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Preface

This report was prepared for the Executive Directors of 46 United Funds who asked eight members of their boards to complete a lengthy questionnaire for us. We are grateful for the assistance provided by these Directors and for the views provided by their wise and conscientious board members.

Arthur Jette and Kenneth Wood of the United Community Funds and Councils of America gave us invaluable advice while this project was being planned. Robert Kerschbaum, the Executive Director of the United Fund and Community Services in Ann Arbor, Michigan was also a thoughtful source of information.

This study was done at the Research Center for Group Dynamics in collaboration with the program of Research in Public Health Practices in the School of Public Health, The University of Michigan. It was financed by a grant to that program from the United States Public Health Service and by a contract with the Center made by the Office of Scientific Research in the United States Air Force.

A more technical report is available from the authors.
I. The Problem

In many organizations in many parts of society a small group must decide what goal among a set of alternatives arrayed along a scale of difficulty the organization will establish for its members. The goal setters choose an objective they believe will guide and stimulate the efforts of people in the larger body, take care that the goal is neither too difficult nor too easy, and change the goal as this becomes necessary. There is much to be learned about why a goal-setting committee selects a particular level of difficulty and why this level is changed. In order to study such matters we need information about the goals chosen by a number of groups whose purposes and procedures are similar. The United Funds are excellent for such study. Each Fund has a goal selected by a committee, measures its progress toward that end, and again establishes a goal, annually.

Several years ago we made a study of the campaign goals and the amounts raised in 150 Funds in each of four years.* Because the three major results of that inquiry stimulated the present investigation, they are summarized here. First, the Funds that frequently fail to reach their campaign goals, compared to those that usually attain their goals, (a) set future goals at a greater distance above past levels of performance, and (b) change the levels of their goals a smaller amount from one year to the next. Second, as the amount per capita raised in a community is lower and the need for money is therefore greater, the discrepancy between the

immediately past level of performance and the level of the future goal becomes larger. Third, placing a future goal well above a past level of performance generates less improvement of performance in failing Funds than in successful ones.

We concluded from these results that a number of Funds fail and fail again in attempting to reach their campaign goals but do not lower their goals to a level that will make a failure less likely in the future. Apparently a failure is more intolerable than lowering the goal would be. This conclusion interested us because members of most groups dislike their group to fail and usually will lower the level of their goal for the next trial in order to prevent a future failure. Why did goal-setters in United Funds act differently?

Several characteristics of United Funds suggest where we might look for an answer to this question.

(a) An official goal in a United Fund is a joint decision which interests many persons, inside and outside the goal-setting group. In selecting its goal the board is exposed to pressures from citizens in the community, including those associated with the agencies supported by the Fund, those responsible for conducting major parts of the campaign, as well as those whose support is essential to the success of the effort.

(b) Members of the UF board and other citizens interested in the size of the Fund's income place greater value on larger budgets. There is virtually no upper limit to the amount they may see as desirable, but there is some amount below which the budget should not be allowed to fall. An important consequence is that there are stronger restraints against lowering a goal than there are against raising it.
(c) Goal setters assume that a community campaign can induce givers to provide what is asked. The purpose of a campaign goal is to arouse inclinations among potential contributors to give, and the announcement of a goal is accompanied by advertising and solicitation which urge citizens to give what is needed. A higher goal is expected to yield more income.

Because of these qualities, which most directly affect board members of a United Fund, and because of our interest in the goals of collective effort, a number of issues become pertinent for the present study. Generally speaking, we wish to know how board members react after a failing or succeeding campaign; specifically, what will a member of a UF board say about:

- their Fund's chances of success in future campaigns,
- the quality of their board's performance in the past (and their personal past contribution),
- their degree of commitment to achieve the UF goal,
- their willingness to change the campaign goal in the light of the Fund's past level of performance,
- their views about why campaign goals are sometimes set too high,
- their sources of satisfaction from successful campaigns, and
- the causes of successful and unsuccessful campaigns.

We have recently been investigating the origins of group aspirations and the conditions which generate changes in these aspirations in the laboratory at the Research Center for Group Dynamics. In these studies the investigators observe small groups while the units work on the same task for many trials. Information about the group's goals is acquired by asking members to select a level of aspiration for the group before
each new trial. These studies have shown that the level of the group goal is determined by both the likelihood of attaining that level and the attractiveness of doing so; a more difficult goal is more attractive than an easier one; members raise the group's aspiration after the group has been successful and lower it after the group has failed; group goals on the average tend to be slightly higher than past levels of performance; external agents can influence groups to select unreasonably difficult or easy goals; members display a stronger tendency to work toward a given objective when they have a greater desire for achievement of group success; and the group's failure or success has important consequences for members' morale and self-esteem. A fuller description of the results in this set of studies may be found elsewhere.* Clearly, the official goals, the amounts subsequently raised in United Fund campaigns, and the reactions of board members to these activities are real-life events analogous to those observed in the laboratory.

Types of Funds and Board Members

In the previous study of UF goals, as already noted, towns with a history of many failed campaigns set goals that were more difficult than did towns with a history of many successes. In other research we have observed that members of chronically failing groups develop different attitudes toward their unit than do members of consistently successful groups. In order to study further the differences that may exist for members of organizations with established records of success or failure,

half of the respondents in this investigation are from Funds with four consecutive successful campaigns and the other half are from Funds with four sequential failures.

We anticipate that information from respondents, plus data taken from records of UCFCF, will reveal meaningful contrasts in the characteristics of failing and succeeding Funds. We expect that these results will help us to identify, at least in part, the reasons for repeated failures. For the sake of simplicity, the following predictions emphasize events in failing Funds. By implication, we make opposite predictions for succeeding Funds.

1. Board members in both successful and unsuccessful Funds believe it is most important to meet the social welfare needs of the community by providing adequate financing for local agencies.

2. Assuming that the goal of a campaign is an accurate indication of the budgetary needs in these agencies, failing Funds, by definition are not fulfilling these needs.

3. Board members in failing Funds react to their lack of success by setting unrealistically high campaign goals after each failure, because of:
   a. Their increased sensitivity to the needs of the agencies and the social pressures to meet these needs,
   b. Their wish to recoup prior losses, or
   c. Their belief that higher goals stimulate larger contributions.
4. Because of continued failure to achieve their goals:

   a. They place less and less emphasis on achievement of a goal as the major criterion for judging the success or failure of a campaign.

   b. They develop poor morale, as shown by their: loss of pride in the organization, low evaluation of their personal performance, a tendency to blame others, inability to recruit volunteers, and feelings of being overworked.

   c. They develop a dislike of the consequences which follow a failure and become more concerned with avoiding these consequences than with ensuring a success in the next campaign.

5. The foregoing characteristics contribute to poorer performance by the Fund and, combined with their tendency to set unrealistically high goals, create a likelihood of continued failure.

   These properties, it can be seen, constitute a sequence—a circular one. They suggest that failure may prepare the ground for further failure, and that success may lead to further success.

   In any organization some members more than others are responsible for how well it performs. This is because the positions they occupy and the duties they must enact have more direct consequences for the progress of the organization toward its goal. Board members in the United Fund, we assume, are reasonably similar in their personal ability to take responsibility, some of them however exercise more initiative and make more decisions than their colleagues and these actions largely determine
the fate of the Fund. Will individuals in more responsible positions
differ from those in less responsible positions in their reactions to
the winning or losing records of their Funds? The results of research
in the laboratory suggest that they will.

In the present study certain respondents were selected because they
have more central position on the board, others were chosen because they
have more peripheral positions. We take it for granted that central
board members will be more concerned about the success or failure of their
Fund than will peripheral members. Because of their more important posi-
tions they should be more interested than peripheral persons in ensuring
that the Fund complete its major mission well--that is, provide enough
financial aid for local agencies so that the latter may offer effective
service to the community. We anticipate that they will do those things
which make a successful campaign possible both in the setting of goals
and the leadership of campaigns. Central persons are also more likely
to be sensitive to the reactions of others because they are the persons
who most often receive social pressures from outside the Fund. Because
they feel they have greater responsibility for how well the Fund does
its job, they may be more alert than peripheral persons to avoid blame or
to win approval from others. Central members more than peripheral persons
will believe it is important to set a good example and to maintain the
morale of the board, they will work harder than peripheral persons and
be more aware of the help available from influential people in the
community.
Our interest, then, is in the views of several types of UF board members. We have those in central positions, who should have a greater desire for successful operation of the Fund than do peripheral ones. We have members of boards in successful Funds and members of failing Funds. Within each of the successful towns half of the respondents are central persons and half are peripheral; in the failing towns again half of the board members are of each type. Thus, there are four categories of respondents: successful-central, successful-peripheral, failure-central, and failure-peripheral.

We will examine in the following pages how contrasting experiences of success or failure by the Fund and the occupancy of central or peripheral positions on the board affect the reactions of our respondents.
II. Procedure in Collecting Data

With the help of the Directory published by the United Community Funds and Councils of America in 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, a number of communities were identified with consistent records of either four successes or four failures during those years. These towns were all in the range between 60,000 and 110,000 in population. First, the names of 32 communities were selected (all that could be found) with four failures in a sequence. Second, additional towns were selected where they had had four successes in a row (there were over 60 of these) and from these succeeding communities 32 were selected, each of which was closely matched to one of the failing towns in population and Effective Buying Income (EBI). Thus, 64 towns were originally chosen for participation in the study--32 pairs of matched communities.

