1994

American Peace Movement Organizations: The 1988 and 1992 Surveys

Mary Anna Culleton Colwell

Doug Bond

American Peace Movement Organizations
The 1988 and 1992 Surveys

by Mary Anna Culleton Colwell
and Doug Bond

Working Paper No. 21

INSTITUTE
FOR NONPROFIT
ORGANIZATION
MANAGEMENT

working papers

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
College of Professional Studies

American Peace Movement Organizations
The 1988 and 1992 Surveys

by Mary Anna Culleton Colwell
and Doug Bond

Working Paper No. 21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the definitive description of the 1988 Survey of Groups and Organizations Working for Peace and the 1992 follow-up of the peace movement organizations which responded in 1988. We discuss American peace movement organizations and the origins and history of the research effort in Part One along with a brief review of some of the theoretical considerations underlying this process.

In Part Two we explain the survey methods and procedures including details on the stratified sample selection, questionnaire development, survey procedures in 1988 and 1992 and response rates. The 1992 effort, especially, was the product of a team of colleagues and we outline that process. (Names and addresses of team members follow this summary). One aspect was collaboration on changes in the 1992 questionnaire and another was a study of nonrespondents to the 1988 survey which increased the level of confidence in the data derived from both surveys.

The dimensions and operations of American peace movement organizations are presented in Part Three. The "demographic" data for both segments of the sample includes founding dates, geographic distribution and focus, tax status, organizational type, constituency, governance, membership type and numbers, staff, expenditures and, for the 1992 survey, sources of income. The first part of relatively stable data are from the larger 1988 survey. Beginning with organizational type we also include 1992 data for comparison. Key findings from these data include the comparative youth of a large segment of these peace movement organizations and their relatively small budgets, their uneven disbursement throughout the U.S. with more than half located in the eastern states plus California, a major focus on local, state, and regional work, and that religious individuals and groups are the only large constituency group.

Almost all of the larger groups in what is called Sample I had a form of Federal tax status, just under half of the smaller groups in Sample II which answered the question on tax status had Federal tax status. (Assuming those that did not answer did not have Federal tax status, only one third of Sample II groups were tax exempt groups which would be listed in IRS records. Therefore, the remaining two-thirds segment represents the large pool of nonprofit associations rarely studied by research based on IRS records). By about the same proportions, almost all the groups in Sample I had governing boards and somewhat over half of the groups in Sample II did. Membership size varied widely from less than ten to over 100,000. In 1988 the median membership size in Sample I was 1500 in 1988 and 1000 in 1992. The medians for Sample II were 63 and 45 members respectively. Annual expenditure ranged from a few thousand dollars to over $1 million. The medians for the two samples were $85,000 in 1988 and $110,700 in 1992 for Sample I and $6,250 in 1988 and $2,800 in 1992 for the smaller groups in Sample II. These medians are

evidence of the major decline in American peace movement organizations which took place between 1988 and 1992. From these data we can conclude that the peace movement of 1988 was extremely diverse and the overwhelming proportion was small groups with minimal resources, many less than 18 years old and a substantial portion less than seven years old in 1988. The meteoric rise of the freeze movement in the early 1980's is reflected in these data, although its decline had already begun by this time.

A review of the organizational characteristics and operations data support the conclusion that peace movement organizations, above the low threshold of a $30,000 annual budget, are likely to be as well organized and managed as any other nonprofit social movement organizations, as far as may be known now in the absence of similar data on a large number of other social movement organizations. This review includes the organizational structure, financial operations, and external organizational relations of these organizations in 1988 and 1992. The 1992 survey of surviving groups, after a major changes in the world political climate that reduced interest in peace movement activities, show generally small percentages and lower means on most of the operations data tallied. In light of previous writing about the peace movement we would expect that many younger organizations would disappear and that the older organizations might maintain an infrastructure for the movement as the basis for its next surge.

Most social movement organizations are known to the public at large because of their goals. Part Four of this paper includes findings about the most important goals for these peace movement organizations. From a list of 21 goals, the top three for both samples in 1988 were "promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence," "promoting social justice," and "eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide." In 1992 "promoting social justice" was among the top three most important goals in both samples. "Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence" and "reduce military expenditures" were the other two top goals in Sample I in 1992. The other two goals in Sample II were "reform views of other peoples or countries" and "changing U.S. foreign policy to eliminate unilateral intervention." This latter goal, among these very small groups, probably reflects the continued existence of many grassroots efforts focused on U.S. activities in Central America and the Caribbean. The percentages choosing many other goals and the changes from 1988 and 1992 are presented in this section, along with the new goals added to the questionnaire in the 1992 survey. An obvious change between 1988 and 1992 is the greater emphasis placed on goals relating to the environment, natural resources, and sustainable development among the 1992 respondents.

The data from a bank of items on organizational values and strategies further reinforces the not surprising finding that these peace movement organizations have a commitment to nonviolence, they seek to influence U.S. foreign policy and they try to act in terms of the slogan

"think globally, act locally." Response to a new set of questions in 1992 show that these groups believe that significant and enduring change in national policy must be based on grassroots organizing, that the UN should play a larger role than the US in peacemaking, and that they wish to advocate change through persuasive, intellectual, appeals for rational solutions to world problems.

The activities and tactics of these organizations include educational, legislative and lobbying, electoral, and direct action efforts. In both years the largest percentages of groups in both samples were engaged in educational activities and the smallest in electoral work, which is to be expected given the regulations governing tax exempt organizations which severely limit electoral activities by nonprofit organizations. From a quarter to over one third of the 1988 respondents engaged in what is called here direct action (e.g. boycotts, nonviolence training, civil disobedience). The percentages in 1992 were very similar with the exception of participation in civil disobedience among the Sample I groups which fell from 27% in 1988 to 17% in 1992. Answers to questions about activities related to recent crises show that the Persian Gulf War had a bigger impact on these peace organizations than the changes which took place in the Soviet bloc between 1988 and 1992. Approximately a third of these groups were involved in the National Gulf War demonstration in Washington, D.C.

Another new section in the 1992 questionnaire asked for estimates of kind and amount of media coverage. Almost 70% of the 1992 respondents had been written about at least once in a newspaper in the preceding year. Very small percentages had weekly or more frequent newspaper coverage. Over 60% of the groups had letters to the editor published and over half were covered in TV news story. In contrast, especially among the smaller groups, large percentages were never covered by cable or local access TV or radio or TV talk shows.

To complement this detailed description of the 1988 and 1992 surveys, Part Five includes summaries of the key findings of most of the analytical papers and articles written by all those involved in this effort from 1989 to date. Some of these analyses provide evidence to contradict commonly accepted ideas about the relationships between mission, organizational characteristics, and activities of social movement organizations. Several analyses are still in progress and more are planned for the future. It is our hope that the variety of these analyses will encourage other scholars to use the unique and comprehensive data base developed by these two surveys. The data and the codebooks are available from Doug Bond, Program on Nonviolent Sanctions, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University (1737 Cambridge St., Cambridge, MA 02138).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PARTICIPANTS IN THE 1988 AND 1992 SURVEYS

Doug Bond
Program on Nonviolent Sanctions
CFIA, Harvard University
1737 Cambridge St.
Cambridge, MA 02138

Mary Anna Culleton Colwell
1628 Jaynes Street
Berkeley, CA 94703

Bob Edwards
Life Cycle Institute
Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. 20064

Sam Marullo
Department of Sociology
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20057

Ron Pagnucco
Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Jackie Smith
Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Advisor:
John D. McCarthy
Department of Sociology
Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. 20064

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The many individuals who participated in this research effort and the institutions and individuals that provided financial and logistical support for the two surveys are described and thanked in the first part of this paper. Here we would like to acknowledge the over four hundred peace people who took the time and effort to respond to the 1988 survey and the almost two hundred and fifty who replied to the 1992 follow-up. These dedicated workers are an essential part of the peace movement and their willingness to fill out a long and detailed survey form made possible the creation of this unique data set about peace movement organizations. We are grateful to all of them for responding and for the important work they do.

TABLES

APPENDIX TABLES

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

In this monograph we outline the approach and methods, and present selected data from two survey studies of American peace movement organizations conducted in 1988 and 1992. The original (1988) survey was mailed to groups and organizations working for peace in the United States, as identified by a leading "information guide to resources and groups working for peace in the areas of peace, disarmament and international security" published by the Topsfield Foundation in 1987. The second (1992) survey was mailed only to respondents of the first survey to track changes in their responses over time.

Observations and propositions of scholars both within and outside the peace movement can be assessed against the data reported here. For example, the data may offer insights into the following questions: What were the most important goals of U.S. peace movement organizations (PMOs) in 1988 and 1992? What values were most salient for all groups or for groups with specific important goals? How many PMOs were tax exempt nonprofit organizations and how many were informal groups of friends or activists working together? To what degree were these groups organized and managed in traditional patterns? What role did members play in developing program, carrying out activities? What are the differences between pacifist and nonpacifist PMOs? Were these PMOs committed primarily to the pursuit of social change and social justice? Were there significant differences in goals or activities between the small local groups and the large national groups?

Inquiries into these and many other questions can be developed with the time series data gathered by these two surveys. The data from the two surveys of groups and organizations working for peace in the United States (hereafter called the 1988 Survey and the 1992 Survey) make it possible to draw profiles of U.S. peace movement organizations (PMOs) from many perspectives. Already, several articles and research papers prepared by the members of the research team focus on some of these questions. These works and works-in-progress are described briefly in Part Five

1

of this monograph. The survey data and codebooks will be made available to other scholars and researchers[1] to encourage additional analysis.

In general there is a dearth of systematically developed, empirical data based on national samples of social movement organizations. The present survey data , therefore, should be of great value both to students of American social movement organizations as well as to those focused more narrowly on the peace movement.

We begin with a brief review of relevant background material on American peace movement organizations. We then discuss the present research effort and its theoretical context in the balance of Part One, along with information on the people, institutions and funding sources involved in the research. In Part Two we describe the data sources, survey methods, procedures and response rates of both surveys. Selected results are then presented in Parts Three and Four. Part Three includes the basic dimensions of American peace movement organizations. These "demographic" data include general characteristics comparable to data on other social movement organizations. In Part Four we review salient data on goals, values, strategies and activities of the groups. Many of these variables are comparable to those selected for analysis of other social movements; a few are specific to the peace movement. The discussion in Part Five includes summaries of ongoing analysis of these data by members of the research team. Finally, the Appendix includes detailed tables to complement and supplement those presented in Parts Three and Four.

Background on American peace movement organizations

Americans have opposed wars since before there was an American government. Some of our ancestors fled to Canada rather than fight against the Crown in the Revolutionary War. Some remained and were punished for their unwillingness to fight. A small band of pacifists have opposed every war throughout our history. They have been joined in the period before a war by many more citizens opposing a specific war or military build-up. Since the earliest days of our country there have been two main currents in the widening and narrowing stream of opposition to the use of war as a tool of foreign policy and national advancement. In a simplified way they can be labeled the pacifist current and the international rule of law current. Certainly there have been some groups opposed to certain wars that did not fit neatly into either of these general categories but many historians, looking at the trend of American peace efforts since the beginning of the republic, have made this broad division (Howlett and Zeitzer, 1985).

---

[1] A copy of the questionnaires, codebooks, and the data sets on computer discs may be obtained for a small fee to cover the cost of the materials from Doug Bond, Director, Program on Nonviolent Sanctions, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University (1737 Cambridge St., Cambridge, MA 02138).

The "peace churches", such as the Quakers and the Mennonites, have provided continuity and minimal organizational structure for the pacifist stream over the past centuries. Religious institutions of all kinds are frequently the incubators and nurseries for social change and social reform efforts and their last refuge when secular groups lose support in the general public (Zald and McCarthy 1987a). Since World War I four organizations have been the core groups until the present day (American Friends Service Committee, Fellowship of Reconciliation, War Resister's League, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom). The first three are officially pacifist groups. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom is internationalist but is often grouped with the first three organizations. There have been a few other non-pacifist, secular peace organizations that have carried the internationalist idea forward from one period to another such as the World Federalists.

The growth, development, activities, and efforts to influence public policy of groups and organizations working for peace are not distinctively different from those of other social movement organizations as far as may be known now, although few secular, nonpacifist, internationalist peace organizations have endured over many decades as have some social movement organizations in other arenas, such as the environmentalist Sierra Club established in 1892 or the American Civil Liberties Union established in 1915 or the pacifist peace organizations cited above.

Peace organizations, like most social movement organizations in this century, are usually organized as nonprofit organizations under the U.S. tax code. As of 1994, numerous college and graduate courses focused on nonprofit organizations have been integrated into university curricula. In addition, a substantial body of research focused on the role of nonprofits in American society, how to establish and manage and, especially, how to fund nonprofit organizations, has appeared in professional journals. The systematic study of nonprofit organizations, however, is of fairly recent origin and most of the empirical research and writing has been done since 1970 (See, for example, O'Neill 1989, Powell 1986).

There is a very large bibliography on peace research and case studies of specific peace campaigns or organizations. Prior to the 1988 survey there were no comprehensive and detailed studies of peace movement organizations in the United States or elsewhere based on a large national representative sample.

The research effort

The research reported here arose from Mary Anna C. Colwell's interest in evaluating peace groups and their effectiveness, from her concern about how social movement organizations develop and grow, from a background in theory and personal experience administering change oriented nonprofit organizations and her board service and volunteer activities with peace organizations. In particular, this effort to gather facts about peace groups and organizations was stimulated by the lack of comprehensive data available on the organizational aspects of the contemporary peace movement in the 1980s in spite of many fine historical descriptions, some of which covered the early part of this period (e.g. Wittner, 1984).

The 1988 Survey of Groups and Organizations Working for Peace was developed by Colwell with support from several small grants (from the Institute for Nonprofit Management at the University of San Francisco, the Samuel Rubin Foundation, the Topsfield Foundation, and from anonymous donors through the Peace Development Fund), logistical support from the Department of Sociology and the Computer Center at The Catholic University of America and the Topsfield Foundation and financial support from James M. Colwell. The survey was developed and administered at Catholic University of America with assistance and advice from colleagues at the Department of Sociology especially John D. McCarthy and Dean Hoge and students Ron Pagnucco, An Qing Shi, Jackie Smith and Mark Wolfson. Pagnucco, especially, contributed to the development of the questionnaire and to the administration of the survey. Sam Marullo of Georgetown University, Jon Cook of The Support Center in Washington, D.C. and John Lofland of the University of California, Davis provided valuable feedback and advice. Details about the 1988 Survey of Groups and Organizations Working for Peace are described below.

In 1991, at a conference of peace movement researchers organized by Nigel Young at Colgate University, Doug Bond, of the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University, initiated a discussion with Colwell about a follow-up survey. Many of those involved in the 1988 Survey participated in some way in this discussion. The 1992 follow-up became a collaborative effort of Colwell, Bond, Marullo, Pagnucco (then at the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, Notre Dame) and Bob Edwards (then a graduate student at Catholic University), with Michelle Markley of the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions as research assistant and administrative support and John D. McCarthy in an advisory role. The Program on Nonviolent Sanctions provided most of the financial and logistical support for the 1992 survey. All the participants and their institutions provided additional support for the 1992 follow-up. Subsequently, Jackie Smith, by then a graduate student at Notre Dame University, joined the 1992 effort. Summaries of the ongoing research of these research team members are included in Part Five.

4

Theoretical context

In this section we discuss briefly the theoretical context of this research. The 1988 and 1992 surveys and the analysis of the resulting data are based on several theoretical orientations. The most important of these are social movement theory, organizational theory, and nonprofit organization management theory. In addition, the large literature on peace movements in the past and present provided background and insights in the development of the surveys and in their subsequent analyses. We provide a brief review of the theories relevant to the development of the questionnaire. A complete review of all the relevant theoretical literature is beyond the scope of this paper. Many of these theories are discussed in detail in the analyses based on these data (e.g. Edwards 1994, Edwards and Marullo 1994, Pagnucco 1992).

The classic study of the relationships between structural variables, tactics, and social protest outcomes by William Gamson (1975, 1990) focused on organizations so much larger than the peace groups studied here that most of his important conclusions are not relevant to this study. Sociologists who analyze social movement organizations (SMOs) from the resource mobilization perspective include organizational funding, ability to mobilize around a "cause" or ideology, and the strength of the opposition (including the permeability of the political structure) as major factors in their evaluation (Havelick 1986; Jenkins 1983, 1988; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Zald and McCarthy 1987). The resource mobilization literature rarely deals with internal management practices or the relationship between these practices and the organization's ideology. An exception, Staggenborg's study of two women's groups in Chicago relates their differing ideologies to the degree of centralization and bureaucratization and 1) organizational maintenance and stability, 2) the breadth of issues addressed, and 3) the ability to adopt innovative tactics (Staggenborg 1989). She concluded that the organization that emphasized building a stable, well funded group became more centralized and bureaucratic over time, survived, and achieved some specific changes in public policy, although the process resulted in a narrowed set of goals and reduced ability to adopt innovative tactics. The second group remained nonbureaucratic and decentralized. It produced some cultural change through the creation of an alternative institution and the development of innovative tactics and added some items to the agenda then addressed by the more traditional organization. Such less formal social movement organizations are less likely to survive over a long period or to achieve a visible policy change but may have changed the overall awareness of the problems they addressed and the range of tactics available to seek change. Staggenborg's study highlights the desirability of more than one definition of success and alerts us to look for cultural changes, alternative institutions, new symbols, and novel tactics developed by nonbureaucratic, decentralized, and short-lived organizations within the peace movement and other social movements.

