



This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

DOGMATISM AND AUTHORITARIANISM IN THE TRANSFORMATION
OF INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT FACILITATORS

presented by

Christina K.W. Lee

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Department of
Educational Administration

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Fred W. Ward". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "F" and "W".

Major professor

Date April 10, 1987



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

FEB 03 1994

**DOGMATISM AND AUTHORITARIANISM IN THE TRANSFORMATION
OF INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT FACILITATORS**

By

Christina K.W. Lee

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to

Michigan State University

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1987

4932031

ABSTRACT

DOGMATISM AND AUTHORITARIANISM IN THE TRANSFORMATION OF INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT FACILITATORS

By

Christina K.W. Lee

In the field of community development, little is known about how intercultural development facilitators became more effective. The study describes, in a context of dogmatism and authoritarian personality traits, the patterns of change and significant experiences that made the facilitators more effective. The areas of focus are a facilitator's: 1) development interpretation, 2) self-perception, 3) interpersonal relationships, and 4) work style.

A case study approach was used to analyze the transformation of a group of 22 intercultural development facilitators from one private development agency. Two standard instruments, the Dogmatism and Directiveness Scales, were used to measure respondents' dogmatism and authoritarianism. The quantitative data was supplemented with qualitative data obtained from non-scheduled interviews.

The "then" and "now" responses were compared to identify significant patterns of change. These results were then analyzed among the four groups and compared as to dogmatic and authoritarian scores.

Findings indicate that 1) the development concept emerges through vicarious experience, especially when cognitive dissonance occurs; 2) development interpretation does not seem to relate to the level of dogmatism and authoritarianism; 3) high dogmatic persons, in time of role transition, tend to depend more on external affirmation for self-identity; 4) low dogmatic persons

tend to have a more flexible view of their role and a greater tolerance for ambiguity; 5) low dogmatic, low authoritarian persons are more likely to value reciprocal interaction; 6) high dogmatic, high authoritarian persons, with a negative self-perception, tend to interact with others in a linear fashion and in a dominating work style; 7) low dogmatic, low authoritarian persons with a positive view toward others, tend to be reciprocal in their relationships and work style; 8) low dogmatic, authoritarian persons tend to internalize problems which leads them to change. High dogmatic, high authoritarian persons tend to externalize problems, thus inhibit change; 9) Cognitive dissonance, witnessing or observing, personal reflection, and spiritual journey are factors likely to lead to positive change; 10) Team work, positive relationships; newly acquired facilitative skills are factors likely to produce an interactive and facilitative work style.

These findings could help a development agency recruit, train, and assign development facilitators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would never have come to be completed without the unfailing guidance and wisdom of the untiring support of many people in this phase of my life. I wish to express appreciation to Dr. Ted Ward, for his insight and guidance in the research; to my committee members, Dr. Gloria Kielbaso, Dr. Richard McCleod, and Dr. Frank Fear for their encouragement and support. No words can express my deepest thanks to Frank for his enthusiastic support, help, and advice in facilitating the writing. He did far more than anyone can expect from a committee member.

My thanks go to Margaret and Bryant Truman for their unfailing friendship over the years, especially to Bryant for his steadfast assistance in all phases of this work. Special thanks also go to my Filipino friend, Rudi, for his timely assistance in data analysis.

I am indebted to Bryant Myers, Reda Hanna, and to my organization for their support that make the research possible.

I am especially grateful to my family members in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Malaysia for their love, patience, and understanding. To Nathan and Sam Sam who have contributed in many special ways I express my thanks.

Finally, it is to all the development facilitators whom I interviewed that I owe more than can be put into words. They had opened up their lives, and been honest with some of the joy and pains of their "transformations," an experience that I personally can identify with. I thank God for such an experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
 CHAPTER	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Research Questions	5
The Concept of Dogmatism	5
The Concept of Authoritarianism	6
Theoretical Framework of the Study	7
Factors Relating to the Effectiveness of Development Facilitators	10
Research Procedures	13
Importance of the Study	14
Assumptions	15
Delimitations	16
Definition of Terms	17
Organization of the Study	18
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	20
The Paradigm Shift in Development and the Role of Education	21
Factors Attributing to Development Facilitator Effectiveness	25
Measurement of Dogmatism and Authoritarianism	35
Summary	42
III. THE RESEARCH CONTEXT	43
Private Voluntary Agencies	43
Historical Background of The Agency	45
The Agency's Philosophy	46
Objectives of The Agency	47
Agency's Organizational Structure	47
Change in The Agency's Structure	49
Projects	49

IV.	METHODOLOGY	54
	Focus of the Research	54
	The Population and the Sample	56
	Instrumentation	58
	Data Gathering Procedures	66
	Approach to Data Analysis	70
	Summary	74
V.	FINDINGS	75
	Research Questions	75
	Profile of Respondents	77
	Respondents' Dogmatic & Authoritarian Scores	82
	Relationship of Respondents' Demographic Characteristics and Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores	83
	Transitional Patterns	85
	Possible Factors Relating to the Transition	111
	Summary of Findings	118
	Summary	124
VI.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	125
	Purpose of the Study	125
	Conclusions	127
	Recommendations for Practice	136
	Research Limitations	141
	Recommendations for Future Research	142
	SUMMARY	144
APPENDICES		
	Appendix A: Interview Guide	145
	Appendix B: Dogmatism Scale	146
	Appendix C: Directiveness Scale	149
	Appendix D: Interview Summary Form	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY		153

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 3.1	Types of Projects Funded by The Agency as of 1987	49
Table 4.1	Respondents' Previous & Current Positions by Work Area	59
Table 5.1	Respondents' Sex, Age, Nationalities by Work Area	78
Table 5.2	Respondents' Educational Level, Areas of Studies by Work Area	79
Table 5.3	Respondents' Development & Cross-cultural Experiences by Work Area	80
Table 5.4	Respondents' Years in Agency by Work Area	81
Table 5.5	Respondents' Years in Previous & Current Position by Work Area	81
Table 5.6	Respondents' Median, Low & High Scores, & Standard Deviations by Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores	82
Table 5.7	Respondents' Nationalities, Development & Cross- Cultural Experiences by Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores	83
Table 5.8	Respondents' Development Experience by Dogmatic/ Authoritarian Scores	84
Table 5.9	Respondents' Cross-Cultural Experience by Dogmatic/ Authoritarian Scores	85
Table 5.10	When did the First Notion of Development occur?	86
Table 5.11	What Triggered that Development Consciousness to happen?	89
Table 5.12	Comparison among Responses on Process, Outcome of Change, & Agent's Role with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then & Now	93
Table 5.13	Comparison among Responses on Sense of Value, Sense of Identity, & View Toward Work Role with Dogmatic/ Authoritarian Scores in Then & Now	97
Table 5.14	Comparison among Responses on View Toward Others, & Interaction Mode with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then & Now	103

Table 5.15	Comparison Between Respondents' Participatory Behavior during Conference with their Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then & Now	106
Table 5.16	Relationship between Respondents' Participatory Behavior during Conference & their Current Interaction Mode	107
Table 5.17	Comparison among Responses on Work Behavior with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then & Now	108
Table 5.18	Relationship Between Respondents' Current Interaction Mode & Operating Mode	110
Table 5.19	Relationship Between Respondents' Participatory Behavior & their Current Operating Mode	110
Table 5.20	Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Development Interpretation	112
Table 5.21	Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Self-Perception	114
Table 5.22	Possible Factors Relating to the Negative Shift in Self-Perception	115
Table 5.23	Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Interpersonal Relationship	116
Table 5.24	Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Work Style	118

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
FIGURE 2.1 Truman's Conceptualization of the Development Paradigm Shift	23
FIGURE 3.1 The Functions of Different Offices in Agency Before and After the Major Re-organization	50

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Much literature and research has been devoted to studying the effectiveness of development facilitators, especially those who come from one culture to assist people in a different culture in the development process (Byrnes, 1963; Biddle & Biddle, 1965; Etling, 1974; McGonigal, 1971; Ruben, 1976; Hawes & Kealey, 1981, Broom, 1981). This concern is partly driven by the desire of development agencies to recruit staff with the requisite skills for development work, and also by their need to improve the effectiveness of intercultural change agents through educational and training programs.

Yet development effectiveness is a normative concept which varies with that of the development agency as well as with the particular development facilitator. Since the early 1970s, development concerns have placed greater emphasis on self-reliance, participation of the people, and quality of life. The intercultural development facilitator, one who travels into new and often distant cultures, has been challenged to bring about a variety of changes in individual and group behavior including attitudes, social values, and the ability to respond to the many problems in life. Effectiveness is no longer just a combination of knowledge and skills acquired by the development facilitator. Personality and attitude also become critical to stimulate or discourage change (Fessler, 1976:32).

The attitudes or qualities cited most often in community development, adult education, and cross-cultural communication literature are closely

related to two exceptionally important aspects of effective development facilitators: dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Dogmatism refers to the degree of rigidity with which persons can receive, evaluate, and act upon the information they are receiving. A high dogmatic (D) person tends to be close-minded and rigid in thinking, while a low dogmatic (d) person tends to be open-minded and more flexible (Rokeach, 1960).

Authoritarianism refers to the degree a person imposes his own will upon others, and at the same time, is submissive to positive authority (Ray, 1971).

Broom (1981) highlights the importance of these two factors in facilitating interpersonal relationships and cross-cultural communication:

It is suggested that open-mindedness and non-evaluativeness serve as facilitating attitudes in interpersonal communication which takes place in a matrix of difference. These attitudes communicate a respect for differing experiences and perspectives, indicating a flexibility and willingness to consider new experience. Listeners are invited to share and respond emphatically, seeking each other's point of view rather than defending their own (p.219).

Etling (1974) conducted research among a group of experienced development facilitators in Ecuadorian villages to determine the characteristics of effective development facilitators in development education. In addition to the necessary knowledge and skills that were identified, he generated a list of critical qualities of effective development facilitators. These qualities are, in ranked-order: dynamism and openness; flexibility and creativity; an independent, yet cooperative character; sensitiveness, considerateness and openness to people from different backgrounds; and a belief in people.

Dewey (1938) and Knowles (1975), leaders in the field of education, claim that an elimination of authoritarian behavior and rigidity of mind is needed if an educator is to induce change in people, especially adults. This concept has received extensive support from other writers and educators, including Rogers (1962,1983), Freire (1973), and Kidd (1959). Rogers (1983) describes the crucial traits of the effective adult educator as genuineness, valuing another's point of view, acceptance, trust, and empathetic understanding.

The salient qualities that are related to levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism, however, are neither totally innate nor are they acquired through training alone. Rather, they sometimes are acquired through the processes of socialization, acculturation, and cognitive and affective development (Andoro et al. 1950; Rokeach,1960). In short, the values, beliefs and attitudes that determine the intercultural development facilitator's effectiveness are shaped, in part, by one's past experiences in the process of "mini-transformations" (Kindervatter, 1978).

So far, very little has been written about how these transformations take place. Numerous questions could be asked to understand the transition process better. What kind of transition has a development facilitator gone through to become where they are now? What are the patterns of transition that intensify or reduce the effects of relevant personality traits, such as dogmatism and authoritarianism? In other words, what are the factors that positively or negatively contribute to the development facilitator's effectiveness (Smith, 1982; Truman, 1986)? A better understanding of the "mini-transformations" that a facilitator undergoes as he gains experience over time in intercultural change agency

becomes an important avenue to pursue because of its applied relevance to development organizations in terms of training design and development facilitator recruitment.

Throughout the study, when referring to development facilitators or the respondents in general, the pronouns "he" and "him" have been selected. This style is used in order to maintain consistency and ease in reading.

Purpose of the Study

In the relatively new field of community development, little is known about the role changes that various development facilitators are commonly asked to assume. Not many people enter this field understanding the process of development and performing the role of development facilitation with any degree of commonality. Each person enters as unique individuals regardless of background or training. In the process of attempting to understand these required roles, a transformation occurs.

The study helps to understand a portion of the required role changes that development facilitators go through by inquiring into a particular facet of the development process or transformation occurring in the lives of intercultural development facilitators. It identifies the development facilitator's transitional patterns and the significant experiences that influence their effectiveness with regard to dogmatism and authoritarianism. The areas of focus in the study are a facilitator's: 1) development interpretation, 2) self-perception, 3) interpersonal relationships, and 4) work style.

The context of the study is a group of intercultural development facilitators employed by the same development organization. Most of the

development facilitators have been with the organization for more than six years and have served in either North America or developing countries of Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

The uniqueness of the study, although small in the number of respondents is that it focuses on a group of people, who as a group, are all at the same time faced with a role re-definition. Some have already begun the transformation, others have not. While the transformation is occurring, the study particularly examines dogmatism and authoritarianism in order to determine to what extent they may be considered as indices of the transformation process itself.

Research Questions

In an attempt to explore the transitional patterns and the factors that influence the effectiveness of the intercultural development facilitator, two major research questions are considered in the study:

1. What are the patterns of transition that are evident in intercultural development facilitators in relationship to their levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism?
2. What significant factors seem to positively and negatively affect the transition?

The Concept of Dogmatism

Dogmatism, as defined by Rokeach (1960:48) is a "personality variable which governs the individual's receptivity to ideas, people and places." According to Rokeach, dogmatism is the structure of the person's belief system as to the manner in which various beliefs are interrelated within the total belief system. The openness of a person's belief system depends on:

the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside (p.57).

According to Rokeach, a low dogmatic (d) person (open-minded), is more empathetic and holds a more positive regard for others. He is highly receptive to new ideas, and has high tolerance for ambiguity. A high dogmatic (D) person (close-minded), as defined by Rokeach and other research, is one who tends to be rigid, is less willing to compromise, and views new information as threatening. He is intolerant of ambiguity, and is reluctant to change everyday beliefs.

The Concept of Authoritarianism

Various research on authoritarianism, since Adorno et al. (1950) The Authoritarian Personality, demonstrates the continuing debate regarding the meaning of the word, "authoritarianism". Some interpret authoritarianism as a cognitive, or an interpersonal style, while others view it simply as an attitude (Ray, 1980). The study uses Ray's concept of authoritarianism, which is used in a three-dimensional way to describe persons who: 1) have a positive attitude toward authority and view a leader as a guide and director rather than as an executive of democratic decisions; 2) approve of institutions and practices with a strong exercise of authority; and 3) have a preference for regulation (Ray, 1971).

A high authoritarian (A) person, as defined by Ray, is strongly in favor of the exercise of authority. He tends to be dominant and aggressive; imposes his own self upon others, and at the same time, is submissive to direction from positive authority. A low authoritarian (a) person is independent, but cooperative, and values participatory behavior.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

The concept of change is inherent in learning. The process of learning implies a change in attitude or behavior (Crow & Crow, 1963). The change process is like a journey through which an individual's attitudes and values and behavior are changed through unlearning, modifying, relearning, updating, and replacing (Knowles, 1973; Hart, 1975; Cropley, 1977). Mezirow (1978) describes this journey as "perspective transformation." New learning is not just added to the existing knowledge but, rather, transforms it to bring about a new perspective.

At least four major streams of thought can be identified as helpful in understanding the nature of adult change and learning. These relate to 1) self-concept; 2) past experiences; 3) interaction relative to new experiences and with other individuals; and 4) reflection on the experiences. These four key components in the change process provide the rationale for the research design and were used throughout the data gathering and analysis phases of the study.

Self-Concept

The self, according to most psychologists, is a learned structure. The self opens to change through interaction within the subjective experience of the individual. The self-concept is the organized set of perceptions of the self at a given point in time. Rogers (1951) suggests that only when a feeling or perception about the self or the environment comes at least dimly into a conscious awareness will it influence behavior. Wylie (1974), therefore, believes that the way to predict human behavior is to understand a person's conscious perceptions of the self conditioned by the environment. This assessment of the self-concept must also include an

exploration of the person's feelings and attitudes toward the self in relation to others.

From the socio-psychological point of view, Rokeach, (1960) and Andro et al. (1950) suggest that all attitudinal and behavioral tendencies are learned by the individual as a result of the interaction of biological, social, and general environmental influences. If dogmatism and authoritarianism are learned patterns, then it should be possible to identify the subjective and environmental influences that create or shape such attitudes and behaviors.

Past Experience

An individual's past experience is an integral part of the formation and re-formation of the self-concept. It also structures a person's approach to new experiences. Therefore, past experience can be either an enhancement of new learning, or an unavoidable obstacle (Brundage & Mackeracher, 1980, Smith, 1982). Dewey (1938) suggests a difference between "educative" and "mis-educative" experiences. The former enlarges the capacity of the individual for richer experiences in the future, while the latter arrests, diminishes, or distorts it. Freire (1973) views experience as the most important theoretical element of learning. To him, educational experience should foster the ability to think and act by developing self-awareness through interaction.

Interaction

Learning implies a continual interaction of new experiences with the past, an interaction within self and with the environment. Kidd (1959) suggests that all new experiences are symbolized and organized into some

relationship to the self, as developed from past experience. New experience will be ignored if there is no perceived relationship with the past. It will be rejected or distorted if the experience seems inconsistent with the structure of the self. Dewey (1938), therefore, calls for a continuity of experience for effective change or learning. Learning not only results from experience, but also actively modifies the quality of experiences in the future. For Dewey, interaction and continuity of experience intercept and unite in the learning process. Freire (1973) contends that learning takes place when the individual, through dialogue, is developing self-awareness in relation to the past and to new experiences. The act of dialogue is a form of interaction where learner and educator both respond critically to the environment.

Reflection

Freire, however, carries the concept of experience and interaction even further to suggest that effective learning takes place only when one reflects critically upon the past and the present and becomes conscious of their linkage. He refers to this process of reflection as "concientization". He identifies three levels of consciousness in the change process. Magic, or transitive consciousness, is characterized by a closed self-concept in which a person is conditioned by his vicarious experience and is unable to perceive the new challenge or sees it in a distorted way. This behavior is primarily defensive, and is adaptive only with regard to biological survival needs. When a person emerges to naive consciousness, he begins to be able to visualize and distinguish a past that was previously ambiguous to him. The person may remain at the emergent stage until he

reaches a level of critical consciousness, where his self-awareness is fully developed and leads to behavior change.

At the level of critical consciousness, a person will act in response to challenge, once he understands and sees the possibility of response. The nature of that action corresponds to the nature of his understanding. Critical reflection upon the past and present leads to critical action to change the reality. These ideas are summarized by Freire in the concept of, praxis, the act of continual reflection and action processes.

These four key components in the change process: self-concept, past experience, interaction, and reflection provide the rationale for the research design. The process of change is a cyclical or spiral process of self-concept formation. It is continuously reformed by the interaction of the past and new experiences through critical reflection. Past experience can inhibit or facilitate new learning because of its influence on the self-concept. The study attempts to analyze the critical reflection of the development facilitators and to identify the positive and negative experiences that have contributed to their effectiveness.

Factors Relating to The Effectiveness of Development Facilitator

The study inquires into development facilitator's perceptions of their own transformation process in the areas of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. These four areas provide a context for evaluating the level of dogmatism and authoritarianism that influence a development facilitator's effectiveness. The study examines this deliberate transformation process as it occurs when development facilitators are asked to redefine their roles. Most of

the development facilitators, at the time of the research, are experiencing a transition from administrative to facilitative styles and roles in their work.

Development Interpretation

Interpretation of development has changed dramatically in the past two decades. The dominant paradigm in the early 60s inclined toward a linear production-oriented development. A new paradigm, initially emerging in the late 1970s espouses a participatory approach (Rogers, 1983, Korten, 1984). A development facilitator's intervention is very much influenced by the individual's concept of development, as well as the orientation of the agent's own organization (O'Gorman, 1978; Christenson & Robinson, 1980). Adequate knowledge of a development facilitator's perception toward his own change process in development interpretation provides some understanding of possible factors for the shift and its relationship to dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics.

Self-Perception

Psychologists, including Wylie (1974) and Rogers (1962), believe that the self is a learned structure and is the anchor of personality. Research indicates that people with a positive self-concept and positive self-esteem are more flexible, receptive to new ideas and change (Klopf et al. 1969; Knox, 1977; Bosier, 1973). Studies also show that experience can change one's self concept. There are significant experiences, that occur in the course of a development facilitator's life that influence their levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Interpersonal Relationship

Experience from development practitioners and studies on community development (Rothman, 1974; Zaltman & Duncan, 1977; Rogers, 1983), intercultural communication (McGongial, 1971; Klein, 1977; Ruben, 1976), and adult education (Freire, 1970; Knowles, 1973; Rogers, 1983) strongly indicate that interpersonal relationships are a key factor in effective planned change. Personality characteristics that encourage reciprocal interpersonal relationships, include: empathy, acceptance of others, trust, seeking others' opinions and flexibility. Hence, the experiences that facilitate or inhibit the development of these qualities in a development facilitator provide some idea relating to their level of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Work Style

Work style refers to methods employed by an intercultural development facilitators in working with people. The people-oriented development approach encourages people's participation in decision-making, implementation, and evaluation (Korten, 1984). It requires a development facilitator to participate and facilitate rather than to control or dominate the process of change. Adult educators, including Knowles, Dewey, Freire, find that a collaborative effort between educator and learner in curriculum development and in the learning event tend to produce more effective learning outcomes. Participatory behavior of the development facilitator is directly related to dogmatic and authoritarian traits.

In summary, previous studies and research show that the concept of development, self-perception, interpersonal relationship and work styles are important measures of development facilitators' effectiveness. The

researcher inquired into the change process of individual development facilitator in each of these areas to identify the possible factors that are associated with dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Research Procedures

A case study approach is used in this exploratory research. The transformation occurring in the lives of development facilitators is a complex process, involving both subjective and objective factors, and influences from a variety of sources over a period of time. The study attempts to provide an appropriate balance between "breadth" and "depth" on a topic that has not been given serious scholarly attention.

The case study focuses on a group of 22 intercultural development facilitators from one development agency. The majority of these people have recently gone through a role change within the Agency. They have extensive experience with the Agency and in development work, and are currently working in Asia, Africa, North America and Latin America. They attended a three-week training workshop held in Hawaii from October 7 to 25, 1985 (where these study data were collected).

The data were gathered using a multiple interview process to explore the respondents' transformation in the four areas of effectiveness described above as they are experiencing a re-definition in their roles. A non-scheduled interview allowed the researcher a choice as to the order of the questions, freedom to attempt alternative wordings of the same questions, and freedom to use neutral probes for clarification or confirmation of information. Two standardized instruments are used: Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale (D Scale) and Ray's Directiveness Scale, to measure the degree of dogmatism and authoritarianism, respectively.

Scores are analyzed in relationship to their transformation patterns in the four areas as indicated above. In addition, information gathered from an expert observer during the training institute was used to supplement data from the interviews and psychological tests.

The respondents of the study came from one of the largest Christian relief and development agencies in the world, with a total of 4,103 international projects, including: assistance to children and families, emergency relief and rehabilitation, community development, and efforts involving evangelism and leadership development. Some 4,800 staff work in more than 80 countries (mostly in the developing countries), where projects are located. The Agency shares many similarities with other non-government or private voluntary development organizations. It has extensive contacts with development organizations internationally and locally in the effort to implement development work and development facilitator training. A study focusing on the intercultural development facilitators within this agency has certain implications for other development agencies in terms of intercultural development facilitator recruitment and training.

Importance of the Study

The study has several outcomes pertaining to understanding development facilitator effectiveness:

1. The findings of the study will increase the understanding of the transformation of intercultural development facilitators in relation to their level of dogmatism and authoritarianism. Specific experiences of intercultural development facilitators that influence their effectiveness will also be understood.

2. The study will increase development agencies' understanding of the educational needs of intercultural development facilitators.

3. The study will provide valuable information and learnings regarding a development agency's ability and understanding in coping with transitions and transformations that occur in development facilitators at similar times and in similar contexts.

4. The study will give development administrators more precise information for staff recruitment.

5. The study will enable the development agency to better anticipate, explain, cope, and plan for recruitment, assignment, or re-assignment of staff in situations of role change and re-definition.