Eight questionnaires were sent to the Executive Directors in each of these 64 communities in August 1967 with a letter explaining the purposes of the study and a letter from Mr. Lyman Ford of the UCFCA supporting the request. Each Executive Director was asked to give four of the questionnaires to central members of his board and the other four to peripheral members. A total of 18 Executive Directors replied that they were unable to participate. Thus, the number of towns in which board members were given the questionnaires was 46; of these 23 were towns with histories of success and 23 were towns with histories of failure. The 23 pairs of towns, analyses revealed, were as closely matched in population and EBI as those in the original larger sample.

By the middle of September 1967, the deadline for the receipt of the completed questionnaires, a total of 255 had been received.
This is 70 per cent of the 368 actually given to potential respondents. These questionnaires were distributed among the four categories of board members as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success-central</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success-peripheral</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure-central</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure-peripheral</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The letter to the Executive Director did not inform him that the success or failure of his recent campaigns was an important factor in selecting his colleagues for study because we believed that such information might embarrass him when he requested help from members of his board. It provided the following statement to help him identify central and peripheral members.

"There is good reason to believe that the opinions and feelings of group members differ as they are more or less central in the work of their group. We ask, therefore, that four of the eight Board members you select be persons who have central positions and that four have peripheral positions. A central person is one who has accepted responsible jobs for the board, has performed them reliably, has a deep interest in the fortunes of the UF, or in other ways has been strongly involved. He may be a present or past officer of the board but he need not be. Your judgment is the best guide here. A peripheral person is one who has held few or no responsible jobs for the board, has shown less interest in its work, or in general has not become greatly involved. These people will tend to be newer members of the board, which is acceptable to us, but we would prefer, if they are available, to have such persons be those who have had one or two years experience on the Board so that they are not wholly unfamiliar with the Board's work."

"You will note that four of the eight forms enclosed are marked with a letter A and the other four with the letter B. Please give the A forms to the four more central persons, as you judge them, and the B forms to the four more peripheral persons. The A and B forms are the same. The letters are simply a convenient way for you to let us know how you see them."
A copy of the questionnaire (with a letter addressed to the respondents) is contained in the Appendix to this report. The respondents were asked not to sign their forms and to return them directly to the authors in envelopes provided for that purpose.

The average characteristics of the four types of respondents are summarized in Table 1. It can be seen that the central members differ from peripheral members in the ways requested. Central directors, compared to peripheral ones, tend to be a bit older, to have held more offices on the board, to have been members of the budget committee, and to occupy slightly more prestigious jobs in the community. Over 50% of C members, but only 20% of P members have been on the board for more than 5 years. No differences in length of time on the board were found between successful and failing towns. The C and P board members do not differ in their amount of formal education or in their role in the campaign organization.

There were no important differences in the characteristics of board members in successful towns compared to those in failing ones, except that those in failing towns (both central and peripheral persons) more often than those in successful towns, have leadership roles in the campaign to be held in the fall of 1967.
Table 1
Characteristics of Board Members who Returned Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Per cent females</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average age</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education</td>
<td>Nearly all completed college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mean prestige of occupation</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 low, 3 high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Presently hold office on UF board</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have held office on board in past</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Presently member UF budget comm.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Presently hold leadership role in UF campaign</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Have held leadership role in UF campaign in past</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) Percentages are based on number of respondents within category indicated at head of each column.
III. Results of the Study

Purposes of the Board Members

It is useful at the outset to determine what board members believe is the major mission of the United Fund, or better, what purpose the board members work towards in their efforts for the Fund. In order to be sure what respondents see as the primary function of the organization, the following question was asked: If, or when, your community raised enough money, reaches its goal, and has a success, what might contribute most to your sense of satisfaction from such an event? (Q.43).* A set of five alternatives was offered and a respondent was invited to place a number one beside the outcome that suits him best, a two beside the one that fits him next best, then a three, and so on until he had ordered all five. The alternatives are listed in Table 2 along with the average rankings assigned to each.

We observe in the Table that satisfaction from meeting the welfare needs of community is given the highest ranking by the respondents, having the Fund be successful as an organization is next most important, and personal gains from the Fund's successes are least important.

We were prepared to find that the more responsible directors, because of their greater importance in determining the fate of the Fund, would be more concerned than peripheral respondents to have the Fund serve its primary purpose well. Although it is not shown in the Table, the sources of satisfaction ranking first, meeting the welfare needs, is significantly more important to central members than to peripheral ones. The source of satisfaction ranking second, successful performance of the organization, is more important among those central board members who perceived

*Exact wording of questions will be found in the Appendix.
themselves as more active in behalf of the Fund (shown in their responses to Q.13) than to those among the peripheral members who were most inactive in their effort for the Fund, and the source of satisfaction ranking fourth, satisfaction with own efforts, was more important to more active central persons in successful towns than in failing towns.

Table 2
Sources of Satisfaction from Successful Campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>rank order average all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43c. Welfare needs of community can be met</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43e. Knowing that our UF is a successful organization</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43d. Community will be approved for doing a good job</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43a. Personally working hard on my part to help achieve goal</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43b. The community will approve of my efforts</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 43: If, or when, your community raises enough money, reaches its goal, and has a success, what might contribute most to your sense of satisfaction from such an event? Place a number 1 beside the one that fits you best, a 2 beside the one that suits you next best, then 3, and so on.

We conclude that membership on the board stimulates a greater desire to be of service to the larger community through work for the UF. A desire to have the organization achieve the goal it has set for itself is close behind as a source of satisfaction in working for the UF. Central members, moreover, have more sources of satisfaction in their work for the UF and feel more strongly about these than peripheral members—in particular,
they are most strongly concerned that the organization be successful and that it serve the needs of the community well. Finally, board members in failing Funds and those in succeeding ones do not greatly differ in their ranking of these sources of satisfaction.

Performance, Goals, and Estimates of Future Success

Although the members of boards in succeeding and failing towns do not differ in the purposes they attribute to the organization, their Funds show marked differences in goals and performance.

Differences in goals and achievement. The campaign goals and the amounts raised in each of these communities in the past four years were taken from the UCFCA Directories. The averages for the successful and unsuccessful Funds are shown in Table 3. We should keep in mind when examining these results that the success and failure towns are matched in size and in Effective Buying Income.

We observe that the succeeding towns solicited more income per capita than the failing towns during the four years. The successful Funds also raised a larger proportion of the wealth available to citizens (level of goal per capita divided by EBI per capita) than did unsuccessful Funds and set goals that asked for a larger proportion of the EBI. In failing towns, however, they placed the official goal for each new campaign a greater distance above the income solicited the previous year than they did in succeeding towns. The proportion of the campaign goal actually raised in these years was also smaller in the failing Funds than in the succeeding ones. Note, however, that the proportion of improvement in income from one year to the next was not significantly different in failing compared to succeeding Funds.
they are most strongly concerned that the organization be successful
and that it serve the needs of the community well. Finally, board members
in failing Funds and those in succeeding ones do not greatly differ in
their ranking of these sources of satisfaction.

Performance, Goals, and Estimates of Future Success

Although the members of boards in succeeding and failing towns do
not differ in the purposes they attribute to the organization, their
Funds show marked differences in goals and performance.

Differences in goals and achievement. The campaign goals and the
amounts raised in each of these communities in the past four years were
taken from the UCFCA Directories. The averages for the successful and
unsuccessful Funds are shown in Table 3. We should keep in mind when
examining these results that the success and failure towns are matched in
size and in Effective Buying Income.

We observe that the succeeding towns solicited more income per capita
than the failing towns during the four years. The successful Funds also
raised a larger proportion of the wealth available to citizens (level of
goal per capita divided by EBI per capita) than did unsuccessful Funds
and set goals that asked for a larger proportion of the EBI. In failing
towns, however, they placed the official goal for each new campaign a
greater distance above the income solicited the previous year than they
did in succeeding towns. The proportion of the campaign goal actually
raised in these years was also smaller in the failing Funds than in the
succeeding ones. Note, however, that the proportion of improvement in
income from one year to the next was not significantly different in
failing compared to succeeding Funds.
Table 3
Average Campaign Goals and Levels of Performance, Four Campaigns
(from UCFCA records, 1965-67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mn. amt. raised per capita</td>
<td>$4.72</td>
<td>$2.99</td>
<td>$ &gt; F***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. per cent of EBI per capita raised</td>
<td>.22%</td>
<td>.14%</td>
<td>$ &gt; F***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. per cent that goals request of EBI per capita</td>
<td>.20%</td>
<td>.15%</td>
<td>$ &gt; F**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. per cent increase in income</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. per cent campaign goal exceeded prior year's income</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>F &gt; S****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. per cent of official goal actually raised</td>
<td>102.72%</td>
<td>90.19%</td>
<td>$ &gt; F***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. per cent that goal for 1968 campaign exceeded income in 1967</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>F &gt; S*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See note for Table 4 for meaning of asterisks.

It appears that although failing Funds, compared to successful ones, set goals which required less money per capita and less of the citizens' available income, they consistently selected goals that were far above past levels of performance. These goals made it likely that failing Funds would fall short of their goals.
**Estimates for the future.** When the respondents completed their questionnaires their organizations had established a goal for the 1968 campaign (to occur in the fall of 1967), but that campaign had not yet begun. It was possible then for us to inquire about their aspirations for the 1968 campaign and, later, to determine from the UCPCA records, how well their 1968 goals were met. It can be seen in Table 3 that failing Funds once again selected significantly higher campaign goals (in the light of their past income) than did succeeding ones.