5

The aspect of organizational analysis most relevant to this study focuses on effectiveness, external influences on organizations, and the relationship between structure, age, size and governance. Organizational studies, including the analysis of nonprofit organizations, emphasize the importance of organizational structure, management styles, finances, number and kind of employees or volunteers, and reciprocal relationships with the external environment or the economic/political structure. Peace movement research has only rarely focused on these considerations.

A growing literature on the management of nonprofit organizations focuses on increasing the effectiveness of nonprofits in achieving their mission or stated goals (e.g. Alexander 1980; Anthony and Young 1984; Bryson 1988; Connors 1980; Franco, et al. 1982; Gross 1983; Mason 1984; McConkey 1981; Selby 1978; Unterman 1982). This literature rarely distinguishes between service and cause-oriented groups and usually does not relate organizational structure or management practices to issue orientation or goals. In one study of the dilemmas of performance measurement in nonprofits, focused on a large service organization (Kanter and Summers 1987), the authors found that most nonprofit organizations do not attempt to measure effectiveness because of problems such as the intangibility of the service provided. Although they were not concerned with cause-oriented groups, one conclusion appears to be particularly apposite. "Since nonprofits tend to believe in their own functioning, failure to achieve goals is taken not as a sign of weakness in the organization but as a sign that efforts should be intensified" (164).

Histories of the American peace movement and analyses of the recent nuclear freeze organizations rarely focus on internal management values, effectiveness, or the relationship between goals sought and activities as Ayvazian and Klare noted (1986). The study of the Nuclear Freeze Campaign by a key staff member, Pam Solo, (1988) indicates this situation has begun to change. She emphasized that internal problems of structure and management were important factors in the inability of the Freeze organization to sustain itself as an independent peace group after the initial rapid mobilization. Examples of issues not faced and resolved include: leadership and power struggles, problems of coordination, internal divisions, elitism, and internal communication problems. These are all issues about which there is a substantial literature in organizational studies. In addition she cited irreconcilable political differences, a faltering educational strategy, and too many options for activities without sufficient direction or focus. These problems are experienced by many social movement organizations not just peace groups.

There is some organizational analysis in two articles about the "peak and trough" cycle of peace movement organizations that expand and multiply in the period before a great war and then almost disappear when the war comes (Boulding 1983; Young 1986). These studies do not include factors such as the size of the organization, number of members, budgets, structures, range of

goals, values and strategies, or different activities during the peak and trough periods. Boulding (1990) examined demographic and organizational data for the 1980s peace movement in the light of an historic overview of the various components of the peace movement and the shifts that took place in the 1980s. She concluded that a lasting contribution of the peace movement in this period was the creation of new symbols and the increased involvement of individuals in peace work through their professional affiliations and identities.

An external influence on all social movement organizations is the political culture within which movement organizations work. The political culture of the U.S. is a key variable in one of the last articles by the prominent peace historian Charles DeBenedetti. Describing the American peace movement he wrote:

> The most remarkable feature of American peace activism in the forty years following World War II has been the disparity between efforts invested and achievements effected. Operating in one of the world's freest and most open societies, citizen peace activists developed ideas, analyses, action, and organizations that established them as an irrepressible force. Nonetheless, they consistently failed to convert their countless efforts into the kind of political effectiveness that might move them into the main currents of American life. (DeBenedetti 1988, 222).

He cited the ambivalence of peace workers with Cold War rivalry as one reason and "their overriding commitment to the peace of justice, freedom, and liberation within a conservative political culture that attached the highest value to notions of order, security, and stability" as the second. (DeBenedetti 1988, 222). At the time he wrote these statements there was no way to ascertain whether all or most peace movement organizations shared the ambivalence about the Cold War or the commitment to social justice he cited. Moreover, these comments imply that the peace movement was ideologically consistent and coherent during the post World War II period. Other observers describe the peace movement as diffuse, diverse, and unable to resolve the fundamental ideological differences between pacifist, liberal, and progressive peace groups (Ayvazian and Klare 1986; Peace 1991:233-253; Washburn and Weyerhaeuser 1979).

Whether external political opposition or internal weaknesses or some other factors are relevant explanations for the lack of success of contemporary peace groups to become recognized as players in discussions of foreign policy and peace and war issues cannot be judged without detailed information about the groups and organizations themselves as well as a much broader discussion of the political and cultural context within which the peace movement operates. The 1988 Survey was a first attempt to gather relevant data on a representative sample of groups and organizations working for peace. The 1992 follow-up survey adds to that data. The current research team is conducting some of the analyses needed to answer questions such as those posed above (described in Part Five). A broad discussion of American political culture or of the foreign policy process in the United States is well beyond the scope of this monograph. Cortright (1993),

who was an active participant in many peace activities of the 1970s and 1980s, discusses how the peace movement has been influential in the foreign policy process.

Terminology

In this paper we refer to those surveyed and to the respondent groups as peace movement organizations, although the original survey was addressed to groups and organizations working for peace, and deliberately included task forces and committees of larger entities not considered peace groups, including mainline religious denominations and civic organizations as well as traditional peace church programs. We refer to these groups as peace movement organizations (PMOs) without attempting to set boundaries for or define "the" peace movement. Almost all social movements have permeable and movable boundaries. This is especially true of the peace movement. From a common sense point of view, however, the groups responding to the 1988 and 1992 surveys are groups doing peace work, and, therefore, are peace movement organizations, even if they are parts of larger entities, or do other kinds of work along with their peace efforts.

The 1988 survey samples

The samples for the 1988 Survey were derived from the *Grassroots Peace Directory (GPD)* published by the Topsfield Foundation of Connecticut.[3] The *GPD* was at that time the most comprehensive national listing of all U.S. groups and organizations working for peace. The 1986 edition of the *GPD* included names, addresses, budgets, and some issue information on 8,800 peace groups of all kinds, not just grassroots groups. The 1987 edition, from which the sample was drawn, had shrunk to 7,700 organizations reflecting the decline in peace movement activity in the last half of the 1980s. The *GPD* deliberately included organizations such as churches and civic groups that did not have a primary focus on peace, but had a committee or task force doing peace work. Therefore, as noted above, not all the groups in the sample were, strictly speaking, PMOs. Early analysis revealed that the peace task forces or committees of some of the "other" organizations had more money and staff for their peace work than many of the medium-sized and smaller PMOs. To obtain data on the resources of the entire peace movement these "other" groups were included in the sampling frame. Commercial ventures, grant-making foundations, research or educational institutions, professional associations, publications, governmental agencies and duplicates in the *GPD* list were excluded from the sampling pool.

The *Grassroots Peace Directory* was developed using paid informants in several regions of the United States, who contacted all the peace groups they knew about and learned from them about others, in a "snowball" method. The result was not only a comprehensive listing of peace movement organizations, but also one of the few sources of detailed information about the widely ignored grassroots associations in American life that are too small to require registration with the IRS or state incorporation. In general, very little is known about the large segment of unincorporated informal grassroots groups responsible for a major segment of voluntary activity in the U.S. David Horton Smith (1994) estimates that there are perhaps 7.5 million associations of this kind about which little is known because most research on nonprofit organizations uses IRS records as a sampling pool (a few studies use state incorporation records, also). The detailed information collected in the 1988 Survey on a representative sample of small grassroots peace organizations is, therefore, valuable not only as a picture of part of the peace movement but also as supplement to the few studies of such nonprofit associations which have been done.

After an analysis of the data in the 1987 *GPD*, Colwell selected a stratified sample. The first tier of the sample included all the groups that had reported annual budgets of $30,000 or

---

more in the 1987 *Grassroots Peace Directory*, after eliminating the categories listed above. This 100% census contained 492 organizations. The second part was a 5% random sample of the remaining approximately 7,200 organizations that reported budgets of $30,000 or less or had not reported budget information to the *GPD*. This procedure yielded a sample of 346 organizations. Surveys returned by the post office as undeliverable indicated that six organizations in the 100% sample and 21 in the 5% sample were already defunct or unreachable. This reduced the two samples to 486 and 325 respectively.

The 1988 survey questionnaire

The survey covered a wide range of information: goals; values and strategies; structure, operations and internal management, staffing and governance; educational, political, and electoral activities; types and numbers of members and their participation; constituency; technical assistance received and needed; location and geographic area served; founding year; and financial information.

Most of the questions on operations and internal management came from an organizational evaluation of recipients of grants from the Campaign for Human Development conducted by Joseph Shields and John D. McCarthy (Shields and McCarthy, 1989). Additional operations questions such as the use of consensus procedures were based on the personal experience of Colwell and Pagnucco working with peace groups. Other questions on management and the role of donors were based on Colwell's background teaching management theory in a program for administrators of nonprofit organizations and her previous research on foundations, public policy, and the influence of funders on nonprofits (Colwell 1993). The techniques listed by Schlozman and Tierney (1983) in their analysis of Washington-based pressure groups were the basis for the section on educational, political, and electoral activities. Questions about a few additional activities, such as participation in prayer vigils or boycotts were also based on the personal experiences of Colwell and Pagnucco working with PMOs. The electoral activities listed by Schlozman and Tierney were expanded to include more aspects of working on a campaign, again based on personal experiences. The questionnaire was sent out in draft form to those acknowledged above as providing assistance and advice and to twenty other scholars and activists who provided useful reactions and comments that were incorporated into the final survey form.

The 1988 survey procedures and response rates

The questionnaire was formatted and administered following as closely as possible the advice in *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method* by Don Dillman (1978). The questionnaire was formatted as a small booklet. Endorsements from two individuals whose names and

11

reputations would be known to many peace workers were put on the front cover of the survey. The cover letter included a detailed explanation of why the survey was being conducted and promised that the answers would remain confidential. The mailing included a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of the questionnaire.

After the initial mailing in early 1987 a follow-up postcard was sent after three weeks to any organization that had not replied. Subsequently another questionnaire and cover letter was sent with a notice on the envelope that this was a second request. We did not have the funds to send a second follow-up postcard. During the summer of 1987 Pagnucco tried to reach about half of the remaining nonrespondents by telephone and discovered that some were no longer in existence.

A few groups provided program information or publications but did not include a completed survey form and were not counted as respondents. Nine organizations explicitly refused to answer the survey, although they returned the survey form. In several cases these organizations rejected the label of "peace movement" group, even though they had been listed in the *GPD*. There were 272 completed surveys in the 100% sample and 139 in the 5% sample. Rounded off, this represents a 56% response rate (272/486) for the 100% sample--including those who refused to reply as nonrespondents. The response rate for the 5% sample is 43% (139/325). Appendix Table A1 presents the schedule of returns for both the 1988 and 1992 surveys.

The 1988 survey nonrespondents

During the follow-up phase, Jackie Smith and Doug Bond designed, and Smith then conducted a comparison of the respondents and nonrespondents from the 1988 sample based on the entire 1987 *GPD* provided by the staff of the Topsfield Foundation. The detailed findings of this analysis are reported by Smith (1993). The main conclusions are that for the 100% sample there is no significant variation between the respondents and nonrespondents in location, scope of activity, constituency, focus, and issues, with one exception. There were more groups working on draft resistance in the 100% sample than among the respondents. For the 5% sample there are no significant differences in location, scope of activity, constituency, focus and issues, also with one exception. Groups working on U.S.-Soviet relations were slightly overrepresented among the respondents in the 5% sample. The comparisons on operations, resources, and organizational characteristics also revealed few differences. In the 100% sample, respondents were more likely to provide speakers or workshops than the nonrespondents.

Some statistically significant variation was evident with respect to tax status, with the respondents more likely to have other than 501(c)3 status (generally a 501(c)4 status) than

12

nonrespondents.[4] Our respondents in the 100% sample were probably more active in electoral and legislative activities than the entire pool of peace movement groups and organizations. The comparisons on operations, resources and organizational characteristics for the 5% sample showed that the respondents were more likely to use legislative strategies than nonrespondents and revealed a difference in tax status in the opposite direction from that of the 100% sample. Groups with tax status other than 501(c)3 were less likely to be among the survey respondents than the nonrespondents. These differences were not large or related to key variables for large numbers of respondents.

The 1992 survey questionnaire and sample

The four year period between surveys (1988 and 1992) was chosen in part to match the U.S. presidential election cycle that is the backdrop for much political activity in the U.S. The 1992 survey focused on all respondents to the 1988 Survey still active in 1992. The original questionnaire was modified in limited ways in a collaborative effort of all the participants (Bond, Colwell, Edwards, Marullo, Pagnucco). Sections in the 1988 Survey on technical assistance received and desired and equipment owned or likely to be acquired were eliminated. New sections included questions on nonviolent strategies, on any recent change in focus, on media coverage, on recent crises, activities relating to the Persian Gulf war and additional questions on religious affiliation and on sources of funds. The verb form on some of the questions was changed.

Prior to the mailing of the 1992 Survey a return postcard notifying the PMOs of the follow-up and requesting information about any changes in address or in organization title was sent to all 411 respondents to the 1988 Survey. Information received in this way and follow-up phone calls by Michelle Markley established that 57 groups were confirmed defunct or had ceased to function as peace groups and 33 groups were presumed defunct because they could not be reached by phone and all correspondence was returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable. An additional seven groups refused to respond, stating that they were not part of the "peace movement" or that their focus had shifted away from it. Thus the 1992 Survey sample is as follows:

411	total respondents to the 1988 Survey
57	groups deleted as confirmed "deaths"
33	groups deleted as presumed "deaths"
7	groups explicitly refused to complete the Survey
321	groups constitute the 1992 Survey sample, including refusals

---

[4] The IRS 501 (c) 3 tax status for nonprofit organizations restricts lobbying activities, forbids electoral activities and allows contributors to deduct their gifts on their income tax returns. The 501(c)4 status allows lobbying and electoral activities but contributors may not deduct their gifts.

The 1992 survey procedures and response rates

In mid-March 1992 questionnaires were sent to the 321 groups in the sample. After two weeks, we sent out a postcard reminder to all nonrespondents; the postcard reminder asked for their cooperation in completing the form and listed a telephone number for them to call (collect) to request an additional copy of the Survey if needed. A second, identical postcard reminder was sent to all non-respondents after four weeks. After six weeks, we called each non-respondent group's contact person--the name of whom was requested in our initial pre-Survey postcard mailing. We again asked for their cooperation and offered to send another copy of the Survey if needed. We continued throughout the Survey period (some 30 weeks) to call and/or write again to each non-respondent at two week intervals.

By mid-May, eight weeks after the Survey mailing, we had mailed at least two copies of the Survey and two postcard reminders to all nonrespondents. Still, the interim return rate of the Survey, even with our follow-up telephone calls beginning at six weeks after the initial Survey mailing, was just 120 respondents--less than half of the 246 groups that eventually responded.[5] Our telephone discussions with the contact people revealed a reluctance of most non-respondents to tackle the lengthy Survey.

At this point we decided to put together a "short form" of the Survey to encourage a higher return rate. The abridged version of the questionnaire ran one page only (back and front, single spaced) compared with the 20 page long form. The short form contained a small selection of the closed-ended questions deemed most important to our research and was supplemented with several open-ended questions that encouraged comparable responses.

We continued to contact all non-respondents bi-weekly by phone and/or reminder mailing over the next seven weeks while compiling the short form. By the beginning of June, however, a full fifteen weeks after the initial Survey mailing, we had received only 191 completed questionnaires. We then sent out the short form and had an immediate swell in returns, including ten groups that submitted both short and long forms. Because only certain key questions were included in the short form some of the 1992 data tables show a wide variation in the number of cases.

The use of the short form increased our respondent rate by 29% (from 191 to 246), increasing the overall rate from just under 60% to nearly 77%. This overall return rate may be broken down into those groups reporting a budget of $30,000 or greater (Sample I) and those reporting less than $30,000 (Sample II), as presented in the Topsfield Directory (1987). Of the 321 groups in the 1992 Survey sample (that is, after the deletions noted above), 233 of them reported

---

[5] The full schedule of returns for the 1988 and 1992 Surveys is presented in Appendix I.

budgets of $30,000 and larger, while 88 reported budgets of less than $30,000. There were 182 returns from the larger budget group or Sample I (for a return rate of 78.1%) and 64 respondents in the smaller budget group or Sample II (for a return rate of 73.0%).

PART THREE

DIMENSIONS AND OPERATIONS OF
AMERICAN PEACE MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Selected findings from the two surveys are presented here and in Part Four. We begin with basic "demographic" information on the groups and organizations surveyed: specifically, we outline their founding dates, geographic locations and focus, and organizational type. We also review their tax status, constituency, governance, number of members, staffing, expenditures, and sources of funds. As most of the demographic data are relatively stable, the presentations are drawn largely from the 1988 survey. The full range of dimensions, however, includes both relatively stable (organizational type, tax status and constituency), and dynamic (number of members, expenditures) measures. Thus for the latter dimensions, we present findings from both the 1988 and 1992 surveys. We also present selected data on the operations and management of the respondents. Many of these data are useful for comparison with other social movement organizations.

Since the two samples (I and II) represent distinctly different types of groups, we report most data in two parts by sample. Recall that these samples were chosen on the basis of budget information collected for the 1987 *Grassroots Peace Directory*. Some groups did not report these budget data to Topsfield. Some budget data may also have changed by the time of the 1988 Survey. Some of the budget data reported in the present surveys is inconsistent with the budget data presented in the Topsfield directory. Only groups that *reported* to Topsfield budgets of more than $30,000 were treated as larger groups or Sample I. Approximately one-tenth of the respondents in each sample, however, had budgets which were either larger or smaller than that assumed in this sample selection procedure. Thus calling these samples the Larger Peace Movement Organizations and the Smaller Peace Movement Organizations reflects the intent of the research design, but not the results. The only completely accurate designation for these samples is the 100% sample (Sample I) and the 5% sample (Sample II). To avoid the confusion that such labels might cause, we call them simply Sample I and Sample II.