6. The researcher will make recommendations about incorporating specific learning processes into curricula for pre-employment, orientation and in-service training to enhance the effectiveness of the intercultural development facilitator.

Assumptions

Several major assumptions that affect the outcomes of this study have been made:

1. Beliefs, attitudes and behavior are formed through the processes of socialization, acculturation, cognitive and affective development. The study assumes that training alone is not adequate to induce change in behavior and attitude (Smith, 1982).

2. Perceptions are based more on the subjective experience of the individual than their theoretical knowledge.

3. Learning takes place when experiences, that cause change in underlying beliefs and attitudes, are identified. Such experiences can then be programmed or included in curriculum for learning to occur intentionally.

4. External forces interact with each other and influence a person in a continual manner. The study assumes that a development facilitator's behavior and attitudes are greatly influenced by his agency's orientation.

Delimitations

Several parameters of the study affect any attempt to generalize the results.

First, the respondents do not represent a random sample drawn from a general population. Instead, it is an opportunity sampling where a group of intercultural development facilitators, who work in the same agency, met at the same location for an extended period of time. The respondents share the common trait of experiencing a similar role re-definition, of moving from administrative to facilitative roles and tasks. They represent a specific population who work as development administrators, consultants and technical staff in different countries. However, the findings may apply to other groups, as well, such as development administrators and development facilitators at the community level.

Second, the investigation into the transformation of the intercultural development facilitators is job-related. It focuses on the individual experiences of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship and work style. The possible factors outside the job areas are not included in this study.

Third, the study deals only with the perception of the respondent as to factors that had caused him to shift and the meanings he had for the changes. The research only focuses on the data that indicate the shift.

Fourth, this is an exploratory study pointing to the relationship which seems to exist between the dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics of intercultural development facilitators and their previous experiences. Cause-and-effect studies must follow to further identify and explain the relationship identified.

Definition of Terms

Intercultural Development facilitator refers to one who comes from one culture to assist people in a different culture in a learning process that leads to a positive change. Other synonymous terms that are used in the study include: "change agent," "adviser," "consultant," "development administrator," "cross-cultural technical adviser," and "development educator."

Authoritarianism refers to the degree to which a person imposes his own will on others, and at the same time, is submissive to positive authority (Ray, 1976).

Dogmatism refers to the degree to which a person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information gathered from the outside on its own intrinsic merits. A high dogmatic (D) person is close-minded, while a low dogmatic (d) person is open-minded (Rokeach, 1960).

Agency is used synonymously with the term "organization" to identify the development agency under study.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) refer to the institutions that receive grants or contracts from the government to carry out development

assistance. NGOs have a recognized status as consultative to the U.N., and are primarily engaged in study and advice on international issues. (Bolling & Smith, 1982)

Private voluntary organizations (PVOs) refer to domestic or international non-profit organizations engaging in overseas direct services.

Private development organizations (PDOs) refer to both PVOs, NGOs and any international private, voluntary development-oriented agencies that are active in overseas development work.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I presents the problem of the study: the experiences that influence development facilitator effectiveness in relationship to their dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics. Specific research questions and historical background are provided.

Chapter II reviews the relevant literature in three major sections: 1) the paradigm shift in development and role of education; 2) factors influencing development facilitator effectiveness, which include: development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. Change agency effectiveness is also discussed; and 3) measurement of dogmatism and authoritarianism from previous research.

Chapter III provides a brief overview of the research context, which includes a general description of voluntary development agencies and a special emphasis on the Agency being studied.

Chapter IV describes the methodology used in this study, which includes the research design, data sources, data gathering procedures and approach to data analysis.

Chapter V gives a detailed description of the data analyzed, and a summary of the findings.

Chapter VI provides conclusions and recommendations drawn from the findings of Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF PRECEDENT LITERATURE

Many fields of study have contributed to our understanding a development facilitator's effectiveness in the context of planned change. The literature review in this chapter draws from the fields of community development, adult education, cross-cultural communication, and social psychology. The major concern of the chapter is focused on identifying the major factors that contribute to development facilitator effectiveness as qualified by the findings on dogmatism and authoritarianism.

The chapter is organized into three sections. The first section includes a brief review of a paradigm shift of development concept and the role of education since the 1960s. This shift calls for transformations in the development facilitator's role and his approach to working with people. Insights from these transitions provide a broad perspective on the process of change. The impact of the change agency on agent effectiveness is also discussed.

The second section focuses on four factors contributing to development facilitator effectiveness: development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationships, and work style.

The chapter concludes with a careful review of previous research on the measurement of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Paradigm Shift in Development and the Role of Education

The term "community development" has emerged in recent years with a variety of meanings. Early attempts to describe development differ greatly from current interpretation. Early definitions of development tended to focus on increased incomes and other quantitative measures of effectiveness. Under the influence of Rostow's Stage Theory during the 1950s, "modernization" became the goal of development. Assuming that people respond automatically to economic incentives, development was defined in terms of production and gross national product (GNP). It was assumed that education would increase the productive "quality of labor" with advanced technological skills. This concept of development tended to produce large, western-oriented educational programs in many parts of the Third World.

By the early 1960s, Human Capital Theory (Schultz, 1963) confirmed modernization and economic growth as the goals of development. Human capital was no longer viewed as a quantity for consumption, but also as an investment that could bring valuable returns. Education allocated greater earnings to those with more schooling, and less to those without.

The unequal income distribution brought on by this economic growth model led to a new definition of development in the 1970s (Goulet, 1971, Streeten & Burki, 1978). An alternative concept of development emerged focusing more directly on enhancing human growth and well-being, eliminating poverty, preserving the productive capacity of the environment, and empowering people through increased participation in the development process (Streeten, 1979; Korten, 1984).

Rogers (1983) suggests that a "paradigm shift" is taking place. The dominant paradigm of the late 1960s and early 1970s is being replaced by an emerging one in the late 1970s and 1980s. The effectiveness of development in the old paradigm, was determined largely by the criterion of quantitative economic growth. The emphasis in the newer, emerging paradigm focuses on more qualitative human factors.

Truman (1986), after examining major literature trends, summarizes the major shifts that have been occurring in the development field (see Figure 2.1.). The trends show a new pattern of development. It is one that seeks for more participation in decision-making, an increase in interpersonal communication; greater flexibility and openness to innovation; and decentralized planning. This movement calls for unavoidable change in the roles of development facilitators, and their approaches in assisting others to change.

The Role of Development Facilitator

A development facilitator fills many different roles in varying degrees of social importance. In the early paradigm, the professional development facilitator was essentially an authority figure. He was a teacher who brought about some innovation as deemed desirable by outside agencies (Rogers, 1983:312). The development facilitator was also a link between a change agency and some client system. The main responsibility was the diffusion of technology designed and brought in from outside sources.

As the development paradigm shifted, the development facilitator continued to perform different roles, but in a lower key, less dogmatic and authoritarian way. The new roles described in the literature included the following: consultant, enabler, motivator, integrator, resource-channel

Figure 2.1. Conceptualization of the Development Paradigm Shift

<u>Trends in Early Paradigm</u>	<u>Trends in Later Paradigm</u>
Decision-making controlled by the top hierarchy or national body.	Wide sharing of decisions and control by the members.
Ideas and communications flow one way from top to bottom.	Ideas and communications diffuse through networks and interpersonal channels.
Decision about what should be introduced made by technical experts and top level administrators.	Decisions about what should be introduced made by local members after informal evaluation of innovation.
Good ideas, innovations come from top, from technical experts.	Good ideas, innovation generated by local members through critical reflection.
Availability of new technology pushes the innovation.	Existence of problem creates desire to find solution as perceived by local needs and problems.
Low levels of participation in planning, evaluating.	High degree of participation being reinvented to suit local needs and problems.
Frequent utilization of directive teaching.	Frequent utilization of non-directive facilitation.
Development measured by quantitative indicators.	Development measured by qualitative indicators.
Emphasis on product.	Emphasis on process.
Centralized planning with emphasis on technology transfer.	Decentralized planning with emphasis on self-reliance.
Focus blame for poverty on individual (internal causes).	Focus blame for poverty on system (internal and external causes).
Emphasis on economic growth.	Emphasis on low level, appropriate technology.

Source: Truman (1986:164)

(Christenson & Robinson, 1980); catalyst, solution-given, process-helper, resource-linker (Havelock & Havelock, 1973); problem-identifier or diagnostician (Zaltman and Duncan, 1977). The effective development facilitator is community-oriented rather than agency-oriented (Rogers, 1983). He not only links the outside agency with the community, but now assumes a broader role in networking by bringing people together, and by finding and seeking the best use of the resources both inside and outside their own system (Havelock & Havelock, 1973).

The shift in the role of development facilitator from a control-orientation to a facilitation-orientation requires a major change in thinking, self-perception, interpersonal relationships, and work style of the development facilitator.

Development Education

Since the development focus has shifted to a more "people-centered" approach, education assumes a new role in the development process. The importance of education is expressed by Nyerere (1976):

Education has to increase men's physical and mental freedom -- to increase the control over themselves, their own lives, and the environment in which they live. The ideas imparted by education, or released in the mind through education, should be liberating ideas. The skills acquired by education should be liberating skills In particular, it has to help men to decide for themselves, in cooperation, what development is (p.10).

The term, "development education", has become popular in referring to this major shift in thinking about development and education. When supplemented to formal processes, development education is critical for facilitating technological progress as well as enabling people to learn how to act on their own behalf in pursuit of human fulfillment. Often a

development facilitator assumes educational responsibilities in the development process. During the past fifty years, the best and the most appropriate ways have been sought to assist adult learners. With the new understanding of the adult as learner, the pedagogical model of teaching, which emphasizes the learner's dependency on teacher, has been gradually giving way to the andragogical model, which assists the learner to take increasing responsibility for his own learning (Knowles, 1973).

Freire (1970) describes the "problem-posing" approach of traditional education as the "banking system." In this system, the teacher is a transmitter, the sole thinker and speaker, decision-maker, organizer, controller, disciplinarian, authority, judge and prime actor in the learning process. In opposition to this dogmatic and authoritarian behavior, Freire calls for a co-learning relationship between educator and learner. The educator becomes an agent of change (Knowles, 1975) who facilitates, helps, encourages, supports, and consults. He is also a catalyst, resource person, mirror and collaborator (Brundage & MacKeracher, 1980). The teacher has a dual role as a member of the learning community, while still being an active and flexible leader (Rogers, 1983). The effective performance of these roles requires both knowledge and skills on the part of the development facilitator, as well as certain essential personality traits.

Factors Attributing To Development Facilitator Effectiveness

A variety of literature fields could be examined to help determine the factors contributing to development facilitator effectiveness. At least four clusters of literature are examined in this section: community development, adult education, cross cultural communication, and

organization theory. Development facilitator effectiveness is examined here, in terms of his development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relations, and work style.

Development Interpretation

O'Gorman (1978) suggests that there are both manifest and latent roles of the development facilitator. The former refers to the roles that are prepared for, and are evident to the agent and the community in the development process. The latter refers to those that are divergent or dichotomous from the manifest roles, depending very much on the agency's development orientation. She therefore points out that the development facilitator's intervention is greatly affected by the orientation, philosophy and ideology of his agency.

Christenson and Robinson (1980) in reviewing the roles of development facilitators from community development literature, comment that the way one understands development affects one's approach in initiating a development program. The authors believe that "such issues are of critical importance because they affect our perception of community change" (p.11).

This point is highlighted in a recent study conducted by Trumam (1986). Among 67 development workers in Bangladesh, the Philippines and Taiwan, a shift in their interpretation of development clearly impacted their approaches to development.

Self-Perception

Brundage and MacKeracher (1980) describe "self-concept" simply as how one describes and feels towards oneself. Klopff et al. (1969) and Bosier (1973) discovered from their research that people who have higher levels

of self-esteem and a more positive self-concept, are more receptive to change and less threatened by others or their environment. Klopff et al. also found flexibility, ego-differentiation, and self-esteem to be correlated. Knox (1977) points out that significant happenings affect the relative stability of adult life and alter self-concept and relationships. These events may either increase potential for positive change, or increase vulnerability which threaten an individual's self-concept.

Self-concept in the field of education has been considered more important than skills, techniques, and practices in determining teaching effectiveness (Combs, 1962). The research found that effective teachers or counselors could be distinguished from ineffective helpers on the basis of their attitudes toward themselves and others.

Brundage and MacKeracher (1980) conclude that learning is better facilitated by an educator with a positive self-concept and self-esteem, and by one who is able to remain flexible and responsive in situations that involve failure, uncertainty, and threat. The educator needs to perceive himself as a learner and to value this role. Being able to learn from adult learners, he is also aware of being a role model for others.

A development facilitator assumes a variety of roles, many of which require a low-key approach. The development facilitator will not be effective in such situations if he lacks a strong self-concept. Havelock and Havelock (1973), in developing a list of characteristics of successful development facilitators, affirm that a strong sense of own identity and own ability to help others is required. He needs to have personal security and self-confidence to deal with uncertainty, the complexity of the community, and the possibility of not being accepted, or failure.

Interpersonal Relationship

Interpersonal relationship skills have been highlighted as critical factors in effective intercultural planned change. In development, greater reliance on the information network of relationships depends upon the development facilitator's ability to develop positive interpersonal relationships (Zaltman & Duncan, 1977; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971; Rogers, 1983). Rogers (1983) has developed twelve generalizations related to change agent or development facilitator success. Three of them concern interpersonal relationships:

1. Change agent success is positively related to the extent that they make effort in contacting and interacting with community members.
2. Change agent success is positively related to empathy with members of the community.
3. Change agent success is positively related to homophily with community members (p.344-345).

The development facilitators in Truman's (1986) study ranked communication and interpersonal relationship skills as critical for effective development practice.

In the field of cross-cultural communication, a considerable amount of research is being conducted relative to cross-cultural interaction in order to improve the outcomes of overseas assignments. This work is being propelled partly by the difficulties encountered by the increasing number of intercultural technicians and advisers. The research unanimously points out human relationships as the critical factor for intercultural effectiveness (Maston, 1966; Jones, 1968; Wight et al., 1969; Wight & Casto, 1969). Hawes and Kealey (1981) did an exhaustive study of intercultural competency and overseas job effectiveness among 160

overseas Canadian technical advisers and 90 spouses. Both host-country persons and the expatriates consider intercultural relations and skills as important for gaining acceptance by the host-culture:

The single most meaningful result of the study, then, is that there is something the individual can do to facilitate overseas effectiveness, whatever be the external barriers to success. It is to develop the capacity to make contact with local people using the interpersonal skills identified (1979:190)

In the general field of adult education, reciprocal and mutually dependent relationships between educator and learners are more likely to induce change in others (Knowles, 1985; Rogers, 1983).

Indicators of Positive Interpersonal Relationship

In the literature as well as in research conducted by several types of international agencies, (the Peace Corps, business, technical assistance and the military) development facilitator qualities that are helpful to develop or to predict positive relationships with local people are mentioned. These qualities include self-esteem, low dogmatism, high regard for the value of equality, the ability to communicate non-verbally, genuineness, warmth and openness; and tolerance for ambiguity (McGongial, 1971).

Hawes and Kealey's study identified three global characteristics in addition to technical expertise: 1) interpersonal orientation, i.e. curiosity and respect for others and a willingness to understand the another's world view; 2) a sense of identity which enhances self-confidence and encourages openness to experiencing local people and culture without feeling threatened; 3) a positive, but realistic, expectation about life in the host countries.

Gudykunst et al. (1977) find effectiveness related to open-mindedness toward new ideas and experiences; empathy toward people from other countries; accuracy in perceiving differences and similarities between the host culture and one's own; and a non-judgemental attitude.

In the field of development, a development facilitator's openness, risk taking, and trust are avenues to innovation (Argyris, 1965, Stephenson et al., 1971). Rogers (1983) suggests that a development facilitator with empathy, and a less dogmatic attitude, is more likely to gain acceptance and establish his credibility.

The interaction between the adult learner and educator is facilitated by an educator who is aware of how he behaves in such a relationship; is accountable, committed, open, and responsive to the learner; has empathetic understanding and who values and respects both himself and the learner. (Brundage & MacKeracher, 1980; Knowles, 1970; Rogers, 1983; Srinivasan, 1977).

A review of research and literature shows a total consensus on several basic qualities required for an intercultural development facilitator to develop positive interpersonal relationships with the persons in the host countries: empathy, tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility, low dogmatism, open-mindedness toward new ideas and experiences; sociability; and respect for others. These qualities are not distinct; most tend to overlap in several areas. The following is a brief description of these qualities.

Empathy. Sarbaugh describes empathy as the "sensitivity to cues in a situation" and "ability to take the other's role" (1979:128). Empathy is the most frequently cited quality of a development facilitator (Rogers, 1983; Zaltman and Duncan, 1977) and in intercultural effectiveness (Brislin,

1983). Empathy helps a person understand how he is being perceived and to communicate effectively. Behavioral evidences of empathy include attentive listening, being sensitive to the needs of others, and understanding another's or the other's point of view (Hwang et al. 1980).

Flexibility. Flexibility is defined by Hawes and Kealey (1979:167) as "the flexible response to ideas, beliefs or points of view of others." It allows the intercultural development facilitator to take on the role of another without becoming judgmental or alienated. A successful development facilitator is one who is able to resist becoming excessively rigid (Britt, 1983). A development facilitator who performs various roles in the development process requires role flexibility in order to successfully complete a task. The capacity to shift between teacher and learner roles or leader and supporter roles is critical in the transfer of skills to people in another culture.

Respect. To respect is to value the individual's worth and to respond in a way that helps them feel valued. Respect increases reciprocity between development facilitator and the community being assisted, and contributes to intercultural effectiveness (Hawes & Kealey, 1979).

Tolerance for Ambiguity. Both Brislin (1981) as well as Gudykunst and Kim (1984) define tolerance for ambiguity as the ability to deal with the problem and situation even though the information needed for the decision or the interaction is unknown.

An intercultural development facilitator with a tolerance for ambiguity becomes effective when he is willing to let the situation take precedence over his own will for the time being. He does not feel threatened in an unknown situation, but is more likely to respond with curiosity and delight

to unpredictable and uncategorizable events (Gudykunst and Kim, 1984) or with calmness in an antagonistic or hostile environment (Hawes & Kealey, 1979).

Open-mindedness. Open-mindedness implies the capacity to change or adapt one's thinking and attitudes so as to respond to others in more appropriate ways (Elmer, 1986). It is identified in the literature as a critical factor in intercultural effectiveness, overseas assignment and adult learning situation. (Schwarz, 1973; Fessler, 1976; Knowles, 1970).

Sociability. Sociability refers to the psychological inclination to be friendly and warm towards others, the ability to build trust, break down suspicions and open up experiences that enhance understanding (Elmer, 1986). It is identified as a predictor of intercultural success.

Work Style

Work style refers to the approach and methods employed by intercultural development facilitators in working with people. The people-centered approach development encourages citizen participation in planning and evaluation. The success of it depends on the development facilitator's participatory behavior (Rogers, 1983):

1. Change agent contact is positively related to a greater social participation among the community members.
2. Change agent is positively related to the extent that he works through opinion leaders.
3. Change agent success is positively related to increasing ability with community members to evaluate innovation (p.344-345).

The development facilitator's participatory behavior is especially important in the adult learning situations. Democratic-relationships (Dewey, 1938), non-dependent-authority relationship (Knowles, 1970,

Srinivasan, 1977), the co-learning context (Rogers, 1985, Freire, 1973) and cooperative partners (Bruner, 1963) in a learning situation would not be possible without low authoritarian behavior from the development facilitator. This includes a non-aggressive approach, not imposing one's own ideas, a willingness to challenge each other's idea and a reluctance to exercise authority. Holmes' (1980) study indicates that a significant relationship was found between facilitating behavior/attitude and the andragogical orientation in which the adult educator perceives his relationship with learners as that of a helper, resource person, consultant, and co-learner.

Work Style and Organizational Climate. Etzioni (1964:3) defines organizations as "social units or human groups deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals." Organizational climate and the specific job have great impact on individual member behavior. Argyris (1971) describes the interacting process of organization and individual members as follows:

Mutual adaptation takes place where the organization modifies the individual's personality and the individual, through the informal activities, modifies the formal organization. These modifications becomes part of the organization.

Weber (1947) perceives bureaucratic organization as an adaptive and rational solution to the complexities of modern life. But Weber's analysis is not exceptionally attentive to the character of the human organization (March and Simon, 1971). There are unanticipated dysfunctional consequences of Weber's bureaucratic organization on individual behavior (Merton, 1940; Gouldner, 1954). Merton stresses that the changes in the personality of individual members of the organization stem from

characteristics of the organizational structure itself. He delineates three such changes: less personalized relationships, an increase of rules in the organization, and fewer creative alternatives due to centralized decision-making. As a result, members of bureaucracies tend to develop rigid behavior. This rigidity increases the difficulties in the organization and the defensiveness in individual behavior.

Lewin et al. (1939) have studied how group life affects an individual member's behavior. The findings conclude that persons with authoritarian tendencies developed patterns of aggressive domination toward others, and their relationships to the leader was either one of submission or a persistent demand for attention. The interactions of the democratic group were more spontaneous, fact-oriented and friendly. Relationships with leaders were free and on an "equality basis." Comparing the two groups, the authoritarian group was significantly more aggressive.

Knowles (1970) discovered that individual learning behavior is affected by the organization. It provides an environment that either facilitates or inhibits learning. For example, a young executive is not likely to adopt a participatory decision-making practice if his own superiors never involve him in making decisions.

O'Gorman (1978) and others have pointed out that the development facilitator's role or work style is very much influenced by his organization's orientation. Bryant and White (1982) believe that a major influence on both behavior and attitude is the role a person plays within an organization. A role carries with it tasks, authority, and expectations that influence individual and group behavior. Frequently, people behave according to role definition and the expectations that this creates among

the work-mates. For example, Bryant and White noted that development workers are most sensitive to the demands and problems of the community while the management staff tend to emphasize proper policies and procedures. Truman (1986:143) noted that the development agency that promotes a control and complex administrative rules tends to produce development workers with the same orientation.

Torre (1957) suggests that a person who previously held a managerial or administrative position will tend to be more authoritarian than one who has held non-administrative role. Furthermore, one who identifies with the agency, and who works in a centralized system, has a tendency to be more authoritarian and demanding than those who work in a decentralized system.

Measurement of Dogmatism and Authoritarianism

In this section, literature from social psychology is used to review the measurement of dogmatism and authoritarianism. For the purpose of this study, the former relates to attitude, the latter to behavior.

Controversy abounds in social psychology literature as to whether there is a consistent or inconsistent relationship between attitude and behavior. As yet, no conclusive evidence has been found to settle the debate. Kiesler et al. (1967) and also Fishbein (1967) suggest that there is little consistent evidence supporting the hypothesis that knowledge of an individual's attitude toward some object will allow one to predict the way he or she will behave with respect to the object. Doob (1947) agrees that attitude and behavior may be unrelated; that is, it is perfectly reasonable for two people with the same attitude to behave differently. For Doob, attitude is a learned pre-disposition to respond. There is no innate

relationship between the attitude and behavior; one still learns a behavioral response. Studies by Ray (1971) on racial prejudice show that attitudes and behavior often do not go together. People who acknowledge prejudiced attitudes may or may not behave in a discriminatory way toward members of other ethnic groups (Ray, 1976:307).

On the other hand, De Fleur and Westie (1958), and Sherif and Hoveland (1961) in separate studies, suggest that there is consistency between attitudes and behavior (Kisesler et al. 1967:27).

Dogmatism

Rokeach (1960), prompted by the work of Andorno et al.(1950) on authoritarian personalities, developed a theory of belief systems. He conceptualized a personality theory which ranged over a complete spectrum of beliefs incorporated in a person's cognitive system. An individual's belief was defined as follows:

We have to infer what a person really believes from all the things he says and does. It is in this sense that we would use the term belief, and the total belief-disbelief system would then be an organization of verbal and non-verbal, implicit and explicit beliefs, sets or expectancies (Rokeach, 1960:32).