We asked respondents if they personally believed that the community's goal for the coming campaign was at the best possible level (Q.17). All but a handful (too few to treat statistically) said, Yes, the goal was a satisfactory one. Thus, they were inclined to accept the level of the 1968 goal. We then asked what (as they recall it) is the official goal for the campaign to occur in a few weeks in their town (Q.15) and computed how much their recalled goal exceeded the income in 1967 (Q.15 minus Q.16). In Table 4 it is revealed that the respondents on the average were accurately aware of the discrepancy between the 1968 goal and the 1967 income except that the peripheral board members in towns with a history of failure believed the goal to be closer to the 1967 income than it actually was. It is evident that respondents knew the level of the goal, did not tend to distort it when asked to recall it, and were aware that it exceeded the past income by a given amount.

Now that we are sure that respondents understand the aim of their joint efforts, we may ask: What per cent of the 1968 goal do you estimate the town will raise? (Q.19). Those in failing communities are less confident than those in succeeding towns that they will achieve the goal;
Table 4  
Estimates of Success and Actual Performance  
1968 Campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mn. per cent that 1968 goal, as recalled by respondent, exceeded actual 1967 income</td>
<td>6.03% 6.72% 18.06% 13.95%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mn. per cent expect to raise, 1968 goal</td>
<td>100.24% 99.60% 97.15% 95.11%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mn. per cent that ideally could raise, 1968 goal</td>
<td>112.46% 105.33% 116.76% 111.39%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn. per cent actually raised in 1968 campaign (UCFCA records) Jan. 1968</td>
<td>99.06% 94.96%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In this and subsequent Tables the vertical columns of values are from each of the four types of board members described earlier. The last column at the right, headed Reliable differences presents the initials of any of the six conditions for which the results are different enough to be noteworthy: C=central, P=peripheral, S=success, F=failure and SC, SP, FC, FP=combinations of the foregoing. The greater the number of asterisks following a set of initials, the more one may be confident that the difference is due to the type of respondent indicated by the initials rather than due to a chance event. Differences in the Table not identified by initials in the right hand column are taken to be unreliable and not worthy of serious consideration. The number of the question is provided in Tables so that the reader may examine its exact wording in the Appendix if he wishes to do so. Rating of 1 is low, rating of 5 is high.
specifically, members in towns with past successes believe that the 1968 campaign will just about reach the goal, while those in towns with past failures anticipate that the campaign will fall short of the goal by about 5 percentage points. We note in Table 4 that these estimates were fairly accurate.

We might obtain further insight into what board members expect if we ask them to make estimates of success in which they are not constrained to be realistic. Thus, the question was offered: If the campaign were run as well as possible, what is the largest amount you think could possibly be raised in your community? (Q.20). One can see in Table 4 that board members in both successful and unsuccessful communities believe that the 1968 campaign ideally could exceed the goal by a large amount; but respondents in failure Funds, especially the central members, were significantly more optimistic than others.

In sum, the goals and level of performance in the 1968 campaigns were on the average consistent with prior records in the Funds.

Deviations from past records. From the available data it was possible to examine more closely the goal and levels of performance in the latest campaigns in order to determine what events were associated with a break in a winning or losing string. These results are largely in accord with what we have already observed. Among the previously failing Funds, those that succeeded in their 1968 campaigns performed significantly better than those that again failed (****). Within the failing towns, those that succeeded in their 1968 campaigns had set goals which were only a moderate increase over their previous year's income (7.8 per cent increase); while those that continued to fail had set goals that were strikingly high in reference to previous levels of performance (25.6 per cent increase).
Considering the instances in which consistently successful Funds succeeded once again in their 1968 campaigns and instances in which consistently failing Funds failed once again in their latest drive, it again is clear that Fail-Fail towns raised less (per capita) than Success-Success Funds and had more difficult goals in the light of their previous levels of performance.

In Tables 3 and 4 central respondents are different from peripheral ones in only several matters not already noted. They are more confident that the Fund will reach its official goal and are more optimistic that it ideally could do so.

Attitudes toward the Level of Campaign Goals

We observed above that the majority of the board members believed that the goal for the 1968 campaign was the best possible one. How do they feel about the goals their community usually has had? Do they wish their Fund's goals were easier or harder?

The respondents were asked: All things considered, in your private judgment, have your community's goals in the last few years tended to be too high or too low? (Q.21). The answers in Table 5 reveal that the members in general judge past goals to be at a reasonable level for their town, but men in successful Funds say these goals have been a bit too low while those in failing Funds say they have been about right.

We expect that members who believe their goals have been too high will wish to lower them in the future and that those who believe their goals have been too low will wish to raise them in the future--this has been the tendency of group members in other investigations. But, we have already seen that Funds tend to raise future goals, or to keep them
at the same level, more often than they lower them, regardless of their past successes or failures. There is stronger resistance to lowering the level of the goal than there is to raising it when a new objective is being selected for a coming campaign. Let us focus then upon the resistance to lowering after a failure since reasons for raising a goal after success are of less interest.

The respondents were invited to consider the following: Suppose for the moment that your campaign this fall does not attain the official community goal, and suppose that a proposal is made next year to set a lower goal than the one your community failed to reach this fall, would you be inclined to support this proposal to lower next year's goal? (Q.32). The higher the rating, in response to this question, the more they would be willing to lower the goal. It is evident in the second row of Table 5 that the participants of each type were alike in their average responses and "probably would not" support the proposal.

At another point in the questionnaire they were asked: If it happened that the campaign goal was not attained this fall, which of the following do you think would best describe your view for next year? (Q.34). They were then given three alternatives to chose among, (a) set the goal low enough to have a good chance of attaining it, (b) keep the same goal even if we might not be likely to make it next year, or (c) raise the goal some reasonable amount. Only 14 per cent of the respondents would lower the goal while the remaining 86 per cent would either keep it the same or raise it after a failure. These proportions were similar regardless of the town's previous history or the position of the member on his board. Again, we see little preference for lowering the goal.
Table 5

Average Attitudes toward Level of Campaign Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Peripheral</td>
<td>Central Peripheral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Past goals too high or too low?</td>
<td>2.74 2.97</td>
<td>3.05 3.14</td>
<td>F&gt;S* FC&gt;SC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Willingness to lower UF campaign goal after failure?</td>
<td>2.03 2.12</td>
<td>2.21 2.37</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46a. Effectiveness of lowering goal in ensuring success?</td>
<td>2.23 2.12</td>
<td>2.20 2.56</td>
<td>FP&gt;SP** FP&gt;FC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47a. Difficulty of lowering goal after failure?</td>
<td>.275 2.85</td>
<td>2.94 2.48</td>
<td>FC&gt;FP*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Scale: 2=a bit too low, 3=about right, 4=a bit too high.

Despite the widespread sentiment against setting an easier campaign goal, there are reasons to expect differences between central and peripheral members in their willingness to adhere to this view. Central members should be more inclined than peripheral members to resist lowering the goal. We see in Table 5 that central persons (in failing towns) do indeed believe that there is less value in lowering the goal (Q.46a) and that it also would be more difficult to lower the goal (Q.47a). It appears that it is the central persons who are most likely to resist lowering the goal for a new campaign following a failure in the previous year. Perhaps the unreasonably difficult goals frequently selected in
Sources of resistance to lowering of goals. Clearly, there are restraints against lowering the level of next year's goal after a Fund has had an unsuccessful campaign. What do the respondents perceive these restraints to be?

Answers to the following question were asked from those whose Funds had had a failure while they were a member of the board: Concerning the most recent failing campaign, why was the goal set too high? What reasons determined where the goal was set? (Q.31). They were provided a number of alternatives and asked to indicate which ones were more likely to account for the selection of an unduly high goal. The average response for all participants is displayed in the second column of Table 6.

We observe that the most likely reasons are: that agencies need increases in their budgets, that the goal was incorrectly assessed to be not too high, and that they thought a higher goal would stimulate more giving. It seems, in sum, that a too-high goal is a response to the need of the agencies supported by the fund and is based on the assumption that citizens will give more if they are told that more is needed. There is not a widely spread feeling that agencies had made unreasonable demands of the board or that the budget committee was careless in deciding what the official campaign goal might be.

It is worth noting that the only item in Table 6 which members of failing boards believe more strongly than members of successful boards is that they set a higher goal (which they failed to reach) because they wished to exceed the performance of the previous year.
Table 6

Average Ratings of Reasons UF Campaign Goals are Set too High and Cause a Failure (Scale: 1=not a reason, 3=possibly a reason, 5=very likely reason)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Ave. all respondents</th>
<th>Succeeded*</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Peripheral Central Peripheral differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a. Agencies need budget increases</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31f. Thought goal was not too high</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31d. Thought high goal would stimulate giving</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31e. Wished to raise more than last yr.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b. Agencies make unreasonable demands</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31c. Budget committee not careful</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31g. No embarrassment from failing to attain high goal</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand means</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 23 persons who had been on the board the last time it had a failing campaign, at least 5 years ago.
These results are relevant to a later discussion about the preference among failing board members to exceed last year's performance, rather than to work toward an established goal.