As noted above, a substantial segment of the 1992 respondents used a short form. Therefore we do not have data from these groups on many questions. For these questions not included on the short form the number used as the basis for calculating percentages is very much smaller than the overall number of respondents. To be accurate and consistent we present the data

along with their respective range in the number of cases for each question. Some of the Appendix tables contain all the data with percentages calculated including missing data as appropriate.

Founding dates

As discussed above, the history of the peace movement in the United States is one of waxing and waning. Many observers consider the danger of an approaching war, or the actual fighting of a war, the major cause of this growth or decrease. The expansion and contraction of the peace movement in the 1980s, however, cannot be explained in this way.[6] Throughout the past the "peace churches" and a few secular peace groups have persisted. At any given time, however, one would expect the majority of peace groups to be relatively young unless the movement had severely contracted and was reduced to a few core groups. This is strikingly illustrated in Table 1 in which the founding dates of respondents to the 1988 survey are presented. Over two thirds of Sample II respondents and 47% of Sample I were less than seven years old in 1988; 82% and 77% respectively were less than seventeen years old. In other words, the overwhelming majority of groups in the present survey were founded since the closing days of the Vietnam War.

Table 1. Year of Founding of PMOs. 1988 Data.		
Founding Year	Sample I N=272 %	Sample II N=139 %
Prior to 1900	<1	<1
1900 - 1939	7	6
1940 - 1949	4	2
1950 - 1959	3	<1
1960 - 1969	8	8
1970 - 1979	30	15
1980 - 1987	47	67
Totals	100%	100%

---

[6] Bob Edwards and Sam Marullo analyzed the "mortality" of PMOs between 1988 and 1992 using the 1988 survey data (1995).

Geographic distribution and focus

The geographic distribution of the 1988 respondents is compared with that of the total list of peace groups in the 1987 *GPD* and the 1986 U.S. population is presented in Table 2. Ten percent of the respondents to the 1988 Survey were in the District of Columbia whereas only three percent of the groups in the 1987 *GPD* were located there. This major difference reflects the fact that Sample I captured most of the nationally oriented groups located in the nation's capital.

Table 2. Geographic Distribution of PMOs. 1988 Data.			
Region	1988 PMO Respondents %	1987 *GPD* %	1986 U.S. Pop. %
East	**45**	**31**	**25**
New England	13		5
New York	9		7
Mid-Atlantic	13		13
District of Columbia	10	3	3
South	**6**	**9**	**21**
Midwest	**19**	**26**	**23**
Plains/Mntns/Southwest	**7**	**12**	**15**
West Coast/Pacific Rim	**22**		
California	16		
N/W & Pacific	6		
Totals	99%	100%	102%

Note, totals do not always sum to 100 due to rounding; Sources: 1988 Survey; *Grassroots Peace Directory*, 1987 and the 1986 U.S. Census.

There is a substantial difference between the percentage of the U.S. population in the south (21%), the percentage of southern groups listed in the *GPD* (9%) and the percentage of southern respondents to the PMO survey (6%). Comparing the percentages of groups in various regions in the *GPD* with the portion of the population in these regions, a higher proportion of *GPD* groups were in the eastern region and on the west coast. The 1988 Survey respondents included an even higher percentage in these two regions, probably for the same reason as the

overrepresentation of the District of Columbia, although the differences in these two regions are much smaller. Nevertheless, and as noted above, the nonresponse bias study showed no significant differences in location between those groups in the sample that responded to the survey and those that did not.

The 1988 survey included a question on the area of focus for the activities of the peace movement organization. Table 3 presents the results.

Table 3. Geographic Focus of PMOs. 1988 Data.		
Area Served	Sample I N=196 %	Sample II N=58 %
Local	28	58
Multi-county	13	12
Metropolitan area; large city	4	2
State/multi-state	16	13
National	27	8
International	13	7
Total	101%	100%

Note, totals do not always sum to 100 due to rounding.

Forty-five percent of the groups in Sample I served a local, multi-county, or metropolitan area. Almost three-quarters of the smaller groups in Sample II focused close to home, although 21 of these organizations (15%) claimed a national or international area of service. The preponderance of PMOs in the late 1980s did not focus on a national or international area of work. The 40% of Sample I that did focus on national or international work includes all the better known PMOs.

Tax status

Nonprofit organization tax status is a significant and relatively stable characteristic. Obtaining a state and federal exemption from income tax is one of the first steps in becoming a formal nonprofit organizations. With that exempt tax status comes privileges and constraints. Research in the past decade supports the view that the tax code and postal code are potential sources of social control over social movement organizations, although this aspect of tax status is rarely considered

19

seriously by social movement scholars. McCarthy, Britt and Wolfson (1991) analyze this social control concept and the channeling of social movement activity which results from the Federal tax and postal laws. They conclude that these Federal laws, along with other channeling mechanisms associated with fundraising, promote the narrowing of goals, tactics, and range of organizational forms of social movement organizations.

Nonprofit organizations with tax exempt status (501) that wish to receive contributions that the donor may deduct on her/his income tax, apply for a 501(c)3 tax status. Contributions to nonprofit organizations substantially engaged in political work such as legislative lobbying and electoral activities are not tax deductible. Thus, 501(c)4 organizations are tax exempt but the money they receive is not tax deductible for the donor.

Many public interest and social movement groups establish both a 501(c)3 and a 501(c)4 organization to work together on educational and political activities. In the questionnaire we asked for the tax status of the responding organization and for the status of any affiliates. Many groups did not answer this question and those that did apparently marked the tax status they knew about but frequently did not answer "No" to the other possible choices. Thus, although 501(c)3 and 501(c)4 tax statuses are mutually exclusive for an individual group, respondents may have answered for related groups as well. Therefore, accounting for the tax status of these PMOs in 1988 requires allocating cases to categories when the respondent specified more than one of the mutually exclusive categories and adding the total for each category.[7] The result is that 241 (89%) of Sample I and 94 (68%) of Sample II organizations reported their tax status as presented in Table 4. State incorporation is a requirement for federal tax exempt status so reporting the cases with federal tax status incorporates all those with state tax status in Sample I. In Sample II there were 13 groups which indicated they had state incorporation but did not have a federal tax exemption, a logical possibility for small organizations.

The category of Political Action Committee also overlapped with the (c) 4 and other categories. In 1988 17 groups in Sample I and 4 groups in Sample II stated they were Political Action Committees. This small number would be even smaller in a year in which there was not a presidential election.

Another perspective on the Sample II tax status data is that only 49 of the 139 respondents claimed Federal tax status. It is reasonable to assume that those who did not answer this question did not have Federal tax status. Therefore, about two-thirds of the Sample II groups

---

[7] The largest overlap was 18 cases in Sample I which claimed both (c)3 and the (c)4 status. We reduced each category by 9 to eliminate this overlap.

represent the huge segment of nonprofit organizations not included in the IRS files about which little is known. This segment is rarely the subject of research.

Table 4. Tax Status of PMOs: 1988 Data.	1988	
Tax Status	Sample I N=241 %	Sample II N=94 %
Group Unincorporated	5	37
State Incorporation	*	14
Federal 501 (c) 3	74	43
Federal 501 (c) 4	21	6
Totals	100%	100%

* All State Incorporation in Sample I included in the 501 (c) 3 percentage.

Organizational type

Each group was asked to select its organizational type as: a small group of friends working together, local independent or affiliated group, regional or statewide group, national federation, independent national group with or without affiliates, peace committee or task force of a larger group, or some other organizational type. Consolidating these categories into local groups, state and regional, national, committee or task force, and other organizational type, these data are presented in Table 5.[8] With this table we begin the presentation of data for both the 1988 and 1992 surveys by the two samples.

The doubling of committee or task force percentage between 1988 and 1992 as revealed in Table 5 may be of significance since these groups do not have independent governing boards and may not have control of personnel procedures, budgets or fundraising.

---

[8] A different and useful division is provided in Edwards (1993); he considered budget size and either local/state focus or national/international focus and created three major "domains": small budget local/state focus; large budget local/state focus; large budget national/international focus.

Table 5. Organizational Type of PMOs: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Organizational Type	1988 N=272 %	1992 N=141 %	1988 N=139 %	1992 N=56 %
Local	28	25	56	48
Regional/ State	15	17	13	11
National	34	34	4	3
Committee/task force	3	6	14	14
Other Type	20	18	13	11
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%

Constituency

Another consideration in this overview of PMO demographics in the late 1980s is their constituency group. The respondents were asked if the group served a particular constituency and, if so, which one(s). Of the 411 respondents, 174 groups described a special constituency. Of these, 100 indicated a religious denomination or a religious group and 25 indicated a specific professional occupation (e.g. physicians, educators). This reflects the long recognized base of the peace movement in the religious communities of the United States and the surge in the 1980s of such groups as Physicians for Social Responsibility, Educators for Social Responsibility, etc. The remaining constituencies listed were women (17 groups), youth/students (10), residents of a geographic area (8), and fourteen groups with constituencies not included above such as veterans, radiation victims, runners, and political party members.

Specific questions about the values and activities of groups with religious constituencies were asked in 1992 in addition to the 1988 questions on values and activities answered by all groups. These 1992 data are discussed in Part Four.

Governance

The presence or absence of governing boards in nonprofit organizations should be relatively stable over a four year period. However, as Table 6 reveals, there were substantial changes between 1988 and 1992 in the percentage which reported independent governing boards. In each year there is a substantial difference between the samples. Almost all of the groups in Sample I in 1988 had governing boards while only 55% of Sample II did. Two-thirds of the 1992 Sample I groups had governing boards while only one third of the Sample II groups did. In 1988 almost all of the

governing boards performed most of the functions that would be considered ideal in any discussion of nonprofit organization management.

The difference in the percentage of governing boards between the two samples reflects the high proportion of small local groups in Sample II and the substantial number of committees, task forces, and other sub-groups in religious communities and civic organizations without independent governing boards. A higher percentage of the boards of Sample II groups are engaged in planning, fund raising, program work, and community relations than among the larger groups. It is typical of smaller volunteer organizations that the board does almost all of the work that gets done. In the absence of staff, or with only very limited part time staff, the board is responsible for most of the group's activities.

Table 6.
Governance of PMOs: 1988 and 1992 Data.

	Sample I		Sample II	
Presence/Absence of a Governing Board	1988 N=272	1992 N=182	1988 N=139	1992 N=64
Have a governing Board	256	120	77	21
Board Functions	N=246-253 %	N=115-116 %	N=73-76 %	N=20-21 %
Organization planning	93	69	96	73
Fund raising	73	29	83	50
Community relations	67	21	73	15
Hire/fire staff	69	51	45	40
Develop/approve programs	96	50	93	50
Develop/approve budgets	92	38	84	67

The marked decrease in board functions in Sample I in 1992 is consistent with the increase in committees or task forces from 3% in 1988 to 6% in 1992 (see Table 4) since these groups do not have independent boards but cannot be explained by this factor alone. It may be the 1992 boards delegated more of these functions to paid staff, although staff levels did not increase between 1988 and 1992. The decrease in percentages of boards performing these vital functions could also suggest a decrease in board commitment to or at least less board involvement with their organizations. Board members of a nonprofit organization in decline may be reluctant to

spend time and energy struggling with decreasing budgets, or doing more strenuous and less successful fundraising.

Membership type

We asked whether the group had individual members only, organizational members only, or both and the number of individual and/or organizational members. In 1988 85% of Sample I and 95% of Sample II answered this question. In 1992 this question was not asked on the short form; thus we have data for only 52% of Sample I and 61% of Sample II. Despite the large difference in number of respondents between the two surveys, the membership profile appears to have remained stable in Sample I. In Sample II, on the other hand, an increase in individual members (78% to 87%) at the cost of organizational members (43% to 10%) appears evident. Table 7 presents the membership type results.

Table 7. PMO Membership Types: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Membership Type	1988 N=232 %	1992 N=95 %	1988 N=132 %	1992 N=39 %
Individuals Only	52	52	74	87
Organizations Only	7	5	5	3
Individuals and Organizations	41	43	20	10
Totals	100%	100%	99%	100%

Individual membership

Beginning with the number of members, we report data that might be expected to vary from one period to another. The number of individual members of these PMOs range from very few to over 100,000 (Table 8). In 1988 almost three quarters of Sample I had fewer than 5000 members and almost nine-tenths of Sample II had from four to 1000 members. For what would be considered peace groups, only a minute percentage had more than 100,000 members. For comparison purposes we note that the Sierra Club had about 400,000 members in 1988 and that it is only one of several large environmental organizations. As noted by Lofland (1994) and others, the concept

of membership is ambiguous; it may mean only a financial transaction (paying dues or making a contribution) or it may mean substantial volunteer involvement in the work of the organization.[9]

The Sample II groups with more than 1000 members reflect the inclusion in the 5% random sample of some groups with larger budgets not reported in the Topsfield Directory. The median number of members in Sample I in 1988 was 1500; in Sample II it was 63. In 1992 the median number of members was 1000 in Sample I and 45 in Sample II.

Table 8. Number of Individual Members: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Number of Members	1988 N=227 %	1992 N=112 %	1988 N=123 %	1992 N=51 %
1-100	17	11	55	59
101-1000	26	40	34	29
1001-5000	30	26	8	8
5001-100,000	23	21	3	4
Over 100,000	4	1	0	0
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%

Staff

In 1988 93% of Sample I and 30% of Sample II had paid staff. In 1992 these percentages were 83% and 33% respectively. The largest category for each segment was one or two paid staff positions (full-time or part-time) and the second largest was three to five positions. In Sample I in 1988 about 25% had more than five employees; only a small percentage in the 1988 Sample II and the two 1992 segments had more than five employees.

Expenditures

As described in the section on sample selection, of the approximately 7,700 organizations included in the *Grassroots Peace Directory*, about 500 reported annual budgets over $30,000 and almost 7,200 listed smaller budgets or had not reported budget information to the *GPD*. A few large

---

[9] We asked detailed questions about member involvement in governance and activities some of which are summarized in Colwell 1990.

budget organizations were included in the 5% random sample because they had not reported budget data to the *GPD*. In the 1988 Survey nine-tenths of Sample I and almost three quarters of Sample II reported expenditure of the previous year, as summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Expenditures of PMOs: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Amount of Expenditures	1988 N=247 %	1992 N=145 %	1988 N=102 %	1992 N=56 %
< $29,999	9	8	88	82
$30,000 - $99,999	40	34	7	11
$100,000 - $999,999	42	51	4	7
Over $1,000,000	9	7	1	0
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%

The median expenditures in 1988[10] were as follows: Sample I, approximately $85,000 and for Sample II, $6,250; in 1992 Sample I was $110,700 and Sample II, $2,800. A smaller percentage reported their expenditures in the 1992 survey in Sample I; there were four years of increases in prices and wages between 1988 and 1992. Taking these factors into account, it appears that the relative purchasing power available to the larger PMOs in 1992 increased very little, if at all. (The 1988 larger PMO mean of $85,000 would be about $103,000 in 1992 dollars with a 5% inflation rate.) Still, the situation was far worse for the smaller PMOs in 1992. Their median expenditure actually declined during this period, by some 55%..

Even these figures understate the erosion in financial support between 1988 and 1992, especially for smaller PMO's. Several of the highest expenditures in each sample are for religious organizations or for a large national organization of which the PMO surveyed is a relatively small task force or committee. Few respondents had expenditures over $1 million and almost all of these are national civic or religious organizations with a peace task force or committee that expends only a part of this budget. The over nine-tenths of the peace movement represented by Sample II operated with severely limited funds. There were only a few groups with substantial budgets that allow for hiring staff adequate to carry out a national or international program in either survey

---

[10] In 1988 the expenditure data was coded before entry by $1000 or $2500 increments. In 1992 the actual amount was entered into the data base.

year. From the perspective of a resource mobilization analysis of PMOs, it must be concluded that financial resources were limited, and spread thinly.

Sources of income

In 1992 respondents were asked for an estimate of the percentage of income from eight possible sources. In 1988 we asked about dues as a source of funds and whether the group raised funds from foundations.[11] Table 10 provides the percentages that received some income from each source in 1992. In each sample a substantial portion did not answer this question and in each sample a substantial portion indicated they also had other sources than the eight listed. These data provide information not otherwise available about income sources for peace movement organizations, and, probably, for social movement organizations more generally.

Table 10. Percentage of PMOs Receiving Income from Various Sources: 1992 Data.		
Sources	Sample I N=123 %	Sample II N=51 %
Individual gifts and bequests	85	57
Publications, sales of merchandise, conferences	68	41
Foundation grants	64	16
Fundraising events	61	37
Dues	51	45
Church/religious organization grants	36	22
Corporate gifts/grants	12	8
Canvassing	10	6

Individual gifts and bequests were a source for the largest portion of both samples and the only source cited by over half of the Sample II. Nonprofit organizations in the United States frequently derive the largest portion of their income from individual contributions. There are striking differences between the two samples in the percentages of organizations receiving foundation grants and using events to raise money. That only a sixth of Sample II groups had the expertise or the staff to raise money from foundations is not surprising. That only 37% of this

---

[11] The lack of a question on all sources of funds is a major deficit in the 1988 Survey.

sample of smaller groups used events of any kind to raise funds is probably evidence that such commonly used methods were not needed to fund these smaller budget organizations. Appendix Tables A-16 and A-17 show what portion of the income came from each source.