According to this theory, all individuals possess belief-disbelief systems. Those having relatively open systems are referred to as open-minded or low dogmatic individuals; those having closed systems are defined as highly dogmatic or closed-minded. The extent to which a system is open or closed is determined by "the inter-connections among central, intermediate, and peripheral beliefs that give the total belief-disbelief system its integrated, holistic and systematic character" (Rokeach, 1960:50).

Dogmatism is defined by Rokeach as a personality variable which governs the individual's receptivity to ideas, people, and places. It also includes the person's ability to evaluate information pertaining to each of these areas on its own merit. High dogmatic (D) individuals would hold beliefs in different ways from those low in dogmatism. In other words, a high dogmatic person has a relatively undifferentiated belief-disbelief system and tends to isolate different clusters of beliefs that may logically appear to interact. Because of their over reliance upon authority, high dogmatic persons tend to view new ideas as threatening or hostile, unless they have been validated by an accepted authority. On the other hand, the world is friendly to a low dogmatic person (d), who is open, more free and more impervious to pressure. To him, authority is not absolute, nor are people to be evaluated according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority.

Attitude toward Authority. Rokeach's concept of dogmatism has been described as a generalized theory of authoritarianism (Rokeach, 1960) as opposed to the specific authoritarianism suggested by Adorno et al. The Dogmatism scale represents a generalized authoritarianism independent of a particular ideological content. Restle et al. (1964) report from their research that high dogmatic depends on an authority figure or on perceived environmental expectations in a learning situation. Kemp (1960), recognizing both negative and positive characteristics, reported that the low dogmatic person perceived authority figures more realistically than the highly dogmatic individuals.

Sociability. Several researchers have focused on the relationship of dogmatism to personality patterns and dysfunction. Plant et al. (1965)

compared high dogmatic and low dogmatic persons on 5 variables of the California Psychological Inventory: sociability, self-control, achievement through independence, intellectual efficiency and responsibility. The findings show that a high dogmatic person is psychologically immature and characterized as being impulsive, defensive, and stereotypical in their thinking. A low dogmatic person was outgoing, enterprising, calm, mature and forceful, and clear thinking. Korn and Giddan (1964) used three different scales and concluded that the more dogmatic an individual is, the less tolerant, flexible and secure he is. The personality scales used in these studies create a personality profile which substantiates the theory of a dogmatic belief structure.

Empathy. Saltzman (1967) reported that the degree to which a person is perceived as being empathetic with positive regard for others, is a function of his level of dogmatism.

Flexibility. Zagana & Zurcher (1964, 1965:126) observed differences between high and low dogmatic persons in interpersonal interactions in an unstructured classroom situation. A high dogmatic person was concerned with leader selection and group structure. When being challenged by authority, he became insecure, waived in their convictions, and showed signs of reduced group cohesion. Druckman (1967) noted that a high dogmatic person was more resistant to change than the low dogmatic and, in a dyadic situation was less willing to defect from a given position since compromise is viewed as defeat.

Tolerance to Inconsistency. Rokeach (1960) suggests that a high dogmatic person is threatened by and tends to avoid exposure to belief-discrepant information. He also reveals less tolerance and more

anxiety for belief-discrepant information. Rosenman (1967) reported that a high dogmatic person is less accepting of information that contradicts traditional societal belief. Foulkes and Foulkes (1965) found that a high dogmatic person, when faced with discrepant information, tends to avoid compromise solutions by either changing greatly or adhering very closely to his original impression.

Anxiety and Insecurity. Rokeach's early finding that dogmatism was related to anxiety has been substantiated (Rebhun, 1966). Therefore, dogmatism may be a psychoanalytic defense mechanism. Rokeach (1954, 1956) theorized that a highly dogmatic person was characterized by a narrowing of time perspective. He was manifested by a tendency to deny the importance of the pressure. It was confirmed by Rokeach and Bonier (1960), and Pavey (1962) that the more closed a person's belief system is (high dogmatic), the more he would be oriented toward the future. This future orientation was interpreted as a defense against anxiety by the high dogmatic person.

Openness. Ehrlich and Lee (1969) reviewed the research dealing with the effects of dogmatism on belief acquisition and learning. They confirmed Rokeach's principle that a high dogmatic person is less able than the low dogmatic person to learn new beliefs. In defining dogmatism, Rokeach (1960) used problem-solving behavior to demonstrate the inability of high dogmatic persons to cope with new conceptual systems and their inability to integrate new beliefs into the existing belief system. Kemp (1960, 1962) provides evidence that a low dogmatic person is superior in problem-solving tasks.

Rigidity. Rokeach (1960) distinguishes between rigidity and dogmatism. A rigid person is one who resists change in a single belief and therefore, is unable to develop a new or different response. A dogmatic person, on the other hand, holds on to his entire belief system. He, therefore, is unable to accept new ideas or responses. White and Alter (1965) found that a high dogmatic person is more resistant to change in a judgement task. Kamenske (1966) interpreted a lack of acceptance of technological change by a highly dogmatic employee as attitudinal rigidity.

Rokeach's concept of dogmatism has stimulated a considerable amount of diversified research. Most of this work has led to a fuller understanding of the open and closed belief systems. The research tends to support Rokeach's contention that dogmatism represents a generalized cognitive state in the individual.

Authoritarianism

Authoritarianism has been conceptualized in many different ways since Adorno et al.'s (1950) The Authoritarian Personality. The conventional belief about authoritarianism, as popularized by Adorno et al., is related to pre-war issues, such as prejudice, conservatism, rigidity, tolerance to ambiguity, and ethnocentrism. They assumed that authoritarianism is a general personality factor incorporating social attitudes and behavior. When research failed to predict the association of authoritarian attitudes and behavior, the instruments used were always faulted (Ray 1976). Research by Titus (1968), Ray (1976) and others have demonstrated again and again that attitudes conventionally called authoritarianism do not predict the behavior conventionally called authoritarianism.

Authoritarianism has been interpreted and measured by different attitude scales. Ray (1984:108-112) reviewed all the measurements of authoritarianism: tough-mindedness (Eysenck, 1954); autocratic style (Levinson & Huffman, 1955); authority acceptance (Masling et al., 1955); anxiety, hostility, rigidity, and dependency (Jones, 1957); acceptance of rational and irrational authority (Rudin, 1961); attitude to authority (Ray, 1971), tolerance for bureaucratic structure (Baker et al., 1973); positive attitude toward institutional authority (Rigby and Rump, 1982); deference (Ray, 1972).

The above attributes of authoritarianism show the various ways in which authoritarianism is measured. Ray (1984) comments that no longer can anyone reasonably insist that there is just one particular meaning for the word "authoritarian," which must be pre-eminent above all others:

"To some, 'authoritarianism' is a cognitive style, to others it is an interpersonal style, while to yet others it is simply an attitude. Unfortunately, these various 'types' of authoritarianism tend not to go together (p.114-115)."

Ray suggests a clear need to specify, in advance, what precisely one means by authoritarianism and what one wants to measure.

In searching for a new definition of authoritarianism, Ray describes an authoritarian as a person who is strongly in favour of the exercise of authority and, at the same time, actually succeeds in imposing his or her will upon others, as an authority or as a support of authority (1984:172). The predictors of authoritarian interpersonal behavior are dominance, aggressiveness, imposing of one's will upon others and, being submissive to direction from superiors.

The Directiveness Scale, developed by Ray, measures authoritarian behavior. The scale is vastly different from the F Scale developed by

Adorno et al. that measures the conventional beliefs of authoritarian personality (Ray, 1984). The Directiveness Scale is ideologically-free, and does not relate to history of participation in war, political activities, religious beliefs, nor is related to social desirability response (Ray, 1976:315). Instead of posing questions on ethical issues, the Scale asks the respondent direct questions about his own daily behavior.

The Directiveness Scale is proving to be a valid measure of one aspect of authoritarianism: authoritarian behavior which is dominant (to inferiors) and submissive (to superiors) (Rigby and Rump, 1981, Ray & Lovejoy, 1983, Rigby, 1984). The person who likes ordering others around also expects to be dominated by their own superiors. The Directiveness Scale is considered to be the best predictor thus far of straight dominance and straight aggressiveness, and is the only scale that shows significant prediction of submissiveness (Ray and Lovejoy, 1983).

Summary

In this chapter a review has been provided in the precedent literature in the fields of community development, adult education, cross-cultural communication, and social psychology . Major trends that contribute to the effectiveness of development facilitators have been identified: development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship and work style. The key ideas of self-concept, past experience, interaction, and reflection which have emerged from the literature, providing the theoretical framework for the research.

The research literature on the instruments indicates that the dogmatism scale can be an effective instrument for measuring attitudes while the

directiveness scale can be effective for measuring authoritarianism behavior.

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH CONTEXT

The type of development agency being referred to in the study is discussed in the first part of this chapter. Following that is a brief description of the historical background of the case study agency -- its philosophy, objectives, organizational structure, the functions of different levels within the agency, and examples of the types of projects undertaken by the agency.

Private Voluntary Agencies

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and private voluntary organizations (PVOs) are different types of organizations according to Bolling and Smith (1982:153). NGOs, with a consultative role to the U.N., are primarily engaged in study and advice-giving on international issues, while PVOs are more direct-service oriented. Nevertheless, both are nonprofit organizations. The majority operate relief and development projects in developing countries. Funds are usually derived from governments, individual, groups, and/or corporations.

In the study, the term private development agencies (PDOs) is used to refer to both PVOs, NGOs and any international private, voluntary development-oriented agency that is active in overseas development work. In recent years, the number of PDOs have been increasing numerically and in the scope of their work. According to Sommer (1977), approximately \$1.4 billion in foreign assistance was channeled through PDOs in 1974. In the early 1980s, yearly budgets of PVOs drastically increased, partly due to

the Africa drought and the increasing USAID resources that are made available to them (AID Policy Paper, 1982:1).

These private development agencies exist for different purposes, such as the concern for human needs, religious convictions, or political and personal interests. Many of them are similar in operation and funding, although they possess a variety of objectives (Sommer, 1977). A common purpose seems to be the provision of assistance to less fortunate people (children, families or communities) in the developing countries. Another similarity that exists among many of these development agencies is the custom of sending expatriates to assist national staff in the development process. Expatriates serve either on long-term assignments -- as development administrators, administrative and technical staff members, and development specialists -- or in short-term assignments, as intercultural development consultants and technical advisers.

Just as the paradigm shift can be seen in the general field of development, many PDOs are also undergoing a process of change. Because of the re-examination of the needs of the world, the resources available in the affluent countries, and the experiences accumulated in alleviating human suffering, many agencies have gradually moved from a welfare assistance to a developmental approach.

Haveman (1981) notes that PVOs moved from relief-oriented activities in the early 1960s to self-help activities in the late 1970s. He argues that this shift would not have been possible without the encouragement from USAID to PVOs (p.50). Korten (1986), drawing upon the United States experience with private voluntary development agencies in Asia, points out that PVOs' efforts to relieve Third World poverty have undergone several

changes over the years as they have grown in sophistication and professionalism.

According to Korten (1986), many of the larger international PVOs relied on private contributions during the early years to deliver welfare services to the poor and unfortunate throughout the world. He terms such efforts as constituting the first generation of PVOs. Then, in the early and mid 1970s, PVOs came to recognize that sustainable improvements in the lives of the poor depend upon increasing their own capacity to meet their own needs with their own resources. Thus, emerged the second generation of private development efforts, which sought to promote local self-reliance through development activities, such as preventive health, improved farming practices, and enhanced local infrastructure. In recent years, some PVOs, in re-examining their basic strategic issues, are now entering into the third generation of development. It focuses on the collaboration between local governments and private organizations so as to sustain local initiatives. In this approach, PVOs play a catalytic role by organizing community groups, while simultaneously helping to strengthen local government capacity to support the self-help development efforts of indigenous groups.

Historical Background of The Agency

The agency being studied in this research (hereafter called, "The Agency") is one of many private development organizations.

The Agency was founded over thirty years ago by a missionary who was concerned about the plight of war-time orphans. Since then, the PDO has claimed a mandate of serving the "poorest of the poor" throughout the world. Service is carried out primarily through development assistance to

children, families and communities. The Agency provides emergency aid, promotes self-reliance, and conducts Christian leadership training. In the first decade, the main focus of The Agency was on the needs of orphaned children, especially needs caused by long term poverty, war, and natural disasters. As the number of orphans decreased, the organization moved away from childcare service in institutional settings and began to concentrate on the child and family as a unit in a community. Children and families continued to be fed, clothed, and provided shelter in a direct manner.

Later, The Agency was challenged by the awareness of thousands of people trapped in absolute poverty throughout the world, and by a growing recognition that attempts to relieve poverty through the direct delivery of food, health care, and shelter attacked only the symptoms of poverty without addressing its causes. Thus, The Agency now promotes and funds local development activities.

The Agency's Philosophy

The philosophy of The Agency, being motivated by the Christian world-view of following the example of Jesus Christ, is expressed in The Agency brochure as follows:

We are stirred and driven by unmet needs of countless millions of human beings caught in the toils of poverty, hunger, disease, loneliness, and despair. These are God's creatures formed in his image, yet unable to reach their God given potential. Our approach to this staggering need is holistic: we decline the unbiblical concept of spiritual over against the physical, the personal over against the social. It is the whole person, in the wholeness of his or her relationship that we want to see redeemed through the one Savior, Jesus Christ our Lord. (Agency Publication, 1978:1)

The Agency works closely with local governments and private organizations in the communities, as well as with local and national churches of different denominations.

Objectives of The Agency

The objectives of The Agency include: 1) ministering to children and families; 2) providing emergency relief and rehabilitation; 3) developing self-reliance; 4) reaching the unreached; 5) strengthening leadership; and 6) challenging the Christian mission.

Ministering to children and families refers to the assistance of needy children through orphanages, schools, and family-aid programs. This is accomplished by feeding, clothing, nurturing, healing, and spiritual ministries.

Providing emergency relief and rehabilitation refers to providing food, medical aid and immediate housing programs for people suffering as a result of war or natural disasters.

Developing self-reliance refers to helping people produce adequate food, earn income, and create a community life resulting in long-term survival and growth.

Reaching the unreached refers to assisting indigenous evangelistic efforts to reach the lost for Jesus Christ.

Strengthening leadership refers to helping Christian leaders throughout the world to attain a more effective Christian ministry.

Challenging the Christian mission refers to calling Christians around the world to carry out the work of Christ wherever the opportunity presents itself. (Agency Publication, 1983)

The Agency's Organizational Structure

The Agency is one of many international PDOs based in the United States. As its worldwide ministries expanded, The Agency became internationalized. The major elements of this internationalization include:

the International Office (IO); eleven Support Offices (SOs); and thirty-eight Field Offices (FOs).

The International Office (IO) is the headquarters of the Agency and is located in the United States. It is responsible for overall planning, policy-making and coordination among support offices and field offices throughout the world.

The Support Offices (SO) are the entities where funds are generated and later used to support the operations of The Agency. The eleven SO's are located in Western and affluent Eastern countries.

The Regional Offices (ROs) (no longer in existence) refer to the three regional level offices (in Asia, Latin America, and Africa). These offices existed before a major reorganization in The Agency. They helped to manage the field offices in each of the three regions, and to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the field ministries. They were replaced in the recent years by Field Development Offices with new roles and new functions.

The Field Offices (FOs) refers to the 38 operational offices of The Agency, which are located mostly in the developing countries. Their responsibility is to oversee the total operations of The Agency, including the expenditure of project funds at the country level.

Field Development Offices (FDOs) refer to offices that are located in each of the three regions where The Agency operates. The functions of the FDO are to provide technical assistance to field offices, and to help facilitate learning at the field office level. The FDOs have replaced the ROs. FDO staff, who originally held managerial positions in ROs, now play

the roles of development consultants, resource linkers, technical advisers and intercultural development facilitators to the staff in the FOs.

Change in The Agency's Structure

Like other major organizations, Agency has gone through several phases of structural change since its founding. The need of The Agency to quickly respond to the needs of the poor has contributed to the fast changing nature of the organization. These changes are described in Figure 3.1 on the functions of different offices in The Agency before and after the major re-organization (referred to earlier).

Projects

As depicted in Table 3.1, Agency currently focuses much attention on child/family assistance and community development. Projects are currently being conducted in approximately 80 countries.

Table 3.1 Types of Projects Funded by The Agency as of 1987

Types of Projects	Total Number
Assistance to children & families	2,826
Community development	1,060
Relief and rehabilitation	62
Evangelism & leadership	246
Total International Projects:	4,194
Number of children & families totally assisted	432,200
Number of sponsored children	394,600

Source: Agency Fact Card, 1987

Figure 3.1 The Functions of Different Offices in the Agency Before and After the Major Re-Organization

FUNCTIONS			
OFFICE	LEVEL	BEFORE	AFTER
IO in U.S.	Headquarters	- Represents Agency to at international level - Coordinates worldwide fundings from SDs to be distributed from IO to FDs directly - Coordinates FDs, SDs and ROs long-range planning & budget - Manages RO and FD activities - Reviews & approves all project proposals - Conceptualizes development models & provides guidelines to RO & FD on project design - Provides training to ROs & FDs management staff regionally or internationally - Develops management & information system between IO, ROs, and FDs - Documents development activities and formulates development policy - Audits all the projects with SDs staff	- Coordinates worldwide funding & planning & budgeting - Directly manages FDs through Regional Vice Presidents (RVPs) for each of 3 regions - Reviews & approves projects with budget above FD's authority level - Develops ministry position paper, policy guidelines, ministries standard with assistance of FDs & FDs - Assists FDs in installing impact evaluation system & conduct proj. impact evaluation for Agency senior management - Provides technical advice or training to FDs upon request
	Policy Level		- Manages FDs directly instead of through ROs - Increases FDs management responsibilities - Greater respect for FDs' autonomy in decision making - Increases its coordination function between SDs & FDs - Focuses more on policy formulation, ministry standard in -ion, ministry standard in - Install proj. impact evaluation system for accountability.
SDs in 11 countries	Income Source	- Seek funds from different entities within the country to support ministries in FDs or in countries without FDs presence - Channel funds to IOs for designated projects through FDs - Communicate Agency ministries to the general public - Communicate news on assisted children & projects to donors regularly - Audit funded projects with IO staff - Represent Agency regionally	(Maintains the same functions) - New addition: - Remains the same except the additional function of evaluating - Conduct project evaluation on government funded projects
	Management Level	- Hold management responsibilities for all FDs in the region - Manage FDs ministry issues - Reviewed project proposal & recommended to IO for final approval - Communicate IO policy and guidelines to FDs - Trained FDs management staff regionally - Communicated directly with IOs & FDs regarding management & technical issues.	(Replaced by FD0 after the major re-organization) - Management function of ROs returned to RVPs at IO

Figure 3.1 (Continued)

FD0s in 3 Regions	Training/ Tech.Level	(did not exist until major reorganization)	(Established to replace ROs) # Provide advice & service to FDs to enhance staff capability and project quality # Coordinate all human resources within or outside the Agency to meet FDs' technical needs # Work directly with FDs dev. staff, esp. area coordinators on project design # Facilitate/share innovations among FDs # Provides tech. advice to RVPs re FDs ministries # Co-design learning events with FDs regionally or in each FD # Provides assistance only upon requests of RVPs or FDs # FD0s assumes the technical function of ROs & part of that from IO # No management responsibilities over FD's # More concentrated emphasis on trainings and FDs capability
FDs in 38 coun- tries	Operational Level	# Represent the Agency to gov't, churches, other agencies & the communities at large # Manage, modify, and direct all projects in partnership with project committees. # Assist project workers and project committees in planning, implementing and evaluating development activities. # Distribute funds to projects according to agreed upon development plans # Submit all new projects to ROs & IO for approval # Train FDs staff including project workers & proj. committee members # Provide regular info to SOs on assisted children projects	# Maintains same functions as before except: # Approve new projects within FD's authority level # Fully responsible for all ministries within the country # FDs status assume more autonomy, & status enhanced # FDs are brought more fully into international team of Agency # Being consulted more often on policy formation, ministry standards and guidelines

The Agency, at present, engages in various types of programs. Some development programs, which focus on small local self-help projects in rural and remoted villages, include income generation efforts, for example, poultry raising, rice bank. Other projects focus on preventive health care, agricultural improvement, literacy, and local infrastructural development, such as building water systems, dams, and roads in isolated villages. Leadership training usually leads to the formation of local co-operatives. In crowded cities, urban ministries, which emphasize networking and community organization, aim at slum dwellers, factory workers, tribal immigrants, the handicapped, and others who need counseling, and legal and referral assistance, for example. In relief and rehabilitation programs, The Agency works extensively with other international organizations to assist refugees. In cooperation with governments, The Agency also takes part in large resettlement projects and village relocations, such as those in Bangladesh and Africa. Rehabilitation usually takes place after immediate emergency response to man-made or natural disasters, such as those that have recently occurred in Mexico. Christian leadership training is conducted nationally and internationally by IO and/or FOs.

The majority of the development projects are operated through project committees as ad hoc partner agencies. The members are composed of either local church leaders or a group of community leaders, who have been identified by project workers or community people. The committee members, representing the community, identify community needs and seek alternatives to meet those needs. These committees become the management body of the projects. They provide guidance to their project

manager for development activities sponsored by The Agency. Very often, the beneficiaries are involved in planning, implementing and evaluating the projects with the committee and the project worker.

Each project coordinator, The Agency's development facilitator, usually supervise 5 to 6 development projects in the same region. They are the contact points with the assisted communities. They represent The Agency, and play various roles, such as development experts, The Agency's policy implementors, community advisers, or trainers of project managers and project committees. They also implement development activities in the communities.

Currently, the FDOs and FOs are focusing attention on training project coordinators so as to enhance their effectiveness as development facilitators.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study is to identify the patterns of transition that intercultural development facilitators have undergone; and the significant experiences that may potentially affect their effectiveness with regard to dogmatism and authoritarianism. The research findings may serve as a basis for the selection of intercultural development facilitators, for designing curricula, for conducting pre-employment orientation, and for designing in-service training programs.

In this chapter, the methodology of the research is presented in detail. It starts with the focus of the study, the population and the sample. The instrumentation design process is described with regard to content, validity, and reliability. The data gathering procedures are then shared. The chapter concludes with the approach used in data analysis.

Focus of the Research

The exploratory study is guided by two major research questions and sub-questions.

1. What are the patterns of transition that are evident in intercultural development facilitators in relationship to their levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism?
 - 1.1.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their development interpretation?
 - 1.1.b. Is the shift in development interpretation evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?

- 1.2.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their self-perception?
- 1.2.b. Is the shift in self-perception evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?
- 1.3.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their interpersonal relationship?
- 1.3.b. Is the shift in interpersonal relationship evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?
- 1.4.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their work style?
- 1.4.b. Is the shift of work style evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?
- 2. What significant factors seem to positively and negatively affect the transition?

Rogers (1962) suggests that the assessment of an individual's personality must be based on an exploration of the person's feeling and attitudes toward himself and others. The respondents in the study are, therefore, guided by the following operational questions to reflect on their past experiences:

- 1. What are the feelings about themselves as they encounter the transition?
- 2. What are their reasonings behind their feelings?
- 3. What are the previous experiences that underly their reasonings?
- 4. How do these feelings, reasonings and experiences relate to levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism?

The research utilizes a case study approach based in a private development agency. It allows the researcher to collect qualitative and quantitative data on the transformation process of intercultural development facilitators. The study provides a comparison of the

intercultural development facilitator's perceptions on their past and present and identifies the possible factors for their transition.

The qualitative data provides the researcher with grounded descriptions of the phenomena and processes. Miles & Huberman (1984) describe qualitative research as one that "can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations." They help researchers to go beyond initial pre-conceptions and frameworks. Both of them consider the findings from qualitative studies with a quality of undeniability:

Words, especially when they are organized into incidents or stories have a concrete, vivid, meaningful flavor that often proves far more convincing to a reader . . . than pages of numbers (p.15)

The quantitative data in the study pertain to respondents' psychological profiles on dogmatism and authoritarianism.