Finally, observe that none of the reasons listed in Table 6 were given high ratings. Either the respondents are not certain about why a goal is set too high or they think that reasons other than those offered are more important. Few persons, however, wrote in additional reasons when invited to do so.

A further attempt was made to determine the perceived source of opposition to lowering a campaign goal. In this instance, after respondents had indicated that they would oppose lowering of the goal (See Q.32, Table 5) they were invited to indicate how important each of a number of reasons might be for their opposition (Q.33). The higher the rating, the more importance they attributed to that reason. The set of items they were given to consider are presented in Table 7. These, in contrast to the items in Table 6, are more directly concerned with the respondent's personal rationalizations.

Among all respondents the greatest importance was attached to two matters: if the goal were lowered, the fund would not meet the needs of the community; and, lowering the goal might make it necessary for separate agencies to solicit their own funds. Once more it is the need of the agencies supported by the fund which determines the board members' felt opposition to lowering the next campaign goal after a failure.

Members of the board in towns with a record of failure were generally not different from those with a record of success in their opposition to lowering of a goal. Central members were different from peripheral ones, however, in several respects that are revealing. Participants with central roles, more than those with less responsible positions, opposed
Table 7
Average Ratings of Reasons for not Lowering UF Campaign Goal

(Scale: 1=not at all important, 3=somewhat important, 5=extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Ave. all respondents</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33f. Would not meet needs of town</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a. Make it necessary for agencies to solicit own funds</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33h. Contributors would reduce gifts</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33d. Would avoid challenge of difficult task</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33c. Unpleasant to cut agency budgets</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33b. Agency supporters would press board for higher goal</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33e. Community would disapprove board</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33g. Time-consuming to reassess agency budgets for cuts</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand means</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lowering of the goal because the board would be avoiding the challenge generated by a difficult task (Q.33d) and because the supporters of the agencies would exert pressures on the board for a higher goal (Q.33b). We should note, however, that the differences just mentioned between C and P respondents mainly occurred among those in successful towns. Thus, they are ratings by members who have seldom had to consider (in recent years) the lowering of a goal after a failure and the explanations these men prefer might be tinged by the arguments they have invoked in order that the goal not be reduced after a surplus-engendering success.

When we limit our attention to respondents in failing towns, the contrasts between central and peripheral persons are different from those noted above. The peripheral members, more than the central ones, oppose lowering of the campaign goal because less money would be raised if that were done (Q.33h), and because a lowered goal would not allow the Fund to meet the needs of the community (Q.33f).

It appears then that a central role, particularly in a successful town, generates interest in meeting a challenge and a sensitivity to pressure from the supporters of the local welfare agencies; while a peripheral role, especially in a failing town, generates an awareness that a lowered goal will cause an inability to meet the needs of the community. Membership in a failing board arouses a concern to do what the town needs rather than an intention to set a realistic goal for the fund, while membership in a successful town arouses an interest in attaining the goal set for themselves as well as meeting the needs or pressures from the community. We remark, finally, that peripheral
persons in successful towns are on the average less likely, compared to other respondents, to declare that any of these reasons are important. This can be seen in the very bottom row of Table 7.

**Success and Failure; Consequences for Motivation and Morale**

Failure in a UF campaign is not a pleasant experience for those who have had a share in planning and working for the Fund. A series of failures is probably worse than a single losing campaign. How do members of the board react to the discrepancies between aspiration and achievement? Do their experiences have unfavorable effects upon their motivation or morale?

**Criteria of success in campaigns.** One way to cope with failure is to play down the importance of goal achievement as a criterion of success, to derogate the importance attached to attainment of the campaign goal (Q.22). We see in Table 8 that board members in failing towns attribute less importance to achievement of the campaign goal than do those in successful towns.

If there were no goal there could be no failure. Will those from towns with records of consistent failure prefer that they not be required to establish a goal? Respondents were asked if they agree with the following statement: I think it would be good if, somehow, the UF could work toward meeting needs in the community without setting official campaign goals at all (Q.48t). In the second row of Table 4 we observe that respondents in failing communities are more inclined to agree with this statement than those in successful communities.

A further finding suggests that members in failing funds prefer not to judge the performance of their agency by its progress toward the official goal. The question was offered: For the coming campaign,
which of the following are you likely to use in judging whether it was a success? (Q.25). They were to choose among the following alternatives: (a) the amount raised is more than the official goal, (b) the amount raised is more than the amount raised last year, or (c) the amount raised is more than the goal you privately prefer the community to have. The results are shown in the bottom half of Table 8. The values in the Table reveal the proportion of persons who chose each alternative within success and failure towns. It is interesting that achievement of the goal was more often favored by successful than by failure board members but "doing better than last year" was more often mentioned by failing than by successful board members.

To summarize: members of boards in failing towns are less satisfied with the practice of selecting a campaign goal than are those in successful towns. The reason doubtless is that the goal itself, given the tendency of failing Funds to place it unreasonably high, is the source of the evidence that their campaign has failed even though the town may have raised more money than it had in the previous year. Board members in failing towns, moreover, appear to get sufficient satisfaction from doing better than last year, regardless of whether they attain the official goal. It seems clear that members of the board in failing Funds do not take the goal seriously. If this is the case, it is also likely to be true that campaign workers and citizens in the community will sense that it is not important to attain the goal when they are asked to help the Fund.

Central and peripheral members do not differ in their willingness to use the campaign goal as a criterion for success. Thus, the criterion they use for judging success or failure is more influenced by the record
Table 8
Criteria of Success

A. Respondents' concern about goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How important that UF campaign attain goal?</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48t. Prefer that UF not set goals at all</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Proportion of respondents preferring to use a given criterion of success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion of success</th>
<th>Amount raised exceeds goal</th>
<th>Amount raised is more than last year</th>
<th>Amount raised more than privately preferred goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succeeded (N=130)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed (N=124)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 9.90, \ p < .01 \]

Q.25: For the coming campaign, which of the following are you likely to use in judging whether it was a success?
of the Fund than by the degree of responsibility they have in the organization.

Evaluation of performance by the Fund. Because of their consistent failures, respondents in failing towns may have less pride in their organization than those in successful towns. Accordingly, they were asked to evaluate the performance of several parts of the UF: the board, their campaign workers, and the effectiveness of the UF in general as a service to the community (Qs. 38, 39, 42). We expect participants in the successful communities to give higher evaluations of these parts than those in failing communities. The results in Table 9 fit this expectation. Note that members of the board in failing towns give lower ratings to the campaign workers than they give to the board as a unit, perhaps they prefer to blame those who conduct the campaign rather than those who oversee the organization, their own group.

Table 9
Average Evaluation of Local Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. How well has UF board performed, recent years?</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. How well local campaign workers performed?</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. How good is UF type of organization for community needs?</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peripheral board members evaluate all aspects of the Fund better than do central members; this difference is stronger in the failing places than in the successful ones, suggesting that central members may have had higher expectations for the fund than peripheral members did and as a result may have felt failures more keenly and judged failing performances more strictly.

Each participant was asked how attractive the UF board was to him. One question concerned how much he enjoyed being with the others on the committee (Q.35), another asked how much benefit he derived from serving on the board (Q.36). We had anticipated that more successful boards would be more attractive to their members, especially among individuals with the more responsible positions. The results indicate, however, that members in all four conditions of this study were highly attracted to their boards alike regardless of the success of the fund or their position on the board. Membership on the board apparently is valued by most respondents.

There is an interesting modifier for the last paragraph, however. We divided the Cs into two groups: those who believed that they put in somewhat more time than colleagues during the campaign weeks and those who believed they did no more than others during that time (Q.13). The same division was made for the Ps. The more active among the Cs and the less active among the Ps were then compared concerning their felt benefit from working on the board (Q.36). In this special analysis the active Cs felt they obtained more benefit than did the inactive Ps. The greatest benefit was derived by central persons in successful towns and the least benefit by peripheral persons in failing towns. Central-active and peripheral-inactive members did not differ, however, in the degree they were
attracted to the members of the board (Q.35).

The effect of the Fund's performance on self regard. If an organization is important to a man, the quality of its performance may determine his self-esteem. When it does well, he has a favorable opinion of his personal contribution; when it does poorly, he develops an unfavorable view of his personal performance. Does the Fund's past record affect our respondents' appraisals of their own work?

Several questions were put forward, shown in Table 10, to determine the effect of the Fund's past on a member's evaluation of himself (Qs.40, 41, 37). It can be seen that participants in failing Funds give lower ratings to their own work on the board than do participants in succeeding Funds. It is interesting, however, that a Fund's history does not affect the members' appraisals of how well they personally help in the UF campaigns (most respondents had some part in the campaigns) or of how much influence they have had in meetings of the board.

In failing towns, central members rate their contribution to the board higher than do peripheral persons (Q.40). Central persons also believe they have more influence on the board regardless of its success of failure (Q.37). The higher evaluations central members accord themselves are perhaps realistic reflections of their stronger and more influential positions as central people in the organization.

We conclude that the past record of a Fund is taken by members to be an indication of how well they personally have performed, but that central persons are not more deeply affected by that success or failure than are peripheral ones.
Table 10
Average Evaluation of Own Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Succeeded Central</th>
<th>Succeeded Peripheral</th>
<th>Failed Central</th>
<th>Failed Peripheral</th>
<th>Reliable differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. How well have you performed your part for the board?</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td><strong>S&gt;F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. How well have you performed your part in UF campaign?</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. How much influence do your opinions have on UF board?</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td><strong>C&gt;F</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work in behalf of the Fund. A successful man enjoys his work, an unsuccessful one feels his work is drudgery. Do people view efforts for an organization in these contrasting ways when it is the organization that is succeeding or failing? How hard do these men feel they work for the Fund?