Summary of demographic data

The present groups and organizations working for peace in 1988 and 1992 included young and old and large and small groups, located all over the United States. Although only a small percentage were founded prior to 1900, one group is over 300 years old. The substantial majority were groups less than eighteen years old in 1988. More than half of the respondents are located in the eastern states plus California. There were proportionately fewer peace groups in the southern section of the U.S. and a smaller percentage of the groups there responded to our questionnaire. In 1988 over one quarter of Sample I and well over half of Sample II focused their work in the local area; 40% of Sample I and 15% of Sample II focused on national or international work. In 1988 over one quarter of Sample I and over one half of Sample II were local organizations; over one third of Sample I were national groups, and an additional one-fifth were committees or task forces of larger organizations that may be assumed to be largely national in orientation. The only constituency group specifically identified by a substantial percentage was religious individuals, groups or denominations.

Over 90% of Sample I groups in 1988 and 84% in 1992 were officially tax exempt nonprofit organizations, some of which do overt political work and cannot accept tax deductible contributions. Assuming that lack of information about tax status indicates a lack of Federal tax exemption, only a third of Sample II in both years had Federal tax exempt status. Almost all of the groups in Sample I and over half of the groups in Sample II in 1988 had governing boards. Many fewer groups in each 1992 sample had governing boards. The continuation of a high percentage of tax exempt status in Sample I in 1992 combined with a decline in the percentages of governing boards supports a conclusion that many of the surviving groups were parts of larger entities without their own independent boards. Membership size varied from less than ten to over 100,000. From half to two-thirds of the Sample I groups had between 100 and 5000 members; the Sample I median membership for the two surveys was 1500 and 1000. Over half (55% and 59%) of Sample II in the two surveys had less than 100 members; the medians were 63 and 45. Expenditures ranged from a few thousand dollars to over $1 million. Three-quarters of the larger groups had annual expenditures between $30,000 and $100,000; the medians were about $85,000 in 1988 and $110,700 in 1992. The median expenditure for Sample II, which represents nine-tenths of the peace movement, was about $6,250 in 1988 and $2,800 in 1992. That is, slightly less than half of all peace movement organizations in the United States operated on these tiny budgets or less.

The group of respondents upon which these demographic profile are based is not significantly different from the nonrespondents (Smith 1993). Thus, to the extent that carefully compiled *Grassroots Peace Directory* of 7,700 groups is inclusive of peace movement organizations in the US. as a whole, these profiles should also reflect the larger pool of those same groups.

We can conclude, so far, that the peace movement of 1988 was extremely diverse and the overwhelming proportion was very small groups with minimal resources, many less than eighteen years old, a substantial portion less than seven years old. Among other factors, the meteoric rise of the nuclear freeze movement in the early 1980s is reflected in these data, although the peak of freeze organizing was substantially earlier than 1988. Another conclusion is that peace activities were widely dispersed throughout the citizenry in all regions except the south. Although the movement organizations themselves might well be considered marginal because of their limited resources, peace work was not a marginal activity as any account of American political life in the 1980s would conclude (see Cortright 1993; Joseph 1993; Lofland 1993; Marullo 1994; Marullo and Lofland 1990; Peace 1991). This profile of peace movement organizations will become clearer with the following consideration of the structure and operations of these peace organizations.

Organizational structure and characteristics

The organizational structure and characteristics of these peace movement organizations may be comparable to those of organizations in other social movements and these data invite comparison with data about other movements. There were more changes in these data between 1988 and 1992 than would be anticipated by those who expect organizations to develop, mature, and retain their structure even in times of decline.

In several sections of the 1988 and 1992 questionnaires respondents were asked to indicate the relative truth or falsity of a statement on a Likert-type scale scored as 0=Definitely False to 6=Definitely True. These data are reported as means. The higher the mean value the more true the statement. Means between 2.5 and 3.5 indicate that respondents were ambivalent about this item or that they were polarized in their views. Due to space limitations the standard deviations are not presented in the text, except when they are high; the standard deviations are included in corresponding Tables in the Appendix.

The questionnaire sections on organizational structure, financial operations, and the relationship of the group to others in the community were answered on the Likert-type scale. Tables 11, 12 and 13 show the means computed from the 1988 and 1992 answers to these items. As with the other tables the order is from high to low on the 1988 Sample I data. The division of

these organizational data into tables is by the content of the questions on a common sense basis, not by statistical analysis. For a factor analyses of these data see Edwards and Marullo (1994).

Table 11.
Organizational Structure and Characteristics of PMOs: 1988 and 1992 Data.

Operations Statements	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=259-265 Means	1992 N=132-172* Means	1988 N=124-131 Means	1992 N=52-61 Means
Developed a sense of group solidarity	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.6
Use consensus procedures	4.5	4.4	5.1	4.5
Clearly defined structure	4.3	4.2	3.0	2.9
Avoided internal divisions	3.7	3.5	4.2	4.1
Elect leaders	3.1	2.7	2.2	2.9

* The Ns for this column vary as follows, in the order given in the table: 131,172,169,132,134.
Refer to Appendix Tables A2 and A3 for standard deviations.

The respondents in Sample I in 1988 and 1992 see themselves as relatively well organized and with a sense of group solidarity, although they have not necessarily avoided internal divisions or disagreements. It is likely that they use consensus decision making procedures. It is neither true nor false that they elect leaders. It may be that many of the larger membership organizations have self-perpetuating boards or that leaders are chosen by consensus not by formal election. Sample II in both surveys reflects that clear structure is as likely to be false as to be true and a much higher use of consensus procedures. In 1988 these groups in Sample II were less likely to elect leaders than the larger ones in Sample I and more likely to have developed group solidarity and avoided internal divisions. These findings are very consistent with the generally accepted picture of small, and, therefore, more cohesive, social movement organizations that may or may not have a conventional organizational structure.

Financial operations

Internal accounting procedures are required for groups seeking tax exemption and it is no surprise that a very high proportion of Sample I indicate that this is true (Table 12). This is substantially less true for the groups in the Sample II, some of which are informal groups without special tax status. In 1988 members of groups in Sample I contributed funds and groups were able

Table 12. Financial Operations of PMOs: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Operations Statements	1988 N=248-267 Means	1992 N=128-134 Means	1988 N=123-131 Means	1992 N=49-52 Means
Internal accounting procedures	5.5	5.0	3.9	3.4
Leaders responsible for budgeting	4.9	4.8	3.7	3.8
Members contribute funds	4.7	*	4.1	*
Maintain steady funding support	4.4	3.8	3.4	3.2
Have a fundraising plan	4.1	3.9	2.2	2.3
Leaders raise funds from grassroots	4.1	3.9	3.1	2.5
Have been able to diversify funding	3.9	3.5	2.0	1.6
Leaders raise fund from foundations	3.7	3.3	1.5	1.3

* Question was asked in a different way in 1992; see Sources of Funds in Table 6.

to maintain steady funding, but it is less true that they were able to diversify their funding base. The respondents in Sample II indicate members contributed funds and leaders are responsible for budgeting. Steady funding support and leaders raising funds from grass roots sources are in the middle category of neither true nor false. Sample II groups were not likely to have a fund raising plan or to have been able to diversify funding. For all nonprofits support from foundations is only likely for fairly large and well established groups. If the sub-set with expenditures over $100,000 were examined the mean for foundation fundraising would be much higher. As expected, this item is considered false by Sample II respondents. The 1992 data show that these financial operations statements are less true for the Sample I groups that continued into 1992; the 1992 means for Sample II do not show a consistent change up or down from 1988.

External organizational relationships

External relationships are presented in Table 13. All four segments appear to be well related to the rest of their community. Their leaders work with others, they have been successful in gaining community support, forming coalitions, and mobilizing people for action.

Table 13. External Organizational Relations of PMOs: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Operations Statement	1988 N=255-266 Means	1992 N=133-134 Means	1988 N=127-130 Means	1992 N=51-58 Means
Leaders able to work with other groups	5.5	5.3	5.2	5.1
Successful in gaining community support	4.8	4.4	3.7	3.7
Form on-going coalitions with similar groups	4.7	4.6	3.9	4.0
Can mobilize people for action	4.6	4.2	4.0	3.9
Recognition that group brings social change *	4.4	4.0	3.1	3.1
Would benefit from greater contact with other groups	4.1	**	4.4	**

* 1992 Sample I N=171.
** Question not asked in 1992.

Sample I respondents in both surveys were recognized as groups that bring about social change. Although they have formed on-going coalitions with similar groups, the 1988 respondents agree that more contact with other groups would benefit their work. Possibly reflecting their lesser ability to form coalitions or mobilize people for action the 1988 respondents in Sample II are even more positive about the benefit to be gained from greater contact with other groups.

Summary of organizational and operations data

Information on governance in Table 6, and the operations data in Tables 11, 12 and 13 support a conclusion that PMOs, above the low financial threshold of a $30,000 annual budget, are likely to be as well organized or managed as any other nonprofit social movement organizations, as far as may be known now in the absence of comparative data on a large number of other SMOs.[12] An analysis of the structures of these groups shows that many PMOs with governing boards do not have all the factors needed to provide what is called a formal organization and substantial portions

---

[12] Comparative study of social movement organizations is not an old or overcrowded field; the first major study was Gamson's *The Strategy of Social Protest* (1975, 1990) and it remains the outstanding example. Although he looked at some structural variables, it was not at the level of detail represented by the tables above and the organizations in his sample were much larger than almost all of these PMOs.

are only semi-formal or are casually organized (Edwards 1993). Whether this level of formal or semi-formal organization is a key ingredient in effectiveness cannot be proved or disproved with the current lack of comparative data between successful SMOs and those with less success. Many of these groups use consensus decision making procedures, often considered a more time consuming and difficult way to make decisions. This approach to decision making is more and more common among social movement organizations, however, and in some sub-units of business organizations and, by itself, should not handicap the operation and management of these PMOs. Moreover, as noted in the discussion above, Staggenborg's research shows that a small, informal, group may not last but may, while it exists, expand the repertoire of tactics, raise levels of awareness in the community, and increase the possibility of acceptance for other, less unconventional, groups within the same social movement.

The 1992 survey of the surviving groups, after a major change in the external climate that reduced interest in peace movement organizations, shows generally smaller percentages and lower means on most of the operations items tallied on the tables above. These data indicate that PMOs in 1992 were fewer in number, less well developed organizationally and less adequately funded than the same groups were in 1988. The aspects of this decline which can be analyzed using the 1988 data and comparing the groups which survived to those which did not are discussed in detail by Edwards and Marullo (1995). In light of previous writing about the peace movement we would expect that many of the younger organizations would disappear and that the older organizations might maintain an infrastructure for the movement as the basis for its next surge. Exploring that possibility is beyond the scope of this fundamental description of the data from the two surveys. The next step after this presentation of the basic dimensions of American peace movement organizations is to describe the goals, important goals, values, strategies and activities reported in 1988 and 1992.

PART TWO

SURVEY METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Comment on survey research

All mailed surveys have the advantage of reaching large populations without the extraordinary expense of personal interviews and perusing documents and reports from each organization to elicit data. Likewise, all surveys have the disadvantage of being a static snapshot at one time period, of being dependent on the good will and efforts of leaders of the groups surveyed for the data, and risk the possibility that only certain kinds of groups will respond which may distort the findings. The follow-up survey in 1992 provides a second snapshot and greatly increases the value of the data gathered in 1988. In addition, the study for nonresponse bias (Smith, 1993), described below, established the representativeness of the 1988 respondents. Finally, the 1992 survey protocol, with its pre-survey mailings, weekly follow-ups and use of a short form, maximized response rates for the time-series data.

Survey research is also dependent on the ability of those who filled out the questionnaire to answer the questions honestly and completely. The same problems exists in all social research unless interviewers or document readers are able to verify every statement independently. The data developed here, however, provide a systematic, empirical basis for drawing conclusions. The present data also provide the framework for in-depth interviews and document research to be undertaken in the future. We recognize that a logical next step would be to discuss the findings with peace leaders and to increase our understanding of their responses to the survey. In the absence of the personnel and resources to do over 400 interviews with the 1988 respondents, the 1992 survey offers an alternative in its second measurement of the same groups. As of 1994, in any case, the data gathered are unique for the peace movement, and there are few other studies of any kind of social movement organizations as broadly based or comprehensive as these surveys.[2]

.

---

[2] In 1994 John Lofland published *Polite Protesters* (Syracuse University Press) an analysis of the peace movement in the 1980s based largely on organizational records and publications and participant-observation. Some of the 1988 data reported here are cited in that analysis.

PART FOUR

FINDINGS ON SELECTED VARIABLES: 1988 AND 1992 SURVEYS

In Part Four we present the varied goals of peace movement organizations and their selection of most important goals. Following this we examine the values and strategies which were followed in the effort to seek these goals. Then we look at the educational, political and electoral activities of these peace movement organizations in both years and data collected only in 1992 on media coverage, values and activities of religiously affiliated groups and activities in recent crises.

Most important goals of peace movement organizations, 1988 and 1992.

The goals of social movement organizations are the focus of much social movement analysis. It is the goals that distinguish groups of one social movement from those of another, in spite of the overlaps that may exist. For each goal statement in the surveys the responding group could choose the goal as a major goal, minor goal, or not a goal. Then we asked which of these goals were one of the three most important goals. The full text of each question and all the data are presented in the Appendix. In Tables 14 and 15 below, we present the goals chosen as Important Goal One by 5% or more of the groups in Sample I. The same data is presented for Sample II in Tables 16 and 17.

Promoting social justice as Important Goal One went from 9% in 1988 (2nd rank/Table 14) to 13% in 1992 (1st rank/Table 14) for the larger PMO's of Sample I. This is largely a reflection of a shift from promoting social justice as Important Goal Two to Important Goal One. Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence, dropped in percent (11% to 8%) as Important Goal One, but remained high on the list (3rd rank) of most important goals in 1992. The most outstanding change from 1988 to 1992 important goals is the complete disappearance of the items relating to getting rid of nuclear weapons and achieving arms control agreements in Sample I organizations. Two new questions asked in 1992, reduce military expenditures and promote social transformation, were chosen as most important goals by significant percentages; both of these are supplementary to or restatements of similar goal questions in 1988 which were not chosen as most important goals by large numbers of respondents. In 1992 there was increased attention to protecting natural resources and the environment among these peace groups and a resurgence in interest in the United Nations and other international organizations.

Table 14.
Sample I Most Important Goals: 1988 Data Ranked by Important Goal One.

Most Important Goals	Important Goal One N=264 %	Important Goal Two N=259 %	Important Goal Three N=251 %
Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence	11	3	6
Promoting social justice	9	12	10
Eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide	8	3	5
Changing U.S. foreign policy to eliminate unilateral intervention	6	5	7
Obtaining verifiable arms control agreement between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.	5	5	5
Establishing a nuclear free zone by ballot or local ordinance	5	3	4
Eliminating nuclear weapons from the U.S. arsenal	5	4	3

Table 15.
Sample I Most Important Goals: 1992 Data Ranked by Important Goal One.

Most Important Goals	Important Goal One N=156 %	Important Goal Two N=146 %	Important Goal Three N=144 %
Promoting social justice	13	9	10
Reduce military expenditures	12	6	7
Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence	8	6	3
Promote social transformation	6	7	7
Protecting natural resources and the environment	5	3	8
Strengthening international organizations (e.g. United Nations, World Court)	5	2	3
Changing U.S. consciousness so war is no longer an option in international relations	5	0	5

The smaller PMO's of Sample II reveal similar shifts overall, with promoting social justice rising to 1st rank in 1992 from 3rd in 1988. Sample II, however, also rated global issues as important. Reforming views of other peoples/countries, another new goal statement in 1992, was

35

Table 16.
Sample II Most Important Goals: 1988 Data Ranked by Important Goal One.

Most Important Goals	Important Goal One N=133 %	Important Goal Two N=130 %	Important Goal Three N=127 %
Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence	18	5	5
Eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide	13	3	6
Promoting social justice	6	9	11
Changing U.S. foreign policy to eliminate unilateral intervention	5	8	6
Encouraging the use of conflict resolution techniques in international disputes	5	6	9
Eliminating nuclear weapons from the U.S. arsenal	5	4	6

Table 17
Sample II Most Important Goals: 1992 Data Ranked by Important Goal One.

Most Important Goals	Important Goal One N=59 %	Important Goal Two N=58 %	Important Goal Three N=55 %
Promoting social justice	14	10	16
Reform views of other peoples/countries	10	0	0
Changing U.S. foreign policy to eliminate unilateral intervention	9	9	7
Reform military recruitment	9	3	0
Strengthening international organizations (e.g. United Nations, World Court)	7	2	2
Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence	5	9	5
Protecting natural resources and the environment	5	9	5
Protect military rights (e.g. veterans, conscientious objector discharges)	5	5	2
Promote disarmament	5	2	4

2nd in rank in 1992; changing U.S. foreign policy to eliminate unilateral intervention was 3rd; and strengthening international organizations was 5th in rank in 1992.