The Population and the Sample

The population of the study includes a specific group of people who work as development administrators, intercultural consultants, and technical advisers in international development agencies.

The sample is a group of twenty-two intercultural development facilitators who work in the same international development agency, referred to as The Agency and generally described in Chapter III. The study respondents came from different work areas in Asia (n=5), Africa (n=7), Latin America (n=1), and North America (n=9). They attended a three-week workshop in Hawaii from October 7 to 25, 1985.

About the Workshop Information

The workshop entitled, FDD/FDO International Institute, was the first attempt of The Agency to enhance the facilitating skills of development facilitators at the International Office (IO), and the Field Development Offices (FDOs). The participants were executives and staff of the Field Development Division (FDD) in the IO, and all the development facilitators in the FDOs in the three regions.

The purpose of the meeting was 1) to review the experiences of development facilitators who have shifted their roles from the managerial positions in ROs to become at present development facilitators in FDOs, and the FDD; and 2) to define ways of measuring the quality of facilitators' performance in giving their support to Field Offices (FOs)..

The objectives for the Institute include the following:

1. Identify and document norms of professional behavior which will allow assessment of development facilitator's services by self and others.
2. Identify and document what experience and study has taught about serving the fields.
3. Develop and practice some basic skills and competencies as development educators or facilitators.
4. Identify issues relating to the quality of The Agency's development ministries which need attention in the near future and establish strategies for completing these actions.

Sample Selection

This workshop was designed specifically for a group of people with common experiences faced in role re-definition. The development facilitators of the three FDOs, including some of their administrative staff, as well as all the executives and staff of the FDD, were invited to attend the workshop.

This group was selected as an opportunity sample. The non-probability approach fits well with the overall research objectives for several reasons:

1. the timeliness of the inquiry, inasmuch as the workshop was expressively designed to serve these who are currently in role transition;
2. maximization of the respondents' development and transition experiences;
3. availability of a structured learning climate for critical reflection.

A small sample, as commented by Miles and Huberman (1984), is more common in qualitative study than survey research partly because the initial definition of the phenomenon is more limited; and partly because social processes have a logic and coherence in a specific setting.

The majority of this group has extensive development experience. Many of them have recently gone through a role transition from a managerial positions as development administrators in ROs to staff positions as development facilitators in FDOs, or the FDD. Their previous and current positions in The Agency or from other agencies is shown in Table 4.1.

The primary researcher is also included as one of the subjects in the study. A professional researcher was added to the staff of the study team in order to handle the interview and the data of the primary investigator. This procedure provided a safeguard for ensuring objectivity in the investigation and data analysis.

Instrumentation

The study focuses on the change process of intercultural development facilitators with regard to their dogmatism and authoritarianism. Three instruments were used to obtain qualitative and quantitative data.

Table 4.1 Respondents' Previous & Current Positions by Work Area

Work Areas	Previous Positions		Current Positions	
	Managerial Position	Staff Position	Managerial Position	Staff Position
Asia	4	1	1	4
Africa	5	2	1	6
L. American	0	1	1	0
N. America	8	1	2	7
Total	18	4	5	17

A non-scheduled interview was developed, and improved during the conference. It was used to determine the range of responses to a question, to ensure the best sequence of questions, and to discover special vocabularies which were more effective and relevant, for eliciting information about the transitions. The two standardized instruments were used to measure the respondents' levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism. In addition, an expert observer's judgement on respondents' participatory behavior on high, medium and low scale was also used as supplementary information to Research Question One.

The Non-Scheduled Interview (Appendix A)

A conceptual framework of a non-scheduled interview was developed and tested on two intercultural development facilitators at the workshop to determine its relevancy and appropriateness. It allowed for the discovery of the relationship between individual experiences and his level of dogmatism and authoritarianism. Gorden (1980) affirms the value of the non-scheduled interview in exploratory research as follows:

- 1) the open-ended interview through natural probing on respondent's feeling toward his experience provides more of an opportunity to motivate the respondent to give accurate and complete information;
- 2) the interview guides the respondent in his interpretation of the questions;
- 3) when the interviewer is unsure of the possible range of responses, the general information can lead to specific data;
- 4) the interviewer allows greater control over the interview situation;
- 5) when the respondent has had one or more prior experiences, it is necessary to ascertain which experience he was talking about due to the value of eliciting comparative responses;
- 6) the interview allows a greater flexibility in questioning the respondents. The more exploratory, the greater the need for flexibility in determining the wording of the question, the sequence of the questions, and the direction and amount of probing used;
- 7) the interview provides a greater opportunity to evaluate the validity of the information by observing the respondent's non-verbal manifestations of his attitudes toward supplying the information (pp.60-61).

Miles and Huberman (1984:37) also affirm the value of a non-scheduled interview. With the difficulties of knowing the parameters or dynamics of a social setting with certainty, a non-scheduled interview provides more precise and more meaningful information through an investigative process of contrasting, and comparing.

The four main categories of inquiry are the comparison of the past and present perceptions related to development interpretation, self-perception, work style and interpersonal relationship. Questioning begins with a focus on the present and then led into an attempted

differentiation of present with some experiences in the past. The categories of "then" and "now" emerge as each individual differentiates the characteristics of current thinking with those in the past. The differentiation allow the researcher to more clearly perceive the actual transitions and transformations. This framework becomes the researcher's map of the territory of investigation to safeguard against being "slipshod."

The basic questions of the non-scheduled interviews were:

Development Conceptualization

1. When did the consciousness of development begin to occur?
2. What triggered that consciousness to happen?
3. How was "development" being defined before and after?
4. Was there any awareness of the shift in interpreting development and why did the shift occur?

Self-Perception

5. What was the most satisfying experience in reference to the work in the past and the present?
6. How does one describe about self on the job then and now?
7. What are the feelings toward the changes and why?

Interpersonal Relationships

8. How did one perceive others on the job before and after?
9. How did one relate with others on the job before and after?
10. How did one feel toward the changes and why?

Work Style

11. How did one accomplish the task before and after?
12. How did one feel toward the changes, and why?

Dogmatism Scale (D-Scale) (Appendix B)

The research suggests that two key characteristics that determine development facilitator effectiveness are dogmatism and authoritarianism. The development facilitator's attitude toward people and the world around him was measured in the study by Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale. The authoritarianism, as indicated by a development facilitator's behavior, was measured by the Directiveness Scale.

The Dogmatism Scale, developed by Rokeach, is designed to measure the cognitive variables of personality: the open-mindedness and close-mindedness of the belief systems. Dogmatism is measured by the respondent's answers to the forty statements that expressed opinions towards the world around an average person in his every day life. They were constructed in such a way that if a person strongly agrees with such a statement, it indicates that he possesses one extreme of the particular characteristic. Conversely, if the person strongly disagrees, he possesses the opposite extreme.

The statements of the Dogmatism Scale were interspersed with each other to disguise their purpose. The respondent indicates disagreement or agreement with each item on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward disagreement or agreement. This scale is subsequently converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1 to 7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all items in the test.

Directiveness Scale (Appendix C)

The Scale designed by Ray is a direct measure of authoritarian behavior. It predicts particular trends in behavior such as a person who

has a tendency to impose his own will on others. Such a person is likely to be a supporter of positive authority (Ray, 1976; Kelman, 1974). The measure uses a three point scale and the range of possible scores are from 0 to 30. Responses are awarded scores as follows: "Yes" = 3 points, "Not Sure" = 2 points, and "No" = 1 point. During the scoring, all items marked "R" (reversed) were scored 1, 2, 3. This technique is designed to maintain validity. A high authoritarian person is reflected by a high score and vice versa.

Expert Observer

The key facilitator of the conference, who has had at least twenty-five years of experience in higher education as well as development education, and is a consultant to a variety of NGOs, provided the researcher with one important observation. The nature of the expert judgement was to provide supplementary information as to the degree of participatory behavior exhibited by each respondent. Such behavior was evidenced by frequent and willing participation in group activities, and through the sharing of ideas with an open attitude for listening to others during the three week workshop. Participatory behavior was then rated in three categories: high, medium and low. This piece of information helped to confirm the perceptions of the respondents toward their shift of work style, interpersonal relationship, and their relationship with dogmatic and authoritarian scores.

Interview Summary Form (Appendix D)

An interview summary form was used after each interview to provide the researcher with a rapid retrieval and synthesis of what occurred during

the interview process. It also helped to remind the researcher of the follow-up questions for the next respondent. The form also served as the first-run data reduction, without losing any of the basic information to which it referred.

Instrument Reliability

The reliability of the instruments used in the research are described separately.

Interview Guide. With the assistance of a tape recording, the primary researcher interviewed each respondent. The respondent may not be willing to articulate certain experiences or may provide socially desirable information. The open-ended non-scheduled interview process provides a meaningful way to understand changes in each individual within the context of a comfortable environment. The researcher provided a supportive and non-threatening milieu for the respondents so that distortions and evasions were minimized. The instrument validity and reliability in the study, therefore, depended largely on the skills of the researcher -- her familiarity with the setting and respondents under study, and her strong conceptual interest in the interview.

The validity and reliability of the interview guide also depended largely upon good interpersonal relationships between the researcher and the respondents. It allowed the researcher to elicit in-depth, relevant information and to empathize with the in-group transition. The researcher was "on guard not to fall into the trap," as mentioned by Gordon (1980), or of persuading the respondents to respond in a certain desired manner.

The tape recorder was used during the interview and was available for helpful reflection during the analysis process.to fully codify the remarks.

It was also used to help prepare for second interviews, if necessary. Follow-up questions were listed for another brief interview with the same respondent to confirm or clarify the data received. Hence, the transcribing of tape-recorded information ensured the reliability of the research data.

Dogmatism Scale. The Scale has been widely used, since 1956, with a high degree of consistency among British and American samples. The odd-even reliabilities of the scale range from .68 to .93 (Roeakch, 1960). The means scores, among the British and American samples, ranged from 141.3 to 183.2 with standard deviations of 22.1 to 28.2. Others have reported that reliability measurement for the Scale have been generally high for adults (Ehrlich, 1961; Lichtenstein, et al., 1961; Schulze, 1962; Troidahl & Powell, 1965). They typically show that high and low dogmatic subjects differ consistently and in a statistically significant manner on the great majority of items.

Directiveness Scale. The scale has been sensitive to authoritarian behavior with a reliability ("alpha") ranges of .73 to .75 (Ray, 1976, 1980). The mean scores were 52.52 (SD 7.57) and 55.41 (SD 8.07) (Ray, 1976). The Scale has also been used extensively in different cross-cultural samples among Americans, Australians, and South Africans (Heaven & Moerdyk, 1977).

Instrument Validity

The validity of the Dogmatism and Directiveness Scales are described as follows:

Dogmatism Scale. The Scale of high and low dogmatism has been validated through research on personality (Plant et al., 1965; Vacchiano, et al., 1968), interpersonal and group behavior (Saltzman, 1967), resistance to

change (Druckman, 1967), defense mechanisms which interferes with the processing of pre-decisional information (Long & Ziller, 1965), psychological adjustment (Vacchiano et al., 1968), learning process and teacher-student relationships (Johnson, 1968), and problem-solving, and rigidity (Rokeach, 1960, Torcivia & Laughlin, 1968). Research has demonstrated that dogmatism is basically independent of ideological content and represents a generalized cognitive state of the individual (Vacchiano, et al., 1969; Lemon, 1973).

Directiveness Scale. The scale has proven to have behavioral validity -- a measure of authoritarian trends that can predict behavior (Ray, 1976, 1980). The scale has been used in a wide variety of cross-cultural applications (Ray, 1980, 1984). It shows a strong ability to predict authoritarian behavior, and is free from racial and ideological bias and social desirability bias (Ray, 1976). Rigby's (1984) study also shows that the scale is a more direct method than an attitude scale in assessing behavioral tendencies.

Dogmatism and Authoritarianism are two distinct variables of personality: attitudes and behavior. The factor analysis suggests that the dogmatic attitude is independent from authoritarian behavior (Kerlinger & Rokeach, 1966). The contention is supported by Lemon (1973). But he also suggests that the two may be related to each other at a deeper level through some form of mental rigidity.

Data Gathering Procedures

The study was introduced by the workshop key facilitator to the participants at the end of the first week. At that time, a sound and trust relationship had developed among the key facilitator, the researcher and

the participants. The researcher, arriving on the third day of the three week workshop, was introduced briefly to the respondents as one of the participants. Having had 13 years of service with The Agency, she was familiar with the majority of the participants and was generally well accepted. She continued to make a special effort to get to know individuals informally by actively participating in workshop sessions, as well as indoor and outdoor leisure activities with the rest of the participants whenever possible.

At the end of the first week, the Key facilitator introduced the purpose of the study, its timeliness, its relevancy to the workshop, and its importance to the participants and to The Agency, (which is in search of improving the effectiveness of development facilitators). At this point, the researcher was introduced again to all the participants and her role in the research explained. The knowledge of the researcher's new role did not affect her relationship with any of the respondents. In some cases, several respondents initiated the interview schedule with the researcher.

The key facilitator also explained how and why the respondents were selected, and that some interviews would have to take place during the sessions so that the data collected by the researcher alone could be completed before the end of the workshop.

A time-table for the interviews was then developed by the researcher at individual consent. Careful choice of the time and place was considered for each interview. To facilitate communication, very frequently the site was chosen at a quiet restaurant or quiet conference hotel room where interviews took place in a more private, but leisurely and relaxing manner. The researcher also made an attempt to choose the optimum and

appropriate time of the day for the interviews so as to meet with the respondent's satisfaction. As a result, interviews took place during breakfast, lunch, and dinner. A small number of interviews took place during the sessions.

Interview Procedures

A multiple interview approach was adopted for this exploratory, qualitative research. Each initial interview lasted from 45 minutes to one hour. After each interview, the researcher retrieved the information, synthesized the first contact and segmentized the responses into four main areas: development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. A brief follow-up interview, which usually lasted about 15 minutes, served to affirm, clarify, or obtain further information that was missed in the previous interview. These brief follow-up interviews usually took place during the breaktime of the sessions, lunch or evening time when respondents were at leisure.

The researcher, at the beginning of every interview, explained once again the purpose of the study, especially its extrinsic value to the respondent and The Agency. She requested that the interview be taped and assured the confidentiality and anonymity of the data. A small cassette-recorder was placed at the desk where the respondent was not conscious of it during the interview.

Each interview began with a very broad open-ended question and was followed by a series of neutral probes. The opening questions were "When did you join the organization?" "What did you do?" "Was that the first time you were involved in development work?" These questions helped establish a reminiscent mood, and led the respondent into more current

episodes. By the time the more recent events were reached, the respondent was becoming aware of changes in himself. The researcher, closely familiar with the interview framework, continued to probe the transition pattern by getting respondents into a habit of thinking or reflecting on the difference in themselves during the periods of "then" and "now." This questioning provided not only a stimulus to the memory, but also a general context, thereby enabling the interviewer to make inferences and pose more searching questions. The researcher would especially probe vague points in the response and would return to a topic more than once. Some questions were omitted when the required information was already obtained indirectly. The overall sequence of the questions began with the description of their past and present, their feelings about the change, and followed with their reason for the feeling. The experience that underlined the reasoning was further probed. In this way, the respondents were guided to see themselves as they reflected on, and organized the meaning of, their experiences.

All of the respondents, except for two cases, were very cooperative, genuine, sincere, and open during the interviews. The researcher was consciously aware of the potential inhibitions that might make the respondents unwilling or unable to give valid or precise information. When resistance within the respondent was detected on certain topics especially in interpersonal relationships, the researcher diverted the questions to other areas but then returned to the same topic again through indirect probing.

Administration of the Instruments

On each of two mornings, the Dogmatism and Directiveness Scale were administered separately to all participants, 29 in total, in the classroom before the morning workshop session began. Only 22 respondents' were included in the study. The other 7 participants were administrative staff whose role was not related to the study.

The respondents took about 10 to 15 minutes to complete each scale and returned them to the Key facilitator. After marking a number at the top of each of the Directiveness Scale and The Dogmatism Scale, the Key facilitator privately listed the names which corresponded with the numbers marked on the instruments on a sheet of paper. The list was given to the researcher after the workshop. The researcher kept the closed list away from disclosure until the data were reduced to preliminary findings.

The expert observer provided the researcher with his observation on the respondents' participatory behavior after the conference was over. It was put aside until till the initial analysis was completed.

Approach to Data Analysis

The data-analysis procedures has three major components: 1) the data sorting and categorizing the statements about the past and the present; 2) comparison among categories and factors according to respondents' dogmatic and authoritarian scores; and 3) sorting and categorizing the possible positive and negative experiences in relationship to the shift.

Quantitative and qualitative analysis were used to answer the two research questions. Both analytical methods with inherent strengths and weaknesses complement and supplement each other in the study. The

qualitative data bring out the social dynamics of the situation by supporting the quantitative data whenever possible, without sacrificing one for the other. Appropriate generalizations are then made when distinct patterns are detected.

In data sorting, the 22 respondents were divided into four groups based on their level of dogmatism and authoritarianism, i.e. high dogmatic and high authoritarian (DA), low dogmatic and low authoritarian (da), low dogmatic and high authoritarian (dA), and high dogmatic and low authoritarian (Da). The comparative analytical methods begin at the (DA) and (da) groups and repeated in the other groups (dA, Da). The purpose was to see the similarities, differences and the transitional patterns in each group. At the same time, it keeps the vitality of individual cases in a group analysis.

One way to identify the transitional patterns is by means of comparing the factors emerged from the following four categories in the then and now time frame:

1. development interpretation
2. self-perception
3. inter-personal relationship
4. work style

Validity of Factors

The statements of "now" and "then" were given to a validity panel judge who has a similar background to the researcher. The selected panel judge, a student at Michigan State University, comes from the Third World with extensive development experience. He is in a similar doctoral program as that of the researcher. The researcher gave him a fresh list of the statements, the categories, factors, and the binary descriptors. The decision rules on factors, and the procedures were also given. It provides

detailed explanation on how these statements are classified by the researcher. The researcher and the panel judge jointly agreed upon the majority of the factors after two revisions were completed on the decision rules. For those in disagreement, the items were discussed extensively and finally arrived at consensus on the use of appropriate factors.

Data-Sorting Process

The process of creating factors in each category was implemented as follows:

1. Organize all statements into a now/then framework according to the above four categories;
2. Sort the statements according to similarity;
3. Re-sort statements in order to create preliminary factors.

Data-analyzing Process

The process of analyzing data involved the following steps:

1. All the responses of each of the major questions in the above categories were displayed on a separate sheet of paper in a then and now time frame.
2. The researcher made preliminary observations on all the basic factors. The decision rules of grouping into the same factor were written down. They were then reduced into concise and mutually exclusively sets of criteria that could serve as decision rules for each factor.
3. As the factors of each category emerged, the statements and the decision rules on categories were given to the panel judge for a validity test.

3. Based on the revised and agreed upon factors in each category, the researcher wrote down the factors on a 3"x5" card for each respondent. They were sorted into four groups according to respondents' dogmatism and authoritarian scores (i.e. DA, da, dA, & Da).
4. The shifting pattern of factors within each group was identified by comparing the binary descriptors (factors) between and among the groups to see any significant difference.
5. Generalizations were then derived for Research Question One. They described the general trend of movement and the significant patterns of shifting among these groups, specifically (DA & da) groups.
6. The possible experiences, that were reported in relationship to "Now" statements, were identified and written on the 3"x5" cards. The cards were mixed and re-sorted according to those who made the positive or negative shift; and those who did not shift at all.
7. Frequency count was used to tally the possible experiences that are related to the shift to answer Research Question Two. Due to the limited size of the sample, percentage was not used to avoid misled information.
8. The possible experiences were basically descriptive and qualitative data. They were identified to see what could be grouped together, but did not necessarily identify cause-and-effect relationships.

Summary

This chapter has provided a description of the procedures and methodology used in the study. The selection of the sample was described and rationale provided for the use of an opportunity sample. The instruments used in the study are non-scheduled interviews, the Dogmatism Scale and the Directiveness Scale. The validity and reliability of the instruments was examined. The chapter concluded with the data analysis procedures.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

The purpose of the study is to identify the significant patterns of transition that intercultural development facilitators have undergone that may affect their effectiveness in relationship to their dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics.

Research Questions

Two main research questions with sub-questions guide the study:

1. What are the patterns of transition that are evident in intercultural development facilitators in relationship to their levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism?
 - 1.1.a. What change (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their development interpretation?
 - 1.1.b. Is the shift in development interpretation evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?
 - 1.2.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their self-perception?
 - 1.2.b. Is the shift in self-perception evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?
 - 1.3.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their interpersonal relationship?
 - 1.3.b. Is the shift in interpersonal relationship evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?
 - 1.4.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their work style?
 - 1.4.b. Is the shift of work style evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?

2. What significant factors seem to positively and negatively affect the transition?

The study has suggested that development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style of intercultural development facilitators are related to their dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics. An attempt has been made to describe the "paradigm shift" in development, from the dominant model of the early 60s to the people-oriented development in the late '70s. The shift brings new meaning to education in development and a new perspective to the role of development facilitator. The literature cited supports the contention that intercultural development facilitator effectiveness is related to the level of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

A case study approach was used in this research to understand the change process of a group of 22 intercultural development facilitators in relation to their dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics. All of them came from the same private development agency (PDO), which has years of development experience in the Third World. Two standard instruments and a non-scheduled interview were used to obtain qualitative and quantitative data.

In this chapter, the data are examined through sorting, counting, and categorizing. All the respondents were divided into four groups according to their dogmatic and authoritarian scores measured by the Dogmatism and the Directiveness Scales:

(DA): high dogmatism and high authoritarianism.

(da): low dogmatism and low authoritarianism.

(dA): low dogmatism but high authoritarianism.

(Da): high dogmatism but low authoritarianism.

Their responses were then analysed through comparison between then and now time frame and among groups.

The findings are organized according to the two research questions and the sub-questions. In Question 1, the data are presented in categories of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. In each category, binary factors are analyzed in order to determine the tendency of worth. Nine tendency of worth are developed in the data-sorting process and presented under Question One. The qualitative data are presented with the support of tables that indicate the number of responses in their 'Then' and 'Now' time-frame.

Profile of Respondents

A total of 22 respondents were interviewed during the three-week-workshop in Hawaii. This section describes some of the demographic data pertaining to the respondents.

Sex

The majority of the respondents, 77% (17), were males, while 23% (5) were females (see Table 5.1).

Age

77% (17) of the respondents were under 50 years old, while 23% (5) were over 50 years old. The mean age was 43. The age of the respondents varies among regions. In Asia, 3 out of 5 respondents were over 50 years

old, while the majority in Africa, Latin America and North America work areas were less than 50 years (see Table 5.1).

Nationalities

All the respondents originated from 10 countries. They were grouped according to regions or continents, rather than individual country. 54% (12) of the respondents were Americans, and the others originated from Asia, Africa, Australia (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1 Respondents' Sex, Age, Nationalities by Work Area

Characteristics	Work Areas				Total	
	Asia (n=5)	Africa (n=7)	L. Am. (n=1)	N. Am. (n=9)	N (n=22)	%
SEX						
Male	4	5	1	7	17	77
Female	1	2	0	2	5	23
AGE						
31 - 40 yrs	1	3	1	3	8	36
41 - 50 yrs	1	3	0	5	9	41
51 - 60 yrs	3	1	0	0	4	18
Over 60 yrs	0	0	0	1	1	5
NATIONALITIES						
Asian	2	0	0	2	4	18
African	0	5	0	0	5	23
Australian	1	0	0	0	1	5
American	2	2	1	7	12	54

Educational Level

The educational levels of the respondents were quite evenly distributed (see Table 5.2). About 86% (19) of the total respondents received at least advanced degrees in various fields. 14% (3) received undergraduate levels, but their development experience ranged from 4 to 8 years.