We measured their effort, as they saw it, by asking how much work they have put into activities of the Fund. The responses in Table 11 suggest that board members feel they work harder for a failing Fund than they do for a succeeding one. Men in failing Funds, more than those in successful ones, believe they put in more time during the weeks of the campaign (Q.12) and work harder than their colleagues do (Q.13). Those on failing boards, furthermore, believe that their personal efforts will contribute more to the success of the coming campaign than do members of successful boards (Q.24). There are no differences, however,
Table 11
Effort Devoted to United Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Effort Devoted to United Fund</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Peripheral Central Peripheral &amp; differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Hours devoted to work for UF (non-campaign weeks)(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Hours devoted to work for UF during campaign weeks(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Do you put in more or less time than average member of the board?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Do you put in more or less time than you should?(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>How important will your efforts be in coming campaigns?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Average number hours extrapolated from rating made by respondent
\(^b\) Scale: 2=a bit less, 3=about the right amount, 4=a bit more

Comparing successful and failing towns, in the number of hours members state they devote to work on the board during non-campaign weeks (about four hours a week, Q.11) or in their belief that they put in about the right amount of time for the UF (Q.14).

The major theme then is that those on failing boards claim they devote more time to the Fund than do those on successful boards, especially during the weeks of the campaign. Is their reported effort an indication of more involvement, less enjoyment, unwillingness to let others do it,
or a lack of volunteers so that members of the board must overwork themselves? Or, do they appear to work harder than men in successful Funds simply because the latter are so confident that they will succeed without any great effort?

Respondents in central positions on the board should differ from those with peripheral positions in their commitment to the purpose of the organization and thus central persons should work harder than peripherals. We see in Table 11 that central persons believe that their efforts will contribute more to the success of the campaign, than do peripheral members (Q.24). Within failing towns the central members claim to put in more hours on the campaign than do peripheral members (Q.12). Clearly the hardest working board member is a central person in a failing Fund, in the fall.

Several other findings are relevant to the motivation of members. We are interested in the degree that the men differ in their disposition to seek achievement of success on individual tasks. This is an enduring personal characteristic called a need for achievement. It is known that some people have this need more strongly than do others. A set of items at the end of the questionnaire constituted a brief scale to measure this characteristic (Q.48m through 48r). The scores on the scale are worthy of notice. Directors in the successful-central condition have the highest scores, next highest are those in the failure-peripheral condition, the men in the failure-central condition followed, and finally those in the successful-peripheral set. Men with greater need for achievement are often designated as strivers. It is interesting then that the persons with the highest scores on this attribute occupy central roles in the more successful towns.
A measurement was also made of the members' tendency to avoid the unfavorable consequences of failure (Q.48g through 48i) and of their sense of social responsibility (Q.48a through 48f). Little was learned from these queries. The respondents did not have much fear of failure and all obtained very high scores in social responsibility.

In summary, the men on the boards in these separate types of towns have developed quite different views about their organizations. Respondents in failing Funds are less than enthusiastic about their unit and the work it must do. Compared to persons in successful communities, the members in failure boards think goal attainment is less important, are more ready to avoid the selection of a goal, think their organization has performed poorly, derive less benefit from serving on the board, judge their personal work unfavorably, and see themselves as working harder than their colleagues.

**Matters which Determine the Success or Failure of United Fund Campaigns**

Successful achievement by an organization requires coordination of effort among many persons; it also requires that the organization have little interference from persons or agencies in its environment. A United Fund has a complicated set of relationships among the various parts that make it go and among the citizens who help it to achieve or who depend upon its achievement.

In the previous study of goal setting in United Funds, and in the present study, we have noted that communities with many failed campaigns solicited less money per capita than those with many successful campaigns, even though the towns were similar in size and available wealth.
Our understanding of the differences between successful and unsuccessful Funds may be increased if we enquire from board members what they believe are sources of better and poorer levels of performance.

First, what factors are seen as contributory to success? The question: If, or when, your local fund has a successful campaign and attains the official goal, how important would each of the following factors be in determining the successful outcome of the campaign? (Q.44). A set of alternatives was provided, listed in Table 12, and the respondent was requested to indicate whether each condition was important or not.

The average ratings in Table 12 are strikingly high for every one of the reasons given respondents to consider. It appears therefore that virtually all of them are of more than minor importance. Some were more salient than others. The three most important reasons for a successful campaign among all respondents were: the campaign is well organized, the campaign chairman provides effective leadership, and the Executive Director provides effective leadership.

The responses of members in successful towns and those in failing towns were significantly different in only one instance. Those in failing communities believe that the campaign will be successful if citizens have a strong interest in the agencies supported by the UF. Men occupying central position, more than those in peripheral posts, placed greatest weight on the importance of having influential persons in the community behind the campaign and on the effectiveness of the Executive Director.
Table 12

Average Ratings of Reasons for Success in UF Campaigns (Scale: 1=not at all important, 3=somewhat important, 5=extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Ave. all respondents</th>
<th>Succeeded</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44e. Campaign well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44g. Campaign chmn. is effective leader</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44f. Exec. Dir. is effective leader</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44c. Citizens interested in UF agencies</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44a. Goal is reasonable</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44i. Influential citizens approve campaign</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44d. Budget needs of agencies well publicized</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44b. People have money to give fair share</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand means</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Average Rating of Reasons for Failure in UF Campaigns (Scale: 1=not at all important, 3=somewhat important, 5=extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Ave. all respondents</th>
<th>Succeeded Central</th>
<th>Peripheral Central</th>
<th>Failed Central</th>
<th>Peripheral</th>
<th>Reliable differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45e. Campaign not well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45f. Campaign chairman not effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45g. Exec. Dir. not effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45c. Citizens not interested in agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45l. Lack volunteers</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>F&gt;S** PP&gt;SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45d. Agency needs not well publicized</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45i. Influential citizens disapprove campaign</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>C&gt;P*** SC&gt;SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45j. Citizens resist pressures to give to UF</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>P&gt;C** PP&gt;PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45a. Goal too high</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>SP&gt;FP*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45b. People do not have enough money</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand means: 3.71 4.00 3.94 3.91 4.01
In a contrasting query the respondents were asked: If, or when, your local Fund does not raise enough money to reach the campaign goal, how important would each of the following factors be in determining the unsuccessful outcome of the campaign? (Q.45). Again a set of items was provided, as shown in Table 13, and the men were to check the importance they attributed to each.

As in Table 12, the average responses for these items is reasonably high, suggesting that most of them have some significance in causing an unsuccessful campaign. The same three factors were believed to contribute to a failure as already mentioned concerning a success.

It is noteworthy that members on failure boards, more than those on success boards, blame lack of volunteers for a failure. Central persons more than peripheral ones, indicate that the approval of important citizens is important while peripheral persons, more than central ones, see the citizens' rejections of pressure to give to the UF as a contributing cause of failure.

The two questions posed in Tables 12 and 13 were asked in a parallel fashion on the supposition that persons in failing and succeeding towns might have different degrees of sensitivity to these various causes of success and failure. It is evident from the results that this supposition was not wholly correct and that only minor differences occurred in the responses of board members with different histories of success. The amount of weight placed on the same item as a contributor to success or failure, however, may differ. Accordingly, the mean ratings of the responses for each item in Q.45 (Table 13) were subtracted from the mean ratings of the same item in Q.44 (Table 12). When this was done several interesting results appeared.
(a) The reasonableness of the goal is cited as a source of success more often than the unreasonableness of the goal is cited as a source of failure. In successful towns, central persons make this distinction more strongly than peripheral ones. In failing towns, peripheral persons believe this more strongly than central ones (*).

(b) The amount of money citizens have available is cited as a source of success more often than it is cited as a source of failure. Board members in failing towns believe this more strongly than those in successful towns (*).

(c) The interest of local citizens in the UF agencies is cited as a source of success more than a source of failure. In failing Funds central board members believe this more strongly than peripheral members (*).

We conclude that board members, when thinking about sources of success in campaigns, become more alert to the difficulty of the goal and the interest and ability of citizens to contribute enough to attain that goal--these matters are less salient when thinking about sources of failure in campaigns.

One other pair of questions requires only brief mention. The board members were asked how effective certain actions might be in ensuring that the next campaign attains its goal (Q.46) and how difficult these actions might be (Q.47). The most effective action, by far, was to obtain more volunteers and this was seen as not very difficult to do, except that those in failing towns perceived it to be harder to do than did those in successful towns. The most difficult action was to hire more staff and this was seen as likely to be least effective.
IV. Summary

We have examined in this study the views of United Fund board members toward goal setting and goal achievement in their organizations. Half of the respondents were selected from Funds who had consistent records of failure during the past four years, the other half from Funds with wholly successful records during that same time. Within each of the failing and succeeding Funds, half of the respondents were central members of their boards and half were peripheral members. Before we review the ways in which board members of these different types respond, we consider several topics on which respondents had strong beliefs but the success of the Fund or position on the board had no important contrasting effects.