Other important goals

In addition to listing goals for the groups to chose as their the most important goal, we also left room for them to write in two additional important goals. In 1988, the write in goals were the largest percentage chosen as Important Goal One. The write-in goals were coded by Sam Marullo who found a substantial portion were simple restatements of the goals already listed in the survey form. In these cases, they were added to the total choosing the listed goals as one of the three most important goals. Table 18 lists those goals chosen by 10% or more of the respondents in either survey or sample when the frequencies for Important Goal 1 (IG1), Important Goal 2 (IG2), and Important Goal 3 (IG3) are summed and the number of groups citing a goal as Important Goal One is used as the appropriate N. We adopted this method of reporting the important goals because common sense, as well as the testimony of individual leaders within peace groups, indicates that the ranking of important goals as first, second, or third was highly dependent on the pressure of work at the time the questionnaire was answered. We assume that the top three important goals chosen represent the major focus of the group at the time of the survey. The goals are ranked by the summed important goal percentage of the 1988 Sample I except for the few items chosen by less than 10% of the 1988 groups but by 10% or more of the 1992 groups. In those cases, the percentage for Sample I in 1992 determined the placement in Table 18.

Adding the percentages for IG1, IG2, and IG3 for each goal, four goals were chosen by over 20% of the 1988 respondents in Sample I (promoting social justice, changing U.S. consciousness so that war is no longer a viable option in international relations, promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence, and encouraging the use of conflict resolution in international disputes). In 1992 promoting social justice plus a new goal, reduce military expenditures, was chosen as one of the three most important goals by over 20% of Sample I. The change in world circumstances clearly changed the percentages choosing certain goals. Goals related to arms control and eliminating nuclear weapons were not salient in 1992. Protecting the environment became much more important in 1992 than in 1988.

In 1988 the important goals of the smaller groups in Sample II were promoting personal peace and a commitment to nonviolence, social justice, eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide and changing U.S. foreign policy to end unilateral intervention. The last items reflect the larger number of nuclear freeze groups still active in 1988 and the importance of Central American issues in 1988. In 1992 social justice goal and ending intervention were chosen by more than 20% of the Sample II groups. Two of the goals selected by less than 10% of the groups in 1988 were chosen by 10% of more of the groups in 1992, protecting natural resources and strengthening international organizations. This reflects a definite shift in the emphasis placed on the environment and a small increase in the focus on international organizations.

Table 18.
PMO Important Goals 1,2,3: 1988 and 1992 Data; Combined Percentages.

Important Goals	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=251-264 %	1992 N=144-156 %	1988 N=127-133 %	1992 N=55-59 %
Promoting social justice	31	30	26	39
Reduce military expenditures	*	23	*	12
Change U.S. consciousness so war is no longer an option in international relations	22	10	16	14
Promote personal peace and commitment to nonviolence	21	16	27	19
Encourage conflict resolution techniques in international disputes	20	12	19	5
Promote social transformation	*	19	*	15
Changing U.S. foreign policy to eliminate unilateral intervention	19	12	20	24
Eliminate nuclear weapons worldwide	16	9	22	7
Obtaining verifiable arms control agreement between U.S. and U.S.S.R.#	15	3	14	2
Preventing development, testing, deployment of specific weapons	14	11	19	8
Eliminating war as a tool of American foreign policy	13	5	10	3
Protect human rights; home and abroad	13	16	16	19
Eliminating nuclear weapons from U.S. arsenal	12	5	14	2
Establishing a nuclear free zone by ballot or local ordinance	12	1	6	0
Protect natural resources and environment	6	15	8	19
Strengthen international organizations	6	10	8	10
Reform view of other peoples /countries	*	10	*	10
Promote disarmament	*	9	*	10
Encourage nonviolent conflict resolution of local/national problems	*	8	*	10
Protect military personnel rights	*	6	*	12
Reform military recruitment	**	3	**	12

* New question in 1992.
# In 1992 "the former Soviet Union."
** Related question in 1988 focused on preventing the draft. Percentages were 4% and 5% for the two samples.

38

Major goals of peace movement organizations, 1988 and 1992.

Next we review goals chosen as major goals grouped by subject matter. This allocation of goals to categories is based on the sense of the question, rather than a statistical analysis.[13] A few goals could be in more than one category. For example, eliminating war as a tool of foreign policy is both a pacifist goal (Table 19) and a foreign policy goal (Table 21). This one item is included in both tables for comparison purposes. New goal questions for 1992 are tallied separately below.

Table 19 reveals a striking difference in the less than one third that chose the practical goals of changing the makeup of Congress, eliminating war expenditures, converting the defense industry, or preventing a draft, from the higher percentages choosing the vaguer goals of changing consciousness, removing war as a tool of foreign policy, and promoting personal peace and a commitment to nonviolence.

Table 19. PMO Pacifist/Anti-war Major Goals: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Goal Statement	1988 N=250-266 %	1992 N=131-139 %	1988 N=121-128 %	1992 N=53-56 %
Changing U.S. consciousness so war not an option in international relations	58	49	56	51
Eliminating war as a tool of American foreign policy	53	52	58	50
Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence	42	44	53	44
Changing U.S. Congress to create majority to shift policy away from war	32	25	34	26
Elimination of U.S. expenditure for war	30	32	33	38
Converting defense industry to non-military production	22	33	26	33
Preventing a draft of American youth into military service	14	*	15	*

* A different question was asked in 1992: see section on new questions in 1992.

Table 20 shows a decrease in commitment to anti-nuclear and arms control goals in Sample II in 1992 as compared with 1988. Many observers state that "freeze" anti-nuclear activities peaked in 1984. It is not surprising that fewer groups chose these nuclear weapons related items as major goals in 1992.

---

[13] For a factor analysis of the goals and values combined, see Marullo, Pagnucco and Smith (1994).

Table 20 PMO Arms Control/Anti-nuclear Weapons Major Goals: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Goal Statement	1988 N=250-266 %	1992 N=131-139 %	1988 N=121-128 %	1992 N=53-56 %
Eliminating nuclear weapons from U.S.arsenal	48	44	57	46
Eliminating nuclear weapons world wide	46	49	59	43
Obtaining verifiable arms control agreements between the U.S. and U.S.S.R.*	42	22	52	22
Preventing development, testing, deployment of specific weapons systems	37	38	48	31
Establishing a nuclear free zone by ballot or local ordinance	8	7	12	4

* In the 1992 survey this was worded "the former Soviet Union."

Table 21 PMO Foreign Policy/International Major Goals: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Goal Statement	1988 N=250-266 %	1992 N=131-139 %	1988 N=121-128 %	1992 N=53-56 %
Eliminating war as a tool of American foreign policy	53	52	58	50
Changing U.S. foreign policy to end unilateral intervention	49	45	50	46
Encouraging the use of conflict resolution in international disputes	46	59	48	45
Encouraging a more positive view of the Soviet Union*	35	18	35	20
Developing alternative to "anti-communism" or "containment" policy	35	#	29	#
Encouraging economic, not military, foreign aid	23	32	40	37
Strengthen international organizations	21	20	24	24

* In 1992 this was worded "of the former Soviet Union."
# Question was not asked in 1992.

Table 21 presents the important foreign policy/international goals; obviously these are closely related to both the pacifist/anti-war goals and the anti-nuclear weapons goals in Tables 19 and 20. One difference is that most of the goals in this foreign policy group would imply that the State Department was the policy relevant organization, not the Defense Department. The major change between 1988 and 1992 was the sharp decline in groups working to encourage a more positive view of the former Soviet Union as would be expected given the vast change in relationships between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. from 1988 to 1992.

Table 22 contains data on three goals which are the main goals of other social movements in the United States, the social justice, human rights, and environmental movements. The first two of these three goals are often considered together. The environmental movement has in recent years begun to be more concerned about social justice and human rights as related to the preservation of natural resources and ecological problems. These three related goals, and the new

Table 22
PMO Related Major Goals from Other Social Movements: 1988 and 1992 Data.

Goal Statement	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=250-266 %	1992 N=182 %	1988 N=121-128 %	1992 N=64 %
Promoting social justice in U.S. & worldwide	55	71	57	72
Protecting human rights at home and abroad	45	56	55	56
Protecting natural resources and the environment	21	40	24	41

goals in the 1992 survey reported in Table 23 relate to another aspect of these peace groups. As the quote from DeBenedetti cited in the Introduction and familiarity with the American peace movement confirm, a close connection between seeking peace and seeking social justice has long been assumed. Promoting social justice in the U.S. and worldwide was chosen as a major goal by over half of the 1988 respondents and these percentages increased in 1992. It is clear that many peace groups have the commitment to social justice cited by DeBenedetti. It is also true that 43% to 45% of the 1988 groups and 28-29% of the smaller number of 1992 groups did not choose social justice as a major goal. (For the percentages choosing these goals as minor goals or not a goal, see the Appendix). Although peace and justice goals are inextricably linked in much peace rhetoric, it is more accurate to say that concern for social justice as a major goal is a way of dividing the 1988 peace movement into at least two major segments (see Colwell 1994). The commitment to social justice in both samples was much higher in 1992.

New goals questions in 1992

In 1992 there were sixteen new goal questions added to twenty repeated from the 1988 questionnaire. Many of these 1992 new goals are supplements and amplifications of 1988 items; a few were entirely new questions such as "promote democracy" or "promote accountability of elected officials." The responses show that reducing the military, seeking social justice, promoting disarmament and nonviolence remain the top goals, in spite of the addition of other goals. The most salient difference in the two samples is on the question about sustainable development where almost twice as large a proportion of Sample I as Sample II chose this as a major goal. This interest is also reflected in the substantial increase in 1992 in the percentage of groups choosing protecting natural resources and the environment (see Table 22 above).

Table 23 PMO New Major Goals in 1992 Survey.		
Goal Statement	1992 Sample I N=130-138 %	1992 Sample II N=51-56 %
Reduce military expenditures	61	45
Promote social transformation	61	57
Promote disarmament	59	54
Encourage the use of nonviolent conflict resolution techniques in solving local/national problems	50	42
Reduce nuclear proliferation	44	42
Promote alternative conceptions of security	39	31
Reform views of other peoples/countries	36	32
Promote sustainable development	36	19
Promote democracy	32	32
Reduce conventional weapons/ technology transfers	31	28
Promote accountability of elected officials (including disarmament issues)	25	30
Reduce biological/chemical weapons	18	20
Reform military recruitment (e.g. draft, selective service, COs)	13	27
Influence policy on foreign military basing (i.e. sovereignty, prostitution)	12	15
Protect military rights (e.g. veterans, conscientious objector discharges)	10	29
Influence policy on domestic military basing (i.e. locations, closings, noise, toxic waste)	10	9

Organizational values and strategies

The questions on organizational values and strategies were also answered with Likert-type scales as described in the section on operations. The higher the mean value the more true the item. The standard deviations for these means are in the relevant Appendix Table. Organizational values and strategies were combined in one section in the 1988 survey.[14] The order in this table is by the value of the mean for the 1988 Sample I with one exception. The mean for a commitment to nonviolence for the 1988 Sample I was .03 lower than seeking to influence foreign policy.

Table 24. Organizational Values and Strategies of PMOs: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Value or Strategy Statement	1988 N=236-265 Mean	1992 N=131-170 Mean	1988 N=129-133 Mean	1992 N=50-61 Mean
Our organization:				
has a commitment to nonviolence	4.8	5.1	5.2	5.3
seeks to influence U.S. foreign policy	4.8	4.3	4.6	4.3
strives to act in terms of the slogan "think globally, act locally"	4.4	4.0	4.5	4.2
is opposed to all wars	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.6
seeks major social change in the U.S. as a necessary prior condition before it is possible to achieve world peace	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5
seeks a moderate public image	3.5	3.5	3.3	4.2
seeks to change how people think about war more than to change specific defense policies	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.7
seeks to educate influential elites as the way to change public policy	3.3	3.2	2.8	3.1
believes in changing individuals rather than public policy	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4
prefers to be independent and not affiliated with other groups in a federation, alliance or coalition	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.2
prefers to focus on local issues	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.7
condones the use of violence for revolutionary change in specific cases	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.0

---

[14] A factor analysis of the goals and values and strategies combined may be found in Edwards and Marullo (1994).

Since commitment to nonviolence had the highest mean in the three other segments it is ranked first in Table 24. The high values of the means for commitment to nonviolence and effort to influence U.S. foreign policy are confirmed by the very low means for condoning the use of violence in specific cases or a focus on local issues. There are few large differences between the means for Sample I and Sample II in either survey year or between the means for the same sample in the two surveys. Of these values and strategies, the top five are true, the bottom four are false and the middle items are ambiguous for the 1988 samples and Sample I in 1992.

In the 1988 Survey organizational values and strategies were combined in one set of questions as reported in Table 24. Doug Bond developed new questions on organizational values and strategies in separate sections of the 1992 Survey. The format and text of each new question is provided in Table 25 and 26. The rank order in each table is by the value of the mean in Sample I. For an analysis of these data see Bond (1993). As may be seen on both of these tables more items are considered false or ambiguous than are considered true by the 1992 respondents.

Table 25 Organizational Strategies of PMOS: New Questions in 1992.	Sample I N=127-171		Sample II N=51-63	
Strategy Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Our organization ('s):				
advocates change through persuasive (intellectual) appeals to rational resolutions	4.6	1.4	4.6	1.4
primary strategy is affecting others' beliefs/attitudes	4.4	1.6	4.3	1.4
primary strategy is networking with like-minded people	4.0	1.7	3.9	1.7
primary strategy is effecting others' behavior/policy	3.8	1.8	3.7	1.6
places a high priority on effectiveness as a criterion for the assessment of its activities	3.7	1.9	2.8	1.8
advocates change through the use of nonviolent sanctions	3.2	2.2	2.8	2.3
advocates change through (reciprocal) compromise or accommodating others' interests	3.1	1.9	2.7	1.9
primary strategy is witnessing our own beliefs	3.0	2.2	3.5	2.1
advocates changes through appeals to a mutually accepted (higher) authority	2.8	2.1	3.2	2.1
advocates change through the threat of nonviolent sanctions	2.5	2.1	2.2	2.2
advocates change through altruistic (self-sacrificing) appeals for the sake of unity	2.4	1.9	2.5	1.8
advocates change through the actual damage and/or destruction of material property	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.8
advocates change through the threat of damage and/or destruction of material property	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.6

Table 26 Organizational Values of PMOs: New Questions in 1992.				
	Sample I N=182		Sample II N=64	
Value Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Our organization:				
believes that significant and enduring change in national policy must be based on grassroots organizing	4.7	1.6	4.8	1.3
believes the UN should play a larger role than the US in peacemaking	4.4	1.7	4.7	1.5
believes that people must transform their personal lifestyles as a precondition for world peace	3.7	2.0	3.8	2.0
believes that the US has a special role to lead other countries to peace	3.1	2.0	3.2	2.1
prefers to communicate its positions on issues in moral rather than political terms	2.9	2.0	3.2	1.9
works to build a local community that can serve as a model of what a new society can be	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.1

Activities

Most social movement organizations are better known for their activities than for anything else. The activities questions were based on a list of items used in research on political pressure groups, and on personal experience with peace groups. Since there is such a range of sizes and of goals it might be expected that there would be some specialization of activities or some clear differences between larger and smaller groups. As Tables 27-31 illustrate, high percentages of the groups in each sample and in both survey years engaged in educational activities and few were involved in direct action or electoral work. As above, the division into educational, direct action, legislative and lobbying, and electoral work is based on the content of the questions, not statistical analysis. The order in the tables is in accordance with the percentages in the 1988 Sample I. Participation

Table 27
PMO Educational Activities:1988 and 1992 Data.

Activity Statement	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=259-265 %	1992 N=132-138 %	1988 N=127-134 %	1992 N=55-58 %
Distributed literature	94	72	88	77
Presented lecture, film, slide show	90	70	86	77
Built up positive relationship with press	89	61	57	53
Participated in letter writing campaign	73	59	86	73
Encouraged members to write letters to a local newspaper	73	56	84	75
Participated in rally or demonstration	70	57	72	69
Encouraged members to participate in citizen exchange or peace delegations	62	43	62	48
Participated in vigil or prayer service	55	46	63	59
Ran advertisement in media stating position on issue	36	31	30	25
Canvassed door-to-door, talked to residents	20	8	9	8

in rallies, demonstrations, vigils and prayer services are included here as educational activities rather than citizen action because these tactics have become routinized efforts to educate the general public rather than protest activities.

High percentages of Sample I and Sample II were involved in the first seven activities in 1988 and in the first six activities in 1992, but there was a distinct drop between 1988 and 1992. The activities reported in Table 28, called here "direct action" are the most likely to produce controversy or official reaction. Two activities, nonviolence training and providing war-tax resistance information could be considered "educational", but since their purpose is to increase citizen direct action they are included in the direct action category. Nonviolence training, in particular, is an educational activity directly related to civil disobedience and other forms of public activity likely to provoke either the general public or powerful opponents in the private and public sector. War-tax resistance is likely to result in confiscation of property and, in some cases, jail terms.

Table 28 PMO Citizen Direct Action: 1988 and 1992 Data.				
Activity Statement	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=259-265 %	1992 N=132-138 %	1988 N=127-134 %	1992 N=55-58 %
Participated in boycott	37	36	43	45
Provided nonviolence training	29	26	26	20
Engaged in civil disobedience	27	17	18	17
Provided war-tax information	26	28	31	31
Provided draft counseling	19	23	19	33
Filed suit/litigation *	15	9	9	9
Provided sanctuary	**	6	**	9

* For this item only in 1992 Sample I N=170; Sample II N=63.
** New question in 1992.

