding of them.

As an aid to meeting his challenge, therefore, Alger (1978:7) also
suggests that we start looking at world interactions from a totally new
intellectual frame. He conceptualizes international relations as occurring within a "complex global polity" (Figure 1.5). The complex global polity framework has been well described by Alger (1980b:24-7). "...The part of the matrix above the diagonal portrays linkage between equivalent units. For example, Cells 23 and 24 represent linkages central to the nation-state model. Cell 23 represents relations among all countries in a region, such as occurs in the Organization of American States. Cell 24 represents relations among all countries on the globe, as exemplified by the United Nations. But the nation-state model tends to ignore meetings of all states (provinces) in a region, such as those that take place between representatives of the New England states and the eastern provinces of Canada (Cell 17). Likewise, it ignores potential linkages between all cities in a region, such as the European Union of Local Authorities (Cell 11), and all cities in the world, such as the International Union of Local Authorities (Cell 12).

"The portion of the matrix below the diagonal portrays the linkage of non-equivalent units, for example, a community development project supported by a national government (Cell 19) or a European Community development project (Cell 25). In this portion of the matrix there are also ten cells with links that cross national boundaries, Cell 21, Cells 25-28, and Cells 31-35. In addition, Cells 19 and 20 could involve international links (between national and local community governments and between national and city governments) although these links could also be within nations. For example, a local community development project in Columbia supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development.
**Linkage of Units with Identical Territorial Boundaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Council</th>
<th>City Mayor's Cabinet</th>
<th>State (Prov.)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region (Multi-Country)</th>
<th>Globe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Community Council</td>
<td>2 Any community in city (same city councils)</td>
<td>3 Any community in state</td>
<td>4 Any community in country</td>
<td>5 Any Community in region</td>
<td>6 Any community in World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Community position to city Council for community park</td>
<td>8 Any city in state</td>
<td>9 Any city in state (e.g., National Conference of Mayors)</td>
<td>10 Any city in region (e.g., European Union of Local Authorities)</td>
<td>11 Any city in region (e.g., International Union of Local Authorities)</td>
<td>12 Any city in world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 State aid to local schools</td>
<td>14 State support</td>
<td>15 Governor's Cabinet</td>
<td>16 Any state in country (e.g., U.S. Senate)</td>
<td>17 Any state in region</td>
<td>18 Any state in world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 National government community development projects</td>
<td>20 National government support for city police</td>
<td>21 State of Ohio relations with Japanese Trade Ministry</td>
<td>22 President's Cabinet</td>
<td>23 Any country in region (e.g., NATO)</td>
<td>24 Any country in world (e.g., UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 European Community development project</td>
<td>26 World Bank</td>
<td>27 Asian Development Bank, Provincial Development Projects</td>
<td>28 OAS German cooperation of European rights in non-OAS countries</td>
<td>29 OAS relations with African Liberation Committee</td>
<td>30 Any region on globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 OAS community development projects</td>
<td>22 UNHCHR</td>
<td>23 OAS German cooperation of European rights in non-OAS countries</td>
<td>24 UN forces in UN peacekeeping missions</td>
<td>25 OAS report to UN</td>
<td>26 UN Advisory Committee on Coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Alper, "Enhancing the Efficacy of Citizen Participation in World Affairs," Paper Presented in a Symposium on Citizenship Education in Modern Society, Marshan Center, Columbus, Ohio, April 1980:23.

**Figure 1.5:** Potential Linkage Between Units in Complex Global Polity.
"The diagonal of the matrix reflects linkage between units in the same territorial domain. For example, a Mayor's Cabinet (Cell 8) contains functional experts—roads, police, sewage disposal, etc.—each responsible for their function within the same local community or city. In the same way the U.N. Advisory Committee on Coordination (Cell 36) is made up of the executive heads of U.N. agencies that are each responsible for the global activities of their functional agency.

"While the entire matrix may be an interesting intellectual puzzle to the scholar, its primary value is as a generator of options for people who wish to cope with global processes in a specific local context. For example, people may not know how to cope with the problems presented by the intent of a large transnational corporation to build a plant in their city. Should they keep them out? Under what conditions might they be allowed in? In many cases these people will find the traditional sources of advice and support, state government (Cell 14) and national government (Cell 20) already allied with the transnational corporation. The matrix suggests other possibilities, such as international regional organizations like the Organization of African Unity (Cell 26) and the Information Center on Transnational Corporations of the United Nations (Cell 32). Cells 9 to 12 also suggest the possibility of turning to other cities, individually or through organizations such as the International Union of Local Authorities, from around the world. Heightened awareness of these possibilities could eventually stimulate exchange of information among all cities in which a specific transnational corporation operates and eventually even the
development of common policies on matters such as tax abatement, pollution standards, etc. Of course, this might also lead to common policies for applying sanctions against those cities who do not adhere to these common policies.

"A checklist of nongovernmental actors can be generated from the same kind of matrix. For example, religious organizations range from the community (parish) church to organizations with wider and wider territorial scope that eventually cover the globe. A national council of churches, i.e., a council in which a number of national churches are represented, would be located in Cell 22. A fraternal worker that is sent by a local church in one part of the world to another local church in another part of the world would be located in Cell 6. World Council of Churches assistance to a development project administered by a church group in a local community would be located in Cell 31. In the same fashion the matrix could be used for outlining organizational possibilities in labor, agriculture, fraternal organizations, the professions, etc.

"There are many instances in which local labor, consumer and fraternal groups establish relationships with similar groups in other countries (Cell 5 or 6). This is sometimes in the context of a sister city program or a program developed by the national headquarters of a nongovernmental organization but it is sometimes done strictly at the initiative of a local ecological, youth, or women's group. Unfortunately this activity is often not as effective in achieving its goals as it might be because those involved do not have access to the
intellectual resources that scholars are providing to national governments. Likewise, those involved do not acquire the participatory insight and satisfaction that might lead toward sustained and increased activity because they do not have awareness of the actual and potential importance of this kind of activity. They look upon their activity as peripheral and insignificant in comparison to the development program of national governments which is made so visible by research of scholars, reporting of the press and self-proclamations of national governmental officials. Yet, in the aggregate the impact of local initiatives is not necessarily insignificant, and is likely of tremendous significance with respect to the participatory learning about global process gained by those involved.

"The matrix can also be used to portray linkages between governmental and nongovernmental units. This could be done by letting the columns apply to nongovernmental units and the rows apply to governmental units. In this case development assistance made available to a rural community through cooperation between a local government and the Association Internationale des Maison Familiales Rurales (AIMFR) would be located in Cell 6. Development assistance made available by OXFAM (a U.K. nongovernmental organization) to the government of Ghana would be located in Cell 22. A contribution sent directly by a local youth group to UNICEF would be found in Cell 31."

A few things become clear by reading the scholar's own description of his conceptual framework. It offers us several points of departure from the existing intellectual models. First, Alger's complex global
polity acquaints us with a new paradigm which aims at identifying all possible international actors by looking at actors involved in every issue area (or activity focus), as empirically observed at every place of activity. By attempting to isolate every possible issue area, it realistically recognizes that mankind's problems and activities are definitely not limited to the four issue areas (physical protection, economic, public interest, and group status) described by Mansbach, et al. Rather, human problems as perceived by intellectuals and practitioners need to be redefined and broadened to specifically include such issue areas as socio-cultural, religious, educational, technological, housing, energy, food, military, and social justice. But a greater point of departure lies within Alger's redefinition of the "levels" constituting the place or target of activity (i.e., the activity locus). I read him as proposing that an understanding of international issue policies is incomplete without a thorough understanding of the most basic, lowest possible activity locus to which such policy-generating activity could be traced. Particular problem-solving policies may be traced to the smallest possible community (e.g., the village); or to the city, province (i.e., intra-country state or region), multi-country region, or even to the globe.

Transnational Problem Solving and Citizen Participation

Alger's work is the most revealing from the standpoint of this study. His intellectual framework, as described by the "complex global
"polity," tremendously deemphasizes the excessive orientation toward a nation-state-centered level of analysis; it reconceptualizes international relations scholarship. Based on the framework, Alger sensitizes us to what he provocatively subtitles the "integrative aspects of disintegration" (Alger, 1978b:237-9). Gerald and Patricia Mische (1977) have earlier documented that national governments and their heads of states are rather powerless in terms of meeting the needs of individuals. Alger (1978b) carries this observation further by clearly showing that governments are becoming increasingly "disintegrated" because of their increasing inability to meet the avalanche of socio-cultural, politico-economic, technological, and other demands which have been placed on them by the various individuals, or cultural, ethnic, tribal, economic, political actors. As a result, an autonomy-invoking integrating process is generated. For these acting entities avail themselves of the improving transportation, communication and technical facilities which make it possible for them to pursue their own global interests, while at the same time interlinking them more with the wider world.

The implication is that while these kinds of interactions suggest increasing autonomy for each interacting entity, local transnational linkages are becoming increasingly recognizable. People are being increasingly affected by various global issues which intrude into their daily lives.

Unfortunately, however, people are not able to cope with the intrusions of global processes into their daily lives (Alger, 1980:1). This raises the question: "why?"
Alger and Hoovler (1978) trace the answer to the predominant "onion-bulb" model of socialization, which makes the individual unable to perceive and understand the various routes and forums (such as voluntary associations, and individual actions) that are open to him for purposes of transnational problem solving (see Figure 1.6). According to these scholars, the way people in most parts of the world learn about the world causes them to feel cut off from international activity. We often acquire knowledge about the world in strata, progressing from our local community, to our province (or state), to our nation, and then to international knowledge. Consequently, international things are seen as "far away," being directed by people in distant places, usually in territorial capitals where the kings, princes, presidents, prime ministers, and all the "powerful" elites reside. And in school curricula, international things are either completely screened out, or relegated to the end of the course, thereby placing them in the outer layer of the "onion" of experience.

The child's socialization illustrates this. In childhood, we often learn first of the family, the school, the church, the police office, the courts—all local things. We are taught that our province (or state) lies beyond these; that our country is even farther away, being made up of several other provinces or states; that international things lie several layers away, only occurring from and beyond the national borders. Thus from childhood, we learn to view the world from our location, seeing it "from inside a layered onion" (Alger and Hoovler, 1978:8).

Figure 1.6: Socialization of Individuals with Respect to Territorial Units.
This is mainly because the teachers and master scholars charged with the duty of understanding the global processes of mankind's interactions have grossly ignored the fact that human activities transcend national boundaries. Instead, they have based their work on the nation-state level of analysis, thereby ignoring that international activities originate at many points within the country, and may also be targeted on diverse external locations, depending on the particular type of activity. They tend to justify their orientation by relying on national statistics to validate their state-centric hypotheses. For example, when Mansbach, et al. (1976:26) assert that "national governments remain the principal actors in the contemporary global system," they depended entirely on national events data (from national newspapers) to validate the hypothesis. There is no question that national newspaper data sources are perhaps highly "state-favored," and cannot inform local people where in the world they are. Yet the products of such scholarship and teaching largely underscore our intellectual and cultural socialization. We are led to learn and relearn seeing the world from inside a layered onion, feeling that international things can only occur in national headquarters. This is the traditional "billiard ball" paradigm in practice. And this "nation-state paradigm inhibits participation" (Alger, 1979b:9-11).

In sum, our method of socialization gives us an inadequate set of mental maps. It imprints on our minds the so-called "billiard ball" image of international relations. It imbues the individual with the norms that the people are not to participate in global issues,
participation being the prerogative of national governments and national institutions. As a result, people are not able to cope with the mounting intrusions of global processes on their daily lives. This is primarily because they perceive that important international things happen in "distant places." And so, they do not expect to take part in transnational problem solving—they have learned to venerate their feeling of self-incompetence: "because they have been taught that they are incompetent" (Alger, 1980:2).

**Toward the Enhancement of Participation**

The question is: how can we enable people to cope with the transnational problems which affect most of their lives? Mische (1977) and Alger (1980:5; 1979:23-4) underscore participation.

Carole Pateman (1970) indicates that local communities are the indispensable training grounds for the participation needed. Diagram 1.1 illustrates Pateman's position. She wades through classical and contemporary scholarship, and concludes that local participatory experience is the cornerstone for creating a participatory society. According to her analysis, participation in the local workplace, for example, leads to the feeling of efficacy. Efficacy, in turn, leads to increased societal participation [and efficiency] in problem solving. Underlying this entire process is the "education" that comes from the initial local (workplace) participation. It engenders group harmony by breeding cooperation; integration, and the acceptance of decisions that emerge from the rank and file [or made by the people's own democratic
This is an extension of Pateman (1970). It was inspired by a conceptualization of Pateman which Alger had presented in a Transnational Relations seminar in Spring 1979, at The Ohio State University.

Diagram 1.1: Illustrating Pateman's Views on Participation.
representatives] are therefore expected also (Pateman, 1970:45-7; 63; 106-8).

This is to say, the individual's attitudes will depend greatly on the structure of interactional relationships found within his local environment. That he develops the feeling of efficacy depends on whether his local environment (e.g., his workplace) permits him to freely participate in decision making. For where individuals tied together by human enterprise realize that they are equally free to take part in decisions affecting their common endeavor, their spirit of belonging, sense of commitment, and level of participation in the local activity become very high. This raises their level of efficacy.3 And with the resulting heightened feeling of effectiveness, being able to, and self-confidence, novel participation become possible not only in broader, external spheres, but also in more differentiated local domains. This is because with the feeling of efficacy, the individual inescapably feels that he can accomplish. He develops an intrinsic sense of confidence in himself. He innately believes that he now can effectively function to do what there is.

All these are able to occur, only by virtue of a pervasive underlying process which educates the individuals and heightens in them the psychological attitudes necessary for increased participation.

---

3Efficacy means the belief that one can do; confidence in one's ability to participate responsibly; the belief that one can effectively control one's life and environment (see, e.g., Pateman, 1970:45-6).
It is this learning process which enlightens the individuals with the needed knowledge of the local situation, which equips them well for future participation.

This suggests that before participation can occur, there must be what Freire (1970) calls "consciousness"—that is, an acute awareness, which leads to the feeling of efficacy.

This premise has been well illustrated by what Alger (1980b; 1979) conceptualizes as the "cycle of apathy." Figure 1.7 depicts this finely. Little or no knowledge of an individual's environment predisposes the person to little or no participation in his environment. This, in turn, produces little or no interest to know, to learn, to find out, to combat, or to embrace. In the presence of this kind of nonchalance, there is an absence of the desire to know or to take part in addressing the issues at hand.

Participation, thus, requires that people be liberated from the cycle of apathy through learning experiences that create "consciousness" in them. Consciousness refers to thorough knowledge of one's contexts. It is a state of pervasive awareness without which an individual cannot be adequately sensitive to situations surrounding him. It sensitizes the individual to the "whats," "whys," and "hows" of issues emanating from his environment. Participatory consciousness creates efficacy; it rules out any prospects for non-aware involvement, and reinforces "responsible participation."4

4Responsible participation means "growing out of a condition of non-aware involvement" (Alger, 1980b:11).

Figure 1.7: The Cycle of Apathy.
Similarly, transnational participation requires that societal inhabitants be liberated from the cycle of apathy through consciousness-building experiences, which increase the people's knowledge in terms of their total personal links to the world, and the links of other people and institutions to their own local community.

Building consciousness definitely involves some learning or process of education (Pateman, 1970; Mische, 1977; Alger, 1980). The Marga Institute (1979 Reports) and Wanigasekera (n.d.) suggest dialogue as a preferred method of building consciousness. Wanigasekera (n.d.: 10, 16) identifies two methods of creating consciousness—the "conventional," and the "dialogic" methods. What Earl Wanigasekera describes as the "conventional" method, I call "directivity" or the "directive" approach. In this method, the consciousness-raiser controls and paces the necessary communication situations, in order to establish or achieve a preset consciousness-building purpose. It is more or less unidirectional. The necessary communication predominantly flows from the consciousness-raiser to the individual whose consciousness is being raised. The awareness being created is controlled. It is meant to reflect and underscore a specific purpose, which has been exclusively defined by the consciousness-raiser. It communicates information and subject matter already predetermined. Indeed, it resorts to a priori fixing of certain limits and bounds, depth and breadth, to the field of consciousness (Marga Institute, 1979: Doc. M/67, p. 44). It is inflexible to its purpose. Consequently, it yields only very narrow consciousness, setting a limit to the variety and depth of issue
awareness. It is often insensitive to the issues, explanations, clarifications or answers that may be of interest to the person whose consciousness is being raised.

The "dialogic" approach, on the other hand, is characterized by diadic communication, horizontal exchange, mutual conditioning, and overall conscientization (see, e.g., Wanigasekera, n.d.: 10). The consciousness-raiser makes no attempt to focus attention only on a few specific areas. He does not restrict the purpose and range of inquiry, and so, is able to generate a comprehensive picture of the reality under scrutiny. A process of mutual education is thus created (Marga Institute, 1979: Doc. M/67, p. 45). Besides, dialogue gives people the opportunity to express their thoughts freely and without inhibitions.

It probes the people's expectations and aspirations, seeks to ascertain how the different people concerned perceive the issues at hand, promotes broad-based discussions on questions of popular interest (e.g., needs, goals, solutions), and motivates people to reflect more awarely on a whole range of solution strategies. It is therefore nondirective, and is highly sensitive to the individual's local environment; it does not allow for the superimposition of any alien ethic, value premises or valuations on any actor. Rather, what it does is to enlighten the people, group or unit by enabling them to draw their own attention to the existence of certain conditions, the possibility of certain solutions, and the noble incentives that may accrue to any alternative lines of action.
These two approaches to creating consciousness can be illustrated by looking at two hypothetical local communities, villages A and B, each suffering from a 98% total illiteracy level, neither having any schools—not even an elementary school. I could go to village A, announce my intention to address them publicly, tell them outrightly that their illiteracy level is rather high, inform them that erecting schools is the most reasoned way to address their problem, establish a school for them later, equip and staff the school with equipment and teachers from my own distant community. This would be a crude example of the directive approach.

I could also go to Community B, which is in the same very poor literacy circumstance as village A. But I may start by initially visiting the villagers individually, probing to find their reactions and thoughts on their illiteracy problem. Then they are each invited to a meeting-of-all, open to all residents and citizens of the village, in which I serve as a mentor, only prompting and moderating them along various paths of their own interest—my prime objective being simply to generate the people's awareness that some problems perhaps exist; to arouse their collective interest toward the possible paths to solutions, and to serve as a "consultant" when needed. The community being so guided necessarily depends on its own resources and potentials. Village B may thus decide that it is time they started learning to read and write. They may decide to start a school the following week, using one of their brethren's large extra household rooms as a temporary "schoolhouse." They may also decide in the meeting to have all local
citizens possessing any high school diplomas or better qualifications to register as their school teachers. By the end of the community meeting, we may find that quite in contrast to my approach to Community A, no "foreign" aids are given—and no alien methods introduced. This briefly illustrates dialogue as an approach to building consciousness.

When the consciousness to participate in community efforts is generated, knowledge replaces ignorance. A sense of democratic belonging is psychologically infused. The feeling of being able to tackle one's own community's problems introduces a sense of worth. The pre-existing sense of worthlessness is eroded. A definite sense of purpose, unwavering self-confidence, and looming hope for increasing efficiency become unmistakable.

Efficacy, which derives from this sense of awareness, makes it more likely that an individual will responsibly participate in enterprises affecting him (Patern, 1970:110); for the individual will self-consciously evaluate his interactions in the light of his personal values or preferences (Alger, 1979:23). It is only logical to expect that such conscious, efficacious participants will be more likely to take part in those interactions which reflect their own preferences. The following model for enhancing participation is founded on this conceptual background.

A Model for Improving Participation

As Diagram 1.2 presents, this study offers a model for enhancing citizen participation, based on the foregoing intellectual background.
Diagram 1.2: A Model for Enhancing Citizen Participation in Transnational Problem Solving.
The model emphasizes consciousness-building at the local community level (preferably through dialogue), as a way of improving individual participation, by creating consciousness, thereby developing the level of efficacy.

Consciousness suggests that the actor knows very well what the problems or issues surrounding him are. He is fully cognizant of his options and preferences. Efficacy refers to the feeling of being able to do something responsibly, the self-confidence that comes with it, and an overall feeling of effectiveness. The suggestion is that as a result of these qualities, the individual participant prefers to mainly interact with those other actors in whom he has trust, and whom he sees as sharing mutual or similar preferences with him.

The model further suggests that if consciousness-building is to occur, there must be a "consciousness-raiser"—that is, an actor, different from the non-participant or the target, which operates at the locality, and which propagates the consciousness to participate. The consciousness-raiser is, at times, described as the "communicator" (see, e.g., Lissner, 1977:141). This, perhaps, is because it certainly elicits, transfers, and inculcates information, thereby educating its targets. However, the term "mobilizer" will be used by this study to refer to the consciousness-raiser. This is because it not only performs such communication functions as transferring, transmitting, eliciting, and inculcating information. It also propagates ideas, articulates thoughts, and motivates its targets to some form of action. Thus, it "mobilizes" its targets into taking appropriate action.
In this study, the transnational voluntary organization (VO) is this mobilizer. That VOs are mobilizers accounts for why this study focuses particularly on VO activities. A more comprehensive justification is however presented hereunder.

Understanding Voluntary Organization Policy Actions

A voluntary organization is a private, independent, nonprofit agency, mainly supported by voluntary contributions from the general public, or its segments, for the purpose of carrying out certain functions related to the solution of some specific societal problem(s).

The term "private" implies that the body is not governmental. That is, the organization was not established by any form of inter-governmental agreement.\textsuperscript{5} It suggests that voluntary organizations (VOS) are nongovernmental entities (NGOs).

Being "independent" implies that the organization is autonomous. And an organization cannot be called autonomous or "voluntary" if it depends almost exclusively on public taxpayer funds, and if representatives of public authorities maintain a decisive influence on its policies (Lissner, 1977:24-5). A voluntary organization must thus maintain a different support base that is independent of government; it must be capable of remaining viable even without public taxpayer support. Besides, it must not be merely another "arm" of the government by being simply a puppet of public authorities. It must be a

\textsuperscript{5}ECOSOC Resolution 288(X), February 27, 1950 defines a non-governmental organization (NGO) as one "which is not established by inter-governmental agreement." The United Nations still uses this definition to determine the consultative status of NGOs with the ECOSOC.
decision-making entity in the sense that its supporters/membership and leadership have the autonomy or independence to determine the VO's goals and how they are achieved. Thus, even though the United States’ Peace Corps is a "volunteer agency," it would be classified by my definition as a quasi-voluntary, para-governmental organization. For one thing, it cannot survive financially without government sponsorship.

The "nonprofit" qualification emphasizes that VOs do not exist just to accumulate funds and maximize profits. This quality sets VOs apart from business organizations. Business enterprises share dividends, and pay out profits which accrue to their accumulated assets. Voluntary organizations do not. Profits from VO operations are often accidental. Where they are not, they are usually designed to improve the VO's capacity to combat the societal problems for which it is supported.

That a voluntary organization is an "agency" implies that the VO is characterized by more than the formal structure (e.g., having an office, some paid positions, division of labor, formal routines, procedures, meetings, etc.) which defines any organization. More than being just a formal entity, the VO is also an "agent" for something (Lissner, 1977:24). This means that it is a vehicle for the realization of certain social objectives. It is supported by a group of people who trust its activities, and see its policies as among the best possible ways to pursue certain social goals. It receives its endorsement from a group of people on whose behalf it also acts. It acts on behalf of the group of people who endorse the social goals.
All in all, the definition of a voluntary organization being offered reveals that VOs embrace what James Schultz (1972:25-30) would describe as an "other-directed," "societal level 'service ideal'"—or 'service orientation.' The societal level "service ideal" which confers on these organizations the quality of being service oriented is predominantly rooted in their contributive and cause orientation. The "contributive" element underscores that VOs are prosocial. They engage in a variety of moral entrepreneurship on behalf of certain segments of society. This is further buttressed by the "cause" element. For the cause element is only present when an actor's functioning depends on its believable appeal to participants, targets or other constituencies regarding the moral quality of enterprise (Schultz, 1972:26).

Let us parenthetically note here, that voluntary organizations may, or may not be transnational depending on the scope (or domain) of their activities. Transnational voluntary organizations are those engaging in activities that transcend national boundaries. The term "voluntary organization" (VO) is used herein to simply refer to these transnational organizations.

As a reflection of their service orientation, several studies (e.g., Curti, 1963; Schultz, 1972; Nightingale, 1973; Hardy and Cull, 1973; Lissner, 1977) thus, for example, indicate that VOs are perhaps the only group of actors with motivations of mutual interest and mutual benefits shared with their targets or constituencies. Moreover, VOs emphasize citizen participation, and at the local level, with more sustained zeal than any other group of actors.
These well-documented qualities of the VO are illustrated by the conceptual framework for analyzing the dynamics of voluntary organization activities portrayed in Diagram 1.3.

Analyzing Voluntary Organization Activities

Diagram 1.3 is meant to further enrich our understanding of VO activities for purposes of empirical analysis. The basic organizational values refer to the fundamental cause element which propels the VO's policy directions. They are the agency's basic social objectives. That is, the set of social goals which the VO is an "agent" of; the set of preferences for which the VO stands to be an instrument of realization—as endorsed by those individuals or societal segments that support the agency. The basic organizational values reflect the VO's worldview. Lissner (1977:74) would describe this as the agency's weltanschauung. It is what the French would call La Optique. All of this simply translated, refers to the underlying perspective within which the VO's functioning is cast.

The basic organizational values thus determine the VO's decision makers' operation values, what policy actions they would prefer, where they would carry out the activities, and how the operations would be executed. At the same time, these organizational values help to clarify what the preferences of the VO's supporters (contributors, or donors) are; VOs are only supported by those individuals who endorse their social objectives. It is therefore to be expected that feedback concerning the activities of the VO will result in changes in the
Diagram 1.3: A Conceptual Framework for Analyzing the Activities of Voluntary Organizations.
donors' support behavior. Feedback which appeals to the donor by being 
in congruence with his personal value preferences are likely to maintain 
or even increase his support for the VO. Unsatisfactory feedback is, on 
the other hand, likely to make the supporter decrease his support. In 
this way, donor preferences and feedback from the societal impact of the 
VO's past activities also determine the operating values of the VO's 
decision makers. VO decision makers look forward to increased societal 
endorsement and support; VO's cannot exist without this support by the 
segments of society which endorse them. This also indicates why the 
voluntary agencies constantly attempt to educate local publics to their 
cause. Voluntary organization decision makers hope that by adequately 
making local populations aware of their VO's social objectives, they can 
enlarge their constituencies. And this translates into higher support, 
endorsement, and viability for the VO.

Underlying the framework, therefore, is the view that VO's are 
"mobilizers." That is, they build "consciousness" among the local 
"non-participants" and thus generate in them the feeling of 
"efficacy"—which leads to the will to "participate responsibly." The 
individuals who are now conscious participants decide to unify their 
newly-found efficacy by becoming the VO's sustaining members (donors, 
contributors or supporters). And, since these members are now conscious 
and efficacious participants, their independent intent is to foster 
their own personal inclinations through the activities of VO's with which 
they share mutual or similar preferences—as indicated by the VO's
basic organizational values (or social objectives). A further suggestion here, is that these individuals must be trustful of the VO's activities in order to support it as members, contributors, volunteers, or continuing supporters.

The Hypotheses

Some empirical questions emerge from this conceptual background:

1) How conscious are VO members of what the VO does? 2) Are VO members really efficacious individuals? 3) How does the VO raise the consciousness of its members? 4) How do VO members behave when their consciousness have been raised? 5) What are their expectations of the VO? In other words, what "turns" people "on" toward participation in VO activities? What "turns" them "off"?

A few hypotheses can be derived to address these questions:

1. The more the VO attempts to build consciousness through the dialogue approach, the more its members will be conscious of what the VO does.

2. VO members more conscious of what the VO does will tend to possess more efficacy.

3. The more efficacious individuals will participate more in VO activities.

6This is responsible participation. That is, participation deriving from a choice based on consciousness and efficacy. The quality of knowing, feeling effective, and feeling able to—which underlie the choice to participate, predisposes the individual to particularly focus on certain preferences; and he avoids activities in which he has no faith.
4.1. VO members will tend to diminish their participation in the VO if they perceive their own preferences as actually different from those of the VO.

4.2. Individuals will tend to participate more in voluntary action when they are more trustful of the VO's activities.

5. Individuals low on efficacy are more distrustful of wider participation through the VOs.

Diagram 1.4 exhibits the relationships hypothesized as existing among the key variables. Each number in the diagram corresponds to the number of the hypothesis which it reflects.

**Strategy of Research**

It helps quite tremendously when a reader has a fair idea of what he is going into, and how he is going into it, especially when the subject matter turns somewhat more technical at certain junctures. It is even more helpful when the reader is himself initiated into what lies ahead by the person who designed and authored the material. Not that what lies ahead is cast in such technical language as Longin Pastusiak (1974:7) decrying when he observes in his Pastusiak's Law, that American social science seems to be losing its parsimony and meaningfulness to excessive technical jargonry. But as a schematizing aid to the reader, let me briefly summarize the research methodology.
Diagram 1.4: The Hypothesized Relationships and the Major Variables.
Variables

The major variables and their interrelationships, as posited by this study, have been displayed in Diagram 1.4. We are attempting to investigate how consciousness-building, consciousness, efficacy, preference perception, and trust are likely to affect responsible participation, the major dependent variable. Two types of consciousness-building (dialogue, and the directive consciousness-building) were identified and explored.

Data Collection

Three data collection methods were adopted. First is library research. This mainly involved wading through the existing body of transnational, international, and voluntary action literature in order to construct a solid conceptual background upon which this study stands. Diagrams 1.2 and 1.3 are perhaps the culmination of this exercise.

Participant observation is the second method that was used to collect data. I occasionally participated in some of the various voluntary agency activities in Columbus as a visiting observer. The activities included VO meetings, fund raisings, community education sessions, and other like local campaigns. This was not done very frequently, however, since the bulk of this study relies on the survey method of data collection. Nevertheless, being able to take part and observe in voluntary agency activities exposed me to several informal discussions/informal interviews with VO leaders and supporters—which have immensely sharpened my understanding of the workings of voluntary organization activities.
The third method that was used to collect data is survey research. This study is primarily based on subjects' responses to the questionnaires used. The questionnaires were structured; they were mainly administered by mail.

A non-random sampling procedure was adopted. First, a local community area—the Columbus locale (made up of Franklin County area of Ohio, U.S.A.)—was chosen due to proximity to the researcher. All the transnational VOs in Columbus were next identified. Of the identified number, five VOs were particularly studied. These were selected on the basis of viability, activity scope, and the organization's willingness to take part in this kind of study.

All local supporters (or members) and staff of two of the VOs were sent questionnaires, while approximately 1/6 to 1/2 of the other three VOs were surveyed depending on the size of the VO. The size of some Columbus VOs range from a few scores of members to as many as 3,000 supporters or more. The VOs included in this study are those that have more than 300 members or supporters.

It should be noted, here, that for data collection purposes, the term "member" is being used to refer to any of the VO's sustaining membership or supporters. That is, those individuals whose support for the VO has been regular in recent months, or recognized by the VO as substantial over the years. This means that the terms "member" and "supporter" are being used interchangeably. This is because many voluntary agencies do not have individuals whom they nominally call "members." At the same time, several VOs prefer not to (and actually do
not) refer to their supporters as "members." VO professionals and leaders prefer to refer to their sustaining membership as the VO's "supporters."

Some 2,615 questionnaires were mailed out, while 196 were handed out in meeting settings. Thus, 2,811 questionnaires were administered altogether. This number constitutes about 41% of all supporters of the VOs that were studied. Of this number, 458 or 16.3% were completed and returned by the respondents.

Measurement

Two sets of measurement tools were used. The first set comprises of three different instruments which were specifically prepared for this study. These include:

1) a Consciousness-Building Inventory (CBI);
2) a Consciousness Survey List (CSL); and
3) a Preference Perception Opinion Questionnaire (PPOQ).

The second set of measurement tools are made up of existing tools that have been merely adapted for this study. These include:

1) The Mathews and Prothro (1966) Participation Scale;
2) Efficacy Scale by Campbell, et al. (1954); and
3) Rosenberg's (1957) "Trust" Scale.

All of these were combined to form the survey instrument. The final questionnaire itself was "pretested" for flow and smoothness. This was done by passing it on to 10 staff members of six different VOs, and to four university professors, all of whom made comments that helped better the coherence and general language of the final survey.
Data Analysis

The analysis of data is descriptive, statistical, inferential and comparative. The descriptions and comparisons are organized around each hypothesis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer language was used for all data analysis.

Dimensional analysis was employed to establish the unidimensionality of the items included in each of the scales. This was done by using the Guttman Scale procedure to search for scalar properties in the instruments being used—in order to see if the measurement tools used actually possess scalar properties in the context of this particular study.

The inter-variable analysis is mainly bivariate. Most of the analysis focuses on two-variable correlations with the Pearson's $r$. Since we are looking for the relationship among variables in terms of covariation, the Pearson's $r$, especially when $r^2$ is used, is more interpretable than the ordinal statistics such as tau-$b$, or gamma. With $r^2$, the proportion of variance explained can be properly inspected. And this is precisely one of the things this study does.

Pearson's $r$ assumes that there is a definite interval between cases scored on individual variables. Using $r$ for ordinal data thus involves some error, because the true intervals (differences) may actually be greater or smaller than the scored intervals.

Partial correlations were computed between some variables. Efficacy and participation were correlated, while controlling on trust.
It was necessary to control for trust in order to make certain that efficacy has a strong direct effect on participation. The partial correlation coefficients resulting from the use of the subprogram "Partial Corr" will be presented.

Frequencies, means, and percentages are severally reported to concretize pertinent data. Many helpful tables and matrices are also presented at several points to make the analysis more understandable.

Summary

An attempt was made in this chapter to come to grips with recent developments in international relations literature, especially in the decade of the 1970s, out of which evolved the focus on transnational relations, and on the individual's ability to responsibly take part in the solution of the transnational problems affecting his daily life. But this was not until we had briefly revisited the historical foundations of the traditional, "billiard ball" paradigm, exposing it as a paradigm which has for centuries mystified the state, and in so doing blindfolded intellectuals and practitioners alike, thereby inhibiting mankind's intellectual and social global intercourse, by tightly strapping most of humanity to the state-centric mental straightjacket.