General Results, Regardless of Type of Fund or Board Member

A successful campaign is satisfying to board members primarily because a success makes it possible for local agencies to have the funds they need for their programs. The second ranking source of satisfaction is in the effective performance of the UF as an organization. Least often, they mention, success provides rewards for themselves as individuals.

Membership on the board is attractive to participants; they like the persons with whom they associate there and they say they derive benefits from serving on the board. There is little resistance against raising goals, regardless of the town's past history of success or failure, but there is strong resistance against lowering goals.
Why does this resistance arise? They believe it occurs primarily because the needs of the agencies in the community would not be met and separate agencies might run their own financial campaigns if the goals were lowered. Respondents also believe that a higher goal stimulates contributors to give larger amounts.

What makes a success possible? More than anything else these respondents think it depends upon a well organized campaign efficiently led by the chairman and Executive Director of the Fund. The reasonableness of the goal and interest of the citizens are described as more salient in achieving a successful outcome than in avoiding a failure.

Reactions to Success and Failure

The significant differences in the responses of board members in successful and unsuccessful Funds are best summarized by returning to the predictions listed in early pages of this report, citing the evidence relevant to each. We ignore for the moment whether the responses are made by a central or by a peripheral person.

1. Board members in both successful and unsuccessful Funds believe that it is most important to meet the social welfare needs of the community by providing adequate financing for local agencies.

As observed a moment ago, respondents state that meeting the needs of the community is (or would be) their most important source of satisfaction following a successful campaign. This appears to be the major reason for their work in the Fund and members of successful and failing Funds do not differ in this respect.

2. Assuming that the goal of a campaign is an accurate indication of the budgetary needs in these agencies, failing Funds, by definition, are not meeting these needs.
Even though their goals are set at an easier level during the four years studied, failing Funds have taken in less money per capita and have solicited a smaller proportion of the official campaign goal than succeeding Funds.

3. Board members in failing Funds react to their lack of success by setting higher goals (or by staying with higher goals) than are warranted by their prior levels of performance. This larger discrepancy between their past levels of performance and their future goals is created by several conditions.

Despite their low intake in their campaigns, they dislike lowering the goal to a level more closely approximating their prior levels of performance and are unwilling to support any proposal to that effect. Those in failing Funds believe that the goal should not be lowered because the needs of the community would not then be met; they also see less value in lowering the goal after a failed campaign than do those in successful Funds and more strongly believe that it would be difficult to do so.

4. Continued failures generate consequences for the motivation and morale of board members which are unlike those among board members in successful Funds.

Members of failing Funds think attainment of the goal is less important than do members of succeeding Funds, they work primarily to beat last year's level of performance rather than to attain the goal, and they would like to do away with goals altogether. Respondents in failing towns, compared to those in succeeding ones, are less confident that they can attain the goal for the 1968 campaign.
The members of failing boards show signs of poor morale. They rate their organization low, rate their own personal contribution low, blame the campaign workers rather than the board for a poor campaign, blame lack of volunteers as the cause of a poor campaign, and believe they work harder than others in their Fund.

5. The foregoing characteristics contribute to a poorer performance in towns with histories of failure: given their tendency to stick with higher goals, this performance creates a strong likelihood of continued failure.

The majority of respondents believe that an unsuccessful campaign occurs because it was poorly organized and poorly led. In the failing Funds the majority of respondents (those who provided answers summarized above) say that they have leadership roles in the current campaign.

Comment on the consequences of success and failure. The central issue in failing Funds, as we noted early in this report, is the large discrepancy between the past level of performance and the level of the future campaign goal. In part, this discrepancy is a more or less rational reaction to a poor campaign in the prior year--based on a belief that past losses to the budgets of the agencies must be recouped. But such an explanation does not account for the repeated choice of a goal that is often impossibly difficult in the light of the Fund's past level of performance. Several different causes for this large discrepancy may have been operating.

(a) Board members in failing Funds, compared to those in successful ones, tend to be more vulnerable to social influence from outside their organization. Thus, the needs of the agencies, which they have failed
to meet in some degree, become more important to those in failing Funds than to those in succeeding ones. The results of laboratory experiments support this view: groups that fail to attain their goal are more readily influenced by external agents to set higher (or easier) goals than are groups that successfully attain their goal.

(b) Boards in failing Funds are more concerned to avoid the negative consequences of another failure such as embarrassment, loss of pride, or disapproval, than to select a challenging level of performance that is likely to be attainable. Their choice of unreasonably difficult goals means that they have probably paid much attention to the favorable consequences of successfully attaining a very high goal but have neglected to estimate carefully their chances that the goal will be attained.

(c) The higher goal, members of the board apparently believe, will solicit larger contributions from givers. The results demonstrate that this belief is not wholly valid. A goal can be too difficult. Thus, the towns with very difficult goals (for them) had less success and poorer performance than towns with realistic goals.

Effects of Central and Peripheral Position on the Board

A person with a more central position, we have assumed, becomes aware that he is more responsible for the outcome of the Fund's work. The results suggest that the occupants of central and peripheral positions view many aspects of their organizations quite differently. Let us first review the responses of central and peripheral board members regardless of whether they are in successful or unsuccessful towns; then, turn to the views of centrals and peripherals who are on the boards of successful Funds, and of failing Funds.
Central and peripheral board members. Central board members, more than peripheral members, are satisfied when their Fund achieves its campaign goal because this achievement, they say, ensures that needs of the community will be met and because the organization has performed effectively in doing so. The occupants of central positions display greater confidence in the future of the Fund than those in less responsible posts: they predict that the Fund will solicit as much as it sets out to obtain and they believe that under ideal conditions it could greatly exceed the official goal.

None of the Board members, we have seen, like to lower the campaign goal from one year to the next, however, centrals offer reasons for their opposition which are not given by peripherals. Centrals do not wish to lower the goal since this would be running away from a challenge and because the supporters of the local agencies would press the Fund for a higher goal.

Centrals, compared to peripherals, believe they obtain greater benefit from working for the Fund, yet they are less satisfied with the results of the Fund's work under their leadership. They give lower evaluations to the board, to the campaign workers, and to the UF as an organization, and they believe that they work harder than anyone else on the board. They recognize that their influence on the board is high, and that their efforts will be important for the success of the 1968 campaign.

Central members appear to be more sensitive to the sources of influence from outside the Fund. We have just noted that they are aware of social pressures toward a higher goal; they also believe that the support of influential people in the community is important if the Fund
is to have a successful campaign and that lack of such support is a primary cause of a failing campaign.

In summary, the contrasts between central and peripheral members reveal that an officer in the Fund must work within a more complicated mixture of motives, duties, and demands than a marginal member of the board. He is more likely to believe in the purpose of the Fund and in the value of an effective organization. He must be a model of optimism, conscientious effort, and the will to succeed. Yet, he does not allow himself to be easily satisfied and believes that the Fund performs less well than it should. He bears the brunt of blame or pressure put on the Fund by citizens who are not on the board and he must encourage support for the Fund among influential persons whose help is needed.

Central and peripheral members in successful towns. When their Fund has consistently been successful, central board members derive greater satisfaction than peripheral members from the effective operation of their organization. They believe that a campaign goal might be set too high because of a mistake in planning but not because the agencies make unreasonable demands. Centrals recognize that lowering of the campaign goal would arouse social pressures in opposition to such a move and describe it as a way of running away from a challenging task. The central members in succeeding towns derive more benefit from working for the Fund than peripheral members do and are more disposed to obtain satisfaction from successful outcomes of their personal efforts on the board. Centrals more than peripherals in successful Funds believe that the goal must be a reasonable one in order to ensure a successful outcome, that the leadership of the Fund must be effective, and the support of influential citizens in the community must be obtained.
In a successful town then, centrals, more than peripherals, derive greater satisfaction from their effort, and believe that success is assured if the goal is reasonable, the campaign well run, and the support of influential citizens is obtained.

Central and peripheral members in failing towns. When their Fund has had a series of failing campaigns, central and peripherals are sharply different in their views about the proper level of the goal. Centrals say that the goal was set too high because the agencies made unreasonable demands and also that lowering the goals would be too difficult. Centrals, more than peripherals, do not believe that lowering the goal would do much to ensure success anyway; citizens must be interested in supporting the local agencies if the Fund is to have a successful campaign. Central board members, compared to peripheral members, put in more time working for the Fund, devote more time during the campaign, and believe their personal efforts will be more important in determining the success of the 1968 campaign.

Peripheral board members, compared to central ones, are against lowering the goal since this would mean that the needs of the community would not be met. If the goal were lowered, moreover, they believe that the contributors would not give as much. Peripheral persons have greater pride in their organization than central members do and they are more likely to hold that a reasonable goal is what best contributes to success.

To summarize, central members in failing towns believe the goal is placed at a high level because of the pressures on the Fund to put it there; lowering the goal, furthermore, would not ensure success because a success required more interest among the citizens and more sharing of
the work that needs to be done. Central members in failing towns, more than those in succeeding towns are aware of the importance of their position on the board.

Practical Implications

Although this study was not designed to examine the practical problems in the operation of a United Fund or to offer solutions for such problems, several suggestions for ensuring effective operation of a Fund follow from the results.

Boards in towns with several failing campaigns in a sequence need to give as much attention to the selection of an appropriate goal as they do to increasing their income through efficient campaign procedures or effective publicity. When setting a goal, the probability of attaining that goal must be taken into account. The most challenging goal, and thus the one that generates the greatest enthusiasm to attain it, is one that is moderately above the most recent level of income in that community. A goal that is placed at too difficult a level, in reference to prior levels of performance, loses its effectiveness as a challenge.