Participating in a boycott was the only direct action engaged in by at least one third or more of the two groups of organizations in both years. A quarter or more of both groups in 1988 and Sample I in 1992 provided nonviolence training and war-tax information. These percentages do not mean that high percentages of individuals in these groups actually practiced war-tax resistance. In 1988 substantially more of the Sample I larger groups engaged in civil disobedience than did the smaller groups in Sample II. In 1992 the percentages were similar for this item in the two samples.

Legislative and lobbyin activities at the national level are presented in Table 29 and at the local or state level in Table 30.

Table 29
PMO Legislative/Lobbying Activities - National Level: 1988 and 1992 Data.

Activity Statement	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=259-265 %	1992 N=132-138 %	1988 N=127-134 %	1992 N=55-58 %
Visited Members of Congress	70	52	63	42
Monitored foreign policy legislation	70	54	65	56
Monitored arms control legislation	62	43	57	42
Monitored voting records of Congress	60	45	71	59
Had influential constituent contact Congressional office	54	41	34	23
Consulted with national government official to plan legislative strategy	35	30	19	14
Testified at Congressional hearings	27	19	11	3
Helped draft national legislation	17	12	4	0

Considering the small size, and usually local orientation of Sample II groups a surprisingly large percentage engaged in national legislative activity, including testifying at Congressional hearings in 1988. In 1992 fewer groups were engaged in each of these activities.

Table 30
PMO Legislative/Lobbying Activities - Local or State Level: 1988 and 1992 Data.

Activity Statement	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=259-265 %	1992 N=132-138 %	1988 N=127-134 %	1992 N=55-58 %
Visited state or local officials	57	41	49	41
Had influential constituent contact state or local elected officials	39	26	27	27
Testified at state or local government hearing	39	28	23	19
Consulted with state/local government official to plan legislative strategy	34	27	19	17
Helped draft state/local legislation	22	10	9	6

More of the larger groups in Sample I engaged in local and state legislative activities than in Sample II. The percentages engaged in these activities dropped off in Sample I for 1992. Sample II percentages were approximately the same for the two survey years or a little lower in 1992.

Activity Statement	Sample I		Sample II	
	1988 N=250-253 %	1992 N=132-135 %	1988 N=125-131 %	1992 N=54 %
Encouraged our members to participate in party caucuses or primaries	30	17	32	20
Encouraged our members to work and/or contribute money to peace-minded candidates	29	12	40	25
Held a public meeting for a political candidate	22	*	17	*
Encouraged our members to join local political party organization	21	10	24	13
Participated in initiative or referendum campaign	20	10	19	17
Conducted a voter registration campaign	18	11	12	11
Helped get voters to the polls	12	7	10	3
Made public endorsements of a candidate	10	6	9	16
Encouraged our members to give money to a political party	6	3	12	8

Table 31
PMO Electoral Activities: 1988 and 1992 Data.

As noted in the Introduction, survey respondents in 1988 were slightly more likely to be involved in electoral activity than the total sample chosen from the *Grassroots Peace Directory*. These figures, therefore, represent the maximum percentages of peace movement organizations likely to be engaged in electoral work. These electoral activities are likely to be efforts of 501(c)4 groups and those without tax exempt status, which helps explain the higher percentages in Sample II for many of these items. That is, the proportion of political activity in Sample II may be larger because over half of Sample II groups do not have official tax exempt status (which prohibits direct electoral activity). The fact that almost one third of each sample encouraged members to be involved in party politics illustrates that groups and organizations working for peace are involved in instrumental as well as expressive activities. There is strong pressure through the tax laws and the postal laws to keep nonprofit advocacy groups out of electoral politics and legislative lobbying. Considering that pressure, the percentages reported in Tables 29, 30, and 31, show a substantial effort by peace groups to be involved in practical politics. It should be noted that 1988 and 1992 were presidential election years and undoubtedly electoral and political activity was higher in those years than in the intervening period.

Other new questions in 1992

In addition to the new questions on sources of funds, strategies, values and goals, tallied above, three other sets of new questions in 1992 provided more detail on religious values and activities, data on activities of peace groups during the Persian Gulf war and estimates of media coverage of peace groups. These data are summarized in Tables 32 and 33 and the following paragraph.

Table 32 Religious Affiliation of PMOs: 1992 Data. Religious Values and Activities of PMOS: 1992 Data.				
	Sample I		Sample II	
Organization primarily a religious organization	24% (N=171)		34% (N=57)	
Affiliated with specific church or denomination	13% (N=135)		25% (N=52)	
If YES on either question above:	N=46-48		N=24	
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S.D.
We attempt to strengthen our church's commitment to peacemaking so its members will in turn exercise citizenship to influence public policy	4.4	2.3	4.1	2.3
Our group considers public moral witness to be an effective way to bring about social transformation	4.3	1.9	4.5	1.9
Our group's peacemaking activities often include participation in prayer or worship services held in public places (e.g. military facility, city hall)	3.7	2.5	2.5	2.1
Prayer is a regular feature of our group's meeting	3.6	2.6	3.5	2.7

The religious community is the on-going core of the peace movement and in the 1980s from one-quarter to one-third of PMOs had some form of religious affiliation. The questions tallied in Table 32 add some depth to our understanding of how well connected these movement organizations are to their faith backgrounds. This is sometimes described as the relationship between discipleship and citizenship--a relationship with built in tensions.[15]

---

[15] A major study of this relationship in five social movements, including the peace movement, is currently underway directed by John Coleman, S.J., Ph.D., at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley.

Table 33. PMO Activities in Recent Crises: 1992 Data.	Sample I N=131-132		Sample II N=53-59	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Persian Gulf War had a major impact on our organization *	4.2	2.1	4.3	2.2
Events in the former Soviet bloc had a major impact on our organization	3.3	2.2	3.2	2.1
Our organization:				
formally opposed the deployment of US troops into the Persian Gulf: August 1990	3.8	2.7	4.1	2.6
actively opposed the deployment of US troops into the Persian Gulf: August 1990	4.1	2.5	4.3	2.2
formally opposed US military action in the Persian Gulf in January 1991	4.3	2.5	4.4	2.4
actively opposed US military action in the Persian Gulf in January 1991	4.5	2.4	4.5	2.2
Questions about the National Gulf War demonstration in Washington, D.C.	N=128-133		N=53	
	% Yes		% Yes	
promoted national Gulf War demonstration	34		33	
organized transportation to demonstration	17		13	
members attended demonstration	36		32	
	Number		Number	
Number of groups whose members attended	49		15	
Range of estimated number of members	2-3000		2-300	
Median number of members attending	25		10	

* This item Sample I N=169.

The Persian Gulf war apparently had a much greater impact on the surveyed peace movement organizations than the enormous changes in the Soviet bloc. The more detailed questions about the activities of these groups with respect to the Persian Gulf War are arranged chronologically rather than by descending order of the mean values in this table. Obviously, involvement grew as time went by. The fact that peace groups were much more likely to actively oppose military action in the Persian Gulf war in January 1991 than to have opposed the original deployment in August 1990 is characteristic of the build-up of opposition before a war. One may also conclude that the peace movement was not sufficiently mobilized in August 1990 for a

majority of them to even formally oppose the troop build-up. Apparently more groups were likely to be active than to draw up a formal policy in either case. Whether this is an indication of actions without a policy direction, or simply that it is easier and faster to get a letter campaign or a demonstration going than it is to have a formal board meeting cannot be determined from these data.

Finally, in 1992 there were new questions about the estimated amount of media coverage. The types of coverage included news stories in a newspaper, on radio or on TV, publication of letters to the editor or an opinion column, mention in a TV or radio talk show or on local access cable TV, use of public service announcements, issuing press releases, and using electronic bulletin boards. The answers ranged from Never to Monthly or Weekly. The complete data for both samples are in Tables A-18 and A-19 in the Appendix. Approximately 70% of all the 1992 respondent groups had been covered at least once in a newspaper story in the prior year. Small percentages (7% of Sample I; 2% of the Sample II) had weekly or more frequent newspaper coverage. The majority of Sample I had either one to two, three to six, or seven to ten stories per year. The majority of Sample II had either one to two or three to six stories per year. Over 60% of the groups had letters to the editor published in a newspaper, and over half had coverage in a TV news story. A smaller percentage of the groups were covered by local access or cable TV or on TV or radio talks shows. Although there was coverage in every form of media listed, high percentages among Sample II never were covered by local access/cable TV (56%), TV/Radio talk shows (50%), or opinion columns (42%). In this same sample, 47% never made Public Service Announcements, 30% did not issue a press release in 1991, and 66% never used electronic bulletin boards. The percentages in the Never column for Sample I were much smaller. Only 7% never issued a press release in 1991, only 15% were never covered in TV/radio talk shows. Approximately one third of these larger groups never used electronic bulletin boards, Public Service Announcements, or were never covered by local access cable TV.

With these questions we finish describing the data from the 1988 and 1992 Surveys. There is a list of variables in the two surveys not included in this monograph at the end of the Appendix. In Part Five we provide a brief discussion based on the analyses already completed by members of the survey team.

PART FIVE

ONGOING ANALYSES AND DISCUSSION

In Parts One through Four of this monograph we have referred to the analyses already prepared and/or published using these data on American peace movement organizations. Here we present brief outlines of several of these various analyses. We are grateful for the assistance of several of the authors mentioned in summarizing their work for inclusion in this monograph. These summaries are presented in approximate chronological order. All papers or articles using some portion of these data, including those not summarized here, are listed in the references and marked with an asterisk. All members of the survey teams are listed with their addresses in the front of this monograph.

Early reports of the data from the 1988 Survey of Groups and Organizations Working for Peace were in two short papers (Colwell 1988c, 1989b). A "Report to Respondents" sent to all the groups which had returned survey forms (Colwell 1989a) was the first comprehensive report on the data. The first analysis focused on the organizational and management characteristics of peace groups (Colwell 1989c). The characteristics paper reported substantial differences between the larger and smaller peace movement organizations in structure; 55% of the larger (Sample I) groups reported a clearly defined structure with agreed upon rules, procedures, and methods for accountability, whereas 28% of the smaller groups reported such a structure. However, there were no systematic variations in operations and management practices related to values, strategies, or goals. The major variations in operations were related to budget size and year of founding.

A significant finding in the organizational characteristics paper was that smaller peace groups ambitiously select more major goals and a wider range of "most important" goals than do the larger organizations. This reflects a lack of realism with respect to the number and types of goals that largely volunteer organizations with limited resources can hope to achieve.

When asked to specify most important goals "promoting social justice" was chosen by more groups than any other single goal. However, there was a sub-set of organizations which stated that promoting social justice was not a goal (discussed further in Colwell 1989b). Many in this group worked on nuclear weapons and arms control issues and a substantial portion were national groups based in Washington, D.C. These and other data indicate segmentation of the peace movement corresponding to goal orientation which may relate to the overall effectiveness of the movement, or the lack thereof, or may reflect a reasonable division of labor within the movement.

Sam Marullo, Alexandra Chute and Colwell (1991) analyzed organizational structure, beliefs and goals, constituencies, and activities of pacifist and nonpacifist groups in the peace movement of the 1980s using the 1988 data. Pacifist groups, as defined by a commitment to nonviolence, opposition to war, and refusal to condone revolutionary violence, were clearly distinguished from nonpacifist groups by their goals and strategies for social change. However, for such attributes as organizational characteristics, constituencies and activities there was both large variability and substantial overlap so the two segments could not be adequately distinguished. Several of the observed differences in organizational characteristics were seen to be a function of size, rather than pacifist status. One difference was in the greater willingness of pacifist groups to challenge the status quo through civil disobedience, boycotts, nonviolent resistance, and resistance to war-tax and to the draft. This article includes a discussion of the tactics and ideals of these groups in relation to more general analyses of social movement organizations and the effectiveness of their goals and strategies.

Ron Pagnucco (1992) did a detailed analysis of the tactics used by peace groups based on Sample I of the 1988 survey data. A key finding is that although many informal, decentralized peace groups used nonviolent unruly tactics, as the social science literature would predict, these tactics are also used by more formalized, professionalized and centralized organizations. Similarly the author found that almost no organizational characteristics had a significant relationship to the use of unruly tactics in contradiction to many claims in the social movement literature. Developing a frame analysis he discerned three different frames, resulting from a combination of goals, which he titled Arms Control, Foreign Policy, and Personalist. He discusses five combinations of tactics, derived through factor analysis called Citizen Action, Electoral, Local Legislative, National Legislative and Unruly. As with organizational characteristics, these various frames are not significantly related to the use of unruly tactics. This also contradicts claims in social movement literature. There is an extensive discussion of the differences between faith based and secular peace movement organizations.

Jackie Smith (1993) did the testing for nonresponse bias described in the first part of this monograph in collaboration with Doug Bond. Her findings that there was very little nonresponse bias, and none on the key variables, are very important. The response rates to the 1998 Survey of 56% and 43% in the two samples could raise a question about how representative the survey respondents are of peace movement organizations as a whole. The Smith study answers this question and increases the degree to which these survey data may be relied upon.

Bob Edwards introduces the concept of semi-formal organizational structure based on his analysis of the 1988 data (1993, and forthcoming 1995). The major finding is that there are many groups which are neither completely informal in organizational structure, nor do they have the full

range of organizational characteristics which define a formally organized group. Edwards used the 1988 data to develop a scale delineating informal, semi-formal, and formal organizations, in contrast to the usual division into informal and formal in organizational studies. He used multiple regression analysis to examine the relations between semi-formal structures and aspects of PMO demographics, internal operations, and external relations. As expected, formal structure of PMOs was associated with surpassing a threshold level of budget size and, beneath that rather low $30,000 per year threshold, with increasing budgetary size. Participation pressures as indicated by increased membership, staff size, and voluntarism failed to predict a formal structure. These results are consistent with studies that show social movement organizations adopt culturally legitimate organizational templates and those that discuss efforts by the state to manage citizen protest through the tax code (tax status being a key aspect of formal organizational structure for nonprofit organizations in the United States).

An analysis by Marullo (1994) of nonviolent direct action asks three questions 1) what are the forms of direct action taken by peace movement organizations (PMOs); 2) how are these actions understood by the PMOs, and 3) what are the organizational co-requisites of these actions. Examining seven clusters of activities he find that PMOs are most likely to use a set of citizen actions--conventional activities such as organizing letter-writing campaigns, attending rallies or demonstrations and vigils. Monitoring national legislation and lobbying members of Congress was the second most important set of activities. Nonviolent direct actions were the third most frequent.

The nonviolent direct action index was regressed on a large number of organizational characteristics as potential independent variables. Older groups and groups that empower their members are more likely to do direct action; those with larger numbers of individual members do less. More resources or a more bureaucratized and centralized structure does not increase the amount of nonviolent direct action. Two particular aspects do relate to increased nonviolent direct action: having organizational as well as individual members, rather than individual members only; and having a range of broad peace goals, rather than being either very narrowly focused or being a multi-movement organization.

This Marullo study also used a frame analysis. The three frames associated with more likelihood of nonviolent direct action were: 1) groups with a personalist frame, which defines the individual as personally response for making peace, even in her or his everyday life; 2) groups that focus more on arms control, particularly nuclear weapons; 3) groups that are more anti-interventionist. Three peace frames are not associated with more nonviolent direct action: 1) the pacifism frame; 2) the peace frame of positive peace (a social justice and humans rights emphasis); 3) the multilateralist frame (relying on the United Nations and other bodies for conflict resolution).

The strongest component of the explanation of nonviolent direct action is an adherence to a grassroots social change strategy. This includes a focus on local issues, belief that major social change is necessary prior to peace, and that one must think globally but act locally. A model of social change that relies on influencing elites and maintaining a respectable image is significantly inversely related to nonviolent direct action. A pluralist model of social change is not related to undertaking nonviolent direct action.

Marullo, Pagnucco, and Smith (forthcoming) used the 1988 and 1992 data to examine changes in frames within the peace movement. They found an overall shift from more bilateral frames like the nuclear weapons freeze to frames emphasizing multilateralism and global interdependence--a finding which may reflect the major global changes caused by the demise of the Soviet Union. Internal frame transformations between 1988 and 1992 represent a trend towards broader, more radical (or structural) and less exclusive peace movement frames. They describe these frame transformations as "retention frames" that represent organizations' attempts to sustain the participation of committed activists. The organizations' appeal to highly motivated and socialized activists means that they will offer more complex diagnoses and prognoses of the problem at hand rather than attempt to appeal to and activate a broader mass public. The authors argue that retention framing is one of the components of negative synergism experienced by movements during their decline stage.

Colwell (1994a) examined and refuted the argument made by Guenter Lewy (1988) that major pacifist groups in the United States abandoned their commitment to nonviolence and conflict resolution during and after the Vietnam War period. Lewy claims that pacifist groups adopted social justice as a primary goal and, therefore, were willing to condone the use violence for revolutionary change in specific cases. The assessment of this argument is based on a division of the 1988 data into four groups by two criterion: Pacifism, as determined by opposition to all wars and a commitment to nonviolence, and Social Justice, as determined by the choice of promoting social justice as one of the three most important goals. The four groups are: Pacifist Social Justice, Pacifist Not Social Justice, Social Justice Not Pacifist, and Other (neither pacifist, nor choosing social justice as a most important goal). The results show that the Pacifist Not Social Justice segment was two and a half times larger than the Pacifist Social Justice segment, that the major American pacifist groups did not fall into the Pacifist Social Justice segment, and that all segments rejected the use of violence for revolutionary change.

Another study by Colwell (1994c) examines the survey data on co-sponsorship of events among peace groups and the building of coalitions. Using the division into domains, the larger state and regional groups are more engaged in cosponsorship with other types of groups (e.g.,

religious, women's, student groups) than are the national groups or the smaller local and regional groups.