Areas of Studies

86.5% (19) of the respondents were professionally trained in areas related to development (see Table 5.2). Of these professionals, 73% (16) were trained in general areas, such as theology, social work, sociology, anthropology, education, community development, and communication. 13.5% (3) were specialized in technical disciplines related to development, such as economic, agriculture, public health care, business administration. And 13.5% (3) were trained in areas not job-related. Their time with the Agency spanned from 5 to 11 years.

Table 5.2 Respondents' Educational Level, Area of Studies by Work Area

Characteristics	Work Areas				Total	
	Asia	Africa	L. Am.	N. Am.	N	%
EDUCATION LEVEL						
College/Diploma	0	1	0	2	3	14
Graduates	5	6	1	7	19	86
AREAS OF STUDY						
Dev Related/General	(2)	(6)	(1)	(7)	(16)	73
Theology	1	2	0	2	5	
Soc./Soc.W/Antho	0	3	0	2	5	
Educ/CD	1	0	1	3	4	
Communication	0	1	0	0	1	
Dev Related/Spec. e.g.agriculture	(2) 2	(1) 1	(0) 0	(0) 0	(3)	13.5
Non-Dev Related	(1)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(3)	13.5

Development Experience

9% (2) of the total respondents had been involved in development for less than a year. 14% (3) had 1 to 5 years development experience, and 77% (17) had development experience from 6 to 35 years. The mean development experience of the entire group was 10.5 years (See Table 5.3).

Cross-Cultural Experience

73% (16) had worked and lived in another cultures for more than 6 years. 13.5% (3) had less than 5 years experience. 13.5% (3) of the respondents from North America did not have any cross-cultural or overseas working experience. The mean cross-cultural experience of the entire group was 8 years (see Table 5.3).

Table 5.3 Respondents' Development Experience and Cross-cultural Experiences by Work Area

Characteristics	Work Areas				Total	
	Asia	Africa	L. Am.	N. Am	N	%
YRS IN DEVELOPMENT						
Less than 1 yr	0	1	0	1	2	9
1 to 5 yrs	0	1	0	2	3	14
6 to 10 yrs	2	4	0	2	8	36
11 to 15 yrs	2	1	1	1	5	23
Over 15 yrs	1	0	0	3	4	18
CROSS-CULTURAL EXP						
None	0	0	0	3	3	13.5
1 to 5 yrs	0	1	0	2	3	13.5
6 to 10 yrs	2	5	0	3	10	46
Over 11 yrs	3	1	1	1	6	27

Years with Agency

23% (5) of the respondents joined Agency within the past year. 32% (7) had been working with Agency between 1 to 5 years; while 45% (10) been employed between 6 to 12 years. Many of them joined Agency before it moved from its childcare orientation to its current development assistance approach. The mean number of years working with Agency for the entire group was 6 years (see Table 5.4).

Table 5.4 Respondents' Years in Agency by Work Area

YEARS IN AGENCY	Work Area				Total	
	Asia	Africa	L. Am.	N. Am.	N	%
less than 1 yr	0	2	0	3	5	23
1 to 5 yrs	3	1	0	3	7	32
6 to 10 yrs	0	4	1	3	8	36
Over 11 yrs	2	0	0	0	2	9

Years in Previous and Current Positions

About 68% of the respondents were currently experiencing role changes from previous managerial positions (see Table 5.5). The previous managerial positions varied from division or department head, associate to the division or department head, church minister, to university and field development administrator. At least four respondents previously held managerial positions for an extended period of time in other agencies before they assumed a staff role with Agency.

Table 5.5 Respondents' Years in Previous and Current Position by Work Area

YEARS IN POSITION	Work Area				Total	
	Asia	Africa	L. Am.	N. Am.	N	%
PREVIOUS						
<u>Manager</u>	(4)	(5)	(1)	(8)	(18)	82
1 to 3 yrs	1	4	1	1		
Over 4 yrs	3	1	0	7		
<u>Staff</u>	(1)	(2)	(0)	(1)	(4)	18
1 to 3 yrs	1	2	0	1		
CURRENT						
<u>Manager</u>	(1)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(7)	32
1 to 3 yrs	1	1	1	0		
Over 4 yrs	1	1	1	2		
<u>Staff</u>	(4)	(4)	(0)	(7)	(15)	68
Less than 1 yr	0	0	0	3		
1 to 3 yrs	4	4	0	4		

Respondents' Dogmatic and Authoritarian Scores

22 respondents completed Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale measuring dogmatic attitude and Ray's Directiveness Scale measuring authoritarian behavior. Table 5.6 shows the median, high and low scores, and standard deviations of the respondents' Dogmatism and Authoritarian scores.

Table 5.6 Respondents' Median, Low and High Scores, and Standard Deviations of Dogmatic and Authoritarian Scores

Scale	# of Cases	Median	Low Scores	High Scores	Standard Deviations
Dogmatism Scale	22	132.50	105	204	24.68
Directiveness Scale	22	51.50	40	62	5.50

The range of respondents' dogmatism scores is 99, while the range of their authoritarianism scores was 22. The theoretical range of the scores on the Dogmatism Scale was 240 (from 40 to 280). The theoretical range of the scores on the Authoritarian Score was 52 (from 26 to 78). The median of the 22 respondents' Dogmatism and Authoritarian scores was 132.50 and 51.50. The median was used instead of the mean in order to avoid extreme scores on either end of the scale. All of those respondents with a dogmatism score higher than the median of 132.50 were grouped "high dogmatic" (D), while those with a score lower than 132.50 were "low dogmatic" (d). All those respondents with an authoritarian score higher than the median of 51.50 were grouped as "high authoritarian" (A), while those with a score lower than 51.50 were "low authoritarian" (a). The 50% tale at the median is less likely to be negatively affected by extreme values. As a result, four groups were formed with high dogmatic and high

authoritarian (DA) (n=5), low dogmatic and low authoritarian (da) (n=6), low dogmatic and high authoritarian (dA) (n=6), and high dogmatic and low authoritarian (Da) (n=5).

With the small sample of 22, Spearman's Rank-difference Correlation was used to measure the correlation of the respondents' dogmatism and authoritarian scores. The statistical result shows both scales are independent of each other. The Dogmatism Scale measures respondents' dogmatic attitude, while the Directiveness Scale measures authoritarian behavior.

**Relationship of Respondents' Demographic Characteristics and
Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores**

The number of respondents in Table 5.7 suggests the relationship between respondents' nationalities, years of development experience, cross-cultural experience and their dogmatic and authoritarian scores.

Table 5.7 Respondents' Nationalities, Development and Cross-Cultural Experiences by Dogmatic and Authoritarian Scores

Groups	Nationalities		Dev. Exp.		Cross-Cultural	
	Amer.	Others	> 10yrs	< 10yrs	> 8yrs	< 8yrs
(DA) (n=5)	2	3	1	4	1	4
(da) (n=6)	4	2	3	3	2	4
(dA) (n=6)	5	1	2	4	3	3
(Da) (n=5)	1	4	3	2	4	1
Total:	12	10	9	13	10	12

Nationalities and Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores

Of 22 respondents, 12 were Americans, with the other 10 coming from Asia, Africa, and Australia (Table 5.8). Of the 12 American respondents, 3 were high dogmatic (D), 9 low dogmatic (d), while 7 were high authoritarian (A) and 5 were low authoritarian (a). In comparison with other nationalities, the American respondents tended to be more low dogmatic and high authoritarian. Among the 4 Asian respondents, 3 were (D) with 1 (d), while 3 were (a) with 1 (A). Among the 5 Africans, 4 were (D) with 1 (d); while 3 were (a) and 2 were (A).

Development Experience with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores

Among the 9 respondents who had over 10 years development experience, there were 4 (D), 5 (d), 3 (A), and 6 (a). Among the 13 who have less development experience, there were 6 (D), 7 (d), 8 (A), and 5 (a) (See Table 5.8).

Table 5.8 Respondents' Development Experience by Dogmatic and Authoritarian Scores

SCORES	10 YEARS and OVER	UNDER 10 YEARS
(D)	4	6
(d)	5	7
(A)	3	8
(a)	6	5

In comparing the years of development experience, those who had less development experience tend to have high dogmatic (D) and high authoritarian (A) scores.

Cross-Cultural Experience with Dogmatic and Authoritarian Scores

Among the 10 respondents who had more than 8 years cross-cultural working experiences, there were 5 (D), 5 (d), 4 (A), and 6 (a). Among those who have less years of cross-cultural experience, 5 were (D), 7 (d), 7 (A), and 5 (a) (see Table 5.9).

Table 5.9 Respondents' Cross-cultural Experience by Dogmatic and Authoritarian Scores

SCORES	> 8 YEARS	< 8 YEARS
(D)	5	5
(d)	5	7
(A)	4	7
(a)	6	5

The 6 (da) who were Americans have less cross-cultural experience. In comparing the groups with years of cross-cultural experience, the data seem to suggest that the length of cross-cultural experience is not related to the respondents' dogmatic and authoritarian scores.

Transitional Patterns

The findings of Research Question 1 were organized according the sub-questions of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style, or under the research sub-questions. In each category, a number of factors were analyzed in order to determine the shifting of the factors in relationship to dogmatic and authoritarian scores.

Development Interpretation

The Development Interpretation category refers to the way a person interprets or defines the development concept. In understanding the process of development conceptualization, two questions were posed to the respondents: "When did the notion of development first occur?" "What triggered development consciousness to happen?"

First Occurrence of the Development Concept When asked when the development concept first occurred, two factors emerged: personal experience and academic experience. 17 (77%) of the respondents mentioned that development idea first came to them through their personal experience, either by actual involvement in development work, exposure to development practice, or on-job learning from Agency. The other 5 (23%) learned of development through their academic experience, either in theological training or graduate studies in social science (See Table 5.10).

Table 5.10 When did the first notion of development occur?

Personal Experience	# of Respond.	Academic Experience	# of Respond.
Working with people	9	Theological Training	3
Exposure to Dev. practice	1	Graduate Studies	2
Learned from the Agency	7		
Total	17 (77%)	Total	5 (23%)

9 out of the 17 respondents who first learned of development through personal experience, had actually been involved in so called "development" work in other agencies. The following responses were typical:

"My first awakening came from working with XX church on agriculture development."

"It began from my early involvement with a small scale development project in church context."

"My development ideas started with The Agency because we sat down and planned program with the people."

The other 7 of the 17 respondents only heard of development when they joined The Agency:

"It was introduced by my boss who brought back the development idea and a development article from the The Agency conference. He was very excited about it."

"When I joined The Agency, I didn't know development. But I read from books and taught it to the field people."

"Never heard of development till I joined the The Agency."

The responses indicate that The Agency, in the early days, hired those who did not have development background either in knowledge or actual field experience. Three of them joined Agency before it changed to development practice. They learned of development as Agency changed its direction.

Of the five respondents who learned of development through academic experience, 3 indicated that it came from their theological training and 2 from graduate studies:

"The idea began in college with Christian experiences and theological training from a Scriptural basis."

"I learned from my graduate studies as a teaching assistant in development courses."

The majority of the respondents expressed that the development concept was not occurred at one particular point in time, but rather, it emerged gradually as their experiences accumulated. The term "development" was vague and unclear to many of them. They were not able

to "name" development at that time, but later realized that they were actually doing development. The following are some examples of the responses:

"I was not aware of development as a concept but I did it."

"[It is] hard to find a particular point in history when development occurred."

"Development was not a concept or discipline to me but rather it emerged through my life experience working with farmers in the jungle who didn't have food and materials."

"The personal journey, working on Scriptures and observations of life around me helped me to become aware of development."

Brundage and MacKeracher (1980) state that adults learn best when the context is personally relevant to the present concern and the learning is relevant to life experiences. The data show that the respondents learned the development concept because of job requirements or because of other immediate concerns. It also shows the importance of the continuity of experiences that bring their gradual awareness of the concept of development.

Triggers to Development Consciousness When asked about what triggered development consciousness to happen, two factors emerged: Internal Dissonance and External Influence. 64% (14) of the respondents indicated cognitive dissonance as the main cause. Development consciousness was triggered when they personally were exposed to, or experienced, an unjust situation. 36% (8) expressed that the external influences, such as reading, visiting a model project, interaction with others or The Agency's orientation, caused that awareness to happen. In 3 or 4 cases, it was a combination of dissonance and external influences. Table 5.11 summarizes the responses.

Table 5.11 What triggered that development consciousness to happen?

DISSONANCE	# of Respondents	EXTERNAL INFLUENCE	# of Respondents
Exposed to/experienced unjust system	3	Studies/Research	2
Exposed to poverty	3	Visit to model project	1
Performance gaps -- expected and actual	7	Interaction w/ others	1
Self-reflection	1	Agency orientation	4
Total	14 (64%)	Total	8 (36%)

Among the 14 respondents who identified dissonance as the main trigger, 3 specifically indicated that their exposure to, or personal experience of, an unjust system situation caused them to think of development. 3 of them attributed their awareness to their exposure of poverty. Some of the examples are:

"In xxx, I was involved in a revolving fund project run by an indigenous church who had a history of insisting on being themselves.... I was upset with the western missionary approach that wouldn't allow people to use their own local language.... Then I saw tribal people were not allowed to plant mother crops in place of opium. I was very angry and began to concern about development other than culture."

"I grew up in a poor area and was deeply affected by my own sense of powerless in a condition where I didn't want to be.... When I was first exposed to the deep poverty in xxx, I began to realize that system forces people into that situation and maintains that poverty. Then I saw how community organization, community development and housing development are addressing the system and we don't have to be subjected to the system."

"I became aware of the retreat and the quietness of the poor during discussions with their leaders. Then a drunken

villagers became outspoken of their exploitation and suffering. It gave me a new meaning to development."

A majority of the group (7) were triggered by the performance gaps that they experienced. Zaltman and Duncan (1977:24) explain a performance gap as a "discrepancy between the criteria of satisfaction in performing some act and the actual performance of that act." Thus a performance gap, whether internally or externally induced, serves as a stimulus to search for alternative ways of responding. Some of the typical examples are:

"I was disappointed at the dependent attitude of our childcare project partners toward us. Our work was very much of giving, providing without letting people see that they had the responsibilities too. Then I got excited by the article written by Stoez on "Thoughts on Development." It gave me a new hope of how we could do things differently."

"As a junior government officer, I led a troop to take over a village in xx. We came with good intentions to help them without any weapons and showed no force. But people responded silently and passively. I then realized that development should be governed by the people themselves, disregard the mistakes they might make."

"I saw the same kinds of service given by the missionaries to my people -- clothing, food and others -- before the independence of my country and 10 years after the independence. I was very disturbed by the same kinds of service given... That is not what I am called to do... I felt bad to see that men and women of my culture losing their pride and dignity when someone always give things to them."

Of the 8 respondents who considered external influences as the cause of their awareness, 4 of them indicated that they learned it from Agency. One respondent considered it was a combination of interaction with others and then later enhanced by the Agency training. The examples include:

"While working as a lay pastor, I was challenged by a lady who was concerned about prostitutes around the church and asked if we should do something about them. I refused because, at that time, I believed that gospel preaching would be weakened if the church involved in social action. But the

challenge stayed inside me till I joined the Agency. I was exposed to the drought and poverty in Africa and I began to see a full picture of Christian concerns for physical and spiritual needs. That was when my deeper awareness of development began."

"My exposure to the Agency's project gave me a broader picture of development than the early solely Christian view of growth."

Development Interpretation The factors defined in the category of development interpretation emerged from respondents' responses to the question: "How was 'development' defined before and now?" The following factors which described the actors, process, and outcome of development were grouped together to form the category of Development Interpretation:

- * Process of Change
- * Outcome of Change
- * Development Facilitator's Role

The "Process of Change" refers to the binary descriptors of a change process. In order to make change happen, they focus either on an individual's self-determination, or other-determination, that is being controlled by others.

The "Outcome of Change" refers to the binary descriptors of aiming either at the individual's attitude change through self-awareness, or at the physical/material change.

The "Role of the Development Facilitators" refers to the binary descriptors of either an enabler who assists, facilitates individuals to bring about change in themselves, or as a controller who manages, provides, plans for, and carries out the change for others.

The descriptors of attitude change, self-determination, and the enabler role in development interpretation imply a people-oriented development.

The descriptors of physical change, other-determined, and the controller role tend to imply a production-oriented development.

Analysis of Question 1.1.a. What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their development interpretation?

"THEN" Development Interpretation The majority (14) of respondents defined development as production-oriented, where a set of procedures or list of activities or programs were provided for, and carried out by the outsider as a means to all ends. They emphasized physical changes, such as improvement in the living conditions, or welfare of the people. The statements implied changes that were brought about mostly by the experts or outsiders. The role of the development facilitator or agency was a controller who carried out the change for others (See Table 5. 12).

Some of the typical examples of production-oriented development interpretations are:

"Development is doing and giving what we think people need."

"Development is providing welfare assistance to the poor."

"Development is applying basic management skills to solve people's problems. If people can solve their problems, they can become self-reliant."

"Development is a long range plan of improving living conditions; saving lives, and at the same time teaching them necessary knowledge."

The other 8 respondents defined development as more people-oriented.

Table 5.12 Comparison among Responses on Process, Outcome of Change, and Development Facilitator's Role with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then and Now

FACTORS/ DESCRIPTORS	(DA)		(da)		(dA)		(Da)		TOTAL	
	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now
PROCESS OF CHANGE										
Self-Deter.	2	5	2	5	2	4	2	2	8	16
Others-Dete.	3	0	4	1	4	2	3	3	14	6
OUTCOME OF CHANGE										
Attitude Change	3	4	2	5	3	6	0	4	8	19
Physical Change	2	1	4	1	3	0	5	1	14	3
DEVELOPMENT FACILITATOR ROLE										
Enabler	1	5	2	6	3	5	2	3	8	19
Controller	4	0	4	0	3	1	3	2	14	3

"NOW" Development Interpretation The majority of the respondents tended to move toward people-oriented development, focusing on attitude change (16), individual self-determination (19), and the development facilitator role as one of an enabler (19). Some examples of these statements are:

"People don't have to live with their limitations, but with the potential to create, and utilize their own knowledge. Development is to help people gain confidence in themselves."

"Development is a process of empowerment by walking with people, giving them the opportunity and removing their limitations at their own time. It is for the total community and not the isolated groups. It is Christian incarnation."

"Development is people being responsible for their own destiny; they built power through coalitions, working

mutually toward common goals and building relationship with one another. It gives pride and self accomplishment."

"Development is liberation and empowerment of people, who, when given a chance to do things for themselves, the success of experiences becomes empowerment. Their abilities emerged which liberate them from oppression."

The responses show a movement from a previous focus of production-oriented development to people-oriented development. There is a gradual sophistication of wording in defining development. They are more ideological i.e. abstract, general and vague. In comparison with the definitions in the past, it may suggest a deeper appreciation for the complexity of development. An increasing emphasis on the internal awareness of the individual as the key in the process of change, rather than physical changes, is noted. An increasing emphasis on the self-determination of an individual in the change process, rather than a paternalistic or outside-controlled approach to change is also noted.

The role of a development facilitator is becoming more low key -- such as helper, enabler, catalyst; rather than being a provider of resources, manager, planner or programmer to carry out change for others.

Analysis of Questions 1.1.b Is the shift in development interpretation evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?

In Table 5.12, the responses show that there was a unanimous shift toward the same direction among the four groups, i.e. toward people-oriented development, in factors of "Process of Change," "Outcome of Change," and "Development Facilitator's Role" among all the four groups. The shift does not seem to be related to respondents' high and low dogmatism and authoritarianism.

The degree of shift among groups is quite similar, except that the (Da) group still prefers the 'Process of Change' being determined by others rather than by the individual self. In the factor of the "Change Agent's Role," the (Da) group tends to be less interested in moving to an enabler role.

Self-Perception

The Self-Perception category refers to the way a person describes and feels about himself. The factors defined in the category emerged from the respondents' answers to two basic questions: "What is the most satisfying experience then and now?" "How do you describe yourself on the job then and now?" The following three factors emerged in the category of how a person perceives himself on the job.:

- * Sense of Value
- * Sense of Identity
- * View Toward Role

The "Sense of Value" refers to the binary descriptors of either self-oriented or other-oriented. A self-oriented person values experience that enriches his own learning by himself, or together with others mentally, emotionally, and intellectually. The other-oriented person values experience that enriches others' growth or others' changes through his effort. Whether the person benefits or learns from that experience is not important. The most important thing is that other people learn.

The "Sense of Identity" refers to the binary descriptors of internal sources or external sources. A person who depends on internal sources, evaluates and values the merits of his experience independently by his own self-actualizing forces. A person, who depends on external sources,

evaluates and values the merits of his experience based on the affirmations of others on how he does.

The "View Toward Role" refers to the binary descriptors of rigid or flexible views toward his work role. A person, who has a flexible view toward work role, is comfortable even though the role is ambiguous. He is able to view the role with a different or mixed nature other than the ascribed role. A person who has a rigid view toward work role, is uncomfortable when his role is ambiguous, but is comfortable when the role is clearly defined with specific tasks or responsibilities.

The three descriptors of 1) self-orientation in sense of value, 2) dependence on internal sources for a sense of identity, and 3) a flexible view toward role, imply that a person is open and receptive to new ideas. He tends to be secure, is flexible, and is likely to be tolerant to ambiguity. On the other hand, the three descriptors of 1) other-orientation in sense of value, 2) dependence on external sources, and 3) a rigid view toward role imply that a person is closed to new or others' ideas. He prefers to play a paternal role towards others. He is insecure about himself, and is rigid or intolerant to ambiguity.

Analysis of Question 1.2.a What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their self-perception?

Perceptions of Self In the Past In the factor termed "Sense of Value," the majority (14) of the respondents tended to be more oriented to self. Their satisfaction came from being able to learn something from the experience either by self or with others (see Table 5.13). Examples of these are:

"What I enjoyed the most was to understand development from a Christian point of view. I learned to articulate, and struggled along with my colleagues who had different background and orientations."

"The most satisfying experience as xx Director was to participate in xxx [conference]. It exposed me to the entire partnership of Agency. It taught me a comprehensive picture of the partnership and a better understanding of the struggles that SOs have gone through in fund raising."

"My time in xx was the most satisfying and learning experience for me. Most of my experiences and knowledge of development came from those days. We tried to put all those things that we learned into practice. And we tried some innovative experimental things and found ways of encouraging people."

Table 5.13 Comparison Among Responses on Sense of Value, Sense of Identity, and View Toward Work Role with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then and Now

FACTORS/ DESCRIPTORS	(DA)		(da)		(dA)		(Da)		TOTAL	
	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now
SENSE OF VALUE										
Self-Oriented	1	2	5	2	3	5	5	3	14	12
Other-Oriented	4	3	0	3	3	1	0	2	7	9
SENSE OF IDENTITY										
Internal Source	5	2	5	6	6	4	5	2	21	14
External Source	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	3	1	8
VIEW TOWARD ROLE										
Flexible View	1	2	3	6	3	4	1	2	8	14
Rigid View	4	3	3	6	3	2	4	3	14	8

The others (7) tended to be other-oriented in bringing them satisfaction. Some of these are:

"When I was the xx Director, it gave me an opportunity to get back to the field and to multiply the development ideas that I have by developing the area coordinators."

"The most satisfying experience that I had was working with field staff. I watched the transformation taking place in individual and carried that out in the community. I like to watch them to do it in community."

In the factor termed "Sense of Identity," the majority (21) of respondents tended to depend very much on their own evaluation of the experience, that is, depending on self-actualizing force rather than through the affirmation of others (see Table 5.13).

"I was very satisfied with my previous role as a manager. I delegated as much as possible and always wanted to encourage the national staff to take on more responsibilities."

"When I worked with the community people, I discussed with them to move from self-owned benefits to sharing them with those who don't have. I was glad to see that the community was willing to share what they have with others."

"I became satisfied when I saw people grow and change through my involvement."

In the factor termed "View Toward Role," 14 of the respondents had a rigid view toward their role on the job. They were frustrated or uncomfortable in facing those ambiguous situations (Table 5. 13).

"My role in xx was ambiguous and I felt not being valued by my boss."

"I felt I had a lot of responsibilities to ensure that the program was moving to the right direction, but I had no authority. I didn't feel good because responsibility must come with authority."

"When I was a teacher, I behaved like a teacher who knew everything... When I (had a different position,) I was a leader fully responsible for the life of the villagers. I didn't like my last job at all, because I was not clear on my job."

8 of the respondents tended to have a flexible view toward their roles on the job. They tended to see their role beyond what was given in a formal sense. Some were comfortable even though their roles seem ambiguous to self and to others.

"When I was in management, my role was a matter of 80-20 management and technical differences. To me it can be adjusted. I have always considered myself a supporter, encourager, a promoter, and a resourcer."

"When I was in management, my role was a matter of 80-20 management and technical differences. To me it can be adjusted. I have always considered myself a supporter, encourager, a promoter, and a resourcer."

"My role in (xx office) had never been clear to me. Even though I was in a management role, I didn't perceive myself as a manager or technical person... People always perceived me as a person with an ambiguous role. But I wasn't bothered by it. I was concerned only about my learning from other people."

"In my early years with the Agency, I was being perceived as a rebel, resisting system and authority. But that didn't bother me. Though I was in a managerial position, I didn't perceive myself as a manager. Rather I was a communicator... I viewed myself as a mirror by asking questions to help people think through what they are doing."

Perceptions of Self In the Present In general, the respondents did not change much in their "Sense of Value." The 12 responses indicate that the majority of respondents' are still very much self-oriented, i.e., interested in self learning or learning with others (See Table 5.13). 9 respondents suggested to be other-oriented.

In the factor termed "Sense of Identity," a shift is evident. The number of respondents who depended on external sources for a sense of identity increased from 1 (in the past) to 8 (in the present). Examples of those who have become dependent on the affirmation of others are as follows:

"The learning event in ... was very satisfying to me because we worked as a team whole-heartedly. We built on our optimism and learning attitude. And we began to receive positive feedback from FOs. We realize that we are getting somewhere with high trust low power structure."

"The most satisfying experience was that I actually saw the materials that we developed worked. I felt I had done extremely well. It was well received and they requested to have more of it."

"I was asked to run a conference... I did an action/reflection for all the directors... It was the time I felt I was not in control especially I could not get the response that I expected. I didn't feel too bad

about it because I received good strokes from many people for my new approach."

In the factor termed "View Toward Role," 14 respondents have a flexible view toward their work roles in comparison to 8 in the past. Some of their statements are as follows:

"I see myself facilitating my staff to accomplish the task, helping them making use of their time to learn in their own development, but being reflective for spiritual growth."

"By the nature of being committed to community organizing and development of people, I was put increasingly in a prophetic role rather than priestly role."

The other 8 respondents exhibited a rigid view toward their work role.

Examples of their statements are as follows:

"My new role is clearly defined. I am now handling projects in ... (country) directly... working with community people, monitoring the projects and doing budget for the whole country."

"I came to (The Agency) as a leader. And if my leadership is not looked up as serious, then maybe I should look somewhere else. I am not here to push paper and ideas."

"In (The Agency,) I don't know what is expected of me. My role and function are unclear."

"I am not a gifted manager managing others to work. I prefer to be an encourager, enabler and a teacher."

In summary, in the factor termed "Sense of Value," the majority of the respondents continued to be self-oriented. A shift occurred in "Sense of Identity" where a number of respondents moved toward depending more on other sources for a sense of identity. There is an evident movement from a previous rigid view toward role to the current more flexible view toward role."

Analysis of Question 1.2.b Is the shift in self-perception evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?

In Table 5.13, the responses show that (da) and (Da) groups have shifted more to an others-oriented view in "Sense of Value," while the (dA) moved to a more self-oriented view. The (DA) group did not show much evidence of a move.

In the factor termed "Sense of Identity," all three groups -- (DA), (dA) and (Da) are moving toward an affirmation of external sources for their sense of identity, while all the (da) are dependent on internal sources for their sense of identity.

In the factor termed "View Toward Role," (DA) and (Da) remained quite the same with a rigid view, while (da) and (dA) seem to be moving toward a more flexible view toward their work role.

In summary, (da) and (Da) have shifted in their "Sense of Value", joining the majority of (DA) and (dA) who continue to be other-oriented. In the "Sense of Identity", the shift is evident in (DA), (Da), and (dA) toward depending on external sources. But (da) remain dependent on internal sources. The shift is also evident in (da) and (dA) who move toward a more flexible view toward role, while (DA) and (Da) remain essentially the same with a "rigid view" toward role.

Interpersonal Relationships

The category of interpersonal relationships refers to the way a person interacts or relates with others. The factors defined in this category emerged from respondents' answers to the interview questions: "How did you perceive others on the job then and now?" and "How did you relate with others on the job then and now?" The following factors were grouped together to form the category of interpersonal relationship:

- * View Toward Others
- * Interaction Mode

The factor termed "View Toward Others" refers to the binary descriptors of a positive and negative view towards the people that they encountered on the job. It ranges from the basic view of people in general to specific individuals with whom the respondents worked, including supervisors, colleagues in the same office, field staff, and community people. Those who have a positive view towards others tend to have a basic belief in people as self-directed persons. They value people for who they are, accept their weaknesses, and regard them as peer or co-learners. Those who have a negative view towards others tend to view people as dependent, immature, and other-directed persons. They emphasize the external influence on the individual, and are more judgemental about what and how they do things.

The factor termed "Interaction Mode" refers to the binary descriptors of the process of interaction: reciprocal and linear interaction. People, who tend to be reciprocal in relating with others as peers, enjoy a 'give and take' relationship. They are open to others experiences, are more supportive, but are less directive. They try to understand others or situations by asking. Those who tend to be linear in relating with others enjoy only a one-way relationship, i.e., giving and influencing others as an authority. They are closed to others' experience, and are competitive. They are more directive in telling others what to do.

A person who has a positive view towards others and relates to others in a reciprocal manner imply that he is relational or that he prefers a non-directional relationship. The person who has a negative view toward

others and relates to others in a linear manner implies that he tends to be task-oriented and prefers a directional relationship.

Analysis Question 1.3.a What changes (if any) do intercultural development facilitators experience in their interpersonal relationship?

Interpersonal Relationships In the Past In the factor termed "View Toward Others," 13 respondents held a positive view toward others while 9 tended to be negative (see Table 5.14).

Table 5.14 Comparison Among Responses on View Toward others and Interaction Mode with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then and Now

FACTORS/ DESCRIPTORS	(DA)		(da)		(dA)		(Da)		TOTAL	
	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now
VIEW TOWARD OTHERS										
Positive View	3	5	3	6	4	5	3	4	13	20
Negative View	2	0	3	0	2	1	2	1	9	2

INTERACTION MODE										
Reciprocal	1	4	1	6	1	5	1	2	4	17
Linear	4	1	5	0	5	1	4	3	18	5

Those who held positive view toward others expressed those views in the following ways:

"I always feel that field people know more about the field situation than those who are afar, such as IO or ROs... People are aware of their own environment and have that ability to do or change that environment."

"I respect people's own ability and realize the tremendous resources they have in themselves."

"I always believe in the ability of people to work together and solve their problems."

Those who were negative held the views that:

"People in my department had very strong personalities. I felt that none of them had real training background to do a good job."

"People need confidence and belief in them from others. It was an ongoing process to believe in people. My role was to watch and help them grow their wings and watch them fly. With my staff, I was not sure if they could figure out the same way as I did."

"I used to see people as ones who didn't have skills, lack of motivation to do something for their situation. They were almost like little children. They needed to be helped."

In the factor termed "Interaction mode," the majority of them (18) interacted with others in a linear manner. Only 4 respondents interacted in a reciprocal way. Those who interacted in a linear way made the following statements:

"I respected my boss and I used to obey his instructions, even if I didn't agree with him sometimes. My staff are my brothers and sisters. But my pushiness sometimes strained our relationship. I tended to be more telling than asking."

"I always like to have direct contact with community people. But I was kind of immature, bossy. The job gave me a powerful feeling that tended to make a person bossy... I wanted to succeed in order to be rewarded. Therefore I tried to accomplish the task within the time frame set by my boss. But my relationship with the community was hurt."

"I was a leader, a mother, and a teacher to my staff. But I was angry with them because I had to do all the work for them."

"I tended to be action-oriented and tried to fix problems for others. I rarely let my feeling regarding others show... I was very much a loner."

Interpersonal Relationships In the Present The number of respondents who have a positive view toward others have been increased from 13 in the past to 20 in the present (see Table 5.14). Some of their views are as follows:

"People are independent who have to define their own goals for growth. No one can decide for them what they want to be."

"People are on their own pilgrimage of change. It begins in a person's inner self before any change can take place."

"I do not view people as I did before... People have different gifts. There is an heuristic movement in individual when they are more open to ideas and move faster."

In the factor of "Interaction mode," there is an evident movement from a linear approach to a reciprocal approach. Other than the 5 who interact in linear way, the number of respondents in the reciprocal interaction have increased from 3 in the past to 17 in the present. The following expressed some of their views in relating with others:

"We, as a team, put our whole heart in the learning event... We reflected, networked, managed learning event together... There is very little dissonance between our spiritual life, and life of facilitators in development process. There is a unity and a sense that God is using us."

"Building trust in relationships and understanding the reciprocal nature of a relationship are critical. My way of interacting with others are not much different than before. But I am now more patient, allowing more time for trust, for relationships to build and to respect the in-built pace of life."

"I start with building the relationship first. To me, the relationship is more important than whether one is in a "line" or "staff" position... I related with FOs in a sort of interactive way, trying to find a mutual interest by asking hard questions."

"I developed a comrade relationship with my staff. I don't solve problems for them any longer. But I try to find a common group to deal with the situation."

In summary, there is a progressive transition in the factor of respondents' "View toward Others." They tended to be more positive. All the four groups seem to move in the same direction. In the factor of "Interaction Mode," all four groups move more toward reciprocal

interaction. The majority have moved from a directional relationship to a non-directional relationship.

Analysis of Question 1.3.b Is the shift in interpersonal relationship evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?

In both factors of "View towards Others" and "Interaction Mode," all four groups made the same movement toward the non-directional relationship: positive view of others and interacting in an reciprocal manner. The shift does not seem to be different among persons with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism, although the extent of the shift in (da) is greater than in the other three groups.

To understand the group's interaction better, the expert observer's rating on all the respondents' participatory behavior during the three-week conference was analyzed. The rating helped in the evaluation of the extent to which the person values a truly participatory role for himself. Table 5.15 shows the comparison of the expert observer's rating and the respondent's dogmatism and authoritarian scores.

Table 5. 15 Comparison Between Respondents' Participatory Behavior during Conference and thier Dogmatism and Authoritarian in Then and Now

EXPERT RATING	DOGMATIC/AUTHORITARIAN SCORES			
	(DA)	(da)	(dA)	(Da)
# of Low Participation 4	1	0	2	1

# of Medium Participation 11	2	2	3	4

# of High Participation 7	2	4	1	0

In comparing the factor of "Interaction Mode" with the expert observer's rating, Table 5.16 shows that 7 out of 7 respondents who value reciprocal interaction exhibited high participatory behavior during the conference, while 3 out of 4 who value linear interaction with others exhibited low participatory behavior.

Table 5. 16 Relationship Between Respondents' Participatory Behavior during the Conference & their Current Interaction Mode

EXPERT RATING	INTERACTION MODE	
	RECIPROCAL	LINEAR
# of Low Participation 4	1	3
-----	-----	-----
# of Medium Participation 11	9	2
-----	-----	-----
# of High Participation 7	7	0

The expert observer's rating on respondents' participatory behavior, in addition to the respondents' "interaction mode," seems to indicate that (da) tend to value a truly participatory role for themselves.

Work Style

The Work style category refers to the operating style of a person exhibited on the job. The factor defined in this category emerged from the question: "How did you accomplish your task then and now?" The only factor in this category is "Operating Mode."

"Operating Mode" refers to the binary descriptors of facilitating and dominating mode of the respondents on the job. Facilitating style refers

to a person who values group wisdom and group participation. He involves staff or learners in the decision making process. He tends to be informal and process oriented. Dominating style refers to a person who is oriented to authority where decision making and transmittal technique by the authority is emphasized. He tends to be formal and content-oriented.

Analysis of Question 1.4.a What changes (if any) do intercultural change agents experience in their work style?

Work Style In the Past The majority of the respondents (16) tended to operate in a dominating style, while 6 operated more in a facilitative style (see Table 5.17).

Table 5.17 Comparison Among Responses on Operating Mode with Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores in Then & Now

FACTORS/ DESCRIPTORS	(DA)		(da)		(dA)		(Da)		TOTAL	
	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now	Then	Now
OPERATING MODE										
Facilitating	1	2	2	5	1	5	2	3	6	15
Dominating	4	3	4	1	5	1	3	2	16	7

Several persons described their dominating style as follows:

"My training approach in the past was pretty top down. I focused on what we at the (RO) felt was important for fields... I felt I had the license to go in the fields whether people like it or not... I went to the fields to help, but with my own agenda."

"I had to work through staff and facilitate staff to do their work. It was very difficult. I know how I could figure out but was not sure how my staff could figure out. So I did it myself for the first time in order to show others how to do it... It was very hard for me to let others do the job that I had never done before."

"When I was in a managerial position, I analyzed and made a decision. Once the decision was done, I communicated right away with my staff to cut down any misunderstanding."

"My training approach in the past was a 'classical university model'. People needed to be given new ideas through lectures and the source of information was important."

Work Style In the Present The majority of the respondents (15) were more inclined to facilitating behavior, while 7 operate in a dominating manner. Some of those who have shifted to facilitating behavior expressed the following:

"Now we visit the field with close coordination with clear objectives. We go because we are asked by the field. And we don't go if we are not asked."

"I experienced that real learning is relational rather than content. I moved from formalized to more informal relational teaching approach."

"I am now more in favor of cooperative action than a confrontational approach. I learned to build a coalition of the power and the powerless in the whole decision making process intensively. It is not the powerful doing for the powerless. I see a much more healthy and Christian atmosphere happening. What occurs is an attitude of cooperation."

"Now my training approach has changed from solely giving information to a mixture of things or a cycle of learning, such as starting with information for them to think about, asking them for the application, and then discussing and sharing of reflection on what they did. I believe that learning takes place with a mixture of group sharing and with input from the teacher."

Analysis Question 1.4.b Is the shift of work style evident in people with high or low dogmatism and authoritarianism?

There was an evident movement of the majority of the respondents toward a facilitative working style. Among the four groups, (DA) tended to retain dominating behavior, while (da) tended to shift more toward a facilitating behavior.

In analysing respondents' current "Interaction Mode" with their "Operating Mode," the reciprocal interaction seems to be related to the facilitating working style (See Table 5.18).

Table 5.18 Relationship between Respondents' Current Interaction Mode & Operating Mode

GROUPS	INTERACTION MODE		OPERATING MODE	
	Reciprocal	Linear	Facilitating	Dominating
(DA)	4	1	2	3
(da)	6	0	5	1
(dA)	5	1	5	1
(Da)	2	3	3	2
Total	17	5	15	7

Yet, in analysing respondent's working behavior with the rating given by the expert observer during the conference, the results do not show any relationship between respondents' facilitating working style and their participatory learning behavior. (see Table 5.19).

Table 5.19 Relationship Between Respondents' Participatory Behavior during Conference & their current Operating Mode

EXPERT OBSERVER	FACILITATING	DOMINATING
# of Low Participation		
4	3	1

# of Medium Participation		
11	7	4

# of High Participation		
7	4	3

In summary, among the 22 respondents, 7 respondents completely shifted toward people-oriented development, positive self-perception,

reciprocal relationship and a facilitating work style. Among them, there were 3 (da), 3 (dA), and 1 (DA).

Four respondents who were people-oriented in development interpretation were more inclined toward a reciprocal relationship and a facilitating work style. But they either had a rigid view toward role or a tendency to depend on others to affirm their "sense of identity." Among them, there was one in each of the following groups: (DA), (da), (dA), & (Da).

Six respondents who were people-oriented in development interpretation were inclined toward either linear interaction (3) or dominating (3) work style. The majority of this group (4) have a rigid view toward their role and an increasing insecurity in themselves as they depend on external sources to affirm their "sense of identity." Among them, 2 were (DA), 2 (Da), 1 (dA), and 1 (da).

Possible Factors Relating to the Transition

The findings of Research Question 2 are again organized according to the categories of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. In understanding the possible factors that might be related to the shift, three similar questions were posed to the respondents when the shifts were noted by the researcher during the interview: "Do you notice the change in your ways of interpreting development, perceiving yourself, relating with others, and your working behavior then and now?" "How do you feel about the change?" "Why do you feel that way?" The possible positive and negative factors of the shift were identified from those responses and displayed in tables when a shift has occurred.

Development Interpretation

A shift occurred among the 22 respondents from production-oriented development toward a more people-oriented view of development. There is an increasing emphasis on individual attitude change, self-determination, and a catalytic role of the change agent.

Positive Factors Possible factors as identified by the respondents are displayed in Table 5.20.

Table 5.20 Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Development Interpretation

Factors	Frequency
1. Cognitive dissonance	10
2. Witness change in individual & community	9
3. Constant interaction with professional & practitioners	8
4. Personal reflection on previous experiences	8
5. Biblical understanding	8
6. Actual work experience with people in development	6
7. Reading	5
8. Further advanced studies in development disciplines	4

The most frequently mentioned cause for the shift by the respondents was the cognitive dissonance (10) that occurred in their early development experience. It triggered them to seek for a better development practice. The dissonance included their exposure to poverty, experience of unjust system, and the performance gap in their own work. Examples include the following:

"In ..., I visited villages, to slum communities, heard people talked. I began to realize that people's problem were related to exploitation...I later realized that the rich was part of the economic strcuture that encourage them to exploited the poor and I am part of it."

Nine respondents indicated that the witness of some good and bad projects, the change in individual and the discovery of community dynamic and their resourcefulness brought them a new meaning of development.

"A lady in the neighborhood was interested in what we were doing and became very committed to the activities. She became very verbal and expressed what was the real problem of the poor. She became a decision making body. The trainer would push her to develop her potential. She was continuously perceived by people as their spokesperson. I observed how a person gained self-confidence."

Eight respondents felt that their constant interaction with outside professionals and practitioners on problems and issues of development were helpful in rethinking development. The respondents indicated their reflective nature and a tendency to evaluate their previous development experiences. Another eight respondents mentioned that their new perspective of development was partly due to their better understanding of The Bible.

The other two possible reasons include actual working experience in development that gave them new insights and extensive reading to understand the problem of development.

In spite of all these experiences identified by the respondents as the possible factors of their shift toward people-oriented development, the majority of the respondents mentioned that several shifts had occurred in the past in their development conceptualization. It was through modification, integration, and re-organization of a continuity or combination of their experiences that brought them to where they are now.

Self-Perception

In the category of self-perception, the shift was not evident in the factor of "Sense of Value." But in the factors termed "Sense of Identity" and "View toward Role," there was an increasing number of respondents moving from dependence on internal sources toward dependence on external sources to affirm their self-identity. In the factor termed "View toward Work Role," an increasing number of the respondents have shifted toward a more "flexible view" of role.

Positive Factors Nine respondents have made the positive shift toward more security in self and flexibility in their view toward the work role. The possible factors related to the shifts are presented in Table 5.21.

Table 5.21 Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Self-Perception

Factors	Frequency
1. Learned by observing and comparing others' behavior	6
2. Spiritual journey	4
3. Gaining self-confidence	3
4. Discovery of own ability to operate in different modes	3
5. Guidance and advice from friends	2
6. Unsatisfied with previous relationship/performance	2
7. <u>Doctrinal/Authoritarian Scores</u>	
(da)	4
(dA)	4
(DA)	1

Among the 9 respondents, who either remained in the positive side of self-perception or have made a positive shift, the most frequently mentioned experience that may relate to their shift is their own "learning through observing, comparing and reflecting on other people's behavior."

The next most frequently mentioned experience (4) is the "spiritual journey" made by several individuals who became aware of their own weakness by looking inward and comparing their spiritual life with their work life.

"Gaining confidence" in self is another factor which was mentioned by 3 respondents. Three others mentioned their successful experiences associated with operating in a new mode, giving them new understanding of the facilitator's role.

In examining the 9 respondents' dogmatic and authoritarian scores, 4 were (da), 4 were (dA), and 1 is a (DA).

In general, most of the respondents, when reflecting on the possible experiences that might have affected their shift, tended to internalise their experiences by examining themselves inwardly rather than focusing on external influences.

Negative Factors The possible factors that may have negative impact on the shift in self-perception among the 11 respondents are presented in Table 5.22.

Table 5.22 Possible Factors Relating to the Negative Shift in Self-Perception

Factors	Frequency
1. Not being accepted, misinterpreted, not appreciated, rejected	7
2. Inflexibility/change of the system	4
3. Did not consider self have changed	4
4. Acceptance of authority or structure	2
5. <u>Dogmatic/Authoritarian Scores</u>	
(DA)	4
(Da)	5
(dA)	2
(da)	2

Of the 13 respondents who either remained (4) in the same, or have shifted toward (9) the negative self perception, the most frequently mentioned causes tend to be outside influences. Seven individuals felt they were being misinterpreted, not appreciated; four considered their situation a result of the inflexibility or changes in the system. Another four mentioned that they did not consider themselves to have changed at all. In analyzing these respondents' dogmatic/authoritarian scores, the majority tend to be (DA) & (Da).

Interpersonal Relationship

In the category of interpersonal relationships, a progressive movement took place among all groups toward a positive view toward others and relate in a reciprocal manner, although some still retain a negative view toward others and prefer linear interaction.

Positive Factors The positive factors that seem to relate to the 16 respondents, who either remain in the same positive view and interaction style or have made the positive shift, are presented in Table 5. 23.

Table 5.23 Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Interpersonal Relationship

Factors	Frequency
1. Experienced team spirit or a caring and supportive community (friends)	8
2. Had positive & satisfying experiences in building relationships with others	7
3. Better understanding of development	6
4. Lack of management support	4
5. Observed good and bad models in relationship building (supervisors)	4
6. Exposed to other cultures	3
7. Aware of people's ability	3
8. Self-examination	3
9. Spiritual journey	3

The most frequently mentioned cause (8) that has helped respondents to become more non-directional is working in a caring community where team work is encouraged. Seven mentioned positive and satisfying experiences in building relationships with others in a reciprocal manner. Six indicated that a better understanding of development helped them to relate to others better. Four suggested that the role they held without management authority forced them to use a non-directive, relational approach to work with people. Four mentioned that their supervisor had set good and bad examples for them when examining and reflecting upon self.

Negative Factor Six respondents seemed to maintain a linear approach in relating with others, although some of them had a positive view toward others. The possible reasons were not specific nor clear. Some of those maintained that they have not changed their way of relating with others. For those who have shifted, the reasons are again externalized, such as the inflexibility of the system, difficulties in adjusting to different expectations, and feeling of not being appreciated.

Work Style

In the category of work style, 15 respondents either retained a "facilitating behavior" or shifted from "dominating" work style to "facilitating" behavior. The possible factors are displaced in Table 5.24.

Of the 15 respondents who tended to operate in a facilitative manner, 10 mentioned the satisfying experiences that they had in facilitating others. Seven mentioned that acquiring facilitating skills and techniques was another factor. Seven others expressed the positive experience of

Table 5.24 Possible Factors Relating to the Positive Shift in Work Style

Factors	Frequency
1. Satisfying and successful facilitating experience without authority	10
2. Learned new skills and techniques in facilitation	7
3. Positive experience of team work and team support	7
4. Positive feedback on their facilitative training approach	
5. Discovered people's ability and learned from them	4
6. Reading	4
7. Worked with different people who have different expectations	4
8. More confidence in self	3

working as a team, and learning the facilitating skills from each other.

Six felt that the positive feedback, received on their training approach affirmed this approach as more appropriate.

Negative Factor Only 6 respondents continued to operate in a linear manner. The possible factors might include their previous experience as a leader, or their authoritative leadership orientation. Other negative factors include communication and theological orientation, and witness of the failure of high participation.

Summary Of Findings

In the identification of the transitional patterns of intercultural change agents in relationship to their levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism, the limited data tend to show the following patterns:

Demographic Patterns

1. American respondents tend to have lower dogmatic and higher authoritarian scores, while Asian and African respondents tend to have higher dogmatic and lower authoritarian scores.
2. Those who have longer length of time in development experience seem to have lower dogmatic and authoritarian scores than those who have less time in development.
3. The length of persons' cross-cultural experience does not seem to be related to their level of dogmatism and authoritarianism.
4. Those who formerly held managerial positions do not appear to be much different from those who previously held a staff position in terms of the levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Development Interpretation

1. Development seems to be conceptualized more from vicarious experiences than from academic orientation.
2. The development concept does not seem to be formulated at one particular point in time, but rather emerges gradually as experience accumulate.
3. Development consciousness tends to be triggered more often by an individual's cognitive dissonance than by external influences.

4. There seems to be a movement from previous focus of a production-oriented development interpretation to a more people-oriented interpretation. But the shifts in "process of change," "outcome of change," and "role of change agent" do not seem to be related to levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Self-Perception

1. In the factor termed "Sense of Value," there does not appear to be a difference in terms of levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.
2. In the factor termed "Sense of Identity," (da) tend to depend more on internal sources, while (DA) and (Da) are moving gradually toward external sources to affirm their sense of identity. Persons with low dogmatic scores seem to be more secure or confident in self than those who have high dogmatic scores.
3. With respect to the "View Toward Role," although there was a general movement toward a more flexible view of role, (da) & (dA) tend to have a more flexible view than (DA), & (Da). Persons with low dogmatic scores tend to be more flexible toward their roles than those who are more high dogmatic.

Interpersonal Relationship

1. There is a progressive movement from a directional relationship to a non-directional relationship.
2. Those who have a positive view towards others are more likely to interact with others in a reciprocal manner than those who have a negative view toward others.
3. Those categorized as (da) seem to value more a reciprocal interaction than the other groups.

Work Style

1. The majority are moving from a dominating operating mode to a facilitative approach.
2. Those categorized as (da) tend to be more facilitative and place greater value in a participatory role than the other groups.
3. The "reciprocal interaction" mode seems to relate to the "facilitative operating" mode.

Relationship of Development Interpretation, Self-Perception, Interpersonal Relationship, and Work Style

1. Those who interpreted development with a people-oriented emphasis tend to interact with others in a reciprocal manner and operate with a facilitative approach.

2. Low dogmatic persons (d) tended to change to a greater degree than the others.
3. Development interpretation does not seem to relate to a person's perception toward self.
4. Self-perception seems to relate positively to a person's interaction and operating mode. Those, who have rigid view toward role and are insecure of self, tend to interact with others in a linear fashion or operate in a dominating manner.
5. Self-perception seems to be one of the possible factors affecting one's interaction mode and operating work style.

Positive and Negative Factors Affecting the Transition

Possible factors that may have positive impact on the shift toward people-oriented development are as follows:

- * An individual's cognitive dissonance
- * Witnessing change in individual/community
- * Constant interaction with professional and practitioners
- * Personal reflection on previous experience
- * Biblical understanding

Possible factors that may have positive impact on the shift toward depending on one's internal source for "sense of identity" and toward having a flexible view of role are as follows:

- * Individual learning by observing and comparing people's behavior
- * Individual's spiritual journey
- * Gaining confidence in self
- * Discovery of ability in self to operate in different way
- * The shift tends to occur among people with low dogmatism

Possible factors that may have negative impact the shift toward depending upon one's external source for "sense of identity" and toward having a rigid view of role include the following:

- * Feeling of being underutilized, misinterpreted, unappreciated or rejected by others
- * Inflexibility or changes in the system as the main cause
- * Individual does not see change in self
- * The negative shift tends to be among high dogmatic persons.

Those who made the positive shift in self-perception tend to look at the causes internally within self, while those who made the negative shift tend to project the cause externally. Low dogmatic persons (d) tend to be able to examine the cause of shift internally, while high dogmatic persons (D) tend to project it externally.

Possible factors that may have positive impact on the shift to a non-directional relationship, (that is, a positive view toward others and interaction in a reciprocal manner) include the following:

- * Positive experience of a team spirit and a supporting community.
- * Had positive and satisfying experience in building a relationship with others
- * Better understanding of development
- * Operating without management authority forced them to begin with non-directional relationship
- * Observed good and bad models in relationship building

Possible factors that may have positive impact on the shift to a facilitating work style include the following:

- * Satisfying and successful experience in facilitating others in a learning process without a sense of authority
- * Acquired new skills and techniques in facilitation
- * Positive experience of team learning and team support
- * Positive feedback on training with a facilitative approach
- * New discovery of people's ability and learning from them

Summary

In this chapter, the data has been examined through a process of sorting, counting, and categorizing. All of the respondents were divided into four groups according to their dogmatic and authoritarian scores measured by the Dogmatism and the Directiveness Scales:

(DA): high dogmatism and high authoritarianism.

(da): low dogmatism and low authoritarianism.

(dA): low dogmatism but high authoritarianism.

(Da): high dogmatism but low authoritarianism.

The responses were then analysed through using a comparison between a "then" and "now" time frame and also among groups.

The findings were organized according to the two research questions and the sub-questions. In each of the questions, the data has been presented in the following categories: development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. In each category, binary factors were identified and analyzed in order to determine the tendency of worth. Through this process a number of statements of "tendency of worth" were developed in the data-sorting process and presented under Question One. The qualitative data are presented with the support of tables that indicated the number of responses in their "Then" and "Now" time-frame.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Literature and research in community development, adult education, and cross-cultural communication have shared an increasing concern regarding the effectiveness of intercultural development facilitators. With the "paradigm shift" in development, from the dominant or production-oriented model of the early 60's to the people-oriented development in the late 70's, intercultural change agent effectiveness is no longer viewed as just a matter of necessary knowledge and skills in bringing change. Personality and attitude have also become crucial factors for eliciting qualitative changes in others. The most cited characteristics of change agent effectiveness are related to levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to identify the significant patterns of transition that intercultural development facilitators have undergone that may affect their effectiveness in relationship to their dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics. The specific areas understudied are development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style.

The research questions asked in the study are as follows:

1. What are the patterns of transition that are evident in intercultural development facilitators in relationship to their levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism?
2. What significant factors seem to positively and negatively affect the transition?

An understanding of the change process of the intercultural development facilitator is important in its applied relevance to an agent's recruitment and training in development organizations.

A case study approach was used in the research to understand the change process of a group of 22 intercultural development facilitators in relationship to their dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics. All respondents were employed by the same development agency. The majority of the respondents had at least 5 years development experience in the Third World.

All the data were collected during a three-week workshop in Hawaii, held specifically for this group of intercultural development facilitators. Two standard instruments, the Dogmatism Scale and the Directiveness Scale, were used to collect quantitative data. A non-scheduled interview was used to collect qualitative data relative to the respondents' perceptions toward the change process in the following areas: development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. An Expert Observer's rating on respondents' participatory behavior during the three-week workshop was obtained to confirm and enhance their perception toward their own shift of interpersonal relationship and work style.

The data, which were examined through sorting, counting, and categorizing, resulted in the emergence of 9 factors associated with categories of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. The factors were compared in "then and now" time frame among groups according to their levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism: high dogmatic and high authoritarian (DA), low dogmatic and low authoritarian (da), low dogmatic and high authoritarian (dA), and high dogmatic and low authoritarian (Da). The factors were used in order to identify significant patterns of transition. Possible

factors that might relate to the positive and negative shifts in the 4 categories were also identified through a frequency count.

An interpretation of the key findings and the major conclusions will be presented in this chapter. Recommendations for practice and future research are also suggested.

Conclusions

The interpretation of the major findings detailed in Chapter V are presented in this section. The conclusions are grouped according to the main categories: demographic patterns, development interpretation, interpersonal relationships, and work style.

Demographic Patterns

1. American respondents tend to have lower dogmatic and higher authoritarian scores (dA), while Asian and African respondents tend to have higher dogmatic and lower authoritarian (Da) scores.

The researcher found that cultural factors may play a key role in determining the level of dogmatism and authoritarianism. Cultural experience prior to entering a new culture may be a significant determinant regarding how one interacts in a new culture.

2. Those who have greater experience in development seem to have lower dogmatic and authoritarian (da) scores as compared to those who have less time in development experience.

This statement suggests that intercultural development facilitators require time to accumulate various kinds of experiences to modify, integrate and reorganize their values, beliefs, attitudes and to reshape their behavior in their particular job setting. It is, therefore, an unrealistic expectation of the

intercultural development facilitator to adopt a new attitude or a new set of preferred behavior immediately in their development practice, or as a result of single training events.

3. The length of cross-cultural experience does not appear to be related to levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

The study data seem to suggest that intercultural development facilitators can live or work in a new culture for years, but may still remain aloof and detached from the nationals. Professional relationships might be preferred over developing significant interpersonal relationships with the nationals. Other factors of development facilitators' intercultural effectiveness should be explored further, instead of taking the length of time of cross-cultural experience as the determining factor of effectiveness. Further study, for example, might affirm that certain persons with little cross-cultural experience are more effective than those with much experience.

4. Those who formerly held managerial positions appear to be very little different in relationship to their level of dogmatism and authoritarianism from those who previously held staff positions.

Organizational literature tends to suggest that a major influence on an individual's behavior and attitude is the role a person plays within an organization. Tasks, authority, and expectations influenced what people do. It is also suggested that a manager in a formal organization tends to rely on proper procedures and routines and has the power to allow change to occur or to stifle change (Bryant and White, 1984). It, therefore, was predicted that managers would tend to have higher scores in dogmatism and authoritarianism than persons who hold staff positions.

Yet, the study data imply that this may not be the case. One possible explanation is because of the nature of development work with which this group of respondents are associated. It could be possible that they have learned through constant interaction with professionals and development practitioners so that their transition might have occurred in the past. It thereby causes their dogmatic and authoritarian scores to be lower than managers of other formal organizations.

Development Interpretation

1. Development conceptualization does not appear to be formulated at one particular point in time. It tends to emerge gradually through vicarious experiences rather than being learned abruptly in a formal academic setting.

In comparing this with the body of knowledge available in the development field over a period of decades, the concept of development has not completely changed, but rather has grown deeper in understanding because of cumulative experiences. This finding suggests that it takes time and process orientation for individuals to understand development in an affective way. An individual tends to go through a continuity of various kinds of experiences that allow him/her to reflect, remodify former beliefs, and reintegrate and reorganise the new meanings with their previous experiences.

2. Development consciousness tends to be triggered more often by an individual's cognitive dissonance than by external forces.

Development theorists in adult education share a common belief that each person has a period of transition when the individual is de-stabilized by things that are in conflict with their usual beliefs. The de-stabilization helps them to move from one state to another. They then enter into a period of stability when

the person is not changing but is consolidating previous changes or preparing for future changes (Erickson, 1976; Levinson, 1978; Gould, 1978). Freire (1973) suggests that greater awareness of the world around the person helps the individual to move through periods of greater consciousness. The ultimate state, that people should be moving towards, referred to as "critical consciousness" brings greatest stability.

3. Development interpretation toward a people-oriented model does not seem to relate to levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

Rogers (1984) and Zaltman and Duncan (1977) in understanding factors associated with the change process suggest that one of the key factors affecting individual action is the confirmation stage. Confirmation requires two steps. The first step is the initial decision to adopt or reject an idea. The second step involves behavior change expressed in repeated and continued usage of an innovation. The decision of continued action is called resolution making.

In the study, the (DA) and (da) tend to be moving in the same direction toward people-oriented development. One possible explanation is that this group of (DA) are in a stage of transition to accept new ideas. Yet to what extent the new interpretation of development is internalized and manifested in behavior is subject to further study.

Self-Perception

1. Respondents with low dogmatic score tend to be self-oriented and value experiences that benefit learning of self and/or with others, while the respondents with high dogmatic scores tend to be other-oriented.

If a person perceives that learning is as much a part of his life, he is more likely to enter into learning and achieve a higher level of intellectual performance.

The other-oriented person, who feels learning is only for others, will likely not actively participate in learning activities himself.

2. Respondents with (DA) tend to depend on external sources to affirm self-identity, while the (da) respondents tend to depend on internal sources for gaining a sense of identity.

Of the 7 respondents who made a shift toward depending on external sources, 6 were going through a role transition from a managerial position to a staff position. The majority of these 6 respondents have higher dogmatic scores.

The study seems to show that (DA) tend to be insecure as they enter a situation which has a high degree of novelty, uncertainty, or lack of familiarity. The new situation creates personal stress, which may be perceived by high dogmatic as a threat. They tend to depend more on external standards to affirm a sense of identity.

(da) tend to view self as an autonomous body, independent of others' control, and is secure even in a new situation.

3. Respondents with low dogmatic scores tend to be more flexible in viewing their role than high dogmatic persons.

Low dogmatic and authoritarian persons, who are secure in self, tend to be flexible in viewing their role and be more tolerant to ambiguity. A person with a positive self-concept is more responsive to learning and is less threatened by peer learning environments (Kloph et al., 1969). High dogmatic and authoritarian persons, who are insecure of self. They perceive their work role with specific

tasks and have less tolerance toward ambiguity. They are also less likely to enter cooperative or participatory activities willingly because they are often threatened by the team work environment.

Rigidity and intolerance to ambiguity imply the tendency of (DA) to remain closely oriented to conventional ideas. Persons who are tolerant of ambiguous situations should be more open to new experiences.

The above findings regarding sense of value, sense of identity, and view toward role seem to show that low dogmatic persons tend to have a positive self-concept. They are more responsive to learning and less threatened by a new environment or new roles.

Interpersonal Relationship

1. A person's view toward others does not seem to be related to the level of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

The literature tends to indicate that how a person views others will influence a person's interacting behavior. In the study, it is difficult to see the relationship, perhaps due to a small sample size.

2. Respondents classified as (da) are more likely to value reciprocal interaction than (DA).

(DA) tend to be threatened by peer learning and reciprocal relationships. In order to have a reciprocal relationship, one must have a high degree of openness and flexibility. (DA) may not have exemplified this as much as those who have low dogmatic and authoritarianian scores.

Work Style

1. Respondents classified as (da) have a positive view toward others. They tend to be consistent with the behavior exhibited in their reciprocal manner and

facilitating work style. (DA), although having a positive view towards others, tend to exhibit inconsistent behavior which is either dominating or interacting with others in a linear or directive manner.

2. Respondents classified as (DA) tend to show participatory behavior in a learning environment, but may operate using a dominating style when in leadership roles.

Other than the findings of the inconsistency of behavior exhibited in (DA), one possible explanation is that (DA) are slow in accepting new ideas. They require a longer period of time than (da) to integrate, test, and manifest new beliefs.

Possible Factors Relating to the Shifts

The experiences identified as possible factors that affect the positive shift seem to coincide with the adult learning pattern of change. Adult seems to learn in a cyclical manner, in which individuals become aware of the need for change, in ways that result in positive outcomes, finally consolidating and integrating the changes into the self. The awareness seems to occur more frequently to low dogmatic persons.

The experiences identified as possible factors that affect the negative shift seem to relate to a person's negative attitude. Individuals who reject the conflict beliefs and tend to externalize the problems rather than looking inward into self. (DA) seems to show such a tendency.

Summary of Conclusions

1. Development conceptualization does not occur at a particular point in time. Rather it tends to begin with an individual's self-assessment and occurs over a long period of time. A person is more likely to move into a new state when dissonance occurs.

2. (DA), although interpreting development as people-oriented, frequently have their interpersonal interactions and work style in conflict. (da) have a higher degree of consistency in their development interpretation, interpersonal interaction, and work style. It confirms Rogers' idea of the process of change that behavior will only take place when the idea is totally accepted at the resolution stage. For (DA), it takes a longer period of time for them to reach the resolution stage.

Adult learning principles suggest that the transformation requires that meaning, values, and skills be raised to a conscious level before being altered. It takes longer time for (DA) to change their behavior because it will have to be tested out in a safe place before being put into daily life use.

3. (DA) tend to relate with others in a linear or dominating manner when they have negative self-perceptions. How one perceives self does have a determining factor in the way one relates and work with others. (DA), when moving into a new situation, tend to be insecure and depend more on external standards to affirm their own identify. The rigidity, insecurity, and intolerance to ambiguity inhibit their willingness to accept new ideas.

4. (da) tend to value non-directional relationships and are more likely to operate in a facilitating work style. Although (DA) value non-directional relationships, they tend to become directional or dominating in their work style when they have negative self-perceptions.

5. The positive shift toward people-oriented development interpretation, and positive self-perception suggests that changes in adults depends, to a great extent, on the inward journey that an individual goes through. This journey includes cognitive dissonance, witnessing or observing changes in others,

personal reflection, the spiritual journey, personal interaction with professionals and practitioners, and gaining confidence in self. Most of the (da) tend to look inward in examining the causes of the shift.

6. The factors that may relate to the positive shift toward reciprocal relationship and facilitating work style depend, to a great extent, on individuals vicarious experiences rather than on formal cognitive influences. Some of those include positive experiences of team spirit and team support; building positive relationships with one another; better understanding of development; acquiring new skills and techniques in facilitation; experiences of developing non-directional relationships without using management authority; and the positive experiences to test out a new approach or behavior.

7. The factors that may relate to the shift toward negative self-perception are considered as external problems outside of the individual. Some people tend to look at the problems outward rather than inward. This may become an inhibiting factor to change. Most of the high dogmatic persons in the study tend to project outward in examining the shift.

8. The majority of respondents have undergone a positive shift in the area of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style. It is suggested that the majority of the respondents have experienced development for a certain period of time. They might have gone through the transitions before they are aware of them.

Another possible explanation for the shift is that the dogmatic and authoritarian scores of these respondents are relatively low in comparison to those found in previous research. It is highly possible that the majority of the respondents, tend to be in the medium range of dogmatism and authoritarianism

scores that they are rather open to new idea than those who have the extreme theoretical scores in dogmatism.

Recommendations for Practice

Recommendations are made for development agencies in terms of agents' recruitment and placement; the curriculum design for orientation and on-job training for effective development facilitators.

Recommendations for Recruitment, and Placement

1. In interviewing or considering potential candidates as an intercultural change agent, the following considerations are suggested:

- a) Understand a person's development orientation
- b) Understand how he perceives self in terms of previous work roles, sense of identity, and self in relation with others, in order to find out the extent of their sense of security, flexibility, and tolerance to ambiguity.
- c) Understand his view toward others, which includes clients, peers, subordinates, and the leadership;
- d) Understand a person's interaction and working behavior especially in cross-cultural settings. Other than knowing the length of time in cross-cultural experiences, it may be appropriate to understand their previous interpersonal relationships outside their job as well as professional relationships on the job.
- e) Understand the degree of openness and flexibility toward change in self by asking them to compare a particular working experience in the past and present.

2. Because it takes more time and energy for (DA) to take on a different set of behaviors, such as openness and flexibility, it is important to consider whether it is appropriate to place (DA) in facilitator roles, or allow (DA) to experience what it is to be a learner through a series of training experiences. The experiences will probably to emphasize both "unlearning" and "learning".

3. Since high dogmatic persons have less tolerance to ambiguity and a structured view toward their work role, consideration may be given to placing them in less ambiguous positions for better performance. Those who are low dogmatic may do well in position with higher ambiguity.

4. As individuals shift their work role, encouragement and assurances are needed from the work place to affirm individual value, ability, and their contribution to the work. Training is also needed to provide the necessary skills and knowledge that is specifically required for the new role.

5. To encourage team learning and facilitating behavior, it is important that such an environment be provided at the work place. Leaders or co-workers should serve as models of the learner and the facilitator so that such role behavior can be observed in normal daily activities. Creations and maintenance of a learning environment should be sought throughout the work place.

Recommendations for Curriculum

1. It is suggested that in any training event for intercultural development facilitators, special attention be given to four areas: enhancing development understanding, developing a positive self-concept, encouraging non-directional relationships, and developing facilitation skills.

2. It is suggested that the following objectives be included in training for intercultural development facilitators:

- a) To facilitate development facilitators in discovering, exploring, and creating personal meaning, values, and skills that they may use to facilitate their own and others' further learning;
- b) To facilitate development facilitators's self-concept and self-esteem, which contributes in a positive way to further learning;
- c) To facilitate the value orientation of the trainer to serve as a role model with a willingness to learn from the participants; and to develop a mutual supportive climate and trusting relationship within individuals and in groups; and
- d) To assist development facilitators in understanding their own personality dynamics because their interpersonal relationships and facilitating behavior will be in agreement with his inner attitudes. An example of this is to analyze one's own attitudes toward poverty, the poor, and often clients that they serve.

3. The emergence of development conceptualization implies a need of continuity of educational experiences that one can build on in order to deepen in understanding of development. It may be advisable to create situations that would help the individual to experience dissonance between what development ought to be and what development is. In other words, experiencing dissonance in a simulated setting might enhance their dissonance or critical consciousness in real situations. Some possible ways to raise the level of consciousness are through exposure to the process of brainstorming, analogies, games, role play, simulations, and case studies.

It is suggested that individual or group reflection time be included in the curriculum as a key component for an individual to reflect on his own experience and then discuss in a group some alternative action. Positive, educational experiences needed to be created so that the change can take place and reach an individual's desired goals or preferred direction, and then later consolidate and integrate the changes into other aspects of life.

4. Some methods to help (DA) unlearn previous experiences or behavior and relearn new behaviors are suggested. The study suggests that (DA) tend to externalize the causes of their situation, which contributes to inhibiting their own learning. It is therefore suggested that:

- a) Reflection time should be built into a training curriculum that allows them time to reflect on their own situation, and analyze why they behave the way that they do;
- b) Ask them to continually write journals that would encourage them to look more inward of themselves;
- c) Create a "dissonance situation" by confronting them with new information and requiring them to explore new sources of data so that they experience a new way of looking at old problems;
- d) Create a supportive working or learning environment where team learning and facilitation are encouraged and the role behavior of the learner, as well as the facilitator, can be observed;
- e) It might be appropriate, at times, to place (DA) in a position where there is no management authority, which may force them to experience non-directional relationships to accomplish the task.

5. To encourage positive self-perception, it is important to reaffirm those who are insecure of self as a valued member of the learning group; provide them with a supporting environment to reduce the feeling of rejection; provide a role model of a learner as well as a facilitator; enhance skills and techniques in facilitation; and provide a safe environment to test out their new skills before putting them into use in daily life, and to reduce the potential threat to the self.

6. To encourage facilitating behavior, the following approaches are suggested:

- a) Provide an experiential learning situation by developing a working environment where team learning and a trusting relationship can be developed and appreciated.
- b) Increase the flexibility of the person by putting him/her in two extreme situations to experience the fact that there is no definite way of handling things. For example, in situations where teaching may be more appropriate than facilitating; and
- c) To model learning and facilitative behavior. This includes: valuing the role of learners as an integral part of work, social, and family roles; valuing and using one's own past experience as a resource for current learning; valuing the role of learner as a responsible status within the group; and alerting the group to the facilitation approach that is being used during the process.

7. To encourage non-directional interpersonal relationships, the following methods are suggested in the work place or in a training curriculum:

- a) Role learning can be carried out through interpersonal interactions, modeling, and experimenting. It can be learned productively when such behavior can be observed in normal daily activities;

- b) Bible study should be included in the curriculum by Christian development agencies. It should encourage individuals to focus on their relationship building and facilitating skills comparing them with the skills used by Jesus Christ as a change agent: how he worked among the poor and the needy; how he developed relationships with others; and how he facilitated the learning of his disciples and others through asking instead of telling; and
- c) Enhance the understanding of the quality of justice in relationship. This may have a major effect on changing people in terms of how they manage relationships in a just way when they change their work role and work relationships.

Research Limitations

1. The small sample size of the study limits the validity of study findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
2. Some respondents' reluctance to express openly or admit their difficulties in interpersonal relationships inhibited the researcher from exploring further the specific experiences that seem to affect the transitions of their relationships with others.
3. The respondents tended to reflect upon experiences that occurred many years ago. This was partly because the respondents saw the changes beginning at that time; and partly because it might be less threatening for them to talk about past history than talk about recent history.
4. There is a lack of before and before measurement within a reasonable time frame to see the actual change taking place in individual.

Recommendation for Future Research

1. Because of the limited sample size of the study, the researcher recommends similar approaches be conducted with a larger sample size, but with the following suggested modifications:

- a) It is suggested that the "before and after" measurements of level of dogmatism and authoritarianism be taken within a shorter time frame. This allows more specific transition and experiences be identified through interviews in relations to dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics.
- b) People are generally reluctant and evasive in admitting their difficulties and problems in interpersonal relationships, especially to the researcher who is an insider. It is suggested that an outsider may be considered for conducting the interviews in order to avoid socially desirable responses. Yet, it is also critical that the interviewer have sufficient understanding of the background of respondents so as to be able to empathize with their transition. "A person's behavior has to be understood in context, and that context cannot be ignored or held constant" (Miles and Huberman, 1984:91).
- c) Instead of probing into personal past experiences in a direct manner, especially with in area of interpersonal relationships, it is suggested that indirect approaches be used to understand the transition. For example, respondents can be asked to interpret and describe their feelings toward such terms as, "leadership", "poverty", "peer or team learning", and "teaching" in their past and present time frame. Should differences be noted, the interviewer can then probe further on why

they interpret or feel differently toward those terms. This may reduce the possible hesitance of exposing self to others.

Another possible approach is to use stories or photos to show different interacting styles. Respondents are asked to interpret and explain them in the "then and now" time frame.

- d) With a large size of sample, extreme scores can be obtained to compare high and low dogmatic and authoritarian scores. It is also suggested that we further investigate the transitional patterns of those who have medium scores of dogmatism and authoritarianism. The researcher suspects that those with medium scores may be the most effective development facilitators because they have acquired both kinds of (DA) and (da) characteristics which may allow them to exercise appropriate behavior according to different situations.

2. Continue the study with a larger sample size to look at differences in development facilitators who have longer development experience vis-a-vis who have shorter time frame, to measure their level of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

3. Further study needs to examine the effectiveness of development facilitators according to those who are (da), (DA), or those who have medium scores in both scales in areas of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style.

4. Further study might examine the effectiveness of development facilitators according to geographical regions in order to identify the cultural factors associated with levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

5. Further study would be useful to understand perceptions of self when seen as a learner according to levels of dogmatism and authoritarianism.

6. Further study might shed light in the difference of behavior exhibited in learner's roles and leadership roles, according to level of dogmatism and authoritarianism. To be more specific, is there any difference in one's learning behavior and facilitating behavior in relation to level of dogmatism and authoritarianism?
7. Further study might involve examining the patterns of transition among development administrators in areas of work style. Is there any relationship between the integration of managerial and facilitator role with the level of dogmatism and authoritarianism? What experiences influence them to integrate their managerial role with their facilitator role?
8. Further study might want to explore factors other than the nine that emerged from the categories of development interpretation, self-perception, interpersonal relationship, and work style.

Summary

The study has attempted to identify significant patterns of transformation in the lives of intercultural development facilitators giving special attention to the factors that influence their effectiveness in relation to dogmatic and authoritarian characteristics. The study examined specific areas in the lives of twenty two intercultural development facilitators related to their development interpretation, self perception, interpersonal relationships and work style.

This chapter has presented a summary of the key findings and provided a list of operational recommendations. In addition, a list of recommendations for future study is provided. It is hoped that the recommendations and the lessons learned in the study will be useful to individuals as well as agencies who are

interested in improving the effectiveness of recruitment and training programs for intercultural development facilitators.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Development Interpretation

1. When do you think your first notion of development came from?
2. Can you recall in the early years your own shift of awareness in development? What specific experiences that caused the shift?
3. How did you describe "development" then?
4. Do you describe "development" the same way as you did before?
5. Are you aware of the changes and why?

Self-Perception

1. What was your most satisfying experience on your previous job?
2. What is your most satisfying experience on your current job?
3. How did you describe yourself on your job in the past?
4. How do you describe yourself now?
5. Are you aware of the changes and why?

Interpersonal Relationship

1. How did you perceive others on the job in the past?
2. How do you perceive others on the job now?
3. How did you relate with others on the job in the past?
4. Do you notice the change in your ways of relating with others now?
5. How do you feel about the changes, and why?

Work Style

1. How do you accomplish your task?
2. Do you always operate it this way? How was it different from the past?
3. How do you feel about the changes and why?

APPENDIX B

DOGMATISM SCALE

D SCALE

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

Please mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| +1 I AGREE A LITTLE | -1 I DISAGREE A LITTLE |
| +2 I AGREE ON THE WHOLE | -2 I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE |
| +3 I AGREE VERY MUCH | -3 I DISAGREE VERY MUCH |

Score

- _____ 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
- _____ 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
- _____ 3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
- _____ 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
- _____ 5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
- _____ 6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
- _____ 7. Most people just don't give a "dam" for others.
- _____ 8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problem.
- _____ 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
- _____ 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- _____ 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

- _____12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- _____13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
- _____14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- _____15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- _____16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- _____17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- _____18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- _____19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- _____20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- _____21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- _____22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- _____23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
- _____24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- _____25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- _____26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he concerns primarily his own happiness.
- _____27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

- _____28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
- _____29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
- _____30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- _____31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he is wrong.
- _____32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- _____33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays are not worth the paper they are printed on.
- _____34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- _____35. It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what is going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
- _____36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- _____37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- _____38. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what is going on.
- _____40. Most people just don't know what is good for them.

APPENDIX C

DIRECTIVENESS SCALE

RAY'S SCALE

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

Please mark each statement in the left margin according to your response, YES (Y), NOT SURE (NS), NO (N)), to each question.

- _____ 1. Are you the sort of person who always likes to get his own way?
- _____ 2. Do you tend to boss people around?
- _____ 3. Do you like to have things "just so"?
- R _____ 4. Do you tolerate foolish people easily?
- R _____ 5. Do you think one point of view is as good as another?
- _____ 6. Are you often critical of the way other people do things?
- _____ 7. Do you like people to be definite when they say things?
- _____ 8. Does incompetence irritate you?
- R _____ 9. Do you dislike having to tell others what to do?
- R _____ 10. If you are told to take charge of some situation does this make you feel uncomfortable?
- R _____ 11. Would you rather take orders than give them?
- R _____ 12. Do you dislike standing out from the crowd?
- R _____ 13. Do you find it difficult to make up your own mind about things?
- _____ 14. If anyone is going to be supervisor would you rather it be you?
- R _____ 15. Do you give in to other people rather easily?
- _____ 16. Do you tend to dominate the conversation?
- R _____ 17. Do you let your wife (or husband, as the case may be) et his/her own way most of the time?
- R _____ 18. Are you generally a follower rather than a leader?

- _____19. Do you like to make your own decisions without assistance from others?
- _____20. When you are going out socially, do you always like to have the say about where you will go?
- _____21. Are you a fast driver?
- _____22. Are you argumentative?
- _____23. Do you like being waited on?
- R _____24. Would you prefer to hear a lecture rather than give one?
- R _____25. Would you prefer to be a worker rather than a manager?
- R _____26. Do you very often accept advice from other people?

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM

INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM

Case #: _____

Location: _____

Date: _____

Interview Time: _____

1. Main issues or themes that emerged from this interview (impression and summary statements).
2. Summarize the information obtained (or failed to obtain) on the four categories from this interview.

Categories

Information

Development Interpretation

Self-Perception

Interpersonal Relationships

Work Style

3. Anything occurred as salient, interesting, illuminating or important in this interview? (Speculations, explanations, hypothesis, factors or variables)

4. Follow-up or new questions needed in considering the second interview.

6. Observation

Interviewee's tone

Hesitancy/positiveness of response, why?

General attitude toward interview

Location/atmosphere for interview

7. Possible ways to arouse more interest from the second interview.
8. Implications for revision, and updating of probing questions.
9. Additional information from the follow-up interview.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agency Publication, (1978). "Declaration of Internationalization."
- Agency Publication, (1983). "What is the Partnership?"
- Agency Publication, (1987). "Agency Fact Card."
- A.I.D. (1982). "Partnership in international development with private and voluntary organizations." Policy Paper. Washington, D.C.
- Adorno, T.W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. Levinson, R. Sanford, (1950). The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Row Publisher.
- Argyris, C. (1965). Organizational & Innovation. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- (1971). Management and Organizational Development. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.
- Biddle, W.W. & Biddle, L.J. (1965). The Community Development Process: The Rediscovery of Local Initiative. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston,.
- Bolling, L. & C. Smith (1962). Private Foreign Aid: U.S. Philanthropy for Relief and Development. Boulder Co.: Westview Press.
- Bosier, R. (1973). "Educational participation & drop out: a theoretical model." Adult Education, 23(4), 255-283.
- Brislin, R.W. (1983). Cross-cultural Encounters. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press.
- Britt, III, W.G. (1983). "Pretraining variables in the prediction of missionary success overseas." Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11(3), 203-212.
- Broom, B. (1981). "Facilitating attitudes and message characteristics in the expression of differences in intercultural encounters." International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5, 215-237.
- Brundage, D. & D. Mackeracher (1980). Adult Learning Principles and Their Application to Program Planning. Ontario: Ministry of Education.
- Bruner, J. (1963). The Process of Education. N.Y.: Vintage.

- Bryant, C. & L. White (1982). Managing Development in The Third World. Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press.
- Byrnes, F.C. (1963). "Americans in Technical Assistance: A study of Men's Perceptions of their Cross-cultural Experience," Unpublished PHD dissertation, East Lansing, Mi.: Michigan State University.
- Christenson, J.A. & J.W. Robinson (1980). "In search of CD." in J.A. Christenson and J.W. Robinson (eds.) Community Development in America. Ames., Ia: Iowa State University Press.
- Combs, A. (1962) (ed.) Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: ASCD 1962 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.,: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Cropley, A.J. (1977). Lifelong Education: A Psychological Analysis. Publication of the UNESCO Institute of Education. Toronto: Pergamon Press.
- Crow L.D. & A. Crow (1963) (eds.) Reading in Human Learning. New York: McKay.
- Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and Education. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Doob, L.W. (1947). "The behavior of attitude." Psychological Review, 54,135-156.
- Druckman, D. (1967). "Dogmatism, prenegotiation experience, and simulated group representation as determinants of dyadic behavior in a bargaining situation." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 279-290.
- Ehrlich, H.J. (1961). "Dogmatism and learning." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62, 148-149.
- Ehrlich, H.J.& Lee, D. (1969). "Dogmatism, learning, and resistance to change: A review and a new paradigm." Psychological Bulletin, 71, 249-260.
- Elmer, M.I. (1986). "Intercultural Effectiveness: Development of an Intercultural Competency Scale." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Lansing, Mi.: Michigan State University.
- Erickson, E.H. (1963). Childhood and Society. 2nd ed. New York: Norton.
- Erickson, E.H. (1976). Adulthood. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Etling, A. (1974). Characteristics of Facilitators: The Ecuador Project and Beyond. Center for International Education, Amherst, University of Massachusetts.
- Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern Organization. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Fayol, H. (1971). "General principles of management." in Pugh D.S. (ed.) Organization Theory. N.Y.: Penguin Books.
- Fessler, D. (1976). Facilitating Community Change: A Basic Guide. San Diego, University Associates, Inc.
- Fishbein, M. (1967). "Attitude & prediction of behavior." in M. Fishbein (ed.), Readings in Attitude Theory & Measurement. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. pp. 447-492.
- Foukles, D., S. Foukles (1965). "Self-concept, dogmatism and tolerance of trait inconsistency." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 104-111.
- Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: The Seabury Press.
- (1973). Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Continuum.
- Garcia-Zamor, J.C. (1985). Public Participation in Development Planning and Managemnt: Cases from Africa and Asia. London: Westview Press.
- Gordon, R.L. (1980). Interviewing: Strategy, Techniques, and Tactics. Homewood, Il. The Dorsey Press.
- Gould, R. (1978). Transformations: Growth and Change in Adult Life. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1954). Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Free Press.
- Goulet, D. (1971). The Cruel Choice: A New Concept of Theory of Development. New York: Atheneum.
- Gudykunst, W.B. & M. Hammer (1977). "Determinants of the sojourner attitudinal satisfaction." in B. Ruben (ed.) Communication Yearbook I. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction-International Communication Associate.
- Gudykunst, W.B., Y. Kim (1984). Communicating with Strangers. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Hart, L.A. (1975). How the Brain Works: A New Understanding of Human Learning, Emotion, and Thinking. New York: Basic Books.
- Havelock, R., M. Havelock (1973). Training for Change Agents. Ann Arbor, Mi.: University of Michigan.
- Haveman, L.J. (1981). "Non-governmental Organizations in International Development: Their History, Role, and Opportunities." Unpublished Masters Thesis. E. Lansing, Mi.: Michigan State University.

- Heaven, P. & A. Moerdyk (1977). "Prejudice revisited: a pilot study using Ray's Scale." Journal of Behavioral Science, 2(4), 217-220
- Hawes, F., D. Kealey (1979). Canadians in Development: An Empirical Study of Adaptation and Effectiveness on Overseas Assignment. Ottawa, 1979.
- (1981). "An Empirical Study of Canadian Technical Assistance: Adaptation and Effectiveness on Overseas Assignment." Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5.
- Homles, M.R. (1980). "Interpersonal behaviors and their relationship to the andragogical and pedagogical orientations of adult educators." Adult Education, 31(1), 18-29.
- Hwang, J., L. Chase, C. Kelly (1980). "An intercultural examination of communication competence." Communication, 9, 70-79.
- Johnson, B. (1968). "An investigation of the cognitive and defense aspects of dogmatism," Dissertation Abstracts, 26, 6838.
- Jones, D. (1968). The Making of a Volunteer. Washington, D.C.: Office of Evaluation, Peace Corps.
- Kamenske, G. (1966). "Some personality factors in attitude toward technological change in a medium sized insurance company." Dissertation Abstracts, 26, 4797-4798.
- Kelman, H.C. (1974). "Attitudes are alive and well and gainfully employed in the action." American Psychologist, 29, 310-324.
- Kemp, C.G. (1960). "Effect of dogmatism on critical thinking." School Science and Mathematics, 40, 314-319.
- (1962). "Influence of dogmatism on the training of counselors." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 9, 155-157.
- Kidd, R. (1959). How Adults Learn. New York: Association Press.
- Kiesler, C., B. Collins, N. Miller (1967). Attitude Change: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Approaches. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons. Inc.
- Kindervatter, S. (1978), Nonformal Education as an Empowering Process. Center for International Education. Amherst, Ma.: University of Massachusetts.
- Klein, M.H. (1977). "Adaptation to new cultural environments." in D. Hoopes, et al. (eds.) Overview of Intercultural Education, Training and Research. Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.
- Klopf, G.J., G. Bowman, and A. Joy (1969). A Learning Team: Teacher and Auxiliary. Washington: Office of Education (DHEW).

- Knowles, M. (1970) Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy Versus Pedagogy. New York: Association Press.
- (1975). Self-Directed Learning. Chicago: Association Press.
- (1973, 1985). The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Knox, A.B. (1977). Adult Development and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Korn, H.A., & N.S. Giddan. (1964) "Scoring methods and construct validity of the Dogmatism Scale." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 24, 867-874.
- Korten, D. (1984). "People-Centered Development: Toward a Framework." D. Korten & R. Klauss (eds.) People-Centered Development. West Hartford: Kumarian Press, Inc.
- Korten, D. (1986). "Private aid enters third phase." Development Forum. June:14.
- Lemon, N. (1973). Attitudes and Their Measurement. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Levinson, D.J. (1978). The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Lewin, K., R. Lippitt, R. White (1939) "Pattern of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates." Journal of Social Psychology, 10, 271-99.
- Lichtenstein, E., R. Quinn, & G. Hover (1961). "Dogmatism and acquiescent response set." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 636-638.
- Long, B.H., & R.C. Ziller (1965). "Dogmatism and predecisional information search." Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 376-378.
- March, J.G. & H.A. Simon (1971). "The Dysfunctions of Bureaucracy." in D.S. Pugh (ed.) Organization Theory. New York: Penguin Book.
- Maston, R. (1966). "Holistic preparation of volunteers." Mimeo, Peace Corps, Washington, D.C.
- McGonigal, R.A. (1971). "A Model for the Cross Cultural Interaction Training of Adults." Unpublished PHD dissertation. East Lansing, Mi: Michigan State University.
- Merton, K. (1940). "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." Social Forces. 18, 560-68.

- Mezirow, J. (1978). "Perspective transformation." Adult Education, 28(2), 100-110.
- Miles, M., M. Huberman (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Beverly Hill: Sage Publications, Inc..
- Montgomery, J. (1972). "Allocation of authority in land reform programs." Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 62-75.
- Nyerere, J. (1976). "Liberated Man: The Purpose of Development." Convergence, 9(4), 9-16.
- O'Gorman, F. (1978). Roles of Change Agents in Development. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Pavey, S. (1962). "The effect of failure on future time perspective in open and closed belief systems." Dissertation Abstracts, 22, 3741-3742.
- Plant, W., C. Telford, & J. Thomas (1965). "Some personality differences between dogmatic and non-dogmatic groups." Journal of Social Psychology, 67, 67-75.
- Ray, J.J. (1971). "An 'attitude to authority' scale". Australian Psychology, 6, 31-50.
- (1976). "Do Authoritarians Hold Authoritarian Attitudes?" Human Relations, 29(4), 307-325.
- (1980) "Authoritarian in California 30 years later -- with some cross-cultural comparisons." The Journal of Social Psychology, 111, 9-17.
- (1984). "Alternatives to the F Scale in the Measurement of Authoritarianism: A Catalog." The Journal of Social Psychology, 122, 105-119.
- Ray, J. & F.H. Lovejoy. (1983). "The behavioral validity of some recent measures of authoritarianism." Journal of Social Psychology, 120, 91-99.
- Rebhun, M.T. (1966). "Dogmatism and test anxiety." Journal of Psychology, 62, 39-40.
- Restle, R. Andrews, M., Rokeach, M. (1964) "Differences between open- and closed-minded subjects on learning-set and oddity problems." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68, 648-654.
- Rigby, K. & Rump, E. (1981). "Attitudes towards parents and institutional authority during adolescence." Journal of Psychology, 109, 109-118.

- Rigby, K. (1984). "Acceptance of authority and directiveness as indicators of authoritarianism: A New Framework." The Journal of Social Psychology, 122, 171-180
- Rogers, C. (1951, 1962). Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton.
- (1983). Freedom to Learn for the 80's. Columbus: Charles E. & Merrill Pub. Co.
- Rogers, E. & Shoemaker, F. (1971). Communication of Innovations. (2nd Ed.) N.Y.:The Free Press.
- Rogers, E. (1983). Diffusion of Innovation. (3rd Ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1954). "The nature and meaning of dogmatism." Psychological Review, 61, 194-204.
- Rokeach, M. & B. Fruchter (1956). "A factorial study of dogmatism and related concepts." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53(3), November, 356-360.
- Rokeach, M., (1960). The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Rokeach, M. & R. Bonier (1960). "Time perspective, dogmatism, and anxiety." in M. Rokeach (ed). The Open and Closed Mind. N.Y.: Basic Books.
- Rosenman, M.F. (1967) "Dogmatism and the movie 'Dr. Strangelove.'" Psychological Reports, 20, 942.
- Rothman, J. (1974). "Three models of community organization practice." in F. Cos et al. (eds.) Strategies of Community Organization. 2nd Edition. Itasca, Ill.:Peacock. pp.22-39.
- Ruben, B. (1976). "Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation." Group and Organization Studies, 1(3), 334-354.
- Saltzman, G.A. (1967). "Programmed materials and school counselor development." Dissertation Abstracts, 27, 2077-2078.
- Sanders, I. (1958). "Theories of Community Development." Rural Sociology, 23, Spring, 1-12.
- Sarbaugh, L. (1979). Intercultural Communication. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden.
- Schon, D. (1971). Beyond the Stable States. New York: Norton.
- Schultz, T.W. (1963). The Economic Value of Education. N.Y.: Columbia University Press.

- Schulze, R. (1962). "A shortened version of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale." Journal of Psychological Studies, 13, 93-97.
- Schwarz, P.A. (1973). "Selecting effective team leaders," in Focus, 2, 2-8.
- Smith, R. (1982). Learning How to Learn. Chicago: Follett Publishing Co.
- Sommer, J.G. (1977). "U.S. voluntary aid to the Third World: what is its future?" Washington, D.C.: Overseas Development Council.
- Srinivasan, I. (1977). Perspectives on Nonformal Adult Learning. Boston: World Education, Inc.
- Stephenson, R.W., S. Benjamin, C. Erickson (1971). "Development of organizational climate inventories for use in R&D organizations." IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, EM-18, No.2.
- Stout, R. (1980). Management or Control. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Streeten, P. & S.J. Burki (1978). "Basic needs: some issues." World Development, 6(3), 411-13.
- Streeten, P. (1979). "From growth to basic needs." Finance and Development, 16: September.
- Thomas, T. (1985). "An introduction to participative planning." in Jean-Claude Garcia-Zamor (ed.) Public Participation in Development Planning and Management: Cases from Africa and Asia. London: Westview Press.
- Titus, H.E. (1968) "F scale validity considered against peer nomination criteria." Psychology Review, 18, 395-403.
- Torcivia, J. & P. Laugilin (1968). "Dogmatism and concept-attainment strategies." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 397-400.
- Troldahl, V., F. Powell (1965). "A short-form dogmatism scale for use in field studies." Social Forces, 44, 211-215.
- Torre, M. (1957). "Performance and adjustment of American personnel in overseas missions." Americans at Work Abroad. Syracuse: Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.
- Truman, B.C. (1986). "An examination of changing development paradigms as a mode for inquiry into the perceived roles and tasks of development workers in a voluntary agency." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Lansing, Mi.: Michigan State University.
- Vacchiano, R., D. Schiffman, R. Strauss (1968). "Personality correlates of dogmatism." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 83-85.

- Vacchiano, R., Strauss, P., Hochmann, L., (1969) "The Open and Closed Mind: A Review of Dogmatism", Psychological Bulletin, 71(4), 261-273.
- Vacchiano, R., D. Schiffman, R. Strauss (1969) "Factor structure of the Dogmatism Scale." Psychological Reports, 20, 847-852.
- Watson, D. (1967). "Introversion, neuroticism, rigidity, and dogmatism." Journal of Counselling Psychology, 31, 105.
- Weber, M. (1947). The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation. Free Press.
- White, B. & R. Alter (1965). "Dogmatism, authoritarianism, and contrast effects in judgement." Perceptual and Motor Skills, 20, 99-101.
- Wight, A., M. Hammons, J. Bing (1969). Cross Cultural Training. Estes Park, Colorado: Peace Corps, Center for Research and Education.
- Wight, A. & G. Casto (1969). Training and Assessment Manual for a Peace Corps Instrumented Experiential Laboratory. Estes Park, Colorado: Center for Research and Education.
- Wylie, R. (1974). The Self-Concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Zagona, S., & L. Zurcher. (1964). "Participation, interaction, and role behavior in groups selected from the extremes of the open-closed cognitive continuum." Journal of Psychology, 58, 255-264.
- Zaltman, G. & R. Duncan (1977). Strategies for Planned Change. New York, John Wiley & Sons.