This study has shown that unreasonably high goals are not taken seriously and lead to poorer performance, rather than to improved performance. Moderately difficult goals (as preferred by successful towns in this study) appear to generate more successes, more income per capita, and bring in a larger proportion of the economic potential in that community. In the 1968 campaigns, among the communities with chronic records of failure, those that broke their losing string and had a successful campaign set goals moderately above the level of income for the prior year; those that failed again had goals placed far above their immediately past level of performance.
A successful campaign that achieves a challenging goal is a Fund's best insurance against becoming caught in a cycle of failure, poor-morale, poor performance, and continued failure. It is clear that board members in successful Funds evaluate their board and their Fund as an organization more favorably, feel more positive toward campaign workers, believe it is easier to recruit volunteer helpers, and do not need to overwork themselves in order to attain their next success.
This is a study of United Fund board members in medium sized cities. It is one of many similar studies made by research teams for The University of Michigan. The main purpose of these studies is to learn how different types of organizations operate, what makes an organization a good one to work for, and why people work for it.

Only sixty-six cities were chosen for this project and only part of the United Fund board members in your town are being asked to complete this questionnaire. In choosing your community (and you) we are seeking to obtain as wide a variety of views as possible. This investigation is being made with the encouragement of the United Community Funds and Councils of America but they have not determined the nature of the study and are not providing financial support. The work is financed by a research grant from the United States Public Health Service. We and the UCFCA hope to learn about aspects of membership on United Fund boards that are not easy to understand without information such as you will provide. We need your cooperation and the success of this study will depend on the information you give us. We need to know your feelings and opinions about your service on the board, what is satisfying and what is not, as well as certain facts about you.

To get this information, we would like you to fill out this questionnaire. It will take about thirty minutes to complete. We will not know your name. Your individual answers will be completely confidential. No one in the United Fund will ever see or know the answers given by you or by any other person, nor will they know what responses are made by people in a given community.

The final value of this study will depend upon the frankness and care with which you answer the questions. There are no right or wrong answers. The main idea is for you to answer the questions the way you really feel--the way things seem to you personally. If you have questions about this form or the purposes of this study, please feel free to write us. We ask that you return the questionnaire by September 10, 1967, before your coming campaign is well along.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.
INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please answer the questions in order.

2. Most questions can be answered by checking (✓) one of the answers provided. If you do not find the exact answer that fits your case, check the one that comes closest to it, but only one.

3. If you wish to write an explanation or comment about an answer, feel free to do so. Make your comments right on the questionnaire.

4. Please use the space on the back of the questionnaire to make as many additional comments and suggestions as you like.

5. When you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the envelope provided and mail it to the Research Center for Group Dynamics, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106.
SOME THINGS ABOUT YOURSELF

The way board members feel about the United Fund may differ because of their length of service with the organization, the kinds of jobs they have filled, and the like. We, therefore, need some background information about you. Let us remind you about the confidential nature of this study. No one in the United Fund will ever see your answers.

Now for the questions

1. What is the total length of time you have been a board member in your local United Fund? (Check one).
   ____ (1) 6 months or less
   ____ (2) Between 6 and 12 mos.
   ____ (3) Between 1 and 2 years
   ____ (4) Between 2 and 3 years
   ____ (5) Between 3 and 5 years
   ____ (6) Over five years

2. What is your sex?
   ____ (1) Male
   ____ (2) Female

3. How old are you? (Check one)
   ____ (1) 25 years or younger
   ____ (2) Between 26 and 30
   ____ (3) Between 31 and 35
   ____ (4) Between 36 and 40
   ____ (5) Between 41 and 45
   ____ (6) Between 46 and 50
   ____ (7) Between 50 and 55
   ____ (8) Over 55 years

4. How much formal education have you had? (Check one.)
   ____ (1) Grade school
   ____ (2) Some high school
   ____ (3) Completed high school
   ____ (4) Some college
   ____ (5) Completed college
   ____ (6) Graduate study
   ____ (7) Received graduate degree

5. What is your occupation? ____________________________

6. Do you presently hold one of the major offices on the UF Board (e.g. Pres., Secy., Treas., etc.)?
   ____ (1) Yes
   ____ (2) No

7. Have you held any such offices on the UF Board in prior years?
   ____ (1) Yes
   ____ (2) No

8. Were you a member of your local UF budget committee when planning for the coming campaign?
   ____ (1) Yes
   ____ (2) No

9. Do you have a leadership role in the solicitation of funds for the campaign just beginning? (e.g. general chairman, division chairman, team captain, etc.)
   ____ (1) Yes
   ____ (2) No

10. Have you filled such a role in prior years?
   ____ (1) Yes
   ____ (2) No
11. What is your best guess about the number of hours you devote on the average to work with the UF during the non-campaign weeks? (Check one.)

(1) Less than 4 hours per week
(2) Between 4 and 8
(3) Between 8 and 12
(4) Between 12 and 16
(5) Between 16 and 20
(6) Over 20 hours per week

12. What is your best guess about the number of hours you devote on the average to work with the UF during the weeks of the campaign? (Check one.)

(1) Less than 4 hours per week
(2) Between 4 and 8
(3) Between 8 and 12
(4) Between 12 and 16
(5) Between 16 and 20
(6) Over 20 hours per week

13. In your opinion, how does this amount of time compare with that of the average member of the Board? (Check one.)

(5) Much more than average
(4) A bit more
(3) About the same
(2) A bit less
(1) Much less than average

14. As you see it, is this amount of time more or less than you should do in the time you have available? (Check one.)

(5) Much more than you should do
(4) A bit more
(3) About the right amount
(2) A bit less
(1) Much less than you should do

YOUR VIEWS ABOUT LOCAL CAMPAIGN GOALS

15. What, as you recall it, is the official goal in dollars for the campaign just beginning in your community? $________

16. How much did your community raise in its last campaign? $________

17. Do you personally feel that your community's official goal for the coming campaign is set at the best possible level?

(1) Yes
(2) No

18. If your answer to Question 17 was NO, what goal in dollars do you personally think your community should have for the campaign just beginning? $________

19. What is your most realistic estimate of how much the community will actually raise in the coming campaign? $________

20. If the campaign were run as well as possible, what is the largest amount you think could possibly be raised in your community? $________

21. All things considered, in your private judgment, have your community's goals in the last few years tended to be too high or too low? (Check one.)

(5) Much too high
(4) A bit too high
(3) About right
(2) A bit too low
(1) Much too low
22. All in all, how important is it that your local UF campaign raise enough to attain its goal? (Check one.)
   (1) Not at all important  
   (2) Not very important  
   (3) Moderately important  
   (4) Quite important  
   (5) Extremely important

23. In your view, how important is it that your local fund attain a goal which compares well with similar communities? (Check one.)
   (1) Not at all important  
   (2) Not very important  
   (3) Moderately important  
   (4) Quite important  
   (5) Extremely important

24. How important do you feel your own personal efforts will be in determining the success of the campaign just beginning in your community? (Check one.)
   (1) Not at all important  
   (2) Not very important  
   (3) Moderately important  
   (4) Quite important  
   (5) Extremely important

25. For the coming campaign, which of the following are you likely to use in judging whether it was a success? (Check one.)
   (1) The amount raised is more than the official goal  
   (2) The amount raised is more than the amount raised last year (regardless of whether it attains the official goal)  
   (3) The amount raised is more than the goal you privately prefer the community to have

26. Is there a dollar goal for some division of the campaign whose successful attainment means more to you than attainment of the community-wide goal? (Check one.)
   (1) Yes  
   (2) No

27. If your answer to Question 26 is YES, what is the name of the unit with this goal? __________________________

28. If your answer to Question 26 is YES, how well on the average has that goal been achieved? (Check one.)
   (3) Better than the community campaign  
   (2) About the same as community  
   (1) Worse than community campaign

29. While you have been a member of the UF Board has the official goal been set at a level which the campaign did not attain? (Check one.)
   (1) Yes  
   (2) No

30. If your answer to Question 29 is YES, in what year was the most recent failing campaign? (Please give year.) ___________
31. If your answer to Question 29 is YES, concerning the most recent failing campaign, why was the goal set too high? What reasons determined where the goal was set? If you are not sure, your best judgment will be useful.

(Which one box for each of the reasons listed below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Certainly not a reason</th>
<th>Probably not a reason</th>
<th>Possibly a reason</th>
<th>A likely reason</th>
<th>A very likely reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Agencies supported by UF needed good increases in their budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supported agencies made unreasonably high demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Budget committee was not careful enough in recommending a campaign goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A very difficult goal, we hoped, would stimulate more giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. We wished to be sure that we would, at the least, beat the previous year's performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. We mistakenly thought the goal was an attainable one, not too high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Failure to reach a high goal is less embarrassing than failure to reach an easy goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. We usually set a goal which is a fixed percent above the amount raised in the last year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. We hoped that we would convince citizens, through publicity, that we needed to reach a high goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Board failed to seek information on state of local economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Others (write in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_______________________________
32. Suppose for the moment that your campaign this fall does not attain the official community goal, and suppose that a proposal is made next year to set a lower goal than the one your community failed to reach this fall, would you be inclined to support this proposal to lower next year's goal? (Check one.)