Edwards and Marullo (1995) examined the differences between the 1988 groups which disappeared before the 1992 survey and those which continued. In their study of organizational mortality in this four year period. In this analysis they divide the 1988 respondents into three "domains", according to size and scope of activities, that facilitate the analysis (small local and regional groups, larger local and regional groups, national groups). Consistent with previous research on comparable organizations, liabilities of size, adolescence and lack of legitimacy are found to be related to mortality in the population as a whole. However PMO demise also differs by movement domain--small budget, nonnational groups differ from larger budget nonnational groups, which differ from national groups. Demise among small PMOs is associated with the lack of threshold levels of organizational structure and resources. The mortality of large PMOs is associated with aspects of organizational agency and legitimacy. Among national PMOs, having a broad peace focus and avoiding deligitimating public affiliations seem particularly important for survival. Using this study the authors also developed a series of suggestions as a practical guide to survival for peace groups (Marullo and Edwards, 1994)

Edwards (1994) also used data from the 1988 survey of peace groups and data on poor people's social movement organizations to examine two central claims of new social movement (NSM) theory. First, he examines the distinctive organizational style said to characterize "new" social movements in contrast to "old-style" class and status movements. Second, he examines claims by NSM theorists about the persistence and transformation of this distinctive organizational style over time. The research develops measures of social movement organization (SMO) bureaucracy, centralization, voluntarism and professionalization. This research offers no unqualified support for either the cross-movement or through time expectations of NSM theory and casts much doubt about its utility as an explanations of the distinctiveness of "new" social movements. The clear indication is that NSM theory greatly oversimplifies they dynamics underlying the distribution, persistence, or transformation of SMO forms. SMO domain, regardless of the social movement industry to which it belongs, is a far better predictor of organizational style than the systematic movement level differences expected by NSM theory. Furthermore, among NSM organizations founding cohorts offer a more promising analytical model for understanding the persistence of SMO forms over time than the pervasive impact of post-industrial restructuring or culture shift claimed by NSM theorists. The distinctive NSM organizational style is primarily found among particularly small SMOs regardless of movement, class base, or social change goals.

Doug Bond, Christopher Kruegler and Doug Imig (forthcoming) analyzed strategic performance and nonviolent direct action by peace movement organizations in the U.S. using selected aspects of the strategic performance based on new questions asked in 1992. The authors stress that strategic performance embodies much more than a blind drive for effectiveness, or a focus on means rather than ends. They suggest that in an era of movement decline (such as the late 1980's), failure to optimize strategic performance could erode the ability of peace movement organizations to mobilize and expand their constituencies thereby threatening their very survival. They conclude that since all uses of direct action, both violent and nonviolent, are indeterminate in their operation and outcome, strategic dogmatism can only limit a group's potential to transform power relations in a struggle. Likewise, the ability to effect policy change as well as sheer survival, especially in periods of movement decline, is undermined by strategic dogmatism.

Colwell and Marullo are collaborating on a book length manuscript which will examine in greater depth the change between 1988 and 1992 represented by the data from these surveys. This study will use the survey data to establish characteristics of movement organizations in decline and contraction to supplement current literature about the origins, development and growth of social movements and the characteristics of social movement organizations when the movement is in abeyance. This study will incorporate written comments from the survey respondents as well as quantitative data, and the reactions of peace leaders to the findings thus far.

The articles, chapters, and dissertations based on the 1988 and 1992 survey, and the proposed book focus on analysis of the peace movement as such and/or on testing social movement theory with empirical data. Thus far, several of the studies have produced findings that were not commonly known and not expected as well as data which challenges accepted social movement theory as briefly outlined above. These studies provide evidence about goals, activities, values and strategies that are often discussed on the basis of a case study or nonsystematic observations. They are only the beginning of the range of analyses possible on specific aspects of social movement operation or social movement theory using these data. The data on the smaller groups without tax exemptions may be an unique national sample of this segment of the nonprofit and voluntary action sector of American society. Everyone associated with the Surveys supports the dissemination of the PMO data base to encourage analyses from as many perspectives as possible. We hope the background and description provided here will lead other researchers to obtain and use the data. In particular, as in the Edwards study, these very rich data provide the opportunity for cross movement and time comparisons, the research and analysis most needed to improve social movement theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, John O. 1990. Planning and Management in Nonprofit Organizations. in Gies, David, J. Steven Ott, and Jay M. Shafritz, Eds. *The Nonprofit Organization: Essential Readings.* Management. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Anthony, Robert N. and David Young. 1984. *Management Control in Nonprofit Organizations.* Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Ayvazian, Andrea and Michael Klare. 1986. Decision Time for the American Peace Movement. *Fellowship.* September:12-13.

Bond, Doug. 1994. Nonviolent direct action and the diffusion of power, in *Justice Without Violence.* Paul Wehr, Heidi Burgess and Guy Burgess (eds.) Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

*Bond, Doug, Christopher Kruegler and Doug Imig. Strategic performance and nonviolent direct action by peace movement organizations in the U.S. (forthcoming) In Meyer, David and Thomas Rochon. *Rethinking the Nuclear Freeze: Origins, Impacts and Lessons.*

Boulding, Elise. 1983. The peace movement in the 1980s. International Peace Research Tenth Annual Conference, Gyor, Hungary.

----. 1984. New development in the U.S. peace movement: challenges and obstacles in historical context. *Forum for Correspondence and Contact. 14:55-68.*

----. 1990. The early eighties peak of the peace movement. in Marullo, Sam and John Lofland, Eds. *Peace Action in the Eighties.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Chatfield, Charles and Peter van den Dungen, Eds. 1988. *Peace Movements and Political Cultures.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Chatfield, Charles (with the assistance of Robert Kleidman). 1992. *The American Peace Movement: Ideals and Activism.* New York: Twayne.

Colwell, Mary Anna C. 1986a. Peace Movements and Public Policy. First Annual Conference of Applied Social Psychology, University of California,Santa Cruz, April.

----. 1986b. Questions for Analysts and Activists on Peace Movements and Public Policy. COPRED Annual Conference, University of Iowa, November

----. 1987. A Peace Research Agenda. Presentation to faculty and students, Catholic University of America, November.

----. 1988a. Data on Peace Movements and Questions About Public Policy. Capital Area Social Psychologist, Washington,D.C. October.

----. 1988b. Survey of Groups and Organizations Working for Peace (available from the author).

*----. 1988c. Dimensions and Goals of the American Peace Movement; Preliminary Findings from a Recent Survey. Society for the Study of Social Problems Annual Meeting, August.

*----. 1989a. Report to Respondents: 1988 Survey of Organizations and Groups Working for Peace.

*----. 1989b. Characteristics of Peace Movement Organizations Citing Promoting Social Justice as a Major and Important Goal. 17th Annual Conference Consortium on Peace Research and Education (COPRED), October.

*----. 1989c. Organizational and Management Characteristics of Peace Groups. San Francisco: Institute for Nonprofit Management, University of San Francisco. Working Paper #8.

*----. 1990a. Membership Participation in Peace Groups in the United States: Data From the 1988 Survey. Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. August.

*----. 1990b. U.S. Peace Organizations: Dimensions, Deficits, and Dilemmas of a Social Movement. Workshop on Frontiers in Social Movement Theory, University of Michigan , June.

*----. 1990c. Defining Social Movements: Questions and Problems Resulting from a 1988 Survey of Organizations and Groups Working for Peace. Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association. Revised version :Colgate University (Invitational conference of peace movement researchers.

*----. 1992. Peace Movement Activism: Findings from a 1988 Survey in the United States. Presentation at the Nonviolent Sanctions Seminar Series, Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense, Harvard University.

----. 1993. *Private Foundations and Public Policy: The Political Role of Philanthropy*. New York: Garland Press.

*----. 1994a. Seeking Justice and Condoning Violence? Peace Studies Association Annual Meeting.

*----. 1994b. Needed Research on How Citizens' Groups Can Influence Foreign Policy. Paths to Peace Workshop, ASA Section on Peace and War. August.

*----. 1994c. Networks of co-sponsorship among movement organizations. Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) annual conference, Berkeley.

Colwell, Mary Anna C., Doug Bond, Sam Marullo, John D. McCarthy, Michelle Markley, Ron Pagnucco and Bob Edwards. 1992 Peace Movement Organization Survey. (available from the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

Cortright, David. 1993. *Peace Works: The Citizen's Role in Ending the Cold War*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

DeBenedetti, Charles. 1988. American peace activism, 1945-1985. in Chatfield, Charles and Peter van den Dungen, Eds. *Peace Movements and Political Cultures*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Dillman, Don A. 1978. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

*Edwards, Bob. 1993. The range and significance of semi-formal organizational structure: an analysis of the US peace movement. Paper presented at the ARNOVA Conference, Toronto.

*----. 1994. Organizational Style in Middle Class and Poor People's Social Movement Organizations: An Empirical Assessment of New Social Movements Theory. Ph.D. Dissertation, Dept. of Sociology, Catholic University of America.

*----. 1995 (forthcoming). Semi-formal organizational structure among social movement organizations: an analysis of the US peace movement. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.*

*----. and Sam Marullo. 1995. (forthcoming) Organizational mortality in a declining movement: the demise of peace movement organizations in the end of the cold war era. *American Sociological Review.*

Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey.(Rev.ed.1992)

Hall, B. Welling. 1984. The antinuclear peace movement: toward an evaluation of effectiveness. *Alternatives* 9:475-517.

Havelick. Penny L. 1986. Interorganizational relations: resource exchange structure and organizational cooperation. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meeting, New York.

Howlett, C.F. and G. Zeitzer. 1985. *The American Peace Movement; History and Historiography.* Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association.

Jenkins, J. Craig. 1983. Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology. 9:527-553.*

----. 1987. Nonprofit organizations and policy advocacy. in Powell, Walter Ed., 1987. *The Nonprofit Sector: a Research Handbook.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Joseph, Paul. 1993. *Peace Politics: The United States Between the Old and New World Orders.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss and David V. Summers. 1987. Doing well while doing good; dilemmas of performance measurements in nonprofit organizations and the need for a multiple-constituency approach. 154-166 in Powell, Walter W. ed. *The Nonprofit Sector: a Research Handbook.* New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 1987.

Kleidman, Robert. 1986. Opposing "the good war": mobilization and professionalization in the Emergency Peace Campaign. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change.* 9:177-200.

Kreisberg, Louis. 1988. Peace movements and government peace efforts. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 10:57-75.

Lofland, John. 1993. *Polite Protesters: The American Peace Movement in Sociological Perspective.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Marullo, Sam. 1986. Leadership and membership in the anti-nuclear weapons movement: specification of resource mobilization theory. Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

----. 1990. Patterns of peacemaking in the local freeze campaign. 246-263 in Marullo, Sam and John Lofland, eds. *Peace Action in the Eighties: Social Science Perspectives.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

*----. 1994. Nonviolent direct action in the U.S. peace movement. Paper presented to the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions seminar, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.

*Marullo, Sam, Alexandra Chute and Mary Anna Colwell. 1991. Pacifist and nonpacifist groups in the U.S. peace movement of the 1980s. *Peace and Change* 16:235-259.

*Marullo, Sam and Bob Edwards. 1994. Survival tips for peace movement organizations during the movement's post-cold war decline. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Peace Studies Association. (Forthcoming in *Peace Review*)

Marullo, Sam and John Lofland, Eds. 1990. *Peace Action in the Eighties.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

*Marullo, Sam, Ron Pagnucco and Jackie Smith. (forthcoming). Frame changes and social movement   contraction: U.S. peace movement framing after the cold war.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. 1988. Social movements. pp. 695-737 in Smelser, N. Ed. *Handbook of Sociology.* Newbury Park:Sage.

McCarthy, John D. 1973. The trend of social movements in America: professionalization and resource mobilization. reprinted in Zald, M.N. and McCarthy, J.D. 1987. *Social Movements in an Organizational Society.* New Brunswick,N.J.: Transaction. pp. 337-339.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. Resource mobilization and social movements: a partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology.* 82:1212-1241.

McCarthy, John D., David W. Britt and Mark Wolfson. 1991. The institutional channeling of social movements by the state in the United States. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change.* 13:45-76

McCrea, Frances B. 1986. Mobilizing resources: tactics and strategies of the national Freeze campaign. Society for the Study of Social Problems, annual meeting, New York.

McCrea, Frances B. and Gerald E. Markle. 1989. *Minutes to Midnight: Nuclear Weapons Protest in America.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Meyer, David and Thomas Rochon (forthcoming). *Rethinking the Nuclear Freeze: Origins, Impacts and Lessons.*

*Pagnucco, Ron. 1992. Tactical Choice by Groups Working for Peace: The Ruly/Unruly Divide. Ph.D.Dissertation. The Catholic University of America.

Peace, Roger C., III. 1991. *A Just and Lasting Peace: The U.S. Peace Movement from the Cold War to Desert Storm.* Chicago: The Noble Press.

Powell, Walter W. 1987. *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Powell, Walter W. and Paul J. DiMaggio, Eds. 1992. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schlozman, Kay L. and John T. Tierney. 1983. More of the same: Washington pressure group activity in a decade of change. *The Journal of Politics.* 45:351-375.

Selby, Cecily C. 1978. Better performance for nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review.* 60:30-32.

Scott, W. Richard. 1975. Organizational structure. *Annual Review of Sociology.* 1:1-20.

Shields, Joseph and John D. McCarthy. 1989. Evaluating citizen action groups: the development of an empirical model. Life Cycle Institute, The Catholic University of America.

Smelser, Neil. Ed. 1988. *Handbook of Sociology.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Smith, David Horton. 1994. The rest of the nonprofit sector: the nature, magnitude and impact of grassroots associations in America. Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action annual meeting, Berkeley, CA.

*Smith, Jackie. 1993. A study of nonresponse bias in the 1988 Survey. Unpublished paper. Available from the author at the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, Notre Dame University.

Solo, Pam. 1988. *From Protest to Policy: Beyond the Freeze to Common Security.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1989. Stability and innovation in the women's movement: a comparison of two movement organizations. *Social Problems* 36:75-92.

Topsfield Foundation. 1987. *Grassroots Peace Directory.* Pomfret, CT: Topsfield Foundation.

Washburn, Michael and Susan Weyerhaeuser. 1978. The peace movement in 1978: where are we, who are we, and where are we going? A report prepared for the Institute for World Order, New York.

Wehr, Paul, Heidi Burgess and Guy Burgess (eds.) 1994. *Justice Without Violence.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Wittner, Lawrence. 1984. *Rebels Against War: The American Peace Movement, 1933-1983.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Young, N. 1986. The peace movement: a comparative and analytical survey. *Alternatives* 11:185-287.

Zald, Mayer N. and John D. McCarthy. 1987a Religious groups as crucibles of social movements. pp.67-95 in Zald and McCarthy. Eds. 1987b. *Social Movements in an Organizational Society.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Zald, Mayer N. and John D. McCarthy. Eds. 1979. *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control and Tactics.* Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

----. Eds. 1987b. *Social Movements in an Organizational Society.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

* Based wholly or partially on the data from the 1988 and 1992 Surveys.

APPENDIX

Table A1					
Peace Movement Organization Survey Schedule of Returns. 1988 and 1992.					
1988: Total returns N=411; No date received recorded for 14 returns.					
Week	Activity	Returns per period N=397		Cumulative	
		Number	%	Number	%
0	Initial mailing				
1		96	24	96	24
2		64	16	160	40
3	Reminder postcard	74	19	234	59
4		20	5	254	64
5	Second mailing	28	7	282	71
6		31	8	313	79
7		22	6	335	84
8		11	3	346	87
9-13	Follow-up phone calls	25	6	371	94
14-22		26	6	397	100%
1992: Total returns N=246					
0	Initial mailing, 1st wave				
1	Initial mailing, 2nd wave	20	8	20	8
2-5	Reminder mailings	100	41	120	49
6-7	Phone calls	28	11	148	60
8-14	Calls and mailings	36	15	184	75
15	Short form mailing	7	3	191	78
16-20	Calls and mailings	36	15	227	92
21-25	Calls and mailings	18	7	245	99+
26-30	Calls and mailings	1	<1	246	100%

Table A2 Organizational Characteristics of PMOs: 1988 Data.				
	Sample I N=259-267		Sample II N=120-130	
Operations Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Developed a sense of group solidarity	4.5	1.3	4.6	1.3
Use consensus procedures	4.5	1.9	5.1	1.5
Clearly defined structure	4.3	1.7	3.0	2.0
Avoided internal divisions	3.7	1.8	4.2	1.8
Elect leaders	3.1	2.6	2.2	2.5

Table A3 Organizational Characteristics of PMOs: 1992 Data.				
	Sample I N=131-134		Sample II N=51-61	
Operations Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Developed a sense of group solidarity	4.4	1.4	3.6	1.4
Use consensus procedures*	4.4	2.0	4.5	2.0
Clearly defined structure**	4.1	2.0	2.9	2.1
Avoided internal divisions	3.5	1.8	4.1	2.0
Elect leaders	2.7	2.5	2.9	2.7

* N=172; ** N=169.

Table A4 Financial Operations of PMOs: 1988 Data.				
	Sample I N=255-267		Sample II N=123-128	
Operations Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Internal accounting procedures	5.5	0.9	3.9	2.4
Leaders responsible for budgeting	4.9	1.7	3.7	2.4
Members contribute funds	4.7	2.0	4.1	2.1
Maintain steady funding support	4.4	1.6	3.4	2.0
Have a fundraising plan	4.1	1.9	2.2	2.0
Leaders raise funds from grassroots	4.1	2.0	3.1	2.4
Have been able to diversify funding	3.9	1.7	2.0	1.8
Leaders raise fund from foundations	3.7	2.3	1.5	2.1

Table A5 Financial Operations of PMOs: 1992 Data.				
	Sample I N=131-134		Sample II N=49-52	
Operations Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Internal accounting procedures	5.2	1.4	3.4	2.2
Leaders responsible for budgeting	4.8	1.6	3.8	2.1
Maintain steady funding support	3.8	1.7	3.2	2.0
Have a fundraising plan	3.9	1.8	2.3	2.1
Leaders raise funds from grassroots	3.9	2.0	2.5	2.3
Have been able to diversify funding	3.5	1.8	1.6	1.8
Leaders raise fund from foundations	3.3	2.2	1.3	2.0

* Question asked in a different way in 1992. See Sources of Funds in Table A?.

Table A6 External Organizational Relations of PMOs: 1988 Data.				
	Sample I N=255-263		Sample II N=127-130	
Operations Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Leaders able to work with other groups	5.5	0.9	5.2	1.4
Successful in gaining community support	4.8	1.3	3.7	1.5
Form on-going coalitions with similar groups	4.7	1.6	3.9	1.9
Can mobilize people for action	4.6	1.5	4.0	1.5
Recognition that group brings social change	4.4	1.6	3.1	1.7
Would benefit from greater contact with other groups	4.1	1.6	4.4	1.4

* Question not asked in 1992.
* Question asked in a different way in 1992. See Sources of Funds in Table 6.

Table A7 External Organizational Relations of PMOs: 1992 Data.				
	Sample I N=133-134		Sample II N=51-58	
Operations Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Leaders able to work with other groups	5.3	1.0	5.1	1.2
Successful in gaining community support	4.4	1.4	3.6	1.4
Form on-going coalitions with similar groups	4.6	1.7	4.0	2.0
Can mobilize people for action	4.2	1.7	3.9	1.4
Recognition that group brings social change	4.0	1.6	3.1	1.7

* Question not asked in 1992.

Table A8 Organizational Values and Strategies of PMOs: 1988 Data.				
Value and Strategy Statements	Sample I N=236-265		Sample II N=129-133	
Our organization:	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
seeks to influence U.S. foreign policy	4.8	1.7	4.6	1.6
has a commitment to nonviolence	4.8	1.7	5.2	1.3
strives to act in terms of the slogan "think globally, act locally"	4.4	1.8	4.5	1.5
is opposed to all wars	3.8	2.0	4.2	1.8
seeks major social change in the U.S. as a necessary prior condition before it is possible to achieve world peace	3.8	2.0	3.5	1.9
seeks a moderate public image	3.5	1.9	3.3	1.9
seeks to change how people think about war more than to change specific defense policies	3.4	1.9	3.4	1.8
seeks to educate influential elites as the way to change public policy	3.3	1.9	2.8	2.0
believes in changing individuals rather than public policy	2.4	1.9	2.5	1.7
prefers to be independent and not affiliated with other groups in a federation, alliance or coalition	1.6	2.0	1.5	1.9
prefers to focus on local issues	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.7
condones the use of violence for revolutionary change in specific cases	1.4	1.8	1.2	1.7

Strategy and Value Statements	Sample I N=131-170		Sample II N=50-61	
Our organization:	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
has a commitment to nonviolence	5.1	1.6	5.3	1.4
seeks to influence U.S. foreign policy	4.3	2.1	4.3	2.0
is opposed to all wars	4.1	2.1	4.6	1.5
strives to act in terms of the slogan "think globally, act locally"	4.0	1.9	4.2	1.9
seeks major social change in the U.S. as a necessary prior condition before it is possible to achieve world peace	3.8	2.0	3.5	2.0
seeks a moderate public image	3.5	2.0	3.2	2.0
seeks to change how people think about war more than to change specific defense policies	3.3	2.1	3.7	1.9
seeks to educate influential elites as the way to change public policy	3.2	1.9	3.1	2.0
believes in changing individuals rather than public policy	2.4	1.8	2.4	1.7
prefers to focus on local issues	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.9
prefers to be independent, not affiliated with other groups in a federation, alliance or coalition	1.5	2.0	1.2	1.8
condones the use of violence for revolutionary change in specific cases	1.2	1.9	1.0	1.8

Table A9.
Organizational Values and Strategies of PMOs: 1992 Data.

Table A10 PMO Goals: 1988 Data. Sample I - N=272.				
Goal Statement	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
PACIFIST/ANTI-WAR GOALS				
Changing U.S. consciousness so war is no longer an option in international relations	59	24	27	3
Eliminating war as a tool of American foreign policy	52	24	22	2
Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence among members and the public	40	29	26	4
Changing U.S. Congress to create majority who will shift policy away from war	30	34	32	5
Elimination of U.S. expenditure for war	27	24	41	8
Converting defense industry to non-military production	21	42	32	5
Preventing a draft of American youth into military service [16]	10	21	63	7
ARMS CONTROL/ANTI-NUCLEAR WEAPONS				
Eliminating nuclear weapons from U.S. arsenal	46	22	28	4
Eliminating nuclear weapons world-wide	45	23	29	4
Obtaining verifiable arms control agreements between the U.S. and U.S.S.R.	40	24	32	5
Preventing development, testing, deployment of specific weapons systems	35	27	32	6
Establishing a nuclear free zone by ballot or local ordinance	7	20	65	8

---

[16] In the study for nonresponse bias this item was less well represented in our respondent group than in the original sample.

Table A10, Continued.	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
FOREIGN POLICY/INTERNATIONAL GOALS				
Changing U.S. foreign policy to end unilateral intervention in other nations	48	24	26	3
Encouraging the use of conflict resolution techniques in international disputes	45	32	21	2
Encouraging more positive view of the U.S.S.R.	33	34	29	4
Developing alternatives to "anti-communism" or "containment" as a foreign policy	33	34	29	5
Encouraging economic, not military, foreign aid programs	22	34	40	4
Strengthening international organizations	20	32	44	5
RELATED OTHER SOCIAL MOVEMENT GOALS				
Promoting social justice in U.S. & worldwide	52	25	18	6
Protecting human rights at home and abroad	43	29	24	4
Protecting natural resources & environment	20	35	40	5

Table A11 PMO Goals: 1988 Data. Sample II - N=139.				
Goal Statement	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
PACIFIST/ANTI-WAR GOALS				
Eliminating war as a tool of American foreign policy	53	29	9	9
Changing U.S. consciousness so war is no longer an option in international relations	51	34	7	8
Promoting personal peace and commitment to nonviolence among members and the public	48	32	11	9
Changing U.S. Congress to create majority who will shift policy away from war	30	41	19	10
Elimination of U.S. expenditure for war	30	28	32	11
Converting defense industry to non-military production	23	37	29	12
Preventing a draft of American youth into military service[17]	14	30	45	12
ARMS CONTROL/ANTI-NUCLEAR WEAPONS				
Eliminating nuclear weapons world-wide	53	21	16	10
Eliminating nuclear weapons from U.S. arsenal	51	17	22	11
Obtaining verifiable arms control agreements between the U.S. and U.S.S.R.	47	22	22	9
Preventing development, testing, deployment of specific weapons systems	42	23	23	12
Establishing a nuclear free zone by ballot or local ordinance	11	30	47	13

---

[17] In the study for nonresponse bias this item was less well represented in our respondent group than in the original sample.

Table A11 Continued.	Major Goal %	Major Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
FOREIGN POLICY/INTERNATIONAL				
Changing U.S. foreign policy to end unilateral intervention in other nations	46	26	19	9
Encouraging the use of conflict resolution techniques in international disputes	44	35	14	8
Encouraging economic, not military, foreign aid programs	37	25	30	9
Encouraging more positive view of Soviet Union *	32	39	19	10
Developing alternatives to "anti-communism" or "containment" as a foreign policy	25	43	21	12
Strengthening international organizations	22	38	31	9
RELATED SOCIAL MOVEMENT GOALS				
Promoting social justice in U.S. & worldwide	52	22	17	9
Protecting human rights at home and abroad	50	16	25	10
Protecting natural resources & environment	21	35	32	12

Table A12 PMO Goals: 1992 Data for 1988 Questions - Sample I - N=182.				
Goal Statement	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
PACIFIST/ANTI-WAR GOALS				
Eliminate war as a tool of American foreign policy	39	20	16	25
Change U.S. consciousness so war is no longer an option in international relations	37	27	11	26
Promote personal peace and commitment to nonviolence among members and the public	33	24	18	27
Eliminate all U.S. expenditures for offensive war	24	26	24	26
Convert defense industry to non-military production	25	28	23	25
Changing U.S. Congress to create a majority who will shift policy away from war	18	20	35	28
ARMS CONTROL/ANTI-NUCLEAR WEAPONS				
Eliminate nuclear weapons world wide	36	18	20	26
Eliminate nuclear weapons from the U.S. arsenal	32	19	22	26
Prevent the development, testing, deployment of specific weapons systems	28	21	25	26
Obtain verifiable arms control agreements between the U.S. and the former Soviet Union	16	26	31	26
Establish a nuclear free zone by ballot or local ordinance	5	14	53	28

Table A12, continued	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
FOREIGN POLICY/INTERNATIONAL GOALS				
Encourage the use of conflict resolution techniques in international disputes	43	22	9	26
Change U.S. foreign policy to end unilateral intervention in other nations	34	21	20	25
Encourage economic, not military, foreign aid programs	24	26	25	25
Strengthen international organizations	15	34	25	27
Encourage more positive view of the former Soviet Union	13	31	30	26
RELATED GOAL SOCIAL MOVEMENT GOALS				
Promote social justice	54	17	5	26
Protect human rights	42	23	11	25
Protect natural resources and the environment	30	26	18	26

Table A13 PMO Goals: 1992 Data for 1988 Questions - Sample II - N=64.				
Goal Statement	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
PACIFIST/ANTI-WAR GOALS	%	%	%	%
Eliminate war as a tool of American foreign policy	44	31	13	13
Change U.S. consciousness so war is no longer an option in international relations	44	30	13	14
Promote personal peace and commitment to nonviolence among members and the public	38	28	20	14
Eliminate all U.S. expenditures for offensive war	36	22	33	13
Convert defense industry to non-military production	28	23	34	14
Changing U.S. Congress to create a majority who will shift policy away from war	22	25	39	14
ARMS CONTROL/ANTI-NUCLEAR WEAPONS				
Eliminate nuclear weapons from the U.S. arsenal	41	19	28	13
Eliminate nuclear weapons world wide	38	22	28	13
Prevent the development, testing, deployment of specific weapons systems	27	25.	34	14
Obtain verifiable arms control agreements between the U.S. and the former Soviet Union	19	19	47	16
Establish a nuclear free zone by ballot or local ordinance	3	16	64	17

Table A13, Continued	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
FOREIGN POLICY/INTERNATIONAL				
Encourage the use of conflict resolution techniques in international disputes	39	36	12	13
Change U.S. foreign policy to end unilateral intervention in other nations	39	20	25	16
Encourage economic, not military, foreign aid programs	31	25	28	16
Strengthen international organizations	20	34	31	14
Encourage more positive view of the former Soviet Union	17	30	38	16
RELATED SOCIAL MOVEMENT GOALS				
Promote social justice	61	17	6	16
Protect human rights	48	31	6	14
Protect natural resources and the environment	34	34	16	16

Table A14 New Goal Questions in 1992: Ranked by Major Goal Percentage. Sample I - N=182.				
Goal Statement	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
Reduce military expenditures	46	17	13	25
Promote social transformation	45	21	8	26
Reform military recruitment	44	19	9	28
Encourage the use of nonviolent conflict resolution techniques in solving local/national problems	37	26	11	26
Reduce nuclear proliferation	32	22	19	27
Promote alternative conceptions of security	29	32	13	26
Promote sustainable development	27	24	23	26
Reform views of other peoples/countries	26	21	26	26
Promote democracy	24	27	24	25
Reduce conventional weapons/ technology transfers	22	29	22	26
Promote accountability of elected officials (including disarmament issues)	18	29	26	28
Reduce biological/chemical weapons	13	34	26	27
Promote disarmament	9	21	45	24
Influence policy on foreign military basing (i.e. sovereignty, prostitution)	8	21	42	28
Influence policy on domestic military basing (i.e. locations, closings, noise, toxic waste)	7	26	39	28
Protect military rights (e.g. veterans, conscientious objector discharges)	7	20	44	29

Table A15
New Goal Questions in 1992: Ranked by Major Goal Percentage. Sample II - N=64.

Goal Statement	Major Goal %	Minor Goal %	Not a Goal %	Missing %
Promote social transformation	48	17	19	16
Promote disarmament	43	23	16	16
Reduce military expenditures	39	23	25	13
Encourage the use of nonviolent conflict resolution techniques in solving local/national problems	36	27	23	14
Reduce nuclear proliferation	34	22	27	17
Promote democracy	27	30	28	16
Reform views of other peoples/countries	27	25	33	16
Promote accountability of elected officials (including disarmament issues)	25	30	30	16
Promote alternative conceptions of security	25	28	27	20
Protect military rights (e.g. veterans, conscientious objector discharges)	25	19	44	13
Reduce conventional weapons/ technology transfers	23	34	25	17
Reform military recruitment	23	23	39	14
Reduce biological/chemical weapons	17	36	33	14
Promote sustainable development	16	32	38	16
Influence policy on foreign military basing (i.e. sovereignty,prostitution)	13	22	50	16
Influence policy on domestic military basing (i.e. locations, closings, noise, toxic waste)	8	23	53	16

Table A16
Percentage of Income from Each Source:1992 Data. Sample I. N=122-3.*

Income from this Source	None %	< One Quarter %	One Quarter to < Half %	Half to <Three Quarters %	Three Quarters to All %	T O T A L
· Individual gifts and bequests	15	37	20	18	10	100
Publications, sale of merchandise and conferences	32	57	8	2	1	100
Foundation grants	36	36	15	7	6	100
Fundraising events	39	52	6	2	1	100
Dues	49	24	17	6	3	99
Church/religious organization grants	64	25	6	1	4	100
Corporate gifts/grants	88	12	1	0	0	101
Canvassing	90	6	2	1	1	100

* 33% of Sample I did not answer this question. Order is by the None percentage, low to high.

Table A17
Percentage of Income from Each Source: 1992 Data. Sample II. N=51.*

Income from this Source	None %	< One Quarter %	One Quarter to <Half %	Half to <Three Quarters %	Three Quarters to All %	T O T A L
Individual gifts and bequests	43	22	6	10	18	99
Dues	55	12	4	10	20	101
Publications, sale of merchandise and conferences	59	33	2	2	4	100
Fundraising events	63	18	10	6	4	101
Church/religious organization grants	78	10	6	0	6	100
Foundation grants	84	4	10	2	0	100
Corporate gifts/grants	92	6	2	0	0	100
Canvassing	94	6	0	0	0	100

* 20% of Sample II did not answer this question. Order is by the None percentage, low to high.

	None %	1-2 times per year %	3-6 times per year %	7-10 times per year %	12 times per year %	52 times per year/+ %	Missing %
TV news story	20	26	13	9	4	2	27
Radio news	13	22	16	14	7	1	26
Newspaper	5	15	19	19	9	7	27
Letters to the Editor	12	21	16	13	7	4	28
Opinion columns	24	28	14	3	4	1	26
Local access Cable TV	31	17	10	3	7	3	30
TV/Radio talk shows	15	23	18	8	4	2	29
Public Service Announcements	30	13	13	10	6	2	28
Used electronic bulletin boards	34	9	7	7	5	9	30
Issued press release in 1991	7	13	18	17	13	5	28

Table A18
1992 Estimated Media Coverage: Sample I. N=182.

In Sample I 32% of the organizations had a person specifically designated to work with the media, 48% actively strove to get media coverage of most activities, and 32% had a press kit available in 1991.

	None %	1-2 times per year %	3-6 times per year %	7-10 times per year %	12 times per year %	52 times per year/+ %	Missing %
TV news story	38	30	13	5	2	0	14
Radio news	33	30	13	9	0	0	16
Newspaper	13	25	33	11	3	2	14
Letters to the Editor	16	20	25	17	5	0	17
Opinion columns	42	31	94	2	0	0	16
Local access Cable TV	56	17	60	0	0	2	19
TV/Radio talk shows	50	27	8	0	0	0	16
Public Service Announcements	47	13	13	6	5	2	16
Used electronic bulletin boards	66	3	3	2	6	6	14
Issued press release in 1991	30	14	20	9	8	2	17

Table A19
1992 Estimated Media Coverage: Sample II. N=64

In Sample II 20% of the organizations had a person specifically designated to work with the media, 45% actively strove to get media coverage of most activities, and 18% had a press kit available in 1991.

List of variables in the 1998 Survey of Groups and Organizations Working for Peace not covered in this paper.

Cosponsorship of activities with other groups
Groups with which organization will not cosponsor
Requirements for organizational membership
Requirements for individual membership
Participation of general members
Use of volunteers and number contributing at least 5 hours a month
Use and duties of staff
Those involved in choosing program activities, budgeting, advance planning of program and finances
Outside organizational assistance (TA) received and needed
Office equipment owned and planned for purchase
Use of electronic networks
Tax status of affiliated organizations
County location
Role of respondent in the organization
Willingness to discuss survey response

DATE DUE

OCT 19 2003			
	, 2003		