Hundreds of years have found the human society deeply emmeshed within the traditional, billiard ball image of international relations. Mankind has thus been taught, over a lengthy period of time, that individuals are not to participate in solving global problems affecting
them. Citizens of our world have, consequently, learned to think of
themselves as powerless, not competent, and incapable in terms of
addressing matters which intrude into their own lives.

The transnational school has emerged to establish a skeptical
regard for nation-states viewed in terms of the billiard balls. Quantum
evidence from scholars of this school indicates an unwillingness to
accept the nation-state as the model for global interactional
analysis. Of these scholars, Alger's work towers most revealingly,
expressing a positive unequivocal belief in the capacities of the
various human collectivities (villages, communities, cities, provinces,
regions, formal and informal associations), and individuals, to provide
the creative impetus needed for solving most of humanity's aching
problems. This needed impetus must be based, however, on what Carole
Pateman calls "democratic participation;" or on what Alger describes as
"responsible participation."

Participation, as described by these scholars, must start from the
local. Local environments are the training grounds for the necessary
participation. Responsible participation requires that "consciousness"
(Paulo Freire's term) be generated. Consciousness, as Alger would say,
enables an individual to self-evaluate his actions (or his
participation) in the light of his personal preferences; it also leads
to what Pateman calls efficacy, which is a prerequisite for
participation. Efficacy infuses a sense of democratic belonging, and is
characterized by a pervasive feeling of ability, self-confidence, and
self-effectiveness. The suggestion thus is that a conscious,
Efficacious individual will not only participate in societal problem solving matters; but he will also be more likely to participate with other societal actors in whom he has trust, and with whom he perceives as sharing similar preferences.

This is the intellectual background based upon which this study offers the model for enhancing participation displayed in Diagram 1.2. Consciousness, however, can be generated only if there is a mobilizer operating within the locality. The mobilizer raises the people's consciousness, which triggers efficacy, and which in turn, leads on to participation.

Literature copiously suggests that voluntary organizations are mobilizers. Besides, they predominantly operate at the local level; they establish what has been called "grassroots" networks of consciousness and support. Moreover, they emphasize participation; voluntary organizations cannot exist without people's endorsement and participation in their activities. These qualities of VOs have been well documented by such scholars as Schultz; Cull and Hardy; and Lissner. The framework for analyzing the activities of VOs which appear as Diagram 1.3, and the variables and hypotheses illustrated in Diagram 1.4 are founded on this corpus of knowledge.

Finally, this chapter summarizes the strategy of inquiry adopted by this study. It is hoped that the summary will make for an easier reading, appreciation, and understanding of this entire study, especially the chapters that are yet to follow.
Chapter 2

STUDYING FIVE LOCAL TRANSNATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Introduction

Plans to undertake this study in the context of local voluntary organizations first took roots three years ago. It dawned on me while attending a 1979 March seminar by Professor C. F. Alger, that quite a number of studies have been done on voluntary organizations (VOs) in today's global system. But I was also quick to discover that most of these studies often focus, however, on functional and typological descriptions of VOs. As a result, only very few have been concerned with the interests and activities of these organizations. And when they do, these studies have mainly focused on the more macro-leveled national and international activities of the voluntary agencies.

In his studies, for example, Sommer (1977) mainly looks at United States VOs which are actively involved in Third World development issues. David Horton Smith and his colleagues (1978), on their own part, further probe the role of national VOs in problems of international development. Then came the work of Jørgen Lissner, a Danish scholar, introducing a highly insightful twist to the study of VO
activities. He systematically approaches the study of VOs by directing attention toward the (political) role of voluntary agencies "at home." By this orientation, however, he only suggested that the international activities of VOs would best be understood through the exploration of the national political roles of VOs in their home countries (see, e.g., Lissner, 1977). Lissner's, like most other studies before his, had thus fallen victim to the same macro-channelled, "onion-bulb"-modeled, national ---> international inquiry emphases. His own emphasis was primarily national.

But what about the local, "home" emphasis, that has been avoided for so long? Does it mean that VOs are nonentities at the local grassroots level? Or is it that the service orientation activities of the VOs do not extend to people in various home localities, who may wish to do something about some transnational problems, by calling upon the agency functions of the VO?

The bid to address these questions immersed me into my first systematic VO research. I set out to acquaint myself with the local VO population in the Columbus area, and later, focused particular attention on those local VOs with international activity interests.

As this first exposure to the workings of local transnational voluntary agency activity flourished, I came in contact with many VO personnel, most of whom I had the privilege to interview several times --on the phone, in person, informally, and in formal settings. Besides, I was able to maintain personal correspondence with a handful of the local VO leaders and staff.
During this initial exposure, I paid particular attention to exploring the activities of four VOs: the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA), the Ohio CWS/CROP, the Columbus Area International Program (CAIP), and CARE. Not only was my understanding of these VOs enriched by this initial research and the March, 1979 seminar, but in addition, I also became aware of the Columbus in the World (CITW) project of the Mershon Center for Research, The Ohio State University, headed by C. F. Alger.

Luckily, the CITW was itself involved in an on-going study of the activities of local VOs. Two empirical data sets had already been collected at that time, for 1974 and 1978, by the CITW researchers. I had the good fortune of being allowed access to this data base (by C. F. Alger, head of the CITW project), even though the data had not been completely analyzed and reported.

In June 1979, I officially became a member of the CITW research team for six months—and have continued to be both "unofficially" and "officially" associated with the team ever since. For me this meant more interactions with local VO leaders, staff, and supporters. At the same time, it acquainted me with several other pioneers in this vein of inquiry. Besides, it greatly expands the pool of quantitative (and qualitative) data bases that may prove helpful in the course of the present study, especially in this chapter. Nevertheless, it needs to be noted that the main body, and hypotheses of the present study—e.g., as reported and analyzed in Chapter 3 onwards—are primarily based on empirical data specifically generated for the purpose of this study.
The following sections will start by defining the Columbus area, exploring and identifying the VO population in this locale. The few VOs on which this study focuses, and how they were selected will next be presented. Further, a word is said about what it took to successfully select and work with the various voluntary agencies. Finally, a profile of each of the five VOs being particularly studied is offered.

Voluntary Organizations in the Columbus Local Area

The Columbus community area, the locality on which this study focuses, is located in central Ohio, U.S.A. It is made up of the tracts of human settlement generally described as the Franklin County and District, the Mid-Ohio area, or as the Columbus Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

According to the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce (1974), metropolitan Columbus boasts of some 1.1 million inhabitants, and contains the 18th largest of the 3,141 counties in the United States: the Franklin County, which has a population of .9 million. Kropke (1975) reports that 66,000 or 6% of this community are of foreign stock, being either foreign-born, or having at least one foreign-born parent. This perhaps may partly explain why the Columbus area is sprawling with international interactions involving various kinds of issues ranging from the purely political, to the socio-economic and cultural.

Not only is the area a densely populated, international activity hub, it also contains a tremendous concentration of local-based voluntary organizations. The Columbus Public Library's Reference
Department maintains a list of 1,500 VOs in Franklin County and District. This VO population has since provided a sampling base not only for my predecessors and colleagues at the CITW, but also for this study.

Donald Cataldi, Leslie E. Stansbery, and other researchers at the CITW sent mail questionnaires to each of these 1,500 VOs in the Spring of 1974. The questionnaires were designed to assess the international interest and activity of the local voluntary sector. Returned questionnaires numbered 161, effecting an 11% rate of return.

Table 2.1 reveals that slightly more than one-half of the respondent local VOs indicated that international affairs were important to their organization, while approximately one of every three responding VOs were actually engaged in some international activity, such as sponsoring discussion groups on world problems (e.g., hunger), or sending/receiving services, money, goods, or information to or from any overseas destination. This overall high rate of international involvement is hardly surprising since the rate of return was probably higher from those VOs which were more active internationally than from those that were not. At the same time, only 18.6% (i.e., about one of every five) of the VOs reported having links to international organizations. This is a clear indication that most of the local VOs that engage in international activities (or, for that matter, any other local actors interested in international activity) do not need to have other international "centers," far removed from the locale, through which they must operate, in order to effectively pursue their own international preferences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total VOs</th>
<th>161</th>
<th>% of Total VOs</th>
<th>% of VOs Reporting International Affairs Important to Their Organization</th>
<th>% of VOs Reporting International Activity</th>
<th>% of VOs Reporting IO Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOs Reporting International Affairs Important to Their Organization</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOs Reporting International Activity</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOs Reporting International Organization (IO) Links</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOs Reporting 20% or More Time Devoted to International Activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 To this point each category is a subset of the one prior to it. The subset of organizations reporting IO links includes 4 of 6 organizations spending 20% or more time for international activity.
2 International activity includes the sending or receiving of any money, goods, services or information to or from an overseas destination. It also includes any local activity that has a self-conscious international emphasis, such as sponsoring discussion groups on world hunger.
3 There are two ways a VO may be linked to an international organization. A VO may be an affiliate or member of an IO, or a VO may communicate or cooperate with an IO. Both INGOs and IOs are included as IOs.
4 In response to the question, "How important are international activities to your organization?" 66 VOs reported little/somewhat, 18 reported fairly/extremely for a total of 84.
5 Four VOs incorrectly reported links with IOs. Actual number of VOs having IO links is therefore 26.

Source: Janice Love and Stephen Saunders, "The International Involvement of Local Voluntary Organizations", (Columbus: CITW, Mershon Center), June 1979:7.
A complementary data gathering exercise followed in the Spring of 1978. In a joint venture between the CITW and the International Council of Mid-Ohio, Janice Love and Stephen Saunders (both members of the CITW team) conducted another local VO survey. This time, the number of VOs were narrowed down to only 57 (of the original 161) identified as exhibiting higher levels of international involvement, especially because the earlier 1974 data indicate that only 6 of the 161 VOs (i.e., approximately one of every 27; or 3.7% of the VOs) reported spending 20% or more of their time on international activities (see Table 2.1).

The 57 VOs were surveyed by phone interviews in the 1978 data collection exercise. Surveys were structured, with a few open-ended items. The intent of the survey was to discover the international areas, activities, issues, or problems on which Mid-Ohio VOs are involved.

Forty-six of the VOs, or 81% of them, responded to the structured interviews. Most of these VOs showed their activity focuses to have been dominated by five major activity areas. Figure 2.1 illustrates this by showing these preferred activities in a descending order of magnitude of involvement. These activities include: 1) efforts of providing educational opportunities about international affairs, 2) the provision of intercultural exchange opportunities, 3) providing long-term economic, social or technical assistance, 4) attempting to influence policies locally, nationally, in states/provinces, and in foreign countries; and 5) the provision of emergency relief.
The Major Activity Areas

19 Educational Activities
9 Intercultural Exchange
8 Long-term Assistance
4 Policy Influence
2 Emergency Relief

Figure 2.1: The Major International Activities of VOs in the Columbus Area

Source: Compiled from the Mershon Center, Columbus in the World Project, 1978 Survey Data.
These major activity concentration areas were, however, only a part of some identified broad issue or problem preference areas being addressed by the local VOs. These general problem/issue groups, and the various Columbus VOs addressing them have been since updated (e.g., in 1979; and in 1980) through follow-up phone contacts with VO officials, by several members of the CITW research project, including this author. The most recent data update is contained in the Directory of Voluntary Organizations in Mid-Ohio With International Concerns, prepared by Steve Saunders in May, 1980.

This study is largely based on this updated data as its take-off point. Table 2.2 shows that at the present, there are 55 VOs in the Columbus area with known "international" concerns. The order in which they are presented is simply alphabetical.

Table 2.3 portrays the problems/issues with which these VOs are concerned. A closer look reveals that these problems are social, political, economic, cultural, and even strategic in nature. None of these problems is confined to only a particular country or society in the world. Neither does any of the problems confine itself to only some particular countries in the globe. They are not problems which affect only national governments. Hunger, starvation, natural disaster, and cultural shock directly affect people, not national governments, even though governments may be indirectly affected. Self-helplessness, decayed or polluted uninhabitable environment, diseases, nuclear radiation, poorer pay for women, "refugeeism", child abuse, racism, illiteracy: all are complex, often intertwined problems which directly
Table 2.2: Voluntary Organizations in the Columbus Area With Known "International" Concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Altrusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>American Association of University Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>American Field Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>American Scandinavian Student Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Amnesty International, USA-Group 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>Bread for the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td>CARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>Central Ohio Council for International Visitors (COCIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Central Ohio Women's Division of Project HOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Church Women United</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Church World Service/CROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Columbus Area International Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Columbus Campaign for Arms Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Columbus Central YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Columbus Committee for the Japan International Christian University Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Columbus Diocesan Council of Catholic Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Columbus Infant Formula Action Coalition (INFAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Columbus Literacy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Columbus Rotary Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Columbus Soroptimists International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Diocese of Columbus Migration and Refugee Resettlement Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Hunger Task Force of Columbus and Franklin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>IndoChinese Mental Health Training Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>International Christian Youth Exchange (ICYE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>International Concerns Task Force of the Ohio Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>International Council of Mid-Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>International Field Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>International Four-H Youth Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>International School Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>International Students Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Junior League of Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>League of Women Voters of Metropolitan Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>National Water Well Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>99's Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Ohio Grain, Feed and Fertilizer Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Ohio Migration and Refugee Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Ohio State University International Wives Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Pacific Educational and Cultural Exchange (PEACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Pilot Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood of Central Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Quota Club of Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Refugee Services of the Ohio Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Transcendental Meditation TM-Siddhi Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>United Nations Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>(The) U.S. Trotting Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>University Women's Club of The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Women's American ORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>World Neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>World's Christian Endeavor Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Youth for Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Zonta International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from the International Council of Mid-Ohio, "Directory of Voluntary Organizations in Mid-Ohio With International Concerns." Columbus: CITW, Mershon Center for Research, May 1980.
Table 2.3: International Problem Emphases of the Columbus Area VOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL ISSUE GROUP</th>
<th>SPECIFIC ISSUES</th>
<th>NO. OF VOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Human Needs</td>
<td>World Hunger</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Supplies Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deaf and Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Understanding and Exchange</td>
<td>Cultural Understanding Without Exchange</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Understanding and Exchange</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Exchange</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Adaptation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Economic Problems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-help</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Supply in Developing Countries</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overpopulation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law of the Sea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability of Multinational Corporations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illiteracy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade and Vocational Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Grants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Resettlement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Services</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade/Business</td>
<td>Trade Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grain Exports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability of Multinational Corporations</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace ..................................................</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms Control (including Disarmament) ..........</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-Building ....................................</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and War ......................................</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Goodwill ................................</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill and Understanding .....................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Harmony .....................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Areas of the World ..................</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa ...............................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan ..................................................</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East ........................................</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil ................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia ........................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indochina ..........................................</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada ..............................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia ....................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Issues ........................................</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations ....................................</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equine Health ......................................</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;All&quot; Issues .......................................</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Compiled from the International Council of Mid-Ohio, "Directory of Voluntary Organizations in Mid-Ohio", (Columbus: CITW), May 1980; International Council of Mid-Ohio and Columbus in the World, "International Activity of Mid-Ohio Voluntary Organizations", (Columbus: CITW, Mershon Center), 1979.
affect individuals, people or human communities. They are not restricted to only particular countries. Rather, they cut across nations and nationalities. A volcanic eruption in the Republic of Cameroon (e.g., by the volcano, Mt. Cameroun) may devastate not only parts of that country, but also a large portion of the eastern part of Nigeria. The Nigeria-Cameroons disaster areas, if petroleum producing, and if not rehabilitated and reconstructed, may not be able to continue its export of oil to the United States. The Columbus resident may be forced to pay skyrocketing gas prices until the disaster area is reconstructed. The needed reconstruction may not be completed in prime time, or within the foreseeable future, if appropriate technical assistance (e.g., equipment, skilled manpower, medical supplies) is not received from some external sources. Columbus and its people may be one of these sources. The "distant" Nigeria-Cameroon local communities would be the thankful direct beneficiaries, with otherwise extended layoffs, starvation, homelessness, illnesses, and other dehumanizing experiences avoided. Similarly, nuclear explosions in a small county in the province of Manitoba, whether they occur by some accident or by design, may not only devastate all Canada, but may also completely erase Columbus and its peoples from the face of the earth. In the event of any such frightful occurrence, the poor farmers of Katowice (in Poland) may starve to death because the food packages made available to them by the people of Columbus through the local CARE would cease to come. The local textile workers of Punjab (in India), or Tientsin (in China) may also brace themselves for starvation and possible death, because the small communities of the Great Plains of Canada and the agricultural
Columbus area which heretofore produced a bulk of the grains exported to them no longer exist, having been wiped out by nuclear radiation. Such are the complex and enmeshed natures of the problems which the Columbus VOs address. Such are human settlements and their inhabiting populations interconnected..., and made interdependent with one another by intertwining human problems. The problems are not only intertwined, but also, they tremendously transcend national boundaries. They are transnational. The local Columbus VOs concerned with them are thus involved in transnational problem solving. These local VOs are therefore transnational.

Appendix 1A identifies each of the voluntary agencies with its problem/issue preferences. The "reference number" in Appendix A refers to the number by which each VO is listed in Table 2.2. The numbers identify each VO with the problems or issues with which it is concerned. The appendix also shows that at times several VOs may have the same problem preferences. The magnitude of commitment to addressing the problems nevertheless vary from one VO to another.

Selecting the Sample of Voluntary Organizations

A quite diversified array of organizations currently exists in the Columbus area. This can be seen by a casual perusal of Table 2.2. It has already been noted that this table perhaps reflects only a small number of transnational voluntary agencies in Columbus. The 1974 CITW survey data indicate that there are, at least, 161 VOs that can be studied in the Franklin County and district.
Some of these organizations, however, are like the All World City, an organization floated about five to seven years ago, but which has not as yet taken off the ground. Besides, its initial founding membership of 20 individuals is losing in strength rather than gaining. Organizations as this can be described as being "neophytes", and as transpiring in a state of limbo.

It is necessary that such organizations be avoided in an empirical study. Simply, there may be no data to collect. Moreover, the data so collected, if any, are likely to be grossly unrepresentative. Furthermore, VO rank and file (and rank and file data) would be miserably lacking.

There is thus the need to emphasize viable organizations. That is, the VO must be, for all practical purposes, actually operating—-and not just in a state of limbo, still "counting down," and hopelessly suffering from the infantile weaknesses of neophyte organizations. In addition, the VO must also have a good pool of supporters. The higher the VO membership, the more likelihood there is for getting representative study results.

These two qualifications (i.e., organizational viability; and a sizeable membership) helped guide the selection of the VO sample on which this study focuses. An attempt was made to seek out VOs boasting of at least 300 or more members.

There were also two other qualifications which helped to guide the selection of the VO sample. First of these is the VO's willingness to take part in the study. An empirical inquiry cannot take place in the
absence of cooperation from the subjects. This is even more true of social research, especially where the study involves looking at the behaviors of a large number of human subjects. In this vein, the present investigation could not have been possible in the absence of cooperation from VO leaders. VOs were sought out, whose leadership, personnel and staff were willing to have their organizations studied.

Not only is there a diversity of VOs in the Columbus area as Table 2.2 shows, but there is also a diversified activity focus among these organizations. Table 2.3 has already displayed these numerous problem or issue areas with which the local VOs are concerned. Appendix 1A further shows that although there are several different activity thrust with which any VO may be concerned, several VOs may actually be addressing the same problems or issues. For the sake of discovering some patterns which may only be possible by comparing organizations with slightly varied activity thrusts, it is insightful to avoid studying only agencies concerned with the same, single, issue area. Attempt was therefore made to select VOs with different (or, at least, not completely the same) problem area preferences. Chosing VOs with varied activity preferences (as much as possible) was thus the last of the qualifications that guided the selection of the local VO sample.

In sum, four criteria guided the selection of the VOs on which this study particularly emphasizes: activity scope/problem area preference; willingness to take part in the study; viability; and membership size.

The actual selection of the specific VOs was indeed not a particularly simple and short process. It was a rather long process
that practically evolved with the entire investigation, and lasted up until almost the mid-part of the data collection exercise.

The selection process itself considerably reflects the central tenets of this study. Starting from the earliest days of its inception, this investigation has been critically sensitive to the need for a local emphasis. Local people ought to be helped to improve their individual competence in addressing societal problems. At the same time, most of the few local professionals already involved in this mighty task are often themselves not with any help, being forsaken by scholars -- the so-called social reformers -- and are thus left to wade through the murky waters of trial, error, and ignorance.

In a bid to propel this study from the standpoint of what might be helpful not only to academia, but also to local practitioners, it was decided that local VO professionals would be brought into its very formative stages. Opinions would then be sought from them regarding what questions would be best to focus on within the context of the author's participation interests. It was realized, of course, that the kind of opinion inputs being solicited would be highly varied, and perhaps even at cross-angles, if obtained from different VO professionals. Yet it was also certain that various VO professionals could be irreparably alienated from the entire study if they felt that their own questions of interest were not among the particular ones chosen for exploration. Nevertheless, it would be humanly impossible to investigate the thousand and one empirical questions likely to be so generated by the various independent VO persons in just a single dissertation research. Consensus of opinions was thus called for.
Decision making literature amply suggests that the easiest and fastest way to generate consensus among a collection of individuals is to congregate them into a discussion group (see, e.g., Janis, 1972; Janis and Mann, 1977). Besides, discussion groups are excellent venues for brainstorming and idea generation. It was therefore necessary to invite a handful of VO professionals to a "round table", conference-type discussion session. The session would also serve as a get-acquainted meeting, especially for me, since I had never personally met with some of the VO leaders that were to be invited.

By March 1981, I was able to identify and select nine local VOs presumed to be viable (active) from available CITW data, as listed in Table 2.2. These VOs include Bread for the World (07); CARE (08); Central Ohio Women's Division of Project HOPE (10); Church World Service/Ohio CROP (12); Columbus Area International Program [CAIP] (14); Columbus Infant Formula Action Coalition [INFACT] (19); Diocese of Columbus Migration and Refugee Resettlement Service/Catholic Relief Services (23); UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus (47); and World Neighbors (52). The numbers in parentheses correspond to the numbers by which the VOs are each identified in Table 2.2. They are also the same as the reference numbers which identify the VOs in Appendix 1A.

An attempt was made to ensure that each of the nine VOs shows preference for at least one problem area with which none of the other agencies is primarily identified. This can be readily observed from Table 2.4. At least the first "specific issue" listed under the "preference" column of any of the VOs appears only for the particular
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.*</th>
<th>Name of VO</th>
<th>Specific Issue Area Preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Bread for the World</td>
<td>- Trade Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Grain Exports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MNC Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Arms Control &amp; Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE)</td>
<td>- Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Disaster Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Socioeconomic Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Africa; Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Indochina; Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Central Ohio Women's Division of Project HOPE</td>
<td>- Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Medical Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Church World Service/CROP</td>
<td>- World Hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Columbus Area International Program (CAIP)</td>
<td>- Cultural Understanding and Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Columbus Infant Formula Action Coalition (INFACT)</td>
<td>- Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Diocese of Columbus Migration and Refugee Resettlement Service/Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>- Refugee Resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Refugee Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus</td>
<td>- Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Self-help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overpopulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>World Neighbors</td>
<td>- Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Self-help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Supply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These numbers correspond to those found in Table 2.2, and in Appendix 1A.
agency. This is not to say, however, that each of the VOs only prefers to be concerned with the specific problem areas listed under it in Table 2.4. As a matter of fact, several of the VOs have been known to be similarly interested in the same issue areas. Appendix 1A, for example, reveals that not only is CARE concerned with disaster relief (as Table 2.4 indicates). But besides CARE, Bread for the World, CROP, and UNICEF also have disaster relief programs. Also, Catholic Relief Services does indeed have disaster relief programs even though neither Table 2.4, nor Appendix 1A depicts that. Similar cross-cutting issue preference patterns have also been identified in Appendix 1A. What Table 2.4 does is show that each of the nine VOs has at least a problem area in which it alone mainly prefers to operate.

Since I was not personally acquainted with many of the leaders of the nine VOs, it was necessary that I be first "introduced" to them in order to capture their attention, and thereafter establish a working relationship with them. Professor C. F. Alger, who was more acquainted with the local VO professionals, offered to help me break the ice, first through letters of introduction, and secondly by personal introductions during the planned get-acquainted, brainstorming, discussion session.

I scheduled the meeting for April 21, 1981. Alger's "letter of introduction" was actually a memorandum which invited representatives of each of the nine VOs to a discussion session with me (see Appendix 2A). It was addressed to the Directors of each of the VOs.
This initial meeting, the meeting of April 21, was however cancelled due to insufficient interest. Five of the VO Directors (CAIP, INFACT, UNICEF, World Neighbors, and Project HOPE) clearly indicated that they could not attend. Many of the VO Directors did not even respond to this initial memo; they had to be called to ascertain whether or not they intended to honor the invitation. Not only did one of the five Directors (Project HOPE) not get back to us, but also she was absolutely impossible to reach. The other four VO Directors (CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Bread for the World, and CROP) expressed their interest to attend. But even two of these (CROP, and Bread for the World), although interested, genuinely preferred a rescheduling.

A second meeting was scheduled following the cancellation of the first one. The date was set for May 8, 1981. After several phone calls, I discovered that neither myself, nor Alger's secretary, could ever get in touch with the Director of Project HOPE. The Directors of INFACT and World Neighbors continued to show a lack of interest; they could not attend the rescheduled meeting.

The remaining six VO Directors, (Bread for the World, CARE, CROP, Catholic Relief Services, UNICEF, and CAIP) all expressed their intentions to attend. Only three of these (CARE, CROP, and Catholic Relief Services) were actually present at the meeting. The others were absent.

Nevertheless, the meeting accomplished what it was meant to do, inasmuch as it helped to crystallize a central thrust of this study. It
was the attending Directors' consensus that a study be designed to help them search out what "turns" people "on" or "off" in terms of participating in organizational problem solving activities.

I made sure that the product of the meeting was conveyed to the three VO Directors (UNICEF, Bread for the World, and CAIP) who did not attend, although they had expressed their interest and willingness to be present. So, while I sent a brief letter of thanks to the three VO leaders that were present at the meeting (See Appendix 2B), I also sent a longer correspondence to each of the other three who were interested but could not attend, briefly informing them of what was decided in their absence (see Appendix 2C). Excepting the Bread for the World, these VOs whose Directors were interested in attending the rescheduled meeting are the selected VO sample on which this study focuses particularly. These include CARE, CROP, CAIP, Catholic Relief Services, and UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus. Bread for the World was dropped from selection because its contact persons became immensely difficult to get hold of during the instrument construction and final data collection stages of the research.

If we refer back to Table 2.4, it is to be observed that the five organizations which constitute this study's select VO sample (CARE, CROP, CAIP, Catholic Relief Services, UNICEF) are, overall, representative of the various issue area preferences with which local VOs are concerned. Again, the only exception is in the Arms Control, United Nations, MNC accountability, trade and grain exports issue areas, in which Bread for the World shows particular activity preferences.
In terms of membership strengths, none of these five organizations maintains any less than 500 supporters in the local Columbus area. Table 2.5 presents the current figures. It should be noted from the footnotes to Table 2.5 that some of the figures are approximations obtained from the respective VO personnel and staff. Some others, also, are very conservative estimates which I made to discount for the name duplications, and other filing inconsistencies which I detected in some VO supporter name files. Overall, however, none of the VOs had less than 500 names on their membership/supporter list. On the other hand, it is more likely that some of the VOs have many more supporters than the figures which I present in Table 2.5. For example, even though I estimate the number of supporters of the UNICEF Committee of greater Columbus at only 3,000, this particular VO maintains three separate sets of activity-supporter lists, containing a total of 6,000 names.
Table 2.5: Membership/Supporter Strengths of the Five Selected VO Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Name of VO</th>
<th>Number of Members/Supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CROP</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CAIP</td>
<td>515c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>500d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>3,000e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a These numbers correspond to those which identify these organization in Table 2.2, in Appendix 1A, and in Table 2.4.

b The total number of supporters or members listed for each of the VOs under this column may be approximated figures as indicated by the various VO personnel and staff. The following notes help to clarify this.

c This membership strength for CAIP is made up of some 48 Board Members, 288 past and present Host Families, and 179 other persons who are Paid Members for the current year.

d This figure was given to me by the Director of the Diocese's Catholic Relief Services/Office of Social Development. It is an approximation. I had no direct access to their Supporter files. Some VOs strictly do not disclose names of their members to outsiders. But because questionnaires were mailed to 500 of the VO's known supporters, I have reason to presume that Catholic Relief Services has, at least, more than 500 supporters.

e The supporter files of the UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus contains 1,000; 3,500; and 1,500 names of persons who support their "tea", "card/brochure", and "halloween" activities, respectively. Because UNICEF's filing system is rather deplorable, I conservatively estimate their total supporter strength at only 3,000. This estimate discounts for name duplications and other filing inconsistencies that I detected.
Capturing and Maintaining the Interest of the VO Leadership, Personnel and Staff

For a researcher, the key to a successful working relationship with any organization lies in the ability to capture and maintain the interest of the organization's leadership, personnel and staff. The local VOs are not exempt to this maxim, especially because they are themselves the laboratories of experience within which I was sensitized to this rule. Indeed, a successful attempt at studying a local VO requires that the interest of local VO leadership, personnel and staff be stimulated and maintained. These VO officials are usually the contact persons for the VOs with which they are associated. They are often the only clique of persons associated with the VO, who are also in constant contact with the VO membership, supporters, and the public at large. They are often professionals in their own right, and highly knowledgeable in what they do. Thus, they not only represent an invaluable link between the researcher and the VOs rank and file, but also, they embody a formidably invaluable source of learning for any researcher intent on discovering the actual workings of voluntary agency activities.

Stimulating and maintaining the interest of this group of individuals requires that they be made to see themselves and their organizations as important parts of the study. This involves making them see the helpfulness of the study to themselves and their VOs. A prerequisite for this is making them feel that they and their supporters are not mere experimental guinea pigs, and that their agency is not just
"one other" scientific laboratory heartlessly subjected to the empirical whims of yet another intellectual goat-head.

These people should be made to feel that they are invaluable and significant parties to the study, being seen as the study's honored subjects, and are not looked upon as unimportant objects of the endeavor. They should be subtly reminded, or at least encouraged, to feel that they themselves are competent local policy makers; that they are decision making problem solvers based in our local community.

One might perhaps wonder why it would be necessary to enable these VO professionals to relish some sense of competence while they work with the researcher. The author must admit that he was quite intrigued himself, in this particular regard, by some of the experiences he had during the course of this investigation. In one case, he had been consulting with a VO leader for almost four months. During this period, she (the VO leader) had half-heartedly critiqued the research questions and data collection instruments, and also helped to reconstruct some of them. As far as the author could tell, she was not lacking in enthusiasm about the study, especially starting from one day when she told him in confidence that she would no longer hold back from helping him to complete the study. According to her, she would thenceforth do everything within her power to help facilitate the on-going research. Yet, the author never ceased to detect spectres of hesitance and half-heartedness in her demeanor toward the entire research, especially when some immediate actions by her were called for. He could not tell why. Could it be that she was still uncomfortable about certain aspects of
the study? Perhaps so. A definite possibility, except that it was almost their fourth month of working together, and most of their conceptual differences had already been resolved, as would be expected.

What then was the source of her apparent leary feelings? The author was not very certain, until after he and the VO leader had both literally constructed the membership questionnaire and it was time to mail out the survey instrument to the VO's rank and file. Then the bomb dropped. She could not let him do it..., because she would not do it. Like most researchers would, the author paused and then begged for an answer to the "why" question. Her answer was simple. She was not sure that she could encourage or commission a study designed to improve her VO's operating strategies even though it would cost her agency practically nothing. She did not think she could do it. She had to pigeon-hole the final survey instrument (which she had encouraged, helped design and construct) for almost three weeks until she had convened the VO's Board meeting.

The truth, however, was that until last year this individual was the VO's Director, a position she had held for about seven or more years. Besides, she was still the overall Manager of the local VO's executive staff. At the same time, she was also the Vice Chairman of the VO. The author therefore had a hunch that if she did not know what to do; that if she felt that she could not do anything—that every other person in her local VO would feel exactly the same way, because she was, without question, the most experienced and most respected of them all.
The author's hunch was definitely right. Neither the VO leader, nor her other colleagues (i.e., not even the local VO's "Board") felt that they were well equipped and able to do something. The local VO's file on the study, which was already in progress, had to be referred to the Director of Field Services at the VO's National Office, before the local office could start mailing out the already prepared questionnaires. By this time the author was beginning to grow very impatient. However, he waited for about two more weeks to elapse before he telephoned the VO's National Office and spoke with the Director of Field Services. The answer he received was not at all surprising. The local VO leadership did not have to refer the matter to the national office. It lay within the jurisdiction of the local VO leadership, particularly the overall Manager of the local VO's executive staff, to make decisions geared toward improved local operations. The national office could not do that for the local VO. Finally, the National Director of Field Services apologized for the five week delay that had ensued; but she was also quick to remind the author that he was working with dutiful professionals who, nevertheless, have a grossly false sense of incompetence.

The author could not have assessed the entire episode any better. This is definitely one of those manifest instances of how the national intellectual straightjacket inhibits effective problem solving at the local level. It further indicates that some of those we see as knowledgeable, respectable local professionals often nurture feelings of incompetence which may make it rather difficult for even a researcher to
strike a good working relationship with them. Subtle suggestions from the researcher, that the research activity lies within the spheres of what the professional is capable of doing, may indeed help. One tool used by this study was to frequently suggest to the particular VO professional (when existing situations truly warranted) that the same thing had just been done (or, was being done or seriously being considered) by some of his compatriots in some other organizations.

Eliciting and maintaining the VO professional's interest seems to be the surest way of getting the necessary cooperation from the VO, which the researcher needs. This is not, at all, a simple task to accomplish. Inviting a group of the professionals to a brainstorming, get-acquainted discussion session, as was done in this study, is definitely a helpful beginning. It makes the local professionals feel that their ideas are being valued; that they are being recognized as part of the local "significant others;" and that they perhaps have a substantial stake in the study being done—since parts of the study, if not all of it, would focus on the research questions which they themselves helped to generate. These good feelings toward the study may elicit in them some degree of commitment to helping the researcher.

But this is just one good step in the right direction. It must be followed through, and a series of innovative researcher initiatives should be invoked. A ready illustration comes to my mind. Even after the brainstorming group meeting had been held and a set of empirical questions already agreed to by consensus, I was utterly dismayed to discover that one of the VO leaders had gone on to convince herself that
it was absolute absurdity to think of studying her organization with the others in the selected sample. Her reasoning was simple. In her eyes, her organization was the only "nongovernmental," and "voluntary" organization in the selected group. It is scarcely refreshing for me to reminisce how I profusely perspired like a mad dog to guide her toward understanding that a "voluntary" organization does not necessarily have to be purely volunteer supported. But even at that, her VO was not altogether volunteer supported. (I did not tell her this at the time --- in order to safeguard my dissertation!) But what I never quite got to, even till this day, is making her see that the other VOs of the sample are all of the "nongovernment" genre. Whether they be CARE, CROP, Catholic Relief Services, UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus, or CAIP: definitely none of these is a governmental entity.

Regardless of her initial absolute, erroneously off-beat, isolationist convictions, I was still able to study the VO leader's organization. I could not have possibly overcome her erroneously off-beat dispositions if I had not followed through on the initial group discussion session to which the VO Directors were invited.

There is, therefore, the need to follow up the initial meeting. I did this through seven different ways: official correspondences, personal meetings, phone conversations, personal correspondences, having the VO professionals take part in the construction of the data collection and measurement instruments used, having the professionals take part in pretesting the instruments, and also having them help administer or supervise the administration of the surveys.
The first formal correspondence which I directly had with the VO professionals was made up of the letter of thanks and the "letter of information" which I sent to those VO Directors who attended or could not attend the meeting of May 8, 1981 (see Appendix 2B, and Appendix 2C). After these initial letters, I determined to invent ways to ensure that I maintain constant touch with this select group of VO people.

An opportunity emerged soon after I started teaching an introductory level international relations course in June 1981. The course was titled "World Problems," which was an excellent coincidence, since it plentifully reflected the thrust of the dissertation research which the local VO leaders had helped me to crystallize. Besides, the content of the course focused a great deal on the kinds of activities with which the local VOs are concerned. I was soon entertaining the idea of inviting the VO leaders to come make lecture presentations to my World Problems class. The official communication that appears as Appendix 3A resulted. I sent this memo to all of the six VOs whose leadership I had started to contact after the meeting of May.

At the same time, I foresaw the positive impression it would make on the VO leadership if I visited them individually to further solicit their independent inputs into the study. So, I first teased out the various questions (that were the consensus during the meeting of the VO leaders) into the skeletal framework of empirical questions which appears in Appendix 3B. This was actually a working draft of the hypotheses before they were cast, recast, and cast again into what they
currently are. With this ready, I first mailed out the memo. Then I
contacted the VO Directors by phone, asking them not only for visits to
my class, but also for personal audiences with me to enable us to
discuss the emerging empirical questions.

All the VOs responded quite well to both requests. Every one of
them came and talked to my class at different times. Some even came
with some other members of their local VO staff and personnel. I also
visited with them all—some after, and some before they came to my
class—depending on what was best for their schedules.

The results of these contacts were highly encouraging. They not
only helped to steam up the working relationship which was already
triggered by the first meeting arrangement, but also, they helped to
establish personal rapport, and personal communication between myself
and the various VO professionals. A look at Exhibit 1 clearly indicates
this.

I realized, however, that I had to keep the momentum going. This
inspired me to maintain very frequent touch with the VOs through several
television calls, formal and informal correspondences, and personal
visits. Where these follow-up contacts were formal (such as the letter
of thanks to the VO leaders for lecturing to my class), I ensured that
they also zeroed in, somehow, onto some aspects of the study (see
Appendix 3C). I also sent each VO Director copies of the various
working drafts of the survey instrument used in this study (see, e.g.,
the letter in Appendix 3D). It was often necessary for me to visit the
VO Director so that we could both sit down and discuss the rationales
Hi Chimezie,

Good seeing you again last Friday! Enjoyed our visit.

I am writing this note to ask if you would arrange for a 16mm projector for my report on CWS/CROP Friday for your class. I don't have one, but I will bring my Kodak slide projector for that part of my presentation. Thanks much. See you Friday.

Yours,

Ted
Ohio CW/CROP
4256 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210
for, and the merits and demerits of the survey items. Several insightful revisions of the survey instrument resulted from this.

Finally, it pleases the local professional a great deal to see the researcher taking part, like every other person, in his organization's activities — or in activities sponsored by his agency. This often makes the local professional feel that the researcher is genuinely interested in a thorough understanding of his VO. It may help diminish the common view of most local professionals that scholars often pretend to be studying them when they are actually using them to prove or disprove some preconceived views they have about the organization, often with the intent to paint the organization black.

I must admit that doing all these were not particularly easy for me. For example, during one organization sponsored walking event, I took part, walked five miles, and ended up unable to stand on my feet for the next four days, being totally muscle-fatigued and muscle-sore. Attempting to elicit and maintain the interest of the leadership, personnel and staff of any organization for the purpose of structuring a good and lasting working relationship with them can thus be a very trying, and often highly painful experience for the researcher. Yet, it often pays well when the needed working relationship, buttressed on steaming organizational enthusiasm is painstakingly maintained.

The researcher may achieve this by seeking out, and using various innovative initiatives geared toward increasing the input of the organization's leadership, personnel and staff into his research program. Such researcher initiatives should also aim at increasing his
formal and informal personal interactions with the organization's representatives. These kinds of interactions often generate unrivaled interest and support from the organization. The tone of the message in Exhibit 2 sent to me by one of the VO Directors reflects this fact. As is reflected by this Exhibit, continued and well-plotted researcher interaction with the organization's managers leads to a time when the organization's professionals, themselves, come to fully appreciate the study's indispensable essence. Besides, it was during some of my many personal contacts with the local VO staff and leadership that I was able to "win back" the Director who, as I have already described, was on the verge of closing her agency's doors to this study because of her invalid, off-beat convictions. This suggests that researcher interactions with the organization's leadership and staff, if adequately planned and executed, may help these professionals to invalidate some of the wrong, self-negating views long held by them -- which may have imprisoned their efficient performances in some aspects of their duties. It is needless to infer that, when organizational professionals are able to interact freely with people in academia, they learn to see us scholars as good-intentioned social reformers. This definitely earns us their confidence, and respect-worthiness. To them we are no longer petty snobs, intellectual SOBs, or heartless academic demagogues, who are out to grab facts for the selfish purpose of dishonestly justifying
September 4, 1981

Chaimie A. B. Gaigweh
Graduate Teaching Associate
Department of Political Science
Ohio State University
223 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Hall
Columbus OH 43210

Dear Chaimie:

I enjoyed our brief meeting yesterday and look forward to seeing you again soon. Thank you for your interest in this particular research. I'm sure that it will be very beneficial to all the organizations with which you are working.

Enclosed is my survey with suggested changes. They are simply to eliminate a small degree of awkwardness and make the survey read a little more smoothly. As I said on the first page, I do not feel strongly about any of the changes with the exception of the CARE program changes.

Thanks again for your interest and your sincere and dedicated attempts at accuracy and effectiveness.

Sincerely,

Jane Austin Patrick
Ohio-Kentucky Director

JAP/aca
Encl.

"HELPING PEOPLE HELP THEMSELVES"
our misconceived, unrealistically-founded theories. Instead, they
learn to see us as humane individuals genuinely spurred by our innate
desires to learn more about humanity, for the purpose of bettering
certain aspects of our universe. (I must admit, though, that some of
us scholars are intellectual bastards who glory in the pursuit of
academia just for its own sake, and thus, at the expense of society and
its practicing local community professionals. Once in awhile
researchers should beware not to allow their scholarly ventures, qua
academia, to obliterate their paramount societal duties of serving their
communities and society at large as responsible social reformers—as
people who should work more closely with local professionals to help
them discover where the local system aches and how, if possible, to cure
the malady. Good agency-researcher interaction is not a bad way to
start).

Apart from all these, good researcher-agency interactions
additionally offer the researcher immeasurable opportunities for
self-development. Not only are the organization's professionals sources
of learning for the researcher, but they are also learning resources, in

1One organization official once wrote me in September 1979: "The
feeling I initially had was that you were not seeking an objective
explanation of my Agency's work, but that you wanted to fit it into some
hypotheses or preconceptions you had before I was asked to present our
cause." I am quite pleased that this professional no longer has any
qualms whatsoever about working with me, thanks to my philosophy of
researcher-agency staff interaction. Today, an organization of which he
is the Director is one of the five which this study specifically
investigates.
themselves, given the wealth of experience and knowledge they amass over time in terms of the organization's operations. Besides, most leadership and staff of organizations are people who had branched off from being academic scholars to being practitioners in non-academic settings. This unique combination of occupational experience, plus possible prior academic training, often gives the agency professional an uncommon ability to offer suggestions that may be very insightful to the researcher. The letters presented in Appendices 3E, 3F, 3G, and 3H show that I did not deny myself the resourcefulness of these individuals. Quite to the contrary. The researcher is not, of course, bound to accept any suggestions made by these agency people. But these Appendices (Appendix 3E; Appendix 3F; Appendix 3G; Appendix 3H) clearly indicate that some of the VO professionals were quite capable of critiquing some aspects of this study with the kind of merciless, albeit very helpful, astuteness which researchers traditionally expect only from their academic colleagues. I found these kinds of researcher-organization interactions to be highly rewarding.

Profiles of the Selected Sample of Voluntary Organizations

This chapter has so far located the Columbus area as the laboratory of focus; explored the teeming voluntary activities and voluntary organizations in Columbus; discovered that most of these activities and organizations are indeed transnational; plowed through several data bases to select the sample of five VOs being studied; and attempts a
revelation of how a researcher may proceed to capture and maintain the support of any organization's leadership and staff, based on the author's own experiences with building a conducive working relationship with VOs of the selected sample.

But we have not substantially discovered any of these organizations yet. The following sections attempt to remedy this by providing a profile of each of the five VOs that were chosen for specific emphasis. Except where it is otherwise indicated, concrete data (e.g., figures, percentages, numbers) cited in the following profiles are based on data gathered with the open-ended interview schedule presented in Appendix 4A. Several other informal interviews/discussions conducted during the research period were also drawn upon while preparing these profiles.

Columbus Area International Program (CAIP)

The CAIP is an affiliate of the Council of International Programs (CIP) founded in 1956 and headquartered in Cleveland, Ohio. Twelve local organizations in twelve cities of the United States take part in CIP's international programs. Only six of the local organizations have full-fledged, year-round programs. Established in 1968, the Columbus Area International Program is one of these (CAIP, n.d.:6).

As recorded in the Directory of Voluntary Organizations in Mid-Ohio (May, 1980:12), the CAIP was formed to sponsor annual inter-cultural professional exchange programs for internationals in the social service field as a way of providing some tangible contribution toward international understanding in the Columbus community. According
to the directory, CAIP fulfills this purpose by bringing social workers to Columbus from around the world to work in social service agencies, in order to enhance the professional development of these workers and the agencies in which they work.

But the activities of CAIP go much further than this. The VO offers a program for the exchange of knowledge and experience, not only in the field of social work, but also in youth leadership and in other areas of the human services (Vancouver: April 1981 Letter). This means that CAIP brings teachers, social workers, community welfare planners, local recreation supervisors, community organizers, counselors, and other such professionals in the fields of human services to the Columbus area. CAIP's "1981-82 Participant Profiles" clearly reflects this broadening thrust of the VO's activities.

Moreover, the President of CAIP, Paul Vancouver, has in recent times underscored "peace throughout the world" as a penumbra of the VO's activities and objectives (see, e.g., Vancouver: April 1981 Letter). This probably explains why Dr. Thomas C. Hatcher, Director General of CIP, and Speaker at the September 1981 CAIP Annual Meeting of Voting Members placed special emphasis on "peace" as one of his discussion themes. This perhaps reveals yet another strongly-emerging area of CAIP focus which, prior to now, has not received much attention by the VO, even though it has nonetheless existed all along.

The CAIP is, however, mainly concerned with interactions involving persons (Schildhouse: August 1981 Letter). Individuals are exchanged or transferred across national boundaries. Neither money, nor goods are.
Mail correspondence is kept up with those individuals from localities in other countries who would be, or who had already been "exchanged."

Although intercultural professional "exchange" seems to be the key word in the CAIP lexicon, there has not been any actual exchange of people. What CAIP does is to accept a few select individuals from other countries for placement in some local agencies. These individuals are then placed in those agencies within the Columbus area that support the program.

It should be noted that this kind of interaction may be described as a one-way traffic. It is unidirectional. Exchange on the other hand suggests a two-directional transaction. It needs to be recognized that some exchange between these in-coming internationals and the local Colombusites do indeed occur within the Columbus area once the international professionals arrive at Columbus. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that only recently, in the past four years, some two or three Columbus residents went to some countries of Europe through the program (Schildhouse: 1979 Interview; Cooper: 1981 Interview). Mrs. Ruth Schildhouse who is the Director of the CAIP was not certain of the exact number of these very few individuals. Yet it must be observed that this represents some new thrust in the objectives and activities of CAIP. But even at that, there was strictly no exchange, since this transfer of persons was not to foreign countries or communities whose residents were expected to be (or had already been) placed in the Columbus area.

To recruit the individuals who come to Columbus, the national CAIP headquarters in Cleveland (i.e., the CIP) receives a list of individuals
recruited by their representatives in various countries. These representatives are either the United States Information Agency, attachés at the various U.S. embassies, or members of the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) in other countries (Schildhouse: 1981, 1979 Interviews). At times, a CAIP representative (e.g., the Director) may directly travel to some foreign countries for recruiting. Recruitment is carried out nationally in the foreign country. Each country representative sends a list of viable candidates back to the Cleveland headquarters. The candidates must be professionals, mainly in the social and human services areas. The CIP headquarters then circulates the lists to its local affiliates, of which CAIP is one. CAIP then selects the number of people it wishes to invite to Columbus. About two dozen individuals are usually invited annually.

Some CAIP funding comes from the CIP, its parent organization. But the major financial support for the VO comes from the local social service agencies and other local organizations (e.g., The Ohio State University; foundations; corporations), which make substantial contributions to the program (CAIP, n.d.:4). Some 63 agencies have supported the VO since 1970 (CAIP, n.d.:10). The local social service agencies contract with CAIP, not with the foreign professionals directly, for the services of these internationals as short-term staff members. Scholarships are solicited from those local social service agencies which may not have enough funds to budget for their full-time employment of these visiting professionals.
Vital to the program are the "host families." These are individuals and couples who house and feed these foreign persons during the VO's summer programs. Members of the public at large are also solicited for support by becoming paid VO members.1

The VO's efforts to enlist support from the different segments of the local community involves attempts at publicity via brochures, newsletters, magazines, other forms of literature dissemination; telephone calls; presentations by the foreign professionals; and discussions organized for would-be host families. The VO's primary efforts involve adding potential supporters to the mailing list. Letters, newsletters, announcements, brochures, invitations and other materials are mailed out to people or groups who have supported the VO in the past year. CAIP also sends its materials to prospective new supporters. But this is done only when some current supporter informs the VO's staff that the prospective individual is a potential supporter (Schildhouse: 1981 Interview). Prospective supporters are talked to on the phone only when they call and ask for some information. Brochures or other materials may be sent to such callers in response. CAIP does not otherwise solicit support through the telephone. CAIP tries to get in touch, usually by mail, almost only with those potential supporters whose general awareness of the need for inter-cultural exchange has already been raised somehow (Schildhouse: 1981 Interview).

The professionals from other countries often speak to local schools, clubs, or other local groups about their home countries and communities. In most cases, however, this is done only when these
foreign professionals are invited for a presentation or lecture by interested local groups.

CAIP also organizes discussion sessions for those intending to become host families. These discussions are not meant to inform the would-be families of what the VO stands for. Rather, they are efforts intended to give these prospective host families realistic previews of what to expect as host families, hoping that each discussion attendant would be eventually convinced to become one.

Other local activities such as the wine-tasting party, the annual welcoming dinner (for the visiting foreigners), and the annual meeting of voting members are mainly events for the current (or some past) CAIP supporters. These events enhance interaction between Columbubites and the visiting internationals. In addition, they keep CAIP supporters abreast with current VO happenings, while at the same time making it possible for some funds to be raised.

These events, coupled with CAIP's literature mailings (even though these are primarily geared to "already aware" individuals) can also be seen as efforts by the VO to further the awareness of its existence to some specific groups within the Columbus society.

Catholic Relief Services—United States Catholic Conference (CRS)

Catholic Relief Services, the official overseas relief and development agency of the United States catholics, began in early 1943 (CRS, 1981:7). It was founded by a conference of American Catholic bishops—the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), now called
the United States Catholic Conference (USCC)—as the War Relief Services agency of NCWC (Tobin: Interview). Although CRS primarily targets only United States Catholics for its home support base, the agency is concerned with reaching as many of those in need as its resources permit, without regard to religious beliefs, race, or political affiliations. The agency's overseas aid philosophy is: "need and not creed" (CRS, 1981:5). It is part of the larger, world-wide network of Catholic agencies known as Caritas International.

CRS was originally formed as a war-time disaster relief organization charged with providing immediate aid to prisoners of war, refugees, and merchant seamen at major ports throughout the world. It shipped recreational and religious articles to American and Allied prisoners of war all over Europe and the Far East, and did likewise for German and Italian war prisoners interned in the U.S. or in Canada. It provided medical supplies, clinical instruments and other materials for refugees the world over. It also served the material and spiritual welfare of merchant sailors by assisting some thirty-two clubs for seamen in major ports of the world (and more than 500 ships) with equipment, funds and libraries all through the war years (CRS, 1981:9).

The agency further assisted war-stricken civilians, and displaced persons all over the world. Food, clothing, and medicines were made available to the war-stricken populations of the Mediterranean, North Africa, East and West Europe, as World War II raged on. Expellees and displaced persons were also resettled by the CRS. For example, about 33.5% of all foreign displaced persons entering the United States
between 1945 and 1965 had done so under the aegis of the voluntary organization (CRS, 1981:11). Besides, CRS helped to resettle thousands of men, women, children, families in many other parts of the world. It also consigned several shipments of foods and medicines for relieving the misery of the victims of concentration camps.

Traditionally, CRS had thus been an emergency relief agency, mandated by the U.S. catholic bishops to assist victims of war anywhere in the world. Today, however, CRS no longer confines itself to wars, emergencies or disasters. The VO has become increasingly involved in long-range programs designed to help eliminate the causes of hunger, poverty, and disease. This stance officially began in 1955 when the original name of the agency, War Relief Services, was formally changed to Catholic Relief Services as a reflection of the VO's enlarged activity emphases (Tobin: Interview).

CRS now has a variety of relief and development programs unrelated to wars or disasters. It has grown to become one of the largest worldwide VOs striving to encourage self-help development projects (including care for the disabled programs), geared toward improving the quality of people's lives, and aimed at fostering self-reliance. For example, 1980 figures indicate that CRS expended about $325 million on its programs. Of this total, $30.7 million was spent on refugee aid; $38.6 million on emergency aid and disaster relief; while as much as
$224.4 million was expended on development assistance (CRS, 1980: 21-8). ²

In order to realize this development philosophy, the VO adopts a strategy of operation which it describes as the "integrated" approach (CRS, 1981:6). This approach simply refers to a style of operation based at the community level. It means that CRS programs are implemented at the local grassroots level in the aid recipient community in a way that enhances, whenever possible, the concurrent solution of various interrelated community problems.

Underlying the integrated approach is a cardinal principle that enunciates the VO's "modus operandi":

...avoid the imposition of plans and schemes and techniques. Development projects are intended to be a joint venture between CRS and local groups. From the initial planning stages to the completion and administration of a project, communities are expected to participate fully. Their opinions and input are respected and sought after (CRS, 1981:6).

In addition to its international office in Geneva (Switzerland), and its five regional offices in the Mediterranean, Asia, Africa, Central America, and in South America, CRS also has its own representatives at most of its project sites. These CRS representatives strive to ensure that the stated principle is actually put into practice.

²Of the remaining $31 million: help for orphans, the handicapped, the ill and the elderly received a $24.9 million allocation, while fundraising and administrative costs were allocated $6.1 million. It should be said that this does not reflect all of the agency's annual income. In 1980, for example, CRS estimated the administrative and program support it received from the countries where it operates (e.g., warehousing, supplies, inland transportation, and personnel support) at about $108.3 million (CRS, 1980:21-28). This suggests that CRS has a total income and expenditure which approximates $442.5 million, at least for 1980, making it one of the largest operating aid VOs.
CRS does not only solicit local participation in its overseas programs, however. Even back "at home," spectres of this same principle of participation can be seen in the VO's attempts to encourage individual members of its local catholic constituencies to buoy up their support—so that in each case, both agency and supporter can continue to take part in the worldwide effort to assist the poor, the helpless, the afflicted, and the disabled. For example, the Columbus CRS does this by encouraging local parishioners (e.g., priests, or other church leaders) to promote the VO in their churches, so that the individual members of the laity are made aware of what the agency seeks to do, and how each and every one of them can become part of that enterprise. The local bishop (who is the Executive Director of the local agency wherever it exists), or the VO's Program Coordinator, normally starts this process by sending letters, enlisting their help as CRS promoters. The parish promoters are sent large numbers of brochures, flyers, posters, and other agency literature, which depict the VO's concerns and strategies. They are also encouraged to start CRS local events in their parishes. Further, these promoters are informed of the list of CRS awareness raising resources available to them upon request, such as workshops films and presentations to their church groups by CRS staff members.

Four agency events are mainly suggested to the parishes by local CRS. First is an "Annual Appeal" during the Lent season. Local priests, or other parish church leaders, are encouraged to make one collection per year for CRS, during the season of Lent. As much as
$50,000, as revealed by 1980 data is earned from this single event (Tobin: Interview). The second is the "Operation Rice Bowl" appeal. This is also a Lenten event, and calls for sacrificial sharing to support nutrition-related projects. Parishioners are encouraged to voluntarily give up a meal during this season of spiritual fasting—and then put the money equivalent in a rice bowl for the agency's overseas projects. About $25,000 was collected through this event by the Columbus CRS in 1980.

Third is the clothes collection appeal. This event is held once a year, and is encouraged during the Thanksgiving week. All kinds of clothing, also including blankets and shoes (new or newly mended) are collected. Clothing collected in Columbus during the 1980 fiscal year totalled almost 50 tons, and was valued at about $150,000 (Tobin: Interview). Emergency appeals comprise the fourth CRS event. The local CRS encourages parish appeals for specific emergencies (e.g., for Poland; for Somalia; for Cambodia), depending on the mood of the time, the recency of the emergency, its magnitude, and the nature of media coverage being received by the specific emergency. It has been the experience of local CRS staff, for example, that a specific political chaos may elicit more constituency support than a more hopeless disaster situation, if media attention disproportionately focuses on the political crisis. CRS thus uses the added media coverage elicited by the general mood of the time to generate a high level of issue awareness among the members of its local constituency. This usually translates into high constituency support (e.g., high contributions and high participation in VO events).
The agency also encourages individuals to choose their own methods of participating in addressing the problems or issues. A CRS supporter may specify that his contributions be used for projects that are not under the CRS appeals. A supporter, for example, may stipulate that his donations be used for rehabilitating the Southeast Asian "boat people," even if the current CRS appeals are for the Polish emergency. Similarly, an agency's supporter may specifically indicate that his own contributions be used to provide food for the drought-stricken Sahel region of Africa, even if CRS is not officially interested in that area at the current time.

Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE, Inc.)

CARE was originally known as the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, a name which reflected its prime geographical area focus soon after World War II, when CARE's programs were exclusively Eurocentric.

The local Columbus CARE is one of the regional branch offices of the international CARE, incorporated on 27th November 1945 in Washington District of Columbia, as a voluntary, nonprofit, nonsectarian, nongovernmental agency chartered to meet the needs of the destitute peoples of post-War Europe (CARE, n.d.). Its world headquarters is in New York.

The founding of CARE was a complex process resulting from the need of Americans to send food parcels to their friends and kinfolk in the war devastated areas of Europe. The founders were 22 major religious
and secular organizations, including the Cooperative League, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference (Curti, 1963:493; CARE, n.d.). Today, CARE's operation is worldwide, its long-term goal being "the elimination of world poverty through self-help programs" at the "grassroots" level (Patrick, 1981:1). This perhaps explains why Jane Austin Patrick, Director of CARE in Columbus, prefers to describe the agency as a "Self-Help and Development" organization.

But CARE operates in a manner that is vividly different from those of most voluntary agencies described as "self-help" and "development" oriented. Unlike many VOs, CARE's national headquarters receives applications from foreign governments. These applications are actually invitations from needy foreign governments asking CARE to contract for some specific projects. The inviting government must indicate the local community area in which CARE would be expected to operate, and the need for the projects desired. If CARE is interested, then it contracts with the particular foreign national government, after a CARE task force has adequately assessed the need as well as the available resources (Peterson: 1979, Interview; Patrick, 1981:2).

CARE thus operates in local communities. But it gets to the communities through the foreign national governments under whose territorial jurisdictions the localities are situated.

Another feature of the VO must also be underscored. CARE's national headquarters not only contracts for projects. It also executes them. Local CARE branch offices in the United States, of which Columbus
CARE is one, only serve the purpose of fund raising. These local VOs are the sites for building CARE's grassroots support at home, enlarging its constituencies and public endorsement at the domestic community level.

And yet another characteristic. CARE has some unique criteria for contracting. Says Judy Peterson, "it cannot be political: we are non-political and non-sectarian. ...If it is a school (for example), the host community must contribute site, labor or any raw materials they might have. The host country must contribute administrative cost." According to her, other criteria include guarantee of transportation to project sites, and duty-free entry into the country. The country must be among the "poorest of the poor," and the project must be a "self-help" program. It must be for "development." And CARE defines "development" as consisting of five elements—food, water, education, medical services, and basic shelter (Addingdon: Interview, 1979). To accomplish these, CARE further emphasizes the transference of technical assistance across national boundaries. It also steps in where disaster strikes.

CARE has greatly marched forward from its original activity thrusts. Starting from May 11, 1946 when it first delivered its Ten-in-One packages to the starving people of Le Havre, France, CARE initially served as a simple humanitarian relief agency which merely sent food

---

3Up till the Summer of 1979, Mrs. Judy Peterson was the Director of local CARE in Columbus, and the Ohio-Kentucky region. Parentheses added. Emphasis added. Interview, 1979.
packages directly from the local community to recipient foreign individuals in Europe (see, e.g., Curti, 1963:491-503). But CARE has metamorphosed over the years to become a highly complex, multi-integrated programming operation, which predominantly emphasizes a community rather than an individual focus. Although it still adheres to its main original function of feeding the destitute, its recent subscription to the maxim of "development" predisposes CARE to seek for contracts in practically all spheres of constructions. This is because CARE's objective of promoting good nutrition and education are now being ascribed the widest possible interpretations. The suggestion is that perhaps the complex aberrations of the human concerns which CARE set out to address are now being apparently better recognized by the VO. To CARE, for example, the promotion of good nutrition not only indicates the need to increase agricultural production. But also, it implies the necessity for improved food processing, media food education, better equipped community warehouses, better roads for easier transportation of farm products, and the vitalization of agriculture-related industries (e.g., forestry, beekeeping, etc.). It may also suggest the need for farmers' good health, and better family planning for local farmers, especially in those developing areas of the world where women toil side-by-side with their menfolks in farms to eke out a subsistence for their families.

CARE's activity emphases are thus very many, involving a correspondingly high amount of finances that run into several hundred
million dollars yearly. For example, CARE's total program expenditures were $191,212,930 and $206,605,676, respectively, for the 1980 and 1979 fiscal years (CARE, 1980:27). This magnitude of financial burden requires that the VO maintain a sizeable income level. CARE partially seeks to do this by adopting a highly business-like method of operation. For example, wherever CARE operates, the national government must pay for all administrative overheads, transportation and custom duties, while the local people must provide all the labor and other local resources available in their community. The result is that CARE is able to generate up to $6.73 in goods and services overseas, for every single dollar it spends, as it did in the 1979-80 fiscal year (Patrick, 1981:3). Reflecting on this method of operation, one CARE official once asserted: "we consider it a form of business in that we seek to get the maximum profit from our investment. If we were not as business-like as possible, we would not have the resources to continue existing" (Peterson: 1979, Interview).

Regardless of how business-like CARE attempts to carry out its projects, however, the VO cannot exist long in the absence of continued endorsement and mounting support by its home constituencies. The local CARE is highly instrumental in achieving this. In 1981, for example, the Columbus CARE (established in October, 1954) set its campaign goal at raising $255,000—which meant an attempt to elicit 34% more financial support than the VO received during the last year (CARE, 1981). Twenty-four percent (24%) of that target or $207,288 was
actually reached by May 1981. This can be translated as meaning that the local VO had already captured some 24% more support (at least, financially) over the last year even before the end of the 1981 fiscal year.

Jane Austin Patrick, Director of the Local CARE and the Ohio-Kentucky regional CARE office, indicates that her VO's local efforts to increase its constituency support involve the use of television, newspaper and radio advertisements; the use of brochures, CARE reports, newsletters, and other CARE related literature; and making presentations that spotlight the VO's overseas activities.

The VO has a number of posters, flyers, and brochures that are available to individuals and groups on request, and are widely distributed free of charge in order to inform people more about CARE activities. Contribution envelopes, "I CARE" buttons, CARE collection boxes, CARE special events cards (e.g., Christmas cards, Mother's Day cards) are also made available for promotional purposes. CARE reports (e.g., the Annual Report, the World Report); newsletters, (e.g., the CARE News Package, the CARE Campus forum); and CARE Special Events Guides are normally mailed to past and current supporters to inform them of recent VO activities. Members of the local CARE staff also speak to various local groups, churches, meetings or clubs to make them aware of the VO and what it does; to encourage each individual or group to support CARE by contributing or volunteering; to encourage individuals and groups to sponsor local fund raising events for the VO. In addition, CARE keeps a free library of "education" resource
The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Committee of Greater Columbus

UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, was established by the United Nations General Assembly on December 11, 1946 as the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF, 80-81:4). It was originally a humanitarian relief agency providing emergency assistance to children after World War II. By 1953, however, UNICEF had evolved into a social development agency, with the long term goals of economic and social justice for children and their communities. To mark this shift in emphasis from emergency to long-range aid, the words "international" and "emergency" were officially dropped from the name. But the well-known UNICEF initials were retained (UNICEF, IS/1/80a; 7/81:4; n.d.:1-9).

The present day central thrust of UNICEF's activities is development aid. Unlike most development agencies, however, the cornerstone of UNICEF's approach is the conviction that children are the means as well as the beneficiaries of national development. Children are seen as mankind's most valuable resources. Consequently, the VO's underlying rationale is that social policies benefitting children are enlightened, and thus essential to economic and social progress (UNICEF, 1977).
UNICEF's primary objective is therefore to help children who are in the greatest need, primarily in the developing countries (UNICEF, 7/81:5; 197). The agency does this by classifying the developing countries into three groups by virtue of children's need levels. The "special assistance" categories are mainly those designated by the United Nations as the "least developed countries" (LDCs). The second priority group is made up of those countries which UNICEF classifies as deserving "normal" levels of assistance. These countries are seen by the VO as being in the middle range of development; although they include many of those currently described as being "most severely affected" (MSA) by current economic problems. The third group of UNICEF's assistance goes to those nations classified by the VO as having reached more advanced stages of development, but require assistance due to particular needs such as the lack of skilled personnel. Only very few in this group (e.g., 18 out of 100 countries assisted in 1976) are assisted by the agency (UNICEF:IS/2/80a, pp. 1-2; 1977).

To fulfill its child-centered development objectives, UNICEF adopts what it describes as the "basic services" approach, which simply is a community programming orientation. By this approach, UNICEF strives to encourage citizens of the local community to identify their most pressing needs, and to select workers from among themselves. These villagers or urban community dwellers are trained locally in simple, task-oriented techniques by UNICEF. They then deliver to their own local communities the basic services, sponsored or funded by UNICEF. These services include UNICEF sponsored local projects in immunization,
health, nutrition, clean water, blindness prevention, sanitation, education, food, improved farming and gardening, responsible parenthood and family planning, supporting services for women and girls, and care for disabled children. Thus, UNICEF's activities in these areas can be grouped into three broad types: assistance in the planning and design of local services for children; delivery of supplies and equipment for the desired local services; provision of funds for training the personnel such as local teachers, nutritionists, social workers, community leaders, health and sanitation workers, etc., needed for working with children (Spretnak: 1981 Memo; UNICEF: 1977, 1981).

UNICEF has a "semi-autonomous" status within the United Nations (UNICEF:IS/1/80a). This does not mean that the agency is not a VO by the definition presented in Chapter One, which requires that the agency must possess decision making autonomy. The "semi-autonomous" status of UNICEF with the UN merely indicates that the agency does not (and cannot) maintain its own country membership like the United Nations. Besides, it is mandated by the UN to operate in both UN and non-UN member countries when requested to do so by "any government." Since there are not usually very many independent countries in the world that are not UN members at any particular point in time; and since all countries, whether UN members or non-members are somehow related to the UN, this stipulation is simply saying that the UNICEF was established by
the UN to assist all nations associated with it. Certainly, the UNICEF does not need to keep a separate country membership to do this. Also, UNICEF's Executive Board is elected by the UN's Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

Aside from this, the "semi-autonomous" qualification does not mean that UNICEF is only quasi independent in terms of making decisions that guide its operations. It does not also mean that the UNICEF is dependent on the UN budget. In actuality, UNICEF is entirely administered by its own international staff responsible to its own Executive Director (UNICEF:IS/1/80a). It coordinates its work by itself, not through the ECOSOC, with other voluntary programs and specialized agencies in the UN system only when and where it deems appropriate (UNICEF:IS/1/80a). Most importantly, UNICEF does not partake of the UN's assessed budgets. It is not financed by the UN. Nor is any part of its project operations funded by the United Nations. It depends exclusively on voluntary contributions (UNICEF:IS/1/80a). Contributions are accepted by UNICEF from individuals, nongovernment and government sources (UNICEF:IS/3/80a, pp. 1-2). These voluntary contributions have come in the past from as many as 133 countries and

---

4 Except for colonies, protectorates, subnational groups, or other dependent nationalities, most other territorial units in the world tend to join the UN as soon as they have knowledge of its existence. The single most critical requirement for admission into the UN seems to be territorial sovereignty, determined by independence. Or, the absence of disputes concerning who governs the geographical entity. For example, all nations of the world are today members of the UN except, perhaps, for Taiwan and the Basque provinces of Spain. But even when the nationalities are neither independent nor in possession of their own sovereign territories, they are scarcely isolated from the UN. Indeed, they tend to be very highly associated with it nevertheless. Examples are the many trusteeships that existed all through the 1950s and the 1960s; or the Palestinian in today's United Nations.
areas of the world (UNICEF, 1977), thus providing a very large support base for the agency.

Incidentally, up to 75% of these contributions come from governments. One explanation I offer for this is that the largest contribution to any long-term UNICEF aid program comes from the assisted country itself; and at any particular time, the agency may be assisting more than 100 countries. This is because UNICEF expects every national government within which it operates an aid project to substantially match its contributions. This requires that assisted governments make large commitments to UNICEF in terms of staff, building materials, locally available supplies and/or funds (UNICEF:IS/3/80a, pp. 1-2).

The remaining contributions come from general public support—specifically from individuals or local groups who endorse UNICEF's activity thrusts and thus support it either financially, or by volunteering their times and energies to help raise funds for the VO.

National Committees for UNICEF (currently in 33 countries around the globe) help to inform the public about the complex needs of mankind's children, especially those in the developing world. Each of these national committees also has affiliate UNICEF Committees in the local community levels, which help build grassroots support for UNICEF.

The United States Committee for UNICEF is one of UNICEF's national committees. And the UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus, established in Summer 1973, is one of twelve local affiliates of the U.S. Committee (Spretnak: Interview).
Unlike the four other VOs being investigated by this study, the UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus (i.e., the local UNICEF) is primarily supported by volunteers. None of its 20-member staff is being paid except one. The local UNICEF is thus made up of mostly volunteers who devote considerable time and effort seeking to increase UNICEF's support constituency in the Columbus community area. They do this by attempting to get local publics acquainted with UNICEF's activities for the world of innocent, but suffering children, who would be otherwise forsaken to the ills and ravages of war, starvation, and natural or man-made disasters.

They do this by displaying UNICEF posters, distributing brochures, flyers, and newsletters. They make presentations to various church groups, schools, colleges, clubs for children and adults, and other local civic organizations and groups—telling them about UNICEF; asking them to donate and take part in UNICEF's activities; or encouraging them to organize fund raising activities for UNICEF. They maintain a local depot for UNICEF materials (e.g., slides, films, etc.), which may be borrowed and returned by interested publics.

In addition, the local UNICEF organizes community fund raising events. Some of these efforts include tea parties or luncheons for Grandparents and Friends of UNICEF, Halloween campaigns, and television appeals. The UNICEF Center (as the local UNICEF is also called) further supervises the sale of UNICEF greeting cards in the Columbus area.
CROP

CROP has no branch offices overseas. Nor does it have office-keeping staff in foreign countries. Rather, it is the local education and fund-raising unit of Church World Service (Stanley, 1979 Letter:1). It is the name given to the local efforts at hunger awareness and fund raising for Church World Service (CWS). At present, CWS represents thirty-one protestant and orthodox denominations which currently provide relief and development assistance in seventy-four different countries (Stanley: Interview, 1981).

"CROP" formerly was an acronym for "Christian Rural Overseas Programs." It was originally founded in 1947, by the Lutheran World Relief, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, and the Church World Service (Curti, 1963:520), as a cooperative venture through which the three denominations could sponsor a grain train at the end of the

5That CROP is affiliated with Church World Service (CWS) does not mean that CROP is not a VO as Ted Stanley, CROP's Director in Columbus, once suggested to me. Given our definition of VO's presented in Chapter One, it is definitely a private, non-profit agency, supported by voluntary contributions for the purpose of solving some specific societal problems. It has its own support base from the people, not dependent on CWS. Besides, it is a decision making entity, having indisputable decision making independence or autonomy from both the CWS and public authorities. It has its own Directors, Program Interpreters, program researchers and evaluators, Financial Developers and Managers, Field Officers, Board Members, Committees, and Area Leaders. Its supporters and leadership have the autonomy or independence to determine its roles, purposes, goals, and methods (see, e.g., Sommer, 1977:131-2; CROP/CWS, February 1976; Stanley, July 1981 Memo:2). Its supporters may even designate overseas agencies other than CWS to receive their pledges. And besides, CROP Event Committees may decide to have up to 25% of all money proceeds returned to local hunger agencies where needs dictate (Stanley, July 1981 Memo:2; also, CROP/CWS, July 1980:1).
second World War (CROP/CWS, August 1980:1). Soon after, the two other groups (Lutheran World Relief; National Catholic Rural Life Conference) lost interest, and disengaged their participation in CROP, thus making CROP an entirely CWS affair.

Today, however, "CROP" is simply a word, ... a name, used to identify the Community Hunger and Clothing Appeals of the Education and Fund raising entity affiliated with CWS. After some thirty-five years of operation, it now reaches far beyond the Christian and protestant populations to include participation by Catholics, the Jewish, and the unchurched. The last two groups comprise 53% of CROP supporters in Ohio (CROP/CWS, August 1980:1).

Besides, while CROP's strength and support has traditionally come from the rural areas, the support from the city and suburban areas has, today, made substantial inroads to the point where CROP now merits the title of being considered the "Community" Appeal for Education and Fund raising affiliate of CWS. CROP is not strictly "oversea" directed in that it has some domestic programs that may be effectuated where local disaster or related needs strike.

It is the efforts of local CROP offices which determine the success of CROP sponsored programs at the world level, or even at the domestic disaster program level. I see the efforts of the local CROP (as well as the other local VOs) as proceeding in three stages. First, the VO attempts to raise the public's consciousness of the problems (e.g., hunger and clothing) with which it is concerned. In so doing, it seeks to rally the endorsement of the local community, hoping that they show
some commitment toward the solution of the problems. This kind of
commitment or endorsement usually translates to support for, or
participation in the activities of the local VO. Then, and finally,
the local VO acts. Based on the pledged support, commitment or
participation which it receives from the local publics, it then sponsors
overseas or domestic problem solving programs. Projects sponsored by
CROP are usually executed by CWS, or by any other agencies which the
donating CROP supporter may care to specify.

CROP, indeed, sponsors most of CWS's programs. Perhaps it will
be an understatement to say that, without CROP, there will be no CWS.
After all, CWS existed long before CROP did; and was even one of CROP's
founding "parents."

Yet, it is of particular importance to note that CROP is rather
very unique in the integral role it plays in its relationship vis a vis
the CWS (or with other agencies which it sponsors). First, it funds the
CWS, raising about one-third of all CWS funding in 1976; secondly, it
generates "tithes of harvests" from individual supporters of CWS (or
other agencies); thirdly, it conveys awareness messages derived from the
relief and development endeavors of CWS and the other agencies whose
programs it sponsors (see also Sommers, 1977:131).

According to Theodore Z. Stanley, the Director of CROP in Columbus
and in the region of Ohio, CROP's ability to perform these functions can
be attributed to its three major local efforts: direct mailings,
working with church and civic organizations, and CROP sponsored
community events.
Local CROP's upward emphasis on direct mailing (even though the Columbus CROP was established in 1948) started about five years ago, and has proven to be a great link between CROP and the community (Stanley: Interview, 1981). Pamphlets, flyers, brochures, and monthly newsletters (e.g., the Buckeye Bounty, in the Columbus area) are distributed to various local civic organizations, church groups, and individuals. Special attention is given to zone/area leaders, and to individuals who have donated time or money to CROP in the past. Special thank-you letters and cards are sent along with current information on CROP's activities. Such follow-up efforts, no doubt show appreciation for past support, keep the awareness of CROP issues and activities current, and seek to encourage continued participation in the VO's future endeavors. Personal visits and telephone contacts are further maintained with the local zone leaders by the agency's local staff.

CROP keeps active with local civic groups by sending representatives to give lectures and presentations on how they can support CROP efforts and make a difference to individuals, families, and communities overseas. An example is the "Meal-A-Month Club" often encouraged in church groups. Group members are encouraged to join the club. Club members skip one meal a month, and send the money saved to CROP. One major annual fund raiser is the "Love Offering." The VO encourages most churches in the community to gather a special money collection during the Lenten season, which is thereafter donated to CROP to help ease the world hunger problem. CROP also initiates other activities such as clothing drives, blanket sales, and hygiene kit drives. "Hygiene kits" contain items such as soaps and wash cloths.
The largest and most ambitious of CROP's local fund raising activities is the Franklin County CROP Hunger Walk. Some 2,043 people participated in this annual event in October, 1981 (Stanley: Memo, October 1981). Each participant gets sponsors who pledge to give a certain amount of money for each mile the participant walks. CROP raised $99,084 in this single event in 1981 (Stanley: Memo, October 1981).

CROP funds or other contributions which it makes available to CWS is allocated to several program areas by CWS. This is, at times, done according to CROP's guidelines (e.g., when CROP supporters stipulate that their contributions be allocated to specific areas). The largest amount of CROP proceeds (33%) is used for giving "appropriate technology" to overseas communities (Stanley, July 1981 Memo: 2-3). Appropriate technology means the provision of equipment, tools, and other development-related resources which are suited for a particular area. This is to say, CROP tries to give people skills, equipment and tools, which their culture can assume and assimilate effectively. The local communities in need are encouraged to make the tools themselves whenever possible. This enhances "enablement" (Stanley's term) for the people—by enabling them to utilize their own natural resources. At the same time, it cuts back on CWS overhead.

The next 19% of CROP's funds is earmarked for its Africa emphasis, and is used to sponsor self-development and emergency relief programs. Another 18% is allocated to food commodities. Different kinds of foods are purchased for CROP-sponsored disaster feeding, supplemental feeding,
Food-for-Work projects, or other feeding programs. In "food-for-work" development programs, individuals perform some jobs and are only "paid" with food items.

Beyond these, it is very significant to note that CROP devotes a substantial part of its funds to what it calls "development education." CROP retained 12% of its 1980 earnings for this expenditure category (Stanley, July 1981 Memo:3). "Development education" is a local-community-directed effort, geared toward helping the local American (in this case, the Columbus citizen) develop better understanding of the day-to-day lifestyles and problems of the world's suffering masses, especially those in developing countries. It is a program of consciousness-raising. It is hoped that those whose awareness of what CROP stands for are raised, through the "education" program, would support more of CROP activities.

The magnitude of CROP's efforts at building local consciousness is well captured by Exhibits 3 and 4. These Exhibits clearly show that CROP does not hesitate to sensitize the major executive and policy making arms of the provincial and local governments to its work, even if that is what it requires, to enable CROP get substantially across to its community constituencies.

CROP's remaining proceeds (about 18%) are used for: the distribution of seeds to families and communities so that people can grow some of their own food in homes, schools and community gardens; supplying practical technical advice to assist the local people in the cultivation and growth of the seeds; population and family planning
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PROCLAMATION
IN RECOGNITION OF
HUNGER AWARENESS MONTH

WHEREAS, National Church World Service/CROP is a private voluntary agency devoted to fighting hunger in underdeveloped countries and in some areas of our own nation; and

WHEREAS, the Ohio CWS/CROP Regional Office is a leader in helping individuals and communities to become more aware of the reality of world hunger; and

WHEREAS, in October, 1981, more than one hundred communities in Ohio will hold CROP Hunger Walks to raise funds to support hunger-fighting programs overseas and in Ohio; and

WHEREAS, many other hunger-related organizations will be sponsoring a variety of community awareness programs:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim that the month of October, 1981, be designated as

HUNGER AWARENESS MONTH

in the State of Ohio.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus, this 8th Day of September, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty-One.

[Signature]
Governor

[Signature]
Secretary of State
PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, it is one of the responsibilities of the Mayor of the City of Columbus to recognize occasions of outstanding significance; and

WHEREAS, National Church World Service/CROP is a private voluntary agency devoted to fighting hunger in under-developed countries; and

WHEREAS, the Ohio CWS/CROP Regional Office is a leader in helping individuals and communities to become more aware of the reality of world hunger; and

WHEREAS, throughout Franklin County during the month of October groups of all kinds will be increasing their awareness of the reality of hunger overseas and in Franklin County; and

WHEREAS, on Sunday, October 18, 1981, more than two thousand persons of all ages in Franklin County will participate in the Fourth Annual Franklin County CROP Hunger Walk to raise funds to support hunger-fighting programs overseas and in Franklin County:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Tom Moody, Mayor of the City of Columbus, do hereby proclaim the month of October, 1981, as

HUNGER AWARENESS MONTH

and further proclaim that Sunday, October 18, 1981, be proclaimed as

HUNGER ACTION DAY

in Columbus, and urge all members of our community to join in recognition of these significant occasions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the Mayor of the City of Columbus to be hereunto affixed this 15th day of September, 1981.

TOM MOODY, Mayor.
education (e.g., midwifery, nurse training, health services, etc.); and on programs that help refugees.

Summary and Conclusion

The Columbus area, like many other local communities in the world, is bustling with international activities. Up to 1,500 or more VOs may be possibly involved. Fifty-five of these are VOs known to have some transnational concerns. Among the 55 agencies, 5 were chosen for specific emphasis by this study. These include the Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE), Church World Service/CROP (CROP), Columbus Area International Program (CAIP), Catholic Relief Services—United States Catholic Conference (CRS), and the United Nations Children's Fund Committee of Greater Columbus (UNICEF). These five VOs were selected on the basis of four criteria: activity/problem area preference, willingness to take part in the study, viability, and membership strength.

Each of the five selected agencies was profiled. Final discussions, as presented toward the end of each agency profile, reveal that all of the organizations engaged, with varying degrees and methods, in attempts to raise the awareness of their respective constituencies in what they stand for, while also beckoning for citizen support for or participation in what they do. Each VO did this through various methods such as mailing out letters, newsletters, and invitations to VO events; publicizing the VO's programs, predicaments and calls for help through the television, newspapers and other news
media; sponsoring VO discussion forums; and organizing VO-related films, talks, and slide presentations in local civic and business organizations. These are definitely examples of consciousness building efforts—meant to capture increased public endorsement for, and participation in the organization's programs.

VOs are thus mobilizers (as suggested in the earlier chapter). They, indeed, raise the consciousness of individuals with respect to what their particular concerns and solution strategies are.

But methods vary from agency to agency. Different VOs not only use various methods of mobilizing the citizenry; they also attach various magnitudes of emphasis to them. The next chapter, thus, attempts to see whether the type of method used makes any difference in the level of consciousness raised.
Chapter 3

CONSCIOUSNESS-BUILDING AND THE
LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Introduction

The first chapter lays down the conceptual underpinnings of this study, and in so doing, plots an intellectual path that offers the six hypotheses already displayed in Diagram 1.4. Chapter 2 carries this forward and traces the development of this study to a point where the five voluntary organizations (VOs) on which the study focuses were identified and profiled. These VOs (CARE, CAIF, CROP, CRS, UNICEF) provide the laboratory within which the six hypotheses are tested.

Each of the hypotheses is investigated in the following chapters. The investigations are not meant to provide proofs or disproofs for the hypotheses. No social science study can ever prove or disprove its empirical statements. All that is being sought is to add to, or detract from the plausibility accorded the hypotheses.

Four hundred and fifty-eight (458) questionnaires returned by the supporters of the five voluntary agencies provide the empirical basis for the explorations that follow. This returned number constitutes
16.3% of all questionnaires (2,811) that were administered. This represents a fairly good response rate considering the length of the instrument. Appendix 5 contains the questionnaires as they were administered to the supporters of each of the organizations. Each survey instrument actually administered was photographically reduced to only six pages to make them less "threatening" to the supporters. Respondents are easily discouraged by very long questionnaires.

Aside from the issue of the response rate is the more crucial question of representativeness. The question here focuses on how the surveyed supporter population was selected, as well as whether or not the returns comprise a representative set. To begin with, the 2,811 individuals that received the questionnaires were, altogether, not selected randomly. This was due to a number of reasons. First, some of the organizations were very touchy about giving out their list of supporters to any outsider. Others were rather uneasy about having the researcher help to determine which of their members would be surveyed. Some others insisted that certain groups of their supporters had to be selected into the study, while certain others had to be excluded. A further reason is that some of the organizations kept records of only the names of those individuals whose past monetary supports had been rather phenomenal. For example, one organization only kept systematic records of supporters who had consistently contributed one hundred dollars ($100.00), or more, each time in the past. As to be expected, it was not particularly easy to convince the agency's Director to dig beyond the VO's systematic records to ensure that up to 1/3 of the
600 members of her organization who received the questionnaires had only contributed between $10 and $100. But even at that, money is only one form of participatory support. Thus, individuals predominantly emphasizing other non-monetary channels of support in this very organization were grossly neglected. Another agency's Director insisted that he would "come up" with 500 supporters of his organization, selection being neither systematic, nor based on any explicit criteria. All of the current members of one of the VOs were given or sent questionnaires. Two other agencies made and encouraged efforts to select representative samples of their supporters into the study (e.g., by randomly generating computer name labels from each zone of their local constituency).

In the final analysis, therefore, a systematic effort to survey a representative sample was not possible. This is not to say, however, that the returned questionnaires did not constitute a representative set. A look at the frequency distributions for the scales used in this study (Appendix 6) shows that overall, responses were evenly distributed and not skewed. This observation is saying two things. First, the survey did not simply bring in only those who were either high or low on the various scales. Very high, or very low overall responses would have indicated the definite existence of some selection bias. It would have meant, for example, that the sample is biased either toward the highly participating agency members who score "high" on all measures; or toward the poorly participating ones who score "low" on all measures. But this did not occur according to the obtained scale
frequency distributions. Secondly, there are indeed some appreciable variations or representativeness in the studied sample.

The frequency distribution for the consciousness scale seems to be the only exception. There appears to be little or no variations in the responses to this scale, with almost every valid case of the sample (105 out of 113) scoring highly. This is because the consciousness scale was constructed to include only 1 or 2, out of 7 items, which any individual who had been subjected to the agency's consciousness-building efforts were likely to fail. And all of the surveyed VO supporters had, at one time or another, been subjected to various agency consciousness-building efforts.

Survey instruments were adapted to each voluntary organization. Supporters of VOs only responded to questionnaires specifically adapted to their particular organizations. It is to be expected that persons may be supporters of more than one organization at any point in time. It was therefore necessary to ensure that two or more completed questionnaires were not received from the same individual, even if they were completed for different organizations. More than one completed questionnaire from each respondent would unnecessarily "swell" the data, whereas the same individual's behavior patterns can best be captured by one instrument. As the letters displayed in Appendix 7 show, respondents who support more than one of the VOs being studied were specifically asked not to respond to more than one of the questionnaires.

Appendix 7 also reveals that the cover letters which were mailed out or distributed with the survey instruments were signed by the
Directors of each of the VOs, and not by the author. The letters were actually drafted by the author in consultation with the agency Directors, among whom there was a common agreement concerning the phrasing and need for Director signatures. Cover letters signed by agency leaders are more likely to evoke higher supporter responses (in terms of completing the surveys) than any such letters written and signed by a researcher not known to the organizations' supporters, and whose interest in the study could be otherwise interpreted as purely academic or self-gratifying. Besides, most VO supporters ordinarily frown at their names and addresses being given away by the VO's personnel and staff to other organizations, groups, or individuals who then deluge the supporters with all kinds of pestering mails or phone calls. The Directors' signatures were thus necessary in order not to alienate the supporters from the very VOs which they support. At the same time, they served to convey to the supporters the agencies' endorsement of the research project.

Follow-up questionnaires were not mailed. The attained 16.3% response rate falls within 8% and 20% to be ordinarily expected for studies like this one, requiring that fairly long questionnaires be completed. Severe budget constraints, aside from everything else, could not have permitted a second mailing.

With this methodological synopsis, the rest of this chapter now turns to take a detailed look at hypothesis number one.
The First Hypothesis

What contributes to the "participation" envisaged by those who join the Columbus VOs as a way to participate in solving local and transnational problems? This is a penetrating puzzle which consistently resounds itself all through this work, especially since the prime purpose herein is to explore how greater citizen participation in problem solving can be achieved in our transnational world--by probing those organizations (VOs) whose actions are widely renowned as being intimately founded on an "other-directed 'service ideal'" profoundly rooted in their "cause" and "contributive" orientation.

The focus on how greater participation can be attained in solving mankind's problems concedes that individual competence in addressing transnational issues is, in fact, a very realistic goal. More still, it concedes that improving the individual competence necessary for coping with the issues is a definite possibility.

Some questions immediately come to mind. How can we affectively realize this existing possibility? How can we, at the least, start attempting to increase the individual competence required for becoming effective, participant problem solvers?

The answer to the first question runs through this entire volume, touching upon everyone of the hypotheses. The second question is however more specific to this chapter, and to hypothesis number one being explored.

Let us recollect our conceptual revelations. Responsible participation (Alger's term), and all other mechanisms leading to it,
always emanate from consciousness-building. It is the act of building consciousness which directly results to a crystal clear awareness of the problems or issues, and of what is being done about them. The eminent Brazilian philosopher and Rector of the University of Campinas, Paulo Friere, would describe this kind of awareness as "consciousness," a term used all through this study.

A more effective process of building consciousness is likely to lead to a more relevant crystal clear awareness of the issues, and whatever problem solving strategies the mobilizer (consciousness raiser) may be interested in. Better consciousness-building approaches are, thus, more likely to foment higher levels of consciousness.

Undergirded by these premises, attempts were made to ferret out various methods of consciousness building. Two were discovered via the social science literature and some real life observations. These major consciousness-building types have been described by this study as the directive and the dialogue approaches.

Emerging from all this is a crucial set of probes. First, is there any validity to the foregoing premises? That is: does the level of consciousness actually covary with the method of consciousness-building? And as corollaries: is consciousness-building related to consciousness level? If so, which method of building consciousness is more strongly related to the level of consciousness? These are the empirical questions which the first hypothesis seeks to address. Thus:

HYPOTHESIS 1: The more the VO attempts to build consciousness through the dialogue approach, the more its members will be more conscious of what the VO does.
Measurement Construction

Testing the plausibility of the first hypothesis required the measurement of two major variables: consciousness-building, and consciousness. Two measurement scales were correspondingly constructed. Each of the scales is separately discussed below.

The Consciousness-Building Scale

Voluntary organization profiles presented in the second chapter reveal that the awareness raising campaigns of VOs involve some explicit activities, even though the activities and their contents may markedly vary from one organization to another. Agencies usually distribute brochures, and mail out newsletters or letters to members of their constituencies. Some use the media by placing advertisements on televisions, radios, newspapers or magazines. Others emphasize personal contact through the telephone, in person, or by home visits. And some others prefer inviting people to various kinds of public forums, get-togethers, meetings, or discussion sessions.

Some VOs emphasize free personal choices, and encourage individuals personally to identify and define what their own stances are. Others do not, but rather emphasize watered down ideas or options precisely defined by the VO's corporate headquarters, and marshalled out in the agency's brochures and pamphlets. And yet some other VOs strongly encourage, adopt and suggest innovative down-home ideas originating from the local people themselves.
These observations were put together to form the inventories depicted as items 1.01 to 1.05, 5, 6, 7.01 and 7.02, in Section A of the questionnaire. These items make up the Consciousness Building Inventory (CBI) from which the consciousness building scale was derived.

Items 1.01, 1.02, and 1.03 were posited as constituting the directive approach to building consciousness. The directive approach refers to a unidirectional method: a method in which the educational communication inherent in the process of consciousness building solely emanates from the mobilizer, and impinges on the target information recipient. Informative communication is thus being viewed as if it were a one-way traffic. Disseminating brochures, newsletters, or form letters (which is the kind of letters that organizations usually send to their constituencies), are different ways by which organizations usually express their decisions, wills, or particular interests to their various constituencies. A form letter, or a pamphlet to be distributed to 2,000 people is usually designed to convey only what the "communicator," the writer or in this case the mobilizer, wishes to impress on the target information recipient. Radio, magazine, and television ads are other typical examples. Advertisements convey exactly no more than what the advertiser wishes to be "stamped" upon the minds of those he seeks to make aware of what he offers.

Dialogue, on the other hand, refers to an interactional, at the least dyadic, non-unidirectional approach to building consciousness. The educational imperatives of dialogue are deeply rooted in the ideal of information sharing: a two-way intercourse in which the mobilizer
maintains a unique sensitivity to the personal stances of members of the constituency, and to the down-home local way of approaching solutions, while at the same time not losing the ability to convey, suggest, or hint any information which it considers pertinent. It is thus a higher level of consciousness-building, more effective, but more difficult to attain.

"Yes" responses to items 1.04, 1.05, 5, 6, and 7.01 were thus posited to be indicators of dialogue. Home visits, telephone conversations (item 1.04); and invitations to discussion forums (item 1.05) sharply reflect openness to a kind of two-way information sharing not at all possible by merely watching, listening to, or reading television, radio, or newspaper adverts. They were posited to be definite reflectors of dialogue. Also, encouraging locally based or locally derived options (item 7.01); encouraging individuals to positively decide that they can help in problem solving (item 5); or encouraging them to personally define their own stances and stipulate their action preferences (item 6) were posited as being perhaps reflective of the dialogue method of consciousness building.

But do these items actually scale? Are items 1.04, 1.05, 5, 6, and 7.01 true measures of dialogue? Or, are items 1.01, 1.02, and 1.03 true indicators of directive consciousness building? Does each of the groups of items provide a valid measurement scale for the variables which they purport to measure?

Answers to these critical questions required that each of the items be first evaluated to find how much it has in common with the others.
The Guttman Scale procedure was chosen to accomplish this. First, it searches for unidimensionality among items. Inspection of the Yule's Q coefficients yielded by a Guttman Scale procedure provides reliable inter-item correlations. Secondly, the statistical procedure searches for cummulativeness in items—which permits the items to be ordered from least to most difficult. Such item ordering is particularly helpful in this kind of study. For example, it makes it easier to decipher whether dialogue is truly a higher level of consciousness-building, more difficult to achieve than the directive approach.

Three separate Guttman item evaluations were made prior to the actual scale construction. The first consisted of the three items (1.01, 1.02, 1.03) described as indicators of the directive method. Table 3.1 displays the resulting inter-item correlations.

The Yule's Q coefficients show that all the items are perhaps measuring the same underlying dimensions. They are each positively correlated. Yet it is to be noted that items 1.01 and 1.02 (distributing brochures, and mailing out letters) are highly correlated, with a coefficient of almost 0.96. But item 1.03 (use of the media--Tv, radio, etc.) on the other hand has a much lower correlation, of no more than 0.40, with either of the other two items. This suggested that particular attention be paid to how this very item also correlated with others of the entire consciousness-building scale.

The second item evaluation focused on the five items (1.04, 1.05, 5, 6, and 7.01) originally posited as indicators of dialogue.
Table 3.1

Item Evaluation: Indicators of the Directive Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1.01</th>
<th>Item 1.02</th>
<th>Item 1.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>Letters/Newsletters</td>
<td>Tv/Radio/Newspapers/Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9558</td>
<td>0.4090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tv/Radio/Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item numbers refer to Section A of the survey instrument (Appendix 5).*
Table 3.2 presents the inter-item correlation matrix obtained from the evaluation. From the Yule's Q correlation scores, it is observed that item 6 has almost a 0.6 inter-item correlation with either item 1.04 or item 1.05, while these two last items have a 0.83 correlation with each other.

On the other hand, item 7.01 has a 0.40 correlation with item 1.04, but then shows very weak overall relationships (0.14, 0.26, and 0.07) with the other three items. Item 5 follows suit by revealing better, but similarly weak correlations with the other items. It shows an acceptable 0.32 and 0.33 correlations with items 1.04 and 1.05, but then dips down to 0.17 and 0.26 correlations with items 6 and 7.01.

These correlations are all positive, indicating that the items capture some of the same things in varying degrees. But the very poor coefficients revealed by item 7 suggest that it is not a strong indicator of the underlying dimension being measured. Overall, it does not belong with the other items, even though it has a sizeable 0.40 relationship with item 1.04. That it has 0.26 and 0.40 correlations with items 5 and 1.04 (its highest correlations) suggests that it perhaps measures, albeit very poorly, some aspects of personal contact which indeed encourage people to make their own problem-solving decisions. Its removal may thus improve the scalability of the other items by perhaps increasing the size and acceptability of item 5's coefficient.

Item 7 is thus very likely to be thrown out as an indicator. But two questions still remain. Should item 5 be retained as a measure of
Table 3.2

Item Evaluation: Indicators of the Dialogue Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1.04 Personal Contact</th>
<th>Item 1.05 Discussion Forums</th>
<th>Item 5 Encourage Own Decisions</th>
<th>Item 6 Encourage Personal Definitions/Preference Stipulations</th>
<th>Item 7.01 Encourage Local Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8387</td>
<td>0.3162</td>
<td>0.5996</td>
<td>0.4078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.04 Personal Contact</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td>0.5987</td>
<td>0.1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.05 Discussion Forums</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1679</td>
<td>0.2571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5 Encourage Own Decisions</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7.01 Encourage Local Options</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item numbers refer to Section A of the questionnaire (Appendix 5).*
dialogue? And can we retain item 1.03 as a reliable indicator of the directive method?

To help answer, all the indicators of the directive and dialogue approaches were subjected to a further evaluation. This third inter-item evaluation sought to see if all of the items actually measure the underlying dimensions called consciousness-building.

The matrix of inter-item correlations which resulted is presented in Table 3.3. A quick look at the table reveals that several of the items not only have very poor Yule's Q correlations, but are also negatively correlated. The inspection of Bi-serial correlations become very helpful at this point. Bi-serial coefficients are correlations of each item with the sum of all the others. These measures make it easier to spot items not positively correlated with the others.

The Bi-serial correlations clearly show that item 7 is both poorly and negatively correlated with the other items. They also indicate that item 1.03 is the next least correlated with the others, followed by item 5.

There was no more question about throwing out item 7 as an indicator. Item 1.03 was also thrown out. The Yule's Q coefficients suggest that it may be an added source of negative inter-item correlations. Moreover, it was observed while evaluating the scale items for the directive method that item 1.03 possesses a disproportionately low inter-item correlation with the other items. All these suggest that the item is not quite a reliable indicator. Item 5, on the other hand, was retained. Its consistently high
Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8788</td>
<td>0.3548</td>
<td>0.5211</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.2857</td>
<td>-0.2488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4643</td>
<td>0.6774</td>
<td>0.8885</td>
<td>0.0926</td>
<td>0.0951</td>
<td>-0.2931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.1345</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td>-0.2190</td>
<td>0.0646</td>
<td>-0.5575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>-0.1782</td>
<td>0.6438</td>
<td>0.2940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.0123</td>
<td>0.4566</td>
<td>0.0794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0703</td>
<td>0.4370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BISERIAL SCALE-ITEM CORRELATION

0.5733  0.5433  0.0285  0.5679  0.6963  0.0550  0.2251  -0.0228

*Item numbers refer to Section A of the survey instrument (Appendix 5).
correlations with item 7 (Yule's Q = 0.42 in Table 3.3; and as observed during the evaluation of items for the dialogue method) suggest that the item's scalability may improve now that the adulterating item 7 has been removed.

The rejection of items 7 and 1.03 resulted to the improved inter-item correlations in Table 3.4. Inspection of the table clearly depicts the increased scalability of all the items. It is to be particularly noted that item 5 improved from a Bi-serial correlation of approximately 0.06 (in Table 3.3) to almost 0.30. More still, item 5 is shown to possess approximately 0.50 and 0.60 Yule's Q correlations with items 1.01 and 1.02 respectively. The suggestion is that the indicator (i.e., item 5) is more of a measure of the directive rather than it is of the dialogue approach. The implication is that encouraging individuals to positively realize that they can make helpful problem solving decisions (i.e., item 5) starts very early in a consciousness-building exercise.

Reinforcing this view is the Guttman Scale ordering which resulted for the consciousness-building items. In an ascending order of difficulty, these items were ordered as: 5, 1.01, 1.02, 1.04, 6, 1.05—with item 5 being the least difficult.

Note also the mild, but inverse relationship between item 1.01 and item 6 (a Yule's Q coefficient of -0.1167) in Table 3.4. It suggests that if a program of consciousness building is one that increasingly emphasizes the use of brochures (i.e., item 1.01), we would expect a corresponding gradual decrease in the extent to which
Table 3.4
Scale Construction: Consciousness-Building Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item 1.01</th>
<th>Item 1.02</th>
<th>Item 1.04</th>
<th>Item 1.05</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
<th>Item 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.01</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8723</td>
<td>0.5451</td>
<td>0.8697</td>
<td>0.4901</td>
<td>-0.1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.02</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7032</td>
<td>0.9130</td>
<td>0.5535</td>
<td>0.3096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.04</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8455</td>
<td>0.1386</td>
<td>0.6566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.05</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1579</td>
<td>0.6273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BISERIAL SCALE-ITEM CORRELATION

| | 0.2981 | 0.6564 | 0.6397 | 0.7112 | 0.2499 | 0.3818 |

*Item numbers refer to Section A of the survey instrument (Appendix 5).
the program encourages individuals to define, identify, or stipulate their personal problem solving preferences (i.e., item 6)—something that the dialogue approach mainly does. The Bi-serial part-whole correlations indicate that overall, neither item is negatively correlated with the others. Item 1.01 has a 0.50 Bi-serial coefficient, while the Bi-serial score for item 6 is 0.40 (approximately).

For the final scale construction analysis, the easier group of items (5, 1.01, 1.02) were selected into the directive consciousness-building scale, while the more difficult items (1.04, 6, 1.05) were grouped into a separate scale measuring dialogue. Each of these scale item groups was further analyzed under the Guttman Scale procedure. This final analysis involved the inspection of two particular coefficients: The coefficient of reproducibility, and the coefficient of scalability. The first of these coefficients measures the extent to which a respondent's scale score truly predicts his response pattern. The second is a measure of how much unidimensionality and cumulativeness the scale actually has.

Based on a total of 52.4% or 240 nonmissing cases, the directive scale has a 0.93 (0.9250) coefficient of reproducibility, and a 0.79 (0.7861) coefficient of scalability. The coefficients for the dialogue scale are less spectacular, with reproducibility and scalability coefficients of 0.85 and 0.55 respectively. These were based on 37.3% or 171 nonmissing responses.

The consciousness-building scale is made up of all the scale items from the directive and dialogue scales combined. These same items have
already been portrayed by Table 3.4. Consciousness-building in a voluntary organization context, thus, is quite appropriately reflected by such activities as distributing brochures (item 1.01), mailing out letters and newsletters (item 1.02), inviting people to public discussion venues (item 1.05), and contacting people by telephones or home visits (item 1.04). And the contents of these activities include encouraging individuals to make helpful problem solving decisions (item 5), and encouraging them to define, stipulate, identify, and suggest their own problem solving preferences (item 6). The resulting scale has a 0.86 (0.8639) coefficient of reproducibility, and a 0.53 (0.5311) coefficient of scalability. These were calculated from 26.2% or 120 nonmissing cases.

The Consciousness Scale

Consciousness, in a voluntary agency setting, evokes the idea of knowledge with respect to what the VO does, and how it does it. For it is this two-part awareness—an awareness of what is being addressed, and an awareness of how it is being addressed—that confers the quality of consciousness to the conscious.

Conscious VO supporters ought, therefore, to possess this dual awareness. They ought to be aware of what the organization addresses. They also should be cognizant of how the agency fulfils its charge: they should be aware of the concrete activities through which the organization accomplishes its concerns.
Measuring consciousness thus required finding indicators for the two underlying dimensions. This was done by asking each of the agency Directors to provide a list of at least ten things, spelling out what their VOs do, and how they do them. The Directors were also asked to arrange the things that they list according to their magnitudes of importance—as perceived by themselves or their organizations.

These lists were combined with data from various VO-specific literature to produce the items on the Consciousness Survey List (CSL) contained in Section B of the survey instrument. It is thus to be noted that the contents of this section differ for each of the five organizations. The attempt is to measure each VO supporter's level of consciousness with respect to a particular VO that he supports. Nevertheless for each VO, care was taken to select for items that search for the dual dimensions of consciousness. Thus, items 1, 2, and 3 of Section B get at what the VO addresses, while items 4, 5, 6 and 7 were developed to measure awareness of how the VO does what it seeks to do. These indicators are made up of a mixture of items considered by the VOs or the VO Directors to be of high and low priority.

The Guttman Scale procedure revealed that the seven items selected for Section B were highly correlated. No inter-item correlation computed disclosed anything less than a 0.90 Yule's Q coefficient. This was not surprising, given that these items were compiled by the author in strict consultation with the agency Directors. The items were all consequently included in the consciousness scale. The Guttman Scale
ordering of the scale items also portrayed an expected order. From the least to the most difficult, the items were ordered as: 3, 2, 1; 7, 6, 5, 4. Thus, all the items posited as measuring knowledge of what the agency addresses (i.e., items 3, 2, 1) were grouped close together, while the other items measuring the awareness of how the organization fulfils its concerns (i.e., items 7, 6, 5, 4) also clustered together.

The consciousness scale has a 0.98 (0.9798) coefficient of reproducibility. Computations were based on 113 (or 24.7%) nonmissing cases. The rather high 0.98 reproducibility coefficient outrightly indicates that the scale is a very valid one.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

How related is consciousness-building to the level of consciousness? Are the consciousness-building variables (dialogue, and the directive methods) differentially associated with consciousness level? These are the central questions being posed by the first hypothesis.

In an attempt to answer, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, symbolized by $r$, was sought for the various variables. Indeed, all data analysis in this study are based on Pearson's $r$ (or on $r^2$) correlations. It reveals a lot of methodological wisdom and practical commonsense to confine one's quantitative analysis, where possible, to the uniform use of an appropriate statistical coefficient.

To start with, the degrees of association between directivity and consciousness-building on one hand, dialogue and consciousness-building on the other, were first inquired into. Correlations between the
directive approach and consciousness-building yielded an \( r \) of 0.58. This shows that there is a relatively strong positive relationship between the two variables, as obtained by looking at 120 nonmissing cases. But correlations between dialogue and consciousness-building depict an even stronger relationship. The \( r \) coefficient is 0.91. Hereagain, the coefficient is positive, indicating that as emphasis on dialogue increases, consciousness-building becomes correspondingly more thorough, and vice versa.

The resulting \( r^2 \) coefficients unveil a lot more about the relationships between the consciousness-building variables and consciousness-building itself. In the first case, for example, an \( r^2 \) of about 0.34 is to be noticed between directivity and consciousness-building. This is saying that the proportion of variance in consciousness-building to be accounted for by the directive method is about 0.34 or 34%. On the other hand, the \( r^2 \) for dialogue and consciousness-building is roughly 0.83. Thus the proportion of variation in consciousness-building (i.e., the proportion of variance in the variable's degree of adequacy) to be explained by dialogue is 0.83 or 83%. This is a rather interesting result especially because while evaluating the measurement items for the consciousness-building scale, it was noted that the items for dialogue were the most difficult. This is being interpreted as implying that even though the dialogue approach is a more difficult route to go, it is a more effective way of building consciousness. It offers more to the consciousness-building scale than the directive items do.
More plausibility accrues to this statement as the relationship between consciousness-building and the level of consciousness is further broken down. An $r$ of 0.34 is recorded between consciousness-building and consciousness. The correlations is positive, indicating that the two variables (consciousness-building, and the level of consciousness) do actually covary in the same directions. A change in one truly effects a change in the other in the same direction. But the coefficient itself ($r = 0.34$) although relatively strong, or moderate, could have been quite stronger. Thus an $r^2$ of 0.12 is obtained, indicating that about 0.12 of the proportion of variance in consciousness is explained by consciousness-building. Put differently, about 12% of the variation in consciousness is explained by consciousness-building.

Caution is called for in interpreting this data. These moderate figures do not mean that consciousness-building and consciousness are unrelated. Quite to the contrary. First, the 0.34 $r$ coefficient clearly indicates that a fairly sizeable positive relationship exists between the two variables. Second, the mild-looking "concomitant variation" (i.e., explained variation) disclosed by $r^2$ may be revealing a pattern that is rather specific to voluntary organizations in general, but not to most other organizations or mobilizers. A VO Director once told me, in confidence, that her agency only attempts to mobilize the "already aware." By this she meant that the VO only targets those who, through their own personal experiences (e.g., extensive higher education; personal or familial ties with past or current members), have already come to appreciate most of the VO's concerns and activities.
Several months of field work revealed that the agency Director and her VO were not alone in that predicament. Similar parallels could be drawn from just about every other VO. Indeed, almost every voluntary agency primarily targets the "already aware" in its mobilizing efforts. Perhaps the only difference is that this particular agency only seeks out the "already aware," while most other VOs mainly target them. However, whether an agency "only" or "mainly" directs its awareness raising efforts toward the already aware, it is quite logical to expect that the target's level of awareness (consciousness) will not be greatly accounted for by the agency's awareness raising (consciousness-building) efforts. Finally, it needs to be noted that the coefficients were plotted from 33 nonmissing cases. Thirty-three is not a particularly great sample.

Suffice it therefore to say that consciousness-building truly correlates with consciousness level, with an $r$ of 0.34. The next question thus is: which of the consciousness-building approaches accounts more for the observed covariance? Correlations between dialogue, the directive method, and consciousness-building already suggest that dialogue predicts more for the direction of consciousness-building in terms of its degree of effectiveness. This suggestion is further examined by taking a look at the specific relationships between each of these consciousness-building approaches and the level of consciousness.

This further step discloses a 0.12 $r$ coefficient between the directive method and consciousness level, based on 75 computed nonmissing
cases. On the other hand, a 0.16 correlation between dialogue and consciousness was also depicted. Again, these correlations are positive, but look small. The small appearance of these values is very deceptive. But indeed, they appropriately and approximately reflect the coefficient obtained when dialogue and the directive methods are combined into consciousness-building, and then correlated with consciousness level. They adequately suggest that the directive approach has a lesser impact on consciousness level, while the dialogue approach has a somewhat greater effect. This becomes clearer if we mathematically round up the correlation scores to one place of decimal. Such roundings would yield the following coefficients: consciousness-building and consciousness \( (r = 0.30) \); directivity and consciousness \( (r = 0.10) \); dialogue and consciousness \( (r = 0.20) \). These coefficients lucidly show that while dialogue plus the directive approaches generate a level of consciousness approximately equal to that produced by consciousness-building \textit{per se} \( (r = 0.30) \), dialogue is overall more likely to produce higher levels of consciousness \( (r = 0.20) \) than does the directive method. Dialogue has a slightly higher covariance with consciousness than does the directive approach. Thus, the first hypothesis seems overall, to have some plausibility despite the moderate and weak appearance of some of the data.

**Discussion**

Measurement construction, through item evaluation and Guttman scaling, provides some acceptable scales for consciousness-building,
consciousness level, dialogue, and the directive method. Data analysis and interpretation underline a few results. First, there is a positive correlation between consciousness-building and level of consciousness. Second, the relationship found between consciousness-building and consciousness level can be even stronger if we could discount for the VO consciousness-building tendencies to mostly target those that are substantially conscious already. Third, there is a somewhat higher correlation between dialogue and the level of consciousness than is shown between the directive method and consciousness level.

All these may offer a host of insights to the scholar. But the local VO professional would perhaps be waiting to be offered some more practical data. This discussion consequently focuses on certain aspects of consciousness-building which may be of further help to the local professional, while also increasing the scholar's insight.

Items 2.01 to 3.04 were included in Section A of the questionnaires precisely for this purpose. These items were meant to provide some practical suggestions on how to most effectively build consciousness.

To capture these practical suggestions, those respondents whose consciousness levels were medium or high were selected, and their responses to the items observed. Items 2.03 and 3.03 were excluded from this observation and following analyses on grounds of poor phrasing.

The first item (2.01) asked these relatively high conscious individuals to indicate whether or not the initial literature sent them by the voluntary organization was short and concise. The "relatively
high conscious" individuals include persons who scored, at least, six out of seven on the consciousness scale. There were 109 of these individuals in all of the 458 survey respondents. Their responses are shown in Table 3.5. Some 89.7% or 70 of these persons (after all missing data are excluded—i.e., the adjusted frequency percent) agree with the statement. Almost 90% of the relatively high conscious persons thus reported that their organizations' approaches to consciousness-building involved the use of short and concisely prepared literature. This position is further strengthened by responses obtained for item 3.01, which asked the respondents whether the VO sent them initial literature that were long and elaborate. Table 3.6 shows that 68 of the 73 fully responding individuals (or 93.2% of the nonmissing cases) indicate a disagreement with the statement. Their "no" responses say that the various VOs did not effectively build their consciousness through sending them long and elaborately detailed literature.

Short and concisely written literature are therefore being suggested as being more effective tools of consciousness-building than very long and elaborate ones. But are brief initial personal contacts similarly more effective than extended initial personal contacts? Items 2.02 and 3.02 probed for an answer to this question.

Item 2.02 asked the respondents if the voluntary organization's initial personal contacts with them lasted for short periods of time. Table 3.7 shows the responses. Of the 69 fully responding persons, 52 or 75.4% answered affirmatively. Again, this response is backed up
Table 3.5
Response of the Relatively High in Consciousness to Item 2.01: "The Initial Literature Sent by the Organization was Short and Concise"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6
Response of the Relatively High in Consciousness to Item 3.01: "The Initial Literature Sent by the Organization was Long and Elaborate"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7
Response of the Relatively High in Consciousness
to Item 2.02: "The Voluntary Organization's
Initial Personal Contact(s) With you Were for
Short Periods"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by the response to item 3.02, which inquired whether the VO's initial personal contacts were for extended time periods. Table 3.8 shows that 80 out of the 82 fully responding individuals (i.e., 97.6% of the nonmissing cases) answered "no" to item 3.02. The suggestion is that most of those who are now relatively high in their level of consciousness were each exposed by the organization to initial personal contacts with agency personnel and staff, which lasted only briefly.

These observations may be interpreted as implying that short initial contacts—whether by person or by literature—are more effective tools for building consciousness. An explanation for this may lie in the fact that brief initial contacts do not permit the agency representatives to utterly spoon-feed the targets. As the notion of dialogue suggests, short initial encounters serve as stimulants or "appetizers;" and the more they are allowed to serve as these, the more effective the consciousness-building exercise would be. Appetizers merely send signals to the human buchal system that certain things quite edible, and perhaps unusually delicious, are on their way to be feasted upon. They stimulate the human system, make it realize that there are things to be eaten within reach, and make it eager to find out what the edibles are. Thus, they make the act of eating a process of sustained expectation, which culminates in enthusiastic discovery. Without this sense of discovery I see eating deteriorate into a dreary, uninteresting, time consuming bore.

Similarly, the mobilizer should stimulate his targets and make them realize that there are a few things which they could be doing, which
Table 3.8

Response of the Relatively High in Consciousness to Item 3.02: "The Voluntary Organization's Initial Personal Contact(s) With you Were Each for Long Discussion Periods"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they are quite capable of doing, but which they may perhaps not be doing. This the mobilizer does through the initial contact, by offering only gists of the issues or activities involved. These "gists" are simply spectres of what the mobilizer's concerns are, and do not require extended personal contact times or detailed pieces of literature to convey. They are meant to inspire the target to wanting to discover more about the issues and activities involved, and thus enable the mobilizer to later serve the target in a more effective capacity as a genuinely concerned guide or consultant.

These premises of dialogue suggest, therefore, that initial consciousness-building encounters with the target, whether through personal contact or through literature, would be more effective if designed to last for only brief periods by the mobilizer—because it stimulates the target individuals to learn more by self discovery, through the asking of several questions which they may consider particularly insightful or of special interest. This thesis is what items 2.04 and 3.04 attempt to examine further, as follow ups to items 2.01, 3.01, 2.02 and 3.02.

Item 2.04 inquired if the respondents asked or wished to ask more probing questions after the VO's initial contacts with them. Table 3.9 shows that 48 of the 83 fully responding persons, or approximately 58% of the nonmissing cases, recollected having asked or having wished to ask more questions. Item 3.04 further underscores this response. Table 3.10 discloses that 49 of 73 fully responding individuals (i.e., 67%) disagreed with the statement that they did not ask or wish to ask
Table 3.9

Response of the Relatively High in Consciousness to Item 2.04: "You Asked More Questions or Wished to Find out More About the Problem(s) After the Voluntary Organization's Initial Contact(s) With You"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.10
Response of the Relatively High in Consciousness to Item 3.04: "You did Not Ask or Wish to Ask More Questions after the Voluntary Organization's Initial Contact(s) With You"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more probing questions after the organization's initial contact with them. It is noteworthy that these respondents are primarily people of relatively high consciousness, who have already indicated that the organization's initial personal or literature contacts with them were for brief time spans. Perhaps their relatively high consciousness may be traceable, in part, to the non-exhaustive nature of the VOs' methods of initial contact—which spark the targets' interest and lead them on to full personal discovery of the relevant issues and activities. In the absence of any other evidence, the implication is that brief but concise and well organized initial literature or personal contacts are some of the most effective tools of building consciousness.

Summary

The scale construction procedure justified the inclusion of only six items from the Consciousness-Building Inventory (Section A of the survey instrument), as part of the consciousness-building scale. But more importantly, the procedure established the following (Table 3.11) Guttman Scale order for each of the items. This statistical ordering of scale items from the lowest to the highest in difficulty indicates that the set of activities representing the directive items (e.g., use of brochures, radio and television ads) are the easier to engage upon, and thus, the most predominantly adopted. On the other hand, the set of activities representing the dialogue items (such as organizing personal contacts, and organizing public discussion meetings) are more
### Table 3.11
The Guttman Scale Ordering of the Consciousness-Building Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Guttman Scale Order (From the Least to the Most Difficult)</th>
<th>Serial Number of the Items (as in Section A of the Survey Instrument)</th>
<th>The Consciousness-Building Scale Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) made you feel that anyway you decided to help would have a tangible effect toward solving the problem(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>[The voluntary organization]: Sent you brochures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>[The voluntary organization]: Reached you through the television, Radio, newspapers or magazines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[The voluntary organization]: Talked to you on the phone, in person or by home visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) explicitly encouraged you personally to define, suggest, identify or stipulate what you could do to help solve the problem(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>[The voluntary organization]: Invited you to one or more public forums for discussing the problem(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effort-taking, and therefore, not very commonly adopted by organizations in their consciousness-building programs. Further, the Guttman Scale order of 1 assigned to item 5 suggests that all levels of consciousness-raising strongly build on a content which attempts to help individuals positively realize that they are quite capable of making helpful problem solving decisions. This is a quality which had been originally attributed conceptually to only the dialogue items.

Data suggest that there is a fairly strong positive covariance between consciousness-building and the level of consciousness. The relationship between these two variables may even be much stronger if we could cancel out for the moderating effects of some identified consciousness-building tendencies that are specific to VOs.

Dialogue has higher covariances with both consciousness level and consciousness-building than the directive approach does. Short, concise, and non-extended initial VO consciousness-building contacts seem to be very effective tools for awareness raising. Indeed, a fairly strong plausibility seem to accrue to the first hypothesis.
Chapter 4

FROM CONSCIOUSNESS TO PARTICIPATION

Introduction

....The impact of a consciousness-building venture is a consequence of the applied consciousness-building approach. Consciousness level is a product of consciousness-building effectiveness. Level of efficacy is a direct function of consciousness level. And the level of participation is mostly traceable to the level of efficacy, although trust is also a prerequisite for participation....

These are some of the views postulated in the early pages of this study. Evidence in the last chapter indicates the soundness of the first two postulations. Dialogue, a method of consciousness-building, correlates more highly with consciousness-building and consciousness level than does the directive approach. And consciousness-building correlates fairly well with consciousness level.

But the other stated relationships between consciousness and efficacy, efficacy and participation, participation and trust still remain unexplored postulates.
Examining some of these relationships is the concern of this chapter. The investigation will be organized into two parts. The first delves into the relationship between the sense of efficacy and the feeling of consciousness, with the second hypothesis as its organizing hub. The second takes a close look at efficacy and participation, testing the third hypothesis.

CONSCIOUSNESS LEVEL AND THE LEVEL OF EFFICACY

The Second Hypothesis

Consistent with this study is a theme which runs through this entire piece, and which has been constantly reiterated herein, especially by the last chapter. The march toward improved responsible participation must always begin with consciousness-building (see, e.g., Mische, 1977; Alger, 1980).

Building consciousness concerts efforts at making the target individuals more aware of their environments. In effect, the more conscious person is a master of his environment. He masters his environment in the sense that he knows what his surrounding contexts (and problems) are, and how to set about coping with them (see chapter 1).

More importantly, however, the conscious individual is also the master of himself. His awareness of the problems inherent in his surrounding contexts, coupled with his knowledge of how to address them
make him nurture the feeling that some change is possible, that he can play a part in heralding this change, and that the efforts he expends toward the problem solving change is indeed worth his while. Thus, the possession of what this study describes as efficacy (see, e.g., chapter 1) makes the conscious individual the master of his own self. Efficacy simply refers to a feeling that one can do or participate, a feeling that one's actions can have some effective impact, and a feeling of self-confidence accruing from the positive belief in one's own ability (see, also, Campbell et al., 1954; Milbrath, 1965; Robinson et al., 1968).

In essence, this study posits that consciousness, which results from consciousness-building leads, in turn, to efficacy. An individual who exhibits a high level of consciousness is therefore presumed to be very likely to exhibit a corresponding high level of efficacy.

One however wonders if there are dints of empirical validity in these positions. Does any degree of association exist between consciousness and efficacy? Is the level of consciousness truly related to the level of efficacy? If so, what is the nature of the relationship? The second hypothesis attempts to answer these questions. Thus:

HYPOTHESIS 2: The voluntary organization members more conscious of what the voluntary organization does will tend to possess more efficacy.
Measurement Construction

Examining the second hypothesis requires that efficacy and consciousness levels be measured. The construction of the measurement scale for consciousness level has already been examined in the last chapter. As a result, the following section only focuses on building the measurement used by this study to capture the level of efficacy.

The Efficacy Scale

Campbell and his colleagues (1954) at the University of Michigan Survey Research Center (SRC) were the first to offer a set of items which they proposed as reliable measures of the concept of efficacy. Since then, the items proposed by this group of scholars have been widely accepted by social scientists in general (see, e.g., Milbrath, 1965; Robinson et al., 1968). These same items were discovered for use in this study.

But Campbell et al. particularly focused on the sense of political efficacy. This study does not. And because of this, there was the need for adaption. The four sets of items presented in Section C of the questionnaire (Appendix 5) were thus adapted from those originally constructed by the SRC group of scholars.

The items were subjected to Guttman Scale analysis in order to test their relevance to this study in terms of truly measuring the dimensions that underlie the notion of efficacy being forwarded. Inter-item correlations were carried out to evaluate the items; and Yule's Q coefficients were also inspected.
Table 4.1 displays the correlation matrix produced by the inter-item correlations. The Yule's Q coefficients ranged from 0.7115 (for items 3 and 4) to 0.9061 (for items 1 and 3). These are all high correlations. Besides, they are all positive. All of these suggest that the items are reliable measures, which attempt to tap the same underlying construct in the same directions.

Further Guttman Scale analysis disclosed that the items yielded an approximately 0.90 (or 0.8968) coefficient of reproducibility, indicating that the items form a valid scale. These coefficients were computed from 82.5% of all the persons who responded to the survey—i.e., from 378 nonmissing cases. Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 were thus included in the efficacy scale used in this study.

Disagreeing with any of the items was considered a pass for that item. The ordering of the items by the Guttman Scale procedure showed that items 2 and 3 were the most difficult to pass. The following ascending order of difficulty was assigned to the items by the scaling procedure: 1, 4, 3, 2—with item 1 being the easiest and item 2 being the most in difficulty.

This item ordering suggests that broadly speaking, several VO supporters remain unaware of the several other ways through which they can support a VO, aside from the commonplace act of making money donations. Voluntary agencies may be overly emphasizing monetary support. This is indicated by the overall lowest pass rate recorded for item 2, with only 240 out of the 378 respondents (or 63%) passing or answering "no" to it. The implication is that voluntary organizations
Table 4.1
Item Evaluation: Indicators of Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>I don't think that [the VO] cares much about what people like me think.</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Donating money is the only way people like me can have a say about how [the VO] operates.</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>People like me don't have a say about what [the VO] does.</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Sometimes [the VO's] activities seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>I don't think that [the VO] cares much about what people like me think.</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8032</td>
<td>0.9061</td>
<td>0.7254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Donating money is the only way people like me can have a say about how [the VO] operates.</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9059</td>
<td>0.7115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>People like me don't have a say about what [the VO] does.</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Sometimes [the VO's] activities seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item numbers refer to Section C of the questionnaire (Appendix 5). Since items were also adapted to specific organizations, the words in brackets [ ] were substituted for the specific agency's actual name.
may direly need to reconstruct the general thrust of their consciousness-building efforts, so as to enable their local constituencies become more aware of the truism that many other ways abound through which any individual can lend more of his support to any of these agencies.

Another suggestion is that many VO supporters who are indeed efficacious (i.e., who truly believe that they can do something through participation in the organization) may actually show little or no participation in organizational matters after their acts of donating are discounted for. A ready and willing individual cannot participate through routes which he does not undoubtedly know to exist. The implication is that it may be at best difficult to successfully examine the relationship posited in the third hypothesis (i.e., that efficacy leads to participation) by relying on voluntary organization data. These issues will be raised again at a more appropriate point elsewhere in this study. Meanwhile, the investigation of the relationship between consciousness and efficacy continues hereunder.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Is there any degree of association between consciousness level and the level of efficacy? This empirical question lies at the very core of the second hypothesis. Pearson's r coefficients were inspected to help get at an answer.

Correlations between consciousness and the sense of efficacy produced an r coefficient of 0.33 (0.3252). The coefficient is positive,
indicating that consciousness level and the level of efficacy do indeed covary in the same directions. A low level of consciousness is likely to indicate a low level of efficacy, while a high level of consciousness is likely to reflect a corresponding high level of efficacy and vice versa. Calculations were based on 104 individuals who fully responded to the consciousness and efficacy scales.

The $r^2$ coefficient is about 0.11 (0.1058). This says that almost 0.11 or 11% of the proportion of variance in efficacy is explained by consciousness.

EFFICACY LEVEL AND THE LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION

The Third Hypothesis

The conceptual model for enhancing participation offered by this study (see, e.g., chapter 1; Diagram 1.2) not only suggests that those who become supporters of organizations are efficacious individuals. It also goes further to suggest that a higher level of efficacy will be manifested by a higher level of participation in the organization's activities. Participation is therefore presumed to be mainly traceable to efficacy. This latter proposition is what the third hypothesis proposes to examine. Thus:

HYPOTHESIS 3: The more efficacious individuals will participate more in voluntary organization activities.
Measurement Construction

Exploring the third hypothesis requires a focus on efficacy and participation. This raises the need for building some acceptable tools for measuring the two variables. A measurement scale has already been constructed for efficacy in the first part of this chapter. As a result, the following section deals with the construction of the participation scale used in this study.

The Participation Scale

Section D of the survey instrument shows the twelve items (numbered 1 to 9) used by this study as indicators of participation. These indicators are adapted versions of items on a participation scale originally developed by Mathews and Prothro (1966). The items were subjected to the Guttman Scale procedure to see how well they measure participation in the context of this study.

Table 4.2 displays the inter-item correlation matrix obtained during the first evaluation. A quick look at the matrix uncovers item 4 as having a deplorable part-whole correlation with the other items. It possesses the poorest Bi-serial score of 0.0165. Items 8 and 9 show the next lowest Bi-serial scores (item 8 = 0.4624; item 9 = 0.1437). But when we look more closely at the inter-item correlations, we discover that item 4 not only correlates very poorly with most of the other items, but also does so very negatively. The Yule's Q coefficients show that the item has negative correlations with items 1, 2.02, 2.04, 5, and 6. The removal of this item would therefore improve the overall strength of the scale and of some of the
**Table 4.2**

**First Item Evaluation: Indicators of Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NUMBER*</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2.01</th>
<th>#2.02</th>
<th>#2.03</th>
<th>#2.04</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.9078</td>
<td>0.9558</td>
<td>0.9299</td>
<td>0.8845</td>
<td>0.8072</td>
<td>-0.0604</td>
<td>0.9345</td>
<td>0.8799</td>
<td>0.8319</td>
<td>0.4759</td>
<td>0.1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8829</td>
<td>0.7804</td>
<td>0.5551</td>
<td>0.7028</td>
<td>0.0690</td>
<td>0.7673</td>
<td>0.7321</td>
<td>0.6614</td>
<td>0.3857</td>
<td>0.2427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8509</td>
<td>0.8634</td>
<td>0.7435</td>
<td>-0.2470</td>
<td>0.8880</td>
<td>0.8384</td>
<td>0.8164</td>
<td>0.4317</td>
<td>0.1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9470</td>
<td>0.6597</td>
<td>0.1200</td>
<td>0.8452</td>
<td>0.7269</td>
<td>0.8001</td>
<td>0.3913</td>
<td>0.1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.6684</td>
<td>-0.1272</td>
<td>0.8746</td>
<td>0.7005</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.5760</td>
<td>0.1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.5664</td>
<td>0.7379</td>
<td>0.5194</td>
<td>0.8118</td>
<td>0.4752</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.2618</td>
<td>-0.4365</td>
<td>0.6072</td>
<td>0.2738</td>
<td>0.1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9336</td>
<td>0.9099</td>
<td>0.5897</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7805</td>
<td>0.5234</td>
<td>0.2357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biserial Correlation**

0.9792, 0.7426, 0.8949, 0.8240, 0.7694, 0.6898, 0.0165, 0.8849, 0.7584, 0.8449, 0.4624, 0.1437

*Item numbers refer to Section D of the survey instrument (Appendix 5).
items. It is interesting to note that item 4 asked the respondents to express whether or not they had participated in the VO through making donations of various kinds (e.g., money, food, clothes).

Apparently these types of donations (money, food, clothes, etc.) are so commonplace among VO supporters that they may not be very reliable measures of participation in voluntary organizations, especially when combined together into a single item as was done here.

Removal of item 4 improved the measurement instrument as was expected. Inspection of the inter-item correlations in Table 4.3 shows that item 8 seems to have benefited most. With the exception of items 2.01, 2.02, 2.03, and 9 with which it respectively has Yule's Q coefficients of 0.42, 0.45, 0.42, and 0.25, item 8 otherwise shows correlations ranging between 0.50 and 0.76 with the other six items of the instrument. These are all relatively high correlations, except for the 0.25 correlation with item 9—which consistently has relatively low Yule's Q correlations with all of the other items.

It is curious, however, that item 8 which deals with office holding has the smallest (but not poor) correlations with items 2.01, 2.02 and 2.03, which ask about discussing VO problems with the family, workplace comrades and other community leaders. Perhaps VO officers tend to take it for granted that members of their family, people where they work, and other community leaders are quite aware of what their VO's problems are. Perhaps VO leaders view these groups of people as the only ones who know almost as much as themselves about the VO's problems and therefore do not consider it worthwhile to spend most of their time rehashing the problems with them.
Table 4.3
Second Item Evaluation: Indicators of Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NUMBER*</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2.01</th>
<th>#2.02</th>
<th>#2.03</th>
<th>#2.04</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9126</td>
<td>0.9530</td>
<td>0.9334</td>
<td>0.8911</td>
<td>0.8172</td>
<td>0.9336</td>
<td>0.8773</td>
<td>0.8416</td>
<td>0.5025</td>
<td>0.1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.01</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8803</td>
<td>0.7919</td>
<td>0.5804</td>
<td>0.7184</td>
<td>0.7699</td>
<td>0.7326</td>
<td>0.6808</td>
<td>0.4163</td>
<td>0.2622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.02</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8506</td>
<td>0.8673</td>
<td>0.7477</td>
<td>0.8944</td>
<td>0.8479</td>
<td>0.8217</td>
<td>0.4474</td>
<td>0.2031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.03</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9500</td>
<td>0.6771</td>
<td>0.8468</td>
<td>0.7292</td>
<td>0.8115</td>
<td>0.4215</td>
<td>0.1257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.04</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
<td>0.8788</td>
<td>0.7101</td>
<td>0.8453</td>
<td>0.6011</td>
<td>0.1585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7438</td>
<td>0.5303</td>
<td>0.8224</td>
<td>0.5020</td>
<td>0.1884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9373</td>
<td>0.9109</td>
<td>0.6013</td>
<td>0.1070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7868</td>
<td>0.5355</td>
<td>0.2779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7606</td>
<td>0.2446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item numbers refer to Section D of the survey instrument (Appendix 5).*
Table 4.3 also reveals that item 9 continues to be relatively very poorly correlated with each of the other items, with Yule's Q coefficients only ranging from 0.10 to 0.28. Rejection of the item, however, did not improve the scale very much (see Table 4.4). A comparison of Tables 4.4 and 4.3 shows that there is hardly any improved changes in the inter-item Yule's Q coefficients portrayed by Table 4.4.

Both items 8 and 9 were therefore allowed to remain as parts of the participation scale. And the scale itself contains the 11 items that have been displayed in Table 4.3.

Further Guttman Scale analysis reveals that the participation scale has a 0.81 (0.8147) coefficient of reproducibility—which is not particularly strong either by convention or by comparison with the other scales produced by this study. Analysis was based on 45% or 206 nonmissing responses. The eleven items constituting the participation scale were found to have the following ascending Guttman Scale order of difficulty: 9, 5, 2.01, 1, 2.03, 2.02, 6, 3, 8, 7, 2.04 (with item 9 being the easiest, and item 2.04 being the hardest).

Of particular interest at this point is the Guttman placement of item 9 as the least difficult to pass. Item 9 asked the respondents if they were also members of other local VOs similar to the one for which they completed the survey. The Guttman Scale order of their responses indicate that just about every other respondent (about 49% of the nonmissing cases) actually belonged to some other VOs with similar concerns. The suggestion is that belonging to one VO seems to be the first step to participating in another. The implication is that there is something like a recruitment process going on, by which a certain
Table 4.4
Third Item Evaluation: Indicators of Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NUMBER*</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2.01</th>
<th>#2.02</th>
<th>#2.03</th>
<th>#2.04</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9115</td>
<td>0.9547</td>
<td>0.9278</td>
<td>0.8957</td>
<td>0.8215</td>
<td>0.9326</td>
<td>0.8819</td>
<td>0.8274</td>
<td>0.5050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.01</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8783</td>
<td>0.7953</td>
<td>0.5668</td>
<td>0.7361</td>
<td>0.7659</td>
<td>0.7343</td>
<td>0.6399</td>
<td>0.3957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.02</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8482</td>
<td>0.8756</td>
<td>0.7385</td>
<td>0.8913</td>
<td>0.8472</td>
<td>0.8148</td>
<td>0.4634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.03</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9383</td>
<td>0.6888</td>
<td>0.8298</td>
<td>0.7073</td>
<td>0.7872</td>
<td>0.4254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.04</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.6807</td>
<td>0.8785</td>
<td>0.7147</td>
<td>0.8507</td>
<td>0.8507</td>
<td>0.6255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7380</td>
<td>0.5326</td>
<td>0.7983</td>
<td>0.4913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9412</td>
<td>0.9138</td>
<td>0.6136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7701</td>
<td>0.5235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item numbers refer to Section D of the survey instrument (Appendix 5).
group of people—those already enthused by concerns similar to that of
the VO—are usually the VO's special targets. This adds more support
to the position held in chapter 3, that VOs tend to gear their
mobilizing efforts toward the "already aware."

Data Analysis and Interpretation

How true is the assertion that efficacy level is related to the
level of participation? This is the question posed by the third
hypothesis. Attempt at an answer was made by first searching for the
appropriate Pearson's $r$ coefficient.

Bivariate correlation of efficacy with participation discloses an
$r$ of 0.30 (0.3036). Calculations were based on 136 subjects that fully
responded to the scale items for the two variables. The coefficient
is positive, indicating that efficacy and participation do indeed
covary in the same directions. The magnitude of the coefficient
itself is also strong moderately, with $r$ being 0.30. The resulting $r^2$
of 0.09 thus suggests that the proportion of variance in participation
explained by efficacy is 9%.

Of noteworthiness is the fact that these coefficients approximate
those found between consciousness-building and consciousness ($r = 0.34,$
$r^2 = 0.12$); consciousness and efficacy ($r = 0.33; r^2 = 0.11$). This
strongly corroborates our postulations regarding the linkage between
these variables as articulated in the first chapter, Diagram 1.2. Yet
it is to be observed that the correlations obtained for efficacy and
participation ($r = 0.30; r^2 = 0.09$) are indeed lesser than those
reported for the other two sets of variables (less by up to 3% and 2%, respectively). The question then is: why this slight deprecation in the observed correlations? Does it mean that the relationship between efficacy and participation is the weakest in the postulated inter-variable links?

By virtue of an inference which has already been made in the measurement construction section, I start by answering "no" to the last part of the foregoing question. It should be recalled that while evaluating the items for the efficacy scale, it was noted that the order of difficulty established by the Guttman procedure unveiled that item 2 (in Section C of the questionnaire) was the most difficult to pass. This item asked respondents to agree or disagree with the statement: "Donating money is the only way that people like me can have a say about how the VO operates." To disagree was to pass, and to agree was to fail the item. It was found that this item had the lowest number of passes (only 63% passes) when compared to other items in the scale.

This meant that as much as 37% of the respondents agreed that donating money is the only way that they could take part ("have a say") in VO operations. This suggested that the VOs may be placing excessive emphasis on money donations, especially when they attempt to build the consciousness of their future supporters.

Offhand it is fairly known through the uncoveries of the specific VO profiles in the second chapter, that most of the VOs do tremendously emphasize fund-raising or money contributions. Nevertheless, the
validity of the suggestion, qua empirical statement, was further examined by observing responses to items 4.01 to 4.11 in the Consciousness-Building Inventory (Section A of the survey). These items capture the respondents' indications of the various alternative ways of participation suggested to them by the voluntary organization during consciousness building.

Table 4.5 summarizes the obtained results. The total adjusted frequency refers to the total nonmissing "yes" and "no" responses to each item. The adjusted frequency percent represents the percentage of the total nonmissing responses answering either a "yes" or a "no" to each item. The table shows that everyone of the 289 persons who responded to the items focusing on money donations (i.e., 100%) answered "yes." All responses indicated that the VO definitely suggested either giving, contributing, or lending money as a way that the individual could participate in the VO's efforts at solving some problems. This figure (100%) clearly stands out when compared to all the other possible ways of participation in VO problem solving. Only one other alternative (volunteering time or services) received as much as a 48% emphasis. And the only other receiving up to a 33% emphasis is the "other" category, with only 69 persons responding.

Data thus disclose that VOs tend to overly emphasize participation through monetary support during consciousness-building. They do this at the expense of the other possible participation alternatives, to which the VOs apparently devote little attention.

An implication is that most individual members of a VO's constituency (including supporters) may not be quite aware of the truth
Table 4.5

Alternative Ways of Participation Suggested by the VOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Ways of Participation Suggested By the VO</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQUENCY PERCENT (%) RESPONDING: &quot;NO&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;YES&quot;</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Donating ( )</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>Contributing (Money donations)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>Lending ( )</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>Housing/hosting visitors</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>Traveling Locally/Abroad</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Donating clothes</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>Donating food</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>Volunteering time/services</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>Voting in voluntary organization forums/meetings</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Voting in local, state, or national government elections for sympathetic public officials.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item numbers refer to Section A of the questionnaire (Appendix 5).
that several other ways exist through which they can effectively participate in the VO's activities. A second and more far reaching implication is that several VO supporters who are indeed efficacious may truly show very little or no participation after their donation activities. Though a person may be eager, confident, willing and ready, he cannot nevertheless participate through ways which he does not clearly know to be existing.

Here again, evidence suggests that there is some quality specific to VOs in general, or to the particular group of VOs being studied, which will always threaten to negate attempts at successfully testing the hypotheses postulated by this study. It is believed that the seemingly weaker correlations found between efficacy and participation could have been much higher if the VO consciousness-building efforts were more effectively conducted. Building consciousness should be directed toward making people equally aware of the different alternative ways to participate in the solving of particular problems. It should not excessively emphasize some specific ways of doing what needs to be done, at the expense of the other alternative ways of doing it.

Summary and Discussion

First, a brief summary of this chapter's findings. Fairly strong positive correlations were found between consciousness level and level of efficacy. A sizable degree of covariation thus exists between efficacy and consciousness. This lends support to the second hypothesis.
The correlations between consciousness and efficacy were approximately of the same magnitude as those found to exist between consciousness-building and consciousness. Thus, about the same degree of covariance found between consciousness-building and consciousness also exists between consciousness level and the level of efficacy. And all covariances were in the same directions. This evidence strongly sustains the relationships so far posited by this study.

Scale item analysis while exploring the second hypothesis hints that VO supporters high in efficacy may not altogether reflect their expected levels of participation due to some VO consciousness-building tendencies.

Evidence for the third hypothesis shows positive moderately strong correlations between efficacy and participation, thus supporting the third hypothesis. But the correlation coefficients were not nearly as strong as was expected, suggesting that the hints dropped by the scale item analysis for the second hypothesis needed some more exploration.

A "why" question thus emerged, seeking to account for the slight depreciation of evidence observed by the third hypothesis. Further analysis suggested a few conclusions. First, the relatively smaller correlations between efficacy and participation do not necessarily reflect a weakness in the hypothesized relationship. Indeed, higher correlations for the same variables are very likely to be obtained by studying VOs or other mobilizers whose consciousness-building
efforts are what they ought to be. People may have efficacy, but lack the particular awareness needed for full and more effective participation in problem solving.

Secondly, VOs are not currently making optimum use of the participation potential of their efficacious supporters due to their tendency to predominantly emphasize only one channel of participation (money donations) during consciousness building. These conclusions provide a focal point for the discussion that follows.

Several comments by some of the VO supporters who completed the survey instrument reflect well on these conclusions. A notation on the questionnaire by one respondent serves as a precise point of departure. Writes this particular individual:

I was sent literature and information on purchases I could make. Never have I been informed about volunteering, or requested to help (in any other way).

First, it should be pointed out that "purchases" (actually, card buying) is the form of money support or money contribution mostly emphasized by the specific VO being referred to by this person. Next, judging from the above statement it can be deciphered that this particular individual has the necessary feeling of efficacy. He appears to believe that he can actually help. He seems to feel that more of his help is truly needed; that is, that he can actually accomplish something effective by helping in any other way aside from money support. He also seems to be quite self-confident by the way he made the assertions. These observations prompted me to particularly review the questionnaire completed by him. Other
comments in his survey revealed that he has held offices (ranging from being the Treasurer to being the President) in several other voluntary organizations. The efficacy scale revealed that he attained the highest possible score. Even though the above assertions reflect him as being willing or perhaps yearning to participate somehow in the VO's activities, his score on the participation scale was deplorable. Nil! He scored zero; the only participation he had ever done in this particular VO was donate money. And quite unexpectedly, his consciousness level in terms of the VO's activities was low to medium. He scored a total of only 3 points out of 7 possible. (The mean for this particular VO was a score of 2.89 on the consciousness scale).

This is just one of the scores of similar cases encountered in this study. But what does one conclude, even by looking at just a single case like this? One very important thing stands out. And putting it tersely: some people may possess efficacy, but may lack the specific consciousness that would ordinarily enable them to participate in specific problem-solving ventures. This becomes the problem when the mobilizer (e.g., the VO) falls victim to overly emphasizing just one channel of participation while, by and large, neglecting the other possible alternatives during times of consciousness building. All other mobilizers, like all voluntary agencies are therefore more likely to enlist higher level participation if they ensure that their consciousness-building activities are comprehensive. A program of consciousness-building
is "comprehensive" in the sense that it exposes the target persons to all the possible alternative ways of participating in the problem solving exercise envisaged by the particular activity concern on which it focuses.
Chapter 5

PREFERENCE PERCEPTION, TRUST, EFFICACY, AND RESPONSIBLE PARTICIPATION

Introduction

If we may pause for a moment, chapter 1 asserts that some relationships exist between the consciousness building variables and consciousness level, consciousness level and efficacy, efficacy level and participation. These assertions have been examined in chapters three and four. They have each been found to have some empirical plausibility.

But chapter 1 also posits some relationships between preference perception and participation level, trust level and participation, efficacy and trust level (see, e.g., Diagram 1.4). These postulations are explored in the current chapter.

The explorations are presented in three parts. The first looks at the relationship between preference perception and participation by examining the first part of the fourth hypothesis. The second focuses on how trust and participation are related, with the second
part of the fourth hypothesis being explored. The third probes the relationship between efficacy and trust by investigating the fifth hypothesis.

PREFERENCE PERCEPTION AND THE INDIVIDUAL'S PARTICIPATION BEHAVIOR

The Fourth Hypothesis: Part 1

At the beginning of this study we argued that a precondition for successful consciousness-building is that the mobilizer makes the people realize that there are some benefits to be reaped by participating in a problem solving endeavor. One would expect that if the said benefits are appealing to the people, they would want to participate in order to achieve them. This may be done in a number of ways. At times the individual may efficaciously wish to consciously act (i.e., participate) by himself. At others he may, as in most community settings, wish to strengthen or broaden his participation power byconcerting his efforts with those of others. This may be by joining an already existing entity (e.g., an organization), or by forming a new one. Whether this entity is newly formed or already existing, it is to be noted that its major attraction for the conscious, efficacious participants is that it greatly reflects their values, which they are now greatly conscious of, thereby offering them opportunities to satisfy those values. As a result, it is to be expected that the value preferences of the
entity will reflect those of the participants—now members. And the members, in turn, owe their support or sustenance to the entity.

These premises have been well enunciated in the first chapter by our discussions of Diagram 1.2 and Diagram 1.3. Some of the individuals in whom the VO has successfully generated a consciousness to participate and the resulting sense of efficacy decide, in effect, to choose the VO as their vehicle for transnational participation. Thus, the VO helps satisfy their preferences, while they owe to the VO all the voluntary support it needs. In effect, these individuals participate in the organization's transnational problem solving by supporting the agency's activities.

It, therefore, follows that if the VO members should at any time perceive that the VO is no longer pursuing the preferences for which they support it, they will no longer be likely to keep up their participation. This is what the first part of the fourth hypothesis postulates. Thus:

HYPOTHESIS 4.1: Voluntary organization members will tend to diminish their participation in the VO if they perceive that their own preferences are actually different from those of the VO.

Measurement: The Preference Perception Opinion Questionnaire (PPOQ)

Hypothesis 4.1 essentially seeks to look at the members' participation behavior relative to their perception of the VO's preferences vis a vis their own preferences. An opinion-type measurement tool was constructed to aid this phase of the investigation. Section E of the survey instrument contains the
measurement tool specifically developed for this purpose—the Preference Perception Opinion Questionnaire (PPOQ). The PPOQ is made up of four statements to which the subjects were asked to respond on a strongly agree—strongly disagree continuum (see Section E, items 2 to 5). The data presented, analyzed and interpreted hereunder are mainly based on supporters' responses to these items.

Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

Pearson's $r$ correlations between the responses to the four items on the Preference Perception Opinion Questionnaire (i.e., Section E of the survey, items 2 to 5) and the participation variable were inspected. The coefficients were computed on 199 nonmissing cases, made up of individuals who fully completed the participation and PPOQ items of the survey. A coefficient of $r = 0.33$ was found between item 2 and participation, while an $r$ of 0.32 was similarly found between item 4 and participation. Item 2 asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the assertion that they actively support organizations which do not reflect their individual values. Item 4 sought to capture their responses to the assertion that they do not mind supporting agencies which do not appeal to their own values. Thus, the strong and positive $r$ correlations which the PPOQ items have with participation (i.e., item 2: $r = 0.33$; item 4: $r = 0.32$) are saying that responses to the two items do covary with the degree of participation in the same directions.
The suggestion is that individuals will tend not to participate, through active support, in organizations which do not reflect their personal values (i.e., many "disagrees" on item 2). Neither do individuals not mind participating in VOs that do not appeal to their personal humanitarian values by actively supporting them (i.e., many suggested "disagree" responses to item 4). In essence, dissimilar preference perception does not lend itself to improved participation.

Correlations between participation and items 3 and 5 sustain this argument. The obtained Pearson's $r$ coefficients (participation and item 3: $r = -0.34$; participation and item 5: $r = -0.39$) are strong but negative. This is saying that strong but inverse relationships exist between these two items and participation. Thus, as scores on items 3 and 5 increase (i.e., the more the individual disagrees with these two PPOQ items), the level of participation decreases. Conversely, a decrease in scores for items 3 and 5 (i.e., more agreement with the items) reflects an increase in the level of participation.

This becomes clearer and avoids misleading interpretations when it is called to mind that the specific coding system used for the PPOQ assigns lower scores to agreement (and higher scores to disagreement) with the items. This suggests that individuals tend to participate in organizations by actively supporting those reflecting their own value preferences (i.e., item 3). Further, people tend to generally feel that they should participate in organizational activities by actively supporting only those
organizations appealing to their individual values (i.e., item 5). Similar preference is, in essence, correlated with participatory support.

In sum, a strong covariation exists between participation and preference perception. And this covariance is indeed in the expected directions. These and other suggestions embedded in the observed Pearson's $r$ coefficients beg for further clarification. The elaborate presentation and exploration of data on each of the PPOQ items which follows helps to do this.

The first of the four items (item 2) asked the VO members to respond to the statement: "I actively support voluntary organizations which do not reflect my personal humanitarian values." Table 5.1 indicates that 360 persons fully responded to this statement. Of this number, only 7% (1.4% + 5.6%) or 25 agreed. On the other hand, as much as 335 individuals or 93% (36.9% + 56.1%) disagreed, with 56.1% expressing strong disagreement. This result is clearly unequivocal in its suggestion. Conscious individuals will tend not to support or participate in the activities of organizations possessing a set of preferences that differs from their own.

Responses to item 4 adds more credence to this result (see Table 5.2). Item 4 sought the opinion of the VO supporters on the assertion: "I do not mind actively supporting a voluntary organization which does not appeal to my personal values." Three hundred and sixty-three (363) nonmissing cases were encountered. Only 52 or 14.3% (2.2% + 12.1%) agreed. The remaining 311 responses,
Table 5.1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2

Supporter Response to the Statement: "I do not Mind Actively Supporting a Voluntary Organization Which does not Appeal to my Personal Values." (Item 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or 85.5% (44.8% + 40.7%) all disagreed. Indeed, individuals do mind what the preferences of the organization which they support are, particularly when they perceive that the organization's preferences do not reflect theirs.

On the other hand, Table 5.3 portrays the subjects' responses to item 3 which states: "I actively support voluntary organizations which reflect my personal humanitarian values." Four hundred and four (404) individuals responded fully to this statement. As much as 96.3% (44.8% + 51.5%) or 389 of the respondents agreed with it. Only 15 persons or 3.7% (2.7% + 1.0%) disagreed. Again, the clear indication is that people do constantly tend to gauge their VO support behavior, with an eye to supporting or participating more in the problem solving activities of those agencies which pursue preferences that are similar to their own.

Member responses to item 5 lend more support to this position. Item 5 asks for responses to the statement: "I feel that I should only actively support a voluntary organization which appeals to my personal values." Table 5.4 displays the results. Of the 373 nonmissing cases, 314 or 84.2% (36.7% + 47.5%) agreed, while only 59 (47 + 12) or 15.8% (12.6% + 3.2%) disagreed.

Thus, not only does a large majority of VO supporters feel that they should not endorse or support the activities of agencies that do not reflect their preferences (e.g., item 5). But also, they in practice do actually support those organizations which reflect their individual value preferences (e.g., item 3).
Table 5.3
Supporter Response to the Statement: "I Actively Support VOs Which Reflect my Personal Humanitarian Values." (Item 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>458</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4

Supporter Response to the Statement: "I feel that I should only Actively Support a VO Which Appeals to my Personal Values." (Item 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An open-ended item which asked the respondents to list or describe what constitutes the "values" that determine whether or not they support an organization was included in the questionnaire (see item E6). So much data was encountered by this and the other open-ended items in this section that it would be overwhelming, confusing or rather impossible to tabulate all that data here. Nevertheless a few helpful observations can be made. It is noteworthy that most of the people who responded listed personal value preferences that were quite reflective of some of the organizational concerns of the VO which each supports. For example, various responses were recorded for supporters of the various organizations when they were asked:

What are these "values" which determine whether or not you actively support a voluntary organization? (LIST OR DESCRIBE THEM).

"Freedom from hunger," "help to the needy," "birth control" were typical responses from CARE supporters. "Peace," "one world," "international understanding," "cultural exchange," "human development" are reminiscent of responses received from the members of the CAIP. CROP supporters mainly focused on "whether it (the VO) helps people to help themselves." And responses from the supporters of UNICEF are typicalized by this retort: "quality of life for all humans (including children); opportunity to pursue and maintain personal dignity and integrity."

Quite often the individual's response to the question unveiled much broader value preferences than those reflected by the
organizational objectives of the particular VO for which he was identified as a supporter. In such instances it was often noted (by observing responses to item D9b) that the individual was also a member of other organizations, which more adequately reflected his other value preferences. One CARE supporter writes, for example, that the underlying values which determine his support of an agency are: "civil rights, freedom from hunger, help to needy, individual liberty, birth control, gun control, peace." CARE is definitely concerned with hunger problems, help to the needy, and birth control, but not explicitly with the other areas of this individual's value preference. It was not surprising to note that this individual was also a strong and consistent supporter of such other organizations as Oxfam, American Friends, Amnesty International, and Meals for Millions—organizations which helped cater more fully for his other personal value preferences. For example, the American Friends (i.e., American Friends Service Committee) is an organization highly concerned with fostering universal pacifism. Some of its efforts include campaigns in favor of gun control and against the so-called, self-styled "Merchants of Death," who peddle the manufacture and sale of all kinds of firearms. And Amnesty International directs its efforts to the worldwide pursuit of human/civil rights for victims of political repression, war, and other forms of social injustice.

These findings underscore the plausibility of hypothesis 4.1. Nonetheless we carry the exploration of the hypothesis further by taking a closer look at items 7, 8 and 9 in Section E of the survey
instrument. Items 7 and 9 respectively asked the respondents if they had ever discontinued: their membership/support; or their donations/contributions in cash or in kind to any organization. Two hundred and forty-three (243) or 69.2% of the 351 persons that responded to item 7 indicated that they had previously terminated their support or membership in an organization. One hundred and sixty-one (161) or 47.8% of 337 respondents answered "yes" to item 9, indicating that they had discontinued their cash, material and time contributions to some organization which they "consistently supported" (or, to which they were strong members) in the past. These two groups of individuals—that is, those answering "yes" to items 7 and 9—were further examined to see how they responded to item 8 (Section E of the survey). Item 8 asked the respondents if they had joined or started supporting other voluntary organizations after they had discontinued membership or activity in others.

Table 5.5 presents the first results. One hundred and ninety-eight (198) of the 243 persons who reported having previously discontinued their membership responded to the question. One hundred and fifty-eight (158) of these, or as much as 79.8% of the 198 individuals say "yes," indicating that they did, indeed, join other organizations soon after they decided not to continue in some others.

As Table 5.6 shows, similar responses were captured for those persons who reported having previously discontinued their cash and kind contributions to some organizations. There were 161 of these persons in all. One hundred and twenty-six (126) of these 161 individuals
Table 5.5
Those who Reported Having Previously Discontinued their Membership in Some VOs: Response to Item 8: "Did you Join or Support Other VOs After you Discontinued?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6

Those who Reported Having Previously Discontinued their Material, Cash, and Time Contributions to Some VOs:
Response to Item 8: "Did you Join or Support other VOs after you Discontinued?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responded to the question. Ninety-six (96) of the 126 respondents, or 76.2%, indicated that they moved on to support other organizations after deciding to terminate their contributions to some others.

Both of these findings suggest that most individuals who sever their membership and participation (i.e., through contributions) in organizations merely do so only to join, support, or participate in others. The implication is that the efficacious individual who is particularly conscious of some problems, and who also espouses the effectiveness of problem solving through organizations, is apt to frequently cherish the idea of inter-organizational mobility, being primarily spurred by an innate wish to find organizations that most properly fulfill his personal value preferences. That is, the individual readily terminates his relationships with some organizations, but then starts new associations with some others which he perceives as reflecting more of his own value preferences.

Support for these arguments is heightened by subject responses to three open-ended questions (items 7b, 8b, 9b) that were attached to help clarify items 7, 8, 9. The open-ended questions asked the respondents to explain why they had discontinued their membership in the VOs (item 7b), why they had terminated their contributions or donations to the VOs (item 9b), and why they decided to join or support other VOs after they had terminated their associations with others (item 8b). Respondents mostly indicated the same responses to the three questions, or indicated with connecting arrows that item 8b was derived from the two others.
Recorded responses explaining why the respondents discontinued their association with some VOs include few assertions such as: "lack of time or money;" "went to work full-time" (which is indeed related to a lack of time or money); and "personal dislike of the organization's leaders." But the most predominantly encountered explanations include those exemplified by the following:

- Disagreement over policy.
- Found organization's views too rigid, authoritarian, or insincere.
- Understood that the organization fostered domination of the Third World, which is against principles in which I believe.
- (The organization) preaches human rights and union support, but turns around and spends its money to aid anti-union contractors.
- Organization deviated from its original purpose.
- Learned that the organization had more money than they needed for their work.
  -- Also I thought that they were becoming quite militant regarding salaries for their professional (staff) group.
  -- So I went and supported others that I believed were concerned about those less fortunate than themselves.
- (Disagreement with organization's) racial bias.
- Political disagreement.
- The organization's activities were judgemental; I joined another that adequately reflected my value system.
- I am GREATLY interested in international ("one world") understanding and therefore joined an organization that emphasizes international cooperation.

This cross-sectional overview of the explanations most frequently offered by respondents (written in their own words), helps to clearly
sustain the other findings in support of the proposition which hypothesis 4.1 makes. Indeed, individuals tend to support organizations which they perceive as holding preferences that approximate their own. Similarly, individuals tend to participate lesser in the activities of those organizations whose value preferences they perceive as being at cross-roads with their personal values.

TRUST LEVEL, THE LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION, AND A NEW LOOK AT EFFICACY

The Fourth Hypothesis: Part 2

That the conscious, efficacious individual may only choose to participate through an entity with which he shares similar values in terms of broader participation underscores the mutuality of preferences which underlie responsible participation (see chapter 1). Embedded in this notion of mutual preferences is the idea that the conscious and efficacious participant independently unifies himself only with those other actors or entities in whose activities he has faith. It is this trust which makes the individual cherish the hope that the interaction would satisfy the mutual preferences of the participants, and thus the view that the entire enterprise is worthwhile.
That individuals will participate more in voluntary action when they are more trusting of V0 activities is what the second part of the fourth hypothesis seeks to test. Thus:

HYPOTHESIS 4.2: Individuals will tend to participate more in voluntary action when they are more trustful of the voluntary organization's activities.

Measurement Construction

Participation and trust levels ought to be looked at in order to probe the plausibility of this hypothesis. This requires that appropriate instruments of measurement be constructed for the both variables. A participation scale has already been offered by chapter 4. The focus here is therefore on the instrument used for measuring the trust variable.

The Trust Scale

Section F of the questionnaire shows the five items used herein as indicators of trust. They are made up of two forced-choice and three yes-no-not sure statements adapted from a "faith-in-people" scale originally developed by Rosenberg (1957).

These items were evaluated by subjection to the Guttman Scale procedure. The inter-item correlation matrix presented in Table 5.7 shows that items 1 to 4 are highly intercorrelated. The Yule's Q coefficients fall between 0.70 and 0.93. Item 5 shows lower inter-item correlations with the other items, with Yule's Q coefficients ranging from 0.18 to 0.47. This reflects
Table 5.7
Scale Construction: The Trust Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...Most VOs Can/Can't be Trusted</td>
<td>...Most VOs are Inclined/Not Inclined to Help</td>
<td>...These VOs Will Take Advantage of You</td>
<td>...None of These VOs Truly Cares About Under-privileged People</td>
<td>...VOs are Fundamentally Altruistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9286</td>
<td>0.9098</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>0.3171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item numbers refer to Section F of the questionnaire (Appendix 5).*
Rosenberg's (1957:25-35) observation that the fifth item does not quite meet the Guttman 80-20 positive-negative marginal standard, although it was included in the scale because it produced a reproducibility coefficient of over 0.90 [actual Rep. = 0.92] with the other four items (see, also, Robinson et al., 1969:236).

Item 5 was similarly retained in the trust scale used in this study because it yielded a 0.93 reproducibility coefficient with the other four items. It should be noted that the coefficient obtained here is higher than the one originally reported in Rosenberg (1957), or in Robinson et al., (1969). Besides, when the rigorous Guttman Scale procedure obtains a coefficient of reproducibility as high as 0.90, the clear indication is that the scale so constructed is a valid one (see, also, Blalock, 1972). Computations presented here were based on 148 or 32.3% nonmissing cases.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

How true is the proposition that people participate more in agency activities when they trust those agencies? Is the level of trust really associated with the level of participation? Pearson's \( r \) correlations were sought to help answer.

Trust level and the level of participation were found to have an \( r \) coefficient of 0.18 (0.1770). Calculations were based on 136 nonmissing responses. The coefficient is positive, but marginally strong.
This is saying that a correlation exists between trust and participation. Trust and participation do indeed covary in the same directions. But the degree of this covariance is only "somewhat" strong, and may lead some scholars to interpret the observed relationship as not very meaningful.

We caution against this interpretation. Our conceptual background (chapter 1: see, e.g., Diagrams 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3; Pateman, 1970; Alger, 1979) suggests that the level of participation is mainly traceable to the level of efficacy. This intellectual background further extends to suggest that while participation is mostly traceable to efficacy, trust is also a prerequisite for participation.

Explorations in chapter 4 show that efficacy has a higher, moderately strong covariance with participation at an $r$ of 0.30. The lower 0.18 $r$ correlation between trust and participation was thus not surprising. This study interprets it as an indication that trust accounts for lesser variation in participation (about one half lesser) than that accounted for by efficacy. The level of efficacy thus explains for more of the variation in participation level, although trust is also a necessary explaining variable.

This interpretation begged for a more thorough examination. Efficacy and participation were thus correlated, while statistically controlling for trust. The Partial Correlation procedure was the statistical control method used. Partial correlation analyses produce
"partial" Pearson's $r$ coefficients. In other words, partial correlation procedures look at Pearson's $r$ correlations.

Efficacy and participation were correlated at an $r$ of 0.29 (specifically, $r = 0.2884$) when the effects of trust were controlled for. This finding clearly discloses that efficacy remains strongly associated with participation irrespective of the removed effects of trust. Trust has not much impact on the moderately strong covariation observed to exist between efficacy and participation. Also, the finding further establishes that trust levels have a lesser power of explanation than efficacy, in terms of variations in participation. Computations for the partial correlation coefficient were based on responses from 136 subjects who responded completely to items on the efficacy, participation, and trust scales.

EFFICACY LEVEL AND THE LEVEL OF TRUST

The Fifth Hypothesis

We have argued that the more conscious person is the more aware individual. He is the master of his environment and of his own self. He knows what the problems surrounding him are, and how to set about solving them. This is more so because he is likely to be efficacious. Thus, he knows what his preferences are and, consequently, prefers interactions with other actors whom he trusts as sharing mutual
preferences with him. In other words, even though the conscious, efficacious individual participates more in problem solving interactions, this participation is more likely to occur with those other actors who he has self-consciously identified as trustworthily sharing mutual preferences with him or pursuing actions of mutual benefit to the both sides.

Being efficacious, he is able to participate more by being able to more effectively identify more of where his own preferences trustworthily lie. Thus, by possessing the quality of efficacy, the individual is more effective in identifying those interaction partners whom he trusts, and therefore sees the interactions or activities resulting from his association with his "partners" as worthy of his participation, because they envisage his notion of mutual preferences.

Underlying the foregoing proposition is the suggestion that individuals low on efficacy tend to participate less because of their high tendency to distrust other actors (and the patterns of interactions) with which they may be associated, due to their poor awareness of the real nature of the problems or issues surrounding them. Hence:

HYPOTHESIS 5: Individuals low on Efficacy are more distrustful of wider participation through the voluntary organizations.
Measurement

The central focus here is on the relationship between trust and efficacy. Scales have already been constructed for measuring these two variables elsewhere in this study. Data collected by the same efficacy and trust scales provide the basis for the analysis that follows.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Correlations of efficacy and trust produced an $r$ of 0.12, indicating that a positive relationship exists between both of the variables. But the degree of relationship is unmistakably weak. This is portrayed further by the resulting $r^2$ of 0.015, which indicates that only about 1.5% of the proportion of variance in trust is explained by efficacy. The $r$ and $r^2$ coefficients were calculated with responses from 136 persons who responded to the two scales used.

Table 5.8 presents a very lucid depiction of the dismal covariance between efficacy and trust. The table looks at the trust levels of those respondents whose levels of efficacy were low. The total absolute frequency shows that 61 of the 136 individuals were low on efficacy. Nineteen (19) or 31.2% of the 61 persons completely responded to the items on the trust scale. Only 2 of these individuals (i.e., 10.5% of the 19 persons who were low on efficacy) were also low on trust. On the other hand, as much as 9 persons (or 47.4%) who had a low level of efficacy possessed a high level of trust, contrary
Table 5.8
The Trust Levels of VO Supporters Possessing Low Levels of Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Response</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to our expectations. Also, as much as 42.1% (or 8 persons) who were low on efficacy displayed a medium level of trust.

There is no mistake in observing that the sample size is small, and may warrant misleading conclusions. Yet it cannot be ignored that our only evidence is clearly saying that the plausibility of the fifth hypothesis is at best weak. Efficacy level may not be associated with the level of trust in any significant sense. And this may be true perhaps, particularly in the context of voluntary organization activities, since VO supporter behavior provides the data for the findings presented herein.

Summary

The findings of this chapter are presented here in a nutshell. First, similar preference perception is highly correlated with the degree of participation. Individuals are likely to revolt at the idea of participating in problem-solving interactions with others whose value preferences they perceive as being at cross-purposes with their own. People have a very high attitudinal tendency, for example, to express more participatory support for the activities of those voluntary organizations that they perceive as upholding value preferences that approximate their own personal values. Hypothesis 4.1 is strongly supported.

Second, the premises of hypothesis 4.2 are also fairly well corroborated. The degree of participation is associated with the
level of trust, even though participation has a much stronger association and concomitant variation with the level of efficacy.

Finally, efficacy levels are only weakly correlated with trust levels. The fifth hypothesis is thus not very well supported by results from our VO data. The large amount of missing data, and consequently the small sample size encountered while investigating this last hypothesis sounds a note of caveat in acceptance of the findings.
Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

The empirical venture tendered by this study produced the following findings. There is a fairly strong positive correlation between consciousness-building and the level of consciousness. The magnitude of the observed covariance seems, however, to have been dampened by the tendency of the studied organizations to primarily target already conscious individuals.

Moreover, VOs seem to pervasively adhere to the simple working assumption that someone who has supported similar or related problem solving purposes in the past is likely to do so again.

Compared to the directive method of raising consciousness, dialogue has higher covariances with both consciousness level and consciousness-building. These findings clearly sustain the first hypothesis. They also add credence to the philosophical premises of The Marga Institute (1979 Reports), and to the conceptual themes of Wanigesekera (n.d.).
Further analysis of the data generated while exploring the first hypothesis indicate that long, elaborate and extended initial consciousness-building efforts are not very effective. On the other hand, short, concise and non-extended initial consciousness-building contacts seem to be very effective tools for raising people's awareness.

Consciousness level and the level of efficacy have strong positive correlations. (This supports the second hypothesis, and the teachings of Alger, 1978c; 1980b). The size of these correlations approximate those seen as existing between consciousness-building and consciousness. About the same magnitude of covariance existing between consciousness-building and consciousness level also exists between consciousness and efficacy.

Positive and moderately strong correlations exist between efficacy and participation levels. Hereagain, the covariance encountered between efficacy and participation is approximately equal to (although relatively lesser than) those found to exist between both consciousness and efficacy, and consciousness-building and the level of consciousness. This not only sustains the third hypothesis, the intellectual framework of Alger (1978c, 1980), and the historical exploratory studies of Pateman (1970). It also buttresses the plausibility accorded the postulations of our conceptual model.

Citizen participation in problem-solving can be enhanced by dialogic consciousness-building, which improves consciousness, strengthens
efficacy and leads to responsible participation (see Diagram 1.2; Diagram 1.4).

Nevertheless, the slight deprecation in the degree of correlation found between efficacy and participation was further investigated. Flowing from this investigation is the finding that people may possess efficacy and yet lack the specific consciousness that would ordinarily equip them well to participate fully and more effectively in problem-solving ventures. This problematic circumstance arises when the mobilizer ruefully falls victim to placing excessive emphasis on single channels of participation while, more or less, neglecting to highlight all other possible alternatives during times of consciousness building. The studied voluntary organizations (which are the mobilizers in this case) are, to a deplorable extent, victims of this malady. As a result, they are not currently making optimum use of the participation potentials of their efficacious supporters owing to their predominant tendency to emphasize only one channel of support (namely, money donations) during consciousness-building. Mobilizers are more likely to stimulate and enlist higher level participation if they make certain that their consciousness-building programs are comprehensive.

Opinion data on preference perception indicate that individuals have a very high tendency to show more participatory support for the ventures of those organizations which they perceive as nurturing value preferences approximating their own personal values. Correlation analysis depicts that similar preference perception covaries very
highly with the degree of participation in the postulated directions. People are therefore apt to rebel at the idea of responsibly taking part in problem solving interactions with other problem solvers whose value preferences they envision as being at cross-purposes with their own personal value preferences. These findings corroborate part 1 of the fourth hypothesis.

The level of trust positively accounts for some of the variation in participation level, although the level of efficacy explains more. The first part of this finding advocates part 2 of the fourth hypothesis.

Efficacy level is only weakly correlated with the level of trust. Our VO data is thus saying that the fifth hypothesis is not very well supported. The small sample size resulting from the large amount of missing data confronted while examining the fifth hypothesis warns that this finding should be viewed with some caution.

Epilogue: Beyond the Hard Evidence

Some crucial observations ought to be made from the research findings. First is that trust level is very weakly associated with efficacy level, and accounts for only a small percentage of the variation in participation when compared to that accounted for by efficacy. Second is the evidence that although the level of efficacy is strongly and positively correlated with participation level, the strength of the observed correlation is not nearly as large as is to be expected by observing the other correlations (i.e., between
consciousness-building and consciousness; and between consciousness and efficacy).

It is to be ordinarily expected that an efficacious individual (i.e., an individual who has a profound belief that he can accomplish something, who cherishes the feeling that whatever he decides to do can be done effectively, and who possesses the self confidence to self-evaluate the utility of his chosen actions) would first, evaluate the interactions open to him, and then choose to participate in those interaction routes in which he trusts. That efficacy level is weakly correlated with trust level suggests, however, that this relationship may not exist to any helpful degree. An efficacious person may be participating in a VO without reference to whether or not he trusts the VO's aptness to accomplish what is purports to do.

And when we turn to the relationship between efficacy and participation, we find that the degree of covariation is not quite as high as expected. Hard data explains this (in the text) in terms of the non-comprehensive nature of VO consciousness-building efforts. Yet, one wonders whether this evidence justifies overlooking the recurring suggestion that immense participation in VO activities take place that are not totally accounted for by efficacy, trust and/or preference perception. Perhaps there are some other subtle and potent motivations which spur individuals toward participation in organizational problem solving.
Two important sets of research questions emerge from this discussion. First, are the fundamental inter-variable relationships hypothesized, found, and reported herein only applicable to problem solving participation in voluntary organization settings? Or are they also applicable to other private, business or even government organizations as suggested in parts of this study? Is our conceptual model as strong when applied to the problem solving activities of non-voluntary organizations? Second, what are the other subtle motivations that account for participation in VO problem solving? What are the systematic relationships among them, if any? How do they affect (responsible) participation?

Some of my informal interviews with several participants in VO activities, coupled with recorded personal conversations with VO Directors offer some helpful insights for looking at the second set of research questions. These suggest that individuals may be motivated to participate in VO activities by a variety of "little," but potent factors such as guilt, affluence, charity, leadership charisma or some kind of hero worshipping. Indeed, some philosophical-conceptual material document the existence of these diverse factors (see, e.g., Nightingale, 1973:136-176; Lissner, 1977:128-132). Ernest Dichter, who has been described by Nightingale as the "king of the motivational psychologists" suggests that the hope of being flattered by an organization gives individuals paramount incentives to participate in VO activities. Hereward Phillips (1969:31) suggests, on the other hand, that the individual is activated to participate in agency
problem solving (regardless of what would have otherwise been his rational stance toward participation) once his guilt complex breaks into free play.

Some individual comments on the returned questionnaires suggest additional support for the existence of these motivational factors. One VO participant wrote, for example: "My contribution to CARE was made because of the esteem in which I held Murray D. Lincoln, one of the founders, and its first president." She went on to explain that her contributions to CARE were not made on the basis of any contacts with the VO, or on any materials she received from the agency. They were not based, either, on her knowledge of what the VO stands for. But simply, she "felt" that any "organization sponsored by Mr. Lincoln was eminently worthwhile."

All of these suggestions definitely present a challenge to future research. For if systematically explored, they may offer further indispensable clues to a proper understanding of why efficacy and trust do not seem to be very related, why trust does not have a more spectacular relationship with participation, and why the magnitude of the relationship between efficacy and participation is not stronger than it is. Besides, the local VO professional would be equipped with added invaluable practical advice that build on an expanded knowledge of the motivational factors and relationships which constantly impinge on his enterprise.

Turning now to the first set of questions suggested for future research, we focus attention on the applicability of this study to other organizations that may be private, business, or governmental.
It is to be noted that the conceptual model and the major findings of this study are saying that citizen participation in problem solving can be improved by establishing efficacy through a process of consciousness-building (dialogue) which develops more consciousness of the surrounding contexts. As Irene Pinkau writes in her 1979 special report, *Serving Human Needs*: "Citizen participation...implies equality and action. Without citizen participation—regardless of the political system of a country—the self reliance desired and needed...cannot be achieved." Pinkau's observation suggests that within all human societies, whether rich or poor, industrialized or nonindustrialized, certain segments of society are victims of inequality and inaction. These segments of society do not possess the desired self reliance, because they lack the necessary participation.

If we visualize the world as one large human settlement, it becomes easier to see segments of it (the so-called developing countries) as lacking adequate participation in world affairs. Consequently, they do not act in equal terms with the other more developed, "self-reliant" world.

Similarly, if we look at every single human society, developed or developing, several societal segments exist which are not "self-reliant"—to the extent that they do not act in equal terms with others in societal matters—because, as Pinkau suggests, they lack citizen participation.

This kind of participation has been described by the Oxford scholar, Carole Pateman, in her *Participation and Democratic Theory*. 
as "democratic participation." This is what this study describes as "responsible participation" (Alger's term). And this kind of participation creates a sense of social belonging, increases social integration, harmony, effectiveness and efficiency not only in political spheres, but also in the private workplace (see, e.g., Pateman, 1970).

Pinkau and Pateman both underscore several prospects for participation research which ought to be highlighted. **First**, research on participation offers prospects for increasing the sociopolitical and economic self-reliance of the developing countries. **Secondly**, research on participation in the workplace may reveal ways to increase workplace harmony, effectiveness and production efficiency in any part of the world. **Third**, participation research promises strategies for attaining a peaceable world, based on economic and social equality, harmony, and diminished conflict in political as well as in economic (e.g., in the local business workplace; in international industrial relations) spheres. **Fourthly**, research on participation holds prospects for discovering ways to enable individuals and whole populations to develop the competence needed for coping with the various global problems (e.g., sexist inequalities in the business workplace, commerce, multinational corporation problems, war, hunger, race, human rights, etc.), which increasingly afflict humanity.

This fourth research endeavor is what the current study has started to explore by placing a focus on voluntary organization
activities. But what of the non-voluntary sector? Can responsible participation be similarly achieved in, say, the private business workplace, and in government organizations as this study suggests? Do the notions of dialogue, consciousness-building, consciousness, efficacy, similar preference perception and trust operate in private business and government settings in accordance with the hypothesized inter-variable links? Besides, is there any credence to the suggestions underlying the first, second, and third suggested research endeavors? These constitute a set of spirited puzzles that undoubtedly promise stimulating challenges for future research.

In sum, a fairly strong plausibility seems to accrue to the conceptual model, and to the major hypothesized relationships (the only real exception being the relationship posited as existing between efficacy and trust). But as in all fields of inquiry outside the pure and physical sciences, the findings negate the assertion of an absolute Quod Erat Demonstrandum. That is, it cannot be pretended that the hypotheses and findings have been ultimately or perfectly "proved." Rather, some questions have been answered. Yet several others have been raised. And putting it all together, a few recommendations can be teased out to serve as practical policy guides to any local professionals interested in promoting increased responsible participation in organizational problem solving.
Policy Recommendations and Conclusions

Helpful policy recommendations can still be drawn from this study's empirical findings regardless of the several research questions raised by the foregoing epilogue. The policy recommendations will be presented next as a brief conclusion to this lengthy empirical treatise.

First, organizations should gear more of their consciousness-building efforts to reaching the unconscious. Findings show that the studied agencies tend to predominantly target the already conscious individuals. The underlying premise appears to be the simple working hypothesis that an individual who has previously exhibited participatory support for a problem solving purpose is likely to do so again for related purposes (see, also, Lissner, 1977:129).

Truly this, in part, reflects some of the views on preference perception expounded herein. That is, an organization gingerly solicits, more or less, only the endorsement, support and participation of those persons whose past organizational activities identify as having pursued preferences similar to those of the organization. But this simple modus operandi monstrously connives at the fact that people's preferences may dynamically change over time. And when this happens, excessively targeting the "already conscious" in the hope of improving the organization's citizen endorsement and participatory support may be self-negating at best. Besides, it does not make for an expanded constituency. It
constricts the organization's support constituency to a very limited or even diminishing circle of participants. Equally targeting the fresh and non-conscious, as well as the "already conscious" makes for an expanded problem solving constituency. Organizations should steer their consciousness-building efforts toward this end.

Secondly, mobilizers should capitalize on dialogue as a way to most effectively raise the level of awareness they desire in their targets. Dialogue has been found to be more effective than the directive method of building consciousness.

Employing dialogue involves more than mere reliance on the use of television spots, radio commercials, or newspaper and magazine adverts. It goes beyond the act of mailing out information brochures. It involves more than making the individual feel that any way he decides to help would have a tangible effect toward solving the problem at hand. Focuses on only these mirror a communication emphasis that is both priorly defined and unidirectional. They are directive.

Dialogue may include these, but then goes beyond them. It involves personal contact. People are talked to in person, on the phone, or by home visit, in a bid to offer them the basic pieces of information they need. It builds on a content which explicitly encourages individuals personally to define, suggest, identify or stipulate what they could do to help address the existing problem. That is, it seeks to cultivate the belief that one can do; it attempts to enable the individual to nurture the feeling that one can
accomplish effectively (e.g., by personal exploration of the problems, which makes the individual know more about them). It does not spoon-feed the individual with all the necessary information. Thus, it also involves such activities as organizing and inviting individuals to public forums for discussing the problems or issues at hand.

Third, mobilizers should adopt, prepare and use short, concise, and non-extended initial consciousness-building tools. These appear to be more effective than those that are long, elaborate and extended. Short and concise pieces of initial literature, as well as non-extended initial personal contacts (e.g., meetings, home visits, phone calls), will tend to equip the target individual with just enough information to inspire his thought on the issues, and thereafter, his eagerness to find out more about the matters concerned. The resulting process of self-discovery, and the innate interest that derives from it, enhances the individual's genuine fascination, willingness, and intent to be thoroughly aware of the circumstances.

Fourth, voluntary organizations as well as any other mobilizer interested in making optimum use of the participation potentials of its (efficacious) targets, supporters or members, should adopt a comprehensive program of consciousness-building. A consciousness-building program is "comprehensive" to the extent that it equips the target individuals with all of the possible alternative channels for participating in the problem solving
venture represented by the specific activity concern for which it is
being run.

Evidence indicates that an individual may have developed the
sense of efficacy, and yet lack the particular awareness essential
for an adequate full participation in the problem solving activity.
The target individual may thus develop and possess the willingness,
eagerness and self-confidence to participate extensively. But he
may confine himself to only one mode of participation because that
is the only way he knows. This situation occurs when the indiscrete
mobilizer exclusively stresses single ways of participation at the
expense or even total neglect of the other possible alternatives.

Voluntary organizations tend to overwhelmingly emphasize one
particular channel (money contributions), while grossly overlooking
the other alternatives (e.g., volunteering time and services,
organizational input and voting, hosting visitors and donating
housing, donating clothes or food, etc.). Programs of comprehensive
consciousness-building are thus called for, if these organizations
desire to increase their success. And this requires that the target
persons be exposed to all the possible alternative ways of
participating.

Fifth, organizations and other mobilizers should constantly
evaluate their value stances vis a vis those of their constituencies
in order to ensure that what they embrace and pursue continue to
reflect the preferences of the populations that they serve or
represent. That people exhibit a strong resistance to participating
responsibly in problem solving interactions with others whose value preferences they see as being in contradistinction with theirs has been found by this study. People possess a very high attitudinal tendency to display more participatory support for the problem-solving activities of those organizations whose preferences they perceive as approximating their own personal values.

It is therefore very necessary that an organization, or any other mobilizer, continues to reflect and maintain the value preferences of its supporters, members or participants—or its constituency at large. And it can only do this if it systematically obtains and evaluates the value preferences of its constituency, while at the same time monitoring its own value premises and preferences so as to learn when some policy interventions are necessary for avoiding indiscrete deviations in its value preferences.

The sixth and final recommendation pertains to trust. Trustworthiness is essential. It is very necessary that the members of a constituency have cause to trust their mobilizer, or the organization with which they closely associate. VO data shows that people are likely to participate in the problem solving activities of those organizations which they trust. Organizations (and other mobilizers) should, therefore, pursue their activities in ways that would warrant their being seen as reliable or trustworthy by members of their constituencies.
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## VO PROBLEM/ISSUE PREFERENCE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Issue Area</th>
<th>Specific Issue Area</th>
<th>Reference No.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Human Needs</td>
<td>World Hunger</td>
<td>7,8,12,42,47,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>7,8,19,24,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4,8,10,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Supplies Aid</td>
<td>10,18,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deaf and Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>1,4,7,8,10,13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,42,52,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>4,7,8,12,16,22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Understanding and Exchange</td>
<td>Cultural Understanding (w/o Exchange)</td>
<td>11,13,17,20,28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,40,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Understanding and Exchange</td>
<td>3,5,9,14,21,26,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,41,53,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Exchange</td>
<td>26,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Adaptation</td>
<td>17,20,25,32,40,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>7,8,12,34,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Economic Problems</td>
<td>7,8,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Help</td>
<td>4,7,47,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Supply in Developing Countries</td>
<td>8,36,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overpopulation</td>
<td>43,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law of the Sea</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability of MNCs</td>
<td>7,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,8,17,18,28,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illiteracy</td>
<td>1,8,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade and Vocational Education</td>
<td>16,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Education</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Grants</td>
<td>1.21.37,55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Rights</th>
<th>Human Rights</th>
<th>6,7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Resettlement</td>
<td>4,16,23,35,39,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Services</td>
<td>4,16,23,25,35,39,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,19,22,37,48,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>19,47,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade/Business</td>
<td>Trade Issues</td>
<td>7,13,19,34,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grain Exports</td>
<td>7,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability of Multinational Corporations</td>
<td>7,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>Arms Control (including Disarmament)</td>
<td>7,15,27,34,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace-Building</td>
<td>3,27,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and War</td>
<td>4,15,27,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace and Goodwill</td>
<td>42,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodwill and Understanding</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Harmony</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Areas</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>17,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>8,27,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indochina</td>
<td>8,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>7,34,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equine Health</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;All&quot; Issues</td>
<td>1,27,28,49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in this column correspond to the number for each of the organizations as found in Table 2.2.

MEMORANDUM

To:  Jim Couts, Bread for the World
     Nancy Driscoll, Project HOPE
     John A. Eckler, World Neighbors
     Jane Patrick, CARE
     Ruth Schildhouse, CAIP
     Lea Ann Smith, Columbus INFACT
     Donna Spretnak, UNICEF
     Ted Stanley, CROP
     Jim Tobin, Catholic Relief Services

From:  Chad Alger, Mershon Center, Ohio State University

Date:  April 13, 1981

Some of you know that in my international relations courses at Ohio State I try to acquaint students with the international activities of our community and also try to get students out into the community so they can learn even more from local people who are involved in international activities.

Last year Mr. Chimezie Osigweh, a graduate student in political science from Nigeria, did a short paper on local organizations providing aid to people in the Third World. He would now like to extend this work into a doctoral dissertation.

It seems to me that it might be useful for Mr. Osigweh to sit down and discuss his plans with members of local organizations that are involved in this kind of activity. I am sure that you will have useful insight and advice. Also, you could encourage him to focus on questions that would be useful to you in your work.

If you find this approach promising, I hope that you will be able to come to the Mershon Center at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, April 21. Please call Wendy Coons or me at 422-1681 and let me know if this date is feasible. If you would like to come but can't make it at this time, I will try to arrange another time for those who cannot come on April 21.
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LETTER TO THE VO LEADERS WHO ATTENDED THE MEETING

The Ohio State University
Mershon Center
199 West 10th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201
Phone 614 422-1681

May 26, 1981

Mr. Jim Tobin
Catholic Relief Service
197 East Gay Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Jim:

Dr. Chad Alger and I were very pleased that you were able to attend the rescheduled meeting of local VO leaders which we held early this month.

Even though we started some 30 minutes later than we had planned, the meeting was nevertheless quite fruitful—much more than we expected. It started us thinking about some questions which we would have ordinarily neglected.

Indeed, we are very glad that you attended. And may I personally look forward to working more closely with you as time goes on.

Sincerely,

Chimezie A.B. Osigweh, Yg.

Programs of Research and Education in National Security, Leadership and Public Policy
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LETTER TO THE LEADERS WHO DID NOT ATTEND THE MEETING

The Ohio State University
The Mershon Center
199 West 10th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201
Phone 614 422-1681
May 26, 1981

Mr. Jim Couts
Bread for the World
1821 Wyton Court
Columbus, Ohio 43227

Dear Mr. Couts:

Dr. Chad Alger and I had looked forward to having you at
the meeting of local VO leaders which we had rescheduled for
May 8. Unfortunately you were not able to attend.

As Chad suggested in his memo to you dated April 13, the
meeting aimed at eliciting research questions which would be
useful to you in your work. In that regard, the meeting was
quite fruitful—much more than we had expected. For example,
it was generally suggested by those who attended that there is
the need to find out what "turns" people "on" or "off" in terms
of taking part in voluntary action.

We feel that these kinds of locally-directed questions need
further exploration. Please drop us a line, or call us, if you
have any suggestions. Meanwhile, let me personally hope to work
more closely with you in the future, since you are a part of the
voluntary organizations whose local altruistic activities continue
to spark our interest.

Sincerely,

Chimezie A.B. Osigweh, Yg.
MEMO TO VO LEADERS INVITED AS GUEST LECTURERS TO MY CLASS

Subject: Lecture to Political Science 105
Date: July 7, 1981
From: Chimezie A.B. Osigweh, Department of Political Science
To: Guest Speakers: Local VO Leaders

You might be amazed to find how many college students are not aware of the various existing world problems, including the ones that your organization seeks to combat. There is no mistake that several of them may have heard of your organization—probably through several TV advertisements. Yet, there is also no mistake that many of these same people do not actually know where or what your organization actually stands for. Besides, it will be rather assuming too much to expect that these students (like millions of other people) know the actual rationales behind the activities of your organization—or even the spin-offs of such rationales—such as development; enhancing global cooperation in problem-solving; achieving peace through better global understanding and cooperation in problem-solving. Moreover, several of these individuals do not know the various routes to citizen participation in global problem-solving which you offer them, not only as citizens of Columbus and the USA, but also as citizens of our large global society called earth.

I am hoping that your talk to my class will help crystallize these things for the personal growth of these listening minds. Feel free to structure the presentation as you please. Slides, filmsstrips or any audiovisuals will be highly appropriate. The following is just a suggested outline:

I What is your organization, and what it does
II What kinds of problems the organization seeks to address. Where, when, and how?
III What the underlying rationales are for the organization's activities
IV How any individual, including each of the students themselves, can participate through your organization in helping solve the global problems

Thanks once again, and may we look forward to seeing you at the scheduled date.

Sincerely,

Chimezie A.B. Osigweh
CABO/mo

xc: Jim Couts (Bread for the World),
Ted Stanley (Ohio CVS/CROP)
Donna Spretnak (UNICEF Center)
Jim Tobin (Catholic Relief Services)
Jane Patrick (CARE)
Ruth Schildhouse (Columbus Area International Program)
The Hypotheses

Some empirical questions emerge when we link up our conceptual bases: 1) How should the voluntary organization (VO) more effectively raise the consciousness of individuals? How does the VO raise the consciousness of its members? 2) Does the method of consciousness-building chosen by the VO lead to a high level of efficacy among the VO's members? i.e., does the method lead to a high level of efficacy among individuals? Which method of consciousness-building leads to a high level of efficacy among individuals? 3) How do VO members behave when their consciousness has been raised? 4) What are their expectations of the VO?

We are essentially asking: What "turns" people "on" toward participation in VO activities? What "turns" them "off?"

A few hypotheses are derived to address these questions:

1. The more the VO attempts to build consciousness through the dialogue approach, the more its members will be efficacious.

2. The more efficacious individuals will participate more in VO activities.

3.1. VO members will tend to diminish their support for the VO if they perceive their own preferences as actually different from those of the VO.

3.2. Individuals will tend to participate more in voluntary action when they are more trustful of the VO's activities.

4. Individuals low on efficacy are more distrustful of wider participation through the VOs.
July 23, 1981

Mrs. Jane Patrick, Director
CARE
35 E. Chestnut
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Jane:

Thank you very much for coming and speaking to my "World Problems" class—Political Science 105.

The students loved your presentation. I enjoyed it very greatly. It afforded us an opportunity to punctuate our otherwise highly abstract subject matter with illustrations from actual real life experiences. This is undoubtedly why the students could not conceal their genuine fascination. They were plentifully thrilled by interacting with, and listening to one of those very professionals, who start from our local community, as they seek to grapple with some of the numerous problems that confront all humanity.

I have always believed that such experiences are very helpful in classroom situations. As a teacher, they make my work easier, no doubts. But beyond that, they also help to raise—in a concrete way, the student's awareness of what is happening around him and who is/are involved. At the same time, they give the visiting professional some insights into the interests and mental maps of the younger generation as they relate to his own spheres of enterprise.

Indeed, I am very pleased that you were able to honor our invitation. Thanks once again and best wishes.

Sincerely,

Chimezie A. B. Osigweh
Graduate Teaching Associate

P.S.: The class feedback (questions) you asked for are enclosed herein. I think they are highly varied, and quite interesting. Don't you?
Appendix 3D

WORKING DRAFT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE: COVER LETTER

The Ohio State University
223 Derby Hall
154 North Oval Mall
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Phone 614 422-2880

July 17, 1981

Mrs. Ruth Schildhouse
Columbus Area International Program
105 W. Lane Ave., #1
P.O. Box 21384
Columbus, OH 43221

Dear Mrs. Schildhouse:

As a follow-up to our last phone conversation, I am enclosing herewith a copy of the survey instrument. This is just a working draft. So, feel free to notate any revisions you suggest.

Pages 18, 21, 22 and 23 are not included herein. They are not part of the instrument.

Please return to me as soon as practicable. And do not hesitate to call if there are certain aspects of the draft you want us to discuss while you still have the copy.

Also, remember the list I requested of what your agency does? I am highly appreciative of your continued attention.

Very sincerely,

Chimezie A.B. Osigweh, Yg.
Mr. Chimesie A. B. Osigweh
Transnational Intellectual Cooperation Program
199 West 10th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dear Mr. Osigweh:

Thank you for forwarding the results of your work so far, and for inviting my comments.

I wish that I would have had access to your abstract before our interview. Some of the uneasiness I felt during the interview (and as I felt again reading your paper) is explainable now.

The feeling I had was that you were not seeking an objective explanation of my Agency's work, but that you wanted to fit it into some hypotheses or preconceptions you had before I was asked to present our cause. This was confirmed by the items you picked up on in the interview, and selected to report on in the paper. Supporting this is the one "People-to-People Opportunities" example of the Chile project you selected. The others apparently did not fit in with what you set out to prove. My question is whether this one example is really honestly representative?

Rather than questioning the overall objectivity of your work and conclusion, I would like to attempt to clarify some of the inaccuracies regarding my organization.

The most glaring error is that CROP is a voluntary organization — with a foreign policy and distribution system. CROP has no representatives in foreign countries nor "branch offices" overseas. CROP is the domestic education and fund-raising unit of our parent organization, Church World Service. Church World Service is the voluntary organization. I am enclosing a description of CROP from Sommer's book that not only spells out the relationship of CROP, but also some of the changes that evolved over the years.

"Enablement" was my own term and description of development (pp. 29 & 30). I haven't seen or heard this term used by anyone else in our organization. It can hardly be used as our official position or stance. The "giving of material resources" does seem "humanitarian" to me, a purpose you state we have gotten away from.
In the listing of material resources we distribute, the "low interest" loans statement is inaccurate. This rebuttal may affect your "maximization" case. I believe I told you I was not sure whether we receive any interest or not. If we did, it like all funds returned on our no-interest loans would be made available to increase available capital for the indigenous group being funded or to other organized groups, and not returned to this country for building up our own organization. In checking with our National Office I found out that CWS policy and practice is no-interest loans rather than low-interest loans.

On page 30 you list tractors among the material resources we give to countries and on page 31 you speak of the "export of tractors to be sold to the communities." Church World Service doesn't sell any materials.

Your "self-interest" accusation on page 33 is not yet a definitized conclusion, you state. I was glad to read this -- and I don't believe you have proven this as regards CWS/CROP. I am willing to continue the discussion (debate?), provided our goal is the impact CWS/CROP is really having in the developing world. It seems to me the people on the other end have to be brought into the discussion some way. You and I can philosophize and criticize, but what about the many people who have received a steady flow of materials from CWS/CROP for 33 years, and will hopefully, in years to come?

Sincerely,

Theodore Z. Stanley
Regional Director

TZS:ld
Enc.

P.S. CWS/CROP still belongs to the churches! The 31 CWS member denominations that chartered and commissioned CROP still determine all operating policies. (cf. enclosed brochure).
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From The Desk Of...........  Ted Stanley.

Sat., Aug. 1, 1981

Dear Chimezie,

I'm home in Columbus for two days before leaving for Wisconsin (until Aug. 10). The staff conference this past week was excellent! I'll tell you more about it when I see you.

This note is to give you a response to the working draft-version of your questionnaire. I am enclosing your questions with a few penciled in suggestions.

General reaction is a question about the length. I think four pages may be plenty. Realize you will have it printed, but think you should cut out some of the material unless it is absolutely necessary. (For example, instead of listing all the organizations, you might list a few as examples of the kinds of organizations you are asking about, to let the people fill in a few blanks with the names of those groups they belong to.) This might be a way to sharpen or condense the instrument (i.e., more fill-ins, and some other choice/descriptions). See my notes on p. 19. Table 4 on p. 27 repeats Table 4 in some questions.

I don't know how much you are going to explain the reasons for the questions you are asking to the audience. The cover letter and titles of tables are pretty important.

Can see you've put many hours into. Hope some of those observations might be helpful. Will be waiting to hear from you when I get back. Hope all's well.

Your brother,

Ted
Chimezie -

First of all, I would suggest limiting your voluntary organizations to perhaps just those working on world hunger in the Columbus area. Suggestions would be: Bread for the World
CARE
CROP
CRS
UNICEF
Hunger Task Force
Red Cross
American Friends
Maybe one or two others.

The survey needs to be as brief as possible. Many people will not respond to a long survey.

Lastly, in talking with my boss, I will have to see the final form before I can commit my (any) list of names. Hope this isn't a problem.

Good luck and thanks for letting me address your class.

Jim
Catholic Relief

P.S. See survey for other suggestions.
July 28, 1981

Chimezie A.B. Osigweh  
Department of Political Science  
223 Derby Hall  
154 North Oval Mall  
Columbus OH 43210

Dear Chimezie:

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to look over your survey instrument. I made a very few changes, but on the whole, I think it is excellent.

I do hope you will get the information that you need by means of this questionnaire. If there is anything I can do to help, I'll be happy to try.

Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Jane Austin P. Patrick  
Ohio-Kentucky Director

Encl.
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LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW:
PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL TRANSNATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

1. What is the current official name of your voluntary organization?

2. Is this its original name? If not, what was/were the others?

3. When was the voluntary organization formed?

4. What is the purpose of this voluntary organization? (i.e., its goals/objectives; what it does.)

5. Is the voluntary organization affiliated with any other organization(s)? Which? What relationship do you have?

6. Do you have branch offices overseas? Or office staff overseas?

7. Who comprises your constituency? That is, what segments of society/community mainly support the voluntary organization?

8. Are there any recent trends in your constituency following, or constituency support?
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9. To what activities, events (or strategies) do you attribute the success of your local voluntary organization operation here in Columbus (e.g., tea parties, newspaper coverage, preparing flyers, etc.). HOW DO YOU do it, use it, or ENGAGE in it?

10. From what local effort(s) do you (the local voluntary organization) get your highest annual earnings or contributions?

11. If you are affiliated with any other voluntary organization, does this voluntary organization set any guidelines (binding on the other voluntary organization) on how to expend the finances contributed by this voluntary organization?

12. Can this local office (and/or does it) set guidelines on how its proceeds are expended?

13. Can the supporter stipulate how they would like their contributions to be spent? (e.g., which area of the world they particularly want it to be sent to, etc.).

14. WHAT percentages of the voluntary organization's incomes are spent on WHAT program categories? (estimates from last year activities, o.k.).

% OR LOW-HI RATING                      PROGRAM CATEGORY
APPENDIX 5

SURVEY: PARTICIPATION AND LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Section A:

As a listed supporter of CARE, we would like you to think in terms of the voluntary organization's efforts to get you involved in its activities. Focusing on some problem(s) needing solution, the voluntary organization:

1. 01. Sent you brochures. ( ) ( ) ( )
   02. Sent you newsletters or letters. ( ) ( ) ( )
   03. Reached you through the television, radio, newspapers or magazines. ( ) ( ) ( )
   04. Talked to you on the phone, in person, or by home visit. ( ) ( ) ( )
   05. Invited you to one or more public forums for discussing the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )

2. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was short and concise. ( ) ( ) ( )
   02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were for short periods. ( ) ( ) ( )
   03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were too short to tell you all you needed to know. ( ) ( ) ( )
   04. You asked more questions or wished to find out more about the problem(s) after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you. ( ) ( ) ( )
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3. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was long and elaborate. ( ) ( ) ( )

02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were each for long discussion periods. ( ) ( ) ( )

03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were long enough to give you all information you needed on the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )

04. You did not ask or wish to ask more questions after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you. ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) suggested that you could help solve the problem(s) by:

01. Donating money. ( ) ( ) ( )

02. Contributing money. ( ) ( ) ( )

03. Lending money. ( ) ( ) ( )

04. Housing/hosting visitors. ( ) ( ) ( )

05. Traveling locally/abroad. ( ) ( ) ( )

06. Donating clothes. ( ) ( ) ( )

07. Donating food. ( ) ( ) ( )

08. Volunteering time/services (specify) __________ ( ) ( ) ( )

09. Voting in voluntary organization forums/meetings. ( ) ( ) ( )

10. Voting in local, state or national government elections for sympathetic public officials. ( ) ( ) ( )

11. Other (specify) _____________________________ ( ) ( ) ( )

5. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) made you feel that any way you decided to help would have a tangible effect toward solving the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )
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6. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) explicitly encouraged you personally to define, suggest, identify or stipulate what you could do to help solve the problem(s).

( ) ( ) ( )

7. Would you say that the voluntary organization's suggestion(s) on how a person can help solve the problem(s) are generally (CHECK ONLY ONE):

01. In line with how we, over here (in Columbus), think that such problem(s) should be solved?

OR

02. In line with how people elsewhere (e.g., outside of Columbus; in other parts of the world; etc.) think that such problem(s) should be solved?

Section B:

To the best of your knowledge, would you say that:

1. CARE seeks to respond when natural or man-made disasters strike? ( ) ( ) ( )  
2. CARE seeks to equip people with the knowledge to work their own way out of poverty? ( ) ( ) ( )  
3. CARE seeks to enable people to survive, to keep alive, and to be responsive? ( ) ( ) ( )  
4. CARE distributes food and undertakes emergency health-related activities? ( ) ( ) ( )  
5. CARE runs rural agriculture, conservation or reforestation in developing countries? ( ) ( ) ( )  
6. CARE engages in child-related and family planning projects in other countries? ( ) ( ) ( )  
7. CARE undertakes construction of houses, roads, dams, community centers and warehouses? ( ) ( ) ( )
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Section C:

1. I don't think that CARE cares much about what people like me think.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

2. Donating money is the only way people like me can have a say about how CARE operates.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

3. People like me don't have any say about what CARE does.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

4. Sometimes CARE's activities seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

Section D:

1. When you talk with people, do you ever talk about the voluntary organization's problems—that is, what's happening in CARE activities in this local community or in the country and in other lands? ( ) ( ) ( )

2. Do you ever talk about the voluntary organization's problems with:
   01. Your family? ( ) ( ) ( )
   02. People where you work? ( ) ( ) ( )
   03. Community leaders—such as church or club leaders, or voluntary organization officials? ( ) ( ) ( )
   04. People in government or politics? ( ) ( ) ( )
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3. Have you ever talked to people to try to get them to donate to CARE?

4. What about you? Have you ever donated (e.g., money, clothes, food, etc.)?

5. Have you ever given a ride, volunteered your time, or done anything to help or encourage someone who was trying to take part in any CARE organization activities? (If "NO," SKIP #5b.)

5b. If "Yes": what did you do? Please specify. _________

6. Have you ever gone to any meetings, rallies, barbecues, tea parties, walk-a-thons, fish fries, or things like that in connection with CARE's activities?

7. Have you ever done any work to help the voluntary organization in its voluntary action campaign? (If "NO," SKIP #8b.)

7b. If "Yes": please specify what work you did. _________

8. Have you ever held an office, or been elected or appointed to a voluntary organization job?

8b. If "Yes": what office or job was that? Please specify. _________

9. Do you belong to, or strongly and consistently support, any other voluntary organization(s) in Columbus involved in international voluntary activities, such as the Ohio CROP, Bread for the World, UNICEF, Catholic Relief Services, the Columbus Area International Program, etc.? (If "NO," SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "Yes": please list the voluntary organization(s). _________
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Section E:

I. 1. Please summarize the various ways in which you have actively supported the voluntary organization(s).

01. Donated money. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
02. Donated clothes. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
03. Donated food. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
04. Donated housing. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
05. Contributed money. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
06. Loaned money. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
07. Contacted public officials. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
08. Voted for sympathetic public officials. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
09. Supported sympathetic political parties. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
10. Traveled locally/abroad on voluntary organization campaigns. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
11. Hosted/housed visitors. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
12. Became a member. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
13. Volunteered your time and services (specify) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
14. Other (specify) ______________________ ( ) ( ) ( )

II. Now, how would you respond to the following?

2. I actively support voluntary organizations which do not reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. I actively support voluntary organizations which reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. I do not mind actively supporting a voluntary organization which does not appeal to my personal values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. I feel that I should only actively support a voluntary organization which appeals to my personal values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. What are these "values" which determine whether or not you actively support a voluntary organization? (LIST OR DESCRIBE THEM). ____________________________________________

__________________________________________
APPENDIX 5 (Contd.)

III.7. Have you ever discontinued your membership in, or support for any voluntary organization?

7b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. ________________________
2. ________________________
3. ________________________
4. ________________________

8. Did you join or support other voluntary organizations after you discontinued? ( ) ( ) ( )

8b. If "yes": Why? (Explain) ______________________

9. Generally, have you ever discontinued your donations or contributions (in cash or in kind) to any voluntary organization which you had strongly and consistently supported in the past? ( ) ( ) ( )

(IF NO, SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue your support? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. ________________________
2. ________________________
3. ________________________
4. ________________________

Section F:

1. Some people say that most voluntary organizations can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful with voluntary organizations. How do you feel about local voluntary organizations involved in international philanthropic activities?

01. ________ Most can be trusted.

02. ________ You can't be too careful.
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2. Would you say that most of these organizations are more inclined to help people, or more inclined to look out for themselves?

   01. ________ To help people.
   02. ________ To look out for themselves.

3. If you don't watch yourself, these organizations will take advantage of you.

4. None of these organizations cares much about what happens to underprivileged people, when you get right down to it.

5. By nature, these organizations are fundamentally altruistic.
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SURVEY: PARTICIPATION AND LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Section A:

As a listed supporter of CROP, we would like you to think in terms of the voluntary organization's efforts to get you involved in its activities. Focusing on some problem(s) needing solution, the voluntary organization:

1. 01. Sent you brochures. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

02. Sent you newsletters or letters. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

03. Reached you through the television, radio, newspapers or magazines. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

04. Talked to you on the phone, in person, or by home visit. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

05. Invited you to one or more public forums for discussing the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

2. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was short and concise. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were for short periods. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were too short to tell you all you needed to know. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

04. You asked more questions or wished to find out more about the problem(s) after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
APPENDIX 5 (Contd.)

3. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was long and elaborate. ( ) ( ) ( )
02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were each for long discussion periods. ( ) ( ) ( )
03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were long enough to give you all information you needed on the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )
04. You did not ask or wish to ask more questions after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you. ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) suggested that you could help solve the problem(s) by:
01. Donating money. ( ) ( ) ( )
02. Contributing money. ( ) ( ) ( )
03. Lending money. ( ) ( ) ( )
04. Housing/hosting visitors. ( ) ( ) ( )
05. Traveling locally/abroad. ( ) ( ) ( )
06. Donating clothes. ( ) ( ) ( )
07. Donating food. ( ) ( ) ( )
08. Volunteering time/services (specify) ____________________________ ( ) ( ) ( )
09. Voting in voluntary organization forums/meetings. ( ) ( ) ( )
10. Voting in local, state or national government elections for sympathetic public officials. ( ) ( ) ( )
11. Other (specify) ____________________________ ( ) ( ) ( )

5. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) made you feel that any way you decided to help would have a tangible effect toward solving the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )
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6. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) explicitly encouraged you personally to define, suggest, identify or stipulate what you could do to help solve the problem(s).

7. Would you say that the voluntary organization's suggestion(s) on how a person can help solve the problem(s) are generally (CHECK ONLY ONE):

   01. ______ In line with how we, over here (in Columbus), think that such problem(s) should be solved?

   OR

   02. ______ In line with how people elsewhere (e.g., outside of Columbus; in other parts of the world; etc.)

Section B

To the best of your knowledge, would you say that:

1. CROP seeks to respond to foreign and domestic disaster situations? ( ) ( ) ( )

2. CROP seeks to help people create for themselves a better, self-sustained quality of life? ( ) ( ) ( )

3. CROP seeks to attach the root causes of hunger, afflictions, and homelessness? ( ) ( ) ( )

4. CROP provides various food items to needy people? ( ) ( ) ( )

5. CROP runs seminars, workshops and overseas experience programs to help Americans to better understand the lifestyles of other countries? ( ) ( ) ( )

6. CROP provides fisheries, machinery, technical consultants and other like resources to developing areas where they are appropriate? ( ) ( ) ( )

7. CROP sponsors population and family planning programs worldwide? ( ) ( ) ( )
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Section C:

1. I don't think that CROP cares much about what people like me think.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

2. Donating money is the only way people like me can have a say about how CROP operates.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

3. People like me don't have any say about what CROP does.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

4. Sometimes CROP's activities seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

Section D:

1. When you talk with people, do you ever talk about the voluntary organization's problems—that is, what's happening in CROP activities in this local community or in the country and in other lands?
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
2. Do you ever talk about the voluntary organization's problems with:

01. Your family? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
02. People where you work? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
03. Community leaders—such as church or club leaders, or voluntary organization officials? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
04. People in government or politics? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. Have you ever talked to people to try to get them to donate to CROP? ( ) ( ) ( )

4. What about you? Have you ever donated (e.g., money, clothes, food, etc.)? ( ) ( ) ( )

5. Have you ever given a ride, volunteered your time, or done anything to help or encourage someone who was trying to take part in any CROP organization activities? ( ) ( ) ( )

(IF "NO," SKIP #5b.)

5b. If "Yes": what did you do? Please specify. ______

6. Have you ever gone to any meetings, rallies, barbecues, tea parties, walk-a-thons, fish fries, or things like that in connection with CROP's activities? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

7. Have you ever done any work to help the voluntary organization in its voluntary action campaign? ( ) ( ) ( )

7b. If "Yes": please specify what work you did. ______

8. Have you ever held an office, or been elected or appointed to a voluntary organization job? ( ) ( ) ( )

(IF "NO," SKIP #8b.)

8b. If "Yes": what office or job was that? Please specify. ______
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9. Do you belong to, or strongly and consistently support, any other voluntary organization(s) in Columbus involved in international voluntary activities, such as CARE, Bread for the World, UNICEF, Catholic Relief Services, the Columbus Area International Program, etc.? ( ) ( ) ( )

(If "NO," SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "Yes": please list the voluntary organization(s).

Section E:

I. 1. Please summarize the various ways in which you have actively supported the voluntary organization(s).

01. Donated money. ( ) ( ) ( )
02. Donated clothes. ( ) ( ) ( )
03. Donated food. ( ) ( ) ( )
04. Donated housing. ( ) ( ) ( )
05. Contributed money. ( ) ( ) ( )
06. Loaned money. ( ) ( ) ( )
07. Contacted public officials. ( ) ( ) ( )
08. Voted for sympathetic public officials. ( ) ( ) ( )
09. Supported sympathetic political parties. ( ) ( ) ( )
10. Traveled locally/abroad on voluntary organization campaigns. ( ) ( ) ( )
11. Hosted/housed visitors. ( ) ( ) ( )
12. Became a member. ( ) ( ) ( )
13. Volunteered your time and services (specify) ( ) ( ) ( )
14. Other (specify) ( ) ( ) ( )

II. Now, how would you respond to the following?

2. I actively support voluntary organizations which do not reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. I actively support voluntary organizations which reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
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4. I do not mind actively supporting a voluntary organization which does not appeal to my personal values.  
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. I feel that I should only actively support a voluntary organization which appeals to my personal values.  
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. What are these "values" which determine whether or not you actively support a voluntary organization?  (LIST OR DESCRIBE THEM). ______________  
   ______________  
   ______________  
   ______________  
   ______________

III.7. Have you ever discontinued your membership in, or support for any voluntary organization?  
   ( ) ( ) ( )

7b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue?  [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]
   1. ____________________________________________
   2. ____________________________________________
   3. ____________________________________________
   4. ____________________________________________

8. Did you join or support other voluntary organizations after you discontinued?  
   ( ) ( ) ( )

8b. If "yes": Why? (Explain) ______________________
   ____________________________________________

9. Generally, have you ever discontinued your donations or contributions (in cash or in kind) to any voluntary organization which you had strongly and consistently supported in the past?  
   ( ) ( ) ( )

   (IF NO, SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue your support?  [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]
   1. ____________________________________________
   2. ____________________________________________
   3. ____________________________________________
   4. ____________________________________________
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Section F:

1. Some people say that most voluntary organizations can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful with voluntary organizations. How do you feel about local voluntary organizations involved in international philanthropic activities?

   01. ________ Most can be trusted.
   02. ________ You can't be too careful.

2. Would you say that most of these organizations are more inclined to help people, or more inclined to look out for themselves?

   01. ________ To help people.
   02. ________ To look out for themselves.

3. If you don't watch yourself, these organizations will take advantage of you.

4. None of these organizations cares much about what happens to underprivileged people, when you get right down to it.

5. By nature, these organizations are fundamentally altruistic.
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SURVEY: PARTICIPATION AND LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Section A:

As a listed supporter of the Columbus Area International Program (CAIP) we would like you to think in terms of the voluntary organization's efforts to get you involved in its activities. Focusing on some problem(s) needing solution, the voluntary organization:

1. 01. Sent you brochures.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
   02. Sent you newsletters or letters.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
   03. Reached you through the television, radio, newspapers or magazines.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
   04. Talked to you on the phone, in person, or by home visit.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
   05. Invited you to one or more public forums for discussing the problem(s).
   ( ) ( ) ( )

2. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was short and concise.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
   02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were for short periods.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
   03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were too short to tell you all you needed to know.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
   04. You asked more questions or wished to find out more about the problem(s) after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you.
   ( ) ( ) ( )
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3. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was long and elaborate. ( ) ( ) ( )

02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were each for long discussion periods. ( ) ( ) ( )

03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were long enough to give you all information you needed on the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )

04. You did not ask or wish to ask more questions after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you. ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) suggested that you could help solve the problem(s) by:

01. Donating money. ( ) ( ) ( )

02. Contributing money. ( ) ( ) ( )

03. Lending money. ( ) ( ) ( )

04. Housing/hosting visitors. ( ) ( ) ( )

05. Traveling locally/abroad. ( ) ( ) ( )

06. Donating clothes. ( ) ( ) ( )

07. Donating food. ( ) ( ) ( )

08. Volunteering time/services (specify) __________________________ ( ) ( ) ( )

09. Voting in voluntary organization forums/meetings. ( ) ( ) ( )

10. Voting in local, state or national government elections for sympathetic public officials. ( ) ( ) ( )

11. Other (specify) ________________________________ ( ) ( ) ( )
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5. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) made you feel that any way you decided to help would have a tangible effect toward solving the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )

6. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) explicitly encouraged you personally to define, suggest, identify or stipulate what you could do to help solve the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )

7. Would you say that the voluntary organization's suggestion(s) on how a person can help solve the problem(s) are generally (CHECK ONLY ONE):

01. In line with how we, over here (in Columbus), think that such problem(s) should be solved?

OR

02. In line with how people elsewhere (e.g., outside of Columbus; in other parts of the world; etc.) think that such problem(s) should be solved?

Section B:

To the best of your knowledge, would you say that:

1. CAIP seeks to create local opportunities for linkages to be established among people of different cultures? ( ) ( ) ( )

2. CAIP seeks to enhance the exchange of experience and skills among human service professionals? ( ) ( ) ( )

3. CAIP seeks to promote individual personal growth, and international understanding? ( ) ( ) ( )

4. CAIP brings about two dozen special teachers, social and youth workers to Columbus each year? ( ) ( ) ( )

5. CAIP contracts with local social service agencies for full-time and short-term placement of foreign program participants as staff members? ( ) ( ) ( )

6. CAIP arranges a program whereby a visiting foreign professional spends five weeks with each of three different host families? ( ) ( ) ( )

7. CAIP organizes a yearly wine-tasting party? ( ) ( ) ( )
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Section C:

1. I don't think that CAIP cares much about what people like me think.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

2. Donating money is the only way people like me can have a say about how CAIP operates.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

3. People like me don't have any say about what CAIP does.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

4. Sometimes CAIP's activities seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

Section D:

1. When you talk with people, do you ever talk about the voluntary organization's problems—that is, what's happening in CAIP activities in this local community or in the country and in other lands? ( ) ( ) ( )

2. Do you ever talk about CAIP's problems with:
   01. Your family? ( ) ( ) ( )
   02. People where you work? ( ) ( ) ( )
   03. Community leaders—such as church or club leaders, or voluntary organization officials? ( ) ( ) ( )
   04. People in government or politics? ( ) ( ) ( )
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3. Have you ever talked to people to try to get them to donate to CAIP?

4. What about you? Have you ever donated (e.g., money, clothes, food, etc.)?

5. Have you ever given a ride, volunteered your time, or done anything to help or encourage someone who was trying to take part in any CAIP organization activities?
   (IF "NO," SKIP #5b.)

5b. If "Yes": what did you do? Please specify. ________

6. Have you ever gone to any meetings, rallies, barbecues, tea parties, walk-a-thons, fish fries, or things like that in connection with CAIP's activities?

7. Have you ever done any work to help the voluntary organization in its voluntary action campaign?

7b. If "Yes": please specify what work you did. ________

8. Have you ever held an office, or been elected or appointed to a voluntary organization job?
   (IF "NO," SKIP #8b.)

8b. If "Yes": what office or job was that? Please specify. ________

9. Do you belong to, or strongly and consistently support, any other voluntary organization(s) in Columbus involved in international voluntary activities, such as The Ohio CROP, CARE, Bread for the World, UNICEF, Catholic Relief Services, etc.?
   (IF "NO," SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "Yes": please list the voluntary organization(s).
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Section E:

I. 1. Please summarize the various ways in which you have actively supported the voluntary organization(s).

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Donated money.</td>
<td>No, Never</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Yes, Indeed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Donated clothes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Donated food.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. Donated housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Contributed money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Loaned money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. Contacted public officials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. Voted for sympathetic public officials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. Supported sympathetic political parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Traveled locally/abroad on voluntary organization campaigns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hosted/housed visitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Became a member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Volunteered your time and services (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Now, how would you respond to the following?

2. I actively support voluntary organizations which do not reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. I actively support voluntary organizations which reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. I do not mind actively supporting a voluntary organization which does not appeal to my personal values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. I feel that I should only actively support a voluntary organization which appeals to my personal values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. What are these "values" which determine whether or not you actively support a voluntary organization? (LIST OR DESCRIBE THEM). ____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
III.7. Have you ever discontinued your membership in, or support for any voluntary organization?

7b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. ______________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________
4. ______________________________________________

8. Did you join or support other voluntary organizations after you discontinued?  ( ) ( ) ( )

8b. If "yes": Why? (Explain) ______________________

9. Generally, have you ever discontinued your donations or contributions (in cash or in kind) to any voluntary organization which you had strongly and consistently supported in the past?  ( ) ( ) ( )

(IF NO, SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue your support? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. ______________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________
4. ______________________________________________

Section F:

1. Some people say that most voluntary organizations can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful with voluntary organizations. How do you feel about local voluntary organizations involved in international philanthropic activities?

01. _________ Most can be trusted.

02. _________ You can't be too careful.
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2. Would you say that most of these organizations are more inclined to help people, or more inclined to look out for themselves?

01. _________ To help people.

02. _________ To look out for themselves.

3. If you don't watch yourself, these organizations will take advantage of you.

4. None of these organizations cares much about what happens to underprivileged people, when you get right down to it.

5. By nature, these organizations are fundamentally altruistic.
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SURVEY: PARTICIPATION AND LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

Section A:

As a listed supporter of Catholic Relief Services (CRS), we would like you to think in terms of the voluntary organization's efforts to get you involved in its activities. Focusing on some problem(s) needing solution, the voluntary organization:

1. 01. Sent you brochures.  
  02. Sent you newsletters or letters.  
  03. Reached you through the television, radio, newspapers or magazines.  
  04. Talked to you on the phone, in person, or by home visit.  
  05. Invited you to one or more public forums for discussing the problem(s).

2. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was short and concise.  
  02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were for short periods.  
  03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were too short to tell you all you needed to know.  
  04. You asked more questions or wished to find out more about the problem(s) after the voluntary organization's initial contact with you.
3. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was long and elaborate.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were each for long discussion periods.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were long enough to give you all information you needed on the problem(s).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

04. You did not ask or wish to ask more questions after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) suggested that you could help solve the problem(s) by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

01. Donating money.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02. Contributing money.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

03. Lending money.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

04. Housing/hosting visitors.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05. Traveling locally/abroad.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

06. Donating clothes.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

07. Donating food.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

08. Volunteering time/services (specify)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

09. Voting in voluntary organization forums/meetings.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Voting in local, state or national government elections for sympathetic public officials.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Other (specify)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) made you feel that any way you decided to help would have a tangible effect toward solving the problem(s).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) explicitly encouraged you personally to define, suggest, identify or stipulate what you could do to help solve the problem(s).

7. Would you say that the voluntary organization's suggestion(s) on how a person can help solve the problem(s) are generally (CHECK ONLY ONE):

01. ______ In line with how we, over here (in Columbus), think that such problem(s) should be solved?

OR

02. ______ In line with how people elsewhere (e.g., outside of Columbus; in other parts of the world; etc.) think that such problem(s) should be solved?

Section B:

To the best of your knowledge, would you say that:

1. CRS seeks to respond to overseas disaster situations? ( ) ( ) ( )

2. CRS seeks to assist self-help activities in different parts of the world? ( ) ( ) ( )

3. CRS seeks to improve the quality of life for "special" people, the disabled and the infirm? ( ) ( ) ( )

4. CRS feeds, clothes, and houses the needy in 86 countries? ( ) ( ) ( )

5. CRS runs various education programs such as in agriculture, health, and nutrition? ( ) ( ) ( )

6. CRS works together with local groups and social service organizations to develop projects? ( ) ( ) ( )

7. CRS sponsors a program called Operation Rice Bowl? ( ) ( ) ( )
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Section C:

1. I don't think that CRS cares much about what people like me think.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

2. Donating money is the only way people like me can have a say about how CRS operates.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

3. People like me don't have any say about what CRS does.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

4. Sometimes CRS's activities seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

Section D:

1. When you talk with people, do you ever talk about the voluntary organization's problems—that is, what's happening in CRS activities in this local community or in the country and in other lands?

2. Do you ever talk about CRS's problems with:
   01. Your family?
   02. People where you work?
   03. Community leaders—such as church or club leaders, or voluntary organization officials?
   04. People in government or politics?
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3. Have you ever talked to people to try to get them to donate to CRS?

4. What about you? Have you ever donated (e.g., money, clothes, food, etc.)?

5. Have you ever given a ride, volunteered your time, or done anything to help or encourage someone who was trying to take part in any CRS organization activities?

(IF "NO," SKIP #5b.)

5b. If "Yes": what did you do? Please specify. 

6. Have you ever gone to any meetings, rallies, barbecues, tea parties, walk-a-thons, fish fries, or things like that in connection with CRS's activities?

7. Have you ever done any work to help the voluntary organization in its voluntary action campaign?

7b. If "Yes": please specify what work you did. 

8. Have you ever held an office, or been elected or appointed to a voluntary organization job?

(IF "NO," SKIP #8b.)

8b. If "Yes": what office or job was that? Please specify.

9. Do you belong to, or strongly and consistently support, any other voluntary organization(s) in Columbus involved in international voluntary activities, such as The Ohio CROP, CARE Bread for the World, UNICEF, the Columbus Area International Program, etc.?

(IF "NO," SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "Yes": please list the voluntary organization(s).
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**Section E:**

I. 1. Please summarize the various ways in which you have actively supported the voluntary organization(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Indeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Donated money.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Donated clothes.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Donated food.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Donated housing.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>Contributed money.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>Loaned money.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>Contacted public officials.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td>Voted for sympathetic public officials.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>Supported sympathetic political parties.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Travelled locally/abroad on voluntary organization campaigns.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Hosted/housed visitors.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Became a member.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Volunteered your time and services (specify)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Now, how would you respond to the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I actively support voluntary organizations which do not reflect my personal humanitarian values.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I actively support voluntary organizations which reflect my personal humanitarian values.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I do not mind actively supporting a voluntary organization which does not appeal to my personal values.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel that I should only actively support a voluntary organization which appeals to my personal values.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>What are these &quot;values&quot; which determine whether or not you actively support a voluntary organization? (LIST OR DESCRIBE THEM).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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III.7. Have you ever discontinued your membership in, or support for any voluntary organization?  

( ) ( ) ( )  

7b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________

8. Did you join or support other voluntary organizations after you discontinued?  

( ) ( ) ( )

8b. If "yes": Why? (Explain) __________________________

9. Generally, have you ever discontinued your donations or contributions (in cash or in kind) to any voluntary organization which you had strongly and consistently supported in the past?  

( ) ( ) ( )

(IF NO, SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue your support? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________

Section F:

1. Some people say that most voluntary organizations can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful with voluntary organizations. How do you feel about local voluntary organizations involved in international philanthropic activities?  

01. _______ Most can be trusted.

02. _______ You can't be too careful.
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2. Would you say that most of these organizations are more inclined to help people, or more inclined to look out for themselves?

01. ________ To help people.

02. ________ To look out for themselves.

3. If you don't watch yourself, these organizations will take advantage of you.

4. None of these organizations cares much about what happens to underprivileged people, when you get right down to it.

5. By nature, these organizations are fundamentally altruistic.
### APPENDIX 5 (Contd.)

**SURVEY: PARTICIPATION AND LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES**

**Section A:**

As a listed supporter of UNICEF, we would like you to think in terms of the voluntary organization's efforts to get you involved in its activities. Focusing on some problem(s) needing solution, the voluntary organization:

**1.**

1. Sent you brochures.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
2. Sent you newsletters or letters.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
3. Reached you through the television, radio, newspapers or magazines.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
4. Talked to you on the phone, in person, or by home visit.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
5. Invited you to one or more public forums for discussing the problem(s).
   - ( ) ( ) ( )

**2.**

1. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was short and concise.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
2. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were for short periods.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
3. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were too short to tell you all you needed to know.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
4. You asked more questions or wished to find out more about the problem(s) after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you.
   - ( ) ( ) ( )
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3. 01. The initial literature sent by the voluntary organization was long and elaborate. ( ) ( ) ( )

02. The voluntary organization's initial personal contact(s) with you were each for long discussion periods. ( ) ( ) ( )

03. The voluntary organization's initial literature or contacts with you were long enough to give you all information you needed on the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )

04. You did not ask or wish to ask more questions after the voluntary organization's initial contact(s) with you. ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) suggested that you could help solve the problem(s) by:

01. Donating money. ( ) ( ) ( )

02. Contributing money. ( ) ( ) ( )

03. Lending money. ( ) ( ) ( )

04. Housing/hosting visitors. ( ) ( ) ( )

05. Traveling locally/abroad. ( ) ( ) ( )

06. Donating clothes. ( ) ( ) ( )

07. Donating food. ( ) ( ) ( )

08. Volunteering time/services (specify) __________________________ ( ) ( ) ( )

09. Voting in voluntary organization forums/meetings. ( ) ( ) ( )

10. Voting in local, state or national government elections for sympathetic public officials. ( ) ( ) ( )

11. Other (specify) ________________________________ ( ) ( ) ( )

5. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) made you feel that any way you decided to help would have a tangible effect toward solving the problem(s). ( ) ( ) ( )
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6. Early voluntary organization contact (or literature) explicitly encouraged you personally to define, suggest, identify or stipulate what you could do to help solve the problem(s).

7. Would you say that the voluntary organization's suggestion(s) on how a person can help solve the problem(s) are generally (CHECK ONLY ONE):

01. ________ In line with how we, over here (in Columbus), think that such problem(s) should be solved?

     OR

02. ________ In line with how people elsewhere (e.g., outside of Columbus; in other parts of the world; etc.) think that such problem(s) should be solved?

Section B:

To the best of your knowledge, would you say that:

1. UNICEF seeks to concern itself with child-care or the essential needs of children? ( ) ( ) ( )

2. UNICEF seeks to offer children relief, emergency assistance and rehabilitation? ( ) ( ) ( )

3. UNICEF helps developing countries of the world, not developed countries? ( ) ( ) ( )

4. UNICEF provides foods and medicines for clinics? ( ) ( ) ( )

5. UNICEF provides capital equipment and other supplies, such as pipes and pumps for bringing water to the community? ( ) ( ) ( )

6. UNICEF (the United Nations Children's Fund) does not share in the United Nations' budget, but is entirely supported by voluntary contributions, including funds raised by local Committees in activities such as greeting card sales? ( ) ( ) ( )

7. UNICEF runs programs to assist or rehabilitate disabled persons, and to prevent disabilities such as blindness? ( ) ( ) ( )
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Section C:

1. I don't think that UNICEF cares much about what people like me think.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

2. Donating money is the only way people like me can have a say about how UNICEF operates.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

3. People like me don't have any say about what UNICEF does.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

4. Sometimes UNICEF's activities seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.
   01. _____ Agree
   02. _____ Disagree

Section D:

1. When you talk with people, do you ever talk about the voluntary organization's problems—that is, what's happening in UNICEF activities in this local community or in the country and in other lands?
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

2. Do you ever talk about UNICEF's problems with:
   01. Your family? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
   02. People where you work? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
   03. Community leaders—such as church or club leaders, or voluntary organization officials? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
   04. People in government or politics? ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
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3. Have you ever talked to people to try to get them to donate to UNICEF?
   ( ) ( ) ( )

4. What about you? Have you ever donated (e.g., money, clothes, food, etc.)?
   ( ) ( ) ( )

5. Have you ever given a ride, volunteered your time, or done anything to help or encourage someone who was trying to take part in any UNICEF organization activities?
   ( ) ( ) ( )

   (IF "NO," SKIP #5b.)

5b. If "Yes": what did you do? Please specify.  
   

6. Have you ever gone to any meetings, rallies, barbecues, tea parties, walk-a-thons, fish fries, or things like that in connection with UNICEF's activities?
   ( ) ( ) ( )

7. Have you ever done any work to help the voluntary organization in its voluntary action campaign?
   ( ) ( ) ( )

7b. If "Yes": please specify what work you did.  
   

8. Have you ever held an office, or been elected or appointed to a voluntary organization job?
   ( ) ( ) ( )

   (If "NO," SKIP #8b.)

8b. If "Yes": what office or job was that? Please specify.  
   

9. Do you belong to, or strongly and consistently support, any other voluntary organization(s) in Columbus involved in international voluntary activities, such as The Ohio CROP, CARE, Bread for the World, Catholic Relief Services, the Columbus Area International Program, etc.?
   ( ) ( ) ( )

   (If "NO," SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "Yes": please list the voluntary organization(s).
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Section E:

I. 1. Please summarize the various ways in which you have actively supported the voluntary organization(s).

01. Donated money.
02. Donated clothes.
03. Donated food.
04. Donated housing.
05. Contributed money.
06. Loaned money.
07. Contacted public officials.
08. Voted for sympathetic public officials.
09. Supported sympathetic political parties.
10. Traveled locally/abroad on voluntary organization campaigns.
11. Hosted/housed visitors.
12. Became a member.
13. Volunteered your time and services (specify)
14. Other (specify)

II. Now, how would you respond to the following?

2. I actively support voluntary organizations which do not reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. I actively support voluntary organizations which reflect my personal humanitarian values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. I do not mind actively supporting a voluntary organization which does not appeal to my personal values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. I feel that I should only actively support a voluntary organization which appeals to my personal values. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. What are these "values" which determine whether or not you actively support a voluntary organization? (LIST OR DESCRIBE THEM). ____________________________
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III.7. Have you ever discontinued your membership in, or support for any voluntary organization?

7b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________

8. Did you join or support other voluntary organizations after you discontinued? ( ) ( ) ( )

8b. If "yes": Why? (Explain) ______________________________

9. Generally, have you ever discontinued your donations or contributions (in cash or in kind) to any voluntary organization which you had strongly and consistently supported in the past? ( ) ( ) ( )

(IF NO, SKIP #9b.)

9b. If "yes": Why did you discontinue your support? [PLACE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FIRST.]

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________

Section F:

1. Some people say that most voluntary organizations can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful with voluntary organizations. How do you feel about local voluntary organizations involved in international philanthropic activities?

01. ________ Most can be trusted.

02. ________ You can't be too careful.
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2. Would you say that most of these organizations are more inclined to help people, or more inclined to look out for themselves?

01. ________ To help people.
02. ________ To look out for themselves.

3. If you don't watch yourself, these organizations will take advantage of you.

4. None of these organizations cares much about what happens to underprivileged people, when you get right down to it.

5. By nature, these organizations are fundamentally altruistic.
## CBSCAL CONSCIOUSNESS BUILDING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WILD) **************************** (364)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VALID CASES 94  MISSING CASES 364
CONSCIOUSNESS SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WILD) 345

FREQUENCY

100  200  300  400  500

VALID CASES 113  MISSING CASES 345
### EFFISCAL EFFICACY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>****** LOW</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>****** MEDIUM</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>******************** HIGH</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WILD)</td>
<td>********************</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FREQUENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALID CASES</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING CASES</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PARTSCAL PARTICIPATION SCALE

CODE

1  ********** ( 101)
   LOW

2  **** ( 29)
   MEDIUM

3  ********** ( 291)
   HIGH

(WILD)  **** ( 37)

.........................

FREQUENCY

0 100 200 300 400 500

VALID CASES  421  MISSING CASES  37
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRSTSCAL TRUST SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ** (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WILD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VALID CASES**  146  **MISSING CASES**  312
September 23, 1981

Mr. Keith E. Herreman
2425 Northridge Road, NW
Alexandria OH 43001

Dear Mr. Herreman:

I am sending herewith a survey designed to examine participation in CARE. The research is part of a doctoral dissertation by Chimezie A.B. Osigweh, an OSU graduate student. Because we have had opportunity to work with Mr. Osigweh in designing the study, the results will be very valuable to CARE. Besides, they may serve as guides to any other local professionals intent on fostering more citizen participation in organizational problem solving.

The information you provide will help us clarify the expectations of our supporters. This will enable us to find out what turns people on toward participation in our activities, and also what turns them off from participating. These kinds of discoveries will undoubtedly help us to redefine some of our current operation strategies and make them more effective.

I am, therefore, asking you to please take a moment to help us compile this valuable information. A postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

In the event that you receive any other copy of this same survey from one or more of our other sister organizations which you also support, please only complete and return one.

Thank you for taking time to help. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jane Austin Patrick
Ohio-Kentucky Director

JAP/aca
Encl.
Dear Friend of CWS/CROP:

I am sending herewith a survey designed to examine participation in CWS/CROP. The research is part of a doctoral dissertation by Chimezie A. B. Osigweh, an Ohio State University student. Because we have had opportunity to work with Mr. Osigweh in designing the study, the results will be very valuable to CWS/CROP. Besides, they may serve as guides to any other local professionals intent on fostering more citizen participation in organizational problem solving.

The information you provide will help us clarify the expectations of our supporters. This will enable us to find out what turns people toward participation in our activities, and also what turns them off from participating. These kinds of discoveries will undoubtedly help us to redefine some of our current operation strategies and make them more effective.

I am therefore asking you to please take a moment to help us compile this valuable information. A postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

In the event that you receive any other copy of this same survey from one or more of our other sister organizations which you also support, please only complete and return one.

Thank you for taking time to help. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Theodore L. Stanley
Regional Director

jkd
Dear Friend,

I am sending herewith a survey designed to examine participation in CAIP. The research is part of a doctoral dissertation by Chimezie A.B. Osigweh, an OSU graduate student. Because we have had an opportunity to work with Mr. Osigweh in designing the study, the results will be very valuable to CAIP. Besides, they may serve as guides to any other local professionals intent on fostering more citizen participation in organizational problem solving.

The information you provide will help us clarify the expectations of our supporters. This will enable us to find out what turns people toward participation in our activities, and also what turns them off from participating. These kinds of discoveries will undoubtedly help us to redefine some of our current operation strategies and make them more effective.

I am therefore asking you to please take a moment to help us compile this valuable information. A postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

In the event that you receive any other copy of this same survey from one or more of our other sister organizations which you also support, please only complete and return one. If you filled this survey out at our Annual Meeting please disregard this one.

Thank you for taking time to help. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ruth Schilhouse
Director

COLUMBUS AREA INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM
105 West Lane Avenue, #1, P.O Box 21384, Columbus, Ohio 43221 • 614 291-4401
In cooperation with The Ohio State University College of Social Work and The Council of International Programs
A non-profit, tax deductible, educational-cultural exchange and professional enrichment program incorporated as 1970

October 22, 1981
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COLUMBUS AREA INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM
105 West Lane Avenue, #1, P.O Box 21384, Columbus, Ohio 43221 • 614 291-4401
In cooperation with The Ohio State University College of Social Work and The Council of International Programs
A non-profit, tax deductible, educational-cultural exchange and professional enrichment program incorporated as 1970
OFFICE OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

September 29, 198X

Dear Friend:

I am sending herewith a survey designed to examine participation in Catholic Relief Services (CRS). The research is part of a doctoral dissertation by Chimezie A.B. Osigweh, an OSU graduate student. Because we have had opportunity to work with Mr. Osigweh in designing the study, the results will be very valuable to CRS. Besides, they may serve as guides to any other local professionals intent on fostering more citizen participation in organizational problem solving.

The information you provide will help us clarify the expectations of our supporters. This will enable us to find out what turns people on toward participation in our activities, and also what turns them off from participating. These kinds of discoveries will undoubtedly help us to redefine some of our current operation strategies and make them more effective.

I am therefore asking you to please take a moment to help us compile this valuable information. A postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

In the event that you receive any other copy of this same survey from one or more of our other sister organizations which you also support, please only complete and return one.

Thank you for taking time to help. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jim Tobin
Program Coordinator

Enc.
Dear Friend of Unicef:

I am sending herewith a survey designed to examine participation in UNICEF. The research is part of a doctoral dissertation by Chimezie A.B. Ozigweh, an OSU graduate student. Because we have had opportunity to work with Mr. Ozigweh in designing the study, the results will be very valuable to UNICEF. Besides, they may serve as guides to any other local professionals intent on fostering more citizen participation in organizational problem solving.

The information you provide will help us clarify the expectations of our supporters. This will enable us to find out what turns people on toward participation in our activities, and also what turns them off from participating. These kinds of discoveries will undoubtedly help us to redefine some of our current operation strategies and make them more effective.

I am therefore asking you to please take a moment to help us compile this valuable information. A postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

In the event that you receive any other copy of this same survey from one or more of our other sister organizations which you also support, please only complete and return one.

Thank you for taking time to help. Your efforts are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donna Spretnak
Mrs. Donna Spretnak
Vice Chairman, UNICEF Committee of Greater Columbus
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