____ (5) I almost certainly would
____ (4) I probably would
____ (3) There is little chance I would
____ (2) I probably would not
____ (1) I almost certainly would not

33. If your answer to Question 32 immediately above was (1), (2), or (3), how important might each of the following reasons be for your opposition to lowering of the goal? (Check one box for each of the reasons listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for your opposition to lowering of goal</th>
<th>Not at all important (1)</th>
<th>Not very important (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat important (3)</th>
<th>Very important (4)</th>
<th>Extremely important (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lowering the goal might make it necessary for separate agencies to solicit own funds</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Supporters of agencies would exert extreme pressures on Board for higher goal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. It would be unpleasant to decide which agency budgets to cut</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. We would be in position of avoiding the challenge of a difficult task</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Citizens of community would disapprove of Board for lowering goal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. We would not be trying to meet the needs of the community</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. It is time-consuming to reassess agency budgets so that they can be cut</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Contributors would reduce their gifts if the goal were lowered</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Others (please describe)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. If it happened that the campaign goal was not attained this fall, which of the following do you think would best describe your view for next year? (Check one.)

   (1) I would rather set the goal low enough to have a good chance of attaining it.
   (2) I would rather keep the same goal even if we might not be likely to make it again next year.
   (3) I would rather raise the goal some reasonable amount.

ABOUT MEETINGS OF THE BOARD

35. If I think of the members of the UF Board as one group: (Check one.)

   (7) I look forward with enthusiasm to the pleasure of being with them
   (6) I very much enjoy being with them
   (5) I enjoy the time I spend with them
   (4) I enjoy being with them a little
   (3) All in all, being with them is slightly unattractive
   (2) Being with them is not attractive to me
   (1) I find being with them quite disagreeable to me

36. When I think of working with the Board of the United Fund: (Check one.)

   (6) I feel I am receiving a tremendous amount of benefit by working with them
   (5) I feel I am receiving a great deal of benefit
   (4) I feel I am receiving some benefit
   (3) I feel I am receiving little benefit
   (2) I feel I am receiving almost no benefit
   (1) I feel that I am not receiving any benefit at all by working with them

37. As you see it, how much weight or influence do your opinions have in the meetings of the Board? (Check one.)

   (5) A very strong influence
   (4) Much influence
   (3) Some influence
   (2) Little influence
   (1) Very little influence
YOUR EVALUATION OF LOCAL UF ACTIVITIES

38. All things considered, how well do you think your UF Board has performed in the last few years? (Check one.)

   (1) Very poorly
   (2) Not as well as it should
   (3) Adequately
   (4) Reasonably well
   (5) Very well

39. How well do you think your local campaign workers have performed in the last few years? (Check one.)

   (1) Very poorly
   (2) Not as well as they should
   (3) Adequately
   (4) Reasonably well
   (5) Very well

40. All things considered, how well have you personally performed your part for the UF Board? (Check one.)

   (1) Very poorly
   (2) Not as well as I should
   (3) Adequately
   (4) Reasonably well
   (5) Very well

41. How well do you think you personally have performed your part in the solicitation of campaign funds? (Check one.)

   (0) Had no part in the campaign
   (1) Very poorly
   (2) Not as well as I should
   (3) Adequately
   (4) Reasonably well
   (5) Very well

42. In your private judgment, how effective is the UF type of organization in helping your community to meet the needs for social services in your area? (Check one.)

   (1) Not at all effective
   (2) Not very effective
   (3) Somewhat effective
   (4) Very effective
   (5) Extremely effective

43. If, or when, your community raises enough money, reaches its goal, and has a success, what might contribute most to your sense of satisfaction from such an event? (Among the following responses, please place a number (1) beside the one that fits you best, a (2) beside the one that suits you next best, then (3), and so on until you have ranked all five.)

   (a) Personally working hard on my part to help achieve the community goal
   (b) The community will approve of my efforts
   (c) The welfare needs of the community can be met
   (d) The community will be approved for doing a good job
   (e) Knowing that our United Fund is a successful organization
Each town is different from other communities, thus unique conditions contribute to the success or failure of each local campaign. We wish to know what you believe has helped or hindered your local Fund—even if you are not sure, your best judgment will be useful.

44. If, or when, your local Fund has a successful campaign and attains the official goal, how important would each of the following factors be in determining the successful outcome of the campaign? (Check one box for each of the listed reasons.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for success</th>
<th>Not at all important (1)</th>
<th>Not very important (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat important (3)</th>
<th>Very important (4)</th>
<th>Extremely important (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The goal is a reasonable one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. People have enough money to give their fair share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Local citizens have a strong interest in agencies supported by the UF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The financial needs of the supported agencies are well publicized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The financial campaign is well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The Executive Director provides effective leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The campaign chairman provides effective leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Certain campaign divisions came through for us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Influential people in the community approve of the campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Others (please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45. If, or when, your local Fund does not raise enough money to reach the campaign goal, how important would each of the following factors be in determining the unsuccessful outcome of the campaign? (Check one box for each of the listed reasons.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for failure</th>
<th>Not at all important (1)</th>
<th>Not very important (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat important (3)</th>
<th>Very important (4)</th>
<th>Extremely important (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The goal is too high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. People do not have enough money to give their fair share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Local citizens have little interest in agencies supported by UF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The financial needs of the supported agencies are not well publicized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The campaign is not well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The campaign chairman does not provide effective leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The Executive Director does not provide effective leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Certain campaign divisions fall down on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Influential people in the community do not approve of the campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Citizens are rejecting pressures to give to the UF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Campaign workers are discouraged by failures in prior years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Too few volunteers worked on campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Agencies not supported by UF compete with UF for funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Others (please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. Suppose for the moment that your campaign held this fall (in 1967) does not attain the official community goal and your Board discusses what should be done in next year's campaign (to be held in 1968) in order to ensure that it will be a success. Each of the following plans is given serious consideration by the Board. How effective do you think each plan would be in ensuring that your next campaign attains its goal? (Check one box for each of the planned actions below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned actions to ensure success</th>
<th>Not at all effective</th>
<th>Not very effective</th>
<th>Some-what effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lower the goal in 1968 to about the level that was collected in 1967</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the remaining plans assume that the goal in 1968 is as high as it was in 1967, or higher

b. Try different techniques for publicity | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |

c. Keep publicity methods generally the same, but spend more on them | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |

d. Revise the plan for organization of campaign | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |

e. Hire more paid staff time | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |

f. Recruit more volunteers for helping with campaign | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |

g. Other (please describe) | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |
47. Please rate the same set of possible actions once more. This time: Regardless of their effectiveness, how difficult do you think it would be for your Board to carry out each of these plans of action? (Check one box for each of the planned actions below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned actions to ensure success</th>
<th>Not at all difficult (1)</th>
<th>Not very difficult (2)</th>
<th>Some-what difficult (3)</th>
<th>Very difficult (4)</th>
<th>Extremely difficult (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lower the goal in 1968 to about the level that was collected in 1967</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Try different techniques for publicity</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Keep publicity methods generally the same but spend more money on them</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Revise the plan for organization of campaign</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Hire more paid staff time</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Recruit more volunteers for helping with campaign</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (please describe)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT YOURSELF

48. Finally, we wish to know something about the preferences of persons who compose the Boards for the UF and how they view certain personal characteristics. Following are a series of statements which can be used to refer to an individual's behavior, his preferences, his attitudes, and the like. In the blank beside each statement place the number from the 5-point scale below which seems most appropriate for you.

1 - This statement does not at all describe me; it does not at all apply to me
2 - This statement describes me a little; it applies to me a little
3 - This statement describes me somewhat; it applies to me somewhat
4 - This statement describes me very much; it applies to me very much
5 - This statement describes me almost perfectly; it applies to me almost perfectly

a. When I work on a committee, I usually let other people do most of the planning.
b. I am often late for UF Board meetings.
c. I am the kind of person that people can count on.
d. I believe it is more important to work for the good of any committee one is on than to work for your own good.
e. I believe every person should give some of his own time for the good of his own town or city.
f. I usually volunteer for special projects when I am a member of a voluntary organization.
g. When I accept an assignment, I stick to it even if things I like to do better come along.
h. I find it is difficult to do a good job when I am working under the pressure of time.
i. Even the least important aspects of a job can become major worries for me when I am strongly concerned with doing it well.
j. I feel greatly relieved when I do something well after I had expected it to turn out poorly.
k. At times I become so worried about an important task that it tends to hinder my effectiveness in performing it.
l. During the UF financial campaign I sometimes lose sleep because of worry.
m. When facing a tough problem which needs to be solved soon, I tend to keep putting it off to the last moment.
n. I prefer a job which is important and in which there is a 50-50 chance of failure rather than a job which is important but not as difficult.
o. I am not at all discouraged by a failure to achieve an important goal if there is an opportunity to try for it again.

p. I feel it is important to do my work well even if it means not getting along with my coworkers.

q. When planning a new project, I prefer to plan in terms of long range goals before developing specific programs of action.

r. If I fail to achieve a specific goal which is important for long term objectives, I prefer to take up other important concerns rather than to try for the same goal again.

s. I am more attracted to a task in which success is uncertain than I am to a task in which I am certain of success.

t. I think it would be good if, somehow, the UF could work toward meeting needs in the community without setting official campaign goals at all.

Please add any other remarks you wish to make about your service on the United Fund Board